U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 87—PART 12

MAY 20, 1941, TO JULY 14, 1941
(PAGES A2385 TO A3402)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1941

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

APR 2 '42

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

No Convoys: No War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD P. NYE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address of my own, delivered over the Mutual network on the evening of Wednesday, May 8, entitled "No Convoys: No War."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, the floodgates of war propaganda, flung wide open these last few days, are subjecting the people of our country to a frantic verbal whipping.

America's interventionists are on the spot, driven frantic by discovery that the people could not be moved by pleas for any aid in Europe's war beyond that which could be given without dragging us into the war.

In this frantic hour the interventionists are putting the people of America on the spot. This week, or these next few days, are to determine whether or not America is going to be in Europe's war, and the people who determine that are going to be the fathers and the mothers, the sons and the daughters of America. Determination of this critical question rests now upon the question of whether the American people will make their wishes heard.

I cannot believe that there are people listening tonight who are not aware of the fact that members of the President's administration and spokesmen for the cause of intervention are blitzkrieging the American people into this war. All possible pressure, accompanied by deception, is being brought into play to cause that great majority of the people of our land opposed to going to war to be fearful and quiet, while the organized interventionist minority strives to give the President reason to believe that there is overwhelming public sentiment favorable to our getting into Europe's war—at least, with our Navy—at once.

While the interventionists and the Cabinet members serve as shock troops, tossing their trial balloons, it is anticipated that the President will sit back and await tomorrow what is the public reaction to these proposals. If none but the organized interventionists pour their thoughts into the White House by letter and telegram now, the President may be given reason to say that he is forced to convoy by public sentiment. If, on the other hand, the American people will continue making their mind known, the result that accumulates in the White House can only be good.

This verbal blitzkrieg which has prevailed now for a few days was precipitated by discovery that the people are unqualifiedly opposed to convoying. The President knew it because his mail and telegrams revealed it. Everyone knows it who has contact with the people of this country. The interventionists know it and they now find it their last chance to drive forcefully and quickly for action which cannot be revoked but which will lead America straight to war.

This verbal blitzkrieg by the interventionists has been cleverly organized. Survey it for just a moment:

Down the road to war we have been going with assurances by our leaders that ours were steps "short of war." Hesitatingly, the people have gone along, approving repeal of the arms embargo, the unlawful dispossession of 50 valuable destroyers, peacetime conscription. On down the road to war we have moved, adopting the lend-lease bill, abandoning the cash-and-carry feature of the neutrality law, appropriating, as a first installment on our leasing and lending and underwriting of a foreign war, $7,000,000,000. All the way have the people gone, but always with the positive assurance that these were steps to keep us out of war, steps "short of war."

It was fair to assume that ultimately the request would come to use our Navy to convoy production intended to aid Britain through the dangerous war zone. But when, 2 weeks ago, the stage set for the "push" to convoying, the American people rose up in magnificient might, left no uncertainty in official Washington respecting their unqualified opposition to this further step, reminding the President that he had said some time back that "convoying means shooting and shooting means war." The people at that stage cried out "enough," and began demanding greater frankness on the part of American leadership.

The anger of those who were displeased by this showing of public determination found outlet through declarations by columnists that there was terrible and dangerous apathy over the country. This anger brought deception into largest play.

The Nation was told by the press one day that an administrative Member of Congress had said that it was reliable information that at least 40 percent of our aid to Britain was being destroyed before it reached Great Britain. It followed that we must convoy this aid. "What is the sense of spending $7,000,000,000 to aid Britain when 40 percent of it does not get there?" we were asked. This was unadulterated deception, and when motion was made last Wednesday to get the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to invite the authorities who knew what the losses were to give the committee and the Congress the benefit of their information, the administration forces upon that committee denied the motion. There was determination that not even the Congress should be given access to truth in this hour when men were driving us to war.

But today truth has its hour. Admiral Land, of the Maritime Commission, has advised the Congress that from December 31 to March 31, 205 vessels loaded with goods for Britain have cleared from United States ports for United Kingdom ports, that of these 205 vessels only 8 have been destroyed. A further disclosure is that in the months of March and April not one shipment of these goods from United States ports to British ports has been destroyed.

With that excuse for convoying smashed, what shall be stated by the interventionists as a sizable excuse for convoying now?

On the same day that this deception about losses was planted the anger of that hour found the President declaring that there might be Nazis in Greenland. Knowing the circumstances that surrounded that declaration, the only conclusion to be drawn is that the apathy of the people had to be met by frightening them into doing the thing against which their sober judgment dictated.

That was but the beginning of this blitzkrieg to move America into this war. These last 3 days have brought into the drive deception, incitement to fear, demands for immediate action, and organization to roll onto the President's desk a mighty telegraphic response from people demanding convoying by our Navy.

Three days ago came the headlines announcing that 17 so-called experts were agreed that we could defeat Germany. On the same day came the word from one of these grasshopper statesmen who hops to England and hops back, President Conant, that it was time for America to throw her might into this war on just the naval side. And on that same day the President let the headlines say, "America is ready to fight for democracy again." Yesterday the blitz continued, with Senator PEPPER tossing up his trial balloon, proposing that we grab Dakar and the Azores, bomb Tokyo, get tough. Only last evening came Secretary Stimson with an unadulterated demand to use our Navy to deliver aid to Great Britain through the war zones, and declaring that Great Britain "has

been accepted by us for a century" as having "accommodated our whole method of life" in America. No man knows better than Secretary Stimson the part that Britain played during this last century in striving to destroy our Union, and yet he would cause the people to adopt the theory that our very life depends upon Great Britain and her Navy.

Tonight the blitzkrieg continues, with Mr. Wendell Willkie's panzer division in a rally in New York, broadcasting a continuation of this spirit of hate and fear, and this demand for America to get into this convoying business without further delay.

Only when men lend their personalities to questionable programs are we entitled to deal with personalities. In this hour when personalities would drive America to war, I am not going to hesitate to speak clearly with respect to some of these personalities. It is time now to speak and to act, tomorrow may be too late; to be as bold as are the interventionists. This is the time to be demanding that American leaders keep their promises, write an end to deception. This is time to be turning our backs upon those who have condemned themselves as insincere leaders.

Many of you heard Mr. Willkie tonight. His purpose in this hour is so diametrically opposed to the one he pledged last fall that I insist that his appeal now is subject to question. It was Wendell Willkie who, last November 4, said:

"Let us remember that dictatorship always begins by asking the people to give up some law or tradition for some special reason. The reason given may even seem logical. The motives behind it may be honorable and sincere. But if you give in to such reasons, little by little the structure of democracy is taken away from you without your realizing it."

This was the same Mr. Willkie who was prevailed on in February to do his hop to England and back, just in time to testify on the last day of the hearings on the lend-lease bill, and appeal for this largest grant of power ever extended by a Congress to an Executive—the same Willkie.

During his testimony at that time Mr. Willkie was reminded of his campaign assertion of October 30, when he said:

"On the basis of his (Roosevelt's) past performance with pledges to the people, you may expect we will be at war by April 1941, if he is elected."

When asked whether or not he still agreed that might be the case, Mr. Willkie responded, "It was a bit of campaign oratory."

It was Willkie who, on November 12, with all call for campaign oratory gone, said:

"Mr. Roosevelt and I both promised the people in the course of the campaign that if we were elected we would keep this country out of war unless attacked. Mr. Roosevelt was elected, and this solemn pledge for him I know will be fulfilled, and I know the American people desire him to keep it sacred."

Could there be language more emphatic? Yet today we hear Mr. Willkie say things that have us wondering if he ever meant what he said when he expressed the desire to keep sacred promises that he and Roosevelt had made to keep out of war.

Let us be sure who leads these days, and that sincerity governs.

America, don't you see what has been happening, what is being done now? Don't you realize that here is concerted effort to drive against the determined will of the American people, to take this Republic of ours into another futile European war that involves no issues new to those that were involved in the last war?

It is time for the people who have a heart for the future of America to emphatically make known to official Washington, from the President on down, that all of this blitzkrieg by the Winchells, the Thompsons, the Stimsons, the Peppers, and the Willkies is not a reflection of popular faith and popular belief. It is time to be demanding frankness, the abandonment of deception, to be reminding official Washington of the promises it has made as these so-called steps short of war have been taken. Among other things the people should be reminding their President and their representatives of assurances that were given on September 21, 1939, when the President said:

"With the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict."

Remind the President, and remind your Congress, that these words of 1939 were accepted as being a sincere assurance to the American people, and that May of 1941 finds the people demanding reassurance on this score of keeping out of the fields of war.

One does not associate with people in the East and West in this land of ours without knowing that there is an overwhelming demand that our country stay out of war. All the beautiful words in captivity are not going to alter that determination so long as the facts remain what they are today.

Interventionists may go forth with their program of planting and fanning hate and fear, but so long as that part of our great people who constitute this overwhelming majority make it clear that they are for America first, the fanning and planting are to no avail.

To talk about carrying freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom from fear to all the world, in our time and generation, does not mean much when all the people of America know that there is a considerable portion of these freedoms not yet available to all Americans. The cause that takes America into these foreign wars again has got to be a better cause than that.

I am not one of those who believe that the President of the United States has been without knowledge of the steps that have recently been taken by interventionists and members of his administration to make it seem that public opinion is driving him to convoying and to war. There will be those who will insist that the President has promised to keep us out of war, therefore he will not let these interventionists drag us in. But let me remind you that however much assurance may have been given to the people by the President, that Mrs. Roosevelt so very recently gave notice that the President had never given any such assurance, or made any such promise.

Don't—I plead with you who hear me—don't let official Washington have any reason, after this pending blitzkrieg is ended, to believe that the people are for the purposes which the blitzkrieg has enunciated. Make yourselves heard, just as the interventionists are going to make themselves heard these next few hours, when with all the might of their organizations, they will flood the President with telegrams and communications which would give the President chance to demonstrate that he was being pressured into convoying, that public demand insisted that convoying be undertaken.

Americans, use the same machinery that your interventionist foes are using in this hour. It is the telling hour. It is the critical hour. It is the determining hour. Don't let the record of public expression that comes to rest in Washington these next few days be any excuse for a conclusion that the American people are for convoying, shooting, and going to war.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH H. BALL, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on Saturday night, May 17, 1941, at Minneapolis, Minn., over the Columbia network, on the subject of our foreign policy. The address is a reply to the America First spokesmen.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I welcome this opportunity you offer me to refute the defeatism and the confusion which the America First leaders have preached in this city and are spreading throughout the Nation.

It is to that duty that I humbly address myself tonight.

I remember well the first Norwegian Independence Day celebration that I covered as a newspaperman. It was a joyous occasion—an occasion for singing and dancing, for speeches recalling fondly and proudly that May day in 1814 when Norway declared her independence at Eidsvold, and adopted a constitution for free men and women modeled on our own American Constitution. It was a gay anniversary.

But I see no gayety, no joyous remembrance of the birth of Norway's independence on the faces before me tonight. Another date, a date of grim and ominous significance, has blacked out—and we pray God that its eclipse is only temporary—the memory of that older, happier date of May 17, 1814. That newer date is April 9, 1940, the day when Nazi warships appeared suddenly in Norwegian harbors, when Nazi warplanes darkened her skies, and when thousands of Nazi tourists whom friendly, peaceful Norway had made welcome, suddenly stripped off their sheep's clothing and were revealed as the hated Gestapo agents who repaid Norway's hospitality by driving a dagger into her back.

Many of you here still have friends and relatives back in Norway, for whose safety you are concerned. The 17th of May can never be for you a joyous anniversary as long as those friends and relatives are within the reach of the cruel and ruthless Gestapo. All of us join you in praying for their early deliverance, a deliverance that can come only if Britain succeeds in stopping the steady, onward march of Nazi barbarism.

That march must be stopped, or like the relentless tides of the ocean, it will engulf the whole world. And I, for one, would rather see it stopped and hurled back 3,000 miles across the Atlantic than to wait complacently until it laps against our very shores. I would not wait until it is our streets that echo to the fearful shriek of the air raid warnings, our cities that are turned into

shambles by bombs and fire, and our women and children who are forced to huddle in subterranean shelters like our prehistoric ancestors.

And just as Norway, Poland, and the other conquered nations cannot hope to regain freedom if England falls, so Sweden, Ireland, Finland, and the few remaining independent countries of Europe cannot hope to escape Nazi domination if England falls.

Tonight all of you are thinking of the homeland of your fathers across the Atlantic. Your thoughts are sad. But I know that you are also thinking of your own homeland here in America and of what the future holds for her in this hour of world crisis. It is of America's future I speak—a future that may hold the key to Norway's future also.

A little over 2 months ago Congress passed the lease-lend bill. It carried in both Houses by nearly a 2-to-1 majority after the fullest kind of debate and public discussion. I believe that vote reflected generally the will of the people of this Nation. By passing the lease-lend bill, the United States did two things:

First, it turned its back finally and completely on an isolationist foreign policy. It admitted that this great Nation is in the world and of it, that its interests are affected vitally by major events and upheavals in other hemispheres, and that henceforth we would use our tremendous political and economic influence in a positive fashion to protect our security wherever it was threatened.

And, second, this Nation declared that the defense of Britain and other free nations fighting Axis aggression is vital to our own defense, and that we therefore would aid those nations to the limit of our productive powers.

Subsequently we appropriated $7,000,000,000 to effectuate that policy.

I voted for that bill, and I supported that policy. I still support it.

Now, why did we, a great and powerful nation, suddenly decide that our security was threatened vitally by a war 3,000 miles across the ocean; so threatened that we passed this unprecedented law?

We didn't do it just because from the beginning our sympathies had been strongly on the side of the British and against the Nazis. Mere sympathy is not sufficient excuse for any nation to run the risk of war, and we recognized at the time that the lease-lend policy did involve grave risks of war. Only the strongest kind of realistic self-interest should ever impel our country to run such risks.

We took those risks because we suddenly realized that this war is not just another European war over the balance of power or commercial markets. We realized that it was the beginning of a world revolution, a revolution plotted and planned over 25 years with the most diabolical cleverness and ingenuity the earth has ever seen. Out of the brutal, ruthless past of mankind had stalked a man—Adolf Hitler. Make no mistake—he is not a madman. He is a genius, a great genius, but a very evil genius. His philosophy is that of the Dark Ages, when men made slaves of conquered peoples, when might made right, when there were no laws and the strong and cruel trod upon the weak and helpless.

To that barbaric and anti-Christian philosophy he has harnessed the great organizing and producing genius of the German people. He has turned the decent instincts of civilized mankind, their respect for laws and treaties, their hatred of war, into the weapons he uses to destroy their liberties, and into the chains he uses to bind them to his war machine. Because he respects no laws, no treaties, because his pledged word has been but a subterfuge to divert suspicion until he was ready to break it, he has enjoyed a tremendous advantage over the civilized men and nations who respected these institutions.

It had become clearly apparent to us that Hitler's aim was, and must of necessity be, world domination. This so-called European war already had spread far into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The Nazi legions invaded Africa, and the Axis acquired a partner in the Far East. We have Hitler's own word for it in Mein Kampf that his aims include the Americas, and his promises in that book are the only ones he has ever kept. Only last year a plot by his agents to seize control of one of our South American neighbors was frustrated. Furthermore, no conquerer in history, from Xerxes of ancient Persia to Napoleon in the last century, ever stopped his conquests until he was stopped by force. Xerxes was stopped at Salamis, Napoleon at Moscow. Shall we sit back and try to stop Hitler at New York, Baltimore, and Charleston, or possibly Buenos Aires and Brazil, or shall we help stop him at the cliffs of Dover?

We recognized this aim when we passed the lease-lend bill. We decided to aid the fight for freedom wherever it was being waged, and not to wait until all the rest of the free nations had fallen and we fought with our backs to the wall and the enemy at our shores.

The leaders of the America First Committee fought passage of the lease-lend bill to the very limit, and since its passage they have fought every move to implement the policy underlying that act. I believe and I trust that these gentlemen—Mr. Lindbergh and Senator WHEELER, and the others—are advocating sincerely the course they believe best for this Nation. I deplore the personal attacks on them and on their patriotism. But I believe also that they are creating serious national disunity which hampers our defense effort and threatens our security. Let's examine their position.

Fundamentally, they are still saying the foreign policy underlying the lease-lend bill is wrong and that we should abandon it and completely reverse our policy to one of isolation.

Actually, we have been opposing the Nazis on the economic and political front for more than a year. You know it, I know it, and so does Hitler know it. Our efforts have been intensified since the passage of the lease-lend bill. If we now reverse ourselves and quit, we not only throw overboard the faith of Britain and her allies, but we gain nothing from Hitler but his contempt for our vacillation and fear. Hitler would be only the more certain to attempt conquest of this hemisphere when the time to him seems ripe if we now, at the first sign of trouble, turn and run.

The America First argument boils down to this: Our present policy is heading closer to naval intervention, so reverse it and turn back. They say Hitler is a reasonable man and we can make terms with him. But even if we can't, we can still build an invulnerable defense for this hemisphere and defeat him if he attacks us.

If we accept their advice, we face two alternatives. One, and they admit it although they try to minimize it, is that Hitler, if he succeeds in conquering Britain, will attempt to gain a foothold in South America as the first step toward eventual conquest of this hemisphere. In that case, we would fight and we would go to war. We would fight alone. And we would fight here in America. Our cities would be subject to bombing attacks, our towns would be blacked out, and our civilian population would know the horrors of night air raids.

The other alternative, and this is the one they stress, is that we come to terms with Mr. Hitler. That is what Czechoslovakia did at Munich. That is what Rumania did, what Bulgaria did. Our terms probably wouldn't be as bad as those imposed on Rumania and Bulgaria—not at first anyhow, because we are much larger and potentially more powerful. But there would be terms—make no mistake about that. We would have to adjust our policies to Hitler's new world order. The adjustment might be slight at first, but it would be an entering wedge. And eventually, unless we rebelled at some period in the process and went to war, we would capitulate completely and some American Quisling would sit in the White House taking orders from Berlin.

Is that farfetched? Study their arguments, analyze them. They reiterate again and again that Poland was not prepared, that France, Yugoslavia, and Greece were not prepared. They say those nations were in no position to resist aggression successfully, and therefore they should have accepted whatever terms Hitler laid down. Then these defeatists declare the United States also is unprepared. Logic leads us inexorably to the conclusion that it is this kind of peace, the peace of Munich, toward which the America First Committee is trying to lead the American people. They would not make America first. They would merely make America the final victim on Hitler's list.

Those are the two alternatives offered by the America First leaders, and I reject both of them with all the emphasis at my command.

The job of stopping aggression is primarily one of production. And America has blazed the trail for the whole world in that field.

Our defeatists speak today in awed fashion of totalitarian efficiency. But who developed the airplane, the submarine, the telephone, the electric light, the radio, all the mechanical marvels of this modern age? It was free American workmen and free American industry. As long as we stand united, as long as our workmen and our industries strive shoulder to shoulder to do the job we have set out to do, they will outproduce all the slave labor in the world, and this great Nation need never appease the dictators.

Our forefathers traveled a long and arduous road toward freedom and civilization. They were told again and again by the defeatists of their generation that "it can't be done." And they proved again and again that it can be done; that defeatism, however useful it may be to Hitler in dividing his enemies, has no place in the lexicon of liberty.

We hear much about a negotiated peace with Hitler. How anyone can talk seriously of that in view of the plain facts of history during the past 2 years is beyond me. Peace treaties and nonaggression pacts are part of Mr. Hitler's war strategy. He makes them when they suit his purposes, and he breaks them whenever he is ready to march. There can be no real peace in the world until Hitler is stopped and hurled back, and then our best hope is that the civilized people of Germany, perhaps the army itself, will overthrow him and set up a government whose word would be worth something.

Here in Minnesota we have thousands of neighbors whose fathers came to this country from Germany. We know first-hand what a great contribution the industry, the thrift, and the solid common sense and democracy of these neighbors have made to the progress of our State. And so we are convinced that the slave system of the Nazis and their lust for conquest are not characteristics of the German people but policies forced upon them by leaders who have betrayed their trust.

The defeatists also like to go back into history and point out all of England's past sins. They claim this is not a war between democracy and nazi-ism, but a war to preserve the British Empire. And that is a very dangerous statement because it is half true It is true that England is fighting for her life, that the British Empire is fighting for its life.

But it is also true that Britain is fighting on the side of freedom against nazi-ism. The opponents of our present policy conveniently overlook that part of the truth. Their conclusion from this line of reasoning is that, except for our sympathies, it doesn't really matter to us who wins the war in Europe. And that conclusion is a deliberate distortion. To prove it, we need only ask ourselves: Why are we spending billions to enlarge our Navy and build an army today? Because we are afraid of Britain? No; because we are afraid of what the Nazis may do if the British Fleet falls. That is the ultimate answer to this half truth given such wide circulation by the America First spokesmen.

They attempt to convince the American people that we are aiding Britain solely for the sake of Britain. That is false. We are aiding Britain, not for Britain's sake but for our own sake.

And, finally, these defeatists make a great point of the fact that public-opinion polls in the United States show sentiment 80 percent against going to war now. They are telling the President and Congress that they dare not take steps they might believe necessary for the security of this Nation because those steps might lead to war and the people are against war and, therefore, it would be bad medicine politically.

Well, maybe these gentlemen of the America First Committee place the safety of their political skins above the safety of their country, but I do not, and I fervently hope and believe that the President and a majority of the Congress do not.

I know the American people don't like war and are against war. I don't like it and I'm against it myself. It's horrible and stupid and uncivilized. Nobody wants war.

But let us not permit our desires to blind us to the realities of the world today, even though we may not like those realities.

America must travel one of three roads.

We can reverse our present policy of aiding Britain and prepare to make the best terms we can with Hitler. The United States can journey to Munich and buy peace at any price.

Or we can abandon Britain to her fate and concentrate on preparations to meet Hitler's attack when it reaches our shores. That road leads to war, not peace, and to a war fought right here in America.

Our defeatists would lead America down one or the other of these craven paths.

But there is a third course. That course is to drive forward on the tremendous task of building an impregnable defense for this hemisphere and at the same time to use the great energy and productive resources of this Nation to help Britain stop Hitler on the other side of the Atlantic. That course involves grave risks, yes, but they are less in the long run than those on either of the other roads.

We of America courageously chose this third road when we passed the Lease-Lend Act. Our immediate objective is to assure the survival of Britain and her fleet.

The best information I have been able to obtain in Washington is that the administration now is doing everything it believes wise and necessary to carry out that policy. It may be that further steps will be necessary in the future to make certain that the guns and the airplanes we are producing reach the fighting men of Britain in time.

Only the administration has all of the facts as to shipping losses, the availability of American and British naval power, and the over-all military and naval knowledge on which to base decisions as to exactly what steps we should take from time to time to achieve our objective, the survival of Britain and her fleet. I believe the administration should and will take whatever steps are necessary to reach that goal. And we should not attempt to tie our Government's hands in this emergency.

The job ahead of us is a big one. Everyone of us will have to make sacrifices to do it. But we can and will do what is necessary to make sure that we hand on to our children intact our own precious heritage of freedom. No task is too great for the sons and daughters of those sturdy Americans who hewed this nation of ours out of a wilderness in the short span of 150 years.

Our America, which has held the torch of liberty for a hundred and fifty years, will never succumb to defeatism and extinguish that torch in this hour of world crisis.

The black tide of aggression and slavery that is sweeping the world must be halted. Only then can liberty be secure here in these United States. Only then can freedom and happiness be restored to the courageous peoples of Norway, Poland, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, France, Yugoslavia, Greece, Belgium, the Netherlands—all the long list of nations under Nazi rule. Only then can the people of Sweden, Finland, Ireland, and Switzerland, those little islands of freedom in Nazified Europe, retain their freedom and happiness.

Let us here in America, with a united will and determination, prepare to throw back this wave of barbarism if worst comes to worst and it laps against our very shores. But let us resolve, with the same united will and determination, to do all we can to hurl back aggression before it comes closer.

And let us now determine that when this conflict is over, we will join with all other freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples in the world to find methods of making certain that never again can the peace of this earth be shattered by the lust for power of a single man.

Thank you.

Home Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a talk I made on Wednesday night, April 9, 1941, from 11:15 to 11:30, over a Nation-wide hook-up of the Mutual Broadcasting System, entitled "Home Defense," and I respectfully request that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD immediately following the aforementioned address an article which I have clipped from the New York Daily Mirror under date of April 9, 1941, entitled "Green Blasts 'Reds,' Tie-ups by Minorities."

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen; may I say initially that I am indebted to the Mutual Broadcasting System for this opportunity to talk with you briefly this evening pertaining to home defense, which means national defense. That is one subject, of course, in which we are all greatly interested and are growing more interested daily, particularly when we take into consideration the fact that Germany has recently invaded another country, Yugoslavia, and, apparently without a great deal of difficulty, has penetrated all the territory southward from the German border to the very important seaport of Salonika in Greece.

In the early morning hours of April 9, 1940, the gray-clad legions of the German Army poured in a steady stream into Denmark, and from there they proceeded by plane and ship to Norway. On the morning of May 10, countless other divisions of the German troops invaded the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Belgium.

What followed is now history, but there are many in this country who, like myself, held to the belief that the quick conquest of Denmark, Norway, Netherlands, Belgium, and, lastly, France, was not due entirely to the might of the German panzer divisions or the great destructive forces of the Stukas and the hundreds of thousands of trained and well-equipped infantry. We know that these destructive forces, as powerful as they were, were aided immeasurably by the so-called Trojan horses, "fifth columnists," spies, and saboteurs. These had preceded the German soldiers onto the field of battle, and long beforehand they had marked the vital spots, and when the time arrived to strike they knew just where to deal the most devastating blows.

History fails to record in all its annals more rampant treachery, the debauchery of nations by men in high places, and the complete destruction of the morale of the people than by these sinister and subversive groups.

We in America in these dark and trying days, when hysteria and fear stalk our land, should profit by the sad experiences of Norway, Belgium, and France. We should now, while we still have the time, ferret out these poisonous groups now lurking in our midst whose sole interest is the destruction and overthrow of our Government. Now is the time; tomorrow may be too late.

In considering the matter of further promoting the defense of the United States, we should, I aver, take into consideration the defense of this country from within for the reason that the fundamentals of a defense program must of necessity be constructed upon the solidarity, unity, and firm structure here at home. By that I mean we must firstly build solid concrete foundations here in America. We must clean house here in America before attempting to launch forth in foreign fields to clean house over there. We are firstly interested in the defense of our country, and as a result thereof, we should firstly make construction of the foundations upon which we can build these defenses here in America. We must firstly see that democracy is safe here at home and that its preservation is assured before we go to Europe or any part of the world to impose our American form of democracy upon those countries who have evidenced their unwillingness to adopt the American way of life.

In speaking of home defense, or national defense, I recall well the obligation that I assumed by oath when I entered the United States Senate in 1932 when I swore that I would defend my country against the enemies from within as well as the enemies from without. And in this connection I wish to call to your attention a statement by the sixteenth President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, in which he said that if this Nation is ever destroyed it must be destroyed from within. He was right then. He is right now, and I am thoroughly in accord with the statement he made pertaining to the enemies from within.

As this fateful year of 1941 is now running its course our country is the battleground of men and women—American men and women—fighting out upon American soil the

feuds of two hemispheres, Europe and Asia, and in my opinion I respectfully submit that those men and women should be devoting their time, their thought, and their energies to a solution of our defense problems here at home.

And so I say, ladies and gentleman, that today our immediate and imminent danger is from within. We must eternally guard ourselves against the inroads being made against our form of government by the enemies of this Government who are eternally boring from within—Nazis and Fascists, their spies and saboteurs, Communists and their propagandists—day and night, night and day—making terrific assaults upon the very foundations of our Government.

I repeat, instead of going across the ocean to make destruction of these "isms" that are constantly working toward our destruction here, I assert that we should devote our time and our energy to destroying these vicious, foreign "isms" right here in our midst.

Home defense—that's what we are interested in. National defense—that is really what we are all striving for. We are all desirous of perfecting a real genuine national defense for the protection of the United States of America, for the preservation of the Western Hemisphere. In order to attain this, in order to build the foundations, firstly it is necessary that we have national unity, and I am just wondering how we may bring about national unity when we have today in our midst millions of aliens, hundreds of thousands of whom are followers of Stalin in Russia, Hitler in Germany, and of Mussolini's Fascists? These people are not interested in the preservation of our country; these groups are not interested in the preservation of our ideals and our institutions. Their first duty and their first loyalty and love is for their countries across the sea—Russia, Germany, and Italy. These are the very forces that made destruction of France, the very ones who destroyed France from within even while she was endeavoring to prepare herself against attack from without, and that is the very thing that we here in America must today guard against.

In this connection it is interesting to note the figures recently released by the Department of Justice regarding the number of aliens in the United States who recently were registered and fingerprinted. The total number who registered at the post offices throughout the United States under the Mandatory Registration and Fingerprinting Act totaled approximately 5,000,000. I estimate that there are in this country several hundred thousand additional aliens who failed to register due to the fact that many thousands entered illegally, while other thousands entered legally but remained illegally. Amongst all these aliens there are, as we all know, many criminal aliens who are subject to apprehension and deportation but who cannot be deported for the reason that the countries from which they came refuse to take them back.

Much of the trouble today in this country regarding strikes on defense projects is attributable largely to subversive influences and forces that are bent upon impeding the progress of our national-defense program—such as Nazis, Fascists, and Communists.

Last year I introduced in the Senate of the United States a resolution prohibiting any labor organization or union from having as an officer or representative any alien, Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, or anyone connected with these un-American, subversive organizations, as well as prohibiting any American citizen who had been convicted of a felony, thus depriving him of his citizenship, from holding any office in any labor union or organization; but, unfortunately, that resolution never got out of committee, so I have again reintroduced that resolution, which is designated as Senate Joint Resolution No. 64, entitled "A resolution to provide for the national defense by prohibiting labor organizations from employing certain persons as officers or agents," and reading as follows:

"Whereas it is common knowledge that 'fifth-column' activities in various European countries contributed largely to their defeat; and

"Whereas such activities consisted in part of sabotage in key industries and propaganda disseminated among the workers of such industries; and

"Whereas such activities are now being carried on in this country and will gather more momentum in the future, thus undermining our national defense; and

"Whereas because of their key positions in our industrial mobilization plans, officers and agents of labor organizations should all be American citizens whose allegiance to their country is unquestioned and who can be depended upon to cooperate: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it shall hereafter be unlawful for any labor union or other labor organization to have as an officer or agent any person who is not a citizen of the United States, who is a Communist, Fascist, or member of any Nazi bund organization who has been at any time within the past 2 years a member of or affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi Bund organization, etc."

As stated above I am of the opinion that these foreign influences and members of organizations bent upon the destruction of our American way of life are largely responsible for labor troubles in this country today, and I believe that if my proposed resolution had been enacted into law last year much of the trouble that we are experiencing now would have been eliminated.

So to those of you who do me the honor to listen in tonight I wish to say that if you are interested in the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 64, you should immediately make your desires known to the two United States Senators from your State, and to the congressman of your Congressional District. Write or wire them today and I should likewise appreciate from you an expression concerning this proposed legislation.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 9, 1941]

GREEN BLASTS "REDS," TIE-UPS BY MINORITIES

WASHINGTON, April 9.—Communism and minority strikes—the one hiding behind labor to commit sabotage and the other seeking every shifty advantage—are denounced by President Green, of the A. F. of L., in a signed editorial appearing today, as the deadliest enemies of the Nation's defense plans.

He appeals to unions to submit controversies to mediation and arbitration during the crisis.

Twenty-four hours after O. P. M. Labor Director Sidney Hillman told Congress "there is no doubt that Communists in this country are organized to make inroads into labor unions," Green makes the following statement in the American Federationist, official A. F. of L. publication:

"We steadfastly charge that when a responsible union official countenances Communists in representative capacity or sanctions Communist policies or practices, he is false to the American trade-union movement and unworthy of the privileges which our Government affords him."

Green does not identify this union official. It is believed Hillman's statement to Congress was based on a similar cognizance of the situation. Hillman is vice president of the C. I. O. as well as one of the top men in O. P. M.

"Our democratic institutions and the very existence of a free labor movement are at stake," writes Green.

"While we must insist on fundamental principles, when collective bargaining breaks down we should submit issues to mediation and arbitration, doing everything within our power to avoid strikes.

"The American Federation of Labor declares that the gravest dangers which menace defense production are these: Tolerance of Communist Party members in positions of influence, and minority strikes as a method of building up technical control to extend nominal organization."

The veteran labor leader makes the flat charge that some recent strikes were "seditious." He says tolerance for differences of opinion or religion is one thing, but that tolerance for revolutionaries seeking to undermine democratic institutions "is the essence of stupidity and disloyalty to our Nation."

"The second menace to our defense program," he writes, "is the strike by a minority group to gain control by strategy that has not been earned on a basis of union membership.

"The picket line keeps workers out of the plant so that production is stopped and the minority leaders, with the help of Government friends, gain credit for negotiating a truce.

"Later the picket line is used to force payment of dues."

(This practice, extended to the homes of "delinquents," has been adopted by Mike Quill's transport-workers union in New York.)

Address by Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida, at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, May 19, 1941, Upon Being Awarded the Degree of Doctor of Laws, Honorary

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered by me at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, on May 19, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Honor, Mr. Chancelor, honorable officials, faculty members, and students of McMaster, friends and neighbors of Canada, you have honored me beyond measure to allow me to come into the fraternity of McMaster. Although my heart goes out to you in overflowing gratitude, I cannot restrain my feeling that you have honored me far beyond my deserts. To come to Canada is for an American a sort of visit to kinsfolk. But to come here under such happy auspices as brings me here today makes me aware of even closer ties that bind us and our countries together.

Except for the embarrassment of a keen sense of unworthiness to bear this great honor which is bestowed upon me in this distinguished company, and with these eminent colleagues today, I heartily welcome the opportunity that it gives to speak to a brave and free people about our world and the overcast but challenging days ahead.

On a recent evening I saw on the screen a creation called Fantasia, by Walt Disney. This remarkable man, as a visual accompaniment to the Rite of Spring, by Stravinsky, has put on the screen a picturization of the evolution of the world from its first plastic forms to the end of the age of dinosaurs. One saw the belching volcanoes, the rivers of molten fire, the elements torn by thunderbolts mightier than Jove ever hurled, the mountains tossed about like pebbles in Nature's giant convulsions. Yet in the passing of time the sky cleared, the sun moderated its terrible glow, the rivers fell docilely into their grooves, the mountains and the valleys held their distances, and the pattern of a peaceful world emerged from the tumult and the chaos.

Then the earth burst forth in riotous abundance. The fishes filled the sea and the birds and the animals swarmed over the land. Amongst this number there grew up one which was the giant killer—the monster against whom none could stand. He terrified the whole kingdom of life. He was the Tyrannosaurus Rex.

The Fantasia ended with the death of the dinosaurs, including the giant killer, Tyrannosaurus Rex. But you and I know that was not the end of the world. It was just the curtain of an era. The world had outgrown the dinosaur. He belonged to a species which Nature had repudiated.

The eyes and the hearts of the men and women of the world—the children, too—now turn to the sources they trust, to their own private oracles, to such old and honored institutions as McMaster, to know whether these horrible things we now see and hear shall, too, pass away.

The answer is, "Yes."

They always have passed away because they break the law of God and man, and the fundamental laws of God and man are immutable.

There are certain absolutes which may be depended upon in any age—the divinity of God and the dignity of man.

The organism of progress has been many times throttled but never destroyed. The trek of the human family has been long and arduous. The way has wound through the wilderness and the desert, over the mountains as well as the plains, through the jungle and upon the broad bosom of rolling rivers. The way has been beset by every kind of enemy, both the bold and the treacherous. The elements themselves have not always been kind. There have been hard times—times when there could be seen no "pillar of cloud by day" or "pillar of fire by night." Again and again stalwart leaders have been smitten and no voice remained big enough to be heard above the tumult and the doubt.

But here we are. Look back and see how long the road is. Is it not marvelous that we made it?

Can anything present or future be worse than we have mastered already? Candor bids us all say no.

What then is our course?

To be steadfast, to be bold, to know that nothing can cheat us of our destiny, to look outward and not inward, upward and not downward, forward and not backward—that is the way, the truth, and the light

The way of progress lies primarily in the hearts of men. Man's dreams are the unvarying north stars by which he sets his course. Hope is his compass. The will, the legs of achievement.

What we are and where we go depends more upon what we think, what there is inside us, than on what there is on the outside. Nothing is either good or bad but thinking makes it so.

The struggle which bleeds the world today bases upon a mighty conflict in what men think. Some men like their ancestors for many generations back think that they have found the tripod upon which truth firmly rests, namely:

1. That race is the basis of morality.
2. That the ultimate test of all value is physical force.
3. That there must be a master class of rulers.

Not upon the Continent of Europe, not in the Near East or Africa, not even upon the waters of the Mediterranean or the Atlantic does the battle for the world and the race now rage, but upon the broad fields of the minds of men around the truth or the falsity of these concepts. In this struggle every creature who is human is engaged. There can be no neutral who claims the dignity of man.

If the first concept of a superior race having the natural right to rule the earth is a truth, then the doctrine of the brotherhood of man is a lie. If the superiority of race is the cornerstone of the moral code, then right is only human and God is an imposter in the kingdom of good. If there is no higher law than a race, there is no future beyond the grave, to which the most lordly race must inevitably fall. And there is no immortality for even the souls of men.

Those who countenance such perfidy, of course, scorn as mockery the cross and denounce as an imposter the One who said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Naturally, they proscribe the race which gave the world the Son of Man and leash every tongue which would speak His name.

If physical force is the final test of value, then the body is the master of both mind and soul, and the actions of men are guided not by the gentle wooing of the spirit but by the bludgeoning of the club. The brute displaces the Christ Child in the seat of adoration. In such thinking, passion is not "trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience," but is enthroned in the Olympian seat of all power and lust becomes a noble sentiment.

The real business of man is war, say they. Then they are not the subjects of the Prince of Peace. One of their prophets—Prof. Ewald Banse—declares that "war provides the ground on which the human soul may manifest itself in its fullest height; * * * nowhere else can the will, the achievements of a race or state rise into being so genuinely as in war. War is a purifying bath of steel, breeding new impulses and an infallible test of fitness."

Oh, wounded soldier, bereaved mother, lonely wife, hear this cry from the jungle, where rules

> "The simple plan,
> He may take who has the power,
> And he may keep who can."

Chesterton caught this pagan spirit in the lines:

> "Their gods were sadder than the sea,
> Gods of a wandering will,
> Who cried for blood like beasts at night,
> Sadly, from hill to hill."

What of all those wise and kindly men who have spoken of the good life, who have preached and practiced the gentle arts of peace?

If this be truth, what of that simple One who said, "Blessed are the peacemakers," and "The meek shall inherit the earth"?

"The Teutons believe in a divine origin of inequality," said Fulop Miller. "Who cares," asks Haiser, "about the life, the fate, the interests of the millions, if only the representatives of the racial soul prosper?" "The whole beehive," he adds, "is incarnate in the queen."

Small wonder they scorn the concepts of a democracy which honors what they call the stupid masses.

The master race must, they claim, be pure and undefiled. Hence, there is hate and persecution for the inferior peoples, scorn of that Christianity which dares to teach that all men are equal in the sight of God.

I shall never forget attending, during the Nuremberg Congress in 1938, a session at which a prominent leader spoke on jurisprudence. I noticed the frequent outbursts of laughter of the audience of 22,000 Nazis in response to what were obviously the sarcastic references of the speaker. I learned upon inquiry that the speaker was deriding the Anglo-American system of law which preserved the archaic principle of specifically defining crime for the citizen instead of the new Nazi technique of making crime whatever might harm the state, in the opinion of the Nazi judges.

A superrace, a superstrength, a superclass, then, is the demand and the doctrine of the so-called New Order. The passion with which this faith is propagated, however, leaves no doubt but that it is part of a great fanaticism. Young men rush into battle with arms locked and singing their faith and their defiance even to death. An Australian remarked on the Battle of Thermopylae that the Nazis charged their artillery with bayonets like crazy men.

Here, then, are the zealots of a new paganism—a modern, scientifically sustained, streamlined blitzkrieg adaptation of the ancient barbarian, the bleak religion of the hardy warriors of long ago who lived in the land of long night, sterile earth, dense forests, and relentless rock.

Against this dynamic doctrine what do we appose?

Maybe it cannot be better stated than to say, we believe in God, we believe in man. We believe in a God greater than Odin, greater than Zeus, "Our Father who art in heaven." We believe in the dignity and the nobility of man and man's destiny. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

We believe that freedom is the inheritance of man; that slavery of the body, mind, or spirit is wrong by the law of God and man.

We believe that the human, like the tree, is due the right to unfold into all his or her potential majesty.

We believe that the spirit is the master of all things; that it is the silken cord which leads man to the land beyond the stars.

We believe in the free flowering of the mind; that it is an abortion to curb the curious reach of one of those tender roots of the intellect toward the moisture of truth.

We believe in the sentiment of compassion, the laudable example of the Good Samaritan. The weak are not to be despised but helped, the underprivileged to be nourished, the rejected to be encouraged, all the brave to be honored.

We believe in the good life; the beauty, the gentleness, the nobility, the affection, the lucid light that illuminates it.

We believe in human progress in the past and in the future. Nothing can shake our faith in a better race and a better world through the effort of man.

Does ours continue a dynamic faith, or has it lost its ardor?

Is our life worth fighting for—worth dying for?

Are its apostles, like Peter, ready to deny it at the first question?

At what price do we hold the virtue of our life?

Is the strange apathy we have so widely presented to the new menace due to our failure to see it, or has its hideous face lost its horror to us?

What shall the historian say of our stewardship of our faith?

I sense that we are today going through one of the great transitions of history. The plastic concepts of the social norm, of life itself, are forming and reforming, combining and separating, breaking up and coming together again.

Is the reluctance of some and the declination of others, who give lip service to our faith, to defend it with determination due

to their lack of conviction; or to their feeling that that faith has run thin; or, indeed, to a sense of values which does not appraise our doctrine above life, liberty, or even comfort?

Or is it, one may ask, that we have become too civilized all over to be able to meet the kind of centaur who has a modern head and a barbaric heart?

The time for equivocation has long since passed. Those who hesitate now run the violent risk of forever being lost. The world has never seen such a crusade as now sweeps across the globe. With fanatical determination to drive every enemy to cowering cover, with every principle and instrument of science prostituted to purposes of destruction, with a mockery made out of the moral code and the instincts of humanity, this juggernaut rolls on with seeming irresistibility.

All men of good will must be called to their colors. The standards of the Cross, the Bible, the Church, the libraries, the homes, the families, of all the old landmarks, of all we love, must be raised high and held up. The rallying cry must come as clear as a mountain call from those who speak "as with authority."

Ours must not be a negative but an affirmative effort. Our strategy must not be a defense but a counterattack. Our only hope to rally oppressed and dejected men and women, the frustrated hopes of boys and girls the world over is to show them that our faith is not a worn-out dogma, a hollow chant, but a living vital fire and without it all life is a cold oven, a frigid hearth. Let us confess that our way of life has been tardily adapted to the technology of the current day and that most obsolescent of all our equipment is our thinking, the excessive tenacity with which we hold to the old, the overreluctance with which we embrace the new.

Let us admit that we have not fully grasped how the principle that we are our brother's keeper applies to our duty to make available in our social order to every man and women, boy and girl, a trade, a skill, a profession, a job, a home, medical care and hospitalization, security—the four great freedoms President Roosevelt eulogized—freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom from want, freedom from fear.

Let us ask our God forgiveness for all we have not done with opportunity and for much we have done with power.

Let us put our faith and our motives through the trial of fire and refine out the dross and the impurities because our position now is that of one who wants to speak to his God with a bare conscience before he engages in mortal combat the enemy.

We must tell those young men who have left their classes and their desks, their simple pursuits of peace, who have broken the ties of hope and home and family, and soared into the clouds or ploughed through the waves or across the desert sands—we must tell them that before God we will not let them down as we did their fathers.

They must go with the conviction in their hearts that they are not sheep to the slaughter, but knights of a greater round table than King Arthur's on a mission as noble as the search for the Holy Grail.

This terrible ordeal may be in the mysterious way of the Divine One—a testing time for the race when we, like Job, shall have our faith tried.

We have already seen enough to know what the outcome will be. We have seen the aroused spirit of a great nation, a mighty empire rising like the glory of a morning sun which no thing on earth can darken or cool. We have seen the majesty of the human will rising unconquerable above every material assault which the forces of hell may loose. We know now that the greatest power on earth is the soul of man.

This heroic example has touched those who have lingered behind hesitant, confused, or shrinking from the terrible struggle. But now the conscience of the world, including my country especially, is stirring like an awakening giant.

You and I know that when it is once aroused its terrible wrath shall shake the earth in righteous indignation, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Here in McMaster, in other schools and colleges, you have the great task of keeping the signal fires lighted. Your generation counts upon you to keep them bright, to keep them true, to see that the flame does not flicker but is steady and strong.

In the heavy night valiant men will lose their way if those lights go out, and they must not lose their way because they, too, are the wise men bound east to keep their own rendezvous with the Christ Child.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ADDRESS BY FORMER GOVERNOR LANDON AND COMMENT BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, over the Columbia Broadcasting System from station WIBW at Topeka, Kans., on Sunday afternoon, May 18, dealing with the foreign policy of the United States. Also I ask to have printed in the Appendix, following Governor Landon's broadcast, an article by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of this morning, commenting on the speech by Governor Landon.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First, I want to protest against the attempt to discredit those who are seeking to continue a realistic discussion of the issues of peace or war for the United States.

In a recent editorial an anti-Semitic organ attacked me for using the Jewish word "tolerance." That was the first time I knew that word belonged to the Jews, or to any other race. I know plenty of creeds it does not belong to. It is not any part of the so-called liberal New Deal. It does not belong to the Nazis, Fascists, or Communists. They seek now, since they have become strong enough, to force their horrible beliefs on the world by starvation, by the concentration camp, and by the sword.

But before they became powerful, Hitler and Mussolini in their early days suppressed free speech by discrediting their opponents. Thus the influence of the opposition was weakened, and the effect of what they said was destroyed before they said it. That has been the technique this present national administration has used since its first days in public office.

Always this administration attempts to smear all opposition as a whole, and its leaders individually. Also, there has been a steady attempt to undermine the confidence of the people in the newspapers of this country. There has been a steady and persistent attempt to discredit private business in this country. Right now some of the most radical of the New Deal war crowd are attempting to lay the groundwork for the ultimate destruction of private business by blaming its management for the deficiencies of our national-defense efforts. And now freedom of the air is on the carpet, with apparently the usual broad stretching of administrative powers.

My record on aid to Great Britain speaks for itself. I favored outright subsidies, as a matter of our self-interest, before the lease-lend bill was ever proposed. My opposition to the lease-lend bill was based on its dishonest label, and its vague and limitless grants of power to the President.

I think it is greatly to every American's interest that England win. But I do not think our security depends upon an English victory. To my mind, this is a weak and defeatist attitude. I deplore the long-range effect on our national thinking, either individually or collectively, of the idea that we cannot stand on our own and that our security depends on anyone else. This is the second time within a generation that we have been told our security depends on England. It is coming too close to a habit of permanent thinking for a strong, virile people like us.

Now, the President has said convoys mean war. So there is no argument there. But it is a shock to the moral conscience of the Nation to see how quickly the campaign promises of last fall are being circumvented in administration circles. They are seeking to do indirectly what the President said he would not do. The end may be the same—war.

If the American people are confused, it is because of this fact. It is because every observant citizen can see there is a direct conflict between the President's own statements and his promises to the American people and the recent statements of the members of his Cabinet. It is because of the statements of the President in the last campaign assuring them, among other things, if he were reelected, of business as usual and peace for the United States. It is because since then the lease-lend bill was sold to them as a way to aid Great Britain and remain at peace.

It is because the President talked about taking the "silly old dollar sign" off of aid to England and turns around and knocks the American citizen silly with an enormous increase in taxes.

It is because the facts of the English shipping situation are clouded.

To convoy presumes a place to deliver our goods. What is our basis at the other end of the line? My information is that England has only two ports available, and that it takes 3 weeks to turn a ship around in these ports. I mean, by the time a ship enters the ports and is unloaded and started out again it takes 3 weeks. This is an important point that we should know more about before we rush into convoying.

How can we have the national cooperation so desperately needed, until we know some of these facts and to what we are committing ourselves? The President has been sending his boys to the mill. But we want to hear from the head man as to any changes he proposes to make in the policies on which he was reelected.

We were told last fall, "no fighting." And there has been no change in the situation since then, the possibilities of which were not contemplated when those promises were made.

The foreign policy of this country has been decided, rightly or wrongly. It was decided in the last campaign. And before that, Congress had passed the Neutrality Act, giving up our 150 years' contention for the freedom of the seas. The President signed this act. Later it was modified, on his recommendation. I supported the modification. But in the

modification the theory was maintained that the warring countries must come to our ports to get the materials and pay the cash. As I have said, I early advocated the further modification of the payment, because this did not mean war.

Now the attempt is being made to induce us to deliver these materials. As the President says, this means war. It means, despite assurances to the contrary, another A. E. F. I repeat again, the greatest deception that is being practiced upon us is the implication that we can have war and not suffer the consequences of war.

Nineteen seventeen to eighteen will seem like a picnic, compared with the demands on us for our money, our ships, and our men, in order to underwrite a Hitler defeat.

We can do the job, in the end. Our natural resources, our industrial production, our splendid American boys, can do the job. But, under the slogan of preserving democracy everywhere in the world, we will destroy every vestige of it at home and sacrifice millions of lives.

I say again that moral conscience and common honesty demand that before the President reverses the policy of the United States established by the Neutrality Act and its amendment, and established in the last campaign, he should make his recommendations frankly and honestly to the Congress and to the American people. He should tell us the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the facts. And, of course, he should do this before it is too late for Congress to do anything else but declare war.

Any other course will place a stigma for all time to come on his record of honesty and straight dealing with the American people who have trusted him for one term more than any other President.

But, I am asked, what if Germany wins? From what I have read of the proconvoy arguments, I am reminded all the time of children telling each other ghost stories. Each one tries to make it worse, so as to frighten the others.

Now I don't mean to say that we are not in dire peril. We are. But the argument that we should go to war because of economic conditions under a German victory is to me a narrow and hateful reason for war. Furthermore, as I have said before, free labor will always whip forced labor, and without going to war to do it.

But what of our security if Germany wins? Well, we are facing a nation that was whipped in the World War 23 years ago. It has had numerous internal revolutions since then, and currency depreciations, and 1½ years of actual warfare. It is spread out thin.

But I am no military or naval expert. So let me quote from one of the leading military and naval authorities in the United States, Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times, in his new book, United We Stand:

"The author does not know a single responsible military or naval officer or Government official who believes that this Nation is threatened by direct invasion. Even if Germany wins we need not fritter away our great strength in foreign theaters, thereby destroying that impregnability that today means virtual security for America. But I do suggest that militarily we are upon sound ground when we assert, with Monroe, that the Western Hemisphere belongs to the American nations.

"There has been no majority in favor of our entry into the war in Europe, no milling crowds demand war with Japan. But hemisphere defense has the overwhelming endorsement of a considerable majority."

To that I agree 100 percent. There is no enthusiasm in America to enter another Peter the Hermit crusade; to make the four freedoms effective in Europe, Asia, and Africa. There is practically overwhelming agreement to defend the Western Hemisphere. As I have said before, let us arm ourselves so terrifically that we can lick any nation or combination of nations that are foolish enough to attack us here.

Let us pull together again. Let us destroy our doubts and hesitations in the fire of our convictions in our ability as a people to defend ourselves against tyranny here in the Americas.

DOUBTING FARMERS HEAR FROM A GOOD PROVIDER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—Two speeches about armed intervention in the war were made this week in Kansas, part of a region where widespread doubt is reported that armed intervention is a wise or necessary course, or can be successful. By pilgrim, grapevine, and other means of communication Washington has been steadily informed that in the Plains States—of which Kansas is one—and in the Northwest the opposition is strong.

One speech, by Alf M. Landon over the radio from Topeka yesterday, typified this point of view. The other was over the Farm-and-Home Hour in Hutchinson, and the orator was Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. It was not difficult to deduce from the content of the speeches that Mr. Wickard had been assigned to combat the other viewpoint, and the reasons for his selection.

He addressed wheat farmers to tell them two things. (1) No wheat loan will be made by the Government unless the growers vote for marketing quotas. Without the loan no 1941 wheat parity is possible. The farmers can get parity for wheat only by voting for the quotas. (2) Lease-lend goods must be delivered to the British because "events of the last few days give new proof that the Nazis are deliberately trying to form a combination of nations to attack us" and the history of the people of the Plains States "proclaims that you will do what needs to be done in your own interests and in the national interests * * * something the Nazis understand and respect, armed might."

In Mr. Wickard the farmers saw and heard the incarnation of their Government bounties. His is the hand that usually is not bitten; from it cascades the torrent of periodic Federal checks. This made him Washington's obvious missionary to a land where the logical development of the President's foreign policy is said to be unpopular. If Claude Wickard, talking about sure parity and wheat loans, is so certain that Nazi success means the destruction of freedom and democracy in the United States, and armed intervention is necessary to prevent this, the Plains States and Northwestern doubters will pay more attention to him than even to the Secretary of State, certainly more than to Secretaries Knox and Stimson. This is the way the political strategists reason, and they may be right.

Mr. Landon, a private citizen, did not have the advantage of the aura of wheat loans, parity, and periodic checks that surrounds Mr. Wickard. But his Sunday talk was probably heard with respectful attention by many in the audience that was addressed by the Secretary. He supported British aid and the antidictator policy of the administration up to the form of the lease-lend law. He proclaimed 3 years ago that in international matters politics "stops at the water's edge." He served Mr. Roosevelt as member of a diplomatic mission to Latin America. He parted company with the President only when official statements and moves appeared to him to foreshadow armed intervention, in which he disbelieves.

This record alone would have gained Mr. Landon a hearing among so many like-minded citizens. But he spoke their own arguments Sunday: Our interest in British victory is paramount, but not our security. The President should tell the people the facts on which he bases any intended changes "in the policies on which he was reelected," and quit "sending his boys to the mill." "He should tell us the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the facts * * * and he should do this before it is too late for Congress to do anything else but declare war."

Mr. Wickard is another of the President's boys who was sent to the mill. But his economic and social relations to the neighborhood of this particular mill are intimate. And since it is now believed in Washington that the President is shortly going to undertake the journey himself, this prior visit by a member of his family who comes from those party was probably an effective "readying-up," as they say in the Plains States. Also it served to provide a prompt reply to Mr. Landon, though doubtless each of the speeches was arranged without knowledge that the other was to be made in that same area, or when.

By all accounts the region of those orations is the most difficult terrain for the germination of Mr. Wickard's (and the President's) views. The citizens have been bred to the belief that Americans can take care of themselves against all comers. Persistent reports are that, though they have come to support the idea of hemisphere defense, they do not believe military invasion of this country is possible from any direction; and they are sympathetic with the viewpoint that (as one authority quoted by Mr. Landon put it) "if Germany wins we need not fritter away our great strength in foreign theaters, thereby destroying that impregnability that today means virtual security for America.

Nearly every visitor to this area, and nearly every report sent from it to Washington, agrees in this estimate of the popular sentiment there. It is this sentiment which the Cabinet "has been sent to the mill" so often to counteract, for which errand Mr. Wickard probably has special qualifications. But the President must eventually go himself, or Hitler must do something to change the viewpoint if it is to be changed substantially.

Attitude of the People Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, May 17, entitled "Why Not Find Out How the People Feel Toward War?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 17, 1941]

IN THE NEWS—WHY NOT FIND OUT HOW THE PEOPLE FEEL TOWARD WAR?

Col. Frank Knox is a good citizen, a good soldier, and a good journalist.

He certainly appears to be a good, constructive Secretary of the Navy.

He is a bit warlike, but he comes of a fighting family, and warriors will be warriors.

Sunday school superintendents are not as a rule put in charge of a fighting fleet.

If, when, and where we get into war with the Japanese, and the Germans, and the Italians, and the Russians, and the Bulgarians, and the Rumanians, and the Hungarians, and the Turks, and the French, the doughty colonel will eat 'em alive, and that is the kind of man we are surely going to need.

There will be a lot of 'em to eat.

Colonel KNOX is also a fiery speaker.

On May 11 he addressed the American Society of Military Engineers with relation to the war now raging, and America's duties and desires regarding participation in it. It is our duty, declared the Colonel, "to oppose the aggressor with enough force either to scare him off or to defeat him."

"And," continued the Colonel, "all America is waiting for the word to go forward. We've made our choice."

That is a ringing statement, but it brings up a lot of questions.

In the first place who are "we"?

"We" can surely not be said to be all America.

We are a divided Nation, as ex-President Hoover truly says, as far as the use of force to get us into the war is concerned.

"We" positively does not mean the mothers of America.

The polls and tests show that 95 percent of the mothers are opposed to war.

"We" does not mean the women as a whole.

They are nearly 90 percent opposed.

Nor the men, who are some 75 percent opposed.

"We" cannot mean the citizenry at all because the administration with which Colonel Knox has allied himself has not consulted the citizenry on any part or phase of this question.

Nor has the administration even disclosed to what extent it has secretly committed the Nation to war.

The citizenry has been wholly ighored on this question most important to the welfare of this Republic and of the plain people who are supposed to control it.

In 1937, when war clouds began to loom on the European horizon, Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, a progressive Republican Senator, introduced a bill in Congress to repose in the hands of the people by constitutional amendment the right to determine by their vote the question of peace or war.

This bill was smothered and killed in the Foreign Relations Committee of Congress under orders from the Democratic administration.

And the people were denied by a Democratic Congress the definitely democratic right themselves to decide whether or not there shall be a war which will determine the fate of their country, and in which they will have to sacrifice their blood and treasure.

Says one-time Republican Secretary Knox, representing this hybrid administration:

"Everything we have over here has been bought for us at the price of sacrifice."

But that surely does not mean that everything we have over here, which has been bought for us by the blood of our fathers and our sons, shall be sacrificed without our citizenry being allowed to express a registered opinion whether the cause is worth the sacrifice.

As early as April 1936, a bill similar to Senator CAPPER's was introduced by Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, and was killed by administration Congressmen.

As late as January 1939, Senator CLARK of Missouri introduced another bill providing for a constitutional amendment to require a national referendum before Congress could declare war, except in the event of an invasion of North America.

Several bills have been before the Representatives of the people in Congress to repose the right to declare war in the hands of the people.

But Congress has ignored these measures and proceeded in the opposite direction, bestowing more and dictatorial powers upon the President and depriving the people more and more of democratic control of their own Government.

No; assuredly "we" does not mean all the people of the United States.

Nor does "all America" mean all the churches, or all the legislators, or all the civic and patriotic organizations of the United States.

On May 6 in St. Louis 7,000 delegates representing 8,070 Christian churches and 1,669,222 church members, urged the President to adopt "no further measures which will carry the hazard of involvement in the war."

The resolution adopted read:

"The embroilment of our country in the conflict which is itself devastating civilization will only add fuel to the flames.

"The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to belligerent participation"—and "we look with grave foreboding upon any action which will plunge a divided Nation into war."

Only 1 member of the 7,000 delegates opposed the resolution.

The remaining 6,999 approved and passed the resolution and apparently disagreed with Secretary Knox's opinion that "all America is waiting for the word to go forward," and that America must oppose the aggressor with force and that we "must make our opposition felt at whatever the price may be to see this thing through."

The Christian delegates expressed the opinion which ex-President Hoover, Republican Presidential Candidate Landon, and many of our wisest and most patriotic statesmen entertain—that "the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to belligerent participation," and that it is a matter of "grave foreboding" to "plunge a divided nation into war."

The delegates of the Christian churches further said:

"We make bold to present this petition, in view of the President's repeated and solemn pledges assuring the country that the armed forces would not become involved in the war."

Most of the Senators and Representatives in Congress who are not in the earmarked, branded, and gelded administration herd realize that all America has not made its choice for war but rather for peace.

One distinguished American statesman, ex-Gov. Philip F. La Follette, of Wisconsin, advocates that Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson, too, be removed from the Cabinet because they are attempting to "frighten and terrorize the American people into a war they do not want."

Governor La Follette impolitely refers to these eminent Cabinet representatives as "two Republican jokers running wild in the New Deal" and publicly urging the President "to break his pledges to our people."

But our eminent Secretary of the Navy declares that the Nation has but three courses to pursue:

Namely, employ force or become isolated from the rest of the world, or to surrender.

"And," says he, "every red-blooded man and woman in this audience will agree with me—we won't surrender."

Surrender what?

Our chief danger is that if we plunge into war we may surrender our democratic rights and liberties to an irresponsible autocracy in our own land.

Another complication is that if we use force to oppose the aggressor we may not scare him and that it may take years and great sacrifice of blood and treasure to defeat him.

Finally, why, pray, is it so wholly unlikely for us peace-loving Americans to choose the isolation from foreign conflicts which has made us in all our past a great and happy people?

What is isolation except minding our own American business, developing and protecting this Western Hemisphere, and not meddling in every war or diplomatic dispute that may arise in Europe, Asia, Africa, or Australasia?

Secretary Knox, this humble columnist respectfully offers the opinion that the American people do choose to mind their own business, and would like their eminent statesmen to mind the American people's business, and not be so deeply and dangerously concerned in minding the internal and external business of all the other peoples on the face of God's green earth.

If our presumably American Federal administration disagrees with the estimates of American sentiment expressed by ex-President Hoover, and Governor Landon, and other noted leaders of patriotic thought, why does it not ordain a national referendum to find out definitely, for the guidance of the American people's representatives in Congress and in the White House, what the sentiment of the American people actually is.

There are several bills for that purpose in Congress buried in New Deal committee rooms, and smothered by New Deal Congressmen.

Let us dig them out and put an accepted democratic policy of popular government into practical operation.

Americans of Germanic Extraction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY THEODORE H. HOFFMANN

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Theodore H. Hoffmann, national chairman of the Steuben Society of America, over station WHA, at Madison, Wis., on April 30, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Radio friends and fellow Americans, in connection with my visit to the Robert G. Siebecker Unit, No. 778, in Madison, Wis., I have been granted the privileges of station WHA. It is, indeed, an honor and pleasure to speak to you over the oldest radio station in the United States, and I wish to thank station WHA for giving the Steuben Society of America, a national fraternal patriotic society, representative of the majority opinion prevailing among American citizens of Germanic extraction, an opportunity to present its views and objectives.

To speak about the contributions of the men and women of the German race to the United States one must begin 258 years ago.

On October 6, 1683, the ship *Concord* sailed up the Delaware River to discharge her passengers, who forthwith established themselves at Germantown under the leadership of Franz Daniel Pastorius, the first considerable group of German immigrants from the country from which a continuous stream of newcomers has since that time arrived in America to become a part of the American people and to contribute to the building of the great Nation of which we are proud today.

Like the landing of the *Mayflower* at Plymouth, the landing of the *Concord* is symbolic of the future history of America. The coming of the Pilgrim Fathers of Plymouth foreshadowed one aspect of the character of the American Nation, and the arrival of the Pennsylvania Pilgrims foretold another aspect. They are not true Americans who cannot grasp the common national significance of both these events, as well as of similar occurrences during the infancy of the American Nation.

We of Germanic extraction are glad to share with our friends who claim descent from other nations of Europe the veneration, love, and affection we owe and give to this, our country. For, after all, we are all extensions of European stock, some of our parents stepping off the immigrant ship a year or two ahead or behind the parents of other men and women who have blended, fused, and merged so that the native-born American is or will be a composite in a very large measure of Irish, English, Scotch, Italian, German, and other blood. To that composition Germany has contributed courage, loyalty, industry, and a love for freedom. German blood has been spilled on every battlefield ever since the existence of the United States. Its crimson trail may be traced from Valley Forge and on through the history of our country.

Firm as a wall of iron the Germans have ever stood in defense of true Americanism, like Steuben at Valley Forge and Yorktown, like von Kalb at Camden, like Armistead at Fort McHenry, like Kichlein at Long Island, like Herkimer at Oriskany, like Quitman at Chapultepec, like Osterhaus on Lookout Mountain, like Schurz and Steinwehr on Cemetery Ridge, like Custer on the Little Big Horn, like Schley at Santiago, like Barbara Fritchie at Frederick, like Muhlenberg in his pulpit, and thousands of others. Americans of Germanic extraction will be on the firing line in any crisis—striking hard blows for the priceless heritage of liberty, the radiant hope of humanity—that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the face of the earth.

Today the dark clouds of war are over Europe, pouring death and destruction over many countries, threatening to engulf the entire world.

Today in our country we are faced with the same sinister and insidious war propaganda which drove our country into the World War, a war which it is now conceded we ought never to have entered.

As Americans, interested in American institutions and principles, we do not consider it to be within our province to presume to prescribe to any other country what form of government its people shall adopt.

Ours is a nation composed of citizens of all countries, and no one has a place in our ranks whose allegiance is not wholly to the United States of America.

We deprecate and disapprove of any exhibition of foreign politics on our shores, which can have no other result than to create a feeling of hostility against those who exhibit it and the country which they claim to represent.

We resent it as in conflict with the principles on which our country is founded. Our problems are different from those of any other country. We here have representations of all the races and nationalities of the world, and when they leave their respective countries they must also leave behind the differences which separated them at home. They must learn to consider and study all questions and problems from the American perspective, and none other. As Americans we cannot tolerate any attempts made to be influenced by any of the many factions in European countries, and for the sake of the continued peace of our people we must frown down any attempt to spread among them the seeds of dissension, which, if allowed to germinate, will cause them to forget and disregard their oath of allegiance to the country of their choice and adoption, and thus be guided in their conduct by foreign-born prejudices and not by what should be their first and only consideration—the welfare of America.

The great justification for the last war was that it was to end war; but what a consummation of that devout wish. The world has not only gained nothing, but has lost almost everything, even its soul. It has violated its pledges to the quick and the dead, has dishonored its signatures under solemn treaties, has defiled its past, and jeopardized its future. The sacred tenets of old have been cast to the winds, the manly fight between foemen was distorted into a deviltry of madmen with pen in hand and sacrilege on tongue.

Various groups and certain individuals in this country are assiduously working through propaganda and organized influence to get the United States to join in this war. They are spreading the crusade idea that this great, powerful, Christian Nation must join the intrigue and military debauchery of the Old World to save democracy, and trying to create the fear of possible invasions by foreign powers. We need have no fear of invasion, because it would mean economic, financial, military, and naval suicide for any nation that would try it.

Today, in the red reflex of the glare cast from the battlefields of Europe, the invisible manacles that have been cunningly forged and which are endangering the policies of the founders of our Republic have become appallingly apparent.

The traditions of our country, and our liberties, are once more threatened by our ancient enemy. Freedom of the seas is denied us. Our friendly intercourse with other nations has been disrupted. Insolent agents and propagandists infest our shores, seeking to drag us into the final horrors of a war in which we are already so gravely involved. So-called Americans dare suggest that we again become a colony of Great Britain.

According to statistics there are over 32,000,000 souls in this country of ours who are of German origin. History is replete with accounts of the devotion, sacrifices, and achievements of the German element in the founding and upbuilding of the United States, yet there are those who dare question the patriotism and loyalty of Americans of Germanic extraction, and who dare to state directly or by inference that they are "fifth columnists."

Yes; there have been "fifth columnists" in this country. They existed in our own struggle for independence in the form of the British Tories; they were in Washington's bodyguard to such an extent that the Father of our Country was forced, for his own safety, to reorganize his bodyguard under the command of Maj. Bartholomaus von Heer and 150 men—each and every one an American of German extraction, who remained faithful to their duty to the end.

We had the "fifth column" with us in the war for the preservation of our Union, in the form of British agents and provocateurs, who tried desperately to split the Union asunder. Abraham Lincoln put a stop to that.

We had the "fifth column" with us in the World War, in the form of an army of British propagandists and anglophiles, and we have with us again today an army of "fifth columnists" in the form of British propagandists, anglophiles, interventionists, and warmongers.

As far as the Americans of Germanic extraction are concerned, you will not find them in the "fifth column," but in the "first column," ready in any crisis, dealing hard blows for the priceless heritage of liberty and justice, and fighting for the preservation of the ideals, institutions, and Constitution of our beloved country, the United States of America.

Americans of Germanic extraction do not want communism, fascism, or nazi-ism, and they do not want British imperialism. They want Americanism.

We believe that the future of American youth is on top of American soil, not underneath European dirt.

Long before the present war hysteria, the Steuben Society of America, in 1932, came out definitely for adequate preparations for national defense. Americans of German descent have always stood for national defense. In order that we may be correctly understood, allow me to read to you the aims and purposes of our society:

Loyally to support the Constitution of the United States of America by advocating the proper application of its provisions and inculcating the principles underlying true democratic government;

To quicken the spirit of sound Americanism; and fostering a patriotic American spirit among all citizens;

To aid in maintaining the independence and sovereignty of the United States of America and its freedom from all foreign influence;

To establish cooperation among its members in the exercise of their civic duties and to encourage among them an active participation in every phase of our national life;

To promote the welfare and enhance the happiness of its members and their fellow men;

To perpetuate itself as a patriotic and fraternal voluntary membership organization and to provide for its government;

To guard our political liberty by maintaining an honest equality of citizenship, regardless of the birth, origin, or religion of any citizen;

To maintain the traditions of our country.

There must be no repetition of 1914 to 1918, resulting in more than a hundred thousand American boys dead, hundreds of thousands maimed or gasping out a miserable existence from shell shock and gas poisoning, and the record of the war debts of our dear Allies to the tune of $13,000,000,000.

What will our country do? Will our young men be sent over once more to be slaughtered on foreign fields to "save the world for democracy?" Shall we be fooled once more by British propaganda and British agents in this country?

This is the great hour in which our country's honor is in our keeping. Our people must speak out with clear and clarion voices or forever sit silent in shame.

Don't delay! This may be our last chance. Write, wire, or telephone, the President, your United States Senators and your Congressman now, and tell them, "We don't want convoys! We don't want 'Union now'! We don't want war!"

Criticism of Nonintervention Advocates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HELENA (MONT.) INDEPENDENT

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Law Risken, editor of the Helena (Mont.) Independent, entitled, "Stop Smearing."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP SMEARING

[From the Helena (Mont.) Independent]

Many Americans, regardless of their personal views on how far this Nation should go in its foreign policy today, must be getting utterly disgusted with the smear tactics of high administration officials against prominent persons, who are attempting to keep us from being pushed steadily toward actual involvement in the terrible conflict raging overseas.

Secretary Ickes vented his spleen on Colonel Lindbergh and virtually all the well-known Americans who oppose our active entry into war, by labeling them "Nazi fellow-travelers" and "Hitler stooges." Senator WHEELER, who is determined that the public shall be alive to all of the perils we are facing through hasty and sometimes ill-advised acts, and who points to the Nation's relative unpreparedness to take action, if we are drawn in, has been roundly condemned by the more hysterical and like the others has been called pro-Nazi. But Montana's Senator and other noninterventionists are standing their ground in the face of this unfair and unwarranted criticism, hoping that the United States shall keep out of the most ghastly war of all history.

Because he considers a Nazi victory inevitable, even if America should fight side by side with the British, Col. Charles Lindbergh has been the object of bitter and unjust attacks. Now, President Roosevelt terms Lindbergh an appeaser because his views don't happen to coincide with those of a group which is moving us precariously near actual embroilment. It is the old story of Mr. Roosevelt's anger when someone dares to take exception with his ideas. When the President and others of his official family act in that manner they are forgetting the constitutional guaranties of free speech to all Americans.

No doubt there are many who do not agree with Lindbergh, Senator WHEELER, and others in their so-called isolationist stand, but most of them will hardly deny these men the right to expression of their views. It should be interesting to some persons to know that polls show more than 80 percent of the people agree with the leaders who are making every effort to keep us out of war.

Where Is Leadership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSFIELD (MASS.) EAGLE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Eagle, of Pittsfield, Mass.:

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Eagle of May 19, 1941]

WHERE IS LEADERSHIP?

In the days when the New Deal was in its fullest flush, as much as the organized taxpayers and conservatives bemoaned wasteful and excessive governmental spending, the spenders at least had a strong social argument for deficit financing even if it did not jibe with economic orthodoxy. Today, however, there is room for little difference in opinion that the staggering burdens of all-out defense should dictate a drastic cutting in nondefense items in the Government's budget. If we are not to have business as usual, is there any reason for politics and the pork barrel as usual?

Therefore it was particularly disquieting for the President to announce last week that if there is to be economy in government the suggestions must come from the Congress. This is only another way of saying that the President doesn't think that savings in nondefense Budget items are essential, or, if he does, that the problem has him licked or he hasn't the time to deal with the problem.

For the President to say that Congress must deal with the problem is all right theoretically. But, for better or worse, the executive branch of the Government has attained powers and prestige far out of line with the original concept of the relationship of the executive to the legislative. Certainly, strong central government with driving executive leadership has been one of the underlying issues in the last two Presidential campaigns, whether it was overshadowed by more specific and concrete issues. The people have decided that they want strong personal government in the White House, and, in one way, this has been a wise choice, because centralized authority and strong leadership is essential in such a crisis as faces the democracies in their struggle against the efficiency and the swift and arbitrary decisions of dictatorship.

Therefore, if government is to depart from the concept of political spending as usual, the initiative for that departure must come from the Executive. Merely to label every item in the Budget as indirectly concerned with total defense, as has been the tendency in the executive departments, is dishonest subterfuge. That the President doesn't agree with the proposition that it would be desirable to cut nondefense items is unthinkable.

Obviously, the problem is difficult in all its implications. But at least on April 24 a start was made with the suggestion by Secretary Morgenthau that nondefense items should be trimmed by at least $1,000,000,000 The President, in effect, however, repudiated the suggestion from the Treasury Department when he put the problem in the lap of Congress.

The problem is further complicated by the immense burdens of leadership which rest on the President. He has chosen not to delegate authority either in defense or in administering the ordinary peacetime activities of government or in relaxing his leadership over Congress on important issues. As a result the issue of government economy, which is but one of the several momentous decisions facing the people, is in a mild state of chaos. A responsible department head who is concerned with the financial structure of America in its hour of need is tacitly disavowed by the President. Mr. Roosevelt himself offers no program but rather seeks to dodge the issue. Because of the particular position of President Roosevelt in respect to Congress, some leadership is essential on any problem and failing it Congress can be no less confused than the man on the street. And confusion and doubt are not something which can make the country equal to the task before it.

Gala Occasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, yesterday the Representative from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, placed in the RECORD the address delivered on Sunday evening by the widow of a former colleague of ours, the late Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Lundeen. I had hoped that this address might be presented in the Senate for printing, because I wanted so much to have offered, in conjunction with the splendid address of Mrs. Lundeen, a recent article appearing in the Washington Post, by Westbrook Pegler, entitled "Gala Occasion." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

FAIR ENOUGH—GALA OCCASION

(By Westbrook Pegler)

You can't tell but that this idea could be the means of financing a great part of the war effort. It popped up in an idle conversation when one guy said he would gladly pay $5 right now for a ticket to the funeral—when, as, and if held—of the dirtiest individual in the history of the United States, and another one said, "Why, you chiseler! You have paid as much as $25 in your time to see punk fights in the Garden, but when it comes to an occasion of national purification and rejoicing, the like of which the country has never known, you want to come in on practically a pass."

"Well, that is just a nominal figure," the first guy said, "because, even though I have held no pair for years, and it has been nothing but nickel-nickel in my life since I hate to tell you when, still I think I would be willing to save, beg, or borrow as much as $100 for a ticket to this gladsome occasion, and, if necessary, go out and get it with a gun. I think any American jury would acquit me on patriotic grounds, considering the motive."

"That much might get you a bleacher seat in double Z, out by the flagpole," another guy said. "Ringside would be around a thousand bucks, and I don't know but that the demand would be so great that you could raffle off ringside seats and get a lot more. The public demand would be something fabulous, and, after all, the little guys would feel pretty sore if they didn't have some chance of sitting down front."

As first one, then another, guy recalled the unclean influence on American morals of the dirtiest individual in the United States, the nasty rumors about the intimate life of married people, the degradation of love, the low gossip piped out of flashy dives run by criminals, the indiscriminate lies and the sudden access of passionate patriotism in a gutter ignoramus who carried two guns and a

bodyguard for fear of a slap in the face, the funeral project glowed brighter and brighter as a national service of thanksgiving and reform, attended by possibilities of a great advantage to the Treasury.

"There must be 50,000 decent newspapermen who would pay at least a couple of months' salary to celebrate the cleansing of the profession," one guy said, "and every respectable woman would want to be there to realize that henceforth she could have a baby in decent privacy. And how about the hundreds of thousands of people who would rejoice in the fact that they could now go to a hotel or a restaurant without feeling that some bellhop was spying through a keyhole or frisking their private papers for information to sell about their private life, or that some waiter was running straight to the gents' room to report their personal conversation? Or that some slimy sneak of a press agent for the hotel or night club was telephoning dirty whispers about them for publication in return for a mention of the place? I tell you this would be a colcasal funeral. It would be a national celebration."

"We could take it on the road," another guy said. "After all, they took Lincoln and Harding on the road, but that was mourning. This would be a national fete. People would feel that the country had been relieved of something shameful to the American character and a source of spiritual, moral, and cultural pollution which had degraded them insidiously. Chicago should be good for a week's play twice a day in Soldier Field, and you have a big, clean American population on the Pacific Coast that would book the attractions solid for months. All the decent Americans would go for it."

"But," said another guy, "it might not happen for years."

"That would be all the better," the first guy said. "It would give more time for the build-up. People would buy tickets and leave them to their heirs, but the Government would get the money now for war financing, and no obligation to pay it back. But I would not want to take a chance on the Yankee Stadium for the premiere. That holds only 80,000, and your overflow would tear down the joint. You would have to get some airport where you could handle around 500,000 head. I will bet plenty of decent American business firms would bid their heads off for the radio rights."

"Well," said the guy who had the original idea, "it looks like I dig up a wonderful thought and then it gets so big I can't get within half a mile of it. I'll probably be behind a stanchion in the next county, but I will be there. That is one that the United States marines can't keep me away from, if I live."

Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

ARTICLE BY HUBERT N. HARRISON

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks and include therein a very timely article by Mr. Hubert N. Harrison, manager of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Waste," as follows:

WASTE

One of the lessons we may get out of the disturbance of war is the importance of the study of waste in American life and industry. With the softness and ease of modern life, its high standard of living for many, and the subsidies of a generous and paternal government, there is danger that we may grow profligate of time and resources.

We are going to be jolted into action all along the line. Labor must develop its craftsmanship to the limit. Business capital and management must enlist themselves for the most efficient production ever known. Substitutes must be found for raw materials we have been importing from across the seas.

The industrial chemists, finding new ways to use the things we have thrown away, must attack the problem of countless leaks and waste in industry. They must battle against ignorance, apathy, skepticism, and scorn of those who say of any new idea that it can't be done because it has never been done.

Waste is a sin—a sin against the waster and a sin against the country. And of all the wastes, the waste of precious time in idleness is the worst. Pity the poor rich man who has not developed inner resources of mind and heart to employ his talents wholesomely when he doesn't have to work for a living.

For the poor man who is idle through no fault of his own, there should be great sympathy. It is one of the tasks of community leadership to try to find ways to employ these men. A hero's shrine awaits the man who finds a way to employ and rehabilitate the uprooted thousands from the cotton farms of the South. This group constitutes an appalling waste of manpower and a menace to the Nation.

The average American family throws enough food into the garbage can to support the average family in less favored countries. We should not wait for war's disruption to force us to conserve what we have. Saving tinfoil and old tin cans and car license plates is a small step in the right direction. We must get down to business in a very serious way on this matter of waste. Perhaps if we can find new ways to use the waste products of farm, mill, and shop, war's threat will not have been without its compensation.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

Louisiana Flood Control Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN OF LOUISIANA

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana is bounded on the east by the Mississippi River and is traversed by many other rivers, all of which have made the problem of preventing floods and securing the proper drainage very important. As a member of the Flood Control Committee of the House I have sought to help solve these problems for the entire State. The biggest job along this line that we have is to get rid of the Eudora Floodway in northeast Louisiana. I set myself to that task immediately upon coming to Congress, and I have never let up in the fight. A few days ago I covered the subject rather fully in a statement I made to the Flood Control Committee of the House, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert that statement:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we are approaching the close of the hearings before this committee. We have heard many witnesses from all over the Nation. I shall confine myself to a discussion of the particular flood-control problems in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas, as they affect Louisiana.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER

I shall first take up the problems which have been presented here concerning the Mississippi River. There are three phases of this problem which present themselves to us at this particular time:

1. The question of overland floodways.
2. The question of the Yazoo backwater area.
3. The question of the Red River backwater area.

Unfortunately, a controversy exists between the State of Mississippi on the one hand and the States of Louisiana and Arkansas on the other hand. This controversy is not of our making nor choosing. When I first came to Congress I took two definite positions with respect to this problem. I found that a great disparity existed as to the protection afforded by law and by existing levees between the State of Mississippi on the east and the States of Louisiana and Arkansas on the west. Mississippi enjoyed then, and still enjoys, a superiority in levee height of 3 feet. The law provided in what is commonly known as the Eudora spillway that excessive flood waters should flow over Arkansas and Louisiana. This arrangement was so manifestly unjust to the west side of the river that my sense of justice revolted against the continuance of that condition. I therefore began immediately to do my best to correct it. From that time on, interest in the equality of treatment on the east and west banks of the river has increased, until now the people of Louisiana and Arkansas are unanimous in the demand that this inequality be eliminated. We have, therefore, proposed, gentlemen of the committee, two things:

1. That all overland floodways be completely eliminated; and
2. That the Red River backwater area be given the same levee protection as the Yazoo River backwater area.

MISSISSIPPI'S VIEWS

The spokesmen for the State of Mississippi have opposed these propositions, and after we have listened to their various arguments, I think we can safely say that practically all they have said rests upon two propositions: (1) That Mississippi is entitled to retain her present superiority of levee height because she—as they contend—started her levee projects before the levee projects on the west side of the river were started, and (2) she contends that since the waters have been flowing over Louisiana, this condition should continue. In other words, Mississippi takes the position that she has a sort of easement or flowage right over Louisiana. I think if anyone will take the trouble to read all of the testimony presented by the gentlemen from Mississippi, it all will boil down to one of these two arguments.

Now, as to the first proposition that Mississippi is entitled to have her levees higher than the Louisiana levees because she started a little before Louisiana did. I do not know whether Mississippi started her levees before Louisiana did or not, but even if it is true, does that grant to Mississippi the right to keep that continued superiority? Can one argue that a State, for example, that was

admitted to the Union first, or that did anything else first, has superior rights to another State? Do we in America consider that an older child in a home has rights superior to the younger children? Equality is one of the first principles of Americanism. The argument that the gentlemen from Mississippi set forth, therefore, has no basis in law or reason.

Now, turning to the second point that Mississippi has a natural right to let the water flow over Louisiana, let us examine that. I think all will admit that before any levees were built on the river, in case of a flood the waters spread out over all lowlands, whether in Mississippi, Louisiana, or Arkansas. Mississippi contends that she built up her levees first. If so, this certainly threw the excess water on Louisiana. Later, the Eudora floodway was established, which threw more excess water on Louisiana by act of Congress.

So, gentlemen of the committee, it is bound to be clear to anyone who will view this matter in a fair and impartial way that it was not an act of God that made a spillway of Louisiana but it was an act of man. The Yazoo Basin is about as low as the Red River Basin. The Creator did not design the Red River backwater area to take care of the backwater from the Yazoo area. The design for running water over Louisiana is man's. How can it be said, then, that Mississippi has a natural right to have excess water that rightfully belongs on Mississippi land transferred over the soil of Louisiana? But if you will read the hearings, you will find that that is the burden of one of the arguments presented.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ENGINEERS

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has carefully reviewed the Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to the Head of Passes in Louisiana, and this review has been made largely in an effort to avoid making an overland floodway out of the States of Arkansas and Louisiana. I have long sought this review. Although the report embodying the review has not been officially reported to Congress by the Board of Engineers, we have the report before us and we know what its provisions are. The engineers have suggested and recommended four additional plans for the existing floodway project. It must be conceded that those projects are engineeringly sound and economically feasible. Otherwise, the engineers would not have suggested and recommended them. The Engineers suggest and recommend the following plans:

	Cost
Plan 1. Existing project	$84,600,000
Plan 2. Narrow Eudora	84,084,000
Plan 3. Eudora extension only	62,030,000
Plan 4. Levee plan project flood	45,441,000
Plan 5. Levee plan based on 1927 flood	35,307,000

Plan 1 is the present Eudora floodway plan. It will, therefore, be seen that plans 1, 2, and 3 are overland floodways and plans 4 and 5 are levee plans. We shall consider them in order. Plan 1, the existing Eudora floodway, is the most expensive, places the most land in jeopardy, and is utterly objectionable. Witnesses testified that the Eudora floodway never would and never could be built, and I concur in that opinion. I do not believe our people would stand for the destruction of nearly a million acres of the finest soil in Louisiana. As a Member of Congress I will never consent to it. The other overland projects, Narrow Eudora, and Eudora extension only, are also very objectionable. We can dismiss them also.

PLAN 4

We come now to plan 4, which is a levee plan to confine the project flood within the river levees proper. Under it the levees would be the same height on each side of the river. The Eudora and other overland floodways would be eliminated and the backwater areas of the Red River in Louisiana and the Yazoo River in Mississippi would be treated alike. General Tyler stated that this plan will protect the greatest amount of acreage in this entire region considering both sides of the river. The engineers frankly admit that it is difficult to place each side of the river on absolute equality, but General Tyler admitted that this was the goal toward which the engineers had been working for many years. Now, let us see how plan 4 would approach that goal.

Under the existing floodway project the testimony of General Tyler shows that for each acre that would be flooded in Mississippi about 2.54 acres would be flooded in Louisiana. General Tyler further stated that plan 4 would reduce the disparity between the States to the point that for each acre of land flooded in Mississippi, Louisiana would have about 1½ acres flooded. The general then admitted that plan 4 would more nearly equal the goal of providing equal treatment to the east and west banks than the other plans suggested.

Mississippi is contending that plan 4 would somewhat increase the area in Mississippi subject to the maximum flood; but if this is true, it is true only because the present plan provides for running all of the water over Louisiana; and when you undertake to approach the goal of equality between the banks of the river each side ought to be willing to share its portion of the burden and should not seek to place the burden entirely on one side of the stream. So, after all is said and done, the burden now rests almost altogether on the Louisiana-Arkansas side of the river and we feel that plan 4 would ease our burden somewhat. The above figures show that Louisiana would still, under plan 4, have the greater part of the burden. Our burden would be 50 percent greater than Mississippi's burden, even under plan 4, because for each acre that Mississippi had flooded we would have 1½ acres flooded.

Plan 5 is objectionable because it would give protection—complete protection—to the east bank but would still leave Mississippi with a 3-foot advantage in levee height which would jeopardize every foot of land in the alluvial valley west of the river. Moreover, plan 5 is admittedly an interim plan and does not propose to settle the problem. Why take a substitute when plan 4 offers a real and permanent solution to the whole problem?

So, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we urge that this floodway plan be settled once and for all. The engineers tell us that overland floodways are no longer necessary. We accept their statement. We have the highest regard for their ability and integrity. When they come in and tell us that they can now confine the project flood between the river levees, we accept their statement and are willing to abide by it. We, therefore, hope that this question which bobs up every year may be settled by adopting plan 4, which General Tyler says will more nearly approach equality between the banks of the river than any other plan suggested.

RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA

Plan 4, as stated above, calls for putting the Yazoo backwater area in Mississippi and the Red River backwater area in Louisiana upon a position of near equality. The engineers in this plan consider only the area lying between Red River and Black River on the south and west and the Mississippi River on the east. The plan would not give complete and all-time protection to the Yazoo and Red River backwater areas because the engineers hold that such is not feasible. The situation in the Red River area between Black River and the Mississippi River would be considerably better than it has ever been before and would protect that region, so the engineers say, from backwater to a point within 1 foot of the 1927 flood. If this could be accomplished it would be far better protection than we have ever had before in that section. I hope to see this incorporated in the bill.

I am interested in protecting the land lying to the west of Black River also but, unfortunately, the engineers say that this is not economically feasible and they will not at this time recommend any protective works west of Black River.

RED RIVER BASIN

Now, I wish to discuss for a moment other matters in which I am also vitally interested. I refer particularly to projects in the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana. For several years I have been working to get a favorable report from the engineers to clean out the channels and provide for proper drainage for the southern part of Rapides Parish and a great portion of Avoyelles Parish. This is to be accomplished by cleaning out and otherwise improving Bayous Rapides, Boeuf, and Cocodrie. Rapides Bayou starts right outside of Alexandria and all of these bayous run in a southerly direction. This project would be one of the greatest blessings possible for Rapides and Avoyelles Parishes because it would run the surface water down through these bayous. This project also calls for running this fresh surface water down through Bayous Teche and Vermilion and the Ruth Canal to provide additional water for the Teche-Vermilion rice lands. I have introduced a bill (H. R. 4684) to accomplish this. The report of the engineers has not yet been officially presented to Congress, but I hope this will be done. The estimated cost of this work is $2,630,274.

I have also introduced H. R. 4738 to authorize the construction of a levee project with appurtenant drainage works and to provide for the improvement of Bayou Rigolette channels on Red River and the separation of Bayous Darrow and Rigolette channels on Red River in the Aloha-Rigolette area in Grant and Rapides Parishes. The estimated cost of this project is $914,500. This bill also provides for a levee project and appurtenant drainage works on Red River in the Rocky Bayou-Pineville area in Rapides Parish, the estimated cost to be $150,100. I am anxious to get favorable action on this, also.

In addition to the projects which I have outlined here on Red River, I wish to say further that my colleague, Mr. BROOKS, has projects farther up Red River in the Fourth Congressional District which he represents, and I understand that he has, or will, present bills to cover these projects. I am heartily in favor of them and he will have my full cooperation.

I wish to mention now that my colleague, Mr. MILLS, representing the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana, will propose legislation for certain flood-control projects in his district and he will have my cooperation.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in conclusion I wish to say that I have frankly and fairly set forth the position and desire of Louisiana in these matters. We need to have the reports of the engineers officially presented to Congress. I ask your cooperation in all these matters. I respectfully submit that our case is just.

Huey Long—Live Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I insert a poem composed by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle entitled "Huey Long—Live Forever."

HUEY LONG—LIVE FOREVER

H-uey Long, dynamic statesman,
U-nique man, that dared oppose
E-verything that hurt his people,
Y-ielded never to his foes.

L-ife to him, yea, was a battle—
"O-nward!" was his battle cry—
N-ever did his courage falter,
G-od knows, e'en when death drew nigh.

N-ature gave him wit and wisdom,
A-nd the tact to put in force
M-easures that might help men forward,
E-ver in life's onward course.

T-rue to those in whom he trusted,
H-uey Long, unto the end,
A-lways proved himself a willing,
T-imely, faithful, fearless friend.

W-hen he crossed death's unseen river,
I-n their hearts, his friends anew
L-et earth know that they most surely
L-onged to see his dream come true.

L-ike the Master, he wrought always
I-n the int'rest of the poor,
V-oicing their needs, in the open,
E-ver doing more and more.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Machines—Servants or Masters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER RAUTENSTRAUCH

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the article following appeared in a late issue of the magazine, Friday. Mr. Walter Rautenstrauch, the author is professor of industrial engineering at Columbia University.

This article certainly is a challenge to all Members of the Congress. At the close of this artificial prosperity, the depression will fall with full force. Let us plan now to meet that impending danger with something other than "stopgap" measures. The machine must be made the slave of society and not its master.

The article follows:

[From the magazine Friday]

A SCIENTIST LOOKS AT INDUSTRY

(By Walter Rautenstrauch, professor of industrial engineering at Columbia University)

More and more in recent days I have been asked: "How much can America produce? What limits are there to the capacity of our men and machines?" As an industrial engineer, I am supposed to know the answer. The answer is supposed to be simple. But it isn't.

Engineers are often tempted to answer such a question by computing the total amount of raw materials available, the number of factories capable of being mobilized, the number of men available to work the machines. The national plant itself is seen as a giant machine; and the production problem is viewed merely as one of organization, of increasing the technical efficiency of the machine, of raising the level of man-hour output.

This might be true in a vacuum. But we don't live in a vacuum. If technology alone were the answer, we in America today would not be faced with a situation in which more than half the population is "ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed"; where ten to fifteen million men have been chronically unemployed for more than 10 years; where production for war is used as a temporary stopgap against national economic collapse.

I have seen America develop miracles in technological advance. In the 14 years between 1920 and 1934, man-hour output in direct manufacturing jumped almost 100 percent. That should have meant twice as much goods on the market, a 100-percent increase in the standard of living. But it didn't. It only meant that the same amount of goods was produced in the factories. Human labor time was cut 44 percent. Millions of workers were tossed on the scrap heap.

The introduction of strip mining in open-pit mines raised their total output in 1929 to three times that of 1919. The next 10 years saw a further increase of 56 percent in productivity. But from 1929 to 1939 employment in the United States dropped 21 percent.

We see a similar story in steel. Automatic hot-strip mills have made it possible for 126 men to turn out 2,500 tons of tin plate a day. Formerly that would have taken 96 mills with a combined crew of 4,512 men. From September 1937 to September 1939, 88,000 tin-plate workers were driven out of the industry.

According to testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee in Washington, production per man-hour in the electrical-equipment industry has increased by 36 percent between 1929 and 1939. Employment has dropped 16 percent. In the manufacture of radios during the same period labor productivity has doubled.

Before 1939, 6 girls working 8¾ hours per day produced 3,500 packed lamps. Today fewer than 6 girls are turning out 18,000 packed lamps in 8 hours. The use of new automatic feeders enables 1 girl to operate 5 machines in 1 operation on radio tubes. Formerly the same operation required 4 girls on 1 machine.

The same story is repeated in the rubber industry. Recent changes from the "pot-heater" method of vulcanizing tires to the automatic watch-case mold have more than doubled the man-hour output. In changing from the core method to the flat top crown method of building truck tires 150 out of 525 tire workers were dispensed with. From 1929 to 1939, 35,000 workers lost their jobs in the tire and tube branch alone.

The installation of continuous processes in the manufacture of synthetic yarn has increased man-hour productivity by 333 percent. Operations which formerly required 85 hours are now completed in 5 minutes.

The Ford laboratory is now at work on the production of synthetic wool fiber from soybeans. Today 2 acres of land are needed to nourish sheep which will produce 10 pounds of wool per year. The same 2 acres, sown with soybeans, can be made to supply 400 pounds of fiber for clothing.

These are but a few of the amazing technological advances which the genius of American scientists has made possible. But this is not all. Hundreds of new inventions, ready for immediate use in industry, have been held back; plans and patents lie locked in the vaults of the big corporations. America's industries are equipped to produce almost unlimited billions of dollars' worth of wealth. Why, then, are people hungry? Why are they asked to "sacrifice"? Why are there millions out of work?

I want to make it clear at once that it is not science, not the machine, which has created poverty and unemployment. The machine is a source of wealth. Not the machine, but those who own and control the machine bear the responsibility for social misery.

For the Nation as a whole the machine is an instrument for the production of wealth. For the few who own the machines it is an instrument for the production of profit. But in order for a producer of commodities to make profits he must find a market for his goods. There must be people willing and able to pay for them.

The owners of the machines have every year been taking for themselves a larger and larger percentage of the income from the goods produced. Immediately after the first World War, the ratio of wages to interest, dividends, and overhead services in all manufacturing industries was 88 to 12. Ten years later, in 1929, the proportion going to wages had dropped to 80 percent, while that which went to capital had risen to 20 percent. It was impossible for the working population to buy back the goods it had produced. The owners, on the other hand, were unable to consume the wealth they owned. They shut down their factories; their commodities rotted in the warehouses. Production stopped because without consumers there could be no profits.

I was down in Washington early in the depression and happened to be called into a conference with some Government officials. They were talking about ending the depression by borrowing $5,000,000,000. I asked them just how they would go about borrowing $5,000,000,000. They told me that it was a mere matter of signing a scrap of paper. They didn't tell me—I had to tell them—that this $5,000,000,000 scrap of paper was nothing other than a guaranty to capital of profits before production.

This promise of profits before production—pump-priming—started the wheels of industry moving again. But the same process by which wealth was drained away from the millions who produced it into the hands of the few who owned it continued at an even more accelerated pace.

Saturated with wealth, the owners of machines invested their money not in the expansion of production of consumers' goods, but in the expansion of capital goods—factories and means of production.

Between 1919 and 1929 there was an average net gain in employment of 535,000 people a year. The entire increase went into overhead services: Office workers, insurance, real estate, and so on. There was no gain whatsoever in the number of people producing consumers' goods on the farms and in the factories, nor of those in the power plants, in building construction, or in transport, taken as a whole.

The workers producing America's bread baskets—the consumers' goods—had to provide these additional 535,000 bread baskets each year. That meant that every year they had to take less for their share of the goods produced.

If this was true up to 1929, it is doubly true today. More and more man-hours are being withdrawn from the production of consumers' goods. Millions of man-hours are being given over to military drill, to the building of rifles and ships, and bombers. The men at work on war production have to be fed and clothed and sheltered by the lessening number of men who produce the bread baskets.

As the bread baskets decrease, as the shares diminish, the wealth in the hands of the owners of production accumulates. Profits increase. They increase not because there are more purchasers of their goods, but because they have received from the Government a "guaranty of profits before produc-

tion." This is simultaneously a guaranty of a precipitous fall in the Nation's general standard of living.

Only a few days ago a large manufacturer in heavy industry remarked in private conversation that if it weren't for Government business, his plant would now be operating at less than 30 percent of capacity.

We have reached the paradox of expanding production, scientific technological advance on the one hand, and on the other a shrinking consumption of the wealth we have created.

All the genius of America's industrial engineers cannot alter the rigid fact that the entire system of production is facing collapse. We are forced to recognize that the problem of increased production—of "how much can America produce?"—is based not on industrial engineering at all but on the relative claims of capital and labor to the goods produced, on labor's ability to keep on living.

If tomorrow the owners of America's machines decided to exercise their purchasing power to the full they could buy up every last bit of consumers' goods in existence, leaving the rest of humanity to starve. That power is the power of life and death, the power to make war and the power to destroy that very machinery by which goods are produced.

These are not fantasies but realities. We have already seen in the last year whole cities—factories, mines, and men—wiped off the face of the earth. A century of building, the piled-up work of science and labor, has been destroyed in France, in Holland, in Belgium.

So long as labor cannot buy back the goods which it has itself produced, so long can we expect a continuance of the present division of production into its three present categories: Consumers' goods to feed the people; factories and capital goods; and war goods which periodically destroy the consumers' goods, the factories, and the people.

So long will technology and the machine be warped into an instrument of destruction.

Bail Him Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEEAN

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Nashville Tennesseean of May 19, 1941. This editorial has been reprinted in full by Lord Beaverbrook's London Daily Express.

[From The Nashville Tennesseean]

BAIL HIM BACK

More than a week has passed since Rudolf Hess started the world's greatest guessing game by bailing out of his airplane over Scotland.

Our advice to Winston Churchill, now that there has been plenty of time to pick the prisoner's mind to pieces, is:

Bail him back.

Bail him back out of an R. A. F. plane over the German capital with a message pinned to his coat tail—a message that there is no peace for Nazi aggressors and "here is your problem child." And then watch the fireworks.

Although Rudolf Hess is one of the major leaders in the totalitarian movement of mass murder and slavery, he has the status of a prisoner of war. Under such conditions, the British are not going to stand him against a wall or hang him by the neck, no matter how much he deserves it.

He may pose as one who sees the error of his ways, but that will always be a matter of grave doubt as long as he is in British custody.

Hand him back to Hitler and see if this party leader who went over to the enemy is greeted as a national hero, in which case we would know that Germany has a craving for peace.

Or wait for the news that he has been liquidated by Herr Himmler's efficient men who, according to the Nazi version, weren't smart enough to prevent him from stealing a plane right under their noses and against the orders of Hitler that would brand him a deserter.

Already there are reports from Sweden that hundreds of Germans, party members and others, are being arrested because of the Hess affair.

It is rumored, and denied, that Willy Messerschmitt, the famous airplane manufacturer, is being held as an accomplice of the alleged peacemaker.

If there is any element of truth in these stories, the situation would not be improved, from the ruling clique's standpoint, by the reappearance of the man who has been one of the biggest figures in the National Socialist organization.

Bail him back and let events speak for themselves.

If Hess were really Hitler's messenger of peace, despite fervid denials, his return would constitute an answer that the Feuhrer could not ignore. He would be a messenger of defeat.

If he went to England on his own volition, he would carry back the news that the British people are detemined to win this war with American backing and that all ideas that they were willing to "negotiate" a peace on Hitler's terms were mistaken ones

And if it should be true that Rudolf Hess really sought escape from the Gestapo after he had seen the writing on the wall, the world would not be long in finding it out. As one who has ordered the maiming and killing of thousands and has preached the doctrine of hate and destruction, he would be subjected to the terrors whose application to others he sadistically approved. That would not be an unexpected fate for a notorious gangster and beer-hall slugger of his type.

From the standpoint of military advantage, it is hardly probably that the man of mystery was in position to give valuable military information, because of the fact that his specialized field has always been party organization. But if he came to England claiming to bring information of value, that information already has been obtained. From that standpoint, his usefulness to Britain is ended.

Sportsmen that they are, the British owe no debt to the Deputy Fuehrer who came among them as an uninvited guest. Nor have they any surplus food with which to nourish him in indefinite confinement.

Having squeezed him dry, they can send him home in a manner equally as dramatic as that which marked his arrival.

And once that is done, Hitler's order to "forget Hess" will have no weight among the German people.

Bail him back!

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, a very good friend of mine, one of Missouri's outstanding insurance men, and a man whose firm does much business in London, recently wrote me as follows:

MY DEAR WALTER: The following is an excerpt from a letter dated May 1, from one of the most prominent underwriters at Lloyd's London, it having only this moment arrived at my desk:

"Things move so fast that it is almost impossible to say what is going to happen next, except one does gather on this side that the United States' nonbelligerency is going to be of a pretty belligerent kind. I hope that the United States keeps out of actual war, as I feel that they can do more good as a nonbelligerent state than as a belligerent."

Being the father of an eligible young man for the draft and an only child, I have as adroitly as possible questioned many people who are strong for convoys and for war as to whether they have any eligible boys for fighting purposes. I presume I passed this question to 150 or 200 people, and only one answered in the affirmative.

I am willing to offer Great Britain all that she can take and that we can possibly spare, but I am unalterably opposed to convoys because "convoys lead to shooting, and shooting leads to war." We urge that you stand pat, and if our President cannot live up to his solemn word which was given before the election, that he was opposed to convoys for the reasons above quoted, then we must depend upon you honorable men in Congress to keep that word for him.

Sincerely yours.

Rhode Island Delivers the Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

REPORT BY EDWARD F. WALKER

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief report by Edward F. Walker, secretary-treasurer of the Rhode Island Textile Association, on a survey just completed, which shows definitely that Rhode Island is delivering the goods. The report follows:

Due to the apparent willingness and ability of both management and employees to

compose their differences on controversial matters, production of important defense items has gone along at an unprecedented rate, with one or two minor exceptions.

All the mills reporting are well up to schedule on deliveries and some, like the Guerin Mills, Inc., in Woonsocket, the American Silk Spinning Co., in Providence, and others, are making deliveries from a few weeks to 2 months ahead of schedule. This is particularly important in such plants as the Guerin Mills, who have probably the largest serge uniform cloth contracts in the State, with orders aggregating more than a million yards well on the way to completion.

This splendid record would not be possible without the wholehearted cooperation of management and employees in a sincere effort to meet the emergency.

Not all Rhode Island plants are operating on defense contracts. Not all are equipped to do so. It may safely be said, however, that practically all of them who are equipped to handle Government business, either directly or indirectly, have bid for some of the work and in most cases have received a share of the business.

As an indication of the tremendous diversity of materials required to equip the armed forces with clothing and accessories, it may be noted that Rhode Island mills are producing linings, elastic and nonelastic webbing, braids and laces, underwear yarn, woolen and worsted weaving yarn, uniform cloth, blankets for the Army, Navy, and the Red Cross, airplane fabric, target cloth, gas cell fabric, balloon cloth, cartridge cloth, lacing twine, sewing silk, cotton thread, silk yarn for powder bags, dyed yarns for narrow fabrics, gas-mask fabric, decorative braid for Navy uniforms, and a wide diversity of other essential textiles. In addition, much of this material being manufactured elsewhere is being dyed and finished here.

Management has done its job promptly and well, and at something of a sacrifice. Profits on Government work are considerably under those to be obtained from strictly civilian business, and, in some cases, great care is essential in order that any profit at all may be shown. Notwithstanding this, the mills have buckled down to their task and are establishing a record in keeping with the best American traditions.

The young men formerly employed in Rhode Island mills and now serving in the armed forces and their "buddies" will be taken care of as far as textile equipment is concerned, far better than they have ever been in any great American Army and Navy in the past, if real united effort on the part of the industry in Rhode Island from mill treasurer to mill sweeper can do it.

The Challenge of the Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY MOST REV. JOSEPH F. RUMMEL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present for the edification of the House of Representatives and the Nation a recent address by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Joseph F. Rummel, archbishop of New Orleans.

This is an admirable analysis of the international situation and attendant domestic problems in the United States, and I strongly commend its contents to the House for study.

The address follows:

Today a new administration is seizing the helm of authority in this noble organization of youthful progressive southern businessmen. Through years of earnest effort and consistent striving toward lofty ideals the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans has carved out for itself a shrine in the life of this community which is a credit to its officers and members and an inspiration to the younger generation of our fellow citizens. To be chosen to guide the destinies of such an organization is indeed an honor, of which any staff of officers may be justly proud; a mark of confidence truly gratifying and stimulating.

Therefore, we take great pleasure in extending to the new staff of officers our warmest congratulations and wish them well as they enter upon their duties and responsibilities. May your administration be characterized with rare wisdom, clear vision, indomitable courage, and brave tenacity of purpose. Such qualities are destined to mark with success your generous efforts to lead to ever new heights of achievement this gallant band of young men who seek to promote the city's prosperity and welfare.

THE WORLD WE FACE

No one will question today the fact that we have fallen upon a critical period in the world's history. I am not now thinking of the horrible situation that prevails in the war-stricken countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Surely the sight of death-dealing instruments, which are destroying property on land and on sea at a pace never equaled in the history of the world, is calculated to make one wonder whether all civilizing instincts have run amuck. No one can read of the miserable fate of hundreds of thousands of human beings who are turned out of home and country, exposed to the ravages of an icy winter, disease, and vermin, without feeling a sense of wrath toward the authors of such barbarous cruelty. No one that feels within his breast the throbbings of a heart that instinctively yearns for liberty can witness the enslavement of nation after nation under the most hypocritical pretexts without a sense of just indignation, without wondering whether in the face of such despotism peace can ever again reign upon the earth.

And yet all these things and worse are but the external symptoms of the real evil which threatens with extinction that which we have cherished with pride as humanity's most priceless heritage, the civilization which for 2,000 years has progressively molded human life into a thing of beauty, dignity, and joy. The world has, after all, tasted war and experienced disaster in many forms often enough not to become totally paralyzed with fear or rendered entirely hopeless, when armies cross again the paths of the conquerors of old. Even in the present crisis we marvel at the courage of a Finland and a Greece, and we stand in admiration before those brave men, women, and children who today scarcely shudder when bombs crash through their homes out of the midnight skies.

The terrifying thing about the impending world cataclysm is the sinister threat of a new brand of world conquest, for which the violence of mechanized warfare is but a prelude, but the wedge to create the opening that will let in an entirely new order, an entirely new way of life.

In this new order freedom, as our forefathers dreamed it and as we have learned to know and cherish it, is doomed to die. Even today, where this new philosophy or way of life is in force, there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of the press, no freedom of the ballot, no freedom even of thought, for men may not even think, much less dare to utter opinions contrary to the dictates of the fanatical rulers. Freedom of worship has been either entirely abolished or so circumscribed that the genuine blessings and consolations of the free exercise of religion are practically made impossible. Certainly every effort is made to alienate youth from the old allegiances that gave to life the zest of honor, purity, honesty, and spiritual idealism.

With this new philosophy and order of life there is also promised a new order for industry and commerce, a new order of finance and business management. In every phase of human existence the rights and prerogatives of the individual must be submerged in the State, and even this in turn will be absorbed in the absolute authority of the dictator. By a strange paradox all individuality is doomed to extinction except the self-constituted supreme individuality of the dictator.

It is well that we should not allow ourselves to be deceived into believing that these characteristics are peculiar to any one brand of dictatorship. Nazi-ism, communism, and fascism are mere names; basically the philosophy of government and of life which each advocates is the same; their methods of operation are fundamentally identical; their ultimate aspirations are kindred. Whether the bond of brotherhood which their leaders profess can survive their individual ambitions is very questionable; this month is certain that they share a philosophy of government and life, which is a menace today to all that we prize as precious and sacred.

THE CHALLENGE

Confronted as we are by such a menace we cannot remain indifferent must less passive. Inasmuch as this menace is one of force, it must naturally be met with force. This we are doing as a Nation through the program of defense, which today is calling our young men to the training camps, setting the wheels of industry humming in the manufacture of armaments, stimulating to new levels of efficiency all the means of production on the farm, in the factory, and in commercial enterprise. In this patriotic effort all of us have a stake, all of us have an obligation to cooperate to the utmost of our ability, resources, and sacrifice. It is still the slogan of our Government to go the full limit, "short of war"; it is still the hope and prayer of more than 80 percent of our people that peace be maintained; it is still the conviction of many that we can render a better and more effective service to the nations which are bravely fighting for freedom and democracy by remaining out of the active conflict. And yet no thinking American will question the wisdom of protecting with all the resources at our command our hearths and our altars, our cherished institutions and the precious principles and rights that sparkle like jewels in our Constitution, the diadem that crowns the brow of fair America.

But in this hour we must not forget that the challenge which the totalitarian dictators have flung out into the world must be met by sound philosophic thought and conviction even more than by the weight of armaments and the skill of leadership on the battlefield, in the air, and on the billows of the sea. Not infrequently have we heard in recent years the demand for a spiritual revival throughout our Nation. This spiritual revival must indeed envision a new emphasis upon the spiritual values of religion, but it must not confine itself strictly to the religious domain.

This spiritual revival must include a rededication to the fundamental principles that underlie a true philosophy of life. No one has stated these fundamental principles better than Pope Pius XII, who has proven himself throughout this entire crisis the true friend of all humanity. In his Christmas message as far back as 1939, shortly after the beginning of the new World War, he enunciated his famous five points for the reestablishment of peace and order in the world.

"The right to life and independence" of all nations, is his first condition, a condition which is flagrantly violated by the would-be conquerors of the world. Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, and latterly the Balkan states cry out to the world for the recognition of this "right to life and independence," of which they have been cruelly deprived.

"Disarmament and liberation from the rule of force" is another condition for peace and civilized order, which the Holy Father proclaims. The totalitarian state revives the ruthless principle of might makes right, and by its application it would rule the universe.

"International organization," stripped of the errors of the past, restoring the sacredness of treaty obligations, is the third condition for a real new order among the nations.

"Fulfillment of the needs and just demands of peoples," is a fourth stipulation, which should bring satisfaction and contentment especially to smaller nations, struggling not for a place in the sun but for existence in decency and honor.

But perhaps the most significant and far-reaching stipulation that the Pontiff makes is "The observance of principles of justice and charity by statesmen and peoples." In this lies the very heart of the solution of the world problem. Selfishness, avarice, greed for power, lust for wealth have dominated the acts of too many so-called statesmen and even fired the ambitions of too many peoples, with the result that justice is rarely found and charity almost despised in the councils of statesmen, deliberating over the destinies of the nations.

The challenge that I sense is that we as individuals and certainly you as an influential civic organization should cultivate these principles even now.

Neither national nor international justice or charity can be realized unless these virtues be professed and practically applied in the personal and social relationships of individual citizens and organizations. Before we can claim or hope for a recognition of "the right to life and independence" among nations, we must recognize those same rights among ourselves; before we can think of satisfying "the needs and just demands of peoples," we should fulfill similar needs and demands in our relations to the individuals and groups with whom we live and work; "principles of justice and charity" must first be realized in the intimacy of our social, economic, and civic relations before they can become a vital and vitalizing force in the adjustment of world affairs.

JUSTICE AND CHARITY AT HOME

Your mission as a civic and business organization may seem far removed from the international or even the national arena, and yet you have it within your power to lay here certain definite foundations, whose relationship to the larger structure will be most important and effective. Against the totalitarian philosophy of government and life you must preach and practice respect for the dignity and rights of the individual. This will express itself in the wages and salaries you pay, in the treatment of those who are in your employ, in the fairness of your attitude toward your clients and customers, and even toward your competitors. Over against the philosophy of "might makes right" you must set principles of humane and considerate conduct toward every individual and group with whom you deal. Injustice and cruelty must be fought by justice toward all without exception and by charity especially toward the underprivileged and oppressed. Totalitarian irreverence and irreligion must be fought by your sense of respect, consistency, and tolerance toward your religion and the religion of your fellow citizens.

You have a great mission to build up in this fair city of ours—a better economic, civic, and social structure. It has been stated statistically that practically two-thirds of the families in New Orleans earn less than $1,000 per year, which is actually only about 70 percent of what is considered necessary for a proper standard of living. Some 30,000 New Orleans families have average incomes less than one-half of what has been fixed as the emergency level, namely, half of $883. These are families on relief and on W. P. A. projects. Estimating the average family at four persons, this means that about 120,000 of our population subsists on a family income of less than $450 per year. This situation should claim your thought, your study, and your effort to increase not only the opportunities for work but also the rate of compensation.

Failure to recognize this responsibility and to even anticipate the demands of the underpaid and sometimes overworked employees will sooner or later drive desperate souls into the ranks of malcontents, who become easy prey for leftist propaganda. In your organization there should be provided a committee whose function it should be to study the economic and social conditions of your city, a committee that will look at facts squarely and strive intelligently and sympathetically to lift the entire community to a higher level of life. Carnivals and fiestas give zest to life, but they will never suffice to build up a substantial economic and social structure, which will make New Orleans in reality a better and happier place to live in. Your mission is to attract and create more and better opportunities of employment, to apply sound principles and policies to business management, to put forth sincere efforts to promote social justice in the relations between workers and employers.

Your mission is to use your influence to promote honesty and efficiency in government, to urge the proper authorities to purge the city of the moral cankers that contradict our claims for preeminence among the cities for charm and beauty. The real charm of a city lies not only in the fairness of its boulevards and in the quaintness of its architecture but also and chiefly in the virtue of its citizens, in the safety of its highways and byways, and in its freedom from the dangers of moral as well as physical contamination. These ideals take on a greater weight of importance at the present time, when tens of thousands of young men, the very flower of the Nation, will be relayed to us week after week in search of relief from the monotonous grind of military discipline and camp life. Let it not be said that through lack of vigilance, much less through criminal connivance, we have been responsible for the contamination of their morals any more than we would wish to jeopardize their physical welfare.

This fair city of ours is but a little corner of our country and a still smaller microcosm of the universe, but for us it is the little world for which we are responsible and in which we have the opportunity to exercise our God-given faculties. Here we can bring into full play our civic pride, our patriotism, our personal virtues, our religious reverence, not in the spirit of narrow-mindedness, but with the consciousness that our zeal will result in a contribution of national and even international proportions. New Orleans is one of the gateways of the North American Continent, gateway to the luxuriant Southwest of our own beloved country, gateway to the teeming industrious valley of the Mississippi, gateway to the Gulf area of the Southland, gateway even to that land of promise which more persistently than ever it is our duty to woo in these critical times, namely, Latin America. To make this gateway a noble expression of genuine American democracy, free, progressive, and beautiful in its civic integrity and individual righteousness is indeed a challenge worthy of the mettle and idealism of the Young Men's Business Club.

May God prosper its endeavors under the new leadership of its staff of worthy executives. Thus we may realize another hope of the great White Shepherd in the Vatican. In his last Christmas message he said, "We express our heartfelt wish that humanity and those who show it the way along which it is to move forward will be sufficiently matured intellectually and capable in action to prepare the ground of the future for the new order that will be solid, true, and just."

Nondefense Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. MEYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last week when the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and other purposes, I felt constrained to support a number of amendments offered, even though I found myself to be the sole majority Member voting with the minority side of the House. This was, to me, a new and not altogether pleasant experience, but since then I have heard from many majority Members who feel that my reasons for so doing were sound. A teller vote was called for on two of the amendments offered which were designed to effect economies in the routine departments of Government, and, although rejected, the teller vote in one stood—yeas 66, nays 79, and in the other—yeas 73, nays 79, indicating that there is a strong sentiment for retrenchment. After the defeat of each amendment designed to reduce expenditures I voted again with the minority party to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with the recommendation that the committee reduce the bill $21,469,245.61 from the various items, with the exception of those items specified in hearings as national defense.

My reason for taking this position is based on the certain knowledge that all expenditures not directly connected with defense should be curtailed as much as possible in order that the entire resources of the Nation may be concentrated on the job at hand. I believe we are united as to the policy of building a strong defense against any possible aggression and that we are united in the belief that we should finance this program as far as is

practicable on a pay-as-you-go basis. I believe that every individual and every business in the country is willing to pay a fair share of the additional tax burden that will be necessary. However, it must be remembered that our peacetime budget and tax load over the last 10 years has been the largest in the history of the country, and it is essential that this staggering cost be apportioned in an equitable manner and the burden on our citizens eased as much as possible so that it will not of itself hamper the program of defense; and it is imperative, to my mind, that spending for nondefense needs be reduced in an effort to make it possible to meet this stupendous obligation. It must also be kept in mind that mere designation as a defense measure does not make it such. This is the case with the St. Lawrence seaway project, which was defeated on its merits, but is now being urged upon us as a necessity to national defense.

It occurred to me that there was no better place to begin economizing than with this appropriation bill which provided for an increase of approximately $21,500,000 over the previous year for the use of the Department of the Interior, and while the effort was entirely unsuccessful I do feel from present indications that drastic moves for economy are forthcoming, and urge that we face in a very real and active way the necessity for rigid economy in unessential nondefense activities as a vital part of the national-defense program.

It has been my policy, during the emergency to lend my support to those measures which tend to strengthen our country economically and build up its defenses and to oppose any reckless pouring out of money on nondefense measures.

That this subject of unessential, nondefense economy is very much alive is evidenced by recent editorials in many leading newspapers and periodicals.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 16, 1941, which I am now filing, and I hope it will have the attention of the membership:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 16, 1941]

A SHAKE-UP IS NEEDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"It would be a tragic error to assume that we can expand our defense production on a colossal scale and still go our usual ways, whether as a government or as individuals. It would be folly to assume that we can continue to spend now for nondefense needs as we did in normal times."—Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau.

On Wednesday the House of Representatives, asked to institute economies, voted to separate Dr. Ruth Gruber, alleged Communist, from the pay roll of the Department of the Interior. This would be a $5,000 saving. At the same time, however, the House approved and sent to the Senate a bill to appropriate $177,027,078 for the use of the Department of the Interior, which would be $21,477,345 more than the current year's appropriation.

This is fantastic. The Department of the Interior provides, in its vast, amorphous, catch-all roominess, a convenient location for countless unessential, nondefense groups and projects. The Department is a congeries of divisions, bureaus, boards, administrations, services, branches, subbranches, commissions, and committees. Merely to list them in close, fine print requires page after page of the Congressional Directory. Nobody, not even Mr. Ickes himself, knows everything that goes on in this grab-bag Department, but everyone knows that here is an opportunity to avoid the tragic error of which Mr. Morgenthau spoke when he warned against spending for unessential nondefense purposes.

The Nation faces a probable public debt of $90,000,000,000. It faces a future darker and more uncertain than at any time since Washington first took the oath of office. Yet, with national safety at stake, the House of Representatives goes its usual way and votes to add $21,000,000 more to the taxpayers' burden. And for a department full of unessential, nondefense projects.

Scapegoats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a scapegoat, according to Webster, is "a person made to bear the blame or burden of another's sin." "A person punished for the sins of another." The term "scapegoat" originated with the custom, supposed to have been common in Jewish antiquity, whereby a goat, upon which the sins of the people were symbolically laid, was sent away into the wilderness carrying the sins of the people away with it. Civilized people today still feel the need of scapegoats and make use of them. The pages of modern history are replete with illustrations of scapegoats, groups of people, religious sects, certain races, upon which from time to time have been placed the blame for the sins and shortcomings of society, and then the ever-ready winds of hate have been loosed upon the chosen victims. Excellent examples of "scapegoats" are to be found in the early history of Christianity, the Catholic Church, the Protestant Church, the Jewish people, each of them having at one time or another been blamed for the sins and shortcomings of other groups, and made to suffer without cause.

Communism is a political program based entirely upon the twin scapegoats class hatred and religious hatred. It operates by fanning these twin hatreds until they become a fanatic, all consuming, intolerant conflagration that threatens to destroy all the decencies of present-day civilization with which it comes in contact.

Hitlerism, or national socialism as exemplified in Germany today, is based upon the triple scapegoats, race hatred, class hatred, religious hatred. Hitlerism operates by fanning these triple hatreds until they become a fanatical, all consuming, intolerant conflagration that threatens to destroy all the decencies of present-day civilization with which it comes in contact. The whole of continental Europe has come under the influence of Hitlerism. Even France, democratic France; tolerant, liberal France; the France that has in past years exalted fraternity, liberty, equality, has now come under the damnable influence of Hitlerism and has decided to pile its many sins upon a scapegoat, the Jewish people, and fall in line with the Jew-hating Hitler program.

We have no room in America for either communism or Hitlerism. We have no place in our scheme of things for race hatred and prejudice, religious hatred and prejudice, or class hatred and prejudice. These things have no place on American soil. Because I feel so deeply about this matter, I give my hearty approval to the article One Man's Opinion, written by Hugh S. Johnson, and appearing in the Washington Daily News of Monday, May 19, 1941, in which Johnson denounces the recent action of the Vichy government in its policy in regard to its Jewish citizenry. I feel sure that Hugh Johnson expresses the opinion of the great majority of real Americans in the following quoted excerpts from his article:

"The French they are a funny race." Now they are going to get tough with their Jews because of the "degeneracy" of "their racial and religious community" * * *. The announcement says the subservient Vichy government is not going to persecute Jews—only to "restrict" them. For example, they can't have anything to do with "banks, industry, commerce, press, radio, cinema, and the theater." I am also advised they can't practice law or medicine. This is a hideous rescript. It is no French concept, I happened to have lived for a short time in France, and been frequently received, which is a privilege in that country, in rather populous families of French Jews. These, just also happened to be prominent in banking, medicine, and art. Among children, I have never seen such discipline, culture or respectful, affectionate, and ideal family relations in any country. There is not a Frenchman of independent patriotic opinion who will not receive this news with a snort of indignation.

It is nice to know these restrictions are not to be applied to Jews who have served France in her wars or those who were converted to Christianity before June 25, 1940. I can't see how Hitler can stand for this. He ordered erased from battle monuments the many names of Jews who died for Germany in the World War. Wouldn't it be a hell of a note if Germany's Unknown Soldier was a Jew? As for being converted to Christianity as a passport to a right to live, that is a sardonic concept of liberty and freedom of conscience and religion. It takes on added luster when you remember that the founder of Christianity and its very greatest apostle, St. Paul, were both Jews. And what magic is there in the day of June 25, 1940? I don't know, except that it was about the time when the French Army went yellow and curled up. Perhaps the Vichy Government needs a goat, or goats, but it is a disgrace to the glorious record of France to try to pin that abjection on a minority of persecuted people.

In this humble opinion, the fate of this fine race is one of the greatest of history's tragedies. Wherever Nazi conquest rolls, the malignity of a single half-crazed man overtakes them, and if now, as seems possible,

he is to move into Palestine, there will be few places left on earth to which they can turn for refuge. Britain is not wholly blameless. After the World War a place in white man's country could have been made for them in Africa. It was suggested but disapproved. With a perfect understanding of the terrible distress of American Jewry, I hope it will not put them in any area of possible accusation of pressing us into this war. I do not believe it has done so. I trust it never will. It seems to me that rather than spend billions to fight another nation's battles in Africa, Asia, and Asia Minor, it would be wiser and more humane to spend an equal amount in transporting and repatriating this harassed and harried people in some area that we can protect from the mad-dog Nemesis that is now pursuing them from one end of the world to another.

Antiwar Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL BY WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial from the Emporia (Kans.) Daily Gazette of May 15 by the distinguished and nationally known editor and writer, William Allen White. It is entitled "Antiwar Drive" and reads as follows:

[From the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette of May 15, 1941]

ANTIWAR DRIVE

Dr. E. Stanley Jones, one of the noblest Christians on this planet, is organizing a drive "to keep the United States out of war." Which is a fine thing. He believes that the way to keep the United States out of war is to stop arming Great Britain.

There are two groups of honest patriotic Americans who are resolved to keep this country out of war. One group, represented by the America First Committee, agrees with Dr. E. Stanley Jones. Another group, equally high-minded and equally patriotic, disagrees with Dr. Jones and his friends, the America First group. The other proponents of peace believe that so long as the whole aim and single object of arming this country is to defend us against the totalitarian powers, we can best defend ourselves and keep out of war by lending whatever aid is necessary to keep Great Britain afloat and fighting so that the totalitarian powers will hesitate before attacking us while we arm. Both sides agree on a huge defense program.

Each crowd is doing all it can for its own objectives. The emotionalized sector of each crowd is making faces and calling names. The America First crowd refers to the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies as warmongers, and those members of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies whose emotional content is rather heavily charged and fizzing, refer to the American First crowd as appeasers.

Appeasers and warmongers are good as epithets. They release something inside the hearts of the moron fringe of each of the committees. But, after all, each group is composed largely of men and women who have an honest desire to keep this country at peace.

War is always futile. A war now would settle nothing in the end. But wars come to nations whether they will or not, and when they come they must be fought. And, alas, no nation ever went to war that it did not go crying, "Peace, peace!" And as Patrick Henry said, "There is no peace."

So, in this crisis, it will be well for those who believe in either side to support their convictions but with the understanding that their opponents are equally honest, equally patriotic, and equally intelligent. To be absolutely cocksure that you are dead right in any argument or difference among honest men is a sign of emotional unbalance. And this goes for the issue of these days.

Stop the War Propagandists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE SENTINEL

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, Congress should pass legislation which will stop the war propagandists. Many aliens, of Nazi, Fascist, Communist, and imperialist leanings enjoy the privileges accorded to them as visitors to our shores. These foreigners should not be permitted to warp the minds of fellow Americans by disseminating base and false war propaganda. With the vast majority of Americans definitely opposed to our entry into another European conflagration, it is offensive to our people to have a foreign ambassador tell them what to do—whether such ambassador be German, French, Russian, Italian, British, or any other nationality.

The following editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 14, 1941, discusses the problem created by Lord Halifax:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 14, 1941]

A MEDDLING AMBASSADOR

Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador to the United States, is making a most offensive attempt to involve the United States in war in behalf of England.

In the guise of learning what the American people are thinking about the war, he is making a tour of the country frankly urging help for Britain.

In all his speeches, he says Great Britain will win the war, providing American help is prompt and adequate.

To be sure, he very grudgingly says that the amount of help we give and how we give it is strictly our own business.

Why, then, does he go about the country making our business his business?

Why does not the American Government call to account this British Ambassador who is trying to make up our minds for us on the issue of peace or war and is otherwise meddling undiplomatically and unethically in strictly American affairs?

Why does not President Roosevelt emulate the example of his great democratic predecessor, President Cleveland, and insist that the diplomatic decencies be observed by foreign ambassadors, on penalty of being expelled from the country for failing to do so?

President Cleveland made an historic example of a meddling British Ambassador in the famous case of the "Murchison letter." When Cleveland was a candidate for reelection in 1888, Lord Sackville, Britain's Ambassador in Washington, thought it would be desirable from the British viewpoint for the American people to keep Mr. Cleveland in office.

He therefore caused a communication to be prepared, known as the Murchison letter, asking the ambassador to give his views on the general attitude of the Cleveland administration toward England.

He replied that it would be considered advantageous to British interests to have Mr. Cleveland reelected.

It was generally believed, and was perhaps true, that Lord Sackville was the real author of both the inquiry and the reply.

At any rate, President Cleveland instead of being pleased by this British intercession in his behalf was most annoyed by it, and bluntly called it foreign meddling in American affairs and caused Lord Sackville to be recalled.

It was, of course, an unpardonable offense for a representative of a foreign government to try to influence an American presidential election.

But is it not a much more unpardonable offense for a representative of a foreign government to try to influence the American people to enter a war they do not want and are not prepared for, especially when they had no part in starting the war and were not even consulted or considered by those who did start it?

Lord Halifax's activities on the rostrum endeavoring to project America into England's war are not only undiplomatic—they are a violation of all international codes of ethics.

They are an abuse of the courtesy of the American people, a challenge to their right of independent thought and action.

Lord Halifax, like Lord Sackville, should be recalled or expelled, and would be if the country had the same kind of self-respecting American Government that it had in Cleveland's time.

Perhaps it is true, as Senator WHEELER, of Montana, says that:

"The more speeches Halifax and the royal refugees make the more determined the people are to keep out of war."

Perhaps it is true, as Senator WHEELER further says, that:

"The American people are getting resentful of the fact that foreigners are trying to involve this country in a war and giving us offensive advice on how to run our country when they have made such a miserable failure at home, and with other European countries with whom they have come in contact."

But the American people should not be compelled to rely entirely on their own endeavors to combat foreign propagandists. They are entitled now to zealous watchfulness over American interests on the part of their Government, as much as they were during the strictly independent and American administration of President Cleveland.

Some Information About Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I want to bring to your attention some information in regard to automobiles and their part in national defense, which has been prepared by the National Automobile Dealers' Association.

Records for the 10-year period from 1930 to 1939 showed that the average number of vehicles scrapped annually was 2,366,000. Replacements, even during the depression years of this period, averaged 85 percent of retail sales. Registrations were also considerably below the present high registrations.

Based on the number of cars 10 years or older that are still in use, the annual rate of cars scrapped is perhaps more nearly 3,500,000. Over 6,000,000 vehicles 10 years or older were registered last year, divided as follows: models prior to 1927, 441,333; 1927 models, 902,555; 1928 models, 778,170; 1929 models, 1,674,351; 1930 models, 1,483,787; 1931 models, 1,438,197.

Since these cars are reaching their last mile of service, they will be junked at a time when replacement is more vital than ever.

The need of industry under the pressures of the defense program indicates that an increasing supply of automobile transportation will be essential as more plants get into war production and hundreds of thousands of additional workers are required to operate them.

Automobile dealers are rendering a real contribution to the national-defense program. It is their responsibility and obligation to see to it that adequate manpower and facilities are available at all times to keep in steady operation the 31,950,000 cars and trucks now in use.

The Sugar Industry in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON SACKS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a resolution introduced by State Representative John P. Corrigan in the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with reference to the sugar industry in Pennsylvania:

Resolution 77

Whereas Pennsylvania consumers for years have paid a large part of the heavy subsidy going to the beet-sugar industry; and

Whereas it is necessary to preserve the cane-sugar refining industry in the State of Pennsylvania and to protect the consumers in the State of Pennsylvania from exorbitantly high prices and an artificial sugar scarcity; and

Whereas an abundant sugar supply is available both here and in the nearby tropical islands to meet any demand the consuming public may make; and

Whereas if the existing law were changed to permit additional millions of dollars to be paid to the already highly subsidized beet-sugar industry, it would put an additional burden on American consumers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress is hereby memorialized to oppose any change in the existing law that would place additional burdens on the already overburdened consumer, cause more unemployment in the State of Pennsylvania, or interfere in any way with our good-neighbor policy with Central and South America; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the present Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, and that they be urged to put forth their best efforts to accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO CALL-BULLETIN

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial under the heading "American Citizenship," which appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of May 12, 1941:

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of May 12, 1941]

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

WEEK'S OBSERVANCE TO EMPHASIZE DUTIES WE OWE AND PRIVILEGES WE ENJOY

American Citizenship Week is being celebrated in San Francisco, with appropriate programs in the schools and other meeting places of the people.

Each day's events throughout the week will emphasize a specific phase of the responsibilities and privileges which accrue from citizenship in the United States.

For instance, today's program is dedicated to study of the history and significance of democratic government.

Tomorrow, the emphasis will be on two of the basic rights conferred on Americans by the Constitution, freedom of speech and freedom of public assembly.

Wednesday's theme will evaluate the fundamental American principle of trial by jury, the very bedrock of the American system of justice.

Thursday's events will stress the benefits of universal suffrage, while the equally vital advantages of universal education will be discussed Friday.

Saturday will be Freedom of the Press Day, when the people will be reminded of the manner in which their own liberties are inseparable from independent agencies of information, news, and opinion.

GRAND CLIMAX

On Sunday the blessings of religious freedom and tolerance will be recounted in all the churches of the community, irrespective of creed.

And on Sunday also, climaxing all the activities of Citizenship Week, will be observance of the annual "I Am an American" Day, when naturalized citizens and young people newly arrived at the age of active citizenship will be specially honored by the entire community.

This is a most ambitious series of public events and programs, and of course a typical American enterprise.

It is, moreover, a typical and characteristic San Francisco enterprise, for this community has always had exceptional aptitude and capacities for patriotic observances.

In fact, the national observance of American Citizenship Week and "I Am an American" Day came pretty close to having its beginning here, San Francisco being among the first few communities of the Nation to see the merits and possibilities of organized emphasis on the significance of citizenship.

BETTER AMERICANS

This year's citizenship programs are well conceived, and cover the vital subjects of patriotic duty and democratic blessings comprehensively.

They have been planned by organizations and individuals thoroughly imbued with the idealistic and appreciative spirit of our national life, and inspired by the high example and devotion and sacrifice of the Americans of earlier days who made our present manner of life possible.

Let the people of San Francisco participate in and enjoy these patriotic programs to the fullest possible limit of their time and opportunities.

They will be better Americans and better informed and better equipped to inspire new and young citizens with faith and love for their country.

The Church Militant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS AND A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Birmingham (Ala.) News;

also a resolution adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention at Birmingham, Ala.:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News]

THE CHURCH MILITANT

When one considers what has happened to free religion in Germany under Nazi rule, there need be no surprise that the Southern Baptist Convention adopted a militant resolution of aid to the democracies fighting Hitler.

The fight that Great Britain is now heading against the totalitarian Axis is really a fight in behalf of Christianity. The resolution adopted by the Baptists said "some things were worth fighting for." One of those things is the right to worship as one pleases.

Baptists have a history of being willing to run great risks for their faith. Many of the denomination helped in founding this country as a place of freedom in worship. One Baptist church in Wales moved as a group to the new land. That Baptists also suffered persecution in this country from the Pilgrims only intensified their devotion to the cause of religious freedom.

And now, 305 years after Roger Williams founded Rhode Island, the Baptists again are opposing the power of a few leaders to impose their anti-Christian, antisocial, and antihuman wills upon the world. It is a brave stand, and one not inconsistent with the history of the church and of Christianity.

The resolution, adopted by acclamation in precedence over all other order of business, reads in full, as follows:

"Whereas Southern Baptists constitute one of the largest democratic and evangelical bodies of Christians in the United States; and whereas they have over 25,000 churches with more than 5,000,000 bona fide members; and whereas some 10,000 members and 'messengers' (or delegates) from these churches are meeting in annual convention in Birmingham, Ala., May 14–18, 1941, they feel it incumbent upon them and altogether appropriate for them to declare publicly certain of their clear convictions at this time of world crisis, in order that our burdened President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and our National Government may be apprised of the sentiments and convictions of the great majority of this body of patriotic and liberty-loving citizens. While they thus record and publish their sentiments and convictions by majority vote in convention assembled, they fully recognize and respect the inalienable right of conscientious objectors to hold and to vote contrary sentiments and convictions if they deem it wise to do so.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the convention:

"1. That we declare our abhorrence of war and all its insanity and brutality. We are a peace-loving people, and we know of no issues, national or international, which could not be settled in fairness and equity by the orderly processes of civilized society if only the leaders of the nations were willing to practice the principles of justice, truth, and righteousness. We sincerely believe that the rank and file of our denomination, even as the rank and file of our Nation and the other nations as well, much prefer that all international disputes and conflicting interests be composed by the processes of peace rather than by the arbitrament of war. But unfortunately, men of evil mind and ungodly heart sometimes gain control within a nation or nations, and with cruel and deadly intent thrust war upon the world in order to gratify their lust for glory and power and fancied gains for themselves and their associates. Such men at the present time have criminally conspired to impose their antisocial, anti-Christian, and antihuman wills upon much of the world. With fiendish force and diabolical scheming they have overrun Europe and threaten to gain the mastery over Asia and Africa. Human rights, freedoms, and liberties have promptly gone into eclipse wherever the power of these ruthless men has been established. They hold nothing as sacred, and they regard with scorn many of the treasured achievements of mankind. They deny the physical, intellectual, moral, social, economic, and spiritual rights and liberties of all who in any way oppose them. In other words, their principles and their practices are the absolute antithesis of everything we have been taught to believe is in line with the will of God, the mind of Christ, and the kingdom of God on earth. If these men are allowed to attain their announced world-wide aims and goals, then many of the values which we esteem as more precious than life itself will be lost, and the world will be immeasurably impoverished socially, politically, culturally, and spiritually. We know not what course others may pursue, but as for us, we hold it were better to be dead than to live in a world dominated by the ideals of these modern dictators.

"2. We declare our belief that some things are worth dying for; and if they are worth dying for, they are worth living for; and if they are worth living for, they are worth defending even unto the death. Among these are liberty under law, that sacred shrine called home, wives and children, the honor of one's country, and, last but not least, freedom of worship. 'Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery' forged by some cruel and godless tyrant? 'Forbid it, Almighty God.' Thus was it prayed in other days when a tyrant sought to enslave our colonial fathers. We believe that Almighty God made answer to that prayer through the deeds of those fathers from Lexington to Yorktown. Our Baptist fathers opposed that tyrant, and we, their spiritual descendants, are ready to oppose any other tyrant who impiously aspires to deprive us of any of our God-given and inalienable rights. Shall we have a vision of eternal values less clear than had those early American fathers? Shall we in our strength forfeit those priceless values which they purchased with their blood and in their weakness? May Almighty God forbid that also.

"3. Baptists are a democratic people—none more so. Therefore it is nothing but natural that our deepest sympathies should go out to those democracies of the world which have been crushed for the time being, or now are sorely beset by ruthless powers which are committed to the overthrow of all democracies. We are convinced that England's heroic resistance to the Axis Powers is one of the great sagas of the human spirit. We, like the great majority of people in the United States, are in thorough sympathy with the efforts being made by our Nation to reinforce England in many ways as she fights, not only for her own life but also and incidentally fights a terrible battle for the other democratic nations of the world. It will be most gratifying to us if these efforts of the United States to reinforce England can be multiplied and be made increasingly effective. We trust our Government to work out the wisest and most effective means to aid England, our natural ally, in this titanic strugle.

"NO AID TO JAPAN

"We desire to register with our Government our clear conviction that the United States and her citizens should promptly cease supplying Japan with materials which enable her to continue her war of conquest against China.

"We also urge our Government to quicken rather than slacken all measures needed to strengthen the defenses of the Western Hemisphere against all kinds of aggression from any and all powers which seek to undermine and to overthrow our peaceful and democratic ways of life.

"4. We pledge ourselves as Christian patriots to pray earnestly unto our God and Saviour that a righteous peace may soon be granted unto all the warring nations; that our own Nation may be spared the horrors of war, if that be the divine will, and that our Nation may be used as a mighty instrument of peace and truth and righteousness and brotherhood; that Almighty God will, in the power of His might, take charge of the nations and overrule their folly and sin to the praise of His great and holy name."

The Tax Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARD JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

LETTER OF LAWRENCE B. WESTON, OF LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter I have received from Mr. Lawrence B. Weston, of Long Beach, Calif., concerning the tax problem.

The letter follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *May 10, 1941.*

Hon. WARD JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: No matter where you place the tax burden, payment thereof will ultimately fall on the man in the middle-class range, of which I am one. The very poor don't pay. The very rich merely pass it on.

We all wanted the defense program, and I think it is high time we started paying for it, along with our terrific national debt, though I question much of the spending which incurred the latter. The banks are bursting with money, so much so that they take the small depositors' money with reluctance. Why, then, should we put our savings in the bank and get practically nothing for them when we have a debt upon which a king's ransom in interest will be paid? I think the whole thing should be handled on as nearly a cash basis as possible—pay as you go.

Yes; I am asking for it. Pour it on heavy while we have something with which to pay. When this thing is over and we fall into the inevitable slump that is sure to follow, Congress may find it difficult to raise funds.

Almost everyone I talk with feels as I do, that while they hate to part with modest earnings, they are eager to pay much higher taxes in order that we might reduce our mounting debt and its ever-present interest. Paying will be a bitter pill, but let's take it and get it over with or at least seriously bite into it.

I believe that all Americans worthy of the name will be proud to knuckle down under a heavy tax load. This will be one way to bring each of us to the realization that he has a stake in the program, and I think he will enjoy it, even though he might grumble traditionally. Many totally escape any direct Federal taxation.

It will only be by hard work and sacrifice that we will be able to make this country strong. There is no easy way, although Americans have come to look for an easy way out of every situation. Germans were forced to sacrifice for their country. We ask for it.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE B. WESTON.

W. L. Gregory, Vice President of Large Midwestern Bank, Discusses Monetary Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

STATEMENT BY W. L. GREGORY, OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, those who are deeply concerned about the future of our country have got to consider her central economic problem. That problem is, in my firm opinion, basically a financial one.

A short time ago the House Conference on Unemployment at one of its meetings had the benefit of the advice and counsel of Mr. W. L. Gregory, a banker of outstanding competence and large experience and presently vice president of the Plaza Bank of St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Gregory's observations, coming as they did out of his experience in the banking business itself, seemed to us of the conference sufficiently worthwhile to warrant inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I submit herewith, therefore, for the attention of the House and of the Nation the highlights of Mr. Gregory's remarks:

The industrial capitalistic nations grew and developed by means of a process of permitting a considerable share of their national income to be drawn off into the higher income brackets and employed for the building of a huge industrial plant. So long as only a few nations were industrialized in this fashion, there were investment and commercial outlets for these nations and their goods in the so-called undeveloped areas of the world. Today the situation is entirely changed. Most of the nations of the world have become in considerable degree industrialized themselves. The plant has been largely completed and there are comparatively few opportunities for the reinvestment of large sums of income or savings by people in the higher income brackets. There are only two possible answers to the problem. Either the approximately 20 percent of the national income that was formerly used for investment has got to be sharply reduced and a major portion of it distributed among the masses of people in the form of consumer buying power so as to enable the home market to absorb substantially all the goods produced at full employment of our people and our plant: or else we must be prepared to operate on a world-wide basis and to go in for a program of competing with other nations in the sale of our goods throughout the world and in substantially raising the standards of living of a large portion of the people of the world so as to dispose of our goods.

Whichever method is used, it is absolutely essential that a managed monetary system as nearly perfect as possible be devised and put into effect.

If we had a perfect monetary system, it would not solve all our problems but no problems can be solved unless the monetary problem is solved.

The original creation of money or credit should be a function of a government agency.

The power to originally create the Nation's money and to control the monetary system must be in a group responsible to the Congress and to it alone.

But there must be a sufficient delegation of power to enable the monetary agent to do its job which at best is an intricate and complex one and will require the exercise of judgment from time to time.

The objective of monetary policy should be to maintain the economy of the Nation at a balanced level of production at which there will be full employment of all productive facilities, including, of course, the labor force.

The productive capacity of the Nation has increased in the past at the rate of about 4 percent each year.

One of our main troubles today is that we have too much decentralization of monetary control. Each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks is too independent of the system as a whole. We must have a controlled monetary system, and the controls must be more effective than they are now.

The proposal to establish and thereafter require a 100-percent reserve-behind-demand deposits is fundamentally sound.

At a matter of fact, the self-liquidating short-term commercial loan is largely a thing of the past so far as banking is concerned today. Seasonal loans are seldom made any more. This is due in large part to changes in business practices, such for example, as the tendency of many companies to carry their own reserves and meet their own financial and credit needs in this manner.

Eighty-five percent of the banks' assets today are capital loans.

To develop an effective monetary system, however, there must be a central body similar to the Federal Reserve Board. It must operate under a mandate from Congress set forth in the form of objectives to be accomplished, but such a central body must be given sufficient power to accomplish those objectives. Among other things, it must be given the responsibility to recommend action in the field of taxation which is one of the most essential elements in monetary control.

The Proposed Increased Gas Tax—The Farmer and the Worker Will Pay the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely unnecessary for me to point out that the citizens of Vermont have established an incomparable record for individuality. To all, it now is obvious that the citizens of Vermont think for themselves. Their convictions are deep and their actions based thereon. Often, they may not see eye to eye with the citizens of other States on matters of common interest, for they are not easily influenced.

But there is one matter of public policy in which the citizens of Vermont find themselves in complete accord with the rest of the Nation. Vermont, industrial and agricultural community and vacation center that it is, therefore, desires to place herself on record, along with numerous other States, as viewing with alarm current attempts further to penalize automotive transportation by increasing the Federal gasoline tax.

We of Vermont feel particularly strongly about this matter, because the economic history of the State literally has been molded by transportation. Let me call attention to the fact that the evolutionary progress of Vermont agriculture during the past 150 years has been a history of heartaches and recoveries brought about by transportation changes. The first early change from a self-sufficient to a commercial agriculture occurred with the development of roads and the availability of markets for surplus crops. General livestock farming became common, wool was the main product, and the famous Morgan breed of horses was developed in our State for sale in eastern markets. Hogs and cattle were driven in large numbers to Boston, Montreal, and New York.

The extension of the railroads to the West brought an end to all this. Commercial agriculture in Vermont declined sharply under the pressure of western competition. Vermont farmers turned to the dairy cow. Again, increased railroad efficiency brought an end to this prosperity, by handing the eastern butter markets to western producers. Once again, agricultural emphasis changed, and, today, Vermont is the principal source of milk supply to metropolitan centers. This later development was brought about by the development of the motortruck, which made it possible to truck milk daily from farm to milk plant, and to ship fresh milk directly and daily from dairy to market by tank trucks. Efficient highway transportation now is the key to our agricultural prosperity.

It therefore is obvious that efforts to discourage the use of the motortruck by increasing its costs of operation threaten the prosperity of the entire State. As Dr. H. R. Varney pointed out in a study which he made for Cornell University of the transportation of milk to the New York market:

The costs and methods of transporting milk from the country plant to the city are * * * of vital interest to the dairy farmer.

During 1939 the farmer received only 40 cents out of every dollar spent by the consuming public for food. It would appear to be contrary to sound public policy to take any step which arbitrarily would increase the costs of transportation and decrease by still more the amount which farmers receive from the consumers' dollar.

THE FARMER AND THE MOTOR VEHICLE

The farmer's interest in the gasoline tax extends quite beyond the transportation-cost problem of the dairy industry. Of the total vehicles registered in Vermont, it is estimated that 36 percent of all passenger cars and 61 percent of all trucks are found on farms.

Actually, the automobile has revolutionized Vermont country life. And,

again, this goes beyond the fact that the motor vehicle has simplified the farmer's marketing problems. It has made available to rural children an equal opportunity to obtain an education. It has brought competent medical aid to the door of the farm. It has relieved the semi-isolation which long was accepted as the unfortunate but inescapable lot of the rural people.

Vermont farmers are paying a sizable penalty for these advantages. They must use a large proportion of the pitifully small cash income which they enjoy in order to meet the tax demands now being made on the person who owns a motor vehicle in Vermont. It is said, for example, that special motor-vehicle taxes on Vermont highway users are nearly a third greater than such taxes paid by the average highway user in other States. The average motor-vehicle owner in Vermont pays an annual special-tax bill of nearly $70. Since his vehicle is worth no more than about $200, the Vermont farmer therefore buys his truck or car in taxes every third year.

Highway users now contribute to the State of Vermont nearly half of all the taxes collected by the State. Since farmers own most of the trucks and a large proportion of the passenger cars, these motorists' taxes impose the greatest burden on the farmer.

FARMER CANNOT ESCAPE BURDEN

It is useless to suggest that the farmer could escape this burden by foregoing the use of his motor vehicle. It is obvious, after all, that the automobile has become so intimate a part of agricultural life that the farmer prefers to make whatever tax sacrifice is necessary in order to keep his truck or car. The simple statement of the fact is that the farmer today simply cannot get along without them.

So, in all probability, the farmer will continue to buy gasoline even though the Federal gasoline tax is increased. His use of the vehicle may be curtailed somewhat, and he may decide that it is too expensive to use his car for anything other than absolutely necessary pursuits.

The inequity in the situation really arises because the farmer has no alternative to paying the taxes. In the last analysis, the question of what is in the best interests for the Nation's citizens is involved in any tax bill—whether under normal or emergency conditions. It is the belief of the citizens of Vermont, as evidenced by letters I have received from my constituents, all of whom to some extent are dependent upon the continued prosperity of agriculture, that a further increase in the Federal gasoline tax unduly would penalize this one group of taxpayers. They believe and so do I that the burden which would be imposed by this tax would be so great as to offset the value of the tax as a revenue producer. The greatest good to the citizens of the Nation could not and will not be accomplished by its imposition.

Graduation Address at United States Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR O'CONOR, OF MARYLAND, AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Governor O'Conor at the Naval Academy, and also a short editorial:

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 17, 1941]

GOVERNOR O'CONOR MAKES A GRADUATION SPEECH

Prominent men chosen to make graduation speeches are not ordinarily among the most fortunate of mortals. The occasion to which they address themselves is an annual one; hundreds of millions of American youth have been addressed by hundreds of thousands of prominent citizens in much the same circumstances. Small wonder that the average of such speeches is a bore to the speaker and to the audience.

Governor O'Conor made a graduation speech on Thursday to the Naval Academy's first graduating class of Reserve midshipmen. It was by way of being a rather special occasion. There was something stimulating in it, and it was to be expected that the Governor would rise to the occasion. But he did more than rise to the occasion. He made a truly eloquent and moving address, as felicitous in phrase as it was cogent in argument. It was a fine presentation of the American cause in the present emergency and an impressive restatement of the American ideal.

A public man capable of realizing the special opportunity for ringing words which the occasion presented and of finding these words and using them to such good effect ought to have special praise for his accomplishment. For its part, the Sun thanks Governor O'Conor for his speech to the young midshipmen.

ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR TO RESERVE ENSIGNS, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MAY 15, 1941

This is not an ordinary occasion. The circumstances under which these exercises are held are indicative of its exceptional nature. Extraordinary conditions justify, and indeed require, that recourse be had to extraordinary measures.

For obvious reasons, it should be a source of pride to be a member of this class. Establishing precedent, as you do at this famed institution, you are the envy of countless numbers of fellow-Americans who glory in your success today. Congratulations are in order and are heartily extended. But those congratulations might well be offered to a Nation, which can invite such a group of young patriots to offer their services, at great sacrifice, and can receive such a response.

It is no exaggeration to say that yours has been an exceptionally difficult call. Collegiate or business careers have been interrupted, if not left permanently, to secure through intensive application the requisite training for a commission in the naval forces of our country, and commissions from the United States Naval Academy are never given except upon requisite scholarship and demonstrated fitness.

The American Navy has ever been the pride of our people. As a peace-loving Nation, the very idea of a huge standing Army has been inconsistent with our nonmilitary attitude. On the other hand, a realistic view of world affairs over the past century caused the Federal Government to maintain a highly efficient naval service, which more than made up in quality what it may sometimes have lacked in quantity. Our far-flung possessions and moral obligations in respect to hemisphere defense called for such a policy. The admittedly high regard in which our people have always held the Navy is proof positive of the efficiency and competency of its personnel

If I may be permitted to add a word, as expressive of the view of Maryland citizens, it would be confirmatory of this appraisal. Maryland has been fortunate in seeing at close range the operations of the Naval Establishment, by reason of the location of the United States Naval Academy. No State could glory more heartily, or could find greater justification for praise than we, as next-door neighbors, who have been grateful that the officials of our country saw fit to locate this great institution on the banks of the Severn.

It is into such a Naval Establishment that you are being admitted. But even more significant is the time at which you are called for the employment of your abilities. In view of the volcanic state of world affairs, it is timely for us to face facts realistically and to state conclusions frankly. Never before—at least during the modern centuries—has the world been confronted by such a threat as it is now called upon to face. Not since the days when the hordes of Islam sought to over-run Europe has there appeared a challenge of such widespread significance as that with which the Dictators now threaten the world.

So defiant and rapid has been the onslaught of these modern Tamerlanes, that the anxiety of virtually the entir. universe has been forced to give way to the realization of a sense of immediate danger. In their mad, but, up to now, triumphant march, the laws, practices, and decencies maintained among nations have been despised and violated. The uses and rights of private property have been disregarded or destroyed. The guaranties of political and individual liberty have been cast aside. Freedom of religious worship has been either infringed upon or denied. The very foundations of western culture and civilization have been uprooted.

When, climaxing all this, the dictator has gloated that his aim is at world conquest, it is high time that our Nation spared no effort for national defense. Let us face the realities, though they be as hard as gun-steel, and as bitter as sacrifice can be. What are some of the realities?

One is that America is only one step away from war. Anyone who tells you otherwise is dodging the truth. Anyone who tries to minimize, to evade or to escape this grim fact, even though well-intentioned, does not square with things as they are.

Yes; America is only one step from war—the most destructive, all-encompassing war

that this planet has ever known. All the instruments of man's genius are being engined for the purpose of spreading death and extinction. There is no one who is safe. There is nowhere to be safe—if we allow the enemy to come to us. And it is as certain as the rising of tomorrow's sun that come to us he will, unless he is crushed and smitten before he makes his lunge.

Why is America so close to war? There are physical causes and there are moral causes. Let us consider the latter first. By our very nature, by the consecrated blood of our forefathers, by our creeds and covenants, we are the moral enemy of all tyranny. We are the moral opponents of any nation or any government which sets itself up as master of mankind. For it is our national faith that men shall be free, and not be slaves; that they shall be equal before one another as they are equal in the sight of God, and not be subservient to false godheads of military might or political overbearance. We are the spiritual antagonists of racial hatreds and religious intolerance; of promise breakers, of all who would trample and annihilate the dignity of man the wide world over.

Nor are these moral issues by any means one-sided. Our dislike for dictators is as nothing compared with their blood-hungry loathing of us. For as long as America stands, she is a beacon in the sky, a promise in the heavens to all the downtrodden peoples of the earth. As long as the torch of liberty burns in our land, there is light upon the earth, there is hope, and there is incentive to rise against the oppressor. How bitterly then must all tyrants hate us? How wishfully must they connive and conspire to have us fall? How artfully in secret council and how savagely by hidden daggers are they forever trying to deal a disabling wound?

No; there is no denying these moral enmities. There is no dodging the responsibilities. Even if we wish it, America could not help being the symbol of world-wide hope. We have been just that for 300 years. It was to the New World that the victims of old oppressions began to look, back in the seventeenth century. It was to the North American Colonies that the experimenters in workable democracy first came and set up constitutional, responsive governments. It was on this continent that the first great and enduring Union of free peoples was instituted. And it was to this country that the fugitives from aggressors migrated in search of what they could not obtain at home. Small wonder, indeed, if the eyes of Europe still turn west—some with longing; some with jealousy. And well may it be said of America—that she is loved for the enemies she has made.

But there are physical reasons, too, for our nearness to war. It has become trite, but remains important, to stress the shrinkage of space in modern times. Whereas the width of oceans once guaranteed us against surprise attack, these waters are almost as obsolete a defense as a moat around a medieval castle. Our watch towers can no longer be set up along the shores. They must be mobile and they must be far-flung to spot an oncoming armada. The old ramparts of Fort McHenry can no longer turn back an invader who now takes to the skies. The old command "Don't fire 'till you see the whites of their eyes" would be a suicide order on a modern Bunker Hill.

And just as space has dwindled, so our line of outpost has been extended. It is not enough to make sure that no enemy approaches the coast line from Maine to Florida. Experience has shown that a peace-loving nation cannot idly await his coming and expect to resist his approach when he appears on the borders of the country. The United States cannot submit to backdoor penetration, and you know, and every well-informed person knows, that we have an Achilles' heel in Panama that must be protected from the east as well as the west.

For even if the American democracy were not a moral menace to dictatorship, the American continents would be a temptation. When the warlords have trampled down the harvests and gutted the mines and demolished the factories of Europe and Asia, where else can they turn for new materials of war and peace? Our land as well as our liberty must be defended; our food as well as our freedom.

Having gathered into their hands such almost indescribable power, the enemies of civilization now confront us with defiant confidence, while they predict the destruction of our liberties and our way of life. It is in the face of such dire contingencies that our people watch and wait, speeding with all their energies further preparations for defense while they wait. For defense, let us repeat, because our Nation has never been, and is not now, the aggressor. There is no land or possession of another country of which we are envious. There is no prized possession of any world power which would cause the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy to send American boys to risk their lives to seize. We have desired to remain at peace, which desire can only be extinguished by unfriendly tactics of hostile nations.

Having roused ourselves to the need, the preparation for defense is now proceeding on a scale consistent with our position, our genius, and our capacity. In an unusually valuable connection in that defense, you gentlemen will be a part. Under the shadow of such a world peril, you are being called to one of the highest services of our defense. Each of the services necessarily is of vital importance. The circumstances of today, however, indicate that the sea service will, at this time, be of the first importance. It will be the function of that service, of which members of this class will be a part, to patrol the oceans, as well as to cover with the utmost care all the water approaches to our soil.

Responding to the urge of self-preservation, our governmental leaders have sensibly chosen the course of supplying munitions and means of defense to the heroic peoples of Britain, who are standing valiantly in our defense, as well as in their own, in withstanding the progress of the dictators. And in giving such help, our President and other national leaders are backed by the overwhelming majority of American people. But when we say that for purposes of self-preservation, if for none other, Britain must be supplied with the tools, it is obvious that she must be supplied with them and not merely offered them. To be effective, those tools must be in hand where the invaders' fury is now centered; that is, in the British Isles. It will serve no useful purpose, and least of all the outnumbered defenders of democracy in England, to have American industries produce the implements of defense, only to have them sent to the bottom of the ocean while en route to the place where their use is essential.

America, as I said, has ever been proud of her Navy. During the past 12 months, however, this feeling of pride has given way to an even more satisfying feeling of confidence—supreme confidence—on the part of all of us that the American Navy is ready to face, and turn back, any onslaught that might be directed against our shores, by sea or through the air.

This confidence has been generated not alone by the addition of the giant battleships *North Carolina* and *Washington* to our fleet; not alone by the fact that in cruisers and in destroyers, in airplanes and in submarines, we have added reassuring numbers of the most modern fighting craft. The prime source of this supreme confidence in our Navy is the realization on all sides that its personnel, the gallant sailors who man our fighting ships, measure up fully to the exacting standards that have always prevailed in our sea forces. In intelligence, in training, in courage, and morale the United States Navy is the equal, or superior, of any Navy in the world today. And you men can be proud to claim membership in its ranks. You enter a service which has never known defeat.

What, then, does one say to young men commissioned in the service of their country? Certainly you can be given no easy promises, no empty phrases, none of the usual graduation pat-on-the-back advice. Nevertheless, it would be just as wrong to hand down the doctrine of despair. History has shown that there never was a time within the life of our Nation when the principles on which it was founded have not been challenged. And those challenges, those threats, have been met by young men remarkably like you. If you are sons worthy of your forefathers, why, then let the enemy beware. If your feet stand as firmly on the decks as American feet have stood before, then the world may truly believe that there shall be no night.

How shall I charge you with your duties? I shall charge you in the names of Perry and Farragut and Dewey; of John Paul Jones and Joshua Barney; of the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* and *Old Ironsides*. I shall remind you of the traditions of the service you are entering; of the men before you who went "down to the sea" in American battleships and swept the enemy from our waters.

For let us remember that the future still belongs to the youth of the world. It is going to be whatever you make of it. The flame of liberty burns inside the human heart, and it will not die in hearts that are ardent with courage and determination. Yours is the heritage of brave hearts and bright souls. Yours is the legacy of freedom and of glory. Be it yours, too, to keep that which our forefathers won and bequeathed us.

Optimism and confidence, based upon determination and resolute action, should be the watchwords of the day. America will say, "Yes" when the question is asked whether we can organize and discipline ourselves to meet the efficiency and brute force of the dictator nations without impairing our system of government or losing our essential rights.

Whatever sacrifices are necessary will be made. Whatever cost is required will be met. Whatever temporary adjustments are essential will be arranged.

We of this generation will keep faith with our forefathers. We will preserve the Nation they founded, and we will pass on to our descendants the same democratic form of government and the same individual liberty and freedom which always have been and, God willing, always will be the heritage of the American people.

The Course America Should Follow in the Present European Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress charged with the responsibility of cooperating with my colleagues in formulating the legislative policies of our Government, many communications are being received from

eminent and thoughtful citizens expressing their views on the international situation and advising the Members of Congress as to the course our Government should follow in dealing with belligerent nations.

In this critical time with so many things of vital importance to our Government, and our people pressing for attention, it is difficult to find time or an opportunity to make a detailed reply in response to each of these communications which are deeply appreciated and most helpful in determining the course to be followed in maintaining our international relations.

For the information of my colleagues and the RECORD, there is inserted a letter I have written in reply to one of the communications referred to:

Now, coming to the consideration of the course to be followed by our Government in dealing with the belligerents in the present conflict, and I am sure you and I are in agreement on one point concerning the war—WE WANT TO STOP IT; we want to save civilization and preserve the homes, facilities, and edifices reared by the labor of centuries; but, more important, and here we seem to differ—still, to my mind, we must insure the rights of the masses to enjoy the fruits of their labor and the equality of opportunity to enjoy liberty and justice and safeguard the general welfare of the human family in general to achieve and maintain the objective of our Constitution to "establish justice and insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare, and secure (preserve) the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." To maintain these ideals of government you and I must envision the future beyond the limitations of the present conflict, and here it seems that we differ in the course that our Government should follow.

Realizing the horror and futility of war, I was in full accord with the ideals of President Wilson in his effort to devise and put into operation a plan to settle international disputes and prevent war, stopping at nothing short of establishing and implementing this authority. In that great hour of opportunity, world conditions and international influences prevented this achievement when domination of the seas, financial and business control proved more important, according to the ideals of victorious European countries, than the adoption of these great humanitarian principles. Confronted with these conditions, our country was forced to abandon our conception of international cooperation and turn its attention to conserve and advance the welfare of its own people, and in furthering this constructive program we adopted the good-neighbor policy in maintaining our international relations.

I must admit that after all our efforts and sacrifices in support of a humanitarian program "to outlaw war and make the world safe for democracy" embodied in the 14 principles announced by President Wilson and subscribed to by the belligerent European government, it made my heart burn to witness the misery and destruction inflicted on the people of Greece by the aggression of the Turks and invasion of Manchuria by Japan, to be followed by the aggression of the Italians in Abbyssinia; England, with her domination of the seas, international financial control, and her world Empire working in accord with the Government of France and the French Empire, has, by financial, military, and political mismanagement, involved themselves and all their neighbors in this disastrous war. No one, not I at least, will accept the proposition that when England and France declared war on Germany they were in fact declaring war for us.

I stand on the principles that when this country has a cause for war against another country, it is time then, and not until then, for us to take up hostilities and declare war. We have the resources, we have the men, and we have the technical skill to arm ourselves and to protect and defend our country from invasion from any quarter or by any coalition of foreign powers. We should continue to stand by the principles of fair dealings as announced by President Wilson.

Since England and her British Empire were allowed to maintain its position as mistress of the seas and financial world domination, and has contrived to hold in suppression the people of other countries, and England and France have failed to join the family of nations in adopting some acceptable plan by relinquishing some of their powers to establish a tribunal with policing powers to maintain and enforce international peace, then England and the rest of the nations will have to take the consequences just as the people of any community would have to do if they refused to establish police and courts to maintain law and order. You may say this is "indulging in fine-spun philosophy." George Washington may have indulged in rugged philosophy when he refused to let this country be drawn into the conflict between England, our recent enemy, and France, our former ally, in the days of the intrigues of "Citizen Genet" when Washington resisted the popular clamor of our citizens for support of France and rigidly maintained our neutrality. Fine-spun theories or not, it is my philosophy that we have no business interfering in the struggle between Germany and England, and if our Government is to undertake the role of an international policeman, then we must have a voice and participate in the consideration of international controversies which may lead to war, and as we have taken no part in such deliberations and have had no say in the course adopted by the belligerents, then we have no business meddling in the affairs of the warring countries or taking part in their hostilities.

The issue involved in the present struggle transcends any personal control or the personal ambition of any dictator, and we can best serve our own people and humanity by keeping out of this war and keeping war from our shores so that we may remain strong and impartial and be willing to assist humanity to restore peace and rebuild its shattered governments on the broad and firm foundation to be constructed on the concepts of our imperishable Constitution.

Conscientious Objection—A Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY REV. DR. JOHN K. RYAN

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Dr. John K. Ryan, associate professor of philosophy, Catholic University of America:

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION—A POINT OF VIEW

(By Rev. Dr. John K. Ryan, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Catholic University of America)

Recognizing that the question of conscientious objection to military service would arise with the enactment of the Selective Service Act, the American Government has attempted to solve the problem in terms of democratic principles and traditions. It has seen that no good purpose will be served by trying to force into military service a man who is intellectually and emotionally unequipped for such service. If a registrant can show that he is unable, according to the dictates of his conscience, to serve in his country's military forces, he may be placed in class IV–E, in which he may do work of national importance under civilian direction.

As a result of this just and liberal policy, about 2,000 conscientious objectors will begin on May 15 a year of civilian service in work camps provided by the Government for that purpose. Seven unused C. C. C. camps are now ready for the conscientious objectors, and 14 additional camps have been selected for the total that is expected by next July. The conscientious objectors will, of course, receive no pay for their year of service. While in camp they must either support themselves, at an estimated rate of $35 per month, or receive their support from the religious sect to which they belong, or from some other sponsoring body. A National Service Board for Religious Objectors has been formed and the camps have been provided as a result of its cooperation with Government officials. The camps are experimental and may be discontinued after 6 months if the plan is not successful.

A large number of the conscientious objectors are Quakers, Mennonites, and United Brethren, but over 60 religious denominations in all are represented. A few of the objectors profess no religious belief. Although comparatively few in number, Catholic conscientious objectors have yet been numerous enough to project a separate camp of their own. In view of the Catholic Church's historic attitude toward war and its insistence on the clear duties of citizenship, and in view of the admitted need for national defense, Catholic conscientious objectors are expectedly few. It is in reference to the present American situation that this article is written.

Statements explaining the position that they have taken have been made public by a number of Catholic conscientious objectors. These have been upon a high plane and show evident and great sincerity throughout. In a number of them emphasis has been placed upon the right and calling of Christian perfection. This is an important and interesting way of thought and one that should be completely developed in all its implications in discussion. Aside from the matter of whether perfection of life and active military service are incompatible and apart from questions related to this matter, it is well to make certain distinctions that are necessary for discussion centering around the questions of war and participation in it. These are principally the distinction between justifiable and unjustifiable use of force and the distinction between defensive and aggressive war. These are traditional among Catholic writers upon the subject of war and must be borne in mind if fundamental errors are to be avoided.

With regard to the moral character of war, there have long been two fundamental errors. One of these is extreme pacifism: The condemnation of all war as something intrinsically and essentially evil, together with the consequent refusal to take part in any war, since war as such is held to be wrong. This extreme pacifism is a false and immoral doctrine. It is as false and immoral as the opposing doctrine of the extreme militarists, such as those of Germany, Italy, Russia, and

Japan, who exalt war as something good and desirable in itself. The extreme militarist claims that war is always justifiable, no matter what the ends or circumstances. In the last analysis, these two pernicious errors amount to the same thing. Both are denials of the existence of right in any genuine sense of the word. The ruthless aggressor, attempting to impose his will by force upon another state, says that might alone makes right. In effect, the extreme pacifist agrees with him, for the pacifist repudiates the right and duty of self-defense before physical assault. It is important to note that Catholic thinkers from the first centuries of the church down to our own day have been as opposed to the pacifistic error as to the other.

Any tenable doctrine must not only oppose these two errors; it must also make careful distinction between two kinds of war, defensive and aggressive. Defensive war has never presented any moral problem. The Nation, just as the individual, has the right of using force in self-defense against unjust aggression. Furthermore, a nation, to be worthy of the name, has the duty of building up its defenses against possible or probable attack. Hence the problem of the morality of war arises only when it is a matter of aggressive war; of an attack deliberately begun and carried out by one nation in order to impose its will by force upon another. Clear cases of aggressive war are the attack of Germany upon Poland, of Russia upon Finland, of Japan upon China, and of Italy upon Greece, to mention only a few instances from recent history. The traditional Catholic doctrine on war has attempted to lay down norms by which we can judge the moral character of aggression. In general it may be said that these norms are such that they demonstrate the folly as well as the malice of the typical aggressor, especially in the modern world.

It must be noted that physical force can be used against the unjust aggressor in defense of another's life and goods as well as in defense of one's own. So, too, in the case of nations. A nation can exercise force in defense of another victim of unjust aggression as well as of itself. Sometimes men and nations have the duty of going to the rescue of others as well as the right to do so. However, whether this right becomes a duty depends upon circumstances that vary from one case to another. But when a nation goes to the rescue of another fighting in just self-defense, it is itself to be considered as fighting a defensive war. This is especially the case where the original aggression has been such as to endanger the peace of the entire world and to constitute a threat to nations that would themselves prefer to remain neutral and at peace. Finally, it is obvious that a nation may be fighting a defensive war in the moral sense while it is fighting an aggressive war in the military or strategic sense. Thus the armies of Greece were for many months attacking those of Italy, but the Greeks were nevertheless defending their country against an aggressor.

These are basic distinctions that must be made. In view of them, no careful or consistent thinker can be guilty of the absurdity of saying that because the unjust aggressor is wrong in waging war his victim must likewise be condemned for waging war. Yet that is the pacifist's error. He denies the existence of the right and duty of self-defense. More precisely, he denies that he as an individual citizen has the right or duty of serving in his country's military forces. This position is both false in theory and disastrous in practice. It is explicit in the Oxford oath, taken a few years ago by so many young Englishmen, with its pledge never under any circumstances to fight for king or country. It is implicit in the statement of some American conscientious objectors that they cannot rightly take part in a "war effort." Actually, to take part in a "war effort" may be the strictest sort of moral duty for those who are called upon to render military service to the nation in time of danger.

It is particularly difficult to accept the conscientious objector's argument with regard to peacetime military service. Here, again, is the familiar failure to make essential distinctions. There is a clear distinction between military defense undertaken in times of peace and the actual waging of war. In the case of a right-minded government, such peacetime military measures are designed to prevent actual war and to forestall attack. If the citizen has the duty of serving in his country's army when it is actually at war, he has the right a fortiori of serving in the army for peacetime defense. Yet the conscientious objector, in an appeal to some asserted duty of nonresistance, denies that he has either right or duty of serving under arms in national defense.

The refusal to accept military service on the ground that such service is wrong involves other errors. The pacifistic objector takes the position that he has the right and duty of passing upon the Nation's policy of defense and of deciding whether that policy is just or unjust. It is certainly not within the moral or mental competence of every citizen to decide upon the wisdom and morality of the most momentous questions of national policy. Especially when the state makes decisions upon war, possible or actual, must its decisions and ends be put above the private citizen's opinions and preferences. The presumption certainly must be that the Government has fuller knowledge and can pass a better judgment upon the Nation's danger and needs than can the private citizen. The fact certainly is that the responsibility for the good and safety of the whole Nation and all its citizens rests upon the Government. Obedience can hardly be said to be here a mere matter of choice. Nevertheless, the supremacy of conscience, recognized by American law, still remains. Hence, if after deliberation with competent authorities, the decision is reached that the war is unjust, then a man has the duty of following the sincere and enlightened dictates of his conscience.

If the conduct of the conscientious objector were followed upon any large scale, there would be chaos within the Nation at a time when national unity of mind and effort is of the utmost importance. If large numbers of citizens claimed the pacifist's exemption from military service, they would make national security impossible and render the country an easy prey for the attacker. It is certain that the duty of serving in the ranks and upon fighting ships must fall upon some citizens in time of national danger.

Duty and right are correlative; each involves the other. In the matter of wartime service, it is necessary to remember that the citizen has duties as well as rights, and that these duties fall on all, although in varying degrees and ways. It is evident that if one man fails in his duty of serving his country in the way that is required of him, others must bear an added burden. Most men and most nations do not want to bear the heavy burden of armaments and extended military service. Certainy America has turned to them as a last resort and after long delay in order to maintain its power and freedom in a warring world. It is only if all Americans unite to do their proper share in the task of national defense that the rights of the Nation and the individual citizen can be safeguarded and extended. Whether for defensive measures in times of peace or for the actual conduct of war, moral realism requires a complete account of duties as well as of rights.

We live in a real world in which powerful nations have proclaimed by word and deed their determination to change the existing order by the sword. Against this ruthless and brutal appeal to the sword, modern Popes, Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XI, and the present supreme pontiff, Pius XII, have uttered repeated warnings. Voicing the moral aspirations of the great mass of mankind, they have again and again pointed out to what doom the path of aggression leads. Pope Pius XI a decade ago said that he could not believe in the existence of a state "so monstrously murderous and almost certainly suicidal" as to plunge the world into a new war. Yet such states have appeared, and ruthless aggression, deliberately planned and savagely executed, has been the record of the past 2 years. Small nations have fallen victims to the aggressor, some of them even without a struggle. Great nations, assaulted one after another, lie crushed and dismembered. In the face of these realities, every nation, and America above all, has the duty of keeping itself strong and alert. In the face of these realities, American men and women, possessed of liberties and goods beyond all other peoples, have the clear duty of serving their Nation in the defense of its just rights and dignities.

Our Farm Laborer Deserves Draft Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DEPOSIT (N. Y.) COURIER

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Deposit (N. Y.) Courier of May 15, 1941.

[From the Deposit (N. Y.) Courier of May 15, 1941]

OUR FARM LABORER DESERVES DRAFT CONSIDERATION

It is becoming increasingly apparent that draft boards serving rural areas have just as great a responsibility not to aggravate shortages of skilled farm labor as do other boards not to drain the supply of skilled industrial labor.

Agriculture is listed among the Nation's chief defense industries and our leaders should well realize it would endanger the health and safety of the country if the farms were to be deprived of irreplaceable workers, of whom there already is a growing shortage because of a drift of farm labor to the higher-paid industries.

Registrants who are inducted from the farms are entitled to the same job protection as any other employees. When a farm worker has satisfactorily completed his Army training, or when he has been rejected at any Army induction station, he should be allowed to resume his employment without loss of any rights or privileges and at wages at least as good as he had before selection. No registrant ordered to report for induction should resign from his job, but should be granted a leave of absence until his return—whether that return is to be within a few days or after a prolonged period of military training.

The Strike at Trona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE INYO (CALIF.) INDEPENDENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Inyo Independent of May 2, 1941, or the Trona strike that has existed in California:

[From the Inyo (Calif.) Independent of May 2, 1941]

THE STRIKE AT TRONA—A CHALLENGE TO TRUE AMERICANS

Yesterday was the forty-ninth day of the Trona strike in which the C. I. O. has tied up the American Potash & Chemical plant. In the meantime Robert Lamson, leader of C. I. O. strikers, and A. A. Hoffman, manager of the Trona plant, are sitting around the Federal Mediation Board table in Washington, D. C., where a solution for the labor trouble is being sought.

We are interested in the development of this strike, its progress, and in its solution, because the strike has definite influences upon this area, for the following reasons:

First. To freeze the economic welfare of a community of more than 1,200 persons in our desert region works a hardship, not only upon the workers and the company but also upon outlying trade territory.

Second. Because we have been advised that from Trona its labor agitators plan to extend their operations into the mines and other labor fields of the Owens Valley. We know that certain of the Trona strike leaders have been in the Owens Valley recently, casting their eyes on developments at Reward Mine, which is operated by the Golden Queen Co., near Lone Pine; and also the tungsten mines in northern Inyo. In fact, we understand that Messrs. Fred E. Balch, Othello H Smith, and Lou Snyder already are working in this valley.

We hold no brief against workers organizing into unions, or against unions themselves, but we doubt if the type of leadership being offered at Trona is the type of American leadership that our labor here should follow.

The probable intention of these men in visiting our valley is to place from one to two or three of their members from Trona on pay rolls of local mines, so that organizing can get underway in the best accepted manner, as known to radical leaders such as we have at Trona.

Now about the Trona strike itself.

It seems to us that what is needed at Trona is a little more plain, everyday American guts.

We know that most of the workers at Trona are American citizens, patriotic in their desire to see this Nation go forward to the solution of its internal and external problems.

Isn't it about time for them to band together and remove the present bargaining committee and bring this strike to a happy settlement?

The company has agreed to many things. It has offered minimum wages of 75 cents an hour, scaling up to $1.15 per hour, which is said to be higher than any other like scale in the United States. The company has offered an apprenticeship program which the union wanted. It has agreed to union recognition; straight seniority in promotions, demotions, and rehiring; certain company benefits to employees called into military service; 3 days vacation after 6 months' service, 8 working days' vacation after 1 year's service, 10 working days' vacation after 2 years' service; full grievance procedure; joint management of company retail activities; and an additional housing program amounting this year to $370,000.

The company will not agree to one thing, and that is the closed shop and preferential hiring clause insisted upon by the C. I. O.

Now the laborers themselves have been given almost everything they demanded. They should be satisfied. But the organized, radical leaders of Trona C. I. O. want to inflict their own hiring procedure upon a company which has many technical employment problems, is located far from the usual labor market and must be selective in its hiring.

We believe that 90 percent of the men now on strike at Trona want to return to work.

The other day we talked with another Trona man, a member of the C. I. O. now on strike at the American Potash & Chemical Corporation.

In the course of our conversation, he said: "I'm ready to go to work, if Robert Lamson will let me."

In case you may not know it, Mr. Lamson is the man who is the leader of the strike at Trona.

He is the chap who is said to be a Communist. At least his leanings allegedly are radical and hardly compatible with a real desire to see labor and capital (or management) prosper side by side.

Some time ago we had several talks with Lamson.

He comes from an interesting background. Reports say his father was killed in a strike. Lamson, the son, was formerly in the Northwest where he got his early training in hating things pertaining to capitalism and in serving as a labor leader. When the C. I. O. came into being he very naturally found his niche as a labor baiter, an agitator and a man who seems to avidly enjoy working in behalf of labor friction and trouble rather than labor peace and happiness.

After all, why should Mr. Lamson be the dictator of whether a man should or should not work? Is Lamson the little tin god of Trona, which is a part of this democracy we call the United States? Who is Lamson to say whether men should be gainfully employed or not?

We frankly question whether Mr. Lamson and his close associates really have the best interests of their own C. I. O. members at heart. Perhaps revenge against capital in general is their theme song.

Mr. Lamson appeals to us as a person who is doing exactly what Mr. Hitler likes to have done. We recall that Hitler wrote and declared that he will capture America from within.

How?

By encouraging strikes, by developing class hatreds. By arousing agitation against law and order.

It seems to us as if Mr. Lamson and some of his cohorts are now helping the cause of the swastika.

Now an amusing situation has developed at Trona among the strike leaders. In their booklet entitled "The Story of Trona—An American Fight for Independence," they made much of the fact that the American Potash & Chemical Corporation is a British concern.

Then a few days ago in their publication, The Trona Striker, they discovered that British capital no longer controls Trona. That is right, and has been known to some people for some time. Just before the opening of the war, British capital sold its interest in Trona to a couple of Holland capitalists. Then Hitler and his legions struck Holland and since that time no one knows who has the stock. The Dutchmen may have it, or Hitler may have seized it.

So now the C. I. O. leaders have turned tail from condemning the company as British, and infer that it is ridden with the controlling tenacles of Hitlerism. In their publication they say: "Most of us were stunned when we learned that the Third Reich had its fingers deep in Lake Searles brine. A. P. & C. C.'s stock is owned by German capital, has been since 1929, through holding companies of Netherlands capital."

Hitler may control the Netherlands but no one knows who controls A. P. & C. C. However, its stock was sold to Holland, and not Germany; not in 1929 but in 1939, and since Hitler took Holland, the United States Government really controls the stock now, because all assets of Holland have been frozen in this country by action of President Roosevelt.

Such is typical of the reasoning of C. I. O. leaders at Trona and of their utter disregard for truth as it is commonly known and appreciated by Mr. Average Man.

Which reminds us of the C. I. O. statements in their booklet, in which they called attention to defense materials furnished by Trona.

Then when the Federal Mediation Board was asked to take over strike discussion the C. I. O. leaders immediately turned tail and said that Trona doesn't produce important defense needs.

The facts, however, are otherwise, in spite of the C. I. O.'s so-called research department.

Trona's products are used in defense. Among these are borax and boric acid. Immediate clearance was asked some time ago by Sidney Hillman, of Washington Office of Production Management, for 10 tons of boric acid for Owens Corning Fibreglass Corporation, and 40 tons of chemical boric acid for the Corning Glass Works.

Mr. Lamson evidently fears the true light of Federal mediation.

It is time that people realized that the leadership of Trona's strike is communistic. It is not American.

Robert Lamson, according to American Federation of Labor records, is a Communist. At least he was a Communist, and we doubt if he has changed his red underwear. Lamson in 1937 and 1938 lived in Long Beach. He was assigned by the Communist Party to unit E-10 to carry out special work of that branch of the red organization. Communist files also disclose that in 1938 he was married to Connie Pickett, who was at the time of the ceremony harbor section dues secretary for the Communist Party of America.

William Gately, another Trona C. I. O. leader, according to Communist records, joined the party in 1937. He was sent to the Communist Party county school in Los Angeles in 1937 and 1938. There he received instruction and was an apt pupil of Grover Johnson, C. I. O. attorney, so reports the A. F. of L.

Eddie Pulsifer is reported to be listed in the Communist Party book as No. 1912. He was assigned to the industrial section of the red party.

These statements were published late in 1940 by the A. F. of L. To date they have not been refuted, we are told.

In addition, Harry Bridges, who is now on trial for his Communist affiliations, after investigation by the F. B. I., took an active interest in the Trona C. I. O. program. He visited Trona and talked to the men there.

After all, what kind of company is this for loyal, patriotic Americans to be in?

And C. I. O. leaders seem to stop at nothing.

We have just seen a recent copy of a mimeographed sheet known as "The Trona

Striker." In it is a statement addressed to C. I. O. members who purchased autos, and so forth, on time and who evidently cannot make their payments. Among other things, the sheet recommends the following:

"Automobiles are the major problem, and they (the credit organizations) cannot repossess a car if they cannot find the car; you may have loaned the car to a friend to take a trip to Oshkosh, or some other place."

In other words, C. I. O. leaders blandly advise their members to hide their cars away from collectors. Such practice is criminal in the eyes of the law.

We print this only to ask the question: "Is the C. I. O. at Trona, and its methods, above the law?"

On May 2, Friday magazine came out with six pages devoted to Trona and the strike. Its publication was filled with misrepresentation. Its pictures, for the most part, were posed for C. I. O. effect. Friday magazine, incidentally, is a red radical publication.

A father of one of the boys at Trona, now on strike and who would rather be working, saw a copy of Friday magazine and wrote his son to return home. He was worried to have him live in "such conditions."

This was the son's reply to his father, which we think is worth printing:

"DEAR FOLKS: Received your letter about Friday magazine, and can readily notify you that it is based on deliberate lies. The union is trying to do everything to degrade the company and are using Hitler methods of propaganda.

"I not only like it here but I actually love it. I live like a king. This is the best camp of its kind in the United States. If you were here you could see for yourself and you could talk to anyone and find out that the article is not representative. Just a bunch of dirty lies. Everybody here complained and wanted the truth in a retraction.

"The men at the head of it are professional union organizers and got us into the strike. They tell us that they use propaganda to make the company come around and settle the strike. The article is a standing joke. Froest is a union organizer and really lives in a beautiful room with all the facilities you could possibly get if you paid $4 per night in the best hotel. Learn never to believe what you read or hear unless you see for yourself and talk to the people. There isn't a vestige of truth in any one of the pictures in Friday magazine.

"Life magazine is going to tell the complete truth very soon and expose the Communist magazine. The union organizers sell the Friday magazine here. I sincerely wish you could see for yourself or have somebody see this place. Wish that ——— could have seen this place and I can assure you she wouldn't want to leave. It's so absurd that it is all a standing joke around here. I showed your letter to everybody around here. Pa, this really is a paradise. Although the Mexicans live on the other side, their houses have all the facilities one could want. I went over there and saw for myself. The family picture depicted by Friday showing them all in one room is a gross fabrication as I know the house and how many rooms and where they all live. The union uses just such methods in order to arouse public opinion against the company, and also to get donations to fight the company. They have used the same tactics in the Allis-Chalmers and Ford strikes, if you have observed.

"Some day when you see this place you will say, 'I can see now why you've stayed here close to 5 years.' I could get all the jobs in the world but there would never be a better place than this one. The pay has always been higher than anywhere in the country. Excessive heat in the summer is about the only draw-back, but when one is acclimated it isn't bad at all. I could go on writing for hours but I'm getting tired.

"Love,

"——— ———."

All of the above has been printed because we know that many men at Trona are wishing for an end to this strike.

It is time that America awakens to its needs.

Labor strife must stop. Management must cooperate, and radicals who would destroy our democracy must be removed from power.

Labor is gaining nothing at Trona by continuing the strike.

Management at Trona has offered the men practically everything they desire, and more.

It is now up to men at Trona to decide if such men as Lamson have the men's best interests and the interests of this Nation at heart.

Again, we reiterate, that we believe in the rights of workers to organize. We believe in their right to bargain under the N. L. R. B.

But, we believe also, that American labor will lose all of the advantages it has gained unless it realizes the present situation of America in its defense program, and unless it takes control away from radical, un-American labor leaders who are selfish in their motives, and owe allegiance to organizations and creeds that are un-American.

It is a challenge for workers to be Americans first.

Why America Should Stay Out of the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT, OF MISSOURI

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the Hon. PHILIP A. BENNETT, of Missouri, at a meeting of the Women's Republican Club, Sixth Congressional District, Warrensburg, Mo., on May 16, 1941.

Every American should read this speech. The sentiment it expresses comes straight from the heart. Forthrightly and courageously the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] states his reasons why America should stay out of the European war. Best of all, this is not a mere political speech but a true expression of his conduct and votes in Congress.

The address follows:

Greetings, my friends of the Sixth District. This is one time a man is to speak and women have no opportunity to talk back. Sorry that I cannot be with you today. But it is a great privilege to be able, by means of the inventive genius of our people, to greet the many fine Republican women of the Sixth District. Your Congressman, our party, and our country are indebted to you for your loyal, unselfish service. I trust that all are happy and may your meeting be a great success.

As your Congressman, I am faced by many problems, but there is one question constantly before me that I want you to think about because I need your moral support and help. The question to which I refer is, "Shall America offer her finest young men as a sacrifice to the god of war?"

During the campaign of 1940 I realized that powerful forces were at work to involve the United States in the age-old quarrels of Europe. I promised then that, if elected to Congress, I would do all in my power to keep America at peace and that I would never vote to send an American boy across the ocean to help fight some other nation's battles. I have felt that such pledge had much to do with the great majority of votes given me. That promise was not campaign oratory but came from one who believes with all his heart that Uncle Sam should build strong national defense and keep his nose out of the other fellow's business. If we will do this, there is no nation, nor combination of nations, capable of doing us serious harm. Just as in the days immediately preceding the first World War, we are being told that if England goes down we will be the next to feel the might of Germany. A vital question of the day is, therefore, "Can Hitler invade America?" For one, I am not convinced. First of all, remember that the countries he has so far conquered are much smaller, all put toether, than the United States. Their total populations equal 110,000,000 people. Ours is 132,000,000. They were 7 different countries, each small compared with Germany; each (except Norway) right on Germany's land frontiers. Hitler attacked each one separately. All he had to do was to roll across their borders with his vast mechanical equipment.

Germany has 80,000,000 population, a tremendous army and an air force three times the size of Britain's. England has only 50,000,000 people. But when Hitler turned on England, there was the English Channel, once crossed by a woman swimmer. Eleven months after France fell he has not even attempted to cross that narrow strip of water with soldiers or tanks. If he should attempt to invade the United States he would have to face the problem of crossing with his armies and equipment 3,000 miles of ocean and not 50,000,000 people on a small island, but a great nation of 132,000,000 people and resources far greater than his own. Friends, all statements to the effect that Hitler could invade our country, even if we would build strong defenses, is pure propaganda for the purpose of leading you to advocate war now.

With the invasion threat refuted by facts the war dancers next raise the threat of economic warfare as an excuse to involve us in foreign wars. They say we would lose our export business. This I deny. But for argument's sake grant it is true. Well, how many years would it require for our exports to equal in value the cost of our participation in the war to say nothing of the lives of millions of our finest young men?

We must provide our country with defenses that will make an invasion by force, however great, impossible. However, I do not favor creating a force capable of invading Europe, Africa, or Asia and carrying on an aggressive war there. I plead with you to stop, look, listen. Remember there is no military authority in this country who believes that an invasion of America by Germany—with or without the British Fleet—is possible.

Two powerful groups favor war. First, the international bankers who desire to preserve with the blood of our boys the financial investments they have made in Europe, Africa, and Asia. They are not interested in preserving democracy. I pause to observe that the chaos resulting from this war will, as before, in all participating countries, speed up the trend toward socialized government, restricting the four freedoms for which it is urged that we fight.

The second group working for war is the inner group of brain trusters. These alien-minded gentlemen who set out to change our form of government have made considerable progress, but are not satisfied. If they can get America into a shooting war, they will

doubtless be able to accomplish their purpose in the turmoil, and under the name of another "emergency."

No; it is not our war nor of our making.

Recently I had occasion to make a trip into the South. I was surprised to learn that in some sections of the South there is still considerable hatred of the North. Why? Because of a war 75 years ago. If, in this Nation where we are of one blood, speak the same language, worship the same God, and prosper or suffer together, ill feelings will exist after three-quarters of a century and even when the vanquished admit that it is better that the North won, can't we understand why there is mistrust, hatred, and fear among the nations of Europe?

There are 20 races living there, speaking a score of different languages and having divergent interests. Their last war was not 75 years ago. They have fought every few years since before the Christian era. They have a set of primary interests entirely foreign to our own. Mistrust is rampant. We sympathize with the oppressed, but we cannot, through force of arms, bring and preserve free representative government to them. We cannot, by force, establish lasting peace where the teachings of the Prince of Peace after 2,000 years have failed to bring it about.

Believing that the lease-lend bill was the first step nearer another blood bath for American youth, one step nearer totalitarianism for the United States, I was unwilling to add my vote to help in any way a course of action which I am convinced can end only in the same bitter disillusionment and futile disasters of the first World War. Advocates of that bill claimed that it was a peace measure. Later, when the second step toward war in the form of $7,000,000,000 appropriation for England and her allies was offered, I spoke and voted against it. I then felt that the third step toward war would be convoys; that proponents of the measure would soon be saying that it is foolish to manufacture implements of war for England and permit them to be sunk.

When the subject of convoys was first mentioned to the President, he claimed to oppose their use and said, "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

Another definition for convoy is "a funeral train." That is just what it will be for the United States if we permit our Navy to convoy supply ships to Britain. It will be a funeral train for millions of our boys killed in an unnecessary war and a funeral train for a great Republic murdered in a foolhardy adventure.

In spite of the truthful definition given by the President, members of his Cabinet and administration leaders in Congress are now urging the use of convoys. Again, I am in opposition. I sympathize deeply with the victims of the aggressors but my first duty is to my native land.

If we are to have a war, it will be a war of our own making. It will be a war thrust upon the American people by foreign agents and propagandists now operating almost uncurbed and unmolested in this country. Why, by the use of deceptive publicity and an appeal to the gullible, thrust our country already to the brink of war, actually into the combat as a full-fledged belligerent in a second attempt to preserve democracy where democracy in the main has already perished.

In this foolhardy attempt to save democracy for countries that manifested a gross inability to protect and preserve it for their own nationals, the war mongers in the United States would sacrifice and destroy the last remnant of democracy and personal liberty that remain in our own Republic.

No Member of the present Congress can dispute the fact that the law-making branch of our Government has practically surrendered its powers to the Executive.

Napoleon once said, "Give me the power over the purse strings of Europe and I will control its destiny." Today the President of the United States has everything that Napoleon wished for and more. God grant that he may use that power wisely and for the best interests of our country. But, alas, we have good grounds for fear. It has long been understood that Cabinet members submit their speeches to the Executive for approval before delivery. I need not remind you that all members of the Cabinet, save one, have recently delivered addresses or gone on record in favor of all-out aid to England.

We cannot look out of the window on these wonderful May days without feeling that it is a beautiful spring. Proof of God's love for the grand and beautiful in nature and for His children surrounds us wherever we go. Various peoples of the earth seem to have overlooked the fact that "The nation that forgets God shall perish." Men must be controlled by God or they will be governed by dictators. Alas, that guns should be so dear and flesh so cheap. The cry of the oppressed and starving is so great that all the waters of the oceans are unable to stifle it.

But, by subtle subterfuge and well-organized propaganda, this great Republic, blessed by Almighty God and favored by geographic location, is being forced step by step into another bloody conflict 3,000 miles away. If those who cause war, if those who vote for war had to fight the wars, there would be much less war in the world. I repeat that I sympathize deeply with the people of England, but I also sympathized with the people of Poland, Finland, France, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, and China. I voted to turn $2,000,000,000 over to the President to use for the relief of victims of the dictators, but the administration would accept nothing short of the peace-end bill. The British Empire still has tremendous resources of men and materials and ships, and they declared war themselves when they got into this conflict. It is their war, in my opinion, and it is not our war. If I felt, as some profess to feel, that England was fighting our war, I would favor a declaration of war. We should not be hypocritical. We should point out the war mongers for what they are. We should prove true to the trust imposed by American sacrifice on every American. If the people will act, they can yet prevent this Nation's involvement in a shooting war. Public opinion is a mighty force. The people are opposed to war, but the propaganda is all on the side of the war mongers. If you want to protect your boys or those of your neighbors; if you want to preserve peace for your Nation, give voice to your desire by writing or telegraphing the President. He will listen if the number of your messages is sufficiently great. Speak while you still have free speech. Remember, the only voice of the oppressed is the cry of woe. "You cannot preserve democracy where it isn't by crucifying it where it is."

The Federal Goverment Should Leave the Field of Taxation on Gasoline to State and Local Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of tax raising in support of national defense is one of the major problems facing the Congress today. We who must determine where this tax burden will be placed are confronted with appeals from many groups of our citizens urging that the taxes be not increased on their particular activities. In fact it is difficult to propose additional taxes in any field without meeting with this objection. We must all be prepared to sacrifice and to realize that in order to carry forward a defense program involving the expenditure of $19,000,000,000 at least in the next fiscal year we must face the necessity of added tax burden upon every activity. However, in meeting this problem we should, insofar as possible, endeavor to spread the burden equitably without increasing the weight of new taxes disproportionately on any group of our citizens. We should place the heaviest burden upon new profit arising out of the national-defense program itself. We should not permit a new crop of war millionaires to come out of our defense program.

There is a proposal to place an additional Federal tax on gasoline which, in the views of many of us, would be a serious mistake. It must be kept in mind that at the same time the Federal Government is seeking to find new sources of taxation and raise immense sums of new taxes, the State and local governments must carry on and provide sufficient revenues through taxation to meet not only their continuing expenses, but to take care of bonded indebtedness heretofore contracted. The tax on gasoline originated in my own State of Oregon. It has proven to be an ideal tax for the State and local communities with which to finance and maintain their roads and highways, and many of the States, like my own, are using this source of income exclusively for that purpose. Many of the States have incurred indebtedness and issued bonds relying upon these revenues to meet their maturing obligations. If the Federal Government now preempts this field of taxation, it will tend to dry up this source of revenue to the States and leave them without adequate sources of taxation to meet their commitments.

The Federal Government already has laid a tax of 1.5 cents per gallon on gasoline. State taxation on gasoline now averages 4.4 cents per gallon which, with the Federal tax, brings the total to 5.9 cents. If 1 additional cent were added by the Federal Government, it would bring the total tax on gasoline to 6.9 cents. In this connection, it should be recalled that many of the States have a tax in excess of the 4.4 cents average. This added burden would impose a sales tax of more than 50 percent on this one essential product. Gasoline has come to be a necessity to the farmer as well as to many of our industrial activities. As shown by the statement of Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, which I will ask leave to include as part of my remarks, from 27 to 68 percent of many agricultural products are now moved from the farms to the markets through the use of gasoline-driven trucks.

While it is true that the Federal Government has contributed to some extent to road construction throughout the

States, this contribution is small in comparison for the total expenditures for this purpose. From 1917 to 1939 the State, county, and local governments expended for roads $29,675,397,000. The Federal Government expended during this time, through the Bureau of Public Roads, $3,225,026,166, which included money spent for grade crossings, forest roads and trails, and national-park highways. The Federal Government, from July 1935 to June 1940, through the Works Progress Administration, spent an additional sum of $2,931,738,000 on the highways, roads, and streets, and the Public Works Administration also expended $641,133,429. The total of these Federal expenditures aggregated $6,797,897,595, of which approximately four and three-quarter billions was for relief. It is thus seen that the Federal expenditure for roads is a very small part of the total expenditures made by State and local governments. Furthermore, the Federal expenditures are for original construction, with the exception of maintenance in its own publicly owned areas, and the States and local governments have the burden of maintenance and upkeep.

No other commodity so essential to the farming industry and the general welfare of the American citizen is taxed as heavily as gasoline, and it would seem the part of wisdom for the Congress to refrain from adding this additional burden upon the farmer by levying an increased tax upon gasoline, now bearing a sales tax of more than 50 percent.

As a part of my remarks, I include the statement of Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on May 16, 1941, during a hearing by this committee on revenue revision for the year 1941. The statement follows:

The National Grange recognizes the fact that our national-defense program calls for heavy increases in taxation. Such new taxes as may be imposed in this connection should be levied as fairly and equitably as possible. These levies should be of such a character as not to destroy our system of private enterprise, upon which the security and well-being of the Nation so greatly depends in the emergency with which we are now confronted. On the other hand, no person should be allowed to make any inordinate profits, nor should taxes be levied for purely punitive purposes.

The Grange has long been opposed to a general sales tax on the ground that it is a tax on the necessities of the people and violates the principle of ability to pay. However, we believe that excise taxes upon a carefully selected list of commodities are justified under prevailing conditions.

We do not believe that the existing Federal tax of 1½ cents per gallon on gasoline should be increased. The highway users of the country are already paying their full and proportionate share of all general taxes. In addition to that, they are contributing, in round figures, about $2,000,000,000 a year in special highway taxes of various kinds—Federal, State, and local. This sum is approximately equal to 14 percent of the total revenues accruing to all the units of government in the United States. Roughly speaking, State and local taxes on highway transportation amount to $1,500,000,000, while the Federal Government is collecting about $500,000,000 a year from this source.

State taxes imposed on gasoline now average 4.4 cents per gallon. The existing Federal levy of 1.5 cents per gallon brings the total to 5.9 cents. Adding another cent per gallon for Federal purposes would bring the average total to 6.9 cents per gallon. At the present retail price of gasoline, this would represent a sales tax of more than 50 percent.

So far as agriculture is concerned, motor transportation under modern conditions is not a luxury but an absolute necessity. More than 1,000,000 motortrucks, or about one-fourth of the country's total, are owned and operated by farmers. A recent survey discloses the fact that with the abandonment of many branch lines of railroads that are no longer profitable there are about 48,000 communities throughout the United States that are entirely dependent upon highway transportation.

The farmer must have his motor-vehicle facilities, and he does not feel that his use of the highways is a proper and adequate measure by which to determine his contribution toward the cost of national defense.

Some idea of the importance of the motor vehicle to the American farmer may be gained from the records of the United States Department of Agriculture, which shows that approximately 27 percent of the butter, 39 percent of the eggs, 65 percent of the poultry, 40 percent of the fruit and vegetables, 62 percent of the cattle, 61 percent of the calves, 68 percent of the hogs, 29 percent of the sheep and lambs, and 50 percent of the mules and horses are now moved from farm to market by truck.

When the revenues derived from gasoline taxes are expended in improving and maintaining the highways, there can be no legitimate criticism. However, it must be kept in mind that much of the gasoline purchased by farmers is used for plowing, harrowing, threshing, filling silos, pumping water, operating spraying machinery, sawing wood, grinding feed, and for other purposes that do not involve any use of the highways. Many States properly refund the tax to farmers on gasoline used in such ways as have been enumerated. Other States do not make these refunds. So far as the Federal tax on gasoline is concerned, no refunds whatsoever are made. To increase the Federal gasoline tax would, therefore, result in increasing the farmer's cost of production.

The cost of transportation constitutes the biggest single service charge that agriculture has to pay. The imposition of an additional Federal tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline would make present excessive transportation costs on farm commodities just that much higher. This would be true of the more than 1,000,000 trucks operated by farmers themselves. It would likewise be true of common and contract carrier trucks that transport the products of the farm, and which haul supplies consumed on the farm.

The owners of common and contract carrier trucks will naturally speak for themselves But it is only fair to say with respect to them that they are engaged in a highly competitive business. The exhaustive study made by former Federal Coordinator of Transportation Joseph B. Eastman shows that highway users are paying their fair share of highway costs and more. The Eastman report, made public about 2 years ago, indicates that trucks as distinguished from passenger cars are paying more than their share of the cost of improving and maintaining our highways. Assuming the correctness of these findings, it would be just as logical to place a special tax for defense purposes on the coal consumed by the railroads as it would be to place a special tax for defense purposes on gasoline.

The intrusion of the Federal Government into the gasoline-tax field cannot be regarded as legitimate. Such appropriations as the Federal Government has made for highways can all be justified from the standpoint of national defense, to facilitate the transportation of the mails, and for other purposes benefiting all the people alike.

By far the major portion of the funds that have been expended for the improvement of our highways has come from State, county, and local sources. From 1917, when the Federal-Aid Highway Act took effect, until 1939, the States expended $16,695,397,000 for roads. During the same period, county and local expenditures for roads amounted to $12,980,000,000, making a total of $29,675,297,000.

During the years in question, Federal expenditures on highways, which were supervised by the Bureau of Public Roads, now the Public Roads Administration, amounted to $3,225,026,166. It should be noted that this includes the money spent for the elimination of grade crossings, forest roads and trails, and national-park highways.

In addition to this, from July 1935 to June 1940 the Works Progress Administration spent $2,931,738,000 on highways, roads, and streets.

Public Works Administration grants for streets and highways from July 1933 to June 1940 amounted to $641,133,429.

The total of all these Federal expenditures aggregated $6,797,897,595, of which $4,757,046,318 was for relief.

The primary purpose of the relief expenditures was to supply work for the unemployed. In fact, in appropriating emergency relief funds for roads, Congress expressly stipulated in awarding contracts in this connection that as much hand labor as possible should be employed.

In support of the proposition that the gasoline tax properly belongs to the States, it should be kept in mind that under the Federal-Aid Highway Act, the funds appropriated by Congress all go for construction. The cost of maintaining these roads devolves upon the States.

Further than that, the States and their minor subdivisions have issued highway bonds in large amounts, and they are depending principally upon the revenues derived from the gasoline tax to pay off these bonds as they mature. As of January 1, 1938, the latest reliable figures available show that the total outstanding highway bonds of the States amounted to $1,931,370,000. Of this total, bonds valued at $466,387,000 were issued to reimburse counties for roads that were originally built from the proceeds of county bonds. County and local highway bonds outstanding as of January 1, 1940, have been roughly estimated at $1,000,000,000.

These figures prove conclusively that the gasoline tax belongs to the States. While everybody recognizes that the revenues of the Federal Government must be greatly increased to meet the costs of national defense, we cannot lose sight of the fact that our State and local governments must likewise be supported and maintained. That the tax policies pursued by the Federal Government during recent years constitute nothing less than a threat to the sovereignty and independence of the States, drying up the sources of revenue upon which they must depend to finance their activities, cannot be denied. The best hope of preserving our democracy lies in preserving the independence and sovereignty of the States, and this cannot be done by pursuing policies of taxation that will gradually reduce the States to impotency and bankruptcy.

The legislatures of half the States, fearing that the intrusion of the Federal Government into a sphere of taxation developed by the States to provide funds for road improvement may have serious consequences on State financing, have memorialized Congress to withdraw from the field of motor-fuel taxation. Congress should certainly heed the voice of the elected representatives of

the States in this matter, because they speak for the majority of the people of the Nation.

In considering ways and means of raising by current taxation as large a proportion as possible of the funds needed to defray the cost of national defense it appears to be necessary to broaden the tax base and to fairly and judiciously lower the exemption on incomes. As we have already indicated, no one should be allowed to make any undue profits, whether from defense contracts or in the regular line of business. We do not want another crop of millionaires such as was spawned by the first World War. Congress can take care of this situation by properly graduating the tax on personal incomes, the corporation income tax, and the excess-profits tax.

In view of the situation with which we are faced the nondefense expenditures of the Government should be held to the lowest possible minimum, without sacrificing any really essential public service. It would be grossly improper and unfair to impose back-breaking taxes upon the people, with the Government squandering public funds to maintain supernumerary employees on the pay roll, or in promoting projects that are nonessential, and which do not contribute in any way whatsoever to the cause of national defense.

Importations of Foreign-Produced Pears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE OREGON-WASHINGTON-CALIFORNIA PEAR LEAGUE, INC.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include copies of two resolutions adopted by the Oregon - Washington - California Pear League, Inc., on April 25, 1941, protesting against the importation of pears. The resolutions follow:

Whereas this organization heretofore has found that importations into the United States of large quantities of foreign-produced pears, which compete directly in the largest markets with pears produced on the Pacific coast, necessarily interfere with and tend to defeat the purpose of the Federal diversion program for west coast fall and winter pears which is in operation under section 32 of the Federal Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended; but no effective relief from such excessive importations has resulted to date from the efforts of the Pacific coast pear industry and of Members of the Congress from the Pacific Coast States: Now therefore

Resolved, That after due investigation and consideration, it is the finding and judgment of the members of this, the Oregon-Washington-California Pear League, Inc., the organization charged with administration of the west coast fall and winter pear-diversion program in effect under section 32 of the Federal Agricultural Adjustment Act, that (1) limitation of the quantities of foreign-produced pears which may be imported into the United States during any season should be determined and made effective early in the season, so that the pear industry of the United States properly may adjust and arrange its marketing program accordingly; and that (2) in the event the Federal Government fails to restrict the importations of foreign-produced pears, the Government should take some action which will prevent an excessive quantity of such foreign-produced pears from coming into competition with the pears produced within the United States, the marketable quantities of which are being limited under a Federal marketing-agreement program, and the diversion of which from normal channels of trade and commerce is being carried on with Federal funds under the provisions of section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; and

Resolved, That we hereby respectfully do request the members of the Congressional delegation of each of the Pacific coast States to continue their efforts to obtain for the Pacific coast pear industry some protection against excessive importation into the United States of pears produced in foreign countries, to the end that ultimately there will be made effective, either under the authority of section 22 of the Federal Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, or under such other or additional legislative authority as may be necessary for that purpose, a reasonable and effective limitation upon or restriction of the quantities of foreign-produced pears which may be imported into the United States; and

Resolved, That the officers of this organization hereby are authorized for and on behalf of this organization to take all proper steps to induce and hasten effective governmental action to stem the growing tide of pear importations; and the Secretary of this organization shall forward a copy of this resolution to each of the Members of Congress from the States of Oregon, Washington, and California, and to such other Government officials or other interested persons as the Secretary may deem advisable.

Whereas this, the Control Committee, established by and engaged in administering the Federal marketing agreement No. 89 and order No. 39, regulating the handling of certain varieties of west coast fall and winter pears grown in the States of Oregon, Washington, and California heretofore has found that importations into the United States of large quantities of foreign-produced pears, which compete directly in the largest markets with the fall and winter pears produced on the Pacific coast and the marketing of which is regulated and limited by the aforesaid marketing agreement and order, necessarily tend to render ineffective and materially to interfere with the marketing control program undertaken under said marketing order and marketing agreement; and

Whereas this committee heretofore, by resolution adopted December 27, 1940, requested the President of the United States, acting pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended and reenacted, to cause an investigation to be made under said statutory provisions by the United States Tariff Commission and such limitation thereafter imposed upon the quantity of foreign-produced pears which may be imported into the United States as such investigation may show to be proper, but no such investigation by the United States Tariff Commission has as yet been undertaken and no action has been taken under the aforesaid section 22 to limit importations of foreign-produced pears: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this control committee hereby does request the members of the congressional delegation of each of the Pacific Coast States to continue their efforts to obtain for the Pacific coast pear industry some protection against the excessive importation of pears produced in foreign countries, to the end that the purposes and beneficial effects of the current west coast fall and winter pear program whereby the growers and shippers of west coast fall and winter pears withhold from market each year a large portion of the total production, will not be defeated and offset by the importation into this country of large quantities of foreign-produced pears; and

Resolved, That in the event it appears to be impossible to obtain, or unlikely that there will be obtained, any effective action under the aforesaid section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended and reenacted, efforts be made to obtain the enactment by the Congress of such other legislation as will afford the Pacific coast pear industry reasonable and effective protection against such excessive imports; and

Resolved, That after due investigation and consideration, this control committee finds and determines that limitation of the quantities of foreign-produced pears which may be imported into the United States during each season should be determined upon and made effective early in the season so that the pear industry may gage and adjust accordingly its marketing program for that season; and

Resolved, That the Secretary of this committee hereby is directed for and on behalf of this committee to forward a copy of this resolution to each of the Members of Congress from the States of Oregon, Washington, and California, and the officers of this committee are authorized to take all proper action for and on behalf of this committee in accordance or consistent with this resolution.

The Road to the Ruhr of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Ruhr of America surrounds her great inland seas. Almost all of the important industrial States of this Nation border the Great Lakes. More marine traffic in tonnage is borne on the fresh water of the five lakes than in all our foreign trade.

No sound reason can be advanced for refusing to build a road for cheap transportation to the industrial heart of America. One by one the specious arguments against the seaway have been disproved. The last attempt was an unfounded recital of legal jargon repeated in an effort to raise the question of whether or not we were surrendering the sovereignty of Lake Michigan. I secured indisputable proof that the treaty as presently drawn would not affect our control of the Lakes from the Solicitor of the State Department and the Attorney General, which made an end to that nonsense.

When the Panama Canal was proposed, the scorching opposition raised the same objections that we hear today about the waterway. Now the Canal is universally praised. The St. Lawrence seaway is more important because of the greater need. The shipping tonnage which passes through the locks at Saulte St. Marie is twice that which utilizes the

Panama Canal and the Suez Canal combined. The only consideration that is germane in studying this project—does the need exist for a new route from Superior to the sea? The affirmative answer is obvious.

The President, after much study, has said that the construction of the seaway is vital to our continued national defense. Some people have shouted that the present plans call for the completion of the seaway in 4 years and that the present war will be over then. Since when, may I ask, can anyone foolishly presume that the end of the present war will mean the cessation of efforts for national defense? Such drivel! It is more likely that the end of this conflict will mark the beginning of greater defense plans. Who knows how long this war will last and can say with smug certainty that in 4 years this project will be too late to assist us?

It has become increasingly apparent that we will have to use the shipyards of the Great Lakes to turn out not only merchant but fighting ships. It takes 4 years to finish a capital fighting ship and construction could begin immediately to insure delivery as soon as the waterway was completed. Wisconsin yards are building submarines for the Navy and must send them to the ocean piecemeal where they are assembled. In the last war the shipyards of the Lakes sustained our merchant marine through a feverish and extensive building program. The same procedure was adopted at that time.

The reason for the President urging the construction of this route from the Atlantic to the Lakes is to tap the resources of these yards. The shipbuilding centers on the Lakes are far removed from the dangers of coastal attacks and bombings. They are close to the sources of building supplies. Our yards on the coasts are overloaded with work, and we need very desperately the added construction capacity of the lake yards to supply our needs and those of Great Britain. The fall or victory of the British Empire, for which we are making huge sacrifices, depends on the replacement of her shipping. Every thinking Member of both Houses should be urging the approval of this project.

When the vested interests alone are the proponents of a project, I usually question its public benefit. The people who are urging the congressional approval of this great trade route are the breadwinners of this country, the practical people who are motivated only by the desire for progress and the common sense administration of this Government. To support this contention, I quote from a resolution adopted by the Superior Federation of Labor:

SUPERIOR FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Superior, Wis.

Whereas the project commonly known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway has been advocated for a great many years; and

Whereas the completion of such a project is of tremendous importance in the light of our national-defense program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Superior Federation of Labor, of Superior, Wis., the central labor organization of Superior, representing 41 labor unions, hereby goes on record as wholeheartedly favoring and urging the immediate commencement and the completion of, as soon as possible, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Wisconsin.

Dated this 2d day of April 1941.

CLARENCE C. REHL,
President.

CHARLES FELL,
Secretary, Legislative Committee.

This represents the views of from 8,000 to 10,000 laborers. The man with the dinner pail, who is the solid foundation of this industrial democracy—the one who pays and feels the burden of heavy taxes—is not urging the expenditure of huge sums of money for something from which no benefit commensurate with the spending will be derived. He usually arrives at an independent conclusion after some hard-headed thought.

The issue of defeatism is being bruited about a great deal lately in connection with our international problems. The isolationists are called appeasers—and worse. I propose that we employ the same terms to those who fail to see, or who refuse to recognize because of questionable motives, the need for an aggressive national outlook.

Bartley Atcheson, editor of Reader's Digest, once rightly said:

I have no patience with sniveling defeatism.

I have none with those who refuse to assist in making this a dynamic and industrially great America.

This project is sorely needed by the entire Nation. The inland agricultural regions and the mighty industrial sections should no longer be isolated from foreign trade. This project is needed so that in our well-sheltered shipyards we can build mighty battleships and merchantmen. We need this project to open new industries and jobs in that great belt of the unemployed. No one can say that we do not have as great danger to this Government and system of living from within as from without. I propose that national-defense efforts like charity shall begin at home. When the resolution for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway comes before Congress I suggest that we rise with a unified purpose, transcending sectionalism, and vote for the good of the Nation—for the seaway.

The issue is placed before us with understanding and foresight in a resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis.:

Whereas the Midwest is vitally concerned in a deep-water outlet to the high seas, the State of Wisconsin, having 22 lake harbors entering the inland oceans, known as the Great Lakes, has championed such a project for many years. The city of Racine, having a harbor in point of water-borne commerce on Lake Michigan, has never ceased its efforts to secure the improvement of the St. Lawrence River as an efficient connecting link between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean.

Whereas the people of the Midwest are conscious of the fact that a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives them of an economical, expeditious, and free outlet for their factory and farm products to the markets of the world, the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel, as advocated by successive Presidents of the United States, will prove an economic advantage to the Nation as a whole. It will bring the Midwest a thousand miles nearer the high seas and that much nearer to the markets of the world.

Whereas, while the project must be regarded as one of the highest importance under normal conditions, it assumes a special significance at a time when the Nation is deeply concerned in the same as a defense measure. While the eastern section of the country is seeking more power service, the Midwest must have greater navigation freedom.

Whereas there can be no doubt that the great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region forms a vital part of an entire Nation, and, therefore, should not be hampered or hindered in rendering a maximum service, the shipbuilding industry in the Great Lakes region deserves encouragement. Such industries not only have their advantage in being centrally located, but at a time when the Nation is dealing with the matter of defense they are more secure if located in the mid-country; and

Whereas thus the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project does not only possess power potentialities and navigation advantage, but also forms an important factor as a defense measure: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Racine herewith formally and respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project as outlined by the President of the United States, and thus remove the economic barriers which now afflict the Midwest country and the Nation as a whole; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives of the National Congress, and to the mayors and common councils of the important sister cities throughout the United States.

Adopted.

Hull's Peace Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. BARNES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News]

HULL'S PEACE AIMS

Secretary Hull's outline of peace aims is statesmanship at its best. It takes the public into the administration's confidence—which is the only way a democratic nation can achieve national unity. And it reveals that the administration is thinking in basic economic terms.

Realism inspires the post-war reconstruction program suggested by the Secretary of State:

"1. Extreme nationalism must not be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.

"2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper.

"3. Raw material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination.

"4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.

"5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries."

That is a far cry from the economic monstrosities of the Versailles peace, which left Germany an easy prey for Hitler and his promises of revenge and conquest.

But it is even a farther cry from the Nazi economic dictatorship which Hitler has imposed upon Europe, and which the Axis would impose upon the world.

Such world economic cooperation cannot be achieved, as Mr. Hull explains, until we have a world free of imminent military danger, and clear of malign political intrigue.

The military and the political cannot be separated from the economic. If Germany and Japan are denied equality of access to world raw materials, resources, and markets, no peace treaties or disarmament pacts will make the world safe from their warring aggression—that was the costly experience of the 20-year truce, 1919–39. And it works both ways: Britain and the United States will not submit to Axis economic domination of the world.

Not only military peace is involved in rational economic reconstruction, but also the political and individual freedoms which are the conditions of democracy. Hungry people are suckers for the demagog and the dictator.

So Secretary Hull is a constructive realist when he talks peace in economic terms. The world has a right to assume that the United States—which controls a disproportionate share of the world's natural resources and gold, and which has been one of the worst offenders in tariffs and trade barriers—will cooperate in fact, as he suggests.

It would be very salutary, we think, if Prime Minister Churchill, who has been so heroically frank in military matters, would now state that Britain agrees with Mr. Hull's peace aims.

Radio Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HOLLYWOOD (CALIF.) NEWS-CITIZEN

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hollywood News-Citizen of May 8, 1941:

[From the Hollywood (Calif.) Citizen-News of May 8, 1941]

CONTROL

While the Nation prepares to defend against external dictatorship, bureaucratic dictatorship within our own Government continues to usurp powers and deny private rights that once were deemed to be incidental to the liberties of democracy.

The recent order of the Federal Communications Commission to the Nation's radio stations and chain broadcasting systems startles the Nation into a keener realization of the dictatorship at home which the New Dealers are plotting.

The Commission, by a 5-to-2 vote, tells the broadcasters that hereafter there is to be no such a thing as the right of contract which all once thought was guaranteed by the Constitution. Advertisers cannot make contracts with the stations they desire to use for the broadcasting of a chain program, says the Commission, and if they see fit to arrange a program for broadcast they must allow any station to broadcast it that so desires.

Under such an arrangement radio listeners would never know from day to day on what stations they might expect their favorite programs. Under such an arrangement an advertiser wouldn't know in advance what a Nation-wide broadcast would cost him or what stations would be broadcasting it.

Under such an arrangement the radio business would be thrown into a turmoil, business goodwill would be destroyed, and enormous financial losses would be suffered by the widespread stockholders in the radio companies.

Throwing the radio business into a turmoil may be a part of the purpose in the minds of the Commissioners. With the effectiveness of radio service destroyed, it would be easy for the New Dealers to step in and take possession of the radio business. With the New Dealers in control of the radio business radio would become the tool of one political faction to control the information received by the public and to develop and maintain a complete political dictatorship in this country.

If Republicans were in power and took any such move as that just taken by the New Dealers on the Commission, the country would not know there was a European war because of the noise the New Dealers would make in protesting a move to place dictatorial powers in the hands of one political group.

Two members of the Commission dissented from the order of the majority. Some of their comment is particularly interesting:

"On the whole, radio broadcasting has an excellent record of public service. * * * Radio is so constituted that it is sensitive to public criticism and responds promptly to changing public tastes. For this Commission or any agency of Government to attempt to substitute its judgment for that of the public involves an arrogant presumption which should be avoided at all costs. * * *

"It can be argued with logic that invasion of this economic field by the licensing authority in the absence of clear legal mandate would constitute an inevitable prelude to the second step of assuming the role of arbiter of public tastes.

"Circumstances may require the Federal Government to exercise broad powers in many fields of our economic life; but it is imperative that broadcasting be maintained as a free American institution."

The great American public will come to a realization of what dictatorship in their own country will mean if the Commission's order is permitted to stand.

Normally one would think that successful resort could be made in the matter to the Supreme Court which has heretofore ruled that the Federal Communications Commission had no authority to go beyond the allocation of mechanical facilities in the licensing of radio. But the Supreme Court is now controlled by new dealers who can write new edicts with startling ease.

If the people do not want their radio entertainment despoiled the people will probably have to look to Congress for protection against a dictatorship that is unquestionably scheming for complete political power.

If radio falls to the dictators, newspapers are next. If newspapers fall, the pulpits are next. If the pulpits fall, Hitler will envy our dictators.

Campaign Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, having received consent to extend my remarks by including therein quotations on the front page of the La Follette magazine now called the Progressive, reminding the President and the Republican standard bearer of their campaign promises made during the last campaign.

The more than 6,000 individuals who have written to me that they are opposed to becoming involved in this war are expecting that these sacred promises be kept. I still believe that the President is doing his best to keep his promise not to involve us in a foreign war in spite of the tremendous pressure exerted on him by his own Cabinet. I hope he keeps steadfast.

The article follows:

[From The Progressive, Madison, Wis., of May 17, 1941]

A MEMORANDUM

From: The people of the United States of America.

To: Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and Wendell L. Willkie, self-designated leader of the "loyal opposition."

Subject: The promises you made to the people of the United States when pleading for their votes last fall.

REMEMBER, MR. PRESIDENT?

"We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conflict or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party; we will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, Naval, or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

"It is for peace that I have labored; and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life" (Philadelphia, October 23, 1940).

"In 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate the hazards which in the past had led to war. We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones" (New York City, October 28, 1940).

"We know that we are determined to defend our country, and with our neighbors to defend this hemisphere. We are strong in our defense. * * *

"The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war" (Cleveland, November 2, 1940).

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

"They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. Yes, the purpose of our defense is defense" (Boston, October 30, 1940).

AND YOU, MR. WILLKIE?

"In protecting America, the maintenance of peace in the Western Hemisphere will be my objective. * * *

"The interests of the United States would have been better served if the third-term candidate had been outspokenly for peace and nonparticipation [earlier] instead of waiting to pledge it in an election" (Cumberland (Md.) October 30, 1940).

"One difference (between my foreign policy and that of the New Deal) is my determination to stay out of war. I have a real fear that this administration is heading for war, and I am against our going to war and will do all I can to avoid it" (Chicago, October 22, 1940).

"We do not want to send our boys over there again. * * * We cannot and we must not undertake to maintain by force of arms the peace of Europe" (St. Louis, October 17, 1940).

"I favor aid to Britain 'short of war' * * * and I mean 'short of war'" (Buffalo (N. Y.) October 15, 1940).

"We can have peace, but we must begin to preserve it. To begin with we shall not undertake to fight anybody else's wars. Our boys shall stay out of Europe. * * * None of us is so simple as to think that Hitler is planning this moment to send an expeditionary force across the Atlantic. * * * He is aware that if we make democracy strong here, his own system of blood and tyranny cannot survive forever" (Cambridge, Mass., October 11, 1940).

The American people expect you to keep faith.

Everyone Must Have His Part in Our Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

PETITION OF LOS ANGELES CHAPTER OF FORTY PLUS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, every person and group in America should have his place and his part in the economic life of America today. Otherwise our defense effort cannot be as strong or effective as it needs to be.

One group that concerns me particularly is the group 40 years of age and over. For years I have had a bill before the House to remove age restrictions as to Government employment. It has seemed to me the least we could do would be to set a good example for industry.

I am glad to include in the RECORD with my remarks the following petition in support of my bill:

FORTY PLUS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, April 15, 1941.

We, the undersigned members of the Los Angeles Chapter of Forty Plus, do hereby ask your support for H. R. 165.

We believe that a man's fitness for work, other than manual, cannot be reasonably measured by his age. For his experience is cumulative and as such is better at 50 or even 60 than at 30.

We therefore ask your earnest support in helping to enact this deserving legislation.

L. L. Moore, 12 South Granada Avenue, Alhambra, Calif.; I. G. Betz, 10980 Ohio Avenue, West Los Angeles; W. C. Jones, 1850 West Seventy-ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; William L. Goff, 822 West Sixth, Los Angeles; Smedley Smith, 529 West Second, Los Angeles; T. H. Dukelow, 2225 Bellevue Avenue, Los Angeles; J. B. M. Wilcox, 1059 South Manhattan Place, Los Angeles; Russell Huffman, 939 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles; G. W. Hoppe 831 East Hermosa Drive, San Gabriel; L. J. Benson, 1041 West Orange Grove Avenue; Louis B. Franc, 139 North Lapeer Drive, Beverly Hills; John L. Hunter, 924½ South Berendo, Los Angeles, Calif.; Fred H. Koch, 1516 North Hobart Boulevard, Los Angeles; J. M. Yeelding, 1672 South Ardmore Avenue, Los Angeles; G. E. Bacon, 317 North Avenue 50, Los Angeles; W. H Piggott, 839 South St. Andrews Place, Los Angeles; A. S. Wilcox, 1709 Hill Drive, Los Angeles; Ben H. Woodcock, 3835 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles; John G. Guffill, 454 West California, Pasadena; Milton C. Robinson, 916 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.; C. L. Johnson, 1740 North Gramercy Place, Los Angeles, Calif; H. Dyock, 916 South Lake, Los Angeles, Calif.; A. E. Herman, 2221 Duane Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; M. L. Henney, 1122 Pointview Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; R. E. Tuttle, 806 West Fortieth Place, Los Angeles, Calif.; F. F. Downs, 2880 San Rafael Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.; H. M. Kurtzworth, 810 South Lucerne Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.; V. E. Nelson, 270 South Bonnie Brae Street; John Bridges, 317 South Olive, Los Angeles; Calif.; H. C. McVeigh, 1349 Linden Avenue, Glendale, Calif.; Lester Bernstein, 6253 Commodore Float Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.; L. A. Rosenfield, 813 South Stanley Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.; G. R. Johnston, 4522 South Budlong Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.; W. E. Hart, 630 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; C. S. Turner, 321 Rosemont Boulevard, San Gabriel, Calif.; Basil E. Fennanstruther, 1202 Roxbury Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.; Manley S. Ross, 4533½ Ambrose Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.; Carl B. Dunster, 8518 Saturn Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Reuben C. Davis, 243 South Manhattan Place; C. E. Cunningham, 6508 Seville, Huntington Park, Calif.; Charles S. Webb, 1421 Ocean Front, Santa Monica, Calif.; M. D. Woolery, 222 South Orange Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.; H. H. Harwood, 1119 South Doheny Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

W. P. A. Appropriations for Next Fiscal Year

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations is starting hearings today on the relief bill that has to do with W. P. A. appropriations. I think these hearings are tremendously important to those sections of our country that have not benefited by national-defense contracts.

In the district I represent there is still an acute unemployment situation. Some people have been taken off the W. P. A. rolls and other people who have been certified by the welfare agencies have taken their places. The W. P. A. is still continuing to do a worth-while work in my section.

I note in today's newspapers that the President has submitted a recommendation for what I consider a rather excessive cut in W. P. A. appropriations. The more you cut them the more people are going to be forced on relief when they are taken off W. P. A. projects.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge ample appropriation of funds for continuance of the W. P. A. program. There is a lot of loose talk to the effect that jobs have been created under the national-defense program and, therefore, the unemployment problem is taking care of itself. Such is not the case. In Minnesota, for example, where no national-defense industries have been located, we still have an unemployment situation which is just as acute as ever. I recently conferred with State Administrator S. L. Stolte, who advised me that while some W. P. A. workers have been taken from the rolls and have found jobs elsewhere, their places have promptly been taken by people on relief who have been certified by the local county agencies. In other words, there has been a waiting list, and where there have been people who have left W. P. A. employment, others on relief have promptly taken their places.

Northern Minnesota, for example, and this includes the city of Duluth, Minn., has shown no industrial recovery because, as I have pointed out, no national-defense industries have been located in our section. I understand that the same situation prevails in other parts of Minnesota. The need for W. P. A. projects in that section of my district known as the Iron Range will become all the more necessary because the State legislature recently reduced the amount of taxes which local municipalities may levy. This will prevent these municipalities from carrying out their present policy of furnishing employment to many people in the various places affected.

I realize that in some sections of the country where national-defense indus-

tries have been located, there is less demand for work for the unemployed, because these industries are furnishing jobs to people in their particular localities. I respectfully suggest that the W. P. A. authorities should be given discretion in connection with these matters so that they may discontinue projects in sections of the country where they are not needed and, if necessary, increase projects in other sections which are not sharing in the location of national-defense industries.

Today's newspapers carry a story which indicates a substantial cut has been recommended by President Roosevelt. In my opinion, this cut will work a hardship. If a reduction in W. P. A. employees in the State of Minnesota is required, these people who are taken off the list will be forced back on county relief.

I also suggest to your committee that the requirement that the sponsor furnish a portion of the funds required for the project be discontinued. In some communities, the sponsor is not financially able to furnish funds.

I am glad to note that President Roosevelt has changed his attitude on the law which requires people on W. P. A. rolls to be laid off after they have worked 18 months. This requirement should be discontinued.

The newspaper article also indicates that there should be a suspension of the present restrictions which prohibit aliens the right of employment on relief projects. I hope this recommendation will be adopted, because if law-abiding aliens who are not able to find work are barred from W. P. A. projects, they and their families will be forced on relief and will increase the burdens and the problems of the various local communities.

In my conference with Mr. Stolte the other day, he pointed out that a large number of people employed on W. P. A. projects in Minnesota are people whose age seems to bar them from securing employment in private industry. In other words, the employers today do not want middle-aged persons or aged persons and a reduction in the number of persons permitted to be employed on W. P. A. works a great hardship on a class of people who are absolutely not able to go out and secure jobs. The same remarks are in point in connection with many disabled World War veterans who have a slight disability which may disqualify them for private employment. I have a letter on my desk from a man 64 years of age and he points out that unless he can continue on W. P. A., on account of his age, he will be forced back on relief. Many communities find it difficult, if not impossible, to carry these relief loads.

I feel very strongly that a relief program should carry with it an appropriation sufficient to enable the various State administrators, under direction of Washington officials, to function efficiently and to carry out the purposes for which this program is enacted.

Let me repeat that the officials in charge should be permitted to use their best judgment in the matter of decreasing projects where national-defense industries are located and, if necessary, furnish more funds to those localities and those communities which are suffering because they have been overlooked in the location of war industries in their areas.

Mr. Speaker, during past sessions of Congress, there has been a great deal of talk about inefficiency and waste of public funds in connection with W. P. A. projects. I am just as violently opposed to those things as any Member of Congress. I have repeatedly said that I believed that public funds should be expended so that the taxpayers get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar that is paid out.

I have consistently taken the position that so long as the Federal Government was going to continue its relief policy, and I refer now to the Work Projects Administration, that the Government should do this until such time as private industry can furnish employment for those men and women who want to work, and who are unable to find jobs.

I have become familiar with the Work Projects Administration program in northern Minnesota. There was a time when I felt that political considerations and other developments shaped the policy in that section. I want to say to the committee, however, that since the appointment of A. T. Gilbertson about 3 years ago in 1937, as district manager, conditions have steadily improved, and I can say without any qualifications whatever that the work carried on in my section is worth while, and that Mr. Gilbertson handles the situation free from politics and with only one object, namely, to provide jobs for people who have been referred to his office as being eligible for certification for work.

I am not giving any second-hand information, because I personally inspected many of these projects and know that high standards of work prevail, and that the projects have been worth while to the various communities affected.

Northeastern Minnesota has had a very acute unemployment problem, and through the agency of the Work Projects Administration, people unable to find any employment anywhere, have been given work. Many factors have contributed to the unemployment situation in my locality. Labor-saving machinery has replaced hundreds of men in the iron-range section where a major portion of the iron ore is dug out of the earth and then shipped down the Lakes to the eastern steel plants. In the past, lumbering was a major industry in my locality. It furnished employment for thousands of people. We no longer have that industry because the timber has been cut and we now have what is known as the cut-over areas which are nonproductive.

I know that an immense amount of good has been done by the W. P. A. in helping the communities solve these problems. Without enumerating all of the localities, I have in mind Gilbert, Minn.; Biwabik, Minn.; Aurora, Minn.; Keewatin, Minn.; Nashwauk, Minn.; Buhl, Minn.; Mountain Iron, Minn.; Kinney, Minn.; McKinley, Minn.; Chisholm, Minn.; together with other Iron Range cities. But for the program carried on by Mr. Gilbertson in these localities, there would have been very little work for the large number of unemployed persons. The records will show that I have supported the appropriation bills which provided funds for numerous projects, not only in these communities, but all over the northeastern section of our State.

In connection with this program, it may be of interest to the committee to know that many World War veterans are being employed in the various types of W. P. A. activities. In my particular district, approximately 800 such veterans are on the W. P. A. rolls, of which 600 are in St. Louis County. Many of these veterans have a disability, and the records show that veterans' needs are increasing, and on account of their age and disability, are not being absorbed by private industry. As of April 1, 1941, in the district, approximately 6,000 W. P. A. workers are being employed in all types of W. P. A. work, St. Louis County, the largest county in my district, carrying a work load of approximately 4,500. Included in the 4,500 W. P. A. workers of St. Louis County are approximately 1,000 white collar workers, given employment in the professional and service programs, which consist of sewing projects, school lunch, housekeeping aids, health and hospital service, recreation, library service, music, art, writers' projects, research and records. National defense is foremost in our minds. We should not forget the plight of these unfortunate people as our second line of defense in the preservation of our way of life with the moral and physical fitness and the social well-being of all the people, army personnel and civilians alike. These needs must be met for a strong line of defense until such time as private industry absorbs this long list of professional workers.

Time will not permit me to discuss all of the accomplishments of the type of program that is being carried on in the district. I would briefly outline the program of the professional-service division in St. Louis County as follows:

First, there is the sewing project, employing some 300 women, producing some 9,000 garments monthly. The county welfare board distributes this clothing to needy families.

Then there are the nursery schools, employing 26 teachers and cooks. These schools have an attendance of 3,000 children, and these children are furnished with hot lunches at noon. They come from relief families that are in straitened circumstances and are nearly all families who are on county relief. I might also refer to the part of this project which furnishes school lunches and which employs 54 persons and which served an average of 36,000 meals per month. This project is handled in such a way that the school authorities determine what children should be covered by the program. My information is that these school lunches are a valuable factor in the problem of proper nourishment for many children.

Another feature of the Work Projects Administration program in northern Minnesota has to do with the research workers. These employees are the so-called white-collar workers, people who

have held office positions and due to reorganization and curtailment by industry, after many years of service have found themselves in the unemployed list.

We could discuss with you a great many more projects, but the ones I have pointed out are typical.

I am, of course, greatly concerned about the policy with reference to the next fiscal year, which begins July 1, 1941, and runs until July 1, 1942. Unless the Work Projects Administration is furnished with sufficient funds, all of these worth-while projects will have to be curtailed or discontinued and the unemployment situation will correspondingly become more acute. Many localities are already finding it difficult, if not impossible, to furnish the 25-percent sponsor's share and, in my opinion, this requirement should be eliminated in the next bill. It is my opinion that the officials of the Work Projects Administration should be left with discretion to determine what projects should furnish a sponsor's share of the funds and in what amount. As I have indicated, some sponsors will be unable to contribute anything at all and yet they may have a great need for W. P. A. work.

The question of reforestation—namely, the planting of trees in cut-over areas—is an important one and is a program which could furnish employment for an unlimited number of unemployed men. I mention this in order to show that W. P. A. funds, if expended in this direction, would not only not be wasted but would be contributing something of lasting value to the communities.

There is also another phase of W. P. A. work which becomes increasingly important in connection with the national-defense program. I refer now to the fact that the W. P. A. officials are conducting trade-school courses for mechanics and others with mechanical aptitude. All of these persons will be needed in national-defense industries just as fast as they can be trained. This part of the program should be expanded, and I mention it to show the need for adequate appropriations at this time. Let me say to the committee that the making of war materials and the building of plants has, of course, absorbed some W. P. A. workers, but there is still a large number who are dependent on a work-relief program. As I have indicated, in northern Minnesota alone, there are some 6,000 people employed on W. P. A. who have not been used on any national-defense work. Unless this relief program is continued, these people will be unemployed and we will face the same old problem of creating jobs until such times as private industry can take care of the situation.

I am sure that the members of the committee want to do the proper thing by the unemployed, and for that reason will not force curtailments which will result in hardship in the various communities affected.

I want to conclude my statement by saying that in Minnesota we have an efficient management, free from politics, and that if there are any other States in a different category it is my opinion that the W. P. A. officials will not tolerate any program of waste or favoritism.

Address to Graduating Class, Austin Peay Normal College, Clarksville, Tenn., May 16, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WIRT COURTNEY, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY], at Clarksville, Tenn.:

I greatly appreciate the opportunity of speaking to this splendid class, graduating from this great school that has done and is doing so much for this section of our State, a school that proudly bears the name of one of our greatest Tennesseans, who wrought so well for his State even to a sacrifice of his own health and life.

When I realize the influence you 90 young men and women will wield in your communities in your day and generation, an influence that through others that you reach and others that they reach in turn, will go on through endless years, I feel that I am totally unworthy of addressing you on this occasion.

At the risk of sacrificing unity and coherence in the few words that I intend to say, I thought I might first discuss the national and international situation existing today and the troublous times into which you are moving with your graduation, and then perhaps make a few suggestions, if I am worthy of doing so, that might be of some benefit in your own personal lives.

America is shocked and horrow-stricken at the brutal, total war now raging over half the world, taking the toll of thousands of lives and untold wealth in property every day. But would it be treason for me to say that in my opinion the American people, or rather the isolationists and partisans among us in the two most critical periods in our Nation's history cannot escape considerable responsibility for the conflagration raging today?

The seeds of this World War were sown in the peace terms of the last, and in the failure of the nations involved to listen to Wilson, our inspired leader of that era. As an overseas soldier in the last war I was on detached service in Paris during the last peace conference as Wilson urged other leaders to agree to a just and generous peace term and to the organization of a strong, effective League of Nations with America lending her great weight and prestige thereto. I saw him from the street from time to time as he moved from group to group assembled there, his face shining with the high ideals and noble purpose of writing the sacrifice of the dead into a just peace and an effective covenant that would bring a new era in world history.

And then I saw him a few months later in Washington after the world leaders had selfishly refused to heed his advice on peace terms and after the repudiation of his league plan by the isolationists and partisans of his day. And what a pitiable spectacle of a man he was in those last days, broken with the realization that his dead had died in vain, walking with shuffling step and drooling mouth toward his grave.

I remember seeing a cartoon by Carey Orr the day after Wilson died. It was called The Chief Joins His Legions, and it represented Wilson entering the spirit world, and there drawn up in review to meet him, were all the hosts of American dead, their poor skeletons of bodies standing erect and at attention. One spectral figure blew upon the bugle, another raised the colors for the dead commander in chief whose dream had come to naught, who was taking over command of his legion of dead whose deaths had come to naught. It was in the repudiation of Wilson and his ideals by Europe and the American Senate that the seeds of the present war were sown and began that moment to bulge and burst toward future fruition.

The second indictment that I level at our isolationists and partisans is at those of this day and generation in their refusal to permit the repeal of our Arms Embargo Act before Hitler started upon his mad drive toward world domination by actual armed force. Up until the time of Hitler's move on Poland and a little later, we had upon our statute books a law that prohibited our selling any war materials to any belligerent nations. An effort was made to repeal that law at the first session of the seventy-sixth Congress. The partisan isolationists defeated that attempt. Their argument was that it was inhuman in time of war to sell to any nation arms for the destruction of human lives. The idea advanced was unsound. Sometimes it is the humane thing to do, especially when arms and munitions have been acquired by one nation in great quantities in preparation for war against another as it went its peaceful way. As someone said at the time, is it humane to sharpen the fangs of the wolf before the attack and then deny succor to the lamb in which it sinks its teeth? Hitler had been preparing for war for 10 years or more. He had purchased some munitions from us. He had taken over the entire armed establishments of what had been Austria and Czechoslovakia and with our failure at that session to repeal the arms embargo, he knew that England and France, largely unprepared in their pursuit of peace and happiness in the years past, could not under the law then existing purchase from us a single defensive gun, a single round of ammunition, a single plane or tank; and so he struck. I may be wrong but I believe that had we been permitted at that session of the Congress to repeal the arms embargo, Hitler would not have sent his mechanized units into action and Poland would be free today along with the other dozen or more countries upon which he has set the iron boot of oppression and we would never have been called on to make the tremendous sacrifices that we now are making in an effort to save the democracies of the world as they make their last stand for freedom.

Finally, however, after Hitler's conquest started, the arms embargo was repealed, and in the present session the lend-lease bill and companion legislation have come into law and we are now coming to the rescue of the oppressed countries with every aid short of war and have recently voted $7,000,000,000 to that end. That amount seems by usual estimate to be a staggering sum of money, but when measured by results to be obtained, objectives to be reached, and ideals to be preserved, it may be trifling, almost insignificant. Is it too much to expend that democracies may survive in the world? Is it too much to offer that men everywhere may worship as their hearts and consciences dictate and demand? Is it too much to set apart to guarantee that in saving England, war shall be kept from our shores?

As we speak here today China, ill-clad, starving, its Government poor and impoverished in arms and munitions, is in its fourth year of heroic resistance to the cruelty and despotism of Japan, mighty in all materials of war.

Greece, without preparation and with little material, imposed the naked breasts and hearts of her soldiers to the modern war machines of Italy and Germany, with a stoic bravery that is worthy of the traditions of Thermopylae, and retains all her honor and glory even in her defeat.

Great Britain, our motherland, the ancient seat of democracy and the mother of parliaments, stands firm, undaunted, and unafraid amidst hail of bombs and sheets of raging fires, and as her people clean the debris of shattered homes, churches, and hospitals, bury their dead women and children, all of them from the highest lord to the humblest menial, have their wills and purposes only strengthened to carry on to a day of victory and peace when dictatorship will be dead forever and their leaders brought to bar for their unspeakable crimes.

As we think of these suffering people, our common stake with them and the defense they are waging for us as well, I say that $7,000,000,000 and twice $7,000,000,000, if necessary, is not too much to wager on their success. One of England's young poets who lost his life in the last war left this epitaph:

"If I should die, think only this of me;
That there's some corner of a foreign field
That is forever England. There shall be
In that rich earth a richer dust concealed;
A dust whom England bore, shaped, made aware,
Gave, once, her flowers to love, her ways to roam,
A body of England's, breathing English air,
Washed by the rivers, blest by suns of home.

"And think, this heart, all evil shed away,
A pulse in the eternal mind, no less
Gives somewhere back the thoughts by England given;
Her sights and sounds; dreams happy as her day;
And laughter, learnt of friends; and gentleness,
In hearts at peace, under an English heaven."

Such a country, inspiring such sentiments, must not be destroyed. There must always be an England and that is why the vast supplies that we are turning out today in England's aid must be made available in ever-growing quantities and their delivery insured if necessary by convoy.

But now let us forego further discussion of world problems. This is your graduation day and one of the big days of your life and you will long remember what is said on this occasion. I would like to make some suggestions that may be helpful to each of you personally as you leave your beloved campus and go out into these bitter and desperate days now confronting all of us. I am not going to stand on a pedestal and talk down to you because I have never accomplished anything in life that would warrant it. God knows and I know how far I have missed the mark that I set for myself so many years ago when I sat on a graduation platform as you do today. I well remember the dreams and visions I had that day of my future and I know how far these dreams and visions have failed me or how far I have failed them—dreams and visions that like snow upon the desert's dusty face, lighted a little hour or so and were gone. But in my half century or more of life I have known some great men and women, great in their homes, great in their communities and great in their State and Nation. I have sought to analyze the reason for this greatness and I think I have found it. The essential feature of the character of all these great men and women that I have known is expressed by what I think is the simplest and most beautiful word in our language and that word is "faith." I do not use it in its restricted sense but rather in a fourfold sense implying first: Faith in God; second, faith in self; third, faith in one's fellow man, and fourth, faith in country.

You know as we leave college we are smarter than we ever will be again. I know I was and about that time in my life I had been reading a lot of Bob Ingersoll, Paine, and Elbert Hubbard, who was something of a rage in my young days. I was halfway beginning to say that Christianity was a myth and that the religion I had been brought up in was for children and old folks. One day while in that frame of mind I dropped into a second-hand bookstore in Nashville and was browsing about as was my custom. I ran across a little volume of some 30 pages. I do not remember the name of the author. I purchased the book but it has long since been misplaced. I do not need it for every word of that little book is as much a part of me as my senses. It was called My Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. The author recounted among other things that his subject had spent his whole life except for a few weeks in Egypt in infancy, in the little country of Palestine, much smaller than the State of Tennessee.

His father was only a carpenter at Nazareth. He had no training nor education. He went mostly among the common people, ate with the publicans and sinners, and dwelt among the humble. In material possessions He was poorer than the birds and foxes, for they had nests and holes, but He had no place to lay His head. When He died His sole possession was a single, seamless garment and yet while time in its inexorable processes has piled 2,000 years between His day and this and covered with the dust of oblivion others who have lived during these years, His name has only been emblazoned: His cause has only been glorified.

He was not a physician and had no knowledge of disease and medicine, yet He cured the sick, made the maimed whole, the halt to leap, the blind to see, and the dead to rise and walk, and while physically absent he no longer performs these miracles among us, to those of His faith come the memory of Gethsemane and Golgotha of that mysterious struggle beneath the olive trees with its sweat of blood, with its final consecration and death agony on Calvary and as His followers remember He still miraculously gives them the strength to endure the pain and bear the toil until life's measures shall be filled.

He was not an author, for He wrote, so far as we know, no word in all His life other than a single line, and that was written in the dust of the ground and disappeared in the hour of its writing. Yet the successful author of this day and time, if his work is of unusual merit, may reach a circulation of half a million copies and have a translation into two or three languages beside his own. Yet the Gospel telling of this man who wrote no line himself had been translated into more than 500 tongues, languages, and dialects. It has reached more editions than can be numbered, increasing its circulation year by year to more than 25,000,000 copies last year.

He was not an artist; He never painted a picture nor carved a statue in all His life, but the fairest images of the human brain ever thrown upon canvas or transformed into enduring marble had Him for their subject.

He was not an architect, not even a builder; only a Galilean carpenter, the maker of wooden plows. Yet the world has been filled in these years with the stateliest buildings, temples, cathedrals, and churches all devoted to His worship. Though not an architect, He has become, in fact, the Master Builder of all ages.

He was not a poet and not a musician. But since His death He has inspired the world's greatest poetry and music. But for Him the genius of Mozart, Schubert, and Mendelssohn would have remained dumb and Milton, Pope, Dante, and Browning would have found no voice. Inspired by Him, there have been woven into the warp and woof of our lives such great Christian hymns as Nearer My God To Thee, Nearer To Thee; Rock of Ages, Cleft for Me, Let Me Hide Myself in Thee; Jesus, Lover of My Soul, Let Me To Thy Bosom Fly.

To this music inspired by Him we bury our dead and, leaving them, are satisfied. When one contemplates these marvelous things he can but fall upon his knees, all callow doubts disappearing forever, and say, "My Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Thou art my Shepherd, I shall not want."

But faith in God is not enough. Many a beggar that you see upon the streets, catching his alms from the passerby, has faith in God perhaps. Many whining, spineless creatures, miserable failures waiting for the tide returning hoarse to sweep them from our sight, have faith in God perhaps. One must have faith, too, in himself.

Many of you read in the papers recently of the death of a dishwasher in New York City. For 2 years or more he had plied his menial trade in the kitchen of a Broadway restaurant. If he had ever eaten of the choice food served beyond the swinging doors or had ever been charmed by such soft music as those who sat and listened, he gave no sign, but continued at his menial trade. One night as he climbed the rickety stairs to his humble room his landlady thought that his step faltered a bit. When he did not come down the next morning at his accustomed time his landlady went to investigate and found him dead in bed. When the coroner came and examined his effects, to the astonishment of all, this dishwasher proved to be a former great surgeon of one of our Middle Western States. What had happened, one day a friend had brought to his clinic his little child for an operation. Just that one time his strong fingers failed and some artery was severed or some vital spot was touched beyond repair and he could only stand by and see this little child die before his eyes. That, coupled, perhaps, with the strain of many years, made something snap inside and he lost all faith in himself. He closed his office and disappeared into the flotsam and jetsam of New York City, because he had lost that necessary quality for success.

Had I the time, innumerable examples of just this type could be quoted.

And then there is the third kind of faith that is essential to a happy and successful life and that is faith in one's fellow man. Christ Himself is our authority for that. You remember back there just before the time of the crucifixion when the Pharisees and Sadducees and the Herodians were seeking to confound Him, one of the scribes, thinking to perplex Him, said, "Master, what is the greatest commandment in the law?" He quickly answered, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, and with all thy soul. This is the first and great commandment, and the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

A great novelist tells the story utterly true to life of a man so steeped in crime of every description that any redemption seemed impossible. He even broke into a church, stealing the holy vessels. The old priest happened to see him, but instead of calling the gendarmes he came up to him, put his arm about him, gave him another piece of silver that the thief had overlooked, and said: "Take this, too, my son; you perhaps need them more than we do, but remember this, wherever you go and whatever you do you have my love, and you leave here with my abiding faith in you." The criminal went his way and sought from time to time to ply his old trade. But in each instance there came to him the kind face of the old priest and his love for and faith in him. With that before him he could commit no crime and under that influence he became one of the noblest characters in fiction.

While this is a story, as I said, it is true to life and if time permitted, innumerable examples could be set out, but this suffices to paint the picture.

Finally, all the great men and women that I have known had in their hearts a burning faith in and love for their country and that is more necessary now than ever before. We must view afresh its jewels of free speech, free press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion, which we have had these 150 years but which are fast disappearing from the rest of the earth. In these critical times it is more necessary than ever to hold with faith and determination to the American way of life and to the ideals of government that we have followed through all these years.

And so, in conclusion, as you leave here today, if I could write in the new, clean Book of Life that opens for each of you, on the first page I would set down the admonition to hold fast to religion and your faith in God. And under that I would write the lines of the Psalm, beginning: "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want."

On the next page I would write down an admonition to have faith in yourself, and under that I would write such lines as these:

"Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever Gods there be
For my unconquerable soul.

"It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishment the scroll,
I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul."

And to that I would add:

"If I had youth I'd bid the world to try me,
I'd answer every challenge to my skill;
Though mountains stood in silence to defy me,
I'd try to make them subject to my will."

And on the next page I would write an admonition to have faith in your fellow man and under that I would add some such lines as these:

"I would not sit in the scorner's seat
Nor hurl the cynic's ban
Let me live in a house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.

"I know there are brook gladdened meadows ahead
And mountains of wearisome height
That the road stretches on through the long afternoon
And passes away to the night.

"But still I rejoice when the strangers rejoice
And weep with the strangers that mourn
Nor live in my house by the side of the road
As one who lives alone.

"I would not sit in the scorner's seat
Nor hurl the cynic's ban
Let me live in a house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man."

And lastly I would write on the next page the admonition to retain always a burning faith in your country and her way of life, and under that I would write—

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burn'd
As home his footsteps he hath turned
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well!
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim—
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The wretch, concentred all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust from whence he sprung
Unwept, unhonor'd, and unsung."

And so with the sincere hope that each of you will in the years to come find the sunkist heights on which your ambitious eyes are fixed today and with my sincere congratulations upon your successful completion of your hard labors in this institution, I say to you this morning: Hail, farewell, and Godspeed.

Award of Medal to Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening at the White House, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt presented a gold medal, an achievement-award medal, to Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, the much beloved and outstanding champion of peace and woman's rights. Mrs. Catt is so well known to you all that I do not have to identify her or speak of her long, brave fight for the cause of women, of her arduous, unselfish toil in the interests of universal peace. Her record and achievements speak louder and clearer than any words I might utter. It is eminently fitting that the words Mrs. Catt spoke in accepting the medal should become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Every one of us who heard them was impressed with the extreme modesty, the clear reasoning, and the interesting manner in which she presented the history of woman's fight for equality. The remarks follow:

To receive a gold medal, be it deserved or undeserved, is a happy, outstanding incident in any life. When it happens in a world where every outlook is dark and forbidding, but is presented by the First Lady of all the First Ladies of the land for 150 years, it becomes an outburst of blue sky with a big, bright star of hope sparkling in it.

Should one paint a picture, write a book, or produce an invention of superlative quality, it might be an achievement worthy of a gold medal, but I have achieved nothing personally. I have been only a single unit in an army which numbered over 2,000,000 at the end and was a mere handful at the beginning. That army marched ceaselessly, tirelessly onward without an armistice or a vacation for five straight generations of 33 years each. Those of us who witnessed the final victory never saw any of those who proposed the program and carried it forward in the first 2 generations and only a few of those in the third. I accept this medal, therefore, not for myself, but for the woman movement, which, altogether, won the achievement of the liberties and privileges that women enjoy in our land today.

I thank you, Mrs. Roosevelt, for your friendly presentation, for the hospitality of the White House, but more than all else for having been a loyal member of our army. I thank the achievement award committee for its great kindness and the generous gift, and I thank the sympathetic friends for having gathered here tonight. I especially thank Prof. T. V. Smith, advocate of logic and liberty, for having honored this occasion by his presence and helped us all by his stimulating words.

The woman movement never began; it always existed. Every race has claimed superiority over all others, every nation has boasted its right of supremacy over others, and centuries before Blackstone men set up the rule that "husband and wife are one and that one is me." More, each upholder of supremacy, be it race, nation, or sex, based its claim upon divine authority. Thousands of years ago women rebelled against the denial of rights, privileges, and freedoms to half the human race by the other half.

Before Christ, Cato, the Elder, made an immortal speech to women who came to plead for liberty so similar to some I have heard upon the Hill that I have been tempted to think of plagiarism. Through the centuries the protests of women every now and then burst forth into group action which became noticeable woman movements. The most momentous of these took place in the Middle Ages, and was drawing to a close when Isabella financed the discovery of America. There were women professors in the faculties of universities in Italy, France, and Spain. There were medical schools where women studied and women doctors practiced in all of these countries. Modern science is scornful of European medicine at this date, but, at least, it is reported that women doctors lost no more patients than did men. Women lawyers appeared also. Schools for girls became common in connection with convents built and supported by women, and many led by Mother Superiors of rare gifts.

Alas, while all was going well, the faculty of the University of Bologna issued a decree in 1377, beginning with: "Whereas woman is the foundation of sin, the weapon of the devil, the cause of man's banishment from Paradise * * * the university shall be closed to them." In a short time every university in the world had shut women out and from that time, 1377 to 1833, 456 years later, when the new College of Oberlin admitted women, not a university in the wide, wide world was open to women students. Even Oberlin was not particularly liberal, for when Lucy Stone graduated there in 1847 it was explained to her that a professor would read her essay, as it was unseemly for a young woman to appear upon the platform and read before men. With a chip on her shoulder from the Middle Ages, this young girl, with a voice like a golden flute, quietly replied, "Very well, sir. I will not write it."

Nor was the movement in Italy ever entirely suppressed, for on the great door of the University of Bologna is still inscribed, I am assured, the epitaph of Clotilde Tambroni, the most renowned Greek scholar in Italy at the time and a professor at that university. At Padua, too, the statue of Elena Cornario, professor of six languages in that university, stands upon the great stairway.

The woman movement moved from Italy to southern France and Spain and then to northern France and England.

After the American and French Revolutions, which had generated much discussion upon the rights of man, and, incidentally, the rights of woman, the last lap of the woman movement we know best began. It was preceded by much talk and considerable writing, but very properly it may be said to have actually begun with Mary Wollstonecraft's Vindication of the Rights of Woman, published in 1792. It was a highly moral and well-reasoned book, which all would pronounce conservative today. It was printed and reprinted again and again in England and America and translated into many foreign languages. Mary Wollstonecraft died at the age of 36, but her book became the primer of the woman movement the world around. Henry Walpole, noted writer, pronounced Mary Wollstonecraft a "she-hyena." There were no hyenas in England or America, but

that title followed the movement and few women who supported the new program escaped that appellation. Its last use took place in 1894 and was applied by a Kansas newspaper to Anna Howard Shaw, the greatest orator the woman movement ever produced. It served the purpose of vilification for 102 years.

The second generation began in 1825 without a college or a high school, so far as we know, open to girls. By way of illustration, in most churches men sat on one side and women on the other in order, so an observer still living assures me, that men (I quote): "Might not be contaminated by the sinful presence of Eve's daughters." By law, no married woman, anywhere, could collect or use her wages or control her property. Yet things were happening. You all know the story of the First World's Anti-Slavery Convention in London which refused admission to 8 American woman delegates, duly elected, and condemned them to a gallery to sit behind a curtain. Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton made a resolution, supported by most if not all of the 8 disappointed delegates that when they returned to the United States they would hold the First Woman's Convention and determine a policy concerning the proper status of women. This they did at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in June 1848. They presented a declaration of 18 grievances which was adopted with a resolution to demand a repeal. This declaration became, in principle, the platform of the modern movement the world around. English women followed at once with organization and program.

Civil and social rights and education were the chief aims in the third generation beginning in 1858. Property rights for married women were granted in 8 States in the fifties, 10 States in the sixties, and 16 States in the seventies.

The most difficult law to change was the right of the married woman to collect her own wages. Five States granted it in the sixties, 15 States granted it in the seventies, and 12 States granted it in the eighties, and the left-behinds in the nineties. Yet there are places in the United States where, even now, this right is denied.

The Negro question plunged the Nation into a civil war and emerged in a reconstruction period which closed with the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments that enfranchised the Negro and were ratified in 1868 and 1870. For the first time, these amendments put the word "male" into the Constitution. The movement, called the Woman's Rights Movement, up to that date, promptly changed its name to Woman Suffrage Association and the remainder of the campaign emphasized, above all else, the winning of the vote.

I once, by request, wrote a paragraph and it consumed a week to find the facts. I have, on that account, regarded it as very precious, so I quote it now. "To get the effect of the word 'male' out of the Constitution cost the women of the country 52 years of ceaseless campaigning. During that time, they were forced to conduct 56 campaigns of referenda to male voters, 480 campaigns to persuade legislatures to submit suffrage amendments to voters, 47 campaigns to persuade State constitutional conventions to write "woman suffrage" into State constitutions, 277 campaigns to get State party conventions to include woman suffrage planks, 30 campaigns to get Presidential party conventions to adopt woman suffrage planks in party platforms, and 19 campaigns with 19 successive Congresses. In each of these campaigns, from 5 to 100 women were employed and thousands in all referenda campaigns. Hundreds of women gave the accumulated possibilities of an entire lifetime, thousands gave years of their lives, hundreds of thousands gave constant interest and such aid as they could. It was a continuous, seemingly endless chain of activity." Nor did any one of us receive a salary or an expense account. We did what we could and the rest went undone. What a waste of time and effort does senseless resistance to good causes drive us?

In the 72 years in which women devoted themselves to winning the vote, there were six crises, after each one of which the movement increased its speed onward.

In 1869, 21 years after the beginning, the Territory of Wyoming gave the vote to women and stood ever after like the Rock of Gibralter. That was crisis No. 1. It would have been clear to any observer that the time would come when a State, by referendum, would grant the vote to women. It would necessarily be a Western State and one of small population. Forty-five years after that observation might have been made, it happened. The State was Colorado and the year 1893. One brave soul of that campaign committee is here tonight. Allow me to present her, Mrs. Ellis Meredith. [Mrs. Meredith, 3 minutes.]

Colorado was in a state of continuous warfare ever after. The opposition concluded that proof of success in Wyoming and Colorado would be the strongest possible argument for woman suffrage in the Nation, and it determined to prove the experiment a failure. The number of books, pamphlets, and editorials that were poured out from Colorado in answer to the charges made was amazing; and the struggle, beyond any other in the entire movement went on continuously for 14 years before another State granted the vote by referendum and crisis No. 2 was passed.

In 1893, a lawyer gave evidence that women might gain the right to vote for President by legislative enactment of the States. Twenty years thereafter, the women lawyers of Chicago planned a new kind of bill which included Presidential suffrage, municipal suffrage, and all kinds not mentioned in the Constitution, which would have meant a referendum. Then they searched far and wide for the best-equipped woman to take charge of the bill. May I introduce that woman, Mrs. Sherman Booth. [Mrs. Booth, 3 minutes.]

The next year an election in Chicago brought out upward of 200,000 women voters, and the newspapers said that the suffrage sentiment in the Nation had suddenly increased by 100 percent. The third crisis was passed with a boom.

We had hoped for a State of large population which would grant the vote by referendum. After a continuous campaign of 4 years and two elections, New York presented the vote to its women by a majority of 102,000. Six thousand three hundred women served on duty at the election booths on election day. About $1,000,000 had been spent in the long campaign. Women had asked the voters to give them a vote by a petition signed by 1,030,000 women. It was the largest, the liveliest, and the most varied campaign for woman suffrage ever had in any land. Mrs. Whitehouse was the able chairman. May I present her to you? [Mrs. Norman de R. Whitehouse, 3 minutes.]

Thus the fourth crisis was passed and the New York delegation went to Washington to vote almost solidly for the Federal amendment.

Fifteen States had enfranchised women by State action and 15 other States had granted Presidential suffrage, following the Illinois law or a primary suffrage amendment with the same effect, before 1919. Thus two-thirds of the total electoral vote now contained women voters and Congress promptly surrendered and submitted the Federal amendment. It would not have done this had there not been a wise guide at the helm. That guide was Mrs. Maud Wood Park who would have been with us tonight had not a slight illness overtaken her. Her wisdom, devotion, and never failing intelligence to seize every opportunity to advance her cause led to the final triumph. Thus the fifth crisis had passed, but it came with the risk of what might happen to ratification.

The thirty-sixth State to ratify was Tennessee, and all the hopes of the suffragists and all the indecencies of the opposition centered on that State. If Tennessee should fail us some women in the Nation would not be able to vote for President in 1920, but in the constituency of two-thirds of the electoral vote women could vote for President whatever happened. This was the situation which made political parties nervous and anxious. For 72 years the political parties had humiliated women and now the tease was reversed. One of the efficient leaders in the Tennessee campaign is a member of the board of the National American Woman Suffrage Association. May I present her to you—Mrs. Guilford Dudley. [Mrs. Guilford Dudley, 3 minutes.] Thus the sixth crisis was passed and the vote was won.

For 150 years women had given the best that was in them to secure for themselves education, opportunity, liberty, and the vote. While odds and ends, here and there, still need attention before it can be said that every wrong has been righted, there is no longer need for a great woman's movement in which practically most of the women of the Nation devote themselves to further improvements in their own status.

The real question before women now is: Since we possess education and the vote, what shall we do with them? Is it enough to expend our energy in deciding whether Smith or Brown should hold a political office or shall we devote the highest and best in us to speeding the coming destiny of the human race?

A problem has been lying on the work table of the world for thousands of years—perhaps it has been waiting for women to come to the aid of men. We call it war. Man alone, apparently, cannot solve this problem. I wish to avoid the discussion of the present world wars. They are only incidents in a world of continual war. During the woman's century, 1840–1940, there were 128 wars, many of them world wars.

I call your attention to the institution of war, the time schedule which began before human history and has never stopped. Problems, many and grave, appeal to us, but this is certainly the most serious in the entire world. It is the plague of every nation, the worry of every governmental financier, the anxiety of parents of all lands, it is the giant producer of poverty, the insidious wrecker of morality, the spreader of malignant diseases, a certain stimulant to unrest, a destroyer and never a builder of civilization. The primary crime of the world is acknowledged to be murder, but war is organized murder and no one can deny it. War has been based upon looting, stealing, cheating, and organized lying and deceit. Its first preparation is to forget the Ten Commandments. Pearl Buck said a few days ago that the Chinese were not prepared for the present war, because they had believed "war to be an occupation of fools." I never heard that expression before, but I have wondered what would happen if all the women in the world should suddenly change the title of this institution from "War" to the "Occupation of Fools."

Let no one misunderstand me. I support defense. I am for convoys and for more vigor in our preparedness than is on display at the moment. I am aware that no one nation can end war. Together the human race must unite and act. If there is to be army, navy air force, etc., it should be international and its sole business should be to maintain the security from war of every nation in the world. To bring war to an end may require a thousand years; then we must make a 1,000-year plan and waste no second of time.

Let us mobilize our education and our common sense to end this nefarious business and to build a saner world.

Effects of Suggested Billion-Dollar Cut in Nondefense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

LETTER OF HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, OF COLORADO, TO THE EDITOR OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have written to the editor of the Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., in response to an inquiry from him as to my position toward the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury that a billion dollars should be cut from nondefense expenditures.

The letter follows:

MAY 20, 1941.

Mr. JACK FOSTER,
Editor, Rocky Mountain News,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. FOSTER: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 14 propounding to me in substance the query: "Do you agree with Secretary Morgenthau who says that the Government's nondefense expenditures can and should be cut $1,000,000,000"?

If I understand the Secretary's position correctly he did not state specifically what items should be eliminated or how much certain specific services should be reduced. I am informed he did outline in a general way certain activities which he termed nondefense and to which he thought cuts might be applied such as the National Youth Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, Public Works (which would include Federal-aid roads, flood control, reclamation projects, etc.), agricultural assistance (which would include soil-conservation payments, parity payments, and sugar-crop payments to farmers), and others which he did not list.

Let me say at the outset that I favor making reductions wherever it is possible to cut expenditures intelligently on the basis of the known facts and circumstances surrounding each case and after considering the relationship of those expenditures to our entire governmental program. I would not commit myself in advance to any arbitrary cut of a billion dollars in expenditures without knowing what items are to be eliminated and reduced or without weighing the effect of those proposed eliminations and reductions.

When people casually refer to nondefense activities in Government, they are generally thinking of everything except the Army and Navy. A large part of the Government's civil expenditures are in some manner related to national defense. There is a defense angle to almost everything the Secretary specifically mentioned and in some a very substantial defense aspect.

Modern warfare is economic, industrial, agricultural, and financial as well as military. Getting a nation on a national defense basis consists as much of gearing the entire population and the entire economic, industrial, agricultural and financial fabric to that level as it does of training soldiers, building naval vessels, and procuring munitions. If agriculture is depressed, there is a weak spot in the national economic armor. If education is neglected and not sufficient trained workers are available for industry, there is a failure to produce the necessary implements of war and peace. If unemployment, no matter how small, is not relieved, some citizens go hungry. Every phase of any Government activity must be examined to determine the appropriate relationship to the national effort before one can definitely throw that activity aside and say "this is nondefense, it has no place in the picture now." I sometimes hear the question, "What is the use of building these huge dams on some of our rivers, they are not national defense?" Yet if it had not been for the dams at T. V. A., Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and others, there would have been at this moment a serious power shortage for the production of vital war materials. So it becomes necessary to examine each activity on the basis of its own merits and its relationship to the entire national effort.

I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for 20 years. I would not knowingly vote for an appropriation that I believed was not important for the development of welfare of our country. A great many people do not pay much attention to the details of the Federal Budget and think that it is susceptible of being cut arbitrarily anytime without harm to our national life. Every item in that Budget is gone over carefully by the President and the Bureau of the Budget before it is recommended to Congress. The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House go through the Budget item by item and eliminate and reduce many. So far this session the House Committee on Appropriations has taken approximately $70,000,000 from the Budget estimates and there are still five more bills to be considered and undoubtedly there will be further cuts.

In the next fiscal year our total for other than defense expenses will be about $7,000,000,000 and will probably constitute one-third of the total estimated expenditures of the year. Of this $7,000,000,000, about one-half is for so-called fixed charges such as interest on the public debt, grants to States (such as social security and vocational education) etc., and the other half, where the cut of a billion dollars would have to fall, comprises all the rest of the Government activities. To take a billion dollars out of this half would mean a drastic cut of about 30 percent on the whole one-half or a greater percentage on the general classes which have been suggested for a cut.

Many of the appropriations the Secretary mentioned are yet to come before Congress for action this session. Those for the N. Y. A., the C. C. C., and some others he mentioned generally have not been acted upon by the committee or the House. The agricultural appropriations are still in conference between the two Houses. When these come before the committee and the House I will vote upon them in the light of the information we then have and their relationship to the entire national welfare. If the facts show they can be cut, I will act accordingly.

It is a noteworthy fact that whenever cuts in expenditures are suggested, the proponents usually offer a general suggestion of an arbitrary amount, they do not go into detail. Perhaps an anecdote of history will be illustrative. One of my predecessors as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, before the days of the Budget, took a copy of the old book of estimates under his arm. He was getting ready for the committee work of the session. He wanted to know where to make some cuts. He visited every member of the Cabinet in turn. He displayed to each the book of estimates and asked him privately where some reductions could be made. Each turned to pages in the book and specifically pointed out general items, which, in that Cabinet officer's opinion, were of dubious national value and should be cut. When the chairman got back to his office and summed these visits all up he found to his dismay that each Cabinet member had pointed out cuts in other departments, but not one of them had suggested a reduction in his own bailiwick.

Everyone is in favor of cutting generally; when we get down to specific cases it is a horse of another color. It is incumbent on those who want to make these arbitrary general reductions to point out in detail, item by item, where they are and what amounts should be eliminated and why they can be taken out. Then we will know what cuts can be made and why they should be made.

This is my fifth year as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It has long been the practice of the chairman on the committee to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of each session a summary of the Government's finances. Because of the extent of our present expenditures and the great interest taken in the subject, I have been placing in the RECORD month by month at this session a summary of receipts and expenditures which the Treasury Department furnishes me. It is absolutely accurate and as complete as can possibly be made. Those who have been following this data have found it informative and useful in watching the course of our finances. It prevents an enormous amount of guesswork, speculation, and misunderstanding of all current appropriations.

I trust this information will be of interest to the people of Colorado.

Very cordially yours,

EDWARD T. TAYLOR.

Real Defeatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WORCESTER (MASS.) DAILY TELEGRAM

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester Daily Telegram of May 20, 1941:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Daily Telegram of May 20, 1941]

SENATOR TAFT ON "REAL DEFEATISM"

Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the Navy Knox are the chief targets of the isolationist offensive these days. Their outspoken analyses of the plight of the democratic cause in the current world conflict have made them momentarily the most conspicuous figures among those who urge immediate all-out aid for Britain.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT refers to them, in a gentlemanly way, as "the real defeatists in this country." Former Gov. Philip F. La Follette is a bit more hardboiled. He calls them "the two Republican jokers running wild in the New Deal," and demands that the President eliminate them from the Cabinet.

Senator TAFT is of the generation which ought now to be predominant in the leadership of the Republican Party. It is a sad commentary on the kind of leadership which the Senator and so many of his equally high-placed contemporaries offered to the party that the party has had to turn for a representative expression of its views, on the most momentous issue of the time, to two older statesmen, Secretaries Stimson and Knox, and to a recently converted Democrat, Wendell L. Willkie.

The phenomenon seems inexplicable. How Mr. TAFT and the others, who share his opinions, can be so blind to the realities in the world situation is a puzzle, particularly when the vast majority of rank-and-file Republicans have so clear an understanding of the significance of the Old World struggle.

Senator TAFT explains that the reason why Secretaries Stimson and Knox are "the real defeatists" is that they both insist that this country depends upon the British Navy for safety. The Senator goes on to enumerate the magnificent resources of this country, and implies that the enumeration of these resources is enough to insure our safety, no matter what may happen abroad.

The Senator's remarks remind one of William Jennings Bryan's "million men springing to arms overnight." Mr. Bryan forgot that before any men can spring to arms, the arms must be there within springable distance; and before there can be any effective springing to arms, the springers must be trained in the use of those arms. Senator TAFT appears to forget that before our magnificent resources can be used effectively in our defense, they must first be mobilized in the proper form and then employed in dynamic fashion.

In belittling the role played by the British Navy in the peaceful development of America, Senator TAFT is denying the evidence of history. Since before the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine, the British Navy has kept Americans free from fear of invasion from Europe. Indeed it was this contribution by the British Navy which has made possible the enforcement of the doctrine.

To be sure, the British Navy was not always acting thus out of deliberate benevolence; but whatever British intent may have been, the result has always been beneficial to America. In this connection it is worth noting that only a little more than a year ago our highest naval authorities—still relying on British sea power—vehemently opposed a two-ocean American Navy. They want it now, however, with the British Navy in peril.

"Defense of What?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 17, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 17, 1941]

DEFENSE OF WHAT?

Talking on the subject Defense of What? at the University of Wisconsin's national-defense institute, Chief Justice Rosenberry cut through a great deal of the confusion which attends most discussion of the hour to speak of America's stake in the world crisis. "We defend," he said, "the right of a free people to possess its own soul and to live its life in liberty under law in the making of which it has a voice."

This is as good a sentence as anyone has devised. But it must be clothed in flesh-and-blood reality, and this Judge Rosenberry proceeds to do. For many will ask, "Who threatens us or with our guardian oceans can threaten us?" "We need to realize," the chief justice says, that "our way of life can be destroyed or at least greatly impaired, even if no foreign soldier steps foot on our soil, no foreign fleet approaches our shores, and no hostile airplane drops its destructive bombs upon our defenseless cities."

This needs explanation. If an enemy—any enemy—cannot get at us, how can we be so hurt that the gains of 300 years can be destroyed? Yet in these days we are making sacrifices of wealth and of what we regard as inalienable rights for defense. We call it an "emergency," with the confidence that it will presently be over, as the World War was, and that we shall then return to normal, gathering once more the kindly fruits of the earth in ever-increasing proportion—repaying the present waste. But where is our assurance that this is how it will be?

"If, when this war is over, England and the dominions—the only democracies besides our own now in the world—are destroyed, and the world hereafter is to be ruled by force and not by reason," says Judge Rosenberry, "then it seems to me clear that the organization we set up and the sacrifices of liberties and immunities that we make will not be merely for the emergency but for the long future."

In such a world, he continues, we would have to organize our whole economy for war, for the production of great armies, navies, and air fleets continuously. "Twenty years of living under such conditions would reduce our standards of living to a level which no American now living has ever experienced," Justice Rosenberry says.

Is there anything wrong or overdrawn in this picture? It is simple arithmetic that the more of our energy we put into producing gunpowder, the less there is for producing the things we eat and wear and enjoy. The totalitarian idea will not exist in the world with the democratic idea except on the basis of armed neutrality. If we are measurably secure on our "island," our immunity is only temporary. It can last only until other parts of the world are subdued, their resources appropriated, their people enslaved.

Then would come our turn. True, we would have built great defenses. But we would have to keep on building. The borrowing to pay for it would become confiscation, first of wealth, then of labor, the only remaining wealth.

Justice Rosenberry has not exaggerated. If some still insist that "if they can't get over here they can't hurt us," they may be asked how, with all our increased productiveness after the World War, with the labor of man producing more than ever before in history, until men as calm as Mr. Hoover declared we had "abolished poverty"—how did the Old World depression get over here? Yet it did, and we on our "island," threatened by no foreign aggression, did not know after 10 years what to do about it.

We are grateful to Chief Justice Rosenberry for recognizing the chief task of Americans in positions of leadership—informing the American people on the facts of our situation and the real issue that faces us.

America's Rendezvous With Destiny: Let It Be Something Less Than Total War and Something More Than Just Our Private Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith the transcript of a radio address which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System the evening of May 20, 1941. It is entitled "America's Rendezvous With Destiny: Let It Be Something Less Than Total War and Something More Than Just Our Private Peace," and is based on conclusions reached from data coming to me as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

Fellow Americans, three choices confront America today as she determines what will be her rendezvous with destiny. As America faces a world at war and considers her relationship to it, we find a strange combination of unity and disunity among our people. In our sympathies and ideals we are most happily united, but in the mapping of a course of action we are most unhappily disunited. In spite of this, however, I believe the urge toward unity is so strong and our points of agreement are so general that we can develop a united national policy if we keep government in tune with the heartbeat of the people for whom this Government exists.

Let us summarize the points of agreement upon which Americans are today united. They want America to stay out of the shooting and the slaughter of the war; they want England and her associates to succeed in their gallant fight against aggression; they want to see the restoration of a completely independent Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Greece, and other foreign States capable of stable self-government; they want more freedom and less human misery to follow this war as the result of a peace which will promote cooperation rather than once again paving the way for another conflict. I want all of these things to come about—and I believe you do. I think this is the almost universal American desire today. On this we stand united.

Having reached such general agreement upon the goal we seek it should not be impossible to project our unity to include support of a sound program to attain that goal.

AMERICA MUST CHOOSE

Let us in this light consider our three choices. One possible choice is to go to war within the next 30, 60, or 90 days either by the un-American and public-deceiving method of using convoys and our fleet in belligerent waters or by the American method of openly and honestly voting a declaration of war.

Over 80 percent of the people of America oppose this choice, and their opposition seems to be growing in strength and gaining in significance each day despite the greatest program of well-organized and highly

financed war propaganda this country has ever witnessed.

It is a sterling tribute to the stability and integrity of American public opinion to realize that it has stood up against this barrage of war propaganda for over 18 months and refused to be tricked or taunted or tempted into another foreign war. I salute the common people of America, whose common sense has thus far kept America out of the war. If we choose war as our selection from the possibilities confronting us, it seems likely that those who would again send our men across the seas to die will seek to evade honest congressional consideration. They are now trying to force the President to usurp the war-making power of this free Republic and to plunge the country into war by the route of convoy patrols or naval escorts, knowing full well that another expeditionary force will quickly follow. No man need longer deceive himself as to the true meaning of convoys. The President himself has solemnly warned, "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." And the President's personal warning that "shooting means war" holds just as true whether that shooting starts from ships or planes operating as a convoy, as a patrol, or as an escort.

BY DOING MORE WE MIGHT AID BRITAIN LESS

Nor are we at all sure that this choice would be the best in order to give aid to Britain. Ex-President Hoover pointed out clearly in his broadcast on Mother's Day, which every American should read in full for a frank and fair analysis of this country's mission in this war, that our entrance into war would mean the immediate drastic curtailment of our flow of aid to Britain. If we put ourselves squarely into a shooting war, perhaps we shall actually aid Britain less than if we remain at peace. If we decide to go to war against the Axis, we must fight Germany and Italy—and perhaps France and Russia, too—in Europe and Africa. But we must also prepare to fight Japan in the Pacific. We shall need men and ships on both fronts; we shall need planes and tanks. We dare not enter a war simply to inherit an American Dunkerque in Singapore, in Shanghai, in Dakar, in Iraq, or in France. If we enter a war, we must fight it through to success if it takes 10 years and twice 10,000,000 men.

America must never end its rendezvous with destiny by a tryst with tragedy.

Surely not even the most sadistic interventionist who calls upon the President for war now would propose that once in the war we continue to give priority in arms to Britain and subsequently send our own flesh and blood to die in foreign fighting without the training and protection of modern munitions and complete equipment of the newest kind. So, if we go to war now, in our serious state of unpreparedness, as some of our emotionalists are urging, our first sorry dividend would be to lose the two objectives on which America stands most united: We would forfeit our peace, and we would be compelled to curtail most drastically our flow of arms to Britain.

CHOICE NUMBER TWO

The second choice America can make is to stay out of the war. This choice is supported by the solemn promises of both major political party platforms. It would fulfill the promise of every sitting Member of the House and Senate, who, without exception, accepted support of this party which pledged the people it would keep them out of war. This choice today is supported by 80 percent of our people—or well over 100,000,000 of the 130,000,000 people of America. And, let us remember, ladies and gentlemen that these 100,000,000 are not ignorant, illinformed citizens. They are not unpatriotic defeatists. They are neither "fifth columnists," copperheads, nor appeasers. They represent the backbone of America—to denounce the 100,000,000 Americans who oppose our entrance into war as defeatists or appeasers is to denounce the very Americanism we would all defend. It is a strange argument the one-fifth uses in this controversy in denouncing the four-fifths for lack of unity. For the less than 1 in 5 to call for unity their way or not at all is like trying to wag a 4-foot dog with a 1-foot tail.

It the one-fifth who call for war would join the four-fifths who would defend our peace, this country would have unity tomorrow in the American way and we could concentrate our efforts in defending ourselves and in supplying the tools of war to Britain.

The choice of staying out of war is the choice to which President Roosevelt has pledged America. In Philadelphia on October 23 of last year, he said, "We will not send our Army, Navy, or air forces to fight outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

THE PRESIDENT ASKED FOR NATIONAL UNITY FOR PEACE

In saying that he called for national unity for peace, he gave his personal promise to keep this country out of war. Both America and Britain have the right to believe he meant what he said and said what he meant.

On October 30, 1940, President Roosevelt repeated this promise in Boston, saying, "And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before and I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." Was the President simply deceiving the people on these occasions to win votes so he could become America's first third-term President? Were these the false and fickle promises of an ambitious man or the faithful pledges of your President and mine? Time will write its own verdict. But until it offers evidence to prove the President has betrayed this public trust, I choose to believe that he will keep these solemn promises.

YOU CAN HELP THE PRESIDENT KEEP HIS PROMISES

You can help him to redeem these pledges. If you who hear me now will write or wire the President before another sunset urging him to keep his trust with you and promising to support him in building an America strong enough to defend its peace—and if you will have others write and wire him the same—it will strengthen the President to resist the war makers who are pushing him relentlessly toward war. Send similar letters to your Senators and Representatives to strengthen them in the overwhelming determination which they now have not to put this country into war.

You can win this fight for peace, if you will work for it one-hundredth as hard as we must all strive for victory if the war crowd has its way and we start overseas to war.

A THIRD CHOICE CHALLENGES AMERICA

And still a third choice now confronts America. If we reject war and select peace as our guiding policy, we can also move forward with a program to lend our great influence on the side of a just and permanent peace for the belligerents. Thus, with something less than total war and something more than just our private peace, we can help restore order to a war-torn world. Not by a peace of appeasement or defeat. Not a peace between a bloody victor and a bleeding victim. Not a peace of mutual exhaustion and despair, nor a peace based on the fickle promises of any man or set of men. We can, however, help to set in motion the machinery for a planned and permanent peace based on reason and justice, on common sense and sound economy.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S UNPRECEDENTED OPPORTUNITY

President Roosevelt has an opportunity unprecedented in history to set in motion such a move toward peace. The world today needs a mighty mediator much more than it needs another gladiator. We have heard more peace talk in Washington the past few weeks than during the preceding year. Wars are ended by victory, by defeat, or by assistance from a neutral group. The time may be nearer than we know when honest striving for a just and ordered peace might bring success. It can never be any earlier to try.

I hope that the people of this Christian country and all of our religious leaders will help revive the teachings of the Prince of Peace by supporting every worth-while effort to bring an early and equitable end to the destruction now sapping the strength of so much of the world.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD CALL A MEDIATION CONFERENCE OF NEUTRALS

I suggest, therefore, that the President issue a call for a mediation conference of neutrals to meet at some point selected by him. The world's crop of neutrals is tragically short this year, but President Roosevelt could send invitations to such a conference; for example, to such leaders as Pope Pius, of Rome; President Wetter, of traditionally neutral Switzerland; King Gusta:, of Sweden; President Inonu, of Turkey; and a South American representative of the Pan American Conference. These five men, or personal representatives appointed by them, could meet with our representative appointed by President Roosevelt to devote their collective intelligence to the problems of preparing the outlines of a lasting peace. This list is merely suggestive; other names might be added. If the war spreads, some of these might have to be dropped, but the conference should start with nations none of whom have profited directly or indirectly from the war. If preliminary discussion warranted it, invitations could later be extended by the conference to Britain and Germany to discover whether some basis might be found for the reestablishment of justice and order in the world. The same treatment could be accorded the Japanese-Chinese situation.

PEACE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ON ITS MERITS

This neutral mediation conference would consider all peace programs on their respective merits. Among others could be studied proposals to set up spheres of influence in the world with some sort of common clearing-house to settle controversial differences among these areas; suggestions for revitalizing and revising the League of Nations to profit from its past experiences; the expansion of the Union Now idea to include all nations, without prejudice, which desire to participate in a working world federation, and the five peace proposals suggested by Secretary of State Hull in his broadcast of May 18. The conference could request the war aims of the belligerents or not, at any time, as it deemed advisable. It would work out the principles and policies for a permanent peace. It would be a mediation conference of neutrals with no axes to grind. It is, of course, true that such a conference might not succeed but who can say it could not work if it is never tried?

NOT A NEGOTIATED PEACE BETWEEN BELLIGERENTS

Such a conference would not impair the war efforts of any belligerent. But its very meeting would strengthen the resistance to war of people in belligerent States whose leaders made dreams of world conquest or personal power the basis of their fighting. The peace it would propose would not be one on Hitler's terms. Nor would it be on Churchill's terms. Neither would it be on such low levels of revenge that Stalin and his Communists would emerge the real victors of the war by projecting their concepts as solace to all the vanquished people. Such a peace would be proposed for once in the world's history on humanity's terms with only war the victim and only humanity the victor. It would not be a negotiated peace comprised between belligerents but an orderly peace conceived by neutrals.

A PEACE FOR ALL WHICH WOULD BE BETTER THAN A VICTORY FOR EITHER

A peace planned this time by a Neutral Mediation Conference instead of at a post-war peace conference between embittered rivals will be better than victory for either side—is surely better than war fought to exhaustion by both sides, is vastly better than our own participation in a war whose objectives we ourselves are unable to define specifically.

I have called my proposal to the attention of President Roosevelt. If you feel it may have merit an expression of your support of it to him and to your Senators and Representatives, and to Secretary of State Hull, might be most helpful. If we keep out of this war, as we can if you demand it, America and the Western Hemisphere may yet point a path to the Old World which will bring an end to tyranny and establish permanent order on a basis which we shall gladly help preserve by methods that have proved themselves so long effective here at home.

AMERICA IS GOD'S LAST CHANCE TO MAKE A WORLD

Someone has said, "America is God's last chance to make a world." Somehow it seems to me that God can do a better job with America if we will do our best to help restore a just peace by our inspiration rather than again to try the futile course of reaching that goal by just our intervention.

This I believe to be America's real rendezvous with destiny.

More Light, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) REPUBLICAN

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am reproducing an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, one of the great newspapers of the country, whose editors are not swept off their feet with an insistent demand for war, but who are analyzing intelligently and calmly our relations to the World War:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican]

It would promote clarity of thought and perhaps more unity of thinking if the leaders of the more ardent interventionsists would define with more precision their objectives. When we are asked simply to turn back "the tide of darkness" from "the Atlantic world," the orator leaves too much to the imagination.

A nation, it has been wisely said, rarely achieves in war precisely what it had in mind to achieve when the appeal to arms was made. The issue of battles often imposes unforeseen burdens on the victor no less than on the vanquished. Our own history proves the truth of those observations.

Mr. Willkie addressed a great mass meeting at Madison Square Garden, in New York City, Wednesday evening. He was inevitably interesting. Yet no feature of the meeting was more thought-provoking than the utterances and aspirations of those speakers who represented small European states like Poland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, and Serbia, which the Nazi armies have occupied. One and all, they championed the restoration of the independence of their home lands, within their former national boundaries. The British Government encourages the "governments in exile," most of which maintain headquarters in London, to cherish the hope of complete restoration.

Assuming an integral victory, may not we Americans be allowed to ask whether the United States would be committed, in case of its full entry into the war, to the program of the restoration of the status quo ante in Europe when the time should come to draft a peace settlement? For many of us cannot forget that the "Balkanization of Europe" by the Treaty of Versailles, especially through the destruction of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire and the creation of the "cordon sanitaire" in eastern Europe, was certainly one of the main causes of the tremendous explosion that the continent suffered 20 years later.

Another aspect of interventionist potentiality that is disturbing to many is the wide-open talk to the effect that this war will make either Germany or the United States the master of the world. Mr. Willkie forecasts Washington as "the capital of the world." If not Washington, Berlin will be; and Mr. Willkie prefers Washington. Analyze so grandiose a conception and an astronomical imperialism confronts you. The America first agitation cannot fail to be strengthened by these symptoms of a new American megalomania outrunning in scope our dream of manifest destiny in the nineteenth century and our world-power complex which was sired by the Spanish-American War.

There is a strong case for undertaking the specific objective of saving Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations. Our national interest seems to require, when Britain comes to make peace with Hitler, that Britain shall not be brought so low in bargaining power that Hitler can take over the whole British Navy and air force and, quite as important, dictate that Britain shall build up no new sea or air forces in the future except what the Berlin government may permit. The Versailles Treaty placed precisely such restrictions on German land, sea, and air power. Hitler will act in reprisal in exactly the same way, if he has the strength to impose his will. If Hitler is able to do that Britain goes under and the Commonwealth of Nations disintegrates, except insofar as the United States can take them into a genuine protective custody.

But, why should the United States go beyond the specific objective of saving Britain from collapse, at the same time conserving the political unity and territorial integrity of the Commonwealth of Nations?

In view of the recent development of military aviation as a major factor in war, Americans may tend instinctively to reorient their conception of their relations with Europe—that is to say, as the British have for 300 years or more, Americans may now begin to fear as a grave menace to their own security the rise to a position of political and military mastery in Europe of any single European power. Hitler is not the first continental dictator Britain has fought.

That fear has controlled British foreign policy for many generations. While under the new conditions of this age Americans may be developing the same fear, however, it does not necessarily follow that we must take over the traditional British foreign policy and make it our own by attempting to dictate what the future political organization of Europe shall be even as the consequence of a successful war.

Wars of limited liability are notoriously hard to keep within the bounds originally assigned to them. Yet is it not clear that the last thing the American people want is a war of unlimited liability?

Crosses in Flanders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

POEM BY MERRELL DOUGHERTY

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a poem entitled "Crosses in Flanders," composed by Merrell Dougherty, an employee of the House Office Building. Because of its uniqueness and the sentiments expressed, I submit this contribution to the Members of Congress and the Nation who may be interested.

CROSSES IN FLANDERS

White sentinels stand erect and still and their eternal shadows by sun and moon shroud the last sanctuary where every wrong and wronged repose, and the world's immortal foemen have come to find the same reward. Their silent vigil o'er the vanquished dead bespeaks a more decorous declamation of the diabolical orgy and wanton desecration upon defenseless humankind than all the surreptitious ideology of Magi, Muse, and Saint. No faith or hope illumines nor transcends their ominous and inspiring awe, for man, the image of an idol he adores, yet practices his vainglories on man and can naught gain from this but iniquitous respite. This salient legion decries with obstreperous and unmistakable vehemence, evil, age-old mockery and the sad and woeful heritage is the ultimate dream of mortal man. Venerated and consecrated by the infamies of centuries of wrong thinking, of worse living and more sordid ideals of false hopes, man, the idolator, lover of craven gods, bestial passion and meaningless mortality, must at last succumb to that impious fiend of death, destruction and despair. Fool! Bow low to war!

The St. Lawrence Seaway Offers Real Transportation Relief to the Farmers of the West and Middle West—All Disinterested Authorities on Transportation, Including the United States Army Engineers, Are for It—Shall the Lobbies Control?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF FRANCIS D. CULKIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a

radio address made by me over the stations of the National Broadcasting Co., on the Grange hour, from Washington, D. C., on May 17, 1941:

Good afternoon, friends. The high cost of transportation is the chief economic disease that afflicts the grain farmer of the Middle West. The National Grange, the oldest and soundest of our national farm organizations, has from its birth been a vigorous battler for the correction of this injustice. Despite the valiant efforts of the Grange, rail charges have been increased year by year until the American farmers are actually getting a lower percentage of the consumer's dollar than the transportation agencies. It is true that trucks have helped somewhat, but carriage by water is the principal agency upon which the farmer must rely for relief. It costs four times as much to transport grain across Montana and Kansas by rail as it does to carry grain by rail where improved channels are present.

GRAIN FARMERS HELPED

The construction of the St. Lawrence seaway reaching the heart of the continent will enable the western farmers to transport their grain to the eastern seaboard and overseas with a saving of approximately 8 cents a bushel. This saving will be reflected back to him and will add hundreds of millions of dollars to the value of his crop without increasing the price the consumer pays.

When peace does come and for many years thereafter America will have the duty of feeding the world. I am confident that we will be able to regain and to hold much of the export grain business which was formerly ours if we avail ourselves of the low-cost transportation which the St. Lawrence seaway will provide.

AN EFFICIENT YARDSTICK

I desire to emphasize that the St. Lawrence route running over 1,200 miles inland will serve as an efficient yardstick on rail rates, particularly in the field of bulk commodities, which include petroleum, coal, grain, and other imports and exports. The classic example of this is in the field of gasoline and petroleum products. Recent investigations show that except for the intervention of water transportation a gallon of gasoline would cost the consumer 20 cents more a gallon at the pump. It is fair to estimate that water transportation beginning at the oil wells saves the American citizen at least $2,000,000,000 a year. These savings can be largely duplicated for the western farmer on his farm products by the yardstick influence and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway. Let us illustrate this yardstick influence. In 1933 a shallow-draft Norwegian steamboat capable of navigating the present St. Lawrence Canal began carrying lard direct from Great Lake ports to Europe at 40 cents per hundred pounds from Chicago, 50 cents lower than the rail-ocean combination rate. The railroads, to meet this competition, and with the usual concurrence of the Interstate Commerce Commission, lowered their rates to 62 cents per hundred pounds. In the winter, when the Lakes were ice-bound, the combination rate was put back to 96 cents. Under this fluctuating competition, the Norwegian service was discontinued. With the St. Lawrence seaway in operation with much larger boats, the rates would undoubtedly go as low as 30 cents per hundred, and there would be continuous service during the season of open navigation.

The overwhelming weight of competent, disinterested authority is for the construction of this seaway. It has been one of the planks in the National Grange platform for many years.

HIGHEST AUTHORITY FOR IT

President Hoover, who was an economist of the orthodox school, and had no illusions about the work a dollar should do, stated on July 18, 1932, at the time the St. Lawrence Treaty was signed by him:

"The St. Lawrence Treaty marks another step forward in the greatest internal improvement yet undertaken on the North American Continent. * * * The treaty provides for the construction of a 27-foot waterway from the sea to all ports on the Great Lakes. Its influence in cheapening transportation of overseas goods will spread widely into the interior. * * * Its completion will have a profoundly favorable effect upon the development of agriculture and industry throughout the Midwest."

President Roosevelt became intimately acquainted with this picture while Governor of New York State. On December 5, 1940, he stated:

"The St. Lawrence seaway is now a vital necessity. It means a more secure nation. It means a continent protected and served by the additional shipping built in inland shipyards. It means more industries, both defense and domestic, thriving on the cheapest power in history. It means more comforts in the homes of many cities and rural areas. It means more work for the ordinary citizen in shipyards, factories, and other transportation services connecting the center of this continent with this great highway to and from our national and international markets. This project will cost the United States less than three battleships, and the power project will be entirely self-liquidating."

President Coolidge, a genuine realist, and President Harding were also ardently for the seaway. The United States Army engineers, the world's leading experts on the economics of water transportation, have twice recommended this great project. The American people complain that the last frontier is gone. The fact is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will open up a new frontier in the Northeast and Middle West which will be of tremendous economic value to all of our people.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

That history repeats itself is proven by the fact that the same arguments that were used against the construction of the Panama Canal are now being used against the St. Lawrence seaway. A new generation of lobbyists representing the same interests who fought the Panama Canal bitterly are now fighting the St. Lawrence seaway. It required all the vigor of Theodore Roosevelt to bring about the construction of the Panama Canal, and public opinion was then divided by the lobbying influences. No one now doubts the advisability and national-defense value of the Panama Canal. The fact is that the St. Lawrence seaway will be of greater economic benefit to all the people of the United States than the Panama Canal. It will correct any inequality that was caused by the construction of the Panama Canal. Make no mistake about it, the hue and cry against the St. Lawrence seaway project is based on the attempt of the railroads to make the Great Lakes area an inland sea without free ingress or egress. This is essential in carrying out the railroads' obvious policy of making certain a monopoly of transportation in America.

POWER DEVELOPMENT

The power development will bring into the United States 1,100,000 horsepower of electric energy. Without doing violence to the existing investment, this great volume of energy produced at an extremely low cost will electrify the farms of the Northeast. This power, which can be carried 300 miles from the site of the dam, will substantially reduce the cost of lighting for the households in New York and New England. Through the medium of this electricity, our share of the cost, $182,726,250, can be amortized and paid off in 20 years.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Recent world events have greatly strengthened the demand for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence navigation and power project. Happenings in Europe and Asia emphasize the necessity for closer understanding and better defense cooperation between the United States and Canada. No matter what may come in the way of dictatorships, no matter what their powers and strength may be, the completion of this project, giving us as it does 3,576 miles of additional seaboard in the interior of the continent, makes all other schemes of national defense pale in comparison.

This undertaking, needed for continental as well as national defense, offers the United States and Canada a new, secure, and landlocked coast line, every foot of which is potentially defensible and provides a safe haven for airplane bases, submarines, destroyers, and other war craft. The St. Lawrence seaway is a national betterment which will tie together the industrial and agricultural areas of the country to the seven seas. It will make the entire continent more compact, efficient, and productive. The farmers and consumers of America will be the main beneficiaries of the Great Lakes seaway.

THE LOBBY *v.* THE PEOPLE

My hearers should remember that favorable action by Congress is necessary to accomplish this great national undertaking. With their eyes on the tragedy going on overseas the American people seem to be passive as to this great opportunity for national betterment that is within their grasp. On the other hand, the railroads and their affiliated lobbies are already on the battle line here in Washington. The old guard and the black horse cavalry of special interests are already riding to the kill both by day and night. The mail of every Member of Congress is filled with fantastic appeals to vote against the seaway. Many of them are adroitly addressed to the selfishness of localities, ever the bane of popular government. Today the corridors of the Capitol and the House Office buildings are already crowded with lobbyists endeavoring to work their will on the people's representatives. I confidently predict that when the seaway is up for consideration there will be a thousand lobbyists here in the Capitol with entertainment for all comers.

What is the answer to this situation and how can it be cured? It is up to you, the people, whose economic liberties are at stake on this issue. It is up to the States and localities whose growth and material interests are jeopardized by this ancient and indecent procedure. If you, the people, will but rouse yourselves to the needs of the hour and flood the Members of the House and Senate with requests for favorable action on this seaway, Congress, always properly responsive to popular demand, will in turn rouse itself to favorable action. I urge my hearers to do this today and to carry this story to their friends and neighbors asking them to do likewise. I ask you to do this in the interest of a better America. I thank you for listening.

The Situation in Palestine and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

LETTER AND STATEMENT FROM THE EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR ZIONIST AFFAIRS DATED MAY 15, 1941, TO HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK, AND SIGNED BY MR. EMANUEL NEUMANN

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement from the Emergency Committee for Zionist Affairs.

I respectfully recommend to the membership of the House a reading of the following letter and statement. After having carefully read the statement and verified the facts, I cannot help but give my unqualified endorsement to the conclusions expressed therein. I feel that the Members would agree with me that everything possible should be done to enable the Jews of Palestine to defend their frontiers, their homes, and their honor.

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE
FOR ZIONIST AFFAIRS,
New York City, May 15, 1941.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: The steady course of events in the middle east, which is bringing the war closer to Palestine, has resulted in the spreading of rumors and reports, which have been inaccurate and confusing.

In order to provide our friends with correct background material, the Emergency Committee for Zionist Affairs has prepared a statement on the position of Palestine and the middle east, and takes the liberty of sending you a copy of it, herewith, for your information.

We hope that you will find it of interest.

Very sincerely yours,
EMANUEL NEUMANN.

[Statement]

THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The threat to the security of Palestine which has been developing during the past days naturally causes serious concern to Zionists and to all friends of Palestine in this country. It has become obvious, first, that maximum efforts must be made for the defense of the country, and secondly, that the Jews in Palestine who would be exposed to special danger in certain eventualities should be given every possibility to defend themselves, the country, and their honor.

2. For many months past the leaders of the Zionist movement and of the Jewish community in Palestine have sought to secure from the British authorities the right to organize a Jewish military force to participate in the Near East in the war against the Axis. These efforts have received the full support of the Emergency Committee for Zionist Affairs in America, and of the Zionist leadership generally.

3. The temporary withdrawal at a given moment of any substantial part of the British forces in Palestine for service elsewhere might be the occasion for subversive elements there, acting in concert with the Nazis to create disorder, riots, or possibly worse. It is therefore of the utmost importance to the stability of the country that, apart from the question of the organization of a specific Jewish military force, the loyal population, of which the Jews constitute the core, be given the means of maintaining order and defending themselves. A cablegram has recently been dispatched to Prime Minister Winston Churchill urging the organization and arming, in this critical moment, of a Jewish home guard in Palestine. To date, however, there is no information at hand as to whether such action has been undertaken.

4. It is important at this juncture of events to see the Palestine situation in proper perspective and to understand the forces that are at work. Without such a perception the whole picture becomes distorted.

It may be noted in the first place that the events now transpiring, whatever their ultimate consequences, have proved to the hilt one aspect of the Zionist case. Not only Zionists but many far-sighted Englishmen have maintained ever since the first World War that a strong Jewish Palestine is vitally important for strengthening and stabilizing the position in the middle east and affording maximum protection to the Suez Canal. As long as the whole region continued weak, semidesert, underpopulated, and undeveloped, it could oppose little resistance to enemy forces and would, on the contrary, attract them as easy prey to predatory design. The influx and settlement of millions of Jews in Palestine would, it was contended, introduce a virile element passionately attached to the land and the cause of freedom and democracy. The introduction by them of science, technical equipment, and industrial development would vastly strengthen not only Palestine but the whole middle east. That the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine was not fostered by the mandatory power with greater vigor and determination is one of the major tragedies of our time, not merely from the point of view of the Jewish people but of the democratic world order as well.

5. The oppression of the Jews in Europe over increasingly wide areas offered an exceptional opportunity to carry out this promising program—an opportunity which was utilized to only a limited extent. Unfortunately, the policy of appeasement in vogue before the war also led to an attempt drastically to curtail this process. Instead of accelerating the development of Palestine and thereby strengthening its powers of resistance, it was sought to secure Arab loyalty by sacrificing the natural expansion of the Jewish National Home. Zionism as an issue was first exaggerated beyond its natural importance by the pre-Churchill government, and then the liquidation of the Jewish National Home was dangled before the Arabs, not only of Palestine but of neighboring countries, as a bait to attract their support. In this way the most important pro-British factor in the Middle East was let down while dubious elements who had been in continuous flirtation with the Axis Powers were rewarded and "appeased."

6. Despite the bitter disappointment caused in Jewish circles by this policy as promulgated in the MacDonald White Paper of 1939, the war found the Jews nevertheless resolved to stand by Great Britain unconditionally and to do their utmost to strengthen her position in the Middle East. The Jews of Palestine as well as Europe are not only violently anti-Nazi; affirmatively, they are fanatically devoted to the democratic cause. This is more particularly the case in Palestine, where the core of the Jewish community and its dominating influence is the Federation of Labor, strongly progressive and democratic in spirit.

A brief rehearsal of Jewish efforts to play their part in the struggle is in place.

7. Before the outbreak of the war a proposal was put forward on the part of Jews to bring to Palestine from eastern Europe a selected group of 100,000 young men of military age, on condition that they enter military training immediately on arrival, in order to have available a sizable army of the best human material and of high morale for the defense of the middle east. In view of the policy of the MacDonald White Paper, this proposal had no prospect of being accepted by the British authorities.

8. Immediately upon the outbreak of the war, the responsible Jewish authorities in Palestine called on the Jewish community to register voluntarily for national service. The call was promptly answered by 136,000 men and women. The Palestine Government expressed appreciation of this action, but availed itself of this offer only to a very limited extent.

9. As the war advanced and the problem of shipping arose, Jewish leaders put forward a proposal that, in order to relieve the scarcity of tonnage, a supply base for military purposes be created in Palestine and that all of the resources available in the country, including experienced management, manufacturing plants and equipment, technicians of all kinds, be mobilized for these purposes, that new factories be built if necessary, and that substantial stocks of raw materials and finished goods be accumulated and stored in the country. This proposal met with but a limited response.

10. For many months past the Jewish community of Palestine and the leaders of the Zionist movement in England have pressed for the creation of a Jewish military force to aid in the prosecution of war against the Axis and for the defense of Palestine. This request has been given consideration but the program has not been implemented to the present day. Political reasons, inherited from the era of appeasement, have played their part in the failure to create this force. Only a limited number of Palestinian Jews, whose strength had nevertheless grown to about 10,000, have been accepted and incorporated into the British service. They have participated in the military operations in Libya, East Africa, Greece, and elsewhere, and have given an admirable account of themselves. The gallantry and fighting value of the Palestine troops have been cited by General Wavell in Egypt and General Ball in Eritrea.

It will be recalled that Mr. Churchill has stated that only two Allied divisions were available at any one time for active service in the operations which brought about the Italian defeat in Egypt and Libya. One may be permitted to speculate whether subsequent reverses might not have been avoided had that army been reinforced by the addition of a further two or three divisions of Palestinian Jews.

11. While the Jews were doing their utmost—under existing limitations—to make a maximum contribution to the war effort, the situation in the various countries of the middle east has been steadily deteriorating. Egypt failed to declare war even after its territory was invaded. Syria came under the administration of the Vichy Government with its policy of supine "collaboration" with Germany. In Iraq the growth of pro-Nazi sentiment kept pace with successive German victories and culminated in rebellion. Saudi Arabia has maintained an attitude of neutrality and reserve. Significantly Palestine is the only country in the middle east which has been on the whole actively pro-British. It has been the only country in the middle east which has gone so far as to supply volunteers to the British forces. It is the place in which King Peter of Yugoslavia and his Prime Minister and the Regent of Iraq have taken sanctuary and to which English women and children have been evacuated from Baghdad. If Palestine occupies this unique position and represents a spot which the Allies can regard as terra firma, it is due largely to the presence of a strong, organized Jewish community of 550,000 of unquestioned reliability, whose loyalty is not merely formal and passive, but intense and dynamic. They represent a force which, if utilized to the full, can still play a vital part in that exceedingly important corner of the world.

12. From the point of view of wider strategy, the significance which attaches to the proximity of Palestine to the Suez Canal is obvious. Not merely is the canal one of the world's great trade arteries but its control is of vital interest to Great Britain in the policing of the seven seas. But it can also become a channel through which aggressor powers may send their warships, surface raiders, and submarines to make their way to the South Seas, the Far East, and the Western Hemisphere. Current developments emphasize what has been understood in the past by only a few far-visioned men. Now it can clearly be seen that it is in the interests of a stable and peaceful world order that this

waterway linking East and West be flanked by nations that are strong, progressive, and devoted to the principles which underlie our democratic civilization.

13. The assumption that antagonism to the Jews or Zionism is an important factor in the disaffection of parts of the Arab world is fallacious. Neither the people of Egypt, nor of Iraq, nor of other Arab-speaking countries have any deep or sustained interest in the Palestine situation. They are on the whole engrossed in their own problems. Their attitude toward Britain and other western democracies is determined by their local interests, by the degree of effectiveness of Nazi agents, and by their own general outlook. The democratic tradition in these countries is young and weak, the people rather primitive, and the popular attitude one of admiration for force. Among some Arab groups the seed of Axis propaganda has therefore fallen on fruitful soil. Their attitude toward the western democracies is bound to fluctuate with the fortunes of war. Democratic victories will insure their loyalty, while Axis successes will tend to produce the opposite effect.

14. That opposition to Jewish immigration into Palestine could not entail serious consequences in the Arab countries is borne out by the fact that events of far graver importance from the Arab point of view failed to produce serious repercussions. By way of illustration, a few years ago an important province of Syria, the Sanjak of Alexandretta, including the important seaport of that name, was annexed to Turkey with the consent of the French Government. So momentous a step which was susceptible of interpretation as the beginning of the partition of Syria passed off with some local demonstrations in Syria, but without protest on the part of neighboring Arab countries. Iraq, which appears so turbulent today, even refrained from sending a diplomatic note to Ankara or Paris. To assume therefore that the anti-British revolution in Iraq is motivated by resentment over the influx of Jewish refugees in Palestine is fantastic. Such an interpretation can only be characterized as anti-Zionist propaganda.

It is a fact, however, that the former Mufti of Jerusalem, who was responsible for repeated riots and massacres in Palestine and who for years has been a tool of the Axis Powers, encouraged and financed by them, has been living in Baghdad for some time, where he has continued to plot and intrigue against the British. The English press now recognizes him for what he has always been—an Arab Quisling in league with the enemy of democracy, imitating and emulating his master.

15. It is, of course, too late as far as the present war is concerned to change the situation radically in the Middle East and to stabilize it by the creation of a strong Jewish Palestine at this moment. It is not too late, however, to make full use of the patriotism, determination, and fighting qualities of the Palestine Jews. The least that can be done is to place weapons in their hands so that, in certain eventualities, they may defend their frontiers, their homes, and their honor. It would be a great injustice to them to let them meet possible attacks with their bare hands, or to compel them to an attiude of nonresistance and abject submission. If the worst comes to the worst they have the right to go down fighting, if need be, like the Poles or the Greeks.

16. Our information is to the effect that large British and Empire forces are being concentrated in Egypt and other points in the middle east. We have complete confidence in the heroism and capacity of these armies and their commanders and see no ground for panic. But assuming the worst, even a temporary withdrawal from the eastern Mediterranean does not spell the end of Zionism. The future of Zionism is bound up with the future of the democracies in whose ultimate triumph we have the deepest and most unshakable faith. Even if Palestine should be invaded and part of what has been created be destroyed, we shall, when the war is over, begin where we left off. The events of the past years in Europe have established beyond a doubt that the creation of the national home is a desperate necessity, a matter of life and death for the Jewish people. The events of the war have also proved that a strong Jewish Palestine is an essential link in the chain of democratic defenses.

Above all, the Jews have demonstrated their capacities to build in Palestine a modern commonwealth dedicated to the cause of freedom. Upon these foundations we shall continue to build.

War Advocates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to read, now and then, the pugnacious pronouncements of some of our over-age citizens. Very frequently these are men in high places—Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, and even men of the cloth. These warlike utterances of men who preach the gospel make one wonder sometimes just how deeply inculcated are their teachings of the Prince of Peace. Some of them are good collectors, other are builders of huge edifices, but, thank God, the vast majority of them are men of faith, whose greatest care still is the welfare, both material and spiritual, of their people. To that vast group—Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant, Christian or non-Christian—I give reverence.

Of course, there are many not of the cloth who are great warriors. They believe in war—for the other fellow. They rattle the saber, beat the drums, and raise their voices in a call to arms.

Hell-Roarin' Harry and Fierce Fighter Frank
Are chafing for war with prestige of high rank;
But while the convoys are braving the deep,
Safely and soundly they'll snore in their sleep.

How true it is that old men make wars which young men have to fight. The following extract is from the Washington Times-Herald:

(By Helen Essary)

I know I should be in a state of rage about something. Columnists should be always. But it's hard to feel mad about anything when the only sounds you hear are the gentle baa-ings of some sheep over on the hillside (oratory again), and the soothing rustle of the wind in the apple orchard beyond the old stone fence.

There isn't even a traffic problem to get upset about in this corner of Virginia, Hot Springs. I haven't seen a stop or go light for days and days.

Still, the knack of getting a mad on hasn't quite left me. A report of the speech of the Rt. Rev. William T. Manning in which that holy old centenarian demanded that the United States go to war with Germany and "take a full and open part in the conflict" has set me to wondering how the church manages so often to let humanity down when spiritual help is most needed.

It would be easier to have faith in orthodox religion if so many of its interpreters were not stupid, inadequate. It isn't surprising that one-half of the world is engaged in murder and the other half is wallowing in vicious hate when you consider the example of the clergy.

Certainly the clergy of the Bishop Manning type. The bishop and the 700 delegates to the one hundred and fifty-eighth annual convention of the Episcopal Diocese of New York who applauded his demand for armed intervention, know that warfare means the breaking of every commandment on which Christianity is founded.

And yet these lofty gentlemen ask that we, the people of the United States, plunge into such filth. The worthy fellows supposedly anointed by God for the purpose of helping poor human beings to be kind, honest, and decent, urge that men go out to kill and steal.

If the clergy were worth the cost of its Sunday go-to-meeting suits, it would have so influenced men and women that there would be no wars. Being a parson when there's only doctrine to preach and a little handshaking to do is no test of a man's fitness as a leader of the Christian faith.

Nor is the building of a cathedral any test of spirituality.

I suppose no really spiritual parson ever got a cathedral built anyhow, and only a smart businessman and a complete pagan ever becomes a bishop. The simple, good pastor seldom has handsome vestments or the velvet-cushioned pews in his tabernacle. It takes a practical man to get anywhere in religion. A practical man who doesn't worry when he fails his people in such times of need as now.

I see by the papers that after Bishop Manning delivered his sweet call to arms, for other people, that a giant halo was made by a sky writer in his honor in the heavens above the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, where the doughty bishop spoke.

In the synod house some dear soul remarked later that "the bishop had an invisible halo but now has a visible one." However, the identity of the "inspiration" for the sky writing was not revealed. It was assumed that "the smoke formation had been paid for by an anonymous admirer of the bishop."

Probably some fellow who owns munitions stock. Today, I'll skip the advice of Bishop Manning in formulating my creed. * * * I'll take my religion from a source closer to God—find my "sermons in stones," my beliefs "in the running brooks"—and as much good in everything as possible.

What an insane world we make for ourselves. We are such fools. All of us.

The Poll Tax and American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an address by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan, Representative RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, on The Poll Tax and American Democracy. The address was delivered under the auspices of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, the Maryland Building, Washington, D. C., on the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co., on Sunday, May 18, at 6:45 p. m.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, today the people of the United States are celebrating I Am An American Day. It is well and fitting that such a day should be observed, for it implies all of the historic liberties for which the American people have fought. It means that you and I, as Americans, have the right of freedom of speech, of religion, and assembly. And it stands for those rights guaranteed by a democracy, such as the right to vote, the right to choose in free and honest elections our Presidents, our governors, and our legislators.

But for 10,000,000 Americans today's celebration has a hollow ring. They are Americans, citizens of the United States, but they are denied the right to vote. They have no power to choose their representatives in Congress or in their State legislatures. They are unable to elect any officials, from the President of the United States down to the county sheriff.

This is due to the fact that eight States in the United States retain an antiquated and un-American restriction on suffrage. I refer to the poll tax. Eight States in the South require that before a citizen may go to the polls to choose the officers of his Government he must pay for the right to vote. The poll-tax fee ranges from $1 to $2. In some States the voter is required to pay the poll tax for only the current year. In other States he must pay all past-due poll taxes for the privilege of voting in any election.

The story behind the poll tax is a black page in American life. The history of the American people has been the history of a struggle for an increasing voice in the Government by the people. In 1689 the first rebellion in America was fought by Virginia farmers against a tory English aristocracy which denied them the right to vote. The American Revolution itself was a contest for a government, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, based on the consent of the governed. In the years following the Revolution nearly every American statesman sought to extend the right of suffrage. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson fought against the landowners and the town merchants who would not trust the people with the right to vote. But the people won and gradually the right to vote was extended regardless of the ownership of property or the payment of taxes.

The modern poll tax was first made a requirement for voting in the South during the heydey of the Populist movement. The first State to adopt it was Mississippi in 1890, and the other Southern States followed in rapid order. By 1908 every State below Mason and Dixon's line required a voter to pay a poll tax.

The purpose of this tax was not to raise revenue or to measure the interest of the citizen in his government. Nor was it levied, as is so often asserted, primarily to keep the Negro from voting. The real reason was stated bluntly by a delegate to the Virginia Constitutional Convention in 1901. I quote: "There is a mass of vicious and incapable whites which must be debarred from suffrage before it will be possible for a better state of things to exist."

Vicious and incapable whites? Who were they? They were the poor tobacco farmers who were protesting against the crushing monopoly of the Tobacco Trust. They were the cotton farmers who were overburdened with mortgages. They were the workers in the towns who wanted relief from a 10- and 12-hour workday. They were the fathers and mothers who wanted a decent education for their children. And these poor people were disfranchised with the result that the officers of their government paid them no heed.

People in all parts of the United States are vitally concerned about this device which keeps the southern people from voting. The effect of the disfranchisement of the common people within the poll-tax States is a matter of self-interest to the people in every State in the Union. The Fourth National Conference on Labor Legislation, held several years ago at the Department of Labor in Washington, reported that the Southern poll-tax States rank lowest in legislation protecting labor, women, and children. Only 1 Southern poll-tax State has a minimum-wage law for women, while 25 of the other States have such legislation, and in that one State, government officials admit that the law is not enforced. Virginia is the only poll-tax State which makes it illegal for women to work more than 48 hours a week. There are twice as many child laborers in the South as there are in the rest of the country. The need for legislation to protect the children is great, yet only one Southern State outlaws child labor for children under 16 years of age. There are only 2 States in the entire country which do not have workmen's compensation laws to protect employees when they are injured. Both of them are poll-tax States.

I mention all of this because it has a meaning for the people not only in the South, but in the rest of the Nation. When working conditions are below the normal standard in the poll-tax States, the workers in the rest of the country are endangered. The cotton mills of New England will move to the South, as they have been moving, to take advantage of a people who have no legislative safeguards. The coal operators of the Nation will try, as they have tried, to force the miners in Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and in the other great coal-producing areas to take lower wages because the miners in Virginia, Tennessee, and Alabama work at a cheaper wage. If their fellow workers in the South must take lower wages and longer hours, then it will not be long before the same working conditions will be foisted upon them. So it is imperative for the welfare of every person throughout the United States to see that the southern people are given the opportunity to subject their Government officials to the test of popular approval.

The poll tax has another effect on the life of the Nation. The 8 poll-tax States send 78 Congressmen and 16 Senators to Washington to help pass our laws. These legislators from the poll-tax States have a great deal to say in determinating what legislation Congress shall pass. And we, in other parts of the Nation, have the right to demand that the legislators from the South listen to the people in their States as we expect our Representatives and Senators to listen to us.

The fact is that the Senators and Congressmen from the poll-tax States are elected by only a fraction of their constituencies. In the 1940 elections, for example, the average vote cast in the poll-tax districts was barely 22,000. But in the other States, where there was no poll tax to disfranchise the people, 128,000 people voted. More votes were cast for two Congressmen in the small State of Rhode Island with a population of 713,000 than were cast in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina with a population of more than 11,000,000 people. Nor were the election figures in the decisive Democratic primaries much larger. In 42 of the poll-tax districts there were no contests, and therefore no primary elections. In the remaining districts the number of voters was still less than one-third the national average.

The past few years have shown that the Legislators from the poll-tax States are not responsive to the 75 percent of the people in their districts who are not able to vote. While Congressmen from other parts of the country, with similar constituencies, have voted for social legislation to protect the rights of labor, to give aid to the unemployed, to promote public-works projects, and slum-clearance programs, the Legislators from the poll-tax States have almost uniformly opposed such legislation.

And they wield a tremendous power. Though they constitute only one-sixth of the Membership of the House and the Senate, they control more than one-third of the major committee chairmanships. Any legislation concerning agriculture, appropriations, banking, foreign relations, the judiciary, naval affairs, or veterans must go through the hands of these gentlemen. They have the power to delay and to prevent the consideration of any legislation which they do not want. And too often the records of these gentlemen indicate that they do not want legislation which is demanded either by many of the people in their own districts or by the people throughout the United States.

So the campaign to abolish the poll tax has become a major national issue. It is not only that we must establish a 100-percent democracy in every part of the United States, but we must protect the interests of the people both inside and outside of the South by making their Congressmen and Senators true representatives of all of the people. The people of the South want the poll tax abolished. They in common with all Americans do not believe that the ability to pay taxes should be a criterion for man's ability to govern himself. We, in the rest of the Nation, should help the southern people to eliminate this blight on democracy.

There is pending in Congress a bill, introduced in the House by Representative LEE E. GEYER of California and in the Senate by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, which would outlaw the collection of poll taxes in Federal elections.

It is very fitting that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has joined with a number of southern organizations to sponsor a national anti-poll-tax week to press the campaign to pass this legislation. For the campaign to abolish the poll tax has become a symbol of the struggle to maintain a democracy in the world. If democracy means anything it means the right of the people to govern themselves.

Every believer in democracy should support this bill to restore the right to vote to the southern people. I suggest that you write to

your Representatives and urge that they support the Geyer and Pepper anti-poll-tax bills.

Thank you.

Title to Certain Streets in the City of Hot Springs, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1941, when the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration H. R. 4590, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, I offered an amendment providing an amount not to exceed $7,000 be appropriated to pay the Federal Government's share of resurfacing and reconstructing Reserve Avenue from its intersection with Cottage Street at the entrance of the Army and Navy Hospital northeasterly to its intersection with Palm Street and that portion of Spring and Laurel Streets immediately adjacent to and surrounding the grounds on which the Government free bathhouses are located. The amendment was to cover the cost of resurfacing that portion of said streets ceded by the Federal Government to the city of Hot Springs, in 1880 for public use.

A point of order against the amendment was made and in the course of discussion some question was injected with reference to the fee simple title. I stated at the time that it was my information that fee simple title was vested in the Government covering one-half of said streets adjacent to the hospital and bathhouses and that the only title vested in the city of Hot Springs was that of public use and supervision, taking the position that the fee simple title was and is now vested in the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] stated that he had been advised that "the title is in the city." This is based upon his information. This colloquy can be found by referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of May 14, 1941, pages 4057 to 4059.

On May 15, I requested Hon. Hillory A. Tolson, Acting Associate Director, National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, to give me a legal opinion with reference to the title to the streets in question, and I received this opinion on May 17, 1941, and herewith I quote same:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, May 17, 1941.

Hon. W. F. NORRELL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. NORRELL: This refers to your recent telephonic conversations concerning the title to certain city streets in the city of Hot Springs, Ark., namely, Reserve Avenue from its intersection with Cottage Street to its intersection with Palm Street, and that portion of Spring Street and Laurel Street immediately adjacent to block 82.

In order to identify the properties under discussion, there is enclosed a plat of a portion of the Hot Springs National Park and vicinity showing the streets involved colored in red and the Government-owned lands bordering the streets colored in blue. The privately owned lands bordering the streets on the south are not colored.

Section 6 of the act of Congress approved on June 18, 1880 (21 Stat. 288), provides in part, as follows:

"That the streets, courts, and alleys and other thoroughfares of the town of Hot Springs, as surveyed, opened, or established by the commissioners and represented on the map of said town, and not included in the permanent reservation, be, and the same are hereby, ceded to the corporation of the town of Hot Springs for public use."

The obvious intent of this provision in the statute was to cede an easement in the streets affected thereby to the town of Hot Springs to be held in trust for the public. It is our view, therefore, that the United States retained title to the underlying fee in the bed of the streets in question, at least to the center thereof, as an abutting owner, and it holds title thereto subject only to the easements for use as public streets granted to the town of Hot Springs by the said statute.

Accordingly, if the streets are hereafter abandoned by the town (now city) of Hot Springs, pursuant to the procedure provided by sections 10028 to 10030, inclusive, of Polk's Digest of Arkansas Statutes, 1937, the public easements in and over the streets held by the city will thereupon merge with the underlying fee, resulting in the vesting of absolute ownership of the streets in the owners of the abutting property.

As long as the public easements in the streets are held by the city and are not vacated in accordance with the above-mentioned statutes, the city has, of course, control over the streets and is charged with the duty of maintaining them in proper condition for public travel. However, we believe that the Federal Government, as an abutting owner and the direct recipient of the usual benefits derived from improved streets, should contribute an equitable amount toward the costs of improving the streets, even though such costs could not legally be assessed against the Government as in the case of private owners.

If we can be of any further assistance in the matter, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

HILLORY A. TOLSON,
Acting Associate Director.

Mr. Speaker, I am merely inserting this opinion in order that there may be no question as to where the fee simple title is with reference to the property ceded under this act, because I shall at some future time make additional efforts to secure the desired appropriation for the paving of these streets.

License Fee for School Busses in District Is Unnecessary and Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a decision handed down Monday in the United States Court of Appeals reinstating the prosecution of the Monumental Motor Tours, Inc., of Baltimore, and Martin J. Graff, a driver, brings to the fore a serious situation that has arisen in connection with the transportation of school children and other sight-seeing groups from the many States into the city of Washington. The action of the Court of Appeals makes it necessary for motorbus operators from other cities to pay a special license fee of $100 if they transport school children and other sightseers from one point of interest to another in the Nation's Capital.

According to the newspaper account of the Court of Appeals' decision, Graff was arrested May 1, 1940, when he brought some tourists to Washington from Baltimore by way of Annapolis. After reaching Washington he delivered his tourists at various hotels and points of interest here and was arrested while waiting at a hotel for them to return to his bus. The police court dismissed charge and the district officials appealed the decision. The decision will affect hundreds of busses which bring parties to Washington each spring and summer from as far away as the west coast, according to the newspaper article.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of busloads of school children come to Washington every June. Their expenses must be kept at the lowest possible figure. In most cases their expense money has been obtained through various entertainments staged during the year. Because of the lack of finances the transportation problem after reaching Washington has been solved by the operators of busses taking these groups from one point to another within the city. In exacting a $100 fee for the operation of school busses within the District, the District officials are placing a burden which cannot be borne by students and, no doubt, will result in preventing many of these groups from visiting the Nation's Capital.

It is apparent that the sightseeing companies located within the city of Washington are opposed to companies located outside of the District operating their vehicles here and through their insistence, the $100 license fee is to be enforced. It is, no doubt, entirely proper that no outside company should come into Washington and undertake a sightseeing business without proper authority and without paying a reasonable fee but in my opinion, it is equally proper that where an operator engaged in interstate commerce brings in a group from outside, especially where he gets no additional fee for doing so, he should be permitted to carry his own group between all points of interest within the city. This, of course, he cannot do if he is required to pay a $100 license fee unless the fee is included in his contract with church and school groups. It is an unreasonable and unfair tax against such groups.

According to the information which I have been able to gather the only people supporting the $100 license fee on school busses are the sightseeing companies within the city of Washington. I have communications which show that the Washington Board of Trade is opposed to such a tax and I am sure that the majority of the members of Congress are opposed to such an unreasonable license

fee. Legislation to correct this unfair situation has been introduced by Representative JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan (H. R. 4077), and is now pending in the Committee on the District of Columbia. I take this occasion personally to urge every Member of Congress who believes that the children from his congressional district should be permitted to use their own sightseeing busses while visiting in Washington to appoint himself a committee of one to see that this legislation is immediately reported to Congress and enacted into law.

Action Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City Derrick of May 20, 1941:

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of May 20, 1941]

ACTION NEEDED

President Roosevelt last January conceded that because of the urgency for defense appropriations, nondefense spending should be cut to the bone. Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau last month asserted that $1,000,000,000 should be cut out of nondefense costs. Speaker RAYBURN a few days later announced he would urge the White House to initiate a reduction of that amount in the nondefense budget for the coming fiscal year. Of course, the Republicans in Congress and most of the country, day in and day out, for the last few years have called for reduction in the rapidly growing nondefense costs of the Federal Government.

But nobody does anything about it except talk. Everybody, it appears, wants someone else to take the initiative—in other words, wants to pass the buck. Mr. Roosevelt seemingly cannot bring himself to wield the paring knife. Mr. Morgenthau says the job belongs to Congress. Members of that august body retort that they are not going to be left holding the bag—or words to that effect. So nothing is being done, despite unanimous agreement that these appropriations should be cut.

Meanwhile most of us have had an opportunity to do a little figuring on the basis of the proposed higher tax increases. We find—we middle-class folk—that Federal taxes on our incomes this year will be two, three, four—yes—even five times what they were on last year's income. So we have told the good wife we must get along on less. We have cut down some of our luxury spending in order to be able to pay these taxes. In other words, we are pulling in our belts a few notches—that is, all of us are doing so except the Federal Government. There, it is "business as usual."

St. Lawrence Logroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH AND ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I extend into the RECORD two editorials, one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and another from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. Both of these editorials sense the administration's intentions on procedure to logroll the St. Lawrence seaway project through the Congress. Such tactics are condemned by both papers.

The editorials follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 14, 1941]

NO TIME FOR LOGROLLING

It is reported from Washington that advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway may attempt to organize an omnibus bill which would provide not only for the seaway, but also for the Florida ship canal, Passamaquoddy, the Tombigbee development, the Arkansas Valley Authority, and the Columbia River development.

If such a bill were drawn it could be resorted to for only one reason. This would be because groups of special pleaders hope to accomplish through legislative logrolling ends which they had despaired of accomplishing as individual groups.

The logrolling device, however frequently employed, is unworthy of democratic representatives. To use it to put over nondefense projects when the Nation is engaged in a mighty effort to build up its defenses would be little short of criminal.

The St. Lawrence seaway idea has its commendable points, enough of them that its backers could only make a colossal mistake in grouping it with such ill-starred projects as Passamaquoddy and the Florida ship canal. The latter have proved themselves to be nothing more than financial rat holes of the worst sort. They had no useful place even when the motive of many Federal projects was merely to put money in circulation. If the administration revived them now, it would be guilty of sabotaging the defense program.

Canada is decidedly cool to the St. Lawrence project and for the sufficient reason that construction of the seaway would divert energy and money which should go into winning the war. The wise course for both countries is to table this controversial issue until public works are needed to offset the let-down which will inevitably follow the war. That will be time enough to pass on this $270,000,000 water power and navigation project.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 18, 1941]

STATUS OF THE SEAWAY

The violent tempo of developments in Europe has so occupied the attention of the President and Congress that nothing has been said recently about the proposed American-Canadian agreement on the St. Lawrence waterways. Presumably both are content to forget about it for the moment, as they concentrate on the problems attending aid to Britain. But a timely warning is hereby uttered, a warning to Congress not to be taken unawares.

It will be recalled that the status of the St. Lawrence project is that of an agreement signed last month by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Mackenzie King. As such it requires for adoption merely the majority vote of any quorum in both Houses of Congress. A treaty requires a two-thirds vote of approval by the Senate. A St. Lawrence treaty was emphatically voted down in 1934. So, although the agreement appears somnolent and unlikely to be called up at this session, it is quite possible for it to be presented at any time when friends of the administration believe the opposition is napping.

This may not be Mr. Roosevelt's intention, but it conceivably could be, and as he classes the waterways project as an emergency enterprise he might press it for passage on that basis, despite the fact that it has nothing to do with immediate defense and requires for completion large sums badly needed for more pertinent defense items.

We didn't need the St. Lawrence waterways project in 1934, and we don't need it now. It is an ill-advised piece of legislation in which the States of the Mississippi Valley are vitally interested, for reasons stated many times. Only recently a new objection to the proposal has been raised, which has direct relation to national defense. Plans are well along for extensive shipbuilding on the Great Lakes. The vessels are of such draught that they can reach the open sea via Lake Michigan, the Illinois and the Mississippi Rivers. But this route cannot be followed if, under the terms of the agreement, Canada controls water levels in Lake Michigan and restricts the flow into the Illinois River at Chicago. In view of the pressing immediate need for ships, common sense alone demands that the inland channel be maintained at present level, or higher. Even granting that the St. Lawrence seaway is needed for defense, which we do not, it could not possibly be completed before 1946, a date too remote to figure in any immediate program.

The Senate disposed of the treaty with finality 7 years ago, but the President has not accepted the verdict. He offers it now under the guise of a defense measure and there are reports in Washington that he has a plan to include the seaway, the Florida ship canal, Passamaquoddy, and several similar projects in an omnibus bill, which he will present to Congress on what has been described as an "all-for-one and one-for-all" basis.

Such maneuvering might get the results he wants. But not if Congress is on its toes. En garde!

Constructive Action and Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

ARTICLE BY THE TIMKEN ROLLER BEARING CO.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because it shows so clearly how

a progressive company can maintain continuous operation without any change being made in our wage-hour legislation, and because I believe the Timken Roller Bearing Co. is entitled to a word of commendation from the Congress for what it has done, I am pleased to include with my remarks the following material on how that company has solved the problem of what has been called "the week end" without any considerable amount of overtime and without a word of complaint against constructive legislation:

HOW THE TIMKEN ROLLER BEARING CO. SOLVED THE WEEK-END BLACK-OUT

Back in August of 1939 the Timken Roller Bearing Co. foresaw the huge amounts of Timken steel, Timken tubing, and Timken bearings that would be required as the defense program gained headway. Steps were taken at that time—20 months ago—to inaugurate a system that would enable us to keep our equipment running 168 hours a week (24 hours a day for 7 days) and thus eliminate week-end black-outs while still complying with the 40-hour workweek. Keeping step with the expansion of defense needs during this 20-month period, one department after another has been put on this schedule.

In brief, this anti-black-out schedule calls for three 8-hour shifts per day up to 40 hours per week. By having four crews (instead of three) to handle these three shifts, we are able to rotate the working time for each crew so that it works 40 hours a week (the four crews thus keeping the equipment running 160 hours a week).

By an ingenious scheduling arrangement of shifts and crews, each crew works five extra shifts over each period of 20 weeks (for which overtime is paid). These five extra shifts for each of the four crews are all that is necessary to bring the equipment workweek up to the 168-hour total.

This schedule has been so carefully worked out that every man works 5 days in a row and then is off at least 48 hours, after which he changes shifts. And over each period of 20 weeks, each man has five Sundays off. The shift schedule runs 20 weeks and then repeats without change.

The inside pages of this pamphlet reproduce a copy of the schedule chart which shows in detail exactly how the plan works. You will note that the three shifts are listed in the left-hand column; and that the four crews are designated by the letters A, B, C, and D. If John Doe is a member of crew A, the hours designated by the letter A on this chart show exactly the hours and shifts he will work during the entire 20-week period.

Elucidation of Philippine Export-Control Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 19, the Philippine export-control law—Senate Joint Resolution 76—passed the House. Its sponsor was the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, which held hearings on the subject.

Through a misunderstanding I was not able to ask him when the bill was under discussion a question to which he had previously agreed to answer in the affirmative and which was discussed in the Villamin memorandum inserted by me in the RECORD of May 15. That question was this: Does the law include the authorization to the Federal Government to procure the Philippine products rendered unexportable by the operation of the export-control law to form reserves and stock piles of them? I wish to ask him this question now. His affirmative answer would remove the question of whether it includes, or not, that authorization from the twilight zone. I wish to anticipate his affirmative reply. And I wish to thank him for the legislative speed with which he pushed through the legislation, which I have favored from the beginning.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it does authorize the American Government to commandeer these vital materials just as it now has the right in the States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make this colloquy and a pertinent memorandum by Mr. Villamin, a Filipino economist, who has made a study of the subject of export control, to go with the discussion of the measure on May 19.

UNITED STATES STOCK PILES OF ESSENTIAL MATERIALS AND PHILIPPINE PRODUCTS

(By Vicente Villamin, May 19, 1941)

This memorandum sets forth what the Federal Government is doing in the matter of procuring and building reserves or stock piles of strategic and essential materials covering their statistical position as of 3 months ago.

Products to be procured as the result of the operation of the export-control law in the Philippines will add new materials to the stock piles. Among them are chrome, manganese and iron ore, hemp fiber and rope, logs and lumber, and copra and coconut oil. Substantial amounts of these commodities now go to China, Japan, and Russia.

The American Government has from the beginning of the World War realized the vital importance of having reserves of materials essential to the health, needs, and defense of the American people.

As far back as 1938 the Treasury Department started obtaining essential products, among them certain kinds of drugs, and stored them away for future use.

In the same year, in a barter agreement with the British Government, the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired 85,000 tons of rubber. At that time it was reported that the United States had only from 6 to 10 months' supply of that staple.

Under an arrangement with the same government, there are being accumulated in the United States some 250,000,000 pounds of British-owned wool. The supply of this commodity has, it is believed, increased greatly.

Since June 1940 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation through its subsidiaries has placed orders for the following articles:

(a) Defense Supplies Corporation—300,000 tons of Chilean nitrates.

(b) Rubber Reserves Co.—430,000 tons of crude rubber.

(c) Metals Reserves Co.—200,000 tons of chrome, of which 100,000 tons will come from the Philippines; 235,000 tons of copper from South America; 75,000 tons of tin from the Far East; and 2,000,000 tons of manganese ore.

The Office of Production Management is encouraging the production in continental United States of strategic and essential products to meet the irreducible minimum of the Nation's requirements when ocean bottoms become short and overseas transportation becomes too perilous. Its program embraces the promotion of the manufacture of synthetics, the increase of supplies under private ownership, and the economical and controlled utilization of strategic and essential materials.

Finally, the Department of Agriculture is working on long-range projects to produce in certain Latin-American countries rubber, quinine, manila fiber, and other tropical and subtropical agricultural staples which are now imported into the United States from without the Western Hemisphere.

I wish to mention here that in a conversation with Representative ANDREW J. MAY, the sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 76 and chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs which handled the measure, and Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD, the former, answering my query and that of Representative CRAWFORD, stated that the measure included the authorization to the Federal Government to procure the products that would be rendered unexportable on account of the export-control law. On account of a slight legislative misadventure Representative CRAWFORD was not able to ask the question, to which Mr. MAY was ready to answer affirmatively, whether that authorization was within the intent and purport of the measure, but he is doing it belatedly so Mr. MAY's statement would become a part of the elucidation of the law.

Although that statement is not legally binding, it is nevertheless expressive of the legislator's intent, and is therefore of persuasive authority in the interpretation of the extent and full meaning of the law. Without that statement the question whether the Federal Government is authorized to procure unexported Philippine products might be left in the twilight zone. It is therefore basically important to have this point clear beyond peradventure of doubt.

The procurement by the Federal Government of Philippine products to be affected by the export-control law would serve to stabilize the Philippine economic position, and that in itself would promote the cause of Philippine-American national defense by strengthening the economic sinews of the Filipino people and stiffening their morale.

The present case is another proof of the generosity of the United States in her relations with the Philippines. It is also demonstrative of the fact that loyal cooperation by the Philippines with the United States is a mighty good policy for the Filipino people to follow.

It would stand reiteration to say that the Filipino people are at one with the United States in any action, effort, or plan that would redound to the security and defense of the domain over which the American flag waves in sovereignty.

A Native at Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

ARTICLE BY JONATHAN DANIELS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because it discusses a very real problem faced by most Americans, and

because it is written by one of the really great figures of our time, I ask unanimous consent that the following article by Jonathan Daniels be printed in the RECORD with my remarks:

[From the Nation of April 12, 1941]

A NATIVE AT LARGE

(By Jonathan Daniels)

"THE GREATEST OF THESE—"

The multiplicity of British and other war charities has the home folks confused in the home towns, where there is a real and increasing desire to give. Britain's people in their tragedy seem neighbors now. Main Street ladies are ready to strip kitchens of mail-order aluminum pots and pans to provide the parts for British bombers. But in the enthusiastic confusion there is a real possibility that both the home folks and the essential foreign war charities may suffer together.

Sometimes it is hard to tell whether the multiplicity of the good-intentioned or the ubiquitousness of the racketeers does the more harm. I suspect that the racketeers are less dangerous than the men of good will. Also, I know from the small towns that the highly organized good will coming from the great cities under big names often fails to reach hearts. The reason for this is the almost rank growth of local individualism in good deeds which has flourished among people who see no reason why they should not go right ahead where they are, collecting for Britain on their own initiative and according to their own plans.

By now a certain able young businessman I know in a small American city must have become a somewhat puzzled national figure. He had plenty of work of his own to do—and little time of his own to spare. But he decided it was his duty to assume the local leadership of one of the largest and best of the organizations seeking gifts for the relief of the people of Britain. He had hardly taken on the job, however, before he discovered that he was not alone. The town seemed full of collectors, each certain of his—or generally her—cause. With great good sense he called a meeting of every type and kind of the friends of the British.

Not all the collectors came. A good many did. There was a preacher who decided he would rather collect funds from school children for British children than work with a national organization of the same kind working in the same way. There was a lady restricting herself to work among the D. A. R. There was a Baptist lady ready to lead her Baptist sisters into any good relief work, and in a hurry to be off. A man who had been collecting pledges of a dollar a head from firemen and policemen, with which to purchase a bomber, was not present. Others were, and enthusiastically, but all with a growing consciousness of confusion. The young businessman wanted a central local committee for charity drives for the suffering in England and elsewhere, similar to the community chest for local drives. He may get it. The confusion is incentive to sense.

But beyond the scope of any such local body is the mail, which comes pleading persuasively from far away. Much of its pleading is for excellent causes. In my own mail one morning were the cry that "there must be no black-out of the Bible" and some deeply appealing save-the-children facts. Both appeals were from highly reputable organizations which are trying to do excellent work and need money to do it with. There are many more such. My only feeling is that the diverse drives of the diverse good causes may do all of them harm.

Of course, there are the racketeers. The world will never bleed so badly that they will not be with us. In the last great war a board named by Secretary of War Baker reported that out of 3,000 money-raising appeals, involving upward of a billion dollars, only 300 were worthy. The State Department by its license requirements has already made some effort to reduce the percentage of racketeering in this war. It has been reduced, undoubtedly. A national agency has been set up to help divide the good from the wicked; it has found organizations about which it urges serious inquiry before any contributions are made—and some of them have heart-touching names.

I am not sure there is any certain way to protect the people in the home towns from either foolish organizations or essentially wicked ones. But of one thing I am sure: a great deal of energy—much of it straight from the heart—is reaching from great centers to little towns, to distant States, for gifts. And in those little towns it begins to look as if not only money but horse sense is needed. The small towns, I think, would like to send back to the organizations in the big cities an appeal of their own—that they get the people of good will together, reduce the number of their organizations, budget their businesses, and cut down the costs of duplicating postage and telephone bills.

If the good organizations will get together, we people in the country will have less trouble in spotting the racketeers. Today the confusion of good works is a rank-growing jungle in which racketeers with only a cash interest in our hearts get beyond them to our pocketbooks. Honest directors of war charity must thin this forest if they hope to get rid of the weeds.

Tribute to a National Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a poem entitled "The Lion of Idaho," which was written by Horace C. Carlisle in tribute to the late Senator, Hon. William E. Borah:

THE LION OF IDAHO

The Lion of Idaho sleeps in his lair,
His roar in the Senate no longer is heard—
When Borah arose every Senator there,
In worshipful silence, imbibed every word.
Those memorable speeches of his, all designed
To help make the Nation what it ought to be,
Are in the archives of the past now enshrined,
A heritage there for the brave and the free.

The Lion of Idaho sleeps in his lair;
But long may the echoes of his words resound
With increasing eloquence, sweet as a prayer,
That right, sacred honor, and truth may abound.
Today our best statesmen in Congress revert
To Borah's great speeches, enshrined in the past;
For fearlessly he, ever on the alert,
Fought wrong, in the open on down to the last.

The Lion of Idaho sleeps in his lair,
Watched over by spirits dispatched from above,
As guardian angels in answer to prayer
From thousands of hearts to the Father of Love.
The throngs who revered him pass silently by—
The life that he lived has made sacred the sod—
Where his peaceful ashes will hopefully lie
Till called into action anew by his God.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Too Costly a Luxury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City Derrick of May 20, 1941:

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of May 20, 1941]

TOO COSTLY A LUXURY

Says a commentator, on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project:

"To examine the proposal from a national-defense standpoint," he writes, "it is proposed to complete the project in 5 years. Are the American people to understand that the United States is going to be in the war for the next 5 years? Most diplomats and military authorities believe the war will reach a climax this year—certainly not later than 1942—because of sheer economic exhaustion and moral break-down. Why should the United States be laying out a 5-year program, involving expenditures of billions of dollars, when it is a reasonable hope the war will be over in a year or two?

"Let's examine this proposed St. Lawrence waterway further as an economic venture. Certainly its benefits would be local and limited. Congress could take the same money and build four concrete highways 30 feet wide from New York to California, and have enough money left to build four concrete highways 30 feet wide north and south across the country from Canada to Mexico. Would anyone deny that such benefits as this would not have a higher economic value as a permanent improvement to the country and extend its benefits more broadly to the people?"

More than the money is involved in the St. Lawrence project. It would divert tremendous quantities of men and materials from genuinely necessary defense and aid-to-Britain undertakings. In normal times, the project, at best, should be regarded as being of highly dubious value. In these times, when the country is being asked to rally behind the cause of total defense, it should be regarded for what it is—a nonessential luxury we cannot possibly afford.

Education as a Means of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last evening to attend the graduation exercises of the Homestead Junior High School at Dailey, W. Va. I include at this point the following commencement address which I delivered:

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to return to my county and State and speak briefly on education as a means of national defense. I ask you to think about what we mean by the term "education"; what education has been; what it is today, and how it can be used as an instrument to help preserve this America of ours as the priceless possession of many generations to come.

It is pleasant to begin this talk by pointing out to you that the United States is still the home of education which is free, that we have our American way of education, democratically controlled. One hundred years' public education has stood here, helping men to climb to greater heights. Our educational system has stood the shock of years—it has its imperfections, to be sure, but today it has come through trying years—years that have rocked the world and that have filled it with wars, hates, and tears. Now the question is what can it do, what is it doing to defend this great Nation?

Once the whole emphasis in education was on the mastery of the "three R's." They were taught as unrelated drill with little reference to the life interests of the needs of the pupil or the community.

A transition has taken place, with shift of emphasis on the "three R's" in terms of growth, learning, and skills. The public schools today teach not only academic subjects but they also teach trades and occupations. Schools today fit more nearly into the fabric of the Nation. They set up conditions that will provide the best possible growth of citizenship in various skills and techniques. Our schools are, indeed, far different from schools of Europe, where learning is displaced by fallacious ideologies, where truth and tolerance and respect for men as human beings have long since been discarded by dictators.

Our educational system has evolved into one of our chief means of character building, and I think our educational institutions will be bulwarks against the tides of intolerance, as United States Commissioner of Education John W. Studebaker, pointed out the other day.

He said, "Our country is characterized by many differences in its social and cultural origins and its political and religious persuasions." So we must build even stronger our educational institutions if we would live together in peace and in harmony and if we would continue to be a nation united in defense of our freedoms.

I asked the Commissioner's office to give me some facts concerning the program of education in relation to national defense. I can assure you that it was very gratifying to learn that the schools of the Nation, including those of West Virginia, are carrying out splendidly the task that was assigned to them last year by the President and the Congress. That task involves training of two types in order that the Nation would have enough skilled workers and technicians to adequately man defense industries for the battle for production.

Primarily, the national-defense training program is predicated on the existence of a public vocational education movement which had its beginning during the World War. Mr. L. S. Hawkins, of the old Federal Board for Vocational Education, has been designated as director of the national-defense training program for skilled workers.

In order to illustrate how vocational education is serving as a means of national defense, I quote some facts from a recent article by Mr. Hawkins.

I find public vocational schools—1,050 of them—in every State are training an army of skilled workers. This training is along democratic lines, in the hands of the States and counties, thus preserving the accepted traditional method of American education.

These vocational schools have trained many thousands of men who belonged to the army of the unemployed during the world-wide depression. Thousands of these workers are at work in airplane plants, shipyards, and other defense industries. They are living proof that American education can be and is a vital democratic means of helping to make this Nation safe from foreign aggression.

Other thousands of workers are receiving "upgrading" for more responsible jobs in defense industries.

This program of training has established literally thousands of classes for out-of-school rural and city youths. Many of them were caught in the maw of economic depression. Today they are being given a chance to learn skills and become apprentices or one-occupation workers in defense industries. In tomorrow's world many of these youths are likely to be key figures of American industry.

There are 52 boys in the eighth and ninth grades who are taking industrial arts in this homestead school.

So, in addition to forming a first-line industrial defense of the Nation, vocational education, harnessed to the needs of the Nation, is opening new doors of opportunity.

West Virginia is receiving the benefits of this expanding program of training.

In several training centers, men are being trained as welders, foundrymen, machine-shop workers, or aircraft mechanics. Around 1,000 of these trainees have been placed in West Virginia defense industries. W. W. Trent, State superintendent of schools, reveals there are defense-training classes for out-of-school youth in 32 of the State's 55 counties, with a total of 3,900 young men enrolled. Several new shops for this training program have been built with Federal funds—at Charles Town, Bell, Parkersburg, Huntington, and Wheeling. The doors of the University of West Virginia have been thrown open to men to learn the necessary skills of defense industries.

It is good to learn that the influence of this training program reaches not only the trainees. Management and labor are brought together in a State advisory committee, representing organized industry and organized labor. In West Virginia the highest representatives of both industry and organized labor help to plan the training programs based on the needs of defense industries.

Along with the defense training program goes the philosophy—a lesson perhaps we have needed to learn—that education for skilled jobs in overalls is just as essential as other forms of education.

What else can education do to help make certain the defense of our shores? There are perhaps several rather important things, but one seems especially important. I believe every State can promote defense to a degree undreamed of if programs of adult civic education, aided by the Federal Government as in the case of vocational defense training, are adopted. Because I believe such programs are vital to the Nation's security, I introduced a bill, H. R. 1070, in the House on January 3. This bill provides for an attack on illiteracy, provides for naturalization education, establishes public-affairs forums.

I believe that this program is essential to reinforce education as a means of national defense. It would place in the hands of the States means of teaching adults over 18 years old the exercise of their citizenship responsibilities. It would make for better citizenship by teaching illiterates to write and read and understand current news and articles on public affairs by teaching the background of American history, government, economics, and sociology. Teaching the democratic approach to our local, State, and National problems through discussion by citizens themselves, I conceive of as being as important to national defense as building battleships. I believe that educating men and women to the responsibilities of democratic life is the surest means of attacking the "fifth column" problem.

When men and women understand what America stands for—and civic education means teaching them to understand—this Nation need fear no borer from within or Trojan horse of any color. Fascism, nazism, or communism of any brand can only grow in the fertile soil of ignorance, oppression, and intolerance.

In education we have long realized that just as Hitlerism has made a mockery of German education and science by exercising ruthless political and racial control, so has Stalinism purged teachers and textbooks, classrooms and laboratories, until no free thought can exist in any totalitarian country.

Thus, as a defense measure, we must guard education itself in order to assure ourselves that our traditional freedoms will live. We must not allow native or foreign totalitarians to confuse us in defense of our gains. Democracy cannot be saved by totalitarian methods—it can be saved by expansion of the democratic process. America will be defended by education that does not use its instrumentalities for indoctrination — education that is based on sound theory and practice, that implores clear thinking and action when the Nation is on the march. Education which practices democracy can be perhaps the greatest means of all in defense of democracy.

A vital need today is that kind of education which will cause all the citizens to understand the relation of the battle of production to our related civic problems.

I am sure all of you know that if we have education to defend America against invasion, against poverty, disease, and injustice, plus education to plan for the well-being in the post-defense period, no powers on earth can conquer us. The hope of democracy is the achievement of goals through education for all its families, for all men, women, and children. They are America—whose destiny will be shaped by the ponderable and imponderable forces of learning.

In closing I want to say I believe it is necessary to permeate the plain people of America with democratic direction. We can't face our fundamental tasks with careless thinking; if we do, we evade them. It is our task in this country to realize the ideals of human life—the true task of Americanism.

Westbrook Pegler Lynches a Community

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in Florida a man has been murdered—perhaps lynched. I say perhaps lynched because four men seized and killed him. There was no mass activity. It is a tragic thing. A fine city and a great State feel it deeply. I believe that justice will be done. I do not condone lynching.

One Westbrook Pegler writes about that unhappy incident. But he does not direct his statements primarily against lynching. He directs them against Florida. He condemns. He slanders. Figuratively, he burns at the stake an old, cultured, patriotic city and a State whose outstanding contributions place her in the front rank of American progress.

I doubt that Pegler has ever seen northwest Florida. Many Members of this House have been there. I believe my colleagues hope, with me, that Pegler will not again presume to write about my State until his knowledge of Florida and of American history improves. Name calling is neither literature nor public service.

Following is an article from the Tallahassee (Fla.) Daily Democrat:

[From the Tallahassee (Fla.) Daily Democrat of May 20, 1941]

WESTBROOK PEGLER LYNCHES A COMMUNITY

The only excuse we can think of for Westbrook Pegler is that he is ignorant. But ignorance is said to be no excuse under the law, and it is certainly no excuse for a writer who offers his opinions to a nation.

The Pegler column for May 19 leads a verbal lynching bee directed at the beautiful, orderly, cultured community of Quincy.

Because a crime was committed near Quincy a short time ago, Westbrook Pegler attacks the community and this section of Florida with a degree of brutality seldom encountered in the press of a civilized nation. This convicts Pegler himself of the charges he hurls with abandon at the community, the section, and the State.

The crime which aroused Pegler's ire was murder. A man was accused of attacking a 12-year-old girl. He was shot to death by four men who have not been identified. This has all the outward aspects of a private vengeance slaying. It was not a lynching.

A lynching is an informal, extra-legal, and often misdirected attempt to apprehend and punish criminals, carried out by a large section of a community. A private vengeance slaying is what the French call a crime of passion, and results from the anger of one or a small group of relatives, neighbors, or friends against a person who has harmed someone close and dear to them. There is no similarity whatever between a community effort at extra-legal justice and a private vengeance slaying.

It makes not the slightest difference whether the victim is white or black. What is a vengeance slaying, if directed against a white person, does not become a lynching simply because the victim is a Negro. It is murder in either case, but the community is more responsible for the action of a large section of its population than for the private crimes committed by one or a few individuals.

In this case, the community of Quincy can be held no more responsible for the crime than for a robbery committed there. The residents of Quincy had no more foreknowledge that the crime would be committed and no greater opportunity to prevent it than the residents of Chicago.

It is, therefore, an uncivilized act to smear a fine community with the faults of some persons who may live nearby. Pegler says the episode "in a little town in northwest Florida * * * could be matched only in cultural exercises of the superrace of Adolf Hitler." To which we reply: "Pegler's unfair attack upon Quincy could be matched only by the beastial excesses of the smear propaganda of Herr Goebbels."

So much for the murder and for Pegler's attempt to lynch Quincy without a hearing and without knowledge of the facts.

The rest of the article is even less truthful. On general grounds Pegler attacks Quincy without mercy and without shadow of truth.

He says, "The section of the country in which this horror occurred is in the social and intellectual slum which, according to the hearsay historians of Florida, was populated by low whites who fled from the other Southern States, notably Georgia and Alabama, to escape service in the Civil War * * *."

It is difficult to imagine a sentence with a greater number of errors. To refute them all fully would require columns of space. It may suffice here to point out that Quincy, though it has no college, is much like a college town, with its clean, shaded, paved streets, its well-kept homes and gardens, its air of culture and gentle living, its interest in the general welfare and in community progress, its ample income without noisy and dirty factories. If Quincy is in a social and intellectual slum, so is Cambridge, Mass.

And what is this about Quincy's population fleeing from service in the Civil War? How absurd that is. If Westbrook Pegler would read written history instead of listening to "hearsay historians," who evidently never heard any facts, he would discover that Florida was one of the first Southern States to secede, that Quincy had been settled and was a thriving, cultured community for half a century before that time, and that anyone fleeing to that city would have run right into the heart of Confederate activity in Florida. Far from providing a haven for cowards, Quincy and these communities along the Alabama-Georgia line put their tottering old men and their beardless boys into the battles of Olustee and Natural Bridge.

In his general attacks on Florida, Pegler follows his usual line of singling out the worst isolated conditions and presenting them in such a way as to give the reader the impression that they are typical.

No one can deny that there are poverty-stricken families in Florida just as there are in New York's slums. No one can deny that there is crime in our State and a fair share of official corruption. But poverty, squalor, crime, and corruption are no more typical of Florida than of any other section or any other State. It is still feasible for any observer to find flowers or weeds anywhere, and Pegler searches for and finds only weeds.

It is a sad thing for a man to become a weed seeker. It may be that we should censor him less than we pity him for a form of mental illness. Perhaps, after all, it is those who are unsure of their own culture and refinement who go about frantically seeking out and pointing to the shortcomings of the most depraved individuals in order that they may reassure themselves that they have some claim to superiority over at least the dregs of humanity.

Pegler suggests, perhaps with a flash of insight into his own personality, that the white men who persecute Negroes do so because they lack other means to demonstrate their superiority. It is even sadder to find a man who must go one step lower to find someone to feel superior to and to persecute.

Britain Delivers the Goods Without Convoys

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession a copy of an advertisement inserted in Monday's newspapers by a large Washington department store announcing the sale of 59,671 pieces of fine British-made china, earthenware, and porcelain at one-fourth the prices ordinarily charged. The advertisement includes a large drawing of crates, barrels, and boxes of British-made merchandise, being unloaded from a ship on an American wharf. The caption of the advertisement reads:

Britain delivers the goods.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that here is a potent argument against the use of convoys. If Great Britain is in a position to flood American department stores with British-made merchandise, such as is being done, why should it be necessary for the United States to convoy American-made arms and munitions to Great Britain? In other words, it seems to me that if Great Britain can bring them, she can take them, without convoys.

The Washington department store responsible for this advertisement now has four large show windows filled with displays of British-made merchandise and large signs conveying the message that—

Britain delivers the goods.

Flooding of the American markets with British-made merchandise substantiates statements made on the floor of the House during the debate on the lease-lend bill to the effect that Great Britain is doing business as usual despite the war, while American factories are in wartime production and the American manufacture of competitive products is being curtailed. In other words, Mr. Speaker, while a minority in America is crying for more and more aid to Britain, Great Britain is doing business as usual and is, apparently, embarking upon a trade-war program that may eventually crush the United States economically.

I do not believe that the advertisements of sales of British-made merchandise in American stores will cause the American manufacturer to become very optimistic and gleeful. In fact, I rather imagine he grows more pessimistic as he strolls through American department stores and sees great stocks of British-made merchandise on sale, while at the

same time he is worrying about where and how he will raise the money to meet his increased tax bills next year—increased tax bills necessitated by the New Deal's decision to fight and pay for Great Britain's war.

British soaps, china, earthenware, clothing materials, tobaccos, and other articles of British make are growing more conspicuous in American department stores each week. To me this proves that Great Britain has every intention of holding her world trade to the detriment of the American farmer, worker, and manufacturer, whose money is being used by the administration in power to pay the bill.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, recalls to mind that not so many years ago Great Britain boycotted American-made merchandise, and during that boycott the countrysides of England were plastered with signs reading "Buy only British-made goods."

How much longer, may I ask, are the people of the United States expected to play the role of "Uncle Sap"?

A Problem To Be Met

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, when prices rise there is always a consumer resistance. This is the fact even if the selling price of the commodity is far below cost of production to the producer.

We should have a Federal agency that represents the producer, the consumer, and the distributor of foodstuffs to meet this situation.

The following article is from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 22, 1941]

CANADIAN FOOD PRICES LOWER THAN UNITED STATES LEVEL—BRITISH-AID BUYING SENDS DAIRY COSTS UP IN STORES HERE

(By Walter Kiernan)

NEW YORK, May 21.—Extension of Government all-out aid to Britain into the field of dairy purchasing led to a paradoxical situation today in which Canada was putting butter, eggs, and cheese on the consumer's table at prices considerably lower than they were obtainable in the United States.

Prices reported for New York City and Toronto by one grocery chain which operates coast-to-coast in both countries put butter at 39 cents in New York and 30 in Toronto; grade-A eggs at 39 in New York, 25 in Toronto, and store cheese at 23 in New York and 19 in Toronto.

CANADIAN PRICES LOWER

In March, butter in New York was 34 cents; eggs 29, and cheese was 19.

Except for coffee, Canada's consumer prices for other food staples also were considerably below those of the United States in the stores of the chain. Comparative prices were:

Chuck roast:		
New York		$0.18
Toronto		.17
Round roast:		
New York		.29
Toronto		.25
Prime ribs:		
New York		.25
Toronto		.23
Meat loaf:		
New York		.25
Toronto		.19
Porterhouse:		
New York		.35
Toronto		.29
Bread:		
New York	36 oz.	.15
Toronto	48 oz.	.15
New potatoes:		
New York	5 lbs.	.15
Toronto	5 lbs.	.15
Coffee:		
New York	2 lbs.	.39
Toronto	1 lb.	.39
Tea:		
New York	½ lb.	.27
Toronto	½ lb.	.30
Cabbage:		
New York	1 lb.	.04
Toronto	1 lb.	.04

In New York the difference in prices of dairy products between the United States and Canada was charged by the antiprofiteering council to the Federal buying program for Britain.

CHEAPER TO IMPORT

The purchase of evaporated milk and cheese has driven up the cost of butter, the council asserted, and huge carload purchases of eggs has sent up the price of that commodity.

Dairymen are suggesting that if the butter price climbs appreciably higher, it will be cheaper to import from Canada.

That would create another strange situation in which American dairy products would go to Britain while Canadian products were bought for the United States.

HENDERSON STUDIES RISING PEPPER PRICES

The rising prices of pepper, subject to speculation because of an acute shortage of shipping from the East Indies, will receive the special attention of the Government today.

Price Control Administrator Leon Henderson met with a committee from the New York Produce Exchange to discuss "undesirable speculative activity" on the pepper market.

The following article is from the Foley (Ala.) Onlooker of May 15, 1941:

[From the Foley (Ala.) Onlooker of May 15, 1941]

BOTTOM DROPS FROM BENEATH LOCAL MARKET—ONE-FOURTH OF LOCAL DEAL ON MARKET AS PRICES CONTINUE TO DROP

The bottom dropped out of the 2-week-old Baldwin potato deal here with only one-fourth of the crop being dug.

The same potatoes quoted here last Wednesday at $1.20 and 60 cents are being sold today for 80 cents and 10 cents, while White Rose variety is quoted at $1 and 20 cents for No. 2's.

Shipment continues to pick up throughout the county as Foley led with the largest day with 119 cars moving on Tuesday.

Shipments over the county by cars are—Foley, 623; Loxley, 369; Robertsdale, 361; Summerdale, 362; Bay Minette, 13, making a total of 1,728 cars shipped by rail from the the county to northern markets.

Mr. Speaker, from these you will note that new potatoes are sold by the farmers in Alabama at 80 cents per hundredweight, or 48 cents per bushel, and retailed in New York at $3 per hundredweight, or $1.80 per bushel.

In old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS I find where a New York Congressman was fighting the high cost of living in New York City when at the same time it cost more to transport a carload of poultry two blocks from the terminal to the killing pens than the cost of transportation from the midwestern State to New York City. This was due to the city racketeers of that time.

What is surprising about the fact that Canadian food prices are lower than the United States level? This is also shown in the fact that we imported 140,604 pounds of butter from New Zealand and 5,766 pounds from Canada the first 3 months of 1941. Further, it is well known that Canada is largely an agricultural country and has millions of bushels of surplus wheat to be shipped when a favorable market can be found for it.

The sooner President Roosevelt can get this price-control situation in hand, the better the consumer, producer, and distributor will be in a position to handle his business. We cannot continue to have price juggling by one small group of people to whom the power may or may not have been legally delegated.

Temperance Essential in Modern Mechanized Armies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

ARTICLE BY COL. GEORGE E. SKINNER, RETIRED, UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from people throughout the Nation expressing concern over reports of the alleged excessive use of intoxicating liquors by our soldiers. I am convinced these reports are greatly exaggerated. Commanding officers of our military posts have advised me that only a very small minority of the soldiers today are using alcohol. They say most of the men seek to advance in their training and are fully aware that modern mechanized armies must be sober armies.

Col. George E. Skinner, M. D., Medical Corps, United States Army, has written an interesting and informative article on this subject for the magazine Signs of the Times. I include Colonel Skinner's article:

[From the Signs of Times]

(By Col. George E. Skinner, Medical Corps, United States Army, retired)

In past days soldiers, in general, have had an unhappy reputation relative to the use of intoxicants. But, as in many other lines of endeavor, a bad name is often fastened on a group by a very small minority of that group, for one drunken soldier will attract much more attention than the rest of a

company who are quietly carrying out their appointed duties.

In the early history of our Army, when the soldier's pay reached the magnificent sum of $3 a month, and $1 of that was deducted for medical and other expenses, it is obvious that he could not go to many excesses. And in recent years there is no record of such extravagance in the matter of his pay that he could "splurge" very often. On pay day, if a few did indulge, it was always a very small percentage of the group, and these as a rule were soon disposed of.

Today our development is so largely mechanical and our equipment moves at such speed that even the most ordinary routine of daily life requires the clearest brain and most accurate and rapid muscular action possible. This is demonstrated daily by the number of traffic injuries, and as traffic is now mostly automobile, the injuries and deaths from this cause are appalling. A large percentage of them are the direct result of the use of alcoholic drinks. Why? We have just mentioned that life now depends largely upon the quick action of the mind and a rapid response of the muscles to the needs of the body. The first action of alcohol is to break up the connection between the mind and body, to confuse the mind, and to slow muscular action. Hence even if the mind notes that the body is in danger and orders the muscles to act, the order is badly mixed up in reaching the muscles, and the response may be directly opposite from what it should be. The worst of it is that the owner of the mind does not realize the difficulty and proceeds serenely on his destructive way until he is either killed, injured, or taken out of circulation in some other way.

These reactions to alcohol operate as surely in the Army as in civil life. In our present defense needs, the protective armament is very largely mechanical and often exceedingly complicated, requiring the finest training and muscular response (coordination) possible. As a man's life—and the lives of others—in an airplane depends upon the accurate judgment and coordination of the pilot—and both judgment and coordination are badly disturbed by alcohol—it stands to reason that a man who indulges in alcohol is not going to be trusted with such an important assignment.

TEMPERANCE ESSENTIAL

The same is true in practically every other part of the modern army, and if our country is to survive in a crisis depending upon defense, we must have a trained defense force that is relatively free from the disturbances of alcohol. By this I do not mean that no one will ever touch beer or wine, though that would be highly desirable, but that the amount will be greatly lessened and the time in which they are used very much restricted.

An air pilot who has alcoholic inclinations is not going to last long on his job, for not only is there danger to the lives of others besides himself but he is in charge of a very expensive machine, which takes months to replace if damaged or destroyed, and one on which the safety of our country may largely depend. He would promptly be grounded, and if his course were not immediately and radically altered, he would be removed entirely from his assignment. Not only does he not have to drink to be a soldier, but if he does drink he cannot occupy any responsible position.

Even in the olden days when everyone in the Army was supposed to be drunk on pay day, it was comparatively few who caused this idea to spread. I have seen the Army at a time when morale was very low, when most of us were in small frontier garrisons, with little to do except wait for something to happen, with slow promotion and small pay, and yet the number who resorted to alcoholic forgetfulness was small. Some of the men did use moderate amounts of beer and wines. Some of us never touched any alcoholic drink, and there were many more of the latter class than we have ever been credited with. As time has gone on and our duties have become more complex, the number using alcoholic drinks and the amount used has greatly lessened.

Industry has done much to limit the use of alcoholics, for accuracy of eye and hand is of the utmost importance, and industry cannot afford to have men injured and machines damaged by alcoholic incoordination. In many industries if a man is even seen or known to visit places where liquor is dispensed, he is summarily dismissed. In others he is warned, and a repetition is not tolerated. These stern measures have been found necessary to protect industry from destruction, for industry is now responsible for injuries to its employees, and injuries are greatly multiplied when men drink any form of booze. It does not matter in what form alcohol enters the body. Its action is always the same, though the conveyors may differ in amount and taste. But, however disguised, it is still alcohol, and alcohol is always destructive to human bodies.

STRENGTH FOR LEADERSHIP

The days when soldiers were regarded as merely something in human form that had little or no brain (or if they had it, it was not necessary to use it) have gone for good. It is truer than ever that soldiers need to work together, and for team play, whether on a university football squad, or in an army drill squad, discipline is necessary. Discipline is only another name for good team play, for in teamwork it is the work of the mass, rather than of the individual, that counts. And for that reason it is necessary for the mass to act as one. This requires leadership, and at the same time subordination of the individual to the group. This need not imply loss of initiative, but rather the reverse, for good team play develops leadership, and in practically any well-trained team any one of the men can immediately assume leadership if necessary. This form of training is precisely what is developed in the army, and it was effectively demonstrated on many occasions in the World War by the leadership of junior officers, sergeants, corporals, and privates. If the regular leaders were incapacitated, the next man in rank took over the command, and there were many instances where very young lads, through this training, showed surprising and very effective leadership. But leadership of this character is not found in the man who is trying to forget his troubles in drinking liquor. Moral and physical stamina do not result from the use of alcohol.

In the Army, as in industry, the man at the top is constantly looking for young men that are worthy of promotion to better jobs. It is absolutely necessary in every organization to provide for understudies, that is, someone to take over responsibility in case the leader is disabled or sick. This means a constant training of new material in higher duties. Any man at the head of an organization that can keep up this supply is doing one of the biggest things possible for the organization. It means constant observation of the possible candidates. Any man that demonstrates unusual ability, stamina, or character is at once spotted, and often given a tryout to determine whether he is worth training. And it is not among the boozers that this promising material is sought or found. My biggest task when heading a large hospital center in France was picking suitable men for special tasks, and I assure you that the young men are most carefully observed for possible advancement.

In our present Army you not only do not have to drink to be a soldier, but if you do drink, your chances for advancement are greatly lessened. Moreover, you are opening the way for rapid physical and mental deterioration, and reducing the opportunities for reaching the highest capabilities for which your physical, mental, and spiritual endowments intended you.

An Answer to Anne Lindbergh

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written for and against Charles Lindbergh. I have read much of it. I believe the best answer I have seen to his philosophy and the philosophy expressed in the Wave of the Future, written by his wife, Anne Lindbergh, was written by a trial judge in Oregon, out on the west coast, who has just been promoted to the supreme bench by the Governor of Oregon. I congratulate the Governor for appointing so able and brilliant a man to the supreme bench of Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, the article by Judge Brand is as follows:

AN OREGON JURIST, APPRAISING "THE WAVE OF THE FUTURE," HEREWITH SUGGESTS AN ANSWER TO ANNE LINDBERGH—A CONTRIBUTOR INVESTIGATES THE LOGIC OF AN APPEALING THESIS THAT HAS ENGAGED THE ATTENTION OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

(By James T. Brand)

(James T. Brand is circuit judge, second judicial district at Marshfield, Oreg. Mr. Brand took his law degree at Harvard, later became city attorney at Marshfield. He is a past president of the Oregon State Bar Association and is a leader in efforts to improve judicial procedure in this State.)

Anne Lindbergh would have you believe that her Wave of the Future, condensed in the Readers Digest, is a permanent wave. I would not.

Her essay is so full of faith and idealism, so subtly and appealingly written, that anyone who criticizes it must feel like a bad boy plucking the wings from a butterfly. One must regret to destroy the flowing magic of her theme by analysis and dissection, but after all, belief in magic is not at the moment the crying need of America.

"The old world we loved is going," she writes, "somehow the leaders of Germany, Italy, and Russia have discovered how to use new social and economic forces. They have sensed the changes and they have exploited them. They have felt the wave of the future and they have leaped upon it."

AUTHORESS SEES POTENTIAL GOOD IN NEW MOVEMENTS

It is with sympathetic sadness that she announces the decadence and doom of our present civilization and the uselessness of resistance to change. But the announcement is clear: "We still have our eyes, our minds, our hearts on the dream that is dying—how beautiful it was, tinting the whole sky crimson as it fades into the west. But there is another on its way in the gray dawn. * * * The wave of the future is coming and there is no fighting it."

Her emphasis, I think, is upon the fading, not the beauty, of the "dream that is dying." And this wave, the wave that Hitler and

Mussolini have leaped upon, she believes is essentially good.

Recognizing that "many of the things we love are going down," she inquires if that which is pushing behind communism, fascism, nazi-ism, may not be some "new and perhaps ultimately good conception of humanity trying to come to birth," and she answers, "Something one feels is pushing up through the crust of custom—I believe that it is in its essence good, but because we are blind we cannot see it." By analogy she refers to the French Revolution, where good ultimately came out of violence and atrocity.

VISION—FORESEES PASSING OF CHERISHED THINGS

What is the old order that is passing like a dream, and what is her new conception of humanity which is to "displace the things we loved"? The things that are passing away are clearly identified in the mind of Anne Lindbergh.

She writes: "For who does not feel today the world I love is going down and all things in it that I cherish? Most of us prefer the old world of England, France, and the United States to the new world of Fascist Europe. I feel that way myself."

So it is the way of life of America that is going down. But she is more specific. It is the "formulas and creeds" that we were brought up to trust implicitly. It is "the sacredness of property, the infallibility of the democratic way of life, the efficiency of the capitalistic system—which seem to be threatened or dislodged from their sacrosanct niches." Thus she indites her morituri te salutamus of the American way of life.

Her idea of the new order which is to displace our "dying civilization" is either less definite or much less definitely expressed. Plainly she would have us swim with the wave of the future. But she has already got Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin astride that wave—the one they leaped upon. So at least we know the company we must keep as we ride.

Again, and most definitely, the new order is linked in her mind with the Nazi discovery "how to use new social and economic forces" and how to exploit them. The death by assassination of European democracy attests the Nazi discovery of the new force technique. So this at least is a part of Anne Lindbergh's dream "that is on its way in the gray dawn."

CLUE TO ANNE LINDBERGH'S OUTLOOK DISCERNED

Now, before I analyze her argument, let me speculate for a moment about Anne Lindbergh herself. A psychiatrist would find in this charming authoress a study of profound interest. She recalls to my mind the theories expounded by Jerome Frank.

The infant, says Frank, is born into a sense of effortless security, but as childhood passes he becomes aware of his incapacity for controlling "the crushing, heedless, reluctant, and uncertain facts of the outer world."

He looks first to his parents for security, but soon realizes their helplessness and fallibility, too. "Then," says Frank, "panic fear" attacks him and in his flight from uncertainty and insecurity he sublimates his fears and, since hope and faith spring eternal in the human breast, he grasps at religion or law or some other great conception, lifts up his face from the world of reality and finds peace and a sense of security at the price of blindness.

And this, I think, is the story of Anne Lindbergh. The key to the riddle of her personality appears in the first lines of her essay. She tells of Boethius contemplating a changing world "witha troubled and uneasy mind. How can this truth be reconciled to that truth, this right to that right." Then she quotes him:

> "And therefore whoso seeks the truth
> Shall find in no wise peace of heart."

As she read those lines, Anne Lindbergh had the "supreme thrill across the centuries." She understood.

TRAGEDY CAUSED HER TO SEEK REFUGE OVERSEAS

She had grown up a delicate flower in a beautiful and protected garden of wealth and culture. Security was hers as a birthright. She married a hero, she bore a son, and then without warning she was engulfed in a black maelstrom of horror and despair. After she had been dragged through the courts half blinded by the pitiless glare of publicity, she walled herself in for security, finally fled to England for security, then went on to Germany and Russia.

Now she sees the whole world whirling in the same maelstrom of black death that engulfed her. And in her Wave of the Future she cries out, "Why has this come?" Bowed down by her shattered faith and lost security, she has done what many a distressed and saintly and sensitive soul has done before her.

There were but two roads to follow, one to face the cruel realities of our day and fight on, seeking an answer that may never be found. That way for her led to madness. The other road she followed. She looked up from the bogs of uncertainty. She saw the things she loved destroyed by apparently invincible brute force. She saw the triumph of despotism in Europe. She lifted her eyes to the heavens and away from the earth, sublimated her fears and uncertainty, and resolved that "all things work together for good," though she forgot the rest of the quotation. It was not her mind that conquered, it was her emotions.

Then she wrote the Wave of the Future, and in it she said: "I offer then not a solution but a record of my attempt to reconcile the many conflicting points of view which have assailed me—perhaps it would be better called a confession of faith. A faith * * * is not seen but felt, not proved but believed, not a program but a dream."

This is Anne Lindbergh, preaching the fall of democracy, the rise of dictatorship, and the destruction of liberty, teaching it because in the presence of disaster and overwhelming force a dreamer must have faith in something or go mad.

CHANGE: SOME TO THE GOOD, SOME TO THE BAD

First of all, we must note that she neglects to tell us why the new dream of Hitler and Mussolini is better than the American way of life. She makes a quantitative, not a qualitative, analysis of the new wave. It is overwhelming, therefore resistance is futile. Nay, more; with a gentle firmness she teaches the duty of submission. Again I quote: "There is no sin punished more implacably than the sin of resistance to change. For change is the very essence of living matter. To resist change is to sin against life itself."

But do we not find changes of death as well as changes of growth in living matter? Rot and decay are forms of change. Lust and crime imprint changes like the mark of Cain on the faces of men and nations.

The wave that was Napoleon was a wave of change, but men built a bulwark against that wave, and it broke and fell back. The wave that was Attila the Hun, the wave that was Genghis Khan, the wave that was Kaiser Wilhelm, the wave that was our War of the Rebellion—all these and many more were waves of change, but men built human bulwarks against them, and because they were waves of destruction, not growth, they broke and fell back. Men were not ostriches then, with their heads buried in the sand, chanting to themselves that the world we love is gone, but all is for the best in the best of worlds.

The very essence of error is in the assertion of Anne Lindbergh that resistance to change is sin. The history of man's rise from savagery is the story of his triumphant battle against change wrought by corruption, destruction, reckless ambition, and death. Such resistance marks the difference between the beasts who resist not and perish and the race of man which fights on and persists. The unforgivable sin is to resist that change which is growth, not the change which is destruction.

MORE THAN FAITH OR DREAMS WORLD'S NEED TODAY

In this hard world, she who would sanctify carnage and conquest by naming it The Wave of the Future, must have more than a faith or a dream. She must face reality and its problems, whether she can solve those problems or not. She must seek truth, though with Boethius she may "find in no wise peace of heart." She must seek the inner meaning of war and conquest, testing it by the great touchstone of our eternal ideal of liberty and justice.

What does Hitler's war mean for the future of education, of peaceful home life, of freedom and initiative and opportunity—of the very right of the yet unborn to dream dreams as she does now.

To support her faith that today's wave is in its essence good, Anne Lindbergh cites the French Revolution and says, "Consider the leaders of the French Revolution. * * * No one today defends the atrocities of the French Revolution, but few seriously question the fundamental necessity or rightness of the movement." Here is a perfect example of illogical reasoning.

The horrors of the French Revolution did introduce a happier and better world. It was a wave of the future. Today there arises a greater horror, so she infers that it too is for the best and must be a wave of the future.

That revolution was a great uprising of the common people against despotism. It led to liberty, equality, and fraternity of a free people. The Hitler regime is an uprising of despotism against the liberty and equality of free people. If the rise of the French people against a despot was good, does that prove that the rise of a despot against the people is also good? Anne Lindbergh would have you believe that it is. I would not.

SOLUTION SHOULD HAVE AMERICAN FLAVOR

Finally, the beauty and tragedy of her dream is shown in words of such loveliness that I must quote them first unmarred by criticism. Foretelling the future of America after the flood, she writes:

"This change will not take the form of a German, an Italian, or a Russian revolution. Our answer should be a solution peculiarly and saltily our own. It should be as American as the white steeples of New England or the skyscrapers of New York; as American as a boy's slang, as backyard life in small towns, as baseball and blue jeans. As American as our red-brick schools, standing like stanch citadels along our country roads; as white clapboard houses with green blinds; as unhedged gardens and open fields; as our stratoliners and streamlined trains; as our air beacons, necklacing a continent at night with their golden beams. As American as October—crisp, clear, tart, sunny, and crimson—like an American apple."

WORDS PAINT VERY AMERICA DICTATORS IMPERIL

Such beauty of expression is seldom found. She paints America almost as it is—and as it may be if we hold to the fine ideals of the past and mold them into a richer, a juster, and a happier future. She paints the very future America that Hitler would destroy, that Stalin would corrupt, that Mussolini would scorn.

Can the white steeples of New England stand when priests and preachers are herded like felons in concentration camps? Can the American red-brick schoolhouse stand like a "stanch citadel" when history and literature are rewritten at the command of a fanatical house painter and the burning of the books is a patriotic rite?

We must save America the beautiful, of which Anne Lindbergh dreams, whether by peace or war I do not know; but this I do know—we must save it from the siren song of poets and dreamers who love America but who speak like mourners at America's funeral of the "good of a dying civilization."

PRESENT SHOWS A WAVE, BUT NOT A TIDE

The flood that engulfs Europe is the mightiest wave of the present that the world has seen. But that wave is not the tide. We, too, have a faith—a faith based on knowledge, knowledge of the riches of American life, knowledge that ours is not a dying civilization but young, vigorous, and strong; knowledge based on the life of the world, which proves that when aroused, freemen are more efficient, more heroic, more triumphant than slaves. Let the wages roll. Our tide "taken at the flood will lead on to fortune."

R. F. C. Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, 1941, the Federal Loan Agency made a report to the President and the Congress which is worthy of close scrutiny and examination by every Member.

It deals more particularly with the R. F. C. and its subsidiary corporations and indicates the accomplishments to date in the field of national defense.

The Rubber Reserve Corporation, which is an R. F. C. subsidiary, embarked on a purchase program for 430,000 tons of rubber, to cost $190,000,000. Of this amount, 98,000 tons have been delivered; 13,700 tons were in transit; 37,500 tons are awaiting shipment.

The Metals Reserve Corporation has made commitments of $609,000,000 for the procurement of tin, zinc, antimony, tungsten, manganese, and other critical and strategic materials which are indispensable to the defense establishment.

The Defense Supplies Corporation is concerned with the acquisition of basic defense supplies and has already made commitments for the procurement of high-octane aviation gasoline and other commodities.

The Defense Plants Corporation has made commitments of $511,000,000 on plants which are owned by the Government and leased to manufacturers. There have also been $194,000,000 in private loans committed. This embraces 288 loans to 217 manufacturers. It includes such commitments as $26,000,000 to Bendix Corporation for the manufacture of aviation supplies; $3,000,000 to Baldwin Locomotive for tanks; $4,750,000 to American Brass, $16,000,000 to Chase Brass, $11,500,000 to Bridgeport Brass for brass cartridges and supplies; $6,500,000 to Colt Co. for machine guns; $60,000,000 to Curtis for aviation; $9,500,000 to Continental Motors for airplane engines; $36,000,000 to General Motors; $8,000,000 to North American Aviation; and $50,000,000 to Studebaker for planes, parts, and accessories; $5,500,000 to General Motors for guns; $6,000,000 to General Electric for superchargers; $26,000,000 to Tennessee Powder for the manufacture of powder.

This is a gigantic program, and the R. F. C. has handled it with dispatch at a minimum of red tape.

On the agenda are other proposals for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, the development of aluminum, and other products which are so essential to the defense establishment and a lack of which creates a critical and dangerous bottleneck.

Legislation is now pending to broaden R. F. C. powers for the purpose of coping quickly and expeditiously with a number of problems which have arisen recently, and this legislation deserves the best attention of the Congress. The R. F. C.'s record is one of accomplishment.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Lindy flew to France 14 years ago Tuesday and now France flies at us.

Convoys lost steam on the sea of public opinion. Will the White House dare to fire the boilers?

Let the Decoration Day orators recite In Flanders Field and the people resolve—never again.

We do not know LaGuardia's plans as head of civilian defense, but we venture they are expensive ones.

The docks about New York are as deserted as a summer cabin on the lake in December. The *Normandie* looks lonesome.

Consternation reigned at the State Department when all the Americans on the *Zamzam* finally turned up safe—in Nazi hands.

If the British had done as well at Dunkirk and Thermopylae as they did last June at Philadelphia it would have been different.

Miss Columbia is conducting a dangerour flirtation with a fickle gentleman named John Bull, but Uncle Sam is still tops with the young lady.

The only failure the President admits in 8 long years is his effort to move up Thanksgiving Day. It is the only time he has been up against a higher power.

The 700,000 persons, mostly contrymen of those whom Hitler has either run out or run over in Europe jammed Central Park in New York for I Am an American Day. Kate Smith and Eddie Cantor entertained.

"Roosevelt bids Americans unite to save our trade"—New York Times headline last Sunday. Now they have disclosed the great moral issue. Leave the trade to Cordell Hull—he will bring them in if our cash holds out.

The big boys in the Quaker City who denied Lindbergh a hall and the radio must be descendants of the 400 who wined and dined the officers of the British Army while Washington and his shoeless soldiers were wintering at Valley Forge.

Convoys and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about public opinion on the subject of convoys. Every day I receive many letters from my district that leave no doubt in my mind that my people are overwhelmingly opposed to their use.

I insert in the RECORD a letter from one of our fine citizens on this subject. It shows, in a typical way, just how the people in the Seventeenth California District feel on the subject.

I believe that it is the fine work of such people as this lady that is keeping this Nation at peace.

The letter follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 20, 1941.*

Hon. LEE E. GEYER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEYER: The past few days I have taken it upon myself to find out how my neighbors feel about convoys and the war.

I have a little four-line letter sent out by the Mothers of America, to be signed and sent in to Congress. The letter states that the signer is opposed to the use of American armed forces to deliver goods to belligerents and against expeditionary forces outside the Western Hemisphere.

I took this little letter and plenty of paper and a pencil and started ringing my neighbors' doorbells.

I was overwhelmed at the response. Over 90 percent of the people on whom I called signed and promised to write to the President.

Last Monday I got 97 signatures.

Last Tuesday I got 57 signatures.

Last Wednesday and Thursday I got 91 signatures.

Last Saturday I got 110 signatures.

Last Sunday I got 27 signatures.

Last Monday I got 50 signatures. For a total of 432 signatures.

I realize that 432 signatures would not turn the tide, but it indicates, to me at least, how my neighbors feel about convoys.

I did this entirely unsolicited, working just around here in the afternoons, after I finished my housework and before time to cook dinner.

Two of my friends have worked some and have a few more signers among their friends and family.

Sincerely and earnestly,

ESTELLE GRAY.

Aviation Abroad—A Rather Remarkable Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

AN ARTICLE FROM THE MAGAZINE AVIATION FOR MAY 1941

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on page A253 of the Appendix of the RECORD I placed an article which appeared in Foreign Affairs, an American quarterly review, entitled "Wings for the Trojan Horse," written by Messrs. Melvin Hall and Walter Peck, both of whom are connected with the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

In the magazine Aviation, for May 1941, I have found on page 104 certain remarks under the heading "Aviation abroad," which will be of interest to those who realize the importance of expanding our aviation facilities abroad, meanwhile watching the Trojan horse.

In the second of the following three paragraphs you will note a reference to the apparent intense interest of Germany in maintaining her aviation interests in South America evidenced by her recent delivery of two airliners—modern transports—plus spare parts.

AVIATION ABROAD

LATIN AMERICA SUPPRESSES AXIS AIR LINES

The past weeks have not been very happy for German and Italian interests in Latin America; not only did the South American Republics follow the United States' example in seizing Axis freighters, but Peru went one step further and took over the whole establishment of the German Lufthansa Peru, which included at least two air liners, and all ground equipment.

In addition, Pan American Grace Airways took one of the first concrete steps to combat further expansion of Axis owned or controlled air lines in South America, by starting a semi-weekly air service in Ecuador between two important inland cities, in direct competition with the German "Sedta." On the other hand, the expansion by German air lines in this hemisphere is made easier by ships slipping through the blockade with new equipment; in this way they have received at least two modern transports, new personnel, and a considerable amount of spare equipment.

The Italian "Lati" will be given one more chance by Brazil, an official announcement said. The air line, which maintains the last air connection between the Axis and Latin America, paid a large fine for unneutral actions on Brazilian territory and was informed that the next case would result in immediate cancelation of all existing contracts and agreements.

The following three paragraphs are also of great interest, showing that in spite of great war efforts being made, Great Britain is maintaining flight schedules abroad in 95 percent of pre-war route mileage, and passenger-transport planes are evidently still being turned out in British factories as well as in the German.

ON SCHEDULE

(By "Vista")

"Britain carries on" is the slogan that is heard so often in the present days, and as far as England's far-flung air routes are concerned, they are carried on. Little has been published about the British Empire's air lines since the war began, and it is not generally known that more than 95 percent of all prewar mileage is being flown on regular schedules by British Overseas Airways. This company, originated from the rival Imperial Airways and British Airways in a Government reorganization plan, now is the prime representative of England in Africa, Asia, and Australia, and is doing an excellent job in these difficult times.

About 30,000 miles per day are flown by British Overseas Airways Co.'s airliners, with passengers, mail, and freight, and though there are Government requirements for space because of the many official personages and cargoes that have to be carried, a respectable number of passengers are brought to their destinations with the same old efficiency that was so noteworthy before the war. Actually, there have been no accidents during wartime operations, though of course the *Clyde* was lost in the hurricane in Portugal last year, and the *Corsair* made an unscheduled landing in the African jungle, but it was repaired on the spot and flown out by Captain Rogers, one of England's ace transport pilots.

On the whole, all routes are flown with the well-known Short boats, but British Overseas Airways Co.'s equipment is notably international, and consists of Lockheed 14's and Lodestars, Junkers, and Focke-Wulfs, besides English types such as the Ensign landplanes, Short boats, and De Havilland Flamingoes.

During the summer months of the past years and continuing through the winter season, a route to Bermuda was shared by Imperial Airways and Pan American Airways. With the seasonal stoppage in 1939 there were plans to send over a newer and better boat to reopen this service as Airways Bermuda, Ltd., but the war changed all this, and in due time most of the flying boats that could be spared were taken over by the British Government, thereby eliminating British flight schedules, and Pan American was left to continue the service on its own. This summer, however, the Atlantic will again be crossed by English planes, operated by Airways Atlantic, a B. O. A. C. subsidiary, using a new type Empire boat, the short S-30 C class, with a gross weight of 53,000 pounds, thereby continuing the service which was maintained last summer. In addition, the three Boeing 314-A's obtained from Pan American by the British may be turned over to B. O. A. C. and used on the Empire routes, thereby making more planes available for the other services, especially the bottleneck between England and Lisbon, at present served by Douglas DC-3's and Short boats.

In the following paragraph is, indeed, a rather remarkable story. I submit it without comment:

A RATHER REMARKABLE STORY

A rather remarkable story came to New York from Buenos Aires, which would indicate that some sort of an interchange of courtesy exists between the Axis and Britain, at least as far as commercial air lines are concerned. It has always been more or less striking that none of the transports still flying in Europe, or from Africa to South America, have ever been shot at, and except for the mistake of a rookie Nazi, who took pot shots at a KLM DC-3 earlier in the war, killing one passenger and riddling the plane, no attempts have been made to bring an air liner down. There have been many stories about enemy airplanes escorting transports with notable passengers on board, but no one has even given a lucid explanation of these facts. The story now goes that as long as the Axis leaves Britain's last link to Lisbon open, England will not interfere with the Italian LATI airline from Portugal to Latin America. This somewhat curious tacit understanding enables the Axis to keep its war-valuable line to Brazil open, and on the other hand does not force Britain to maintain a North Atlantic air line in winter, impossible with present equipment due to the frozen-over harbors at Botwood and Montreal.

Protests Against Involvement of the United States in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

QUOTATIONS FROM WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS AND A SPEECH OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND LETTERS FROM WASHINGTON STATE RESIDENTS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following quotations from Washington's Farewell Address and President Roosevelt's speech at Boston on October 30, 1940, and letters received by me from residents of the State of Washington:

George Washington said: "Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other" (from the Farewell Address).

PRELUDE TO WAR

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars" (President Roosevelt in speech at Boston, October 30, 1940).

TACOMA, WASH., *April 28, 1941.*

Hon. KNUTE HILL,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Words alone are inadequate to fully express my appreciation of your noble stand in behalf of America, our youth, and our future welfare. You are eternally right.

I am but one of the many thousands of those boys who fought and shed their blood upon the battlefields of France in 1918. It seems incomprehensible how any one man or group of men could condemn our boys to the gory caldron of European wars today. Furthermore, how can anyone give America away—lock, stock, and barrel—and still call himself an American?

To our "armchair warriors" war must seem like a picnic. They do not know war and they will never fill the trenches or the graves in foreign lands. The committee of "defending the Allies by robbing America," believes that our active participation in this

war will be the height of their achievement. They do not know how sadly they fool not only themselves but their dupes. It will be the beginning of their own destruction.

We still remember the post-war period with its many thousands of jobless veterans. In order to reconquer all Europe, perhaps even Russia and Japan, we must have an army of at least 10,000,000 of combat troops. What will happen when the war is over and millions of these men are hungry? Nature may take its course, but "armchair warriors" will have to fight then.

Enclosed please find a poem, expressing my experience and my observation.

Very respectfully,

J. H. ZEGENDER,
Served with One Hundred and Forty-fifth Infantry, A. E. F.

TO THE CROSS ON FIELDS OF BATTLE

(By J. H. Zegender)

Inch by inch, we once were creeping,
Step by step, we're marching now—
Soon, no doubt, we shall be rushing
Till the sweat pours from our brow.
Wave by wave, we'll soon be sailing,
Mile by mile, across the sea—
To the distant shores of Europe
And perhaps, eternity!

To the cross on fields of battle,
Crucified by shot and shell—
And by lethal fumes there spouting
From the depths of Satan's hell.
In entanglements of wire
And entwined in barbs of steel—
Hanging limply, arms asunder,
Just like Christ in His ordeal!

When this war has finally ended
And we awaken from our trance—
When the millions jobless veterans
Roam our land and seek a chance—
When the shell-shocked, maimed, and wounded
Fill the wards behind barred doors,
We then perceive our vain delusion
Of waging wars on foreign shores.

BELLINGHAM FURNITURE MANUFACTURERS, INC.,
Bellingham, Wash., May 3, 1941.

Representative KNUTE HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We employ 184 people, and a survey that we have made would show that they are practically unanimous, along with myself, in emphatically protesting against the convoying of American ships, as we firmly believe such action would embroil this country in a European war.

While we are also practically unanimous in our belief that all possible aid should be given the democracies we are against any aid which may cause the loss of a single American life.

The writer was an officer in the Army, in five battles, during the last war, so do not believe that the matter of patriotism can be questioned. We do not consider this a matter of patriotism, but a matter of good common sense.

Can definitely say that we are unanimous in the opinion that the defenses of this country should be built up, but we do not believe any foreign power, for a great number of reasons, will attempt to attack this country.

This letter is being written, as due to the great many times we hear the statement "we are already in the war," we want you to know that it is our firm opinion we are far enough in the war and do not wish to go any further.

Yours truly,

A. R. DEBURGH, *President.*

SPOKANE, WASH., *May 9, 1941.*

Hon. KNUTE HILL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just read with extreme satisfaction a report of your address given the students of Columbia University, wherein you state your views upon the convoy question.

Would to God there were more like you, and may your position be one that will in some way cause many more Members of Congress to express a like view.

Where I am employed I heard much praise given you today, and many expressed themselves as wishing they could vote for you.

My sincere wish is that Great Britain will win this war, but fail to see why we as a nation again become the victims of their propaganda, as we did in the other war. It is my belief that they have many resources upon which to draw to furnish much of what they ask of us, and therefore I cannot understand why we should burden ourselves and posterity with a debt that will make slaves of our coming generations and yet leave ourselves unprotected.

Their thanks and appreciation for our sacrifices in the last war still linger in my memory, as well as their desires to interfere with our world trade, in which as traders they are hard to beat.

May God give us a united country and it is my belief this can be done by making it safe for those who love it and will be ready to defend it with their blood and wealth.

Again extending to you my heartfelt thanks for your courage and wishing you health and prosperity.

I am,

Yours very truly,

W. S. TRAPP.

Miracles Performed by Automobile Industry in Nation's Defense Effort

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM AUTOMOBILE FACTS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the automobile industry is ahead of schedule in our national-defense effort. Miracles are being performed as the industry speeds forward, day and night, to provide our fighting forces and those of Great Britain with essential weapons and matériel.

One of the new and difficult tasks being accomplished in record time by the automobile industry is in the production of machine guns. Two machine-gun plants have been placed in operation and actual production is 8 months ahead of schedule. It is an interesting story, and, under permission to extend my remarks, I herewith include an article appearing in this month's issue of Automobile Facts, under the title "Never Saw One Before."

[From Automobile Facts]

NEVER SAW ONE BEFORE

One day in September 1940, United States Army ordnance officers asked representatives of four automobile accessory plants if they could undertake mass production of machine guns for delivery by January 1942. The manufacturers offered to try.

One day in April 1941, the first consignment of machine guns to be manufactured in automotive factories was placed aboard an Army airplane for delivery to ar arsenal—8 months ahead of schedule.

The accomplishment was the first fruit of a remarkable example of cooperation by Government officials and automotive engineers. To achieve the result, jungles of red tape had to be slashed, hundreds of antiquated machines had to be moved from arsenal storerooms and reconditioned, scores of automotive machine tools had to be adapted to new tasks, dozens of new machines invented, and thousands of workers taught new crafts.

Though the men responsible for it would be the last to admit that the achievement is miraculous, they do maintain that it shows how the determination and ingenuity of free people in a democratic society are capable of matching the concerted effort which an autocratic state imposes on a regimented people.

Here is a measure of the accomplishment:

When the question was first asked of them, most of the manufacturers had never previously seen a machine gun of any of the types needed. After studying the ordnance exhibit, they asked:

"Do you want guns as beautifully finished as those hand-made products?"

"No," was the reply. "We want efficient guns and a lot of them—a hundred a day if possible."

The next question concerned machines for making the guns. Did the arsenals possess such machines?

They did.

But when the machines were moved out of the storerooms and divested of their protective coatings there was general consternation among the motor technicians. The machines, whose ages ranged from 21 to 73 years, were mainly belt-driven, antiquated devices.

"They're the best we have," said the officers.

"We'll try to recondition them," said the manufacturers.

Moved into the automotive plants, the machines were cleaned, painted, reconditioned, retooled, and motorized. Their ranks were bolstered by the addition of machines borrowed from automobile production lines.

While this work was in progress some of the arsenals' machines were loaned to schools for the training of operators and supervisory personnel, of which more than 10,000 will be required in the 4 plants for peak production. Hence, by the time operations were ready to begin the nucleus of the personnel was ready. Machines were set up in accordance with accepted assembly-line practice, so that individual gun parts would move in steady streams via overhead conveyors through successive operations toward the final assembly point, the firing test range, and the shipping room.

Working together, Army officers and production engineers vied with each other in instituting daring innovations in ordnance manufacturing techniques—and had a good time upsetting traditions.

Tumbling machines were designed and installed to eliminate almost 90 percent of the time-wasting hand filing formerly deemed necessary to put the final finish on the 285 parts of the average gun. For the drilling of bores—formerly a slow and laborious operation with a horizontal drill—a special machine was built which drills six barrels at once, with the force of gravity and

oil under pressure assisting the vertical drills.

For the cutting of some parts of the guns' mechanisms, gunsmiths traditionally used high-speed steel cutting tools, which had to be sharpened between each operation.

"How about using cemented carbide tools?" the auto engineers asked.

"Let's try," the Army officers replied.

Result: Tremendous savings of time.

For the finishing of some very small parts the innovators borrowed machinery formerly used in the manufacture of sewing machine parts.

Techniques developed in the manufacture of valve stems were brought to bear on the job of turning out firing pins. Trunnion blocks and side holding plates, formerly drilled separately and subsequently fitted together in assembly, were drilled together so that no laborious fitting operations would be necessary. Rivets, formerly turned out one at a time by turning down bar stock with screw machines, are now being knocked out at the rate of 180 a minute by a header machine handling rod stock. Side plates, formerly milled singly, are now ground out six at a time. Airholes in the barrel jacket were traditionally elliptical, requiring three operations for each hole.

"Why not round holes?" the auto engineers asked.

"Why not, indeed?" the Army officers replied.

So, round they became, and 3 operations per hole became 1 per 10 holes. Then, to give the trick an additional fillip, they tried punching instead of drilling. It was faster and better. At the moment of this writing the tradition busters are playing with the idea of punching all the holes at once in a flat steel sheet and then rolling it into a tube.

The delicate task of rifling the barrels baffled the experimenters for a time. It called for 15 trips of the chiseling tool through each of the 4 spiral channels in a barrel. When the Army officers said there was to be no check-reining of imagination on this job, the production engineers invented a machine which reduced the operations to 2. Rifling is now done in one-thirtieth of the former time.

As done by gunsmiths, production of shell chambers was a precision job from start to finish. As revised by these novice ordnance engineers, the emphasis on precision is placed where it belongs—toward the end of a series of simplified operations, where a few highly skilled men can refine the rough cuts that unskilled operators make in early stages of manufacture.

In cleaning gun barrels after test firing, the saving of time is phenomenal. "Miracle" is the only fitting word for the trick which, employed here, telescoped 48 hours into less than a minute.

Protest Curtailment of Sugar-Beet Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MICHIGAN RETAIL GROCERS AND MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed May 13 by the Michigan Retail Grocers and Meat Dealers Association in convention at Bay City, Mich.:

Whereas the stability of thousands of Michigan farmers whose livelihood is largely dependent upon the cash returns from the production of sugar beets; and

Whereas it is impossible for Michigan sugar-beet growers to compete in the labor market with foreign sugar: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Michigan Members of the National Congress, the President of the United States, and others in authority in National Government be called upon to permit Michigan sugar growers to plant acreage consistent with their customs, and not to curtail the production of this industry, which is so vital to the welfare of Michigan people.

Adoption attested to.

HERMAN HANSON,
Recording Secretary.

Utility Fined For Bribery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is said that young Cato never made a speech in the Roman Senate without uttering the expression "Carthage must be destroyed."

For years I have demanded the breaking up of the vast, useless holding companies that are being used to rob unsuspecting investors and to plunder the helpless consumers of electric light and power. I repeat what I have said time and time again and that is that the consumers of electricity, the people who pay the bills, can never get justice in light and power rates in any area in which the electric industry is dominated by one of these vast holding companies that tries to run everything by bribery, corruption, and remote control.

Some time ago I pointed out the Union Electric Co. as one of the worst offenders. I was taken to task by Power Trust propagandists immediately. Well here is the answer. I will let the press tell the story. The following news item appeared in Labor recently. Read it carefully

[From Labor of May 20, 1941]

UTILITY FINED FOR COLOSSAL BRIBERY—CONCERN LOSES CHARTER UNTIL IT PAYS $175,000; CORRUPTED POLITICIANS AND PRESS

ST. CHARLES, Mo., May 15.—For subsidizing politicians and public officials to the tune of at least $580,000, the Union Electric Co. was fined $175,000 and had its corporation charter taken away here this week by Circuit Judge E. B. Woolford. These drastic penalties are a stern warning to other utility companies which have been spending "slush funds" for political purposes.

Such expenditures are forbidden both by the Wheeler-Rayburn Utility Holding Company Act and the Missouri State Corrupt Practices Act, under which Union Electric was prosecuted.

The facts which led to the conviction and heavy fine were disclosed by a Securities and Exchange Commission probe.

RAISED HUGE SLUSH FUND

It revealed that Union Electric raised a huge secret fund by means of "kick-backs" from lawyers, supply companies, and other individuals and concerns doing business with the utility corporation.

A large part of the money was paid to politicians and newspapermen who fought public-owned electric-plant projects opposed by Union Electric.

Judge Woolford said he will give the corporation charter back and allow Union Electric to continue doing business in Missouri if the company pays its fine within 120 days.

Now read the following brilliant editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 15, 1941:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 15 1941]

TRAIL'S END

The Union Electric Co. has reaped the full harvest of its corruption of government in Missouri. It stands today under a fine of $175,000, with its charter declared forfeited in court and its right to do business in the State revoked.

The terms of the decree of Circuit Judge Woolfolk at St. Charles do not require the company to go out of business. Liquidation, as the court said, would inflict heavy losses on the company's innocent stockholders. If the company pays its fine within 120 days, the charter forfeiture will be stayed, the stay to continue so long as the company does not violate the law.

Found guilty to the extent that banishment from the State is justified; penalized with one of the heaviest fines ever imposed on a corporation in Missouri; placed on strictest probation, with the court retaining its jurisdiction to enforce its order—that is the Union Electric Co. today.

What a fall from the high-handed, bribing rule of Missouri political life of only a few years ago.

What an ignominious end for the long invisible supergovernment of this State.

The story of Union Electric's intrigues in municipal elections, such as those in the St. Charles case, in the legislature and elsewhere, is long and sordid. There is no need to retell it now. Missourians know it backward as well as forward.

And it is not the devious tale of slush funds, lobbying, costly entertainment, and generous presents which is important anyway. The important thing is that the whole crooked business has been exposed and the perpetrators are paying for their misdeeds.

Louis H. Egan, president of the utility in the days when it pulled the strings and called the plays at Jefferson City, is under Federal indictment for perjury. Frank J. Boehm, executive vice president during the golden era, is out on bond after conviction. Albert C. Laun, ace lobbyist, who kept a book of bribe rates on legislators, has served his time behind the bars. So has Fred J. Martin, once rural sales engineer.

But the house cleaning which the S. E. C. instituted has not been confined to a Missouri company alone, big though that company is. The trails were followed to higher places; and one way to measure the magnitude of the accomplishment is by the reorganization in the North American Co., extensive utility holding company controlling Union Electric.

As a direct consequence of the exposé in Missouri of the corruption in North America's largest operating unit, the executive control of the large holding company was changed. James F. Fogarty, North American president during much of the period when Union Electric was buying what it wanted at Jefferson City and elsewhere, was shifted from the presidency. For its new president, North American chose a virtual outsider, Edward L. Shea, who was in no way tarred with Union Electric's scandalous misuse of its customers' and stockholders' money.

Judge and prosecutor are entitled to the public's appreciation for their handling of the St. Charles election corruption case. David A. Dyer, young prosecuting attorney of St. Charles County, had to overcome many obstacles, including office funds insufficient to conduct the case properly. Judge Woolfolk wisely devised a stern penalty which saves the company from ouster and liquidation, but also makes further punishment immediately possible if the company again stoops to illegal practices.

The invisible government of Missouri has been dragged into the open and purged. We wish we could say as much for the visible government, the legislature, now sitting where the Union Electric's whisper was once the law.

Mr. Speaker, when you realize that in 1940 the electric-light and power consumers of Missouri were overcharged $24,396,095 for their electricity, according to the T. V. A. yardstick rates; $27,424,318, according to the Tacoma, Wash., rates; $23,483,471, according to the Bonneville yardstick rates; or $28,353,673, according to the Ontario rates—when you realize what a cross the people of Missouri are bearing, then you can appreciate this editorial.

Now, read it again, and again, and again, and you can understand why I am urging the S. E. C. to break up these vast holding companies now.

London Calls for American Blood To Defend the British Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

NEWS DISPATCH FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE NEWS BUREAU IN LONDON

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news dispatch from the Herald Tribune Bureau in London under date of May 21, 1941:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

LONDON PAPER CALLS ON UNITED STATES TO ENTER WAR NOW—NEWS CHRONICLE APPEALS TO AMERICA TO FIGHT NAZIS, BAR COLLAPSE OF EUROPE

LONDON, May 21 (Wednesday).—In an editorial taking up almost one-half of its editorial page, the News Chronicle, influential London newspaper, appealed today to the United States to enter the war now as an active combatant.

The flat and outspoken plea for American entry into the conflict against Germany as Great Britain's ally, mirroring the growing feeling of the desperate urgency of the British cause, was believed to be the first such statement by any major British organ of opinion. Whether or not the editorial had been seen by Prime Minister Winston Churchill or any other responsible official was unknown. Gerald Barry is the editor of the paper, which has a listed circulation of 1,300,000 daily.

"We, the British people, want you, the American people to be in this war on our side—fighting," the editorial declares. "Not to save us from defeat but to help us to victory—quickly."

The document headed "We appeal to America," opened with the words: "May this newspaper try to speak on behalf of the British people to the American people? For many months now we, the British people, have refrained from speaking what was in our minds to the American people. We felt that it would not be right for us to speak. We felt that what America and Americans did in the war was their business. We felt that we, the people, must make no appeal either of sentiment or necessity to the American people. We felt that the American people should have to make up their own minds freely."

For 20 months the British people abided by that decision, the paper continued. Britain asked America to sell her planes, tanks, and guns.

"You sold them to us, and we were grateful for them," the editorial said.

When Britain's money began to run out, America made a "characteristically great and generous gesture," lending arms, it went on. Meanwhile, many British children were taken into American homes. The Red Cross and other organizations sent relief aid. Harry Hopkins, Wendell L. Willkie, and others came on inspection visits. "We can only say, 'Thank you,'" it added.

"But now," the editorial continued, "we feel the time has come for us to speak frankly to you, to tell you that now we want more from you than arms, more than knitted comforts and bandages, more than words of sympathy."

American Potash & Chemical Corporation of Trona, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9, 1941, on pages 3820, 3821, and the first column of page 3822 a lengthy address attacking the American Potash & Chemical Corporation, of Trona, Calif. In the address were severe statements of criticism of the corporation's method of doing business and the manner in which it was purportedly treating its employees. Apparently the entire address referred to was based upon a story furnished by a reporter for the Friday magazine and not upon personal investigation of actual conditions existing, because no one could address themselves on the subject in such an all inclusive and erroneous manner based upon fact, as many of the criticisms against the American Potash & Chemical Corporation made in this address were far from being factual. Without intent of placing responsibility, I feel that from my personal knowledge, based upon many visits to the property of the American Potash & Chemical Corporation, which is in my congressional district, that it is only just to all concerned that erroneous statements pertaining to this company's method of doing business and treatment of its employees should be factually presented upon the basis of personal observation and knowledge, and not upon hearsay.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, there is no mystery regarding the stockholder ownership of this corporation. The company is at all times willing to disclose the ownership of its stock to proper authorities upon request. There has been supplied to the Department of Commerce a tabulation showing the names and addresses of the shareholders who own a controlling interest in the corporation and the number of shares owned by each individual. This stock is listed on the curb exchange, and a large number of shares are outstanding and in the hands of the American public. A majority of the shares of this stock are foreign held, the same as many other American corporations. In the first instance, the control of the company was held by the Consolidated Goldfields of South Africa, Ltd., but a few years ago a majority of that company's holdings was sold to a group of investment trusts in the Netherlands, where they are still held.

Investors of Netherlands nationality own securities in many other American enterprises, including large American oil interests and American railroads. It might also be noted at this point, Mr. Speaker, that American corporations own control of many important properties in the Netherlands territory, with specific reference to the prolific oil fields of the Netherland Indies. In the address referred to, the statement was made that the American Potash & Chemical Corporation was a foreign-directed plant; while, in fact, this plant for many of the past years of its existence has been managed, and is still managed, by citizens of the United States of America, who have full authority and responsibility for its operation. What was meant by the charge, "a foreign colonial outpost," in the address that appeared in the RECORD is problematical. No one who is acquainted with the management of the corporation has ever questioned their loyalty to the American form of government. All of these gentlemen who are connected with the management of this corporation are considered outstanding citizens of high integrity and splendid people. This plant, located at Trona, Calif., furnishes employment for approximately 1,200 men, most of whom I believe to be American citizens.

Relative to the statement alleging shipments of this company's products to Japan, I find upon minute investigation that the American Potash & Chemical Co. has never made shipments of bromine to Japan, either before or after the beginning of this war; in fact, the company has never exported any bromine. The only products ever shipped to Japan have been potash and borax. While Japan was a customer of this corporation for several years, at the beginning of the present war even the shipments of potash and borax were discontinued, although very profitable contracts were held for Japanese consumption.

I would like to call attention, Mr. Speaker, that our own Government is permitting the daily sale of gasoline to Japan under leadership whose integrity has not been questioned by anyone other than those politically minded. Referring

to the criticisms of the company's profits, particularly where the language—nastily applied—stated, "at the expense of American labor," many years were required to develop the process and plant to an extent where it was a profitable enterprise. The history of this company's progress definitely indicates that experimental and development capital were not available in this country but had to be obtained from other sources. No dividends were paid to the stockholder from 1913 to 1928, and the sum of $1,849,365 was the dividend paid from 1928 to 1935, inclusive. The records of the company definitely show that for the entire period from 1913 to 1938 the company reinvested or put back earnings of $9,238,703 in this plant on American soil, which was furnishing a substantial pay roll for American employees.

Regarding the criticisms that were made of this company pertaining to its employees' facilities, and so forth, being inadequate, living conditions deplorable, and excessive prices being charged to employees for merchandise, permit me to state, again from personal knowledge, that this plant is located out on the desert, miles away from centralized populations, and it was essential that the company provide housing and other facilities such as transportation, new roads, and pipe lines for water for domestic purposes, which all had to be built under remote desert conditions, and these facilities are being furnished to the employees of this company upon a nonprofit basis. The only charges made were for housing facilities and utility services to cover the cost of operating and maintaining these facilities, and nothing more.

They have a medical hospital, the services of physicians and nurses, a grammar and kindergarten school, library, Catholic and Protestant churches, restaurants, motion-picture theaters, a splendid club house, tennis courts properly lighted, golf course, a splendid swimming pool—in which I have bathed—and a baseball diamond which, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is more indicative of a highly developed country club than a penitentiary for employees.

Aside from that type of high-class program which the employees can enjoy and participate in, they also have an opportunity for group-life insurance with health benefits which are made available at as reasonable a premium as insurance companies permit anyone, and one-half of these premiums, if you please, are paid by the company. I am reliably informed, upon a recent check, that it was found that approximately 98 percent of the employees eligible are insured under this splendid group arrangement.

I would also like to call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that Senate Resolution 274, enacted June 18, 1936, of which that splendid gentleman, Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, was chairman, made an investigation of the potash industry, including the plant, facilities, and ownership of this company located at Trona, Calif., and the investigation was made by the subcommittee which was conducted by Senators Pittman, of Nevada, and ADAMS, of Colorado, two splendid gentlemen who were very thorough in their work and whose integrity is not questioned by anyone. I think that anyone who would have taken the trouble to have read the reports made by these gentlemen could have very readily found facts from an unquestionable source that would have absolutely precluded the acceptance of any information by a reporter who will work for the Friday magazine.

Regarding the criticisms of so-called excessive charges for merchandise sold at the company's store, again I find some very inconsistent statements. The store is actually operated on a nonprofit basis. Prices are regulated by comparing prevailing market prices at near-by towns. Those prices are very close to the prices that exist in the city of Los Angeles, Calif. I wish to call specific attention to the fact that the profits made through the operation of this so-called company store are divided among the employees at 6-month periods in proportion to the amount of the employee's purchases.

The allegation made that "scrip is required in making purchases as a device to require employees to purchase merchandise through this nonprofit store" is not correct. Scrip is used for the specific purpose, when it is used, to permit the employee to participate in the profit-sharing plan. There are customers served at this store from adjacent districts who are paying the same prices as the employees; and the employees, if you please, enjoy the profits that are derived through serving people who are not employed by this corporation; which definitely indicates, to my mind, an extremely fair attitude toward its employees by the American Potash & Chemical Corporation.

The criticisms offered that employees of this firm at Trona were paid lower than like industries, again, is not correct. The wage scale of this company over a period of years has been as high, and in many instances higher, than most industries similarly situated in that section of the country.

As there are quotations taken from a report of the Department of Commerce regarding this company's methods of operation, I call your attention to the concluding sentence of the Department of Commerce's report, which states:

> It appears that the potash industry has demonstrated clearly those factors of pioneering development, technological advance, and responsible management which represents the highest expression of American industry.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am not assuming what is equitable or inequitable in the present controversy existing at the Trona plant, but I am taking definite exception to statements that employees are not properly housed; that employees are being exploited in the company's store; that employees do not have proper recreational facilities; and that there is not every reasonable provision made to see that employees are comfortable under conditions that prevail on the great American desert.

Anyone who makes statements contrary to the above conditions is either maliciously and intentionally misquoting or is quoting from a source of information which is definitely not reliable.

Pathway of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 16, 1941:

[From the Boston Post of May 16, 1941]

PATHWAY OF THE FUTURE

A year ago the Nazis were beating down the impregnable gates of Sedan as if they were muslin and hurrying along the road to Paris.

The mighty armies of France were crumbling beneath blows they had never anticipated. Gamelin, in a frenzy, was calling upon his men to "conquer or die." They responded without question.

Against surpassing armament—tanks in front of them and planes overhead which Jules Verne might have created out of his imagination, and "fifth columnists" tearing away behind them—many died and multitudes started on the tragic retreat.

Those who now live, either in the Nazi prison camps or back in civilian labors again, must have shaken with grief and anger yesterday when another of their leaders, Petain, announced that another battle had been lost and that they must turn their backs on hopes for freedom for a long, long time.

When he had finished his abrupt, reluctant, 2-minute speech they must have wondered if it had been Petain after all. How hard it must have been for them to believe that it was their beloved and respected Petain, in whom they had such confidence, the block on the way to complete submission, who had stood off Hitler and the Lavals for a year. Yet he had said:

"It is up to you to follow me without mental reservation on the road of honor and of national interest."

This was no Gamelin call to "conquer or die." It was a sentence which had been pronounced upon them, a sentence of doom which shattered dreams of the day when France would be free again and made them an unwilling party to placing another terrible burden on the backs of their fierce-fighting allies, the English.

If they had dared, they must have been ready to leap to their feet, as Anthony Eden did in the Commons and shout:

"We can no longer place any reliance in the French Government."

They will wonder about this "collaboration" with the Nazis. Under strict censorship they probably have no idea that it was under way before Petain made it known to them.

Only by whispers can they be aware of the charges that Nazi transports hugged the French shore of Africa to land troops in Lybia, that Nazi boats were allowed down a French river to strike the English in a new place or that France has now put the foe in a fresh striking position against the British by allowing Nazi planes to land in French-mandated Syria.

When they do comprehend what has happened, even if they feel it was forced, they will hardly believe what Petain said—that the meeting between Hitler and Darlan "permits us to light up the pathway of the future."

If a year of suppression has not destroyed the spirit of 1914, the Bastille and Lafayette, they will be thinking of De Gaulle.

We Must Face Realities in Formulating Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, those who are opposed to entering the World War are constantly told they are not willing to face grim realities and are likened to the ostrich who sticks his head in the sand. As a matter of fact the exact opposite is true. It is really the so-called isolationists who never permit their wishing to run away with their thinking.

In the first place, the interventionists tell us we are in danger of invasion; that Hitler intends to conquer the world. When you ask them why they believe that, you are informed Hitler stated that fact many times in Mein Kampf and in many other public addresses. You are asked to take these statements as gospel truth just because Hitler has made them. On the other hand, when you call attention to the fact that Hitler has not committed an overt act against this country or violated in any way our neutrality, you are told that the same situation existed with the many small democracies in Europe with which Hitler had treaties guaranteeing their neutrality, and yet when the time came and he desired to do so he ruthlessly destroyed them; that his word and his treaties are worthless.

In other words, in one breath we are told we are in danger of invasion because Hitler has said so, and with the next breath they tell us his word is worthless. No wonder there is resulting confusion and difficulty in answering arguments of this type.

It seems to me that those who do not wish to enter this war approach the problem realistically. Before they enter into this conflict they want to know what will be the cost; can we accomplish the task; where will such a program end and what will be the result for the United States.

On May 11, 1941, after 6 months of silence, former President Hoover addressed the American people. He agreed with the foreign policy that had been adopted by the administration and never questioned the fact but that we should give all aid to England short of war. He did, however, look grim realities in the face. He told the American people we must render this aid to England but only by methods that would not get us into the war. He advocated against the use of convoys as he felt this was almost a sure way to become involved in war. He called attention to the cold-blooded fact that this country was not prepared to go to war; that we could not even properly outfit 200,000 troops, let alone 5,000,000 that he said would be necessary for an expeditionary force. He called attention to the difficulties that confronted us preparing for an invasion of Europe and that it would be just as difficult for Germany to invade us. He said neither we nor Germany could be properly prepared to conquer the other world unless there had been at least 10 years of preparation.

Certainly no one can accuse President Hoover of being pro-Nazi as all his sympathies have been toward England, and no one can question his wide experience both in Europe and as President of this country for 4 years.

I am inclined to agree with Senator Taft when he said that the real defeatists in this country are those like Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of Navy Knox, when they insist we depend upon the British Navy for our safety. I believe we can build up our own defenses so we will not have to depend upon the navy of any other country.

President Roosevelt said, in his message at the opening of the Seventy-seventh Congress, that we should establish four essential human freedoms throughout the world.

The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

He said these could be accomplished in our generation. No one would quarrel with such an idealistic goal and everyone would like to see established such a Utopia but who is being realistic, Mr. Hoover or Mr. Roosevelt? Are we told how we can establish freedom of religion in Russia; freedom from fear in China; freedom of speech in Germany, freedom from fear in India? Which one is doing the wishful thinking and putting his head in the sand to obvious facts? Why would it not be better to dedicate ourselves to a foreign policy that would have for its goal America first?

Almost every American school child is familiar with that part of George Washington's Farewell Address when he cautioned the American people against becoming involved in European affairs but not as many know that Jefferson said on one occasion:

I am relying for defense on our own Navy and our own naval force to protect our coasts and harbors. I am for free commerce with all nations; political connections with none, and little or no diplomatic establishments. I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe; entering that field to preserve their balance. For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character. The first object of my heart is my own country.

These words are just as true today as the day they were spoken, and I feel that all true Americans could well adopt them as their creed. Why not adopt a foreign policy that would save this country before we attempt to save the world? My colleague and friend KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, has summed up four objectives for this country to follow, which I think are more practical for America than the four freedoms suggested by the President. He said on the floor of the House:

That America stay out of war.

That we extend all aid short of war to Britain and her associates.

That we build and protect our own Military Establishments so as to make this country impregnable.

That we preserve in this country our American system of representative government in which the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches share coordinate power.

If we adopt these four objectives, I believe the future of America would be secure.

It seems to me the time has come when America should exert her efforts in the cause of peace rather than in the cause of war. I was greatly pleased to hear the five-point peace proposal of Secretary of State Hull in his broadcast of May 18, 1941, which I believe any fair-minded nation should be glad to accept. The President might well consider calling a conference of nations with the ultimate goal of working out plans that would bring permanent peace to the world. Secretary Hull's peace proposals were a step in the right direction, and I hope the administration will see fit to continue his efforts in behalf of peace.

Should Public Opinion Polls Be Investigated?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing much these days about the desirability of having a fair and impartial investigation by Congress to determine the reliability of public-opinion polls. The attached article from this morning's Washington Times-Herald reports a speech by a prominent educator of my State pointing out how these polls are sometimes used to mold and influence public opinion rather than as a method of simply analyzing it.

Senate Resolution 111 is now before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. This resolution would empower this committee to make a complete and candid investigation of the various public-opinion polls now using the mails to

pursue their endeavors and purporting to be operated without prejudice or propaganda purpose. I think it would be highly instructive to all Americans to have this investigation conducted and I urge others to lend their support to Senate Resolution 111.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 22, 1941]

GALLUP POLL HOLDS DANGER TO PUBLIC, SAYS EDUCATOR

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., May 21.—Subtle dangers lurk in polls of public opinion despite the usefulness they have in common with all social techniques, Prof. Charles A. Harper, of the Illinois State Normal University's history department, warned an audience of businessmen here today.

Professor Harper centered his analysis on the Gallup poll, conducted by Dr. George Gallup, of the American Institute of Public Opinion, which this week does an about face and announces that 52 percent of the public favors the use of the Navy to guard ships carrying war materials to Britain, whereas last month the same poll showed only two-fifths of the voters advocating such a step.

"In the Gallup poll, there is some evidence that the interventionist angle in the present crisis is unduly accented," Professor Harper commented.

"Four independent studies indicate this fact. The best and most recent of these careful scientific criticisms has been recently made under the direction of Ross Stagner, of Dartmouth College. Forty-eight out of fifty-five Gallup poll questions on the war were found to be biased in favor of an interventionist answer. The Fortune poll has run 20 to 40 percent lower on interventionist policies.

"The American Institute of Public Opinion is assuming such a serious place in American thinking that it behooves every thoughtful citizen to regard it with a critical mind," Professor Harper continued.

"If it were merely forecasting elections the accuracy of its findings could be adequately checked, but when it attempts to evaluate fundamental public attitudes there is no definite means of estimating its authenticity.

"If it is to influence Congress and the administration of the United States Government, the American people must have greater assurance that it takes a fair sampling of the public, and, which is most important, that its questions are scientifically formed and are not leading questions loaded with conscious and unconscious bias."

"Social psychologists," said Professor Harper, "have found that questioning to find attitudes and opinions is a discouragingly difficult technique."

An American Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER M. LEEDOM, JR., OF HOLLIDAYSBURG, PA.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the present national emergency has caused deep thought on the part of every interested American.

The billions represented by our national-defense program have caused our national debt to proceed in the direction of $100,000,000,000.

The following interesting article from the pen of Walter M. Leedom, Jr., 209 Allegheny Street, Hollidaysburg, Pa., is an expression from an outstanding student of public affairs and is inserted for its informative value:

The direction the great economic energies generated by our defense effort take will undisputably help shape to a large degree the whole structure of tomorrow's society. The plan here outlined proposes a method for using this extraordinary period of economic activity to curb inflation and to build a permanently safe and stable employee-employer relationship, compatible with our private enterprise system, by syphoning labor's excess purchasing power into equity holdings in the corporations wherein they derive their livelihood.

Priorities in more and more industries will inevitably cause a shortage in consumers' goods just when our purchasing power, especially labor's, is at an all time peak. Some Government compulsion will be necessary to dry up this excess purchasing power, in order to curb inflation. The three commonest methods of taxes, rations, and compulsory loans will be used in varying degrees as variable conditions necessitate.

For our immediate purpose let us look at the method of employing compulsory loans or savings. One compulsory loan plan has been advanced by the British economist, Mr. J. M. Keynes, the salient point of which is that a loan to the government be made mandatory on all income in excess of a subsistence level, the redemption date of this loan to be projected into the post-war period to act as a cushion for the probably deflationary dominated economy of that period. The inescapable danger inherent in this plan is the unprecedented degree of state domination over the whole economy.

This tendency toward state domination, which would lead—unintentionally or otherwise—to state socialism, could be alleviated somewhat by the plan herewith presented for directing labor's excess purchasing power into the purchase of private corporative equities rather than into what would in the long run amount to government equities.

A modification of the Keynes plan leaving individuals—not a few but many—in control of the post-war economy is the aim of this presentation. In brief, there shall be a reconstruction of all corporative capital structures, setting up a structure wherein laborer and investor will have equal capital interest; the labor in each specific corporation must invest its surplus purchasing power in capital equity in the corporation with which it is associated.

The goal to be obtained would be a corporation having 50 percent of its capital owned by a labor-capital group and 50 percent owned by an investor-capital group. If this were to be achieved in a 5-year period, only 10 percent of present capitalization would need to be liquidated in any one year. In fact, with the growing demand for more expansion capital, the need for liquidation of established capital would be even less than the 10 percent per year if the new capital financing were done with the newly acquired money from the employee group. No doubt the capital liquidated would find its way into Government investments, but in so doing its indirectness would add to available sources for taxation, thus facilitating current Government financing.

The corporative capital structures would, of course, have to be constructed to give equal representation and responsibility to both the labor-capital and the investment-capital groups. This new structure must be such that neither group can hold any priority claims over the other. The market (and real—no watered stock) value of both groups' holdings must always be equal, this to be accomplished by intracorporation stabilization machinery. The labor-capital group in contrast to the investor-capital group must be composed wholly of bona fide employees in that specific corporation wherein they find employment. Should a holder in the labor-capital group lose his status as a bona fide employee, his equity must be surrendered for reabsorption by bona fide employees.

At a time when labor is in possession of excess purchasing power and most corporations are in need of expansion capital, the realization of a plan of this breadth can be accomplished with a minimum of difficulty to either group—truly a heroic step capable of accomplishment in a limited amount of time only during a period of an heroically expanded economy. Therefore, when we enter into a more tranquil period of industrial and political activity, labor will find itself a responsible unit in our society; each member of the labor group will be a small capitalist in his own production sphere. Thus he will have a tangible proprietary interest in the capitalistic system, in contrast to the intangible remoteness of proprietorship in the ambiguous structure of state socialism.

Under such an individualistic set-up the worker will feel a part of the building in which he works; he will feel a sense of security from his very tools, a comprehensive understanding of the problems of management, and, above all, it will give him a concrete reason for believing in our way of life. According to Abraham Lincoln, each man shall direct his energies toward building a home of his own, rather than toward tearing down that of his neighbors.

Is the United States Willing To Undertake This Realistic Task?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks there has been a widespread tendency in the National Capital to give consideration to the tremendous responsibilities involved in this country becoming an active belligerent in the war. Peace, and the requirements of stabilizing human relationships, constitutes a real challenge. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Times-Herald, which discusses this timely subject:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

NOT ETHICS, BUT MATHEMATICS

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again; your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." (President Roosevelt at Boston, October 30, 1940.)

TROOP CALL

The above was the most important promise that President Roosevelt made during his campaign for third-term reelection. To date, he has done nothing that we know of to violate that promise.

The promise was made in the speech in which Mr. Roosevelt thanked for his campaign support "that Boston boy, beloved by all of Boston and a lot of other places, my Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, Joe Kennedy."

Mr. Kennedy, the day before, had radioed a fervent plea for the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt. The polls and straw votes were indicating that the contest would be unexpectedly close; the Catholic leaders in Boston were (and are) against United States intervention. Mr. Kennedy is one of the most prominent of Catholic laymen, and his help was most timely, especially his statement:

"Unfortunately, during this political campaign there has arisen the charge that the President of the United States is trying to involve this country in the World War. Such a charge is false."

Well, the London News Chronicle day before yesterday came out with an editorial plea to the United States to send troops into the war now. Britain is safe, said the News Chronicle; * * * "cannot be defeated in these islands * * * convinced we are going to win the war." But, it went on—

"If you come in and come in fighting, we can whip these savages back to their caves before the end of next year."

Thus begins an old familiar British technique. This first request for troops comes from an opposition paper. The next one can be expected to come from a paper supporting the Churchill government; and after that Mr. Churchill himself can be expected to make the request for troops.

Will that request be granted? If it is, can we and the British "whip these savages back to their caves before the end of next year"?

PROBLEM IN MATHEMATICS

Let's grant, for the sake of argument, that the Germans are savages. The trouble is that, as savages, they are like the Iroquois Indians, meaning they are tough and ruthless fighting men rather than like the peace-loving, slew-footed Diggers, Menominees, or Siwashes of old.

The Germans may be highly unethical from our point of view, but this isn't a question of ethics. It's a question of mathematics. We can't wish them back inside their former borders just by having high ideals. The real problem is: How can the 200,000,000 Anglo-Saxons apply the necessary armed force to the 70,000,000 to 80,000,000 Germans to beat them back to their alleged caves and restore some kind of sovereignty to Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Yugoslavia, and Greece?

Hitler has from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 men under arms and highly trained. To get at him in Europe we and the British will have to establish a bridgehead somewhere in Europe, presumably on the French coast. Judging from the recent highly carbonated conversations between Secretary of State Hull and French Ambassador Henri-Haye, the French won't give us such a bridgehead free for nothing. We'll have to fight for it.

Our problem, then, is to combine in crushing strength against Hitler the factors of arms, plus ships, plus planes, plus distance, plus time, plus other less factors.

As things look now, it will take 10,000,000 Allied (British and American) soldiers to do that. It cannot possibly be done before the end of next year, as promised by the London News Chronicle. It looks more like a job that will last from 10 years up. And there is no sure guaranty that we shall win in the end. We shall be operating 3,000 miles from our base; the Germans at home.

All defeatism and emotionalism aside, that is the mathematical, logistical problem involved in a decisive British-American defeat of Hitler. Because there are 130,000,000 of us and only 70,000,000 British, we shall inevitably be called to furnish most of the manpower and the materials. Before hastening to accept the British invitation to send over some men, let's be sure that we have the main outlines of the problem clearly in mind, so that we can know what we're letting ourselves in for.

Defense Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in Il Progresso Italo-Americano on May 19, 1941:

[Translation of editorial appearing in Il Progresso Italo-Americano on May 19, 1941]

DEFENSE BONDS

In the various branches of the Chase National Bank, which is the largest bank in the world, are displayed posters bearing the legend, "Now dollars, too, can enlist." Translated freely in the Italian language, it might sound something like this: Now the time has come for the dollar to do its soldier's duty.

In fact, the issuance of defense savings bonds is the voluntary mobilization of savings to cooperate in the defense of the Nation. In other countries, in cases of emergency such as they now find themselves, they would impose so-called forced loans, which is the compulsory mobilization of the financial resources of the nation.

The United States has not had recourse to coercion.

The patriotic sentiment of American citizens creates miracles which no coercive law can create.

The Government's appeal has found a profound response in the heart of every person loyal and faithful to this great country, and every purse has loosened its strings in a genous competition of offering, which clearly demonstrates the compact solidarity of the people to immunize the United States from every danger and from every present or future threat.

It is said that money is for necessity and no necessity is more urgent and impelling than that of national defense. He who defends his own country defends not only his spiritual and material patrimony, his government, its institutions, and the collectivity of the citizens, but he also defends his own person, his own family, and his own interests.

Italo-Americans have instinctively understood the significance of this voluntary conscription of money and have responded, are responding, and will respond with the generosity inspired by the gravity of the moment. From the richest to the humblest, everyone has done, is doing, and will do his duty to prove that in their loyalty to America there are not mental reservations and they are ready for every possible sacrifice for national security.

After all, purchasing national-defense bonds is not only a patriotic duty, but a profitable, prudent, and secure investment of one's savings.

A bond of series E, for example, may be purchased for only $18.75. After 10 years this bond is worth $25.

A bond of series F costs only $74. After 12 years it is worth $100.

The interest on these bonds is paid semiannually by Treasury checks sent directly to the investors.

As we have already pointed out, for those who have not the necessary cash to purchase a bond, there are defense-savings stamps which will serve to accumulate the sum necessary for the purchase of the bonds.

While defense-savings bonds can be purchased directly from the Federal Reserve banks or any other bank which have been authorized to sell them, defense-savings stamps can be acquired at all post offices.

Today there is no more remunerative and at the same time more secure investment. He who purchases these bonds not only performs a patriotic duty but also an excellent business transaction because he protects his money and he assures himself of a future income.

In referring to this issue, the executive council of the American Bankers Association declared that once again the national financial policy has counted on the monetary power of the United States to adequately carry on its vast defense program.

The issuance of these bonds—it added—tends to prevent the dangers of inflation and the economic dislocations which are common after a period of feverish activity stimulated by the emergency.

We must see to it that greater incomes do not increase our desire for dissipation. We must encourage savings and to encourage savings there are no more attractive means than remunerative investments, which offer an attractive premium guaranteed by the resources of a nation whose annual income amounts to $80,000,000,000.

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

RESOLUTION OF ANACONDA (MONT.) ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

ANCIENT ORDER OF
HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA,
Anaconda, Mont., May 14, 1941.

Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Deer Lodge County, Mont., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it has been intimated that the United States Fleet be used as a convoy for merchant ships carrying munitions of war to certain belligerent nations now at war in Europe; and

"Whereas those convoy ships would necessarily have to travel in waters infested with submarines and sunken mines and thus run

the risk of being destroyed, such an act would inevitably bring the Government of the United States into the European war: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the officers and members of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Deer Lodge County, Mont., do hereby protest the use of the United States Fleet acting as such convoy for ships carrying munitions of war to belligerent countries in Europe or Africa;

"*Resolved*, That we petition His Excellency Franklin D. Roosevelt to be ever-mindful of his promises to the electorate in the recent campaign for reelection that no American boy would ever be sent across the Atlantic to fight on foreign soil; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; a copy to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State; a copy to the Honorable Senators B. K. Wheeler and James E. Murray, United States Senators; and a copy to the Honorable James F. O'Connor and Jeanette Rankin, Members of Congress from Montana; and a copy spread on the minutes of this meeting."

Yours very truly,

MICHAEL LACEY,
P. J. O'DONNELL,
JAMES MULVEY,
Committee.

Tax on Intangible Personal Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony given by me before the Ways and Means Committee on the tax bill:

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, is the next witness on the calendar. I regret that we have not more members of our committee here to hear what I know will be a splendid statement.

Mr. PATMAN, will you please give your name and address?

STATEMENT OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. My name is WRIGHT PATMAN, Member of Congress, representing the First Congressional District of Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you prefer to make your statement without interruption?

Mr. PATMAN. I would like to. However, if anyone wants to ask me a question that happens to be timely at the particular time I am talking, that will be all right.

I am hoping that the committee will accept one or more of the suggestions that I make. However, if they are not accepted, I expect to vote for the tax bill that this committee brings in. I realize that a large part of these expenditures should be paid by current taxation; that is the only way we can prevent a dangerous inflation with the large expenditures that we are making.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure, Mr. PATMAN, that the committee has a high regard for your good judgment, and your ability, and your familiarity with these problems, and anything that you say will be received with an open mind and given due weight and consideration.

NEW AND UNTAPPED SOURCE OF REVENUE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, members of this committee are seeking for new sources of tax revenue and have asked for suggestions as to where such revenue can best be found. The problem is particularly acute at the present moment, in view of the tremendous expenditures which we have recently made for the national defense. I have been studying a field which I feel offers an unparalleled source of tax revenue. It is a field that can be easily and cheaply tapped at a minimum of injury and inconvenience to the taxpayers and the national economy. I refer to taxes on intangible personal property, the stocks, bonds, and money of the Nation. I believe intangible personalty is a tremendous source of potential tax revenue for the Federal Government.

INSURANCE PREMIUM

Our Government is spending billions for national preparedness each year. The cost is referred to as a good insurance premium to protect us against a greater loss. It is said that even if we never need the battleships we are building, or the planes, the tanks, the guns, the ammunition, or the men we are training, it will be worth all it is costing because of the protection such a program gives to our country, including its wealth. I agree that this is true; but should not the wealth of the country help to pay these insurance premiums? Why should it all be borne by income taxes, sales taxes, and other different forms of taxes that are quite burdensome on the people who are making the greatest contribution toward building our country?

If the people who own the stocks, bonds, and money of the Nation are allowed to escape any tax burden except the small amount they pay on the net income derived from them each year, I doubt that wealth pays its fair and proportionate part to protect itself.

The point is: Should the person who owns the million dollars' worth of bonds, stocks, or money pay defense taxes only on the net income earned, or should he also be required to pay something on the million dollars for the protection of the million dollars?

WEALTH SHOULD PAY ITS FAIR PORTION

It is my belief that the wealth of this country should pay its fair share of the cost of preparedness. The States have failed in their efforts to tax intangible wealth because of the many perplexing problems of assessment, discovery, and the shifting residence of the owners, but there is no reason why the Federal Government cannot succeed in enforcing the intangibles-tax law. Such a law could be made to raise billions of dollars a year and at the same time allow very liberal exemptions. Possibly the first $25,000, $50,000, or even more should be exempt on the theory that the owners of such amounts pay their part through other kinds of taxes, but surely those possessing so much wealth to be protected should pay a special tax for that purpose.

It is suggested that the subject might be presented in a question-and-answer form, using the questions commonly asked:

1. Question. What do you mean by intangible personal property?

Answer. The term "intangible personalty" has no fixed legal signification. Intangible personalty is property which is not real property or tangible personalty and includes stocks, bonds, mortgages, notes, and similar commercial papers which embody an obligation in a document. Moneys and credits are generally deemed to be within the classification.

2. Question. What is the amount of the "intangible personalty" in the United States?

Answer. Estimates as to this vary. I am informed that there is around $400,000,000,000 worth of intangible personal property in the United States. The estimate of Mr. Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of Congress, places it at $300,000,000,000, an estimate which he considers conservative. Mr. Stam's figures are to be found on page A1239 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the present session.

3. Question. How much in taxes could be equitably raised from this kind of property?

Answer. The possibilities for tax revenue are practically limitless. I myself am inclined to concur with Congressman KNUTE HILL, of Washington, who, in the last session of Congress, introduced a bill, H. R. 10174, providing for a tax of 5 mills or one-half of 1 percent on the excess of accumulations of intangible personal property over $50,000. It is estimated that this revenue measure would yield between $800,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 in tax revenue, on the basis of the estimated present concentration of wealth. This bill has been reintroduced in the present Congress as H. R. 980. In my investigation I discovered this well-drawn bill was pending. I am endorsing the part relating to taxing intangible wealth and not the part relating to taxing State and city bonds.

4. Question. What you are advocating is a capital levy, is it not?

Answer. No. A capital levy, to my information and belief, is a tax taking 20 or 50 percent or some other portion of a man's property without any reference to the benefits which he himself receives from the Government. The tax which Mr. HILL proposes is merely a property tax, a small property tax. It is no more a capital levy than is the general property tax levied by the States. The tax is directly in proportion to the taxpayer's ability to pay. With international bandits on the loose, the cost of protecting property is going up, and it is only fair that property owners should stand part of the cost of this protection.

5. Question. Intangible personalty pays taxes, does it not? The States tax it, do they not?

Answer. Fourteen States and the District of Columbia have no taxes of any kind on "intangible personalty." Some States have special so-called moneys and credits taxes on this type of property. A few apply general property-tax rates to it. This type of taxation has broken down in the States altogether. Most States rely on township or local subdivision assessors to assess their taxes. These men have no way to assess a man's intangible personalty. They cannot go to the books of banks or corporations. Intangible personalty is not fixed and visible like real estate or tangible personalty. It is transitory and can be easily hidden in secret depositories inside or outside the State. It is estimated that only 8 to 20 percent of the intangible property is declared for tax purposes in those jurisdictions which tax it. Intangible property is invariably on record some place, and the only way to reach it is to tax it on a national scale through an authority that has the ability to consult the places of record if need be. However, self-declaration has proved very successful in the income-tax field, and I feel that it would be equally successful in the field of Federal taxation of intangible property.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would you permit an interruption there?

Do I understand you to say that a man living in Texas who has his intangible wealth in New York cannot be taxed in Texas?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, if you had a way of getting at it, possibly you would be able to do it, but these local and State assessors are not in a position to examine books and make investigations that agents of the Federal Government are permitted to make.

Mr. KNUTSON. The States are permitted to examine the Federal records, and it would seem that that would make the information gained available to the local assessors.

Mr. PATMAN. In theory you are exactly right, Mr. KNUTSON, but in practice they have absolutely failed; and many States, including your own of Minnesota, have made a very conscientious and honest effort to enforce the law and failed.

6. Question. Would the States feel that their rights have been encroached upon should the Federal Government enter this field of taxation?

Answer. The Federal Government is already in this field through capital-stock taxes and similar taxation, although the incidence of these taxes is different from the tax that I have in mind. The States could not validly object to the Federal Government taxing intangible property because it is a field that they have been almost powerless to exploit through no fault of their own. If it is necessary, the Federal Government could arrange offset provisions to enable the States to benefit as much from the new law as they are benefiting under the old, and it would cost the Federal Government but a small fraction of its tax revenue. In the long run the States would probably benefit from this tax through Federal benefits.

7. Question. Is the thing that you are proposing—that is, an increased burden on intangible property—preferable in your mind to an increase in the income-tax rates?

Answer. I think so. I feel that a man's income is not always the best indication of his ability to pay taxes. A man whose income is derived largely from property is better able to pay a tax than a man whose income is derived from skilled or personal services. The income of the former is derived with less effort and is less likely to fluctuate than the income of the latter; and, if the worst comes to the worst, he can always fall back upon the security of his invested capital. The effort to solve this inequity by taxing so-called earned and unearned income at different rates has been a failure. It is administratively impracticable to trace and differentiate between them for tax purposes. An income tax can never accomplish this differentiation, whereas a tax on intangibles can, because it can reach the corpus of the property.

8. Question. Do you advocate a tax on intangible property to supplant an income tax?

Answer. No; but State income taxes are already at a high level. Federal corporation income and excess-profits taxes run up to 62 percent. Other levies are additional. Personal Federal income taxes are graduated up to over 81 percent. I know that the Office of Production Management is frequently troubled by the refusal of businesses to take defense work by reason of the high taxes on any profit margin. It is possible that a sizable portion of an increase in income-tax revenues will have to be paid out by the Government in plant subsidies. It seems to me that it might be better tax psychology in some upper-bracket tax cases to take only, say, for illustration, 25 percent of a man's income through an income tax and another 25 percent through a property tax rather than take the entire amount of, say, 50 percent of his income through an income tax.

I am afraid that we may get into trouble if we try to take the entire cost of this war out of consumers, producers, and businessmen through excise and income taxes. If a man's income is taxed at 70 or 80 or 90 percent his incentive to produce will naturally decline. Instead of taxing his income so heavily, consider taking part of it out of property. For example, I understand that many prominent executives are no longer bothering much about production and manufacturing because they already have all the money they want and could not make much more if they wanted to. However, if a man's tax is much the same irrespective of his income, he will have considerable incentive to produce.

Insofar as possible, taxes should be an incentive to production rather than restrictive. This is the theory of the intangible property tax; it measures ability to pay with fine discrimination, yet does not decrease the incentive of the owner to engage in productive enterprise.

9. Question. What is happening in other countries?

Answer. Great Britain is trying to finance her defense largely through income taxation, excises, and borrowing. Germany, which has been on a war economy for some time, has had since 1936 something approximating an intangibles tax in the form of a net worth tax. It is a tax of 0.5 percent on all property with exemptions of RM10,000 for a single man, RM20,000 for a married person, RM10,000 for each child, and RM10,000 if the taxpayer is over 60 years of age, incapacitated, or has an income of less than RM3,000. Norway has a graduated property tax with an exemption of 5,000 kroner. The tax runs from as low as 0.3 krone per 1,000 kroner on 10,000 kroner up to as much as 6 kroner per 1,000 kroner.

This rests most heavily on the owners of intangibles because property of this type tends to become more concentrated in its ownership. Sweden and other European countries have similar taxes. In the United States, by comparison to these countries, we get a disproportionately large amount of our Federal, State, and local revenue from real property and a disproportionately small amount from intangible property.

10. Question. Would this be double taxation? I mean that, inasmuch as a property tax is paid on the tangible property, which is frequently the basis or the security of the intangible property, would a tax on the intangible itself be taxing the same property twice?

Answer. I think not. For example, a bondholder has no interest in the equity of the property behind his bond. He is interested in it only insofar as it is security for the loan. He has no responsibility for the taxes or the liabilities of the property, yet his certificate is as valuable as though it were tangible property. It is a different kind of property altogether. Besides, it is not taxed at all by the Federal Government.

Stocks are not greatly different from bonds. Many corporations, particularly family corporations, have converted a large part of their stocks into bonds so that they might pay their income out as interest instead of dividends, and thus escape corporation taxes. Thus the two main types of securities are often rather similar in their nature for tax purposes.

Double taxation is generally a fallacious argument. The incidence of any property tax paid by a corporation or a debtor is usually very different from that paid by the owner of the intangible property. In any event, it is more than likely that double taxation may be desirable under some circumstances.

11. Question. I presume that such a tax as you propose would have some effect on multiple holding companies whose securities rest in layers one upon the other?

Answer. Yes. "Corporations" are included within the term "taxpayers" as it is used in H. R. 980. Each holding company would find it necessary to pay a property tax on securities which it holds in excess of the $50,000 exemption. This would tend to cut down the great tiers of holding companies in some fields and thus tend to accomplish some of the purposes of the Holding Company Act.

This tax would also reach idle, undistributed corporate surpluses by taxing the surpluses in the hands of the corporation and by taxing the increased market value of the stock in the hands of the stockholders, thus accomplishing in part the purpose of the undistributed-profits tax.

12. Question. What would be the effect on the security market of the bill which you propose?

Answer. I do not believe it would have any material effect on the security market, certainly no greater adverse effect than the presently proposed increase in corporation taxes.

A liberal exemption, such as $25,000, $50,000, or $75,000, will keep the intangibles tax from hitting the marginal investor. Thus, the tax would be absorbed where it hit and would not be capitalized to force down the security market.

Every new factor affects the security market, for that matter, and the results are not too bad, because things soon settle down to a new equilibrium. The value of capital goods is a derived value. It is derived from the demand for the things which the capital produces. This factor is more important in determining capital-goods values than the demand of an investor for an investment. Consequently, the security market can be affected almost as much by consumer taxes as by a tax on capital itself. In the long run, such a tax might help the capital-goods market by decreasing liquid capital and by lightening the tax burden on consumer purchasing power.

13. Question. Would such a tax rest more heavily on "low income" securities than it would on "high income" securities? I mean that where you take the value of the intangible property as a tax base without regard to the income and tax a low-income-producing security at the same rate as a high-income-producing security, might it not be a disproportionately heavy burden for the former?

Answer. I do not think that this is a valid criticism. To start with, the value of a security, like the value of land, is, in a large measure, determined by the income which it produces. Speculative future value also plays a part. There is some variance in the ratio of the income of the security to the value of the security by reason of the varying safety of the investment, or the convenience with which it can be liquidated. The question of whether the capital itself is increasing or depreciating in value is also important. A tax would have little bearing on these value-determining factors. If anything, I think that the value of a security is a fairer tax base than the income it produces.

14. Question. You state that the taxation of intangible personal property has broken down in the States. Do you think that the Federal Government would have an easier time assessing and administering such a tax?

Answer. Indeed I do. I think that the ease and economy of assessing and administering this tax by the Federal Government is one of its best features.

To start with, a relatively small number of taxpayers own more than $50,000 in intangible property. Then, self-declaration by taxpayers has been very successful in the income-tax field. It would be even more successful in connection with a national tax on intangibles. A man's net income may vary tremendously from year to year, but his net worth on his personal balance sheet changes but little. It is hard to check on the amount of a man's income in a particular year whereas it is a relatively easy matter to discover the amount of property he has. Income may be hidden or disguised. This is more difficult with property. An intangible must usually be of record some place whereas income is frequently not.

The States get only an 8 to 20 percent declaration of intangibles because they rely almost solely on township or other local assessors. These men have no authority to look at corporation or bank books in their own or in neighboring States. The Federal Government would not be balked by any such limitation in its jurisdiction.

I might also add that I am informed that such a tax has greatly aided some of the European countries in checking estate-tax and income-tax returns.

15. Question. You know that the so-called apportionment clause of the Constitution says that no poll tax "or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the census * * *," etc. Would a tax on intangible personal property by the Federal Government be a "direct tax" contrary to this prohibition in the Constitution?

Answer. I think not. I know that there is authority both ways on this subject. I understand that the "apportionment clause" of the Constitution to which you refer was written into the Constitution only to satisfy southern landowners who were fearful that the North would try to tax their land and slaves. In 1880 the Supreme Court in the case of *Springer* v. *U. S.* (102 U. S. 586, 602), said, I quote:

"Our conclusions are that direct taxes, within the meaning of the Constitution, are only capitation taxes, as expressed in that instrument, and taxes on real estate."

However, the Court in 1895 in a 5-to-4 decision called *Pollock* v. *Farmers Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 429 and 158 U. S. 601), decided that an income tax on income from real estate or personalty was a direct tax. This necessitated the sixteenth amendment. The Pollock case made no mention of the Springer case, and did not purport to overrule it. On the other hand, the Court in 1911 in *Flint* v. *Stone Tracy Co.* (220 U. S. 108, 152), cited the Springer case with approval. Some authorities conclude that *Spreckels Sugar Refining Co.* v. *McClain* (192 U. S. 397), a case decided in 1904, overrules the Pollock case. I am confident that the present Supreme Court would hold a Federal tax on intangible personal property to be constitutional.

SAVE $2,000,000,000 A YEAR

It is wrong for Congress to compel taxpayers to pay $2,000,000,000 a year interest on the public debt.

A few months ago when I appeared before this committee, advocating a slight change in our monetary system whereby the taxpayers would be saved from one to two billion dollars a year in interest charges, it was suggested that this matter properly came before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member. Since that time, however, administration leaders and experts before this committee have been insisting that in connection with the raising of taxes, social and economic problems, as well as effects upon the monetary system, including inflation, should also be considered. I presume that this committee is taking these different factors into consideration in writing this tax bill. If I am correct in that assumption, I desire to urge the committee to seriously consider at this time the proposal that I made at my former appearance.

The proposal was as follows:

"1. That Congress, as the policy-making branch of our Government, should adopt a policy of not paying interest; it is unnecessary.

"2. That the Federal Reserve Banking System should be owned by the Government instead of the private commercial banks.

"3. That when the Government needs money or credit, it should deliver to the 12 Federal Reserve banks noninterest-bearing Government obligations and secure credit for the amount thereof.

"4. That such a system will not cause the printing of an extra dollar because it is using exactly the same system that is in effect today, except the taxpayers will be saved the interest, which will be at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year at the end of this year if Government expenditures continue as contemplated."

In that connection, may I state that the payments made by all of the individual income tax payers of this country are not sufficient to pay the interest on our Government debt? It only amounts to about 50 percent, if the interest is $2,000,000,000 a year, as contemplated by the end of this year, and some estimates go as high as $3,000,000,000.

Mr. REED. You mean on the Federal debt alone?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

RIGHT OR WRONG IS QUESTION

If this proposal is adopted, the tax bill under consideration will be unnecessary. I know that uninformed people, misinformed people, and those who are selfishly interested or those who may not have given the subject adequate consideration will immediately say "printing-press money," but they cannot for long succeed in misleading the people with the misinformation that such a phrase implies. The truth is, and every informed person knows it, that it is absolutely idiotic for the sovereign Government of the United States, which has the power to create both bonds and money to issue and sell bonds—interest-bearing—to purchase money of its own creation. This is not a question involving expert advice or monetary science. It is a question of right or wrong and is just as simple as the simplest problems confronting us in everyday life. People, who say that this part of monetary control is a mystery, have not given the question sufficient consideration, or they have been bluffed or intimidated by the artful and clever phrases of those, who profit by such a system that is so burdensome to the poor people of this Nation. I realize that a short, clever slogan will destroy an hour of logic and reason, but it should also be understood that such destruction is temporary and is not lasting. The truth will prevail and the truth is, one of these days the American people are going to wake up and curse their lawmakers for not changing such an idotic system and thereby placing upon them such an unnecessary and heavy burden.

Why allow the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks to use our Nation's credit free to purchase interest-bearing Government bonds? It simply does not make sense, and this committee should now take the initiative in making the change.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I desire to urge the committee to consider the following suggestions relative to this proposed tax bill:

First. That the wealth of this country, and especially the intangible property, should bear a fair proportion of the cost of protection that is afforded through national preparedness.

Second. That a policy should be adopted by Congress which will save the taxpayers $2,000,000,000 a year in interest charges.

Third. That the automobile tax of 20 percent that has been proposed is unreasonable, clearly out of line with other taxes proposed, and should not be accepted.

Fourth. The proposed tax on bank checks is deflationary, in addition to being a nuisance, and will cause the people great inconvenience and trouble that cannot be justified for the comparatively small amount to be raised. The Government should cultivate the good will of the people in this emergency instead of creating ill-will through an annoyance tax.

Fifth. The Treasury, if it continues the policy of paying interest, should have a stable rate of interest on all issues, instead of 25 or 30 different rates as at present, or should acquire the money and credit necessary through competitive bids.

Sixth. Under no circumstances should taxes be levied on the income of State, county, or political subdivision bonds or securities.

I respectfully suggest that our enormous public debt can be retired in 25 years without a burdensome tax on the people if the Government will adopt the policy herein proposed of issuing no more interest-bearing bonds and by paying 4 percent each year on the principal of the bonds outstanding.

I repeat that it is wrong for the American people to be compelled to pay the bondholders $2 for every $1 that is borrowed and used to pay soldiers, materialmen, and others for services and supplies in connection with national defense or for other purposes.

As stated to you, gentlemen, in the beginning, I hope that you accept one or more of these suggestions, but I realize that money has got to be raised to pay this enormous debt and these expenditures in order to prevent a dangerous inflation.

I am in accord with your views expressed that a large part of it should be paid as we go, and I expect to support the bill that this committee in its judgment reports to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. That is very kind and considerate, I am sure, and the members of the committee appreciate that.

I would like to ask a question about the last paragraph of your statement, Mr. PATMAN.

"I repeat that it is wrong for the American people to be compelled to pay the bondholders $2 for every $1 that is borrowed and used to pay soldiers, materialmen, and others for services and supplies in connection with national defense or for other purposes."

Now, with regard to that $2 for $1, they would not have to pay $2 for $1 if the money was borrowed at a low rate of interest, such as the rate at which the Government borrows now, as compared with what individuals pay, unless the Government has the use of the money long enough so that this low rate would make it $2 for $1? That is, if you borrow it today and pay it back next year it would not be $2 for $1, but only a low rate of interest for the use of the money; is that not so?

Mr. PATMAN. I am just taking the history of bond transactions, and the history discloses that the Government usually pays $2 for every $1.

The CHAIRMAN. But the question that I wanted to ask right there is this: There is no way of making the bondholders, the people that have this money to loan, give us the money. The Government has got to get the money from somewhere, by taxing or borrowing or by printing it. How would you get the money from these bondholders?

Mr. PATMAN. You do not need to get it from the people now. I think the banks have too many Government bonds, I do not think it is in their interest or the people's interest to have so much of their resources in Government bonds.

The CHAIRMAN. Under your plan you would not get it from them at all.

Mr. PATMAN. The Government would use its own money just like it is doing now, except that the Government is now paying interest.

If the chairman will permit me a moment, the way it is now the Secretary of the Treasury causes to be issued both bonds and money. They are printed in the same place over here at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. When he issues bonds and sells them to a local bank, the local bank usually gives the Treasury credit at the Federal Reserve bank in that district. It is money created by the banks.

The Treasury recognizes that in this present bond campaign, because it is specifically provided that the banks cannot create the money to buy these bonds; they cannot do it. They do not want the banks to create any more money and I think that they are right about it. They have over $20,000,000,000 in Government securities already.

Now, the Federal Reserve bank has credit that may be checked upon by the United States Treasury, and the United States Treasury in paying debts of different kinds and various bills draws checks upon that Federal Reserve credit.

The only change that I would make, I would not go through that local bank at all. I would just deliver non-interest-bearing bonds to the Federal Reserve bank, and have the Federal Reserve bank give credit for those bonds just like it is giving the local bank credit now, and issue checks to pay the bills in the same way and manner as they are now issued.

Then I would retire 4 percent of that each year, and in 25 years you have got your national debt retired. It cannot be any more inflationary than the banks creating the money; no one can seriously contend otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it would require additional legislation to compel the Federal Reserve bank to do that; would it not?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know; they could not very well refuse to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am just wondering if it would not require additional legislation to compel them to do that.

Mr. PATMAN. I should think that there should be legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have to start back at the Banking and Currency Committee to get that authorized, would you not?

Mr. PATMAN. No, sir. This committee is now considering—and I hope I am correct in this—together with the matter of raising the money you are also considering the effect upon inflation or deflation or other economic problems, and if this committee has assumed the burden of doing that I think that the question properly belongs right here with this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that we would have jurisdiction?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; in view of that.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not know whether the Banking and Currency Committee would be jealous of their prerogatives.

Mr. PATMAN. As one member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I know that I would not object to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then in your prepared statement, on page 14, your item No. 13, referring to automobiles, you state that the 20 percent that has been proposed is unreasonable, clearly out of line with other taxes and should not be accepted.

That is a pretty steep increase, we all realize that. But if it is the policy of the Government in the national-defense program to curtail automobile production in order that the material and skilled mechanics and others connected with the production of automobiles may devote their time and efforts to producing war materials, and war supplies; if that is the policy of the Government, and that creates a shortage in automobiles and the demand is greater than the supply, competition then for the automobiles that are made will be so great it is just natural the effect would be to raise the price.

Now, the traffic can only bear so much. If the effect of this policy of the Government is to curtail the production whereby the supply will be short of the demand, will not the automobile manufacturers if there is not something done to control the price, reap a rich harvest there?

Mr. PATMAN. It will be harder on the owners than it will on the manufacturers. It will be harder on the 30,000,000 owners of automobiles than it would be on the manufacturers.

The manufacturers will only produce, say, about 4,000,000 cars, but there are 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 cars in the country today.

The CHAIRMAN. We are talking now about new automobiles; are we not?

Mr. PATMAN. No; this proposal goes to second-hand cars, too. If it does increase the value of the article of 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 people, the value of their property, I do not see where that would be very harmful to the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it not be fairer for the Government to take this difference between what the automobiles ought to sell for, and this inflated price? Should there not be a tax in there?

Mr. PATMAN. I would not object to a fair tax, but I think 20 percent is so clearly and unreasonably out of line that it should not be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. I would not say this is the policy or purpose of the Treasury at all, but sometimes proposals are made for trading purposes.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. CROWTHER. In relation to the statement about paying $2 for $1, your chief complaint is about the excessive interest burden that we bear on the national debt; is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. Any burden, Doctor, that is paid by the Federal Government, the sovereign Government that has the power to create its own credit, any amount is excessive, I say.

Now, if it were a State, I would say all right, or a political subdivision, or a private corporation. They should pay, but they do not have the money-creating power; they do not have the credit-creating power; but here we are dealing with the agency that has the power to create both money or credit and bonds.

Mr. CROWTHER. Have you any idea how much money the taxpayers have paid in interest on the World War debt?

Mr. PATMAN. I could determine it rather quickly, because many people will wonder why this is brought up now, and that goes right to the heart of it.

For the first 125 years of our country's history we paid no interest hardly; it meant nothing; it was insignificant, only about $3,000,000 a year, except during the War between the States. There were 3 years at that time when the annual burden of interest got up as high as $25,000,000. But outside of those years, the interest burden did not exceed $3,000,000 a year for the first 125 years of our country's history.

During the last 25 years, and since the World War of 1917, we have paid up over $1,000,000,000 a year, so we have paid approximately $25,000,000,000, Dr. CROWTHER, on the World War debt.

Mr. CROWTHER. We have not paid as much as that, but we have paid close to $15,000,000,000 on the World War debt.

Mr. PATMAN. I am just roughly guessing at it, knowing that it went over $1,000,000,000 a year, except for a short time it came down to about $700,000,000; I think that was about the lowest. I am not sure about that, but I am just averaging it up for the 25 years, at $1,000,000,000 a year. That is $25,000,000,000.

Mr. CROWTHER. But it started at $26,500,000,000, and got down to around $15,000,000,000, and there is $15,000,000,000 that is now attributable to the World War. That is part of our present debt, and on that debt alone we have paid very close to $15,000,000,000 in interest, and there is $15,000,000,000 of it still outstanding.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the point exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask my colleague there, he is a good financier and a good statesman. Do you not think it would have been better to have paid a little higher taxes and not have had to pay so much interest, or to have increased the taxes so that it would raise more revenue and we would not have had to borrow so much.

If we had increased our taxes we would not owe so much money.

Mr. CROWTHER. I do not know that there was any discussion at that time about raising it. Of course, hindsight is always a lot better than foresight. If we all had as good foresight as we do hindsight, we would all of us be worth a million.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think I can agree with you, Congressman, about the matter not being discussed then. I think that if you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back during that time, they were saying then what they are saying now, that we should pay a substantial part of the debt as we go along, and I think you will find where President Woodrow Wilson said that the cost of the war should be paid by those who profited most from the war, and in order to do that higher taxes should be raised, including excess-profits taxes.

Mr. CROWTHER. We had all of them.

Mr. PATMAN. We had every one of them, and I think if those taxes had remained on the statute books we would have had the whole national debt liquidated by June 30, 1927.

Mr. CROWTHER. There is something to that, and over a period of years when the Ways and Means Committee were busy reducing taxes, we did have advice from outstanding economists, one in particular, Thomas G. Adams, and there were several of those people that thought we ought not to reduce taxes as long as there was a dollar of that war indebtedness left on the books.

Mr. PATMAN. I remember that was one of the principal contentions brought out.

Mr. CROWTHER. But there was a great hue and cry all over the country to get to a peacetime rate on taxes, to get away from the high rates and get down to a peacetime basis of taxation.

Now, whether that was right or not or wrong or not, I do not know, but it did involve a considerable degree of discussion at the time.

Mr. PATMAN. There was another argument along about then that was very interesting, too, that we should at all times have a large national debt, because it gave the insurance companies and banks and trusts and estates and different institutions like that an opportunity to have a backlog of Government bonds upon which they could rely at all times, and for that reason we should keep a high national debt.

Mr. CROWTHER. And were they tax exempt?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; they were tax exempt.

Mr. CROWTHER. We have not had much of a cessation of the issuance of tax-exempt securities during the last 8 years.

Mr. PATMAN. This committee made a step in the direction of taxing these securities.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have one question, Mr. PATMAN. At this time and in this emergency, which would you prefer, a full production of airplanes or a full production of automobiles?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the answer is obvious; I do not have to answer that; you know what the answer would be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, we must put defense needs first?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly we must; there is no question about that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And in doing that, we should follow the advice of our technical experts to the extent that they tell us we must curtail production of automobiles in order to speed up the production of airplanes?

Mr. PATMAN. I would consider the advice. I would never commit myself to taking the advice of any expert, but I would consider it, because I think that you will find that where there is one expert saying one thing, there is another expert saying something different. And you cannot take the advice of both of them. They are like lawyers; there is a lawyer on each side of the case; one of them is bound to be wrong.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. PATMAN, if I understand your theory, then, it is that we might as well stop issuing bonds of any kind and let the printing presses go to work and put out the money; is that the idea?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, that is a phrase that is used by people that have not given this adequate consideration, the way I view it.

Mr. BUCK. I have read all of your articles that you have been courteous and kind enough to give us, and I have listened to you on the floor many times.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sorry that I have not been able to convince the gentleman, but the gentleman does not state the question the way that I understand it.

Mr. BUCK. Will you please state it in your own language then?

Mr. PATMAN. My restatement is that you do not have to print an extra dollar, not a one; you do not change your monetary system, leave it like it is; you do not have to change the machinery in any way; you do not have to change the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" so far as the issuance of money is concerned; you just merely make a short cut to the Federal Reserve bank instead of going around the roundabout way and paying for the use of the Government's own credit. That is the only thing in the world it is. It is a question of right or wrong; it is not a question of monetary science.

Mr. BUCK. You object, however, to the payment of interest on bonds by the Government?

Mr. PATMAN. By the Federal Government; yes. I think it is absolutely wrong and uncalled for and unnecessary and extravagant.

Mr. BUCK. What about the bonds that are outstanding?

Mr. PATMAN. You could refinance them as they were due, as they became due, in the same way.

Mr. BUCK. And hereafter you would utilize the printing presses—I am sorry that you object to the word.

Mr. PATMAN. They would run just like they are now but no more; you would not print a dollar more than you are now; you can use the printing-press money now if you want to.

Mr. BUCK. You would put it in circulation; is that the idea?

Mr. PATMAN. In the same way that you put it in circulation now.

Mr. BUCK. It does not go into circulation now.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it would not go into circulation then.

Mr. BUCK. Why?

Mr. PATMAN. Because you would have the same system exactly, the same money presses, the same printers, and the same system to put it out, and the same checks used; and you cannot answer that argument, Mr. BUCK; you just cannot do it.

Mr. BUCK. I am asking you; I am not answering anything. I am trying to get your viewpoint on it. After all, this is not the committee that deals with banking and currency.

Mr. PATMAN. I know; but you are dealing with inflation. You can double the reserve requirements of the banks, or give the banks the power to increase the reserve requirements, and you can give them lots of power to stop inflation, and you are dealing with that, and you should deal with this in connection with it.

Mr. BUCK. Well, I am always very glad to listen to you.

Mr. PATMAN. If you can find an answer to it, I would like to know it. If there is any reason on earth why that should not be done, I would like to know what it is.

Mr. BUCK. I think the answer is obvious. Like the gentleman from Texas, I am going to say that I do not think it is necessary to give the answer because I think it is obvious.

Mr. BOEHNE. I have just one question. Mr. PATMAN, forgetting for a moment the emergency and defense problems, under this system, what incentive would there be to take a thousand dollars that I have and buy a Government bond with it?

Mr. PATMAN. You would not do it; you would put it in something else and the Government would get its money elsewhere. The Government does not need your thousand dollars. The Government can create the $1,000 upon its credit.

Mr. BOEHNE. It has been needing it for years.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where would the Government get its money?

Mr. PATMAN. Just exactly where it gets it today, the same place, and the same system. The only difference is you would not pay anybody tribute for the use of the Government's own credit, and you would save $2,000,000,000. a year,

Mr. KNUTSON. I have got some Government bonds that I would sell tomorrow if I thought that they would adopt any such plan.

Mr. PATMAN. You would not sell them until they became due and then you would get your money for them, and you could continue to get the interest on them until they became due. It would not affect the bond market at all.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thought that you said that the Government should not pay interest on bonds?

Mr. PATMAN. I say that; but if they have a contractual obligation outstanding, they should respect it and pay it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then no private individual would buy a Government bond.

Mr. PATMAN. He would not need to; they would buy State, and county, and political subdivision bonds, and make investments otherwise.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where would they get the money?

Mr. PATMAN. They would get it from the Treasury, just like they get it now.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where would the Treasury get it?

Mr. PATMAN. From the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, where they get it now.

Mr. KNUTSON. We are getting down to paper now, are we not?

Mr. PATMAN. That is where we are now, down to paper.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is interesting, and I think you are right. We are right down to 59-cent dollars, anyway.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman is going to trade with foreign countries, of course his dollar is 59 cents, but over here it is the same old 100 cents.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think that that is true. Do you think that we could better ourselves by further deflating it?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think that that is a question that is before this committee right now.

Mr. KNUTSON. If it has a bearing, probably it should be before us.

Mr. PATMAN. I see no reason for deflation of the dollar further, and at this particular time I see no reason for it, but I am in favor of giving the President the power to do it if it is necessary.

Mr. KNUTSON. In the final analysis, we would get the money down at the Bureau of Printing and Engraving.

Mr. PATMAN. We would get it at exactly the same place that we are getting it now. We would not change a thing, we would use the same old trucks to haul it from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to the Treasury, and the same people to print it, and the same paper, and the same presses, and the same length of time, and not an extra dollar would be printed.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is interesting.

Mr. CROWTHER. Does your plan have any reference to the backing of currency by gold?

Mr. PATMAN. No, sir; it has no reference to it.

Mr. CROWTHER. None whatever?

Mr. PATMAN. It has the same reference to it that it has today, there would be no change in that, it would be exactly the same as it is today.

Mr. CROWTHER. Now, we have got some twenty-odd billions of dollars' worth of gold in various places here; have we not?

Mr. PATMAN. You have got $22,500,000,000 worth of gold.

Mr. CROWTHER. Who really owns that?

Mr. PATMAN. The Government.

Mr. CROWTHER. The Government owns that?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; certainly; read your own law on that.

Mr. CROWTHER. Where is that?

Mr. PATMAN. All of the right, title, and interest in that gold is in the United States; that is what your language says, and I think that you gentlemen wrote that language.

Mr. CROWTHER. Now, I have been told that the Federal Reserve banks own that gold.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, they cannot legally own it.

Mr. CROWTHER. They have issued certificates against it; have they not?

Mr. PATMAN. That is a kind of hocus-pocus shell-game proposition that they use.

Mr. CROWTHER. It seems to me that there is a lot of hocus-pocus about this business.

Mr. PATMAN. But the Government does own that gold. If the Federal Reserve banks owned it, why did not they get the increased value by reason of the devaluation? Who got that? The Government got it, because the Government owned the gold.

Mr. CROWTHER. Well, of course the Government does not get any increased valuation, because they paid the highest price for the gold, did they not?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, anyway the increased amount that the Government had at the time.

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes; they made $2,000,000,000 out of that.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, if the Federal Reserve owned that gold, why did they not get that $2,000,000,000?

Mr. CROWTHER. I cannot answer that; I am trying to get a little information.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I say, Dr. Crowther, that the law that you gentlemen wrote says that all of the right, title, and interest in that gold is in the United States of America. You cannot change that law by regulations.

Mr. CROWTHER. That has no relation whatever to our currency; that is on a 40-percent backing, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; the old law still remains like it was.

Mr. CROWTHER. You remember a number of years ago at the bonus hearings which finally developed into a question of monetary policy a number of years ago in the old House Office Building, a number of the experts and including some of the bankers thought that they could issue currency on a 25-cent gold backing instead of 40 percent. Do you remember that?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, England stayed on the gold standard for 100 years with 10-percent gold.

Mr. CROWTHER. Well, what good is that gold doing us?

Mr. PATMAN. Not a bit. We are digging it out of one mountain and putting it in another mountain.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, we thank you.

Mr. CROWTHER. Just a minute. I noticed today a letter in one of our leading newspapers from a man that thought that that was the answer to our taxation problem, not to have any tax bill but to hoist that gold out, and also the silver down at West Point, and pay the bills with that.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the plan I propose is doing the same thing in a different way.

Mr. CROWTHER. Without disturbing the system?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; using your system but just not paying the interest.

Mr. BUCK. Did the gentleman from Texas ever read the story of Marco Polo?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I used to read it.

Mr. BUCK. Did you ever read it?

Mr. PATMAN. It has been a long time since I read it.

Mr. BUCK. Did you ever read about the Emperor Kublai Khan?

Mr. PATMAN. I would rather the gentleman would make his own statement, because it has been so long that I read anything of it.

Mr. BUCK. I am afraid that we cannot; we put too much in it. But Kublai Khan and his successors issued these paper notes, and I do not know whether they even had 5 or 10 or 15 percent gold reserve against them in the great Empire of China, and they were accepted for a long time, maybe 100 years, and I do not know how long. I have forgotten that myself. But they were not any good; either they were burned up or they were destroyed, or they just were not used any more.

It seems to me that the gentleman in his thesis is presenting a theory that is along the same idea that Kublai Khan had.

Mr. PATMAN. He did not have this $22,500,000,000 of gold to back up his money, did he?

Mr. BUCK. What good is that gold?

Mr. PATMAN. It is worth a lot in international trade.

Mr. BUCK. Do you think that we have international trade now?

Mr. PATMAN. We have a little.

Mr. BUCK. Very little. But anyway, suppose that we did, and suppose that we get back to where we can have international trade, and it might be worth something. In the meantime, all we would be doing would be printing nice, pretty pieces of paper, hoping that people would take them, and they probably would for a long time, and receive them at the dollar value, or the $5 value that was printed on them.

I regret very much that I cannot agree with the gentleman in his theory that he has expressed here today, but I cannot.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, may I invite your attention to one final illustration along the lines that you suggested?

Mr. BUCK. Certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. When Texas was a republic, before it was a State in the Union, we had a firm at Galveston, Tex., by the name of Mills Bros., and they were issuing their own checks, which were as good as money in Texas, but the supreme court held under our constitution that they could not issue these checks as money. So over at Holly Springs, Miss., there was a bank that was issuing all kinds of wildcat currency; it was no good but it was used all over the country, but when it got right back to Holly Springs they would not get their money because the concern was no good, the bank was no good.

But the Mills Bros. took some of this money and they knew it was no good at all, and they endorsed it "Mills Brothers" on the back, and that money remained worth 100 cents on the dollar as long as Mills Bros. was in existence, so it depends on what is behind this money.

Although that was admittedly bad money, that was the only way that they could under our Constitution use a medium of exchange in their trade in connection with the business that they were running at the time.

Mr. BUCK. I think those things have happened elsewhere. In 1916 a check was issued by Frank H. Buck Co. of about $23, something like that, to a man who had been in the employ of the company. He went off as a fisherman up into the Alaskan seas. In 1928 that check came back through the bank, the man who had signed it who was at that time vice president, was dead, and they called me up and wanted to know whether it was any good or not, and so forth. Of course, I said it was.

Now, those things happen all the time, and I do not think that they are to be considered.

Mr. PATMAN. You can take the city of Cleveland as an example.

Mr. BUCK. I do not want to argue with the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. They did save their interest on their obligations. They will issue a bill and it looks like a greenback, and it is just a note that is signed by the city of Cleveland, and another one signed by the county, and they pay their employees half in that and half in regular money. And in that way they save their interest.

Now, here we are: We have the creating power, and we have the power to create both bonds and money, and we will sell the bonds and pay interest on the money of our own creation.

Mr. DISNEY. That is like the story of the $100 bill that was counterfeit, but paid all of the debts before it was discovered.

Patriotic Rally at Ardmore, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. WILSON WALLACE, PRESIDENT, ARDMORE DEFENSE COUNCIL, AND ARTICLE FROM THE DAILY ARDMOREITE

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Hon. Wilson Wallace, president of the Ardmore Defense Council, and an article from the Daily Ardmoreite relative to a patriotic rally held at Ardmore, Okla., on May 13, 1941, at which a resolution was adopted urging the President to speed up the production of munitions and to use every available power to deliver these supplies to Great Britain.

The letter and article follow:

ARDMORE, OKLA., *May 14, 1941.*

Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WILBURN: Enclosed herewith please find a copy of a resolution passed unanimously by citizens of southern Oklahoma, assembled in Ardmore in a mass meeting the night of May 13, 1941, signed by Thad B. Orr, chairman.

The citizens attended this meeting as a voluntary movement because of their patriotism and because of their belief that the production of defense materials and munitions must not be stopped or hindered in any way by anyone and the delivery of those productions to Britain must not be stopped or hindered.

I desire to call to your attention the fact that the resolution calls for drastic means to stop any delay in war materials. I might point out that at the meeting the greatest outburst of cheering and applause during the entire time was given when the statement was made "that strikes and profits by employees and employers must not be allowed to delay the defense program in any way while American boys are being forcibly taken from their homes to serve for $21 a month because of the emergency."

We citizens of southern Oklahoma are back of you and back of the President in any drastic steps that you may take to stop the disgraceful and un-American activities of business management and employees alike in the industries producing defense products. We expect you to stop dilly dallying and procrastinating and to do something, and do it now.

A copy of this resolution is being sent to each member of the United States Congress from Oklahoma and to the President of the United States.

Most respectfully submitted for your immediate attention and action.

Respectfully yours,

WILSON WALLACE,
President, Ardmore Defense Council.

To the President of the United States and to the Oklahoma Representatives in the House and Senate of Congress:

Whereas destruction of the democracy of England is imminent unless immediate aid is given by the United States of America in the way of tanks, planes, guns, and other munitions of war: Be it

Resolved by the citizens of southern Oklahoma in mass meeting assembled at Ardmore, Okla., on this the 13th day of May 1941, That the President of the United States immediately speed up production of munitions of war; and in the event delay should be threatened from any source, that he take the most drastic means to prevent same; be it further

Resolved, That he direct the transportation of such munitions as rapidly as possible to England in such manner as he may deem necessary to assure their safe delivery, and to use armed convoys on the sea and in the air to insure that delivery.

Adopted unanimously.

THAD B. ORR, *Chairman.*

[From the Daily Ardmoreite of May 14, 1941]

RESOLUTION ASKS DELIVERY SUPPLIES TO GREAT BRITAIN—PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT URGED TO USE EVERY AVAILABLE POWER TO ACCOMPLISH PURPOSE

Southern Oklahomans, gathered at a patriotic mass meeting held in convention hall on Tuesday evening, enthusiastically and unanimously adopted a resolution urging the President to use every power at his control to provide the sinews of war for Britain and to resort to any method he may deem wise to deliver these weapons to England.

The resolution, which was presented by Wilson Wallace, Ardmore attorney, at the close of a meeting marked by a patriotic address by Robert Kerr, former departmental commander of the American Legion, will be sent to the President, to each of the Oklahoma Congressmen and Senators, and to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate.

It reads:

"To the President of the United States and to the Oklahoma Representatives in the House and Senate of Congress:

"Whereas destruction of the democracy of England is imminent unless immediate aid is given by the United States in the way of tanks, planes, guns, and other munitions of war: Be it

"*Resolved* by the citizens of southern Oklahoma in mass meeting assembled at Ardmore, Okla., on this the 13th day of May 1941, that the President of the United States immediately speed up production of munitions of war, and in the event delay should be threatened from any source that he take the most drastic means to prevent same: be it further

"*Resolved,* That he direct the transportation of such munitions as rapidly as possible to England in such manner as he may deem necessary to assure their safe delivery and to use armed convoys on the sea and in the air to insure that delivery."

SPEAKERS APPLAUDED

The program, arranged by a committee from the George R. Anderson post of the American Legion, was not as well attended as had been anticipated but the applause which greeted the statements of the speaker indicated the approval of his viewpoints by his audience.

Kerr rapped business management and labor leadership which stood in the pathway of defense preparation and warned against the so-called leaders who plead for appeasement and prattle of defeatism.

"We are committed to a program which requires our fullest effort and complete sacrifice," he declared. "We cannot afford to wait or waste time.

"We know that we cannot get along with the dictators and we do not want to get along with them. Our course is clear, and we are struggling to save our own ideals and our own principles.

"We must either disregard or destroy those who seek to obstruct the pathway we follow. We are for complete defense and we must move quickly. This is not a war of men, but of machines. We can make the machines.

"We have the horrible example of other nations which sought to appease the totalitarian leaders; we cannot and will not make the mistake they made."

AMERICAN SPIRIT PREVAILS

"There are those who are ready to fight, they say, when the enemy reaches our shores. I say, let's stop that enemy on other shores. We do not want to wait until that deadly time.

"Our history is replete with instances where freemen fighting for a cause in which they have believed have accomplished miracles and the same American spirit that inspired these heroes of our history is still with us and must be preserved.

"As Americans we must make the resolve that no sacrifice and no effort can be too great for us to make in this drive to save American ideals and the ideals of democracy."

Thad Orr was master of ceremonies at the meeting. A concert by the Ardmore High School Band under the leadership of E. Paul Enix preceded the program proper.

The colors were advanced as the opening feature with representatives of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officiating. The Reverend George H. Quarterman pronounced the invocation. A group of Boy Scouts led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

Special guests were Sam Battles, France Paris, Democratic State chairman, and Mrs. Kerr.

Quinn Wicker, mayor, spoke briefly commending the leaders who arranged the meeting.

Closing feature of the program was the singing of God Bless America by the audience, led by Mrs. Meredith Rawlins.

Representatives of all organizations in the city were present on the platform.

Condition of the Bituminous Coal Industry in the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

LETTER FROM NORTHWESTERN RETAIL COAL DEALERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NORTHWESTERN RETAIL COAL DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 19, 1941.

The Honorable JOSHUA JOHNS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A condition has developed in the bituminous-coal industry at the present time which seriously concerns the northwest coal industry and the consuming public in the Northwest. This is brought about by virtue of the fact that a very substantial part of all coal supplies for the northwest territory is shipped across the Great Lakes to docks at Duluth, Superior, Ashland, Manitowac, Green Bay, and Milwaukee. Stocks of coal on hand at these various docks are now at the lowest point in a number of years. Very little coal is moving across the Great Lakes at the present time.

There is a very real threat to the Northwest in the much discussed additional coal strike in the bituminous-coal mines. In the event that it occurs, navigation across the Great Lakes will be delayed for a period of not less than an additional 30 days. There has already been lost a period of 60 days' navigation across the Great Lakes.

If there is anything that can be done by Congress or by the Government of the United States to prevent any additional shut-down of the bituminous-coal mines, it will be most helpful to the coal industry and to the public in the Northwest. Your interest and cooperation is earnestly solicited.

Yours very truly,

NORTHWESTERN RETAIL COAL DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
B. E. URHEIM, *Secretary.*

American Association of Independent Small Business Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY ALFRED CALVIN GAUNT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, although it was delivered nearly a year ago, I had never seen until very recently a copy of the speech of Alfred Calvin Gaunt, chairman of the Advisory Council of Independent Small Business, delivered in Washington last June 14. I think some of the things Mr. Gaunt says are so true and so important that I am asking to have portions of this speech reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Every economic force at work in our country today favors big business and monopoly. But our defense program cannot succeed unless the little businesses are brought into it and made a part of it. And certainly unless we bestir ourselves and fight now for these small enterprises and against the monopoly that stifles them, I shudder to think what will happen to them in the post-defense period. A good start for all of us will be to read what Mr. Gaunt has to say.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF ALFRED CALVIN GAUNT

Small businesses, employing less than 200 workers, comprise 98.7 percent of all businesses, according to the Social Security Board's latest figures. They employ half of all wage earners and do 65 percent of the Nation's business. An independent small business, as defined by the American Association of Independent Small Business, is one which does less than 5 percent of the business in its particular field and whose management or control is independent of outside domination.

THE TRUE NOTE

Deterioration of our economic picture has been attributed to many causes. The one true note that runs through most criticisms of our maladjusted economy is that undue restriction is at the root of all our troubles, whether it be restriction of output by labor through overshort hours or a slow-down attitude, by agriculture through a policy of destroying crops or raising less, by industry in maintaining prices or policies which curtail demand, by investors with timid capital which goes into tax-exempt securities instead of financing new enterprise, or by Government in restricting the employment of American workers by admitting from abroad materials that American labor can well produce at home.

Maintained prices or monopolistic practices or production restrictions, whether perpetrated by agriculture, or by labor, or by industry, or by Government, are the greatest deterrents to consumption and the greatest handicaps to recovery.

Lower prices mean more demand. If we as producers can lower prices or improve quality, we benefit doubly. The demand is multiplied because for every producer in America there are three consumers. So we are blessed with more work and less unemployment.

Therefore the promotion of independent small business with that full and free competition, which is the very antithesis of some big business, with its monopolistic tendencies, is the sound and immediate answer to our so-called No. 1 problem of unemployment.

The competitive instinct is one of the most powerful instincts of mankind. We call it by many names—ambition, individual initiative, fear of failure, desire for reward, venturesomeness, pioneer spirit. It is a driving force that is most noticeable in youth. It is the direct opposite of any philosophy of a so-called social security that would provide hand-outs rather than jobs. It has its unpleasant aspects, of course, and must be kept of service to the common good by a cooperative spirit of friendliness and helpfulness to one's fellows.

BIG GROWING BIGGER?

Forty-five years ago, with a population of only 64,000,000 persons, there were 350,000 independent manufacturing concerns in the United States, while today, with a population twice as large, there are less than 210,000. From 1926 to 1929, 960 corporations made $16,000,000,000, which was about the same amount that 450,000 smaller businesses made. But from 1930 to 1935 the 960 companies continued to make profits of $9,000,000,000, while the 450,000 lost seventeen billions.

Small independent business is steadily being merged or eliminated, while big business and concentration of wealth are growing apace. In only 3 years, from 1930 to 1933, 600,000 independent enterprises in industry, trade, and the professions were driven out of business—1 out of 6. The survivors tremble.

The rise of the need of big Government is because of the development of big business and its attendant evils. Only by a big Government can big business be regulated or controlled. And big business must be regulated or controlled or it can run wild, as did, for instance, Standard Oil, when it sought and obtained secret rebates to the effect that competition was destroyed, and Standard Oil was reaching the position of monopoly, where all citizens could have been compelled to pay on a necessity of life any tribute demanded.

We read in the New York Times of May 28, of the indictment of an optical monopoly that makes us pay $20 for spectacles that could be profitably sold for $7.50, with one of the principal members of the trust being a concern under the domination of the Ger-

man trust or cartel. Only a big Government, with its enforcement of its Sherman Law can curb such vicious monopolies.

Let's list some concrete examples of handicaps operating against small-scale operation:

1. Inequitable burden on small enterprise of governmental returns and reports.

2. Disproportionate cost to small units of credit accommodation and financing and insurance and other services.

3. Undue and discriminatory quantity and cumulative discounts. The Postal Service is a good example of democracy in prices. Letter postage is 2 cents regardless of the customer or the quantity.

4. Reciprocal buying: Big No. 1 can and does say to big No. 2, "Regardless of the fact that you are getting good service from small independents, unless you buy from me everything in my line which you use, you lose my business."

5. Unfair competition such as less-than-cost selling in certain territory by big business to clean out independents.

6. Use of patents and patent pools for price-fixing agreements of industry-wide scope.

7. Lack of enforcement of laws against monopolistic practices and price fixing.

Let's also list concrete things that will help independent small business.

OUR DUTIES

1. Keep the country out of war. With adequate defense, let our leadership be that of tranquilizers and not that of provocateurs.

2. Let any emergency measures of promulgation of overlong hours of labor, or of agriculture or industrial regimentation, be delayed as long as possible, and then be effectively limited to the terms of the emergency.

3. Promote full, free, and fair competitive enterprise in industry, trade, and agriculture.

4. Promote proprietor-owned enterprise with the social benefits resulting from close contact between owners and employees.

5. Discourage tendencies toward absentee ownership which work to destroy human relationship and thus engender the wholesale curtailing of employment at the first sign of business recession.

6. Freeze overlarge chains at present levels or unwind them where they constitute threat of monopoly. Weigh against any alleged lower prices of chain stores, with their impersonal, distant, and absentee control, the violation of those sentiments of solidarity which we all implicitly feel for our fellow men.

7. Retard the accelerating absorption of business by big aggregations of capital as an insidious menace to the liberty of the citizen.

8. Limit so-called benefit payments for restriction of production to not over $10,000 to any one outfit, or discontinue altogether.

GOVERNMENT'S DUTIES

9. Let any War Resources or other boards and commissions be constituted to include representatives of independent small business and of agriculture, as well as big business, labor, and consumer.

10. Let such regimentation as may be necessary be on a graduated basis, with big business first, medium business next, and the tiny "pants presser" entirely exempt.

11. Curtail wasteful expenditures and work toward a balance of the Budget.

12. Curtail or abolish the issue of tax-exempt securities, such as may be used for purposes of tax evasion.

13. Repeal the present so-called reciprocity wherever it deprives American workers of their jobs, and seek true reciprocity whereby we promote the exchange of materials of which we have a surplus for materials that we lack.

14. Eliminate State barriers affecting interstate trade.

15. Outlaw monopoly or monopolistic practices.

16. Regulate closely the operations of natural monopolies or utilities and their application of excessive salaries and rates in the interest of the whole public.

17. Abolish the holding company as a device for owning, controlling, and managing other corporations, for avoiding competition, for tax evasion.

18. Reestablish parity for industry and labor by debarring products of foreign low-paid labor which unfairly compete with products made under American conditions.

As You Sow, So You Reap—The Battle of Armageddon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

POEMS BY CITIZEN OF CHICAGO

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two original poems written by a citizen of Chicago:

AS YOU SOW, SO YOU REAP

(Book of Job IV: 6; Galatians VI: 7; Proverbs XXII: 6)

You sowed into the minds of young and old
The hellish seed of hatred millionfold.
You taught the very babes to scorn and hate,
As did Benito, your confederate.
You warped the souls of dupes by hook and crook,
He by his snout, you by your beak and—book,
In history the sole one of its kind,
The loony bastard of a rabid mind.
Do you recall its crack-brained lore of thought?
Not one lone line of common sense it taught,
But hatred only, of a madman's rage,
From top to bottom and from page to page.

This seedy rubbish from a seedy brain
Was fed by both of you with might and main.
And ceaselessly you nurtured it to grow,
To share it promptly with your erstwhile foe,
The one you both abused and called him red,
When seemingly he got of you ahead.
And, finally, with half the world ablaze,
You joined, the three of you, the yellow race.
And now you'll reap what you have sown in crime!
Your crop matured, and it is harvest's time.

The reaper has appeared. His name is Mars!
He'll stride along and end this bloody farce.
For hate breeds hate, as spite breeds spite, and spurn—
All those you hated, hate you in return.
All decent mankind, north, south, east, and west,
Hate human beasts of your kind like the pest.
And now you rant, you swear at us, and cuss—
Did you expect a lover's kiss from us?
Did you suppose that we sit idly by
While you rain deadly hatred from the sky?
While all of you rob wholesale, burn and sack
Your very neighbors like a wolfish pack?
Like thugs and ruffians, whether shine or storm,
You're naught but highwaymen in uniform!
And while you burglarized states far and near,
Did you imagine we were struck with fear?
You sowed the seeds of war in hate and sin,
As cutthroats do, but you will never win!
The scale has swung, and all the dice are tossed—
Who sows the wind will reap the holocaust!

—*Civis Americanus.*

THE BATTLE OF ARMAGEDDON

No bombs from out the clouds or sea below
Will in near future strike the final blow.
And no torpedoes with their thund'rous crash
Will in this struggle score the final smash.
No tanks on ground, no foe in sky or sea
Will ever quench our torch of liberty!
It is still blazing in its dazzling light—
The symbol stellar for the final fight.

The Armageddon battle, when 'tis fought,
Will down forever deviltry and fraught,
All reign of terror from the fists of mail,
And all mass murder in its gory trail;
All pillage, robbery, and wholesale pelf
By fiends committed from their victims' shelf.
When it is faught some day, all war will cease,
And human kind will breathe again in peace.

The Armageddon battle is at hand,
The conflict final over sea and land.
No longer 'tis a bloody home affair,
But spheric in its nature ev'rywhere;
Gigantic in its littoral extent—
The fray of continent 'gainst continent,
Of west against the east, both front and rear,
Of hemisphere against a hemisphere!

Thus speaks a prophecy of ages old.
Its test in battle never could be told,
For there was none in mankind's history
Announced supreme for all the time to be.
And yet a conflict, final and complete,
Is bound to come, should freedom meet defeat,
When all the west will fight the east en masse—
The Armageddon, then, may come to pass.

—*Civis Americanus.*

Farmers Protest Increase in Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in discussing levies to safeguard national security we should consider thoroughly the admonition of President Roosevelt that the taxes imposed upon the American people shall not make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

To avoid inequalities in the imposition and burden of taxation we must consider carefully the basic theories of taxation and weigh painstakingly the effects of proposed taxes upon the economic well-being and the morale of the people.

The Congress of the United States has a sacred trust to see to it that taxes should be imposed in accordance with our democratic ideals of equality.

Fair and just taxation is the bulwark of democracy. Democratic principles

cannot survive in a nation where inequitable tax burdens are imposed upon the people.

A study of history reveals that the democratic way of life has gone forward only when just taxation prevailed. The history of the rise of representative government in the world consists chiefly of the people's struggle for control over the public purse strings—the control of taxation and appropriation. Our constitutional form of government developed largely because transference of the source of governmental authority from the person of the ruler to the people brought about sounder principles of taxation. King John in accepting the Magna Carta at Runnymede in 1215 abandoned his authority for high-handed and unfair taxation, giving the barons more control over the levying and spending of taxes.

At the time the common people were not represented in the council, and the struggle was between the King and his barons. Between the granting of the Magna Carta in 1215 and the adoption of the Bill of Rights in 1689, the English people, from which our American stock has largely descended, and whose traditions guide us in our destiny, pressed steadily for enlargement of their control over taxation and appropriation. The Bill of Rights transferred the taxing power from the Crown to Parliament.

The American Colonies broke away from their mother country largely because of the unfair tax burdens that were imposed upon them through the arbitrary dictates of King George III. The colonists believed that democratic freedom could not exist and flourish under any system of taxation without representation. The American Revolution thus was brought about chiefly from unfair taxation policies.

As representatives of a democratic people, the Congress of the United States, therefore, in this critical time should examine carefully the guiding principles of taxation to be used in framing the levies needed to defray the cost of the national-defense program.

There are three traditional types of taxation in the United States:

First. Taxes on wealth.

Second. Levies to control forces in the public interest.

Third. Benefit taxes.

It should be pointed out, however, at this point that there are two kinds of wealth in the United States, namely, first, tangible wealth and, second, token wealth. Real estate, machinery, automobiles, and other physical objects are tangible wealth. Token wealth consists of money, stocks and bonds, and Government securities. These tokens merely represent their holders' shares in the physical wealth of the land. All the stocks, bonds, and other so-called token wealth in the whole United States could be obliterated and the intrinsic wealth of the Nation would not be diminished one iota.

It would appear that taxation of the token wealth of the United States should receive first consideration in any tax program to defray the cost of national security.

The second type of taxes are those levied to control forces in the public interest. Taxes on liquor and tobacco are at higher rates than on other commodities, as food and clothing. The Congress of the United States also for many years has enacted high tariffs on certain commodities, as wool and sugar, to protect the standards of living of American workmen from being undermined by competition from cheap labor abroad.

It should be pointed out, however, at this point that all taxes, regardless of their broad objectives, aim to raise revenue.

The third type of taxes, the so-called benefit taxes, are levied primarily to defray the costs of special services provided by Government. The Federal Government charges 3 cents to mail a letter to cover the cost of the particular service provided. Gasoline levies and automobile registration fees were inaugurated by the States to obtain money from highway users to build and maintain roads. Such levies are based upon the benefits received. The family that does not own an automobile does not pay such taxes.

Congress, in 1932, adopted a temporary emergency tax on gasoline. Revenue of the Government was at that time at its depression low, standing at only about one-quarter of its level in recent years. The tax was planned only as a temporary expedient, to be removed within a year or two.

However, Congress has repeatedly extended the tax, competing with the States in its search for revenue. Last year Congress increased the tax by 50 percent for defense purposes. Thus, motor fuel is now subjected to double taxation by the Federal Government, over and above the heavy levies imposed by the States.

Our farm and agricultural organizations contend that to increase further the Federal tax on motor fuel would serve only to confuse and muddle the principles of taxation in a democratic people. The burden of Federal taxation on motor fuel now stands at 12 percent of the retail price. That burden is paid largely from the pocketbooks of families with modest incomes.

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau has warned Congress from imposing taxes upon the table of the workingman. Mr. Speaker, levies on motor fuel are taxes that fall chiefly upon the efforts of the average man to earn a livelihood. According to the United States Public Roads Administration, more than half of the gasoline used in passenger cars is consumed by men and women in earning a living.

A tax on motor fuel, therefore, is chiefly a burden upon the efforts of millions of men and women to earn a living. There are few taxes on the table of the workingmen that can compare with the present Federal tax on the workingman's motor fuel.

If the Federal Government increases its tax on motor fuel, the burden of such taxation will fall largely upon those families least able to pay increased taxation upon so vital a prop to their present standards of living. There are 12,000,000 car-owning families, it is estimated, in the United States with incomes of less than $30 a week. By no stretch of the imagination could these families be thought of as wealthy. These should not be subjected to excessive taxation by the Federal Government either on their table or upon their transportation. Any increase in motor-fuel taxation by the Federal Government can result only in depressing the standards of living of the lower-income families of the Nation.

GRANGE OPPOSES INCREASE

Mr. Fred Brenckman, national legislative representative of the National Grange, in testifying against the proposed increase in the gasoline tax, before the Ways and Means Committee, on May 16, 1941, said:

We do not believe that the existing Federal tax of 1½ cents per gallon on gasoline should be increased. * * *

So far as agriculture is concerned, motor transportation under modern conditions is not a luxury but an absolute necessity. More than 1,000,000 motortrucks, or about one-fourth of the country's total, are owned and operated by farmers. A recent survey discloses the fact that with the abandonment of many branch lines of railroads that are no longer profitable, there are about 48,000 communities throughout the United States that are entirely dependent upon highway transportation.

The farmer must have his motor-vehicle facilities, and he does not feel that his use of the highways is a proper and adequate measure by which to determine his contribution toward the cost of national defense.

Some idea of the importance of the motor vehicle to the American farmer may be gained from the records of the United States Department of Agriculture, which show that approximately 27 percent of the butter, 39 percent of the eggs, 65 percent of the poultry, 40 percent of the fruit and vegetables, 62 percent of the cattle, 61 percent of the calves, 68 percent of the hogs, 29 percent of the sheep and lambs, and 50 percent of the mules and horses are now moved from farm to market by truck.

Looking For Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, one illustration of the way in which the President has advocated peace, while carrying a chip on his shoulder and looking for trouble, is well shown by an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune on May 20. That editorial is as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 20, 1941]

INTO THE WAR ZONE

Mr. Roosevelt told the inquiring reporters that he didn't think Germany would be able to blockade the Red Sea and that the United States was merely adhering to its unbroken policy of insisting on the freedom of the seas. When Mr. Stimson, as a proxy voice, demanded

the convoying of supply ships, he referred to piracy and intimated that if an American warship encountered a raider it would mean merely dealing with outlawry on the sea.

When he made that reference there was an expectation that more would be heard of it, and Mr. Roosevelt obliges. He refers to the Barbary pirates which our new Republic had to fight and to the undeclared war with France to protect our shipping. With these illustrations he prepares a way for new naval encounters along these lines.

Mr. Roosevelt's reversion to the freedom of the seas is a departure from the position he took when he started his war moves by asking for repeal of the Neutrality Act. Mr. Wilson, when the other World War began, did insist upon freedom of the seas. He demanded that Germany abide by the recognized rules of naval warfare, and he also addressed himself sharply to the British Government, protesting against violation of American rights.

Mr. Roosevelt in 1939 said in effect that this was a mistake. He said that it gave rise to the incidents which drew America into the other war. It allowed American ships to go into dangerous zones where they were destroyed. It was a cause of war and he didn't want any of it. He wanted authority to prohibit American ships and American citizens from going into war zones and that would preserve the peace. He put freedom of the seas on the shelf as a dangerous doctrine and Congress gave him authority for which he asked.

Now he uses that authority to open up a war zone and is back in Mr. Wilson's position without any of Mr. Wilson's consistency in the matter. Furthermore, he has no reason to hope, as Mr. Wilson might have had, that he can carry his point and make the American policy respected. Mr. Wilson almost did. But what he got out of it in the end, for this and for other reasons, was the war he said he was trying to avoid.

Mr. Roosevelt rejects his own policy and goes back to the Wilsonian principles because he wants the war he said he wanted to avoid. If he had persisted along the lines he first adopted, he might have made it very difficult for this country to find any cause for war. If he were doing now what he promised in September 1939, the peace of the United States might not be threatened. He has reversed himself on all points, he has betrayed the faith he pledged to the people in the beginning, and he is doing every war-provoking thing that he said he would not do.

The authority he asked for one purpose he is using for an exactly contradictory purpose; his cash-and-carry has become contribution and convoy; his war-zone restrictions have been split to permit the carrying of material of war by American ships into the Egyptian war zone, and he asks the German raiders what they are going to do about it.

What he says, in effect, is, "Here's an American ship; so what?"

A Separate Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, a separate air force independent of the Army and the Navy and coequal with them has great public appeal and sounds logical on the face of it. However, such a military division does not, in my opinion, fit the military needs of the situation for the United States at this time. The time may come, and I very strongly feel that it will come, when military and naval aviation will not bear the same relationship to our Army and Navy that they do today. I think the time is now virtually at hand when experience in aviation will be a prerequisite of all high military or naval command. I visualize the time when air will be the main striking force and the ground and surface naval forces will be in support of the air force; but a realistic examination of the peculiar military problems of the United States does not indicate that a separate independent air force will fit our needs under present circumstances.

In my opinion, 90 percent of the military problem of the United States in its initial critical stages of perhaps the first 6 months, is naval. Naval aviation is just as distinct from Army aviation as the Navy is itself distinct from the Army. It merely happens that in both cases they use the same method of transportation—the air. This is no proof that aviation is in itself separate from either the Army or the Navy. Both the Army and the Navy use gunpowder as their main weapon. This does not mean that therefore the Army and the Navy should be consolidated. If 90 percent of our military problem is naval, then it stands to reason that 90 percent of our aviation problems is naval aviation. No one expects that a thoroughly trained, competent naval officer should also be a thoroughly competent Army officer. Yet it is just as reasonable to expect this as it is to expect that a naval aviator should be a competent Army aviator or vice versa. The training, the mission, and the target of the naval aviator and of the Army aviator are entirely independent of and unrelated to each other. In the one case the target is a naval target, and in the other case it is a ground target. An average human being has done all that the average human being is capable of accomplishing if he has become a thoroughly competent and well-trained naval aviator, experienced in naval navigation, naval missions, naval tactics, and the ability to recognize and differentiate from great altitudes not only all types of surface vessels but also the silhouettes of every type of vessel of every different nation's navy. An Army aviator has accomplished all that the average human being can accomplish if he has become a thoroughly competent and highly trained Army aviator, experienced in land-flying navigation, Army tactics, military formations, and in ability to recognize, estimate, and properly report the size of troops, their tactical maneuvering, and to most effectively interfere with their operations by the appropriate use of machine gunning, high-level bombing, or dive bombing. To try to make both a naval aviator and an Army aviator out of the same individual is very likely to result in a pilot becoming thoroughly accomplished in neither branch of aviation. One of the tragedies of the British campaign in Norway when they lost the Battle of Narvick was the fact that they had a separate air force neither properly trained nor equipped for naval aviation and naval cooperation. The Navy had no control over the Royal Air Force; the Royal Air Force had no control over the aircraft carriers. The results are well known to the world. The Royal Air Force pilots in many instances were unable to distinguish their own ships from the German ships, and too often British ships were bombed unintentionally by Royal Air Force pilots.

The United States today has the most competent, efficient, and effective naval aviation force in the world. To endanger this effectiveness at this time might very well become a world tragedy. What I do believe is absolutely essential, however, is that in both the Army and the Navy separate Air Corps be set up, similar to the Marine Corps in the Navy. The Navy has no such Air Corps, and its Bureau of Aeronautics is largely only a procurement organization. In the Army the so-called Air Corps is simply a branch similar to infantry or artillery. The United States Marine Corps is recognized as perhaps the most highly efficient fighting force in the world. It is a complete separate military entity but within the framework of the Navy. In my opinion, both the Army and Navy need such an organization of their aviation, within the Navy and within the Army.

So often we hear that the all important thing is to gain supremacy of the air. Actually, the all important thing is to gain military supremacy, of which air is only a part, albeit a very vital part. But merely to gain supremacy of the air, without naval and military control also, is ineffective and gains little. Germany has had superiority in the air from the beginning of this war, but lacking naval control of the Atlantic, has failed to conquer the British Isles.

The converse is also true. Naval superiority, without control of the air, is ineffective. Control of the air is vital to success either on land or on sea. No matter how large or efficient our Army or Navy are, unless we can control the air for both of them, we cannot win a war.

I am thoroughly sold on air power, and its absolute importance. The important thing is to get superior air power.

The question of a separate air force versus Army and Navy Air Corps, is not in itself the question of air power. This is merely a question as how to best organize your air power. I not only concede the dominant character of air power, but I have been carrying on vigorous fight in and out of Congress for years to step up our aviation to the point of dominant air power for us.

The method of organizing and administering aviation is a very important matter. Since airplanes cannot of themselves occupy territory any more than artillery can, but are both auxiliaries to infantry, the control of airplanes must be under the same supreme military command as the artillery, tanks, infantry, and so forth. True, airplanes can transport troops, but it is the infantry as passengers who occupy the territory seized, and not the crew of the plane who do the occupying.

Merely aerial bombings, no matter how effective, no matter how intense nor how

extended, will not in themselves win a war. The ability to follow up effectively with troops is the dominating factor. You may not have actually to use the troops or even commence the physical land force invasion, but your ability and readiness to do so must be established. If after sufficient bombing, the home defenses are sufficiently shattered to make your invasion certain to succeed, the enemy quite likely will capitulate rather than suffer further damage with certain defeat as the outcome. No Allied soldier ever set a foot on German soil until after Germany surrendered in 1918. But, Germany knew that the Allies, with the American reinforcements, were by then capable of an invasion of Germany.

The Navy's effectiveness has been materially lessened, if not destroyed when it operates close enough to shore so that land-based aircraft can dominate coastal waters. This does not mean that navies are obsolete. Far from it. They still dominate the high seas.

The battleships will disappear, with the rest of the Navy, when the commerce of the world is carried in airplanes.

What will actually happen then, is that the Navy will take wings, and in effect we will have virtual flying battleships.

The fundamental military and naval situation, however, will not be altered.

Unified military control will still be an absolute necessity.

The Challenge to World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, COORDINATOR OF COMMERCIAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most interesting and informative address delivered by Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller, on the subject The Challenge to World Trade. Mr. Rockefeller, who is Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, spoke at the world trade luncheon of the New York Foreign Trade Week Committee, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on May 19, 1941. I know that the Members of the Congress will be interested in reading about what Mr. Rockefeller and his organization are doing to combat subversive activities in this hemisphere and to cement the friendly relations existing between the peoples of North and South America.

In this fateful year of 1941, foreign-trade week takes on special significance.

In ordinary times foreign-trade week has focused attention on the importance of external trade to our national well-being. It has been an occasion to reaffirm our faith in trade conducted on a plane of mutual advantage—openly, fairly, and with peaceful intent.

But these are no ordinary times. The world is locked in a struggle in which is at stake every institution that contributes to our spiritual and material welfare. We must go beyond a simple expression of confidence in liberal economic policies as an instrument of economic progress.

How best can that instrument be preserved and strengthened? How best can we insure the survival of a world in which such policies will be acceptable?

I believe the answer is clear: We must produce the goods needed in defense of the free way of life. We must see that those goods reach the armies of the democracies. I am confident that we will. We will unite in support of any and all measures that may be necessary to achieve these purposes.

The American people, as always, are responding to the moral issues of the struggle for human freedom. On these grounds alone we reject the passive role. On these grounds alone we enlist on the side of the democracies the greatest engines of production the world has ever seen—the might of American industry.

But the economic issues further fortify us in the decision that democracy must survive.

You who operate on the far-flung frontiers of American trade well know wherein lies our national interest. You have seen the fate of businessmen who sought to temporize with the aggressor. You have seen the course of commercial development in Germany during the past decade. You see the pattern of economic life in the countries that have fallen. You know the blueprint which Germany has drafted for the world.

Can we trade with this Germany?

Can we trade with an enslaved Europe?

Can we continue healthy trade relations even within our own hemisphere, once the familiar technique is fully unleashed—the deliberate use of commerce to extend political authority, the sapping of the strength of peaceful nations by infiltration, by propaganda, and by sowing of internal dissension?

Can we visualize a victorious Germany denying itself the greatest prize of them all—the Americas, North, South, and Central?

Can we hope to prosper with the economic life of the rest of the world subordinated to a conqueror's lust for world domination, geared to the task of bringing down the last great citadels of freedom?

Let us be realistic. The time is short, the issue clear, the answer is, "No."

A compromise is unthinkable. He who would have to trade with Hitler would be compelled to do so on Hitler's terms. He would be compelled to deliberately close his eyes to the coupling of commerce with political penetration.

The position of this Government was set forth by Secretary of State Hull at Habana in this way: "Only where equal treatment, fair practices, nondiscrimination, and peaceful motives lie beneath trade can it develop to the degree needed to rehabilitate a shattered world and to provide a foundation for further economic progress."

It is clearly to our national interest to maintain foreign trade, a healthy trade in a free world. There is no denying this. We tend to underestimate the importance of our $4,000,000,000 of exports and $2,500,000,000 of imports when we compare it with our national income of $72,000,000,000 last year. Foreign trade is vital to particular areas and particular segments of our production. Its benefits permeate our economic life at all points.

Yes, we want and need foreign trade, but not that trade which is used by totalitarian powers as a lever to political domination.

We need Europe, but let us not confuse pre-war Europe with the Europe which Germany would reorient as slave to a master. Under the Hitler blueprint human and national interests would be sacrificed relentlessly in ruthless shifts of population, industries, and occupations. Such a reorganization, stemming from the continuing quest for political power, would force upon the world a drastic revision of the whole mechanism of international trade. It would force upon us a revision of our whole economy in an effort to hold our own in an unending economic war.

I have confidence in the drive and organizational capacity of the free Americas once fully aroused to danger. But unless we make our resistance to the Nazi threat effective now, we make doubly difficult the task of preserving our political institutions, maintaining our standards of living, and retaining our social gains.

We realize that when the war is over and the victory is won, we must be prepared to face major changes in our international economic relations. But we shall at least be sitting down to the problem in the company of free men.

As national defense has enlisted more and more of the Nation's productive energies, a major role has fallen to those of you who maintain trade relations with the other American republics. It may seem commonplace to mention (1) the replacement of agents engaged in anti-American activity; (2) the expanded purchases from Latin America; (3) adequate shipping in the inter-American trade; and (4) the supplying of essential manufactured goods to the other American republics.

Yet these add up to the maintenance of economic stability of the Americas, and that is a major contribution to hemisphere defense. The job is to a large extent in your hands. It is against the other American republics that the first attack on this hemisphere would be launched by aggressors. These are the areas whose economic vulnerability would provide the first target. And on them would be based the final challenge to a free America.

Our people are alert to the importance of hemisphere solidarity. Only last week the Gallup poll of public opinion revealed that 86 percent of the people would approve taking up the arms of defense in case of an attack on any one of the American republics.

Our Government also is alert to the importance of hemisphere solidarity. It is making continued progress in the creation and use of machinery for closer inter-American cooperation—the wise use of funds of the Export-Import Bank, joint action in regard to commodity problems, participation in the inter-American bank, and in the establishment of the Inter-American Development Commission, which has already set up nine local councils in as many countries, the creation of the merchandising advisory service, are all part of this effort.

But you men hold the key to the full performance of this job. This is clear from the contributions you have already made and from the responsibilities which rest upon you today.

We are already buying at a heavily increased pace in the other American republics. A considerable portion of the increase derives from the requirements of our tremendous defense program, but in no small measure it reflects your efforts to find products that can be successfully marketed in the United States.

Some of you may have seen a dispatch from Berlin in the newspapers last week in which the Berlin Institute for Business Research charged, among other things, that we have failed to maintain our purchases from Central and South America since May 1940. Actually, our purchases from the other American republics in the last half of 1940 were 12 percent higher than in the same period of 1939 and 39 percent higher than in the same period of 1938. In the first quarter of 1941 our purchases were 41 percent higher than during

the same period of 1940. We are now buying from the other American republics at the rate of a billion dollars a year.

I do not propose to go into a point-by-point discussion of the other errors and misrepresentations in the Berlin analysis, but I cannot refrain from one additional comment. When Berlin mentions surpluses with which the Americas are glutted, when it points to the normal ability of Europe to absorb them, it brings home to me more strongly than ever the fact that we must not allow trade to be strait-jacketed into the Nazi pattern, that we must not allow the great consuming capacity of the Continent of Europe to be wiped out by the enslaving of its people.

Certainly Europe is not consuming what it should consume. Certainly the Americas feel this loss of markets. But an enslaved Europe producing under the lash of the conqueror, and an America driven to trade intended to enslave them as well, is a mighty poor alternative to hold out to a free people.

I should like to mention particularly an area in which American exporters are rendering an effective service in the interest of hemisphere defense. The Office of the Coordinator in conjunction with the Departments of State and Commerce has been engaged for the past few months in enlisting the cooperation of our exporting firms in replacing representatives who are identified directly or indirectly with anti-American activities in the other American republics. Our objective is to withdraw from these subversive elements the financial support and prestige acquired through the represenation of United States business which they have been using to combat and weaken hemispheric solidarity.

The response to this aspect of our defense effort has been one of immediate and wholehearted cooperation. It is a large job, and the job is by no means completed, but I can assure you that we are getting results. To date the problem has been taken up directly with upward of a thousand companies and already we know that hundreds of undesirable representatives have been replaced; hundreds more are in the process of being replaced. We have communicated with some 17,000 companies interested in export trade and have requested them to use care in taking on new representatives and accounts. The Department of Commerce is assisting exporters in checking their existing representatives and in making new connections. The result has been that the undesirable agents are finding it almost impossible to do business with United States companies today.

Shortly we hope to be able to make a comprehensive report on the accomplishments of this cooperative approach to a most serious problem. We hope the entire job can be done through the cooperative approach. Based on the response received so far there can be no question that an overwhelming majority of responsible exporters recognize that it is to our advantage to have our goods distributed abroad by representatives who will not mix trade with political penetration or subversive activities. It is imperative in a cooperative approach to this problem that each of us charge himself with the responsibility for seeing that clean-up action is taken and taken promptly.

One of the most serious problems facing us today is the supplying of minimum import requirements of our neighbors. In this period of international crisis you who are engaged in export trade are faced with an important strategic part in the Nation's defense effort. Inseparable from our determination to preserve the economic stability of the hemisphere is our responsibility for keeping its nations supplied with their vital production requirements.

Many of you are already working at full capacity on defense business and civilian consumption. Yet, recognizing that our aid to the democracies is in itself defense of our neighbors, you must not lose sight of the vital requirements of these nations. As you plan for future production, you should always keep in mind the importance of making deliveries on orders of the other American republics.

The United States is the only remaining major source of these nations for manufactured and semimanufactured goods. Their purchases from us have already increased from about $500,000,000 in 1939 to around $750,000,000 and probably a still larger volume of demands on your production will be forthcoming. With their export markets already dislocated by the war, it is doubly important that the industrial plants, the construction work, and the efforts at diversification of industry continue functioning.

If you fail to meet their minimum import requirements, factories will close down for want of machinery, workers will be laid off from construction work, and industrial employment for lack of small quantities of imported goods, with the result that an additional strain will be put upon their economies.

Our national-defense program, our program of aid to the democracies fighting on the front lines, are measures of hemisphere defense. After we meet the demands of these efforts, our industry must turn its productive capacity in the direction of our neighbors as well as toward sustaining our needs at home.

As defense-conscious Americans engaged in export trade you will recognize the soundness of such an approach. When the emergency is over, we shall be able to point with pride to an industry which was able to deliver the goods on all fronts.

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

PETITION OF STUDY GROUP OF FARM WOMEN OF PARK COUNTY, MONT.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

We, the undersigned members of a study group composed of farm women of Park County, Mont., say to you, the President of our United States, that we are willing our sons and grandsons should protect our own country and our own shores should that need arise, but we protest their being taken to Europe, Asia, or Africa to fight in foreign wars. We believe you will be violating your oath of office if you send convoys. We believe convoys mean war and war means sending our sons and grandsons to slaughter. We protest.

Mrs. A. M. Kirscher, Mrs. M. D. Stieves, Mrs. D. Z. David, Mrs. G. A. Chadbourne, Mrs. A. W. Chadbourne, Mrs. Guy Gibson, Mrs. Gretchen Dunn, Mrs. Louise Gibson, Mrs. Marion W. Kenney, Mrs. Myrtle Birch, Mrs. Bill Gibson, Lucetta Holliday, Mrs. H. D. Von Gundy, Mrs. E. C. Durgan, Mrs. Marion A. Melin, Mrs. J. D. Ballard, Mrs. Beatrice Young, Mrs. E. B. Keitz, Mrs. Haakon L. Nelson, Mrs. John Putzker.

What Constitutes An American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon, as I sat on the platform on the Mall in Central Park, New York City, I saw thousands of people in front of me who had come together to reaffirm their faith in democracy and in the United States. Everywhere throughout this great land of ours, the same stirring scene was being reenacted at about the same time. Last night, I saw a news reel which showed that all of these scenes had been photographically preserved.

I think it both desirable and proper that the leading address delivered in New York City as part of the I Am An American Day celebration on May 18, 1941, should also be preserved for posterity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although I feel sure that this vivid, homely talk of Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, on that occasion will be retained in many places and in many minds for a long time to come. I know that those who did not have the pleasure of hearing Secretary Ickes speak will derive new strength for their democratic belief from his forthright affirmation that our democracy is a positive program rather than the last weak defense of defeatism. His remarks at that time, are as follows:

I want to ask a few simple questions. And then I shall answer them.

What has happened to our vaunted idealism? Why have some of us been behaving like scared chickens? Where is the million-throated, democratic voice of America?

For years it has been dinned into us that we are a weak Nation; that we are an inefficient people; that we are simple-minded. For years we have been told that we are beaten, decayed, and that no part of the world belongs to us any longer.

Some amongst us have fallen for this carefully pickled tripe. Some amongst us have fallen for this calculated poison. Some amongst us have begun to preach that the "wave of the future" has passed over us and left us a wet, dead fish.

They shout—from public platforms, in printed pages, through the microphones—that it is futile to oppose the "wave of the future." They cry that we Americans, we free Americans nourished on Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, hold moth-eaten ideas. They exclaim that there is no room for free men in the world any more and that only the slaves will inherit the earth. America—the America of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and Walt Whitman—they say, is waiting for the undertaker and all the hopes and aspirations that have gone into the making of America are dead, too.

However, my fellow citizens, this is not the real point of the story. The real point—the shameful point—is that many of us are

listening to them and some of us almost believe them.

I say that it is time for the great American people to raise its voice and cry out in mighty triumph what it is to be an American. And why it is that only Americans, with the aid of our brave allies—yes, let's call them "allies"—the British, can and will build the only future worth having. I mean a future, not of concentration camps, not of physical torture and mental strait jackets, not of sawdust bread, or of sawdust Caesars—I mean a future when free men will live free lives in dignity and in security.

This tide of the future, the democratic future, is ours. It is ours if we show ourselves worthy of our culture and of our heritage.

But make no mistake about it; the tide of the democratic future is not like the ocean tide—regular, relentless, and inevitable. Nothing in human affairs is mechanical or inevitable. Nor are Americans mechanical. They are very human indeed.

What constitutes an American? Not color nor race nor religion. Not the pedigree of his family nor the place of his birth. Not the coincidence of his citizenship. Not his social status nor his bank account. Not his trade nor his profession. An American is one who loves justice and believes in the dignity of man. An American is one who will fight for his freedom and that of his neighbor. An American is one who will sacrifice property, ease, and security in order that he and his children may retain the rights of free men. An American is one in whose heart is engraved the immortal second sentence of the Declaration of Independence.

Americans have always known how to fight for their rights and their way of life. Americans are not afraid to fight. They fight joyously in a just cause.

We Americans know that freedom, like peace, is indivisible. We cannot retain our liberty if three-fourths of the world is enslaved. Brutality, injustice, and slavery, if practiced as dictators would have them, universally and systematically, in the long run would destroy us as surely as a fire raging in our nearby neighbor's house would burn ours if we didn't help to put out his.

If we are to retain our own freedom, we must do everything within our power to aid Britain. We must also do everything to restore to the conquered peoples their freedom. This means the Germans, too.

Such a program, if you stop to think, is selfishness on our part. It is the sort of enlightened selfishness that makes the wheels of history go around. It is the sort of enlightened selfishness that wins victories.

Do you know why? Because we cannot live in the world alone, without friends and without allies. If Britain should be defeated, then the totalitarian undertaker will prepare to hang crape on the door of our own independence.

Perhaps you wonder how this could come about? Perhaps you have heard "them"—the wavers of the future—cry, with calculated malice, that even if Britain were defeated we could live alone and defend ourselves single handed, even against the whole world.

I tell you that this is a cold-blooded lie.

We would be alone in the world, facing an unscrupulous military-economic bloc that would dominate all of Europe, all of Africa, most of Asia, and perhaps even Russia and South America. Even to do that, we would have to spend most of our national income on tanks and guns and planes and ships. Nor would this be all. We would have to live perpetually as an armed camp, maintaining a huge standing army, a gigantic air force, two vast navies. And we could not do this without endangering our freedom, our democracy, our way of life.

Perhaps such is the America they—the wavers of the future—foresee. Perhaps such is the America that a certain aviator, with his contempt for democracy, would prefer. Perhaps such is the America that a certain Senator desires. Perhaps such is the America that a certain mail-order executive longs for.

But a perpetually militarized, isolated, and impoverished America is not the America that our fathers came here to build.

It is not the America that has been the dream and the hope of countless generations in all parts of the world.

It is not the America that 130,000,000 of us would care to live in.

The continued security of our country demands that we aid the enslaved millions of Europe—yes; even of Germany—to win back their liberty and independence. I am convinced that if we do not embark upon such a program we will lose our own freedom.

We should be clear on this point. What is convulsing the world today is not merely another old-fashioned war. It is a counter-revolution against our ideas and ideals, against our sense of justice and our human values.

Three systems today compete for world domination. Communism, fascism, and democracy are struggling for social-economic-political world control. As the conflict sharpens it becomes clear that the other two, fascism and communism, are merging into one. They have one common enemy, democracy. They have one common goal, the destruction of democracy.

This is why this war is not an ordinary war. It is not a conflict for markets or territories. It is a desperate struggle for the possession of the souls of men.

This is why the British are not fighting for themselves alone. They are fighting to preserve freedom for mankind. For the moment the battleground is the British Isles. But they are fighting our war; they are the first soldiers in trenches that are also our front-line trenches.

In this world war of ideas and of loyalties we believers in democracy must do two things.

We must unite our forces to form one great democratic international.

We must offer a clear program to freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

Freedom-loving men and women in every land must organize and tighten their ranks. The masses everywhere must be helped to fight their oppressors and conquerors.

We free democratic Americans are in a position to help. We know that the spirit of freedom never dies. We know that men have fought and bled for freedom since time immemorial. We realize that the liberty-loving German people are only temporarily enslaved. We do not doubt that the Italian people are looking forward to the appearance of another Garibaldi. We know how the Poles have for centuries maintained a heroic resistance against tyranny. We remember the brave struggle of the Hungarians under Kossuth and other leaders. We recall the heroic figure of Masaryk and the gallant fight for freedom of the Czech people. The story of the Yugoslavs', especially the Serbs', blows for liberty and independence is a saga of extraordinary heroism. The Greeks will stand again at Thermopylae, as they have in the past. The annals of our American sister republics, too, are glorious with freedom-inspiring exploits. The noble figure of Simon Bolivar, the great South American liberator, has naturally been compared with that of George Washington.

No, liberty never dies. The Genghis Khans come and go. The Attilas come and go. The Hitlers flash and sputter out. But freedom endures.

Destroy a whole generation of those who have known how to walk with heads erect in God's free air, and the next generation will rise against the oppressors and restore freedom. Today in Europe, the Nazi Attila may gloat that he has destroyed democracy. He is wrong. In small farmhouses all over central Europe, in the shops of Germany and Italy, on the docks of Holland and Belgium, freedom still lives in the hearts of men. It will endure like a hardy tree gone into the wintertime, awaiting the spring.

And, like spring, spreading from the south into Scandinavia, the democratic revolution will come. And men with democratic hearts will experience comradeship across artificial boundaries.

These men and women, hundreds of millions of them, now in bondage or threatened with slavery, are our comrades and our allies. They are only waiting for our leadership and our encouragement, for the spark that we can supply.

These hundreds of millions of liberty-loving people, now oppressed, constitute the greatest sixth column in history. They have the will to destroy the Nazi gangsters.

We have always helped in struggles for human freedom. And we will help again.

But our hundreds of millions of liberty-loving allies would despair if we did not provide aid and encouragement.

The quicker we help them the sooner this dreadful revolution will be over.

We cannot, we must not, we dare not, delay much longer.

The fight for Britain is in its crucial stages. We must give the British everything we have. And by everything, I mean everything needed to beat the life out of our common enemy.

The second step must be to aid and encourage our friends and allies everywhere. And by everywhere I mean Europe and Asia and Africa and America.

And, finally, the most important of all, we Americans must gird spiritually for the battle. We must dispel the fog of uncertainty and vacillation. We must greet with raucous laughter the corroding arguments of our appeasers and Fascists. They doubt democracy. We affirm it triumphantly so that all the world may hear:

Here in America we have something so worth living for that it is worth dying for.

The so-called wave of the future is but the slimy backwash of the past. We have not heaved from our necks the tyrant's crushing heel only to stretch our necks out again for its weight.

Not only will we fight for democracy, we will make it more worth fighting for.

Under our free institutions, we will work for the good of mankind, including Hitler's victims in Germany, so that all may have plenty and security.

We American democrats know that when good will prevails among men there will be a world of plenty and a world of security.

In the words of Winston Churchill, "Are we downhearted?"

No; we are not.

But someone is downhearted.

Witness the terrified flight of Hess, Hitler's No. 3 man.

And listen to this—listen carefully:

"The British nation can be counted upon to carry through to victory any struggle that it once enters upon, no matter how long such a struggle may last or however great the sacrifices that may be necessary or whatever the means that have to be employed; and all this even though the actual military equipment at hand may be utterly inadequate when compared with that of other nations."

Do you know who wrote that?

Adolf Hitler in Mein Kampf.

And do you know who took down that dictation?

Rudolf Hess.

We will help to make Hitler's prophecy come true. We will help brave England drive back the hordes from hell who besiege her and then we will join for the destruction of savage and bloodthirsty dictators everywhere. But we must be firm and decisive. We must know our will and make it felt. And we must hurry.

America Speaks Its Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since I delivered my radio talk on May 20 over the Columbia Broadcasting System, many members have expressed an interest in learning what reaction I received to my proposal (which appears on page A2425 of the Appendix of the RECORD) that President Roosevelt call a mediation conference of neutrals to consider the basic outlines of a just and enduring peace for the nations of the world. For that reason, I am reproducing herewith some typical examples of the many wires and letters I have received from members of the radio audience.

Insufficient time has elapsed to permit mail to reach Washington from the West and Middle West so, except for telegrams, most of these communications come from what I believe has been erroneously referred to as the "interventionistic east." All communications are identified by the initials of their senders and the complete letters with original signatures are available in my office if any one wishes to read the whole cross section of correspondence coming in as a result of this broadcast.

Since so many speakers and writers are devoting their entire time to endorsing policies designed to put this country completely into a total war or to the defense of just its private peace, it is both surprising and gratifying to me to learn that so many people in so many sections of America are interested in the possibility that this country can render an even greater service to the world by inspiring and helping to formulate the terms of a sound and just peace. Judging from the overwhelming tone of the correspondence reaching me following my broadcast, a great many Americans feel that we can better serve humanity by helping to end the war now by a peace planned on terms of common decency, sound economics, national justice, and Christian brotherhood than we can by expanding the conflict to engulf the rest of the people of the world. It is to be hoped that our national leaders will fully explore every possibility of ending all the fighting in the world before the fighting intensifies and spreads to the point where it may put an end to all the civilization of the world.

Some letters—about 10 percent of the total—have also reached me in protest against my proposal that President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull invite leading neutrals of the world to meet at some neutral point to discuss among themselves the fundamental basis for bringing order out of chaos and of suggesting a series of provisions which would be considered by this conference as a just and equitable formula for restoring peace. Practically all of these dissenting letters were based on the false assumption that such a peace would be proposed on Hitler's terms or that it would be a "negotiated peace" on the theory that Hitler had won or was winning the war. Such a false assumption entirely misses the purport of my proposal and suggests a defeatist attitude which I am unwilling to admit as valid or acceptable. In my opinion, Hitler has not won this war. Nor can he win it so long as the British Navy and the British Isles withstand attack. Furthermore, I think that Hitler and the German people know that they have not won the war. Many indications coming out of Germany suggest that even there can be found a much greater sentiment for bringing an end to this destructive war than is popularly supposed.

A set of peace suggestions, prepared by a mediation conference of neutrals and agreed upon by them as sound and just, might find a better reception in both Germany and Britain than leaders of either country could presently admit for fear of showing weakness or destroying public confidence in the progress of their side of the war. Certainly, if Hitler and Mussolini refuse to consider or accept the type of equitable and just peace suggestions which could come from a mediation conference of neutrals they will weaken their position dangerously on the home front by depriving themselves of the propaganda value of an appeal to their followers that "we must crush the enemy or be destroyed as a race and as a state."

Since every military strategist of any note agrees that the best and quickest way of invading the continent and stopping the aggressors is to break down the morale of those who follow the dictators, there is much to gain and nothing to lose by encouraging a mediation conference of neutrals to prepare the outlines of a peace which will give victory to all with vengeance to none and which will so settle this worst of all wars that no seeds will be sown in its wake to again crop out in a bloody harvest of worse wars to come or more depraved forms of government ideology to follow after.

SECRETARY HULL HAS PROPOSAL FOR MEDIATION CONFERENCE OF NEUTRALS

Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Secretary of State Hull advising me that the White House has referred to him the proposals for a mediation conference of neutrals which I sent to President Roosevelt before my broadcast of May 20. These proposals are now being studied by the State Department. It will be recalled that on May 18 the Secretary of State himself suggested some general proposals as guide rules for what might become a permanent peace for all the world. It is well that before we weakly say, "it can't be done," we bravely say, "let's do our best to try." Surely while we are at peace there can be no harm done in trying to see our way through to a pattern which the world can accept as an alternative to a type of warfare which puts a premium upon the bombing of babies, the destruction of churches, and the burning of homes.

If we fail to make the effort now, the world has no place else to turn in search of a great influence to right the wrongs of this war and to reestablish order in a world which has gotten almost entirely out of gear.

A war fought on for many years to come, increasing in its death-dealing destruction as it goes, ending in a weird confusion of exhaustion, bankruptcy, and despair for all sides offers little hope for any new order except prolonged disorder and depression, coupled with a near world-wide break-down of morals, economic practices, and political behavior. The four freedoms might have to start from scratch again after the final end of such a war. And while one side might call out "quits" before the other, there can come no victory or security or permanent peace for any side from the ashen fruits of such a finish fight.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is the unerring vision of the common people of America seeing the dark road that lies ahead which stimulates them to write so hopefully and helpfully in favor of America launching a "peace offensive" now, which would not impair the war activities of any belligerent, would not consult their claims and counterclaims, but which would bring together the nonbelligerent leaders of the world for one last try at fixing up the formula for a return of sanity and justice to the world. Those "defeatists of war" who urge that America cannot survive unless we get into a total war and those "defeatists of peace" who urge that because the task is difficult America should make no effort to bring order out of chaos by helping formulate the "area of agreement" needed to revive the hope and happiness of peace, should take courage as they tune in with the heartbeat of America, which has not yet lost faith in the teachings of the Prince of Peace or the power of reason, justice, tolerance, and equality. There follows a liberal sampling of typical letters which have come to me since May 20:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I bespeak the feeling of a lot of us "battle casualties" when I say that your radio talk of last evening was one of the best yet and my wish for you is that you live to deliver the same speech the day when some few will finally be compelled to gather around a peace table, as it's the only way it can be settled. I can express myself best by saying, "Them's my sentiments."

C. M. W.

ARLINGTON, VA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUNDT: I am writing in regard to your proposal, as reported in this morning's paper, for calling an end to the war by a conference of neutrals. This sounds like one of the most sensible plans

yet made. I wish to offer you my earnest hopes for success in your efforts. Please send me a copy of the full statement of this plan.

I. R.

WORCESTER, MASS.

SIR: Thanks for your constructive talk about a peace by humanity and for humanity. It may be possible. It is worth trying.

E. F. T.

JERSEY CITY, N. J.

HONORABLE SIR: Heard your timely and, if heeded, country saving, humanity saving speech. If we do this and also put America first there is no possibility of American boys going over to become cannon fodder in European wars. I also hope the fine ideas expressed in Secretary Hull's speech will become our policy.

Miss M. C.

WALTHAM, MASS.

Your peace plan the finest American utterance in recent years. We have wired our support to the President and our Senators. May God crown your efforts with success.

Mr. and Mrs. F. J. S.
Mr. and Mrs. F. W. C.

WOODRIDGE, N. J.

Congratulations; your peace plan is the first sensible proposition to come to our attention. Am wiring the President accordingly.

J. F.

FREEPORT, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: We just heard your patriotic speech over the radio and we heartily endorse the sentiments you have expressed.

Mr. and Mrs. C. G. K.

STEBBINS AVENUE, BRONX, NEW YORK CITY.

SIR: I listened to your fine radio address advocating that we stay out of the present European war. Your common-sense views are right. I agree with you that our President should be the man who would bring peace.

W. H.

EAST FORTY-NINTH STREET,
NEW YORK CITY.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Just listened to your sane and eloquent appeal for peace over Station WABC which you so aptly captioned, "America's Rendezvous With Destiny." It is certainly reassuring to know that some of our lawmakers are thinkers and not just jobholders. I have a real Congressman representing me, the Honorable WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER, of New York. I am writing the President along the lines you suggested.

J. J. A. M.

NINETIETH AVENUE, WOODHAVEN, N. Y.

HONORABLE SIR: May I express my gratitude on your energetic defense of America by keeping out of foreign entanglements. Please continue your efforts in behalf of our country as expressed by you over the radio this evening.

Mrs. M. M.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MUNDT: I congratulate you for your radio address this evening. I urge you to continue your efforts for peace.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

Your broadcast address last evening was very effective. Please send copy at once. Will publish same in effective trade journals.

W. M. P.

FORT WAYNE, IND.

Congratulations on your radio address. Please keep up the good work. Millions are behind you.

H. J. M.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

God bless your peace proposals.

A. V.

MITCHELL, S. DAK.

Powerful, clear, and understandable speech. Over 100,000,000 people will think the same. You are making history. Keep up the good fight.

C. W. F.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

DEAR SIR: I heard your talk last night on the radio and appreciated it very much. I know that all American mothers appreciate the work Senators and Congressmen are doing to keep this country at peace. Would it be possible to get 1,000 copies of your speech? American mothers will not forget those Senators and Congressmen who have stood by the American people.

Mrs. L. S.

MASPETH, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I liked your radio talk on Tuesday. I noted particularly that you offered something constructive; some alternative to war. As an American, I want something else; something American. I am glad, too, to hear Secretary Hull speak out with a degree of common sense.

J. T. K.

[From high-ranking officer in one of America's greatest insurance companies]

HARTFORD, CONN.

MY DEAR MR. MUNDT: I listened with a great deal of interest to your radio address last evening entitled "America's Rendezvous With Destiny." If you have a copy of this address available, will you be kind enough to send it to me?

C. B. E.

WEST OHIO STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you many times for your excellent broadcast of last night; it is so seldom nowadays that one may listen to constructive proposals. Most broadcasts are just emotional. History should make it clear that violence cannot be cured with more violence.

G. P.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Congratulations on your radio speech of May 20. You have the right idea. Starting today on airplane pushing same objectives.

W. B. L.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

DEAR MR. MUNDT: I was encouraged by your able and forceful radio address of May 20. I will write my Congressman and the President, urging favorable consideration of your peace proposal. I know that you will persist in your courageous stand against further involvement in the war and do your utmost to inform the people of the perils of convoying, patrolling, etc., and of the vicious propaganda being used to incite the people to war. The inarticulate masses of our people will be eternally in your debt for your efforts in their behalf, and I wish you Godspeed in the great work you are doing.

W. K. P.

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL,
Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MUNDT: I attended the political rally in the Boston Garden, October last, and consider the President's promise not a mere campaign gesture, but a solemn pledge to those who made him trustee of their Government for 4 years. Student sentiment seems as strong or stronger than it has been in the past against our involvement in this war. President Conant has a strong following among our law professors (all too old to fight), and we find ourselves subjected to very subtle propaganda from visiting professors from England. Keep up the good fight.

A. R. S., *Law Student.*

MADISON, OHIO.

DEAR SIR: I have just listened to your radio broadcast from Washington, America's Rendezvous With Destiny. I appreciate talks like that. You are working while others stand still. May you have support to carry forward your good ideas.

E. W.,
Rural Free Delivery No. 2.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I heard your address on the radio last night and was much impressed with the outline of the possible peace position for the United States of America.

C. L. S.,
British World War Veteran.

CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR MR. MUNDT: I heard your splendid talk this evening. I hope and pray that our President will follow your suggestion for peace. We surely expect the President to keep his campaign pledges not to get us into war.

MRS. J.

DALLAS, TEX.

Listened to your radio talk last night and you are to be congratulated. The most sensible talk I have heard on our war problem. Please air mail me copy of your speech.

J. A. E.

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

SIR: Wonderful speech of yours tonight. I wish you could have been at our peace rally here Sunday of farmers, workers, teachers, ministers—all eager for peace. They have no radio or newspaper to control, but they are legion. Fight for peace.

E. E. E.

MILFORD, CONN.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MUNDT: I am a native-born American citizen whose father fought in the Civil War and whose three half-brothers voluntarily enlisted in the World War. I am for America first, last, and always. If America is attacked, then every loyal American man and woman will pitch in and fight the invader, and I will be one of them. I am opposed to America's entry into another foreign war and to the use of convoys. I have a right, and it is my duty, to be as concerned about my country as any foreigner is about the land of his birth. God bless you and all the other Congressmen championing the cause of America and of Americans.

A. W.

BOSTON, MASS.

HONORABLE SIR: I would like to have a copy of your radio address as given over the network last night. I endorse wholeheartedly your most basic American stand.

S. E. S.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing are but a small sampling of the communications which I have received in connection with my suggestion for a mediation conference of neutrals and that America keep out of this war, both in her own interests

and in the interest of better maintaining our flow of aid to Britain. These samples are sufficient, however, to indicate the trend of these communications. Any Member desiring to read any of these communications coming from his city or district, or to read through the entire stack of this correspondence, is invited to come to my office where the entire collection of telegrams, letters, and post cards will be made available to him. It is quite apparent that the people who comprise the backbone of America are doing some mighty serious and constructive thinking in this important period of our history.

Speeding Up American Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CARL A. HATCH OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. on Monday night, May 19, 1941, on the general subject of speeding up American industries.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before speaking on the subject which I have chosen for this evening, I first want to thank the Evening Star for the opportunity to appear on this program.

I address you tonight with no thought of promoting the aims or purposes of any group or faction, organization or party. Fortunately, we are not now concerned with any question of partisan politics. Even the much-too-often used terms "interventionist" and "isolationist" have no meaning in connection with the things I have in mind. In fact, I wish those terms had never become a part of our vocabulary. The words "interventionist" and "isolationist," as they have been used in recent months, carry the implication to the country, and to the world for that matter, that America is divided on vital issues of policy and even of defense. That, I deplore.

I do have a purpose—there is one thing I do want to promote. That one thing should be paramount in the minds of every American. It involves only one course of action. It is a course of action upon which we can all agree, without any difference and without reservation of any kind. I plead tonight only for those things which will insure and guarantee the welfare and the safety of the people of the United States of America and her form of government. In this spirit and from this standpoint alone, I speak tonight.

It was not until just about 1 year ago that we in America became conscious of the absolute necessity to arm and prepare ourselves, as we had never dreamed would be necessary in our day and generation. I do not mean by this that we had been altogether asleep. I, myself, have always advocated a strong preparedness program, and since I have been in the Senate I have voted for and supported every bill which has in any way tended to strengthen defenses of this country. I am frank to confess that until the downfall of France last year I did not believe it would be necessary for us to take the extreme measures which we are compelled to adopt today. I believed that we could maintain a more-or-less neutral position and that we could avoid becoming involved in the war abroad.

Certainly no man dislikes more than I do the terrific waste which even preparedness for war involves. War itself is something I hate with all the intensity of my soul. But of war and our becoming involved therein, I shall not speak tonight. Let us hope that that bitter cup will pass us by.

I am glad that I can say that this urgent need for defensive rearmament and the awful threat of war which hangs over every nation of the world today are not of our making. Not one single bit of it can be charged to America, her people, or her leaders; for that, I am thankful.

Notwithstanding our complete lack of responsibility for the condition which confronts the world, we must nevertheless face that condition as it is. The safety of 130,000,000 people, the preservation of free government for free men, are obligations and responsibilities which we cannot shirk. We have no choice; the choice has already been made for us by those powers and nations who know no law except the law of brute force. Our safety lies only in our strength; our full strength must yet be developed.

With these general thoughts in mind, I want to discuss with you tonight some of the conditions with which we are actually confronted.

I think we all realize that war as waged in the last Great War is not the kind of war that is happening today. During the long years of that war the armies of the great powers faced each other on the battlefields with practically unbroken fronts. Machine-gun nests, artillery fire, barbed-wire entanglements, deep trenches, and all those things held the respective armies in check. When attempts to break through those lines were made the loss of life was so appalling the attempts often failed. Relying upon the experiences of that war, practically all the nations of the world, save one, prepared their defenses along those lines. France, at great cost, built the Maginot line. Other countries relied upon their more or less stationary and natural fortifications. They believed themselves to be secure against attack from without.

Under Chancelor Hitler, the German nation pursued a different course. With his ascent to power, they rearmed their people for war in a way which now seems to have been entirely beyond the comprehension of the other great powers. Mechanized armies furnished with tanks and other equipment were strong enough to pierce almost any fortification. Airplanes and air forces in overwhelming numbers not only swamped but actually terrified the opposing forces. Germany relentlessly used and adopted all the machinery and everything the inventive geniuses of the world had provided as a part of her scheme to conquer and destroy, dominate and control the entire world.

While not a part of my general theme tonight, it might be well to observe here, merely to show how entirely and completely the German nation started on this road of conquest, that even more devilish and brutal than her armed forces were her cruel and barbous methods of the "fifth column." Through spies and intrigue, they sought to destroy—and did in more than one instance bore from within and conquer an entire nation without the firing of a single shot and without the loss of a single German life. Their diabolical program in this regard is ably detailed and explained in an article appearing in the current issue of Fortune magazine by Mr. Edward Taylor. From that article I quote a short paragraph:

"At the core of the totalitarian philosophy of war, profoundly influencing its strategy and tactics, is what might be called pure political warfare—attacks on political objectives with political weapons. By political warfare the Nazis, who are its leading exponents to date, mean all the roughest and shadiest tactics of politics such as bribery, blackmail, terrorism, assassination, and propaganda utilized in accordance with strict rules of strategy to destroy the enemy from within."

Added to the vicious methods being employed in the world today, the German nation has not hesitated to but does freely make use of the insidious, but nonetheless deadly, economic warfare. It is as much a part of German strategy as the hordes of marching armies Hitler has constantly at his command. In this phase of warfare they adopt every evil practice known to the world of trade. Monopolistic practices, all sorts of trade discriminations, barter according to their own peculiar standards, and many other methods in which no honorable businessman would deal, are the rule and not the exception.

While I shall not dwell with these subtle, insidious, and ingenious practices of the "fifth column" or of the economic warfare tonight, I think it is well that America should realize exactly the type of warfare that is being carried on in the world today, and which we in this hemisphere may not escape—try as we may. In fact, can there be any doubt that many of these practices are being employed in this hemisphere even now? You don't see these things in the headlines of the newspapers; you don't read about them largely because they are under cover. They are secret, and only come to light when their evil aims and designs have been accomplished.

Yet, we cannot be blind to these conditions. In the light of Norway, Denmark, Holland, and all of the other strictly neutral countries conquered from within and without, to say nothing of the tragedy of Greece and the other Balkan states, can any of us justify any fond hope that we are to escape unscathed and unhurt when the whole world is being burned and destroyed by the forces I have mentioned. Only the deaf hear not; only the blind see not. Let America be neither deaf nor blind.

I said in the beginning that our choice has already been made. It has been made. There is but one course and there is but one answer to these perilous conditions—which I have only mentioned and have not attempted to portray in all their horror. We must prepare. We must be so strong in military might and power, in the air, on the sea, and on the land, that no outlaw nation, either in Europe or in Asia, will dare engage us in battle. We must prepare to fight the hard fight of an economic invasion, just as strongly as we would fight an invasion by force of arms. The activities of the hated "fifth column" must be stopped immediately and those who carry on its evil work must be rooted out and driven forever from our land.

All this is the great task which confronts all America—not any group, not any faction, not any party, but each and every one of us.

The greatest immediate need now is the immediate speeding up of our vast industrial machine. We have proudly and truthfully boasted that we are the greatest industrial nation in the world. We lead the whole world in our manufacturing establishment and our equipment, skill, and energy for the mass production of every conceivable kind of machine

and device. A large part of the German triumphs, through the machine and mechanical equipment, is due to American inventive genius.

Because we are the kind of people that we are, however, and because we have been more concerned, in fact only concerned, with peaceful pursuits, we have not geared this industrial machine of ours to wartime methods such as are employed today. Our plant capacities have been devoted to the building of tractors for humble farm use, automobiles for pleasure and commercial purposes, trucks for similar uses. We have never sought to utilize this great capacity to make machines of death. This is all to our credit, and I am glad that we are that kind of a people. But, nevertheless, today we are faced with this fact, which I believe is unalterably true, that if we are to live and are to be able in the future to direct our attention to those peaceful pursuits, we must today turn this vast industrial empire of ours away from peaceful pursuits and into the ways of preparing ourselves with every war machine which the enemies of free government and free people already possess. We must not only equal them in the production of these things, we must excel them. That is our immediate task; that is the call to industry in America today. Civilian needs are going to have to be curtailed. In some respects we may be able to continue with the production of certain needed and required machines for civilian use, but if we are going to prepare this Nation as I believe she must be prepared, the military requirements for our great defensive program must supersede and take priority over all other considerations.

Perhaps you are thinking I am extreme in these views, and you may look back again at the first World War and think that we did not then completely turn our entire industrial activity over to the manufacture of military supplies. That is true: we did not. During that war our Allies were able to, and did, supply us with much of the equipment with which our armies fought. After a time we were able to supply our Army in France with light equipment, such as arms, rifles, bayonets, and so forth; but even at the time of the armistice, all the heavier equipment, such as heavy artillery, was being supplied by the French and British. Even with our knowledge of tractor machinery and equipment, according to Secretary of War Stimson, we had succeeded in shipping only 143 tractors to France when the armistice was signed.

In 1917 we knew nothing, practically, about airplanes for war purposes. Even after we had declared war we sent a mission to France to find out what types of planes were needed. It was not until 1918 that a single plane was delivered in France. In July 1917 we had appropriated $365,000,000 for the purchase of airplanes; in 1940 the Congress appropriated one and one-half billion dollars for this purpose. The situation in the manufacture of airplanes vividly portrays what I am trying to tell you. Compare one and one-half billion dollars against three hundred and sixty-five million and you will see how necessary it is that this industrial machine be speeded up and faster and greater progress be made each day.

The figures I have just used give something of the general idea confronting the industries of this Nation. Time does not permit a detailed discussion of each industry; therefore I shall only mention one—again merely to show something of the gigantic task that awaits industry itself.

If this war has proved anything, it has proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that a nation which is not adequately supplied with air power will lose. Control of the air today is as vital as control of the seas proved to be in the last war. The first job, therefore, in the Nation's arms program is the building of airplanes—and more and more planes. We are told that with the impetus given by French and English orders the airplane industry had already launched a gigantic development and expansion program before our effort really began in 1940. But even now the number of planes being produced is far short of the 4,000 planes monthly which the President recommended.

Unfortunately, adequate supplies of aluminum and magnesium have not been provided. One company had a complete monopoly of the production of aluminum in this country. The special Senate investigating committee, headed by Senator TRUMAN, of Missouri, which is considering many questions of our defense program, developed some most interesting information concerning the aluminum and magnesium supplies. This is important when it is considered that at least 80 percent of a big bomber, including the engine, is aluminum. The Aluminum Co. had followed the practice of providing no excess capacity, either of alumina or aluminum production. This may have been good business practice, beneficial to a monopoly, but it gave us no excess capacity for war purposes. The Aluminum Co.'s total production on its own power, even in 1942, will only be 410,000,000 pounds annually, whereas the estimates for direct military needs alone are more than 1,200,000,000, without including indirect needs or civilian requirements.

This situation in aluminum presents the thought which I just expressed with reference to civilian uses. It applies likewise to many other industries. I am definitely of the opinion that if we are going to put forth our full effort, we must reduce, curb, and curtail our civilian uses of these essentially important war materials. Our industries must devote their entire time and all the facilities toward the building of our defense needs. When I say, "they must devote their entire time and facilities," I include not only the machines but also the management which owns the machines, and the men who operate them. I mean there must be no strikes, either of labor or of capital. The selfish interest of no group shall be permitted to impede or hold back this work vital to the welfare of the whole country.

Most inadequately, I fear, I have endeavored to give something of the great need for the mobilization of all our industries in order to make this country as strong as it can be made—and as it must be made.

I have not mentioned our program of aid to the British. It is a subject unto itself. Frankly, I believe that the superb battle Britain is putting up daily strengthens our own defense. I therefore wholeheartedly approve our program of giving all aid possible to Great Britain.

Our own task, though, is to utilize the vast industrial equipment of this country to its full capacity. That can be done, but it will require strong effort. Half-way measures are not enough; anything less than complete use of the facilities which we have could be disastrous. The cost will be great—but failure will cost far more. Whatever lies ahead in this hour of our country's need, it must be met courageously. Let us not be afraid. Let effort be put forth for our country's welfare.

"He who lets his country die,
Lets all things die;
And all things dying, curse him.

"But he who lets his country live,
Lets all things live;
And all things living, bless him."

Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

LETTERS BETWEEN ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF AND DR. MARY BEARD

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on Tuesday last I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of letters between Alexander Holtzoff, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, and Dr. Mary Beard, of New Milford, Conn., on the subject of the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. My request was granted, but at the time I did not have the estimate provided for under the rules. I now have the estimate. The expense will be $247.50. I renew my request.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1940.

Dr. MARY BEARD,
New Milford, Conn.

MY DEAR MRS. BEARD: While you probably do not remember me, Professor Beard will, of course, recall me in view of the fact that in my student days at Columbia I did some research work for him for a couple of years. On the strength of this fact, I am taking the liberty of writing you this letter.

The Washington Star for Saturday, March 23, contains an article summarizing an address delivered by you at the Wardman Park Hotel the night before. The article contains the following statement:

"Dr. Beard scored the Federal Bureau of Investigation and declared that 'under the aegis of our Federal Government an incipient Ogpu or Gestapo appears to be taking form.'"

One of the headlines reads as follows: "Assails F. B. I."

It may be that you were erroneously quoted. If so, I am sure you will welcome having the matter brought to your attention, as you would probably want to make an appropriate correction.

If, however, you were accurately quoted, I should like to inform you of certain facts of which it is reasonable to assume you are not aware.

It so happens that for the past 15 years I have been, and am now, connected with the Department of Justice in a legal capacity. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, as you know, is a branch of that Department. I have had numerous official contacts with the Bureau, sometimes almost daily. In addition Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is my close personal friend. Consequently I have had an excellent opportunity to observe the operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at close range from day to day.

I know that as a liberal you will not want to make unfair or inaccurate accusations against any individual or group of individuals, founded on insufficient data. The liberal spirit, of course, includes within its scope a spirit of fairness and tolerance.

I feel strongly that all liberals should support the Federal Bureau of Investigation as an outstanding demonstration of the fact that the criminal law can be enforced efficiently and at the same time with due observance of the rights of the accused.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation does not make arrests on suspicion. It first investigates the facts from an impartial point of view, free from any preconceived ideas. An arrest is made only after the investigation inescapably leads to the conclusion that the person that is being taken into custody is guilty of the offense with which he is charged. This is an explanation of the fact that about 98 percent of persons arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation are later convicted in the courts—a record that is never equaled by any State or local law-enforcement agency.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation does not engage in any third-degree tactics, either physical or moral. It observes all the requirements of the law, some of which are highly technical, safeguarding the rights of prisoners as to detention, arraignment, removal from one district to another, etc. I have seen Mr. Hoover and his agents time and time again meticulously analyzing the legal rights of a person whom they had placed under arrest and assuring that such rights are properly protected.

In a number of cases an investigation made by the Bureau has resulted in a vindication of persons suspected, and occasionally even convicted of grave offenses, for all investigations conducted by the Bureau are carried on on a perfectly impartial and scientific basis, without any desire to lead to a particular conclusion.

The Bureau, as you probably know, has placed criminal investigation on a scientific basis and has harnessed the processes of physics, chemistry, and other sciences to the task of solving crime. The result is that in the Department of Justice Building today there is an outstanding physical and chemical laboratory, used solely for investigative purposes.

Democracy and liberalism are not incompatible with efficiency. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is an outstanding illustration of this fact.

Mr. Hoover himself represents the best type of career men in the Government, a type of public servants without which the Federal Government cannot effectively function. One of the basic reasons for the failure of our municipal governments is found in the fact that they have not developed the career type of public servant to any great extent. Mr. Hoover has rejected many an opportunity of pecuniary advancement in an entirely honest and legitimate manner. For example, 2 or 3 years ago he spurned an offer to go on a radio program for a period of 3 minutes a week, which would have resulted in paying him several times the annual salary that he receives from the Government, and which he could have accepted without interference with his official duties. Mr. Hoover still lives in the modest house in which he was born.

Personally Mr. Hoover is a practical idealist. He has the highest possible ideals of public service. He devotes to his work almost all of his waking hours, as well as many hours during which he should be sleeping, and has practically no outside interests. He is a dynamic person and is a magnificent organizer and executive. In addition, he is equipped with a splendid imagination and vision, which is, of course, needed in his line of work. And yet, when you get to know him closely, you find, strange to say, that he is a man of an artistic temperament, and is highly sentimental not only in his own personal circle but also in his relations with all of his subordinates, and even at times in dealing with persons whom he has to arrest. In spite of the fact that Mr. Hoover is a strict disciplinarian and a hard taskmaster, his entire staff idolizes him, and it has been my observation that, certainly here in Washington, the severest critics and the most discerning judges of the merits of a high public official, are his own subordinates, for Washington is not addicted to hero worship. The entire personnel of the Bureau is permeated with enthusiasm and high ideals for public service as a result of Mr. Hoover's pervading influence.

You will, of course, recall that the kidnaping wave which menaced the Nation several years ago was checked as a result of the work of the F. B. I. Similarly bank robberies have diminished to such an extent that insurance companies have reduced their insurance rates on policies protecting banks against burglars and robbers. On the other hand, I have never heard of an innocent person being convicted as a result of an F. B. I. investigation, while persons erroneously suspected have frequently been vindicated by the F. B. I.

There have been a few criticisms recently directed against the Bureau which, on analysis, do not hold water. These criticisms have originated from three groups of persons. In the first are some persons who are moved by professional jealousy. I have no criticism to make of them, because nature endowed mankind with envy and jealousy. The second group is composed of those who have been interested in persons who have come afoul of the criminal law. Of them nothing need be said. The third group is composed of a few isolated liberals who have not taken the trouble to inform themselves, but have acted on hearsay derived from the first two sources. They have forgotten that "He that filches from me my good name robs me of that which not enriches him and makes me poor, indeed."

The criticisms have been directed to an arrest of a few individuals in Detroit for violating the statute making it a criminal offense to enlist persons in this country for service in the armed forces of foreign countries. The fact is that these prosecutions were ordered by Attorney General Murphy, who directed that firm and prompt action be taken. It was Mr. Hoover's duty to carry out those directions. The arrests were made early in the morning, as it was known that some of the persons against whom the warrants were issued were so employed as made it necessary for them to leave their homes very early. The persons arrested were not put in cells, but were permitted to remain in the Bureau offices until they were arraigned in court that afternoon. They would have been arraigned in the morning, except for the fact that the judge did not want to take the case up until 3 o'clock. After arraignment, they were turned over to the United States marshal, with whom the Bureau has no connection. A picture has been published showing the prisoners as being chained with others for safe conveyance to jail. This happened after the prisoners left the custody of the Bureau.

A considerable fog has been created in regard to wire tapping. Actually, the Bureau has employed this investigative weapon in comparatively few cases, and even then in respect only to such grave offenses as kidnaping, extortion, etc. Other investigative agencies, such as the post-office inspectors and the alcohol tax agents of the Treasury, have been accustomed to use it to a far greater extent. To what extent wire tapping conducted by law-enforcement officers is illegal has not as yet been decided by the courts. The Supreme Court has merely held that evidence obtained by this means is not admissible in court. Whether it will hold that tapping telephone wires by law-enforcement officers is illegal for all purposes, for example, locating the victim of a kidnaping, remains for the future to determine.

As a matter of ethics, tapping telephone wires is no different from wearing false whiskers, overhearing a conversation, pretending to be an employee, or any of the other devices which have been used by investigators from time immemorial and which have always been sanctioned by public opinion. Tapping wires is, after all, nothing but an elongated form of eavesdropping.

I suppose that if a member of your family were kidnaped and you were informed that Bureau agents had lost the trail of the kidnaper because they were unable to tap certain telephone wires, you would be exceedingly indignant. This discussion is, however, purely academic, because the Attorney General very wisely has issued orders that all wire tapping should stop, and that no cases in which any Government agency had tapped wires should hereafter be prosecuted by United States attorneys, unless and until the Congress should clarify the matter by further legislation.

Some persons who are not familiar with the situation have intimated that Mr. Hoover likes publicity. This is a common human failing, but one which Mr. Hoover does not share. Newspaper men in Washington have frequently criticized Mr. Hoover for his inaccessibility to reporters and for his refusal to divulge information to which they think they are entitled. He never discusses pending cases, because he does not consider it in the best interests of law enforcement to do so. After an arrest is made the public is entitled to the information, and such information and the surrounding details are given out through the Attorney General's office.

I have on more than one occasion told Mr. Hoover that in his files are many interesting statements that would make excellent material for a Sunday newspaper article, or for a magazine story, but he has always shrunk, with, I think, unnecessary and undue modesty, from volunteering to give out such data.

This letter has been longer, perhaps, than it should have been. I know, however, that as a liberal you will want to know the facts, for the liberal point of view necessarily implies such an attitude. I also know that you would not want to do an injustice to a group of efficient, high-minded public servants, who, after all, have not lost the feelings of human beings merely because they have entered the Federal service.

I am enclosing herewith transcripts of two speeches made in the Senate and House of Representatives dealing with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which substantiate the foregoing facts.

With best regards to yourself and Professor Beard, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF.

NEW MILFORD, CONN., *March 30, 1940.*

DEAR MR. HOLTZOFF: It is a pleasure to renew an old acquaintance if only by letter. Of course, I remember you very well and the efficient help you rendered my husband in other years. He often speaks of you himself in warm terms of appreciation of your cooperation at that time and has been interested in good work you have since done on your own responsibility.

Coming to the subject of your letter to me, dated March 25, I admit first of all that the report of my address to which you refer is substantially correct. I did say that "an incipient Ogpu or Gestapo appears to be taking form" and that a black network is being prepared under the aegis of the Federal Government.

In reply to this declaration of mine, you pay high tribute to Mr. Edgar Hoover as a man and to the services which he has unquestionably rendered in tracking down genuine criminals such as kidnapers. Of course, efficiency in this matter is commendable and all decent citizens are grateful for it. But to use the language of lawyers, if

I am not presuming, I reply, in turn, that your comments on my charge, granting their truth, are immaterial and irrelevant.

My statement was a statement of fact. The proof of the fact is provided by Mr. Hoover's own testimony.

Now what is an Ogpu or Gestapo? It is a political police system. In his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations on November 30, 1939, Mr. Hoover stated that he had "found it necessary to organize a General Intelligence Division in Washington" for the purpose (among other things) of indexing individuals, groups, and organizations engaged in "subversive activities * * * or any activities that are possibly detrimental to the internal security of the United States." In his testimony in January 1940 Mr. Hoover elaborated on the work of this G. I. D. and said that he is getting ready for the event of "any greater emergency to our country."

You know very well, Mr. Holtzoff, as a lawyer, that it is the sole business of the F. B. I. to detect crimes under Federal law, and crimes only You know very well that subversive activities are not crimes defined by any statute of the United States. You know also that activities possibly detrimental to the internal security of the United States are not crimes defined by any statute of the United States. You know that these are political terms used, often loosely, to blacken or smear anybody who holds unconventional or unpopular ideas. Until such things are made crimes by law, no officer of the Government of the United States has any lawful right to index or spy upon persons engaged in these activities.

Thus, on the basis of Mr. Hoover's own testimony, he stands convicted in the eyes of the law and justice of the offense of setting up a political police for the purpose of spying upon and blacklisting persons guilty of no crimes against the United States. Do you deny Mr. Hoover's own testimony? Do you deny that the G. I. D. is primarily concerned with so-called political opinions and actions which are not crimes at all? Do you contend that Mr. Hoover has plenary jurisdiction over the opinions and political activities of American citizens and a right to index and blacklist them in the F. B. I.?

Granting that your high praise of Mr. Hoover as a gentleman is entirely correct, I must say to you that I have first-hand knowledge (evidence) of the kinds of offenses against decency and democracy which were committed in the days of A. Mitchell Palmer when the same Mr. Hoover was associated with the same kind of general intelligence work he is now undertaking; when the most elementary political and civil rights of American citizens were violated by Federal officers; when innocent persons were hounded and rounded up; when persons were arrested on mere suspicion, held incommunicado, and then released without so much as a word of apology. You and Mr. Hoover himself may have forgotten this history, but informed, educated men and women of America have not forgotten it.

It is by their words that men are known. You know that the political police hysteria of those days not so long ago has been vigorously condemned by such outstanding and exceedingly reputable citizens as Charles Evans Hughes, Harlan F. Stone, and Felix Frankfurter, now Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

You and Mr. Hoover will have to do more than praise your own works and his character if you are to escape the charge of forming a political police and blacklisting citizens innocent of all crimes under the law. You will have to clean house. You will have to abolish the political police division of the F. B. I. You will have to convince the decent people of America, defending their democracy at home, that you are engaged solely in enforcing the law and that you are not interfering with lawful political opinions and activities—that is to say, with free speech and assembly. Fortunately a majority of the members of the Supreme Court have respect for the Constitution and the laws of this land and those of us who have any money may defend ourselves against your political police, though the poor and helpless may have to take blackjacks, detention cells, prison, and ruin.

To these insistent questions I shall greatly appreciate your answers: Is there a G. I. D. in the F. B. I.? Or is there not? Is it engaged in activities connected with the indexing of persons who in Mr. Hoover's sovereign opinion are engaged in activities which he calls subversive or "possibly detrimental to internal security?" Or is it not? What does the adverb "possibly" mean in this relation? Is Mr. J. Edgar Hoover the same person who helped in the Palmer raids? Or is he not?

These questions can be answered simply by a yes or a no. And you know the answers. What are they?

With warm personal regards based on an old friendship,

I am sincerely.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1940.

Dr. MARY R. BEARD,
New Milford, Conn.

DEAR MRS. BEARD: I appreciate your full and frank reply to my letter of March 25, and I take pleasure in promptly answering the questions contained in it.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover was not in charge of, and had nothing to do with, the manner in which the arrests were made of the so-called radicals under the administration of Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer. Mr. Hoover at that time was not connected with the Federal Bureau of Investigation but was a special assistant to the Attorney General. His function was at that time limited to the handling of legal matters and the preparation of evidence for presentation to the proper authorities in connection with those activities.

It is unquestionably the fact that the function of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is to detect violations of Federal criminal statutes and to apprehend offenders against such statutes. I am afraid that there is a great deal of misapprehension concerning the General Intelligence Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Bureau, as any efficient law-enforcement organization should do, and many of them actually do, keeps lists of persons who have committed certain crimes in the past, and may therefore commit similar crimes in the future. For example, it has a list of bank robbers. In the same sense it maintains a list of persons who have engaged in foreign espionage and sabotage or have committed other similar criminal offenses. These activities, it must be remembered, are violations of specific Federal criminal statutes.

The phrase "subversive activities, or any activities that are possibly detrimental to the internal security of the United States" was used by Mr. Hoover in his testimony in that narrow sense as being limited to activities that constitute violations of statutes that are now on the books. It was not used in the tenuous, nebulous sense in which it is sometimes employed. Consequently, I must indeed deny in answer to your question that the General Intelligence Division is concerned with so-called political opinions and actions which are not crimes at all. There is no political police division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In this connection the term "subversive activities" was used in a similar sense in a statement made by the President on September 6, 1939, instructing the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to take charge of investigative work in matters relating to espionage, sabotage, and violations of the neutrality regulations.

I am afraid that I do not understand your suggestion that the poor and helpless may have to take "blackjacks, detention cells, prison, and ruin." Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents do not carry blackjacks or any other weapon of that type, and they have never been known to maltreat prisoners. The few detention cells that they have are used in the same manner as are cells in every police station, to hold a prisoner overnight or for a few hours during the day before he is taken before a Federal Judge or a United States Commissioner for arraignment. No one is sent to prison except as a result of a trial prescribed by law.

With kind personal regards to you and to Professor Beard, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF.

NEW MILFORD, CONN., *April 4, 1941.*

DEAR MR. HOLTZOFF: I am grateful to you for your kind letter of April 2, in reply to my reply to your original letter to me. In writing you again, I am taking it for granted that you appreciate the fact that I am not a virago but a seeker after the realities of this affair. And as I am given to see the situation, your letter of April 2 does not yet meet the issues which I had raised. So let me take up the points of your reply seriatim.

I said in my letter to you, dated March 30, that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover was associated in the days of A. Mitchell Palmer with the same kind of general intelligence work he is now undertaking. You reply that he was not in charge of and had nothing to do with the manner in which arrests were made; that he was not then connected with the F. B. I.; that he was a special assistant to the Attorney General.

But I did not say that Mr. Hoover had anything to do with the manner of the arrests or that he was connected then with the F. B. I. I know that Mr. Hoover, from 1919 to 1921, was special assistant to Mr. Palmer, and that Palmer was the man guilty of the outrages described in The Deportations Delirium of 1920, by Mr. Louis Post, then Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Wilson administration.

You admit that Mr. Hoover handled legal matters and the preparation of cases in connection with those activities. Thus you concede my contention that Mr. Hoover was then associated with that type of general intelligence work. Mr. Palmer's whole policy was a policy of frenzy; arrests were often made in defiance of law; the whole business was disgraceful; and yet Mr. Hoover stayed right there at his post helping Palmer. If he was not in thorough sympathy with the activities of his superior he could have resigned as a free citizen of the United States and not an intransigent bureaucrat. So I contend that my point about the two men—Hoover and Palmer—stands unshaken. Indeed it is confirmed by your own statement in your letter dated April 2.

In the second place, you say that the F. B. I. keeps lists of criminals. Of course, it does and should. I never suggested that it should not keep track of criminals and persons charged with being criminals. Hasn't the F. B. I. been doing that all along? I have not assailed it for that operation. But why the establishment of a General Intelligence Division in September 1939? Why didn't the Bureau simply expand its Indexing Division if it needed more indexing of criminals?

In the third place, you say that Mr. Hoover used the phrase "subversive activities or any activities that are possibly detrimental to the internal security of the United States in that narrow sense as being limited to violations of statutes that are now on the books."

Mr. Hoover is a trained lawyer. Subversive activities and possibly detrimental activities are loose words and they are never used by a careful lawyer as denoting positive crimes on statute books. Nor is the word "general", as applied to Intelligence Division, one of nar-

row implications. Mr. Hoover is either a loose thinker and a loose talker or he uses words in their exact meaning as far as may be. If the former is true, he has no business in the Department of Justice at all. If the latter is true, he was talking about running down persons not guilty of actual legal crimes. Furthermore, Mr. Hoover, in the testimony to which I have referred in my earlier letter, used other language indicating that he meant exactly what I declared he meant, namely, interfering with persons not accused of crimes. Please read again the whole of Mr. Hoover's testimony and then let me know whether you are still confident that he meant only crimes defined by statue.

In the fourth place, you say that there is no political police division in the F. B. I. Then why have a General Intelligence Division at all? Why not call it a division for indexing criminals? The fact that President Roosevelt spoke of subversive activities does not make these activities crimes. Nor does it necessarily make these activities subversive. Subversive of what? And after all, President Roosevelt is not the lawmaker under the Constitution.

In the fifth place, you say that the F. B. I. has "never been known to maltreat prisoners." This may not be known to you but if you will read the booklet F. B. I. Detroit and the statements signed by the persons arrested in Detroit, you will surely have more information on this subject.

In my letter I said that "the poor and helpless may have to take the blackjacks, detention cells, prison, and ruin." That is what many of them got in the last "general intelligence" delirium, under A. Mitchell Palmer whose special assistant was J. Edgar Hoover. Since we are threatened with another "general intelligence" delirium, it seems rational to expect that many will have to take these things again.

You say that no one is sent to prison except as a result of a trial as prescribed by law. But as a lawyer you know that many a person has been tried in scenes of hysteria, falsely convicted, and imprisoned. In an address to the Harvard law alumni in 1920, Charles Evans Hughes himself described the fanatical way in which many trials were conducted in the "general intelligence" outburst of 1919.

Naturally I am not recounting here the history of that political police frenzy. Fully to get my meaning you have but to read the volume by Louis Post cited above.

Yours sincerely.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1940.

Dr. MARY R. BEARD,
New Milford, Conn.

DEAR MRS. BEARD: Naturally I do not want to prolong unduly the correspondence that we have been having concerning your criticisms of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, Mr. John Edgar Hoover. I do feel, however, that the remarks contained in your letter of April 4 call for some comments.

The fact that Mr. Hoover had no connection with the manner in which the arrests were conducted under the direction of Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer is sufficient to disassociate him from any responsibility in the matter. The mere fact that he was connected with the Department of Justice at the time is of no consequence. There are many officials and employees now in the Department of Justice who were here when Mr. Palmer was Attorney General, and there are a good many who antedate him. There are many here now who served in the Daugherty era. Surely you would not visit on them the sins of Mr. Palmer and Mr. Daugherty. In a big organization such as the Department of Justice the various members of its personnel cannot be held morally responsible for actions of other officers or employees. Each one is responsible for what he does himself. Neither is there any moral responsibility on the part of a member of a big organization to resign from his position merely because he disagrees or disapproves of some of the actions of his associates. I strongly feel that any intimation that Mr. Hoover is in any way responsible, or should be judged even to a partial extent by the character of the raids conducted in the Palmer regime, is grossly unfair, especially as I happen to know that he has personally disapproved the course then pursued.

A considerable portion of your letter is devoted to questioning the terminology used by Mr. Hoover and by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. After all, this resolves itself into a disputation over linguistics. The facts themselves are as I have stated them heretofore.

So far as the Detroit arrests were concerned, I think it is only fair to reiterate that they were ordered by Attorney General Murphy, who issued directions that the matter be handled immediately and with firmness. The alleged maltreatment of the prisoners consisted in the fact that they were chained by the marshal after they were committed by the court. This happened subsequently to the time that they left the custody of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The fact is that during the few hours they were in custody of Bureau agents, they were treated with every possible consideration and were allowed to sit in the offices of the Bureau until the judge convened court.

The last two paragraphs of your letter constitute a criticism of the courts rather than of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and, therefore, may properly be considered to be outside of the scope of the questions that we have been considering.

I consider myself a competent witness concerning the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, since I have watched them from day to day over a period of years. The facts are as I have stated them in my former letters to you. I can vouch for their accuracy. Of necessity you have not had the opportunity to secure any information except through hearsay, which always forms a very unreliable and uncertain basis for condemning another human being or group of human beings.

I hope that this correspondence will lead to a renewal of our old acquaintance. If either you or Professor Beard have occasion to be in Washington, I trust that you get in touch with me.

With best regards to Professor Beard and yourself,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF.

NEW MILFORD, CONN., *April 16, 1940.*

DEAR MR. HOLTZOFF: Of course, you and I have no desire merely to quarrel. Nor do I wish to base my thinking on mere hearsay, for that is not my custom.

You are no doubt right in saying that perhaps a prolongation of our correspondence may not be useful. I appreciate what you have written me, and what you have written out of your knowledge and experience naturally carries weight with me.

But there is one point concerning which I have doubts and which I would appreciate your helping me to clear. You were not in the Department of Justice in 1919–20 and your statements bearing on that period must be based on some documentary or other evidence, rather than on hearsay. May I therefore assume that you have such documents which you can refer me to or send to me? Or that you have talked over that period with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and have his personal authority for your statement concerning his relation to the actions then taken against elements called "subversive"?

If you could enlighten me on this matter, I should feel more certain of my ground. I regret that the distance between us makes direct conversation so difficult.

Yours sincerely.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C. April 23, 1940.

Dr. MARY R. BEARD,
New Milford, Conn.

DEAR MRS. BEARD: I am very glad that you propounded the question which is in your mind concerning assertions that have been made and which attempt to connect Mr. J. Edgar Hoover with the raids conducted under the direction of Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer.

My statement to you to the effect that he did not direct, supervise, participate in, or have any connection with the manner in which those dragnet raids were conducted was based on Mr. Hoover's personal authority to me, and therefore I am willing to vouch for it. The arrests were made under the direction of William J. Flynn, then head of the Bureau of Investigation, who, together with Mr. Palmer, must be regarded as responsible for such excesses as took place. Mr. Hoover was then special assistant to the Attorney General. His function was confined to the preparation of evidence. He did not participate in ordering or carrying out the arrests.

I also happen to know that Mr. Hoover personally did not and does not approve the manner in which those raids were conducted. This can be demonstrated by the fact that since Mr. Hoover became Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation the Bureau has never engaged in dragnet raids of any kind, not even when endeavoring to solve a vicious crime. The Bureau considers such tactics as an improper procedure and violative of the civil rights of individuals who may turn out to be innocent, although I might add that there are other law-enforcement agencies which indulge in such practices without having any criticism turned against them from liberal groups.

While I did not become connected with the Department of Justice until October 1924, during the regime of Justice Stone as Attorney General, many of the events that had transpired during the preceding few years were still sufficiently fresh in the minds of many members of the departmental staff, to enable me to gather considerable knowledge as to the departmental activities during that period.

May I add in this connection that it was Justice Stone, who, as Attorney General, elevated Mr. Hoover to his present post. Justice Stone, as an outstanding liberal, would not have done so if he had not made a study of Mr. Hoover's personality and found him in every way fit for the high position that he occupies. As you probably know, Justice Stone in addition to being a great liberal is an excellent judge of men. The confidence reposed in Mr. Hoover by Attorney General Stone was continued by every one of his successors.

I feel very strongly that a grave injustice has been done to Mr. Hoover in attempting to connect him with the Mitchell Palmer raids, merely because he happened to be a member of the departmental staff at the time. Unfortunately, it is difficult to make complete reparation for criticisms that have been publicized against persons in the public eye. For that very reason it is essential that caution and care be observed in undertaking to condemn an official publicly.

If there are any other questions that I may be able to help to answer, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know, as I want to do everything in my power to give you ample and accurate information on the subject in which you are interested.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF.

NEW MILFORD, CONN., *May 7, 1940.*

DEAR MR. HOLTZOFF: Prior to the receipt of your letter of April 25 it was my intention to let the subject of our correspondence drop. But your categorical declaration in that letter

raises a question of fundamental accuracy which has led me to review as carefully as I could the historical evidence in my possession that bears upon all your allegations, assertions, and contentions. Naturally, as a student of American history, I keep records of events which, in my opinion, are basic to this history.

With respect to your letter of April 25, 1940, to which I refer, you declare positively, in language that admits of no double interpretation, "My statement to you to the effect that he (Mr. Hoover) did not direct, supervise, participate in, or have any connection with the manner in which those dragnet raids were conducted, was based on Mr. Hoover's personal authority to me, and therefore I am willing to vouch for it. * * * He did not participate in ordering or carrying out the arrests."

You make this affirmation on the authority of Mr. Hoover himself, you say. But I invite your attention to the following facts relative to this declaration—facts drawn from authentic statements by high authorities in a position to know just what were Mr. Hoover's connections with those political raids:

(1) The raids of 1919–20 led to a report by a group of distinguished lawyers in 1920 which condemned the Department of Justice for gross illegalities and violations of civil rights. This signatory group included Dean Roscoe Pound, of the Harvard Law School; Dean Tyrrell Williams, of the Washington Law School at St. Louis; Profs. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., and Felix Frankfurter, of the Harvard Law School, and many others in different parts of the country. As a result of their investigation, a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee conducted hearings on these charges in 1921 (66th Cong., 3d sess., Charges of Illegal Practices of the Department of Justice, pp. 19–20). Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer was questioned by this committee. When he was asked how many search warrants were issued in the worst of the raids, that of January 2, 1920, Mr. Palmer said that he did not know and that he would have to ask Mr. Hoover, who had been in charge of the raid.

In placing this statement by Mr. Palmer, Attorney General of the United States, beside your statement, made on the authority of Mr. Hoover, that Mr. Hoover did not "direct, supervise, participate in, or have any connection with the manner in which those dragnet raids were conducted," which are we to believe? Shall we accept the statement of the head of the Department of Justice? Or the statement of Mr. Hoover, then a subordinate in the Department?

(2) If it be assumed that Mr. Palmer, now dead, was misrepresenting the situation, for whatever reason, we can consult Mr. Hoover himself, who is living.

In your letter of April 2, 1940, you state categorically that Mr. Hoover at that time (of the raids under Palmer) "was not connected with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but was a special assistant to the Attorney General." This is what you write me, on the authority of Mr. Hoover himself. But what did Mr. Hoover himself say in 1935?

In that year, the F. B. I., under Mr. Hoover's direction, prepared a mimeographed digested history of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This document is mentioned in footnote 26 on page 429 of a volume by Attorney General Cummings and Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Carl McFarland. It is entitled "Federal Justice" (Macmillan, 1937).

The footnote reads as follows: "A digested history of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (mimeographed document of the Bureau, 1935), states that the "General Intelligence Division" was organized in 1919 "under direct administrative supervision of J. Edgar Hoover, since 1917 in charge of counter-radical activities as a Special Assistant to the Attorney General."

While Mr. Hoover was head of it, this statement was prepared in the F. B. I. and accepted as truth by Attorney General Cummings. It declares that Mr. Hoover was head of the General Intelligence Division organized in 1919 and after 1917 (when the period of dragnet raids opened) was "in charge of counter-radical activities as a Special Assistant to the Attorney General" and that Mr. Hoover had "direct administrative supervision" over the General Intelligence Division organized in 1917 when the dragnet raids began in full force.

Am I to accept, that is, believe, what Mr. Hoover said about himself in 1935? Or what you say about him, on his authority, in 1940?

(3) In what activities then did this General Intelligence Division engage after it was organized in 1919 "under the direct administrative supervision" of Mr. Hoover? The importance of this question and answer lies in its direct indications of the kind of activities in which Mr. Hoover might again engage through the new General Intelligence Division created in 1939.

An answer to this question comes from high authority and deserves credence. It is provided in the Cummings-McFarland book (cited above) on pages 429–430 dealing with the period following the armistice of 1918. This is what these authorities affirm respecting the activities which, you allege in 1940, Mr. Hoover disapproved:

"The War Emergency Division had been dissolved. A new unit, called the General Intelligence Division, was created to investigate radical activities. Within 3½ months it gathered and indexed the histories of over 60,000 persons, and it received many complaints regarding prominent teachers or writers. It maintained a force of 40 translators and assistants who read nearly 500 foreign-language newspapers published in the United States and abroad, to keep a check on radical propaganda. Before long 200,000 names were in the suspect indexes. A few days after his house was bombed, Palmer appeared before a congressional committee to advocate legislation for the suppression of sedition in time of peace. Seventy bills were pending in Congress 5 months later. However, none of the measures passed.

"Nevertheless, with such enthusiastic approval, the agents of the Department of Justice, in a series of dramatic raids, took more than 5,000 persons into custody. American citizens were surrendered, sometimes to be dealt with by State and local authorities; aliens were turned over to the Bureau of Immigration for deportation. Palmer's plans met with some discouragement when the Labor Department failed to cooperate in wholesale deportations on what it regarded as flimsy evidence. Warrants to the number of some 5,000 had been issued on assurance that the aliens in question were participants in a gigantic conspiracy to overthrow the Government. As the records were referred to assistant Secretary of Labor Louis F. Post, for deportation authorizations, he began to doubt wholesale participation in any such conspiracy. He investigated, and in March and April ordered the cancelation of hundreds of warrants."

(4) The Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Palmer, had said in 1921 that Mr. Hoover had charge of the dragnet raids. Mr. Hoover said in 1935 that he was "in charge of counter-radical activities" after 1917 and was head of the General Intelligence Division after its organization in 1919. The activities of this General Intelligence Division were described by a succeeding Attorney General, Mr. Cummings, and his special assistant. Then, in 1936, Melvin Purvis, associated with Mr. Hoover in the F. B. I. for a number of years and holding high position under Mr. Hoover as head of branches in various large cities, published a book entitled "American Agent" (Doubleday, Doran, 1936). In this book, on page 57, Mr. Purvis confirms Mr. Hoover's statement of 1935 that Mr. Hoover was head of the General Intelligence Division which, according to Cummings and McFarland, directed, supervised, and participated in general dragnet raids. On page 57 of Mr. Purvis' book appears this passage:

"On May 20, 1924, J. Edgar Hoover, who from August 1, 1919, had served as head of the Intelligence Division as a special assistant to the Attorney General, was appointed Acting Director (of the F. B. I.) On December 19, 1924, he was appointed Director."

The activities of Mr. Hoover's Intelligence Division are described above (in item 3).

In the light of all such testimony, was Mr. Hoover head of the General Intelligence Division after 1919? Or was he, as you insist, merely a special assistant to the Attorney General, looking after legal business?

(5) Before 1940, Attorney General Palmer testified (in 1921) that Mr. Hoover had been in charge of dragnet raids. Before 1940, other high authorities, including Mr. Hoover himself, testified that Mr. Hoover was "in charge of counter-radical activities" after 1917 and head of the General Intelligence Division on its organization in 1919. High authorities have described for us the actual activities of the General Intelligence Division which was directed by Mr. Hoover in that period. Either these reputable authorities were mistaken and Mr. Hoover himself mistaken or his memory has failed him in 1940.

But there is other evidence on this point, contained in the court records of the case of *Colyer* v. *Skeffington*. One of the Federal dragnets raids, that of January 2, 1920, led to litigation before United States Circuit Judge George W. Anderson in the United States district court in Boston. Much testimony was introduced in evidence. One item consisted of the instructions issued by Burke, Acting Director of the F. B. I., to George B. Kelleher, head of the Boston office of the F. B. I. The instructions were dated December 27, 1919, and related to the proposed January 2 raids. These instructions contained the following items, among others:

"On the evening of the arrests this office will be open the entire night, and I desire that you communicate by long distance to Mr. Hoover any matters of vital importance or interest which may arise during the course of the arrests. You will possibly be given from 7 o'clock in the evening until 7 o'clock in the morning to conclude the arrests and examination. * * * I desire that the morning following the arrests you should forward to this office by special delivery, marked for the 'Attention of Mr. Hoover,' a complete list of the names of the persons arrested, with an indication of residence or organization to which they belong, and whether or not they were included in the original list of the warrants. * * * I desire also that the morning following the arrests that you communicate in detail by telegram, 'Attention of Mr. Hoover,' the results of the arrests made, giving the total number of persons of each organization taken into custody, together with a statement of any interesting evidence secured."

On December 31, 1919, the Acting Director of the F. B. I. wired Kelleher in part as follows:

"Arrests should all be completed and examinations concluded by Saturday morning, January 3, 1920, and full reports forwarded by special delivery, addressed attention Mr. Hoover."

Both documents just quoted are to be found in the opinion which Judge Anderson wrote in the case of *Colyer* v. *Skeffington*,

printed in 265 Federal Reports, beginning on page 17, these documents themselves being on pages 32–33 and 36. The decision was rendered on June 23, 1920.

The opinion of the Court shows that the raids were conducted by F. B. I. agents; that they engaged in gross illegalities; that they made arrests without warrants; that they employed agents, provocateurs, and informers to take part in the organizations to which the persons raided belonged and to cause them to assemble in meetings on the night for which the raids were planned; that they chained the arrested persons and exposed them, chained, to photographing by newspaper reporters; that they subjected the arrested persons to spectacular publicity; that they held them incommunicado; that the F. B. I. agents were no better than a mob; and that they detained the arrested persons under improper conditions. The Court severely criticized what was done by the F. B. I. agents, including their examination (through Labor Department inspectors) of the arrested persons without permitting them to have the assistance of counsel. (See the opinion, pp. 28, 36–40, 43–48, 65, 67–69, 78.)

(6) In the taking of testimony before Judge Anderson, one of the F. B. I. agents was questioned as follows:

"Question. Did you have instructions as to this procedure?

"Answer. We had an understanding.

"Question. Written instructions?

"Answer. No. We had a conference in Washington in the Department of Labor with Mr. Hoover and another gentleman of the Department of Justice.

"Question. Who is Mr. Hoover?

"Answer. Mr. Hoover is an officer in the Department of Justice."

This testimony is printed as exhibit 13, page 46, of the report issued by the distinguished lawyers and law professors cited above (fact 1).

(7) If, however, it be contended that all the witnesses whom I have quoted with respect to Mr. Hoover's activities before 1921 were mistaken, suffered lapses of memory, or simply lied, there can be no doubt that Mr. Hoover became Assistant Director of the F. B. I. in 1921. That year Attorney General Palmer went out of office and Harry M. Daugherty, well known in American history, became Attorney General under President Harding.

Who's Who in America states that Mr. Hoover became Assistant Director of the F. B. I. in 1921. This statement is confirmed in the foreword, written by Courtney Ryley Cooper, to the volume published by J. Edgar Hoover, entitled "Persons in Hiding" (Little, Brown, 1938). Since this is Mr. Hoover's own book, since he and Mr. Cooper have together written many articles on crime for magazines, and since Hoover wrote the foreword for Cooper's book, Ten Thousand Public Enemies (Little, Brown, 1935), it may be assumed that Cooper knew what he was saying and that Hoover approved when Cooper declared in his foreword to Hoover's book (on p. XI): "in 1921 * * * J. Edgar Hoover was made an Assistant Director of the Bureau of Investigation."

In this connection, did Mr. Hoover's position alter his operations or give greater scope to his talents in the sort of work he did under Mr. Palmer? On this point let me quote from the testimony given in October 1938 before the Dies committee by Jacob Spolansky (vol. 2):

"The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

"Mr. SPOLANSKY. Jacob Spolansky. (P. 1310.)

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever connected with the F. B. I.?

"Mr. SPOLANSKY. Yes, sir; I was connected with the Department of Justice for 6 years.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. What did you specialize in while you were there?

"Mr. SPOLANSKY. Exclusively in subversive activities (p. 1310). * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. What is your background. Were you once connected with the F. B. I.?

"Mr. SPOLANSKY. I was in the Military Intelligence Department of the United States Army during the war. I was assigned as a personal investigator to General Wood. Immediately after I was discharged from the Army I was appointed as a special agent of the Department of Justice and I worked under the direction of Mr. Hoover until 1924" (p. 1444).

It is well known that the Department, in the period 1921–24, went much further than in the Palmer period in its drive against radicals and against labor unions. The annual reports of the Department of Justice—that is, of the Attorney General—boast of these activities in those years.

(8) In your letter of April 25, 1940, Mr. Holtzoff, you speak of Justice Harlan F. Stone as "a great liberal," and cite the fact that Mr. Stone, then Attorney General, "elevated Mr. Hoover to his present post"—as if that disposed of any charges respecting Mr. Hoover's activities prior to 1924.

Mr. Stone, serving as Attorney General, ended the G. I. D., as I reminded you in one of my letters. And it is true that he retained Mr. Hoover in the Department of Justice in the Crime Bureau. But have we any evidence that Mr. Stone, suddenly plunged into the Department of Justice as Attorney General and charged with cleaning the Augean stables left by Attorney General Daugherty, was familiar with Mr. Hoover's personal record? Some of the evidence I have cited on that matter was already buried in musty documents before Mr. Stone took office. Other portions of the evidence did not come to light until he had left the Department of Justice for the Supreme Bench. Mr. Stone was appointed Attorney General on April 7, 1924, and transferred to the Supreme Court on March 2, 1925. Thus he was head of the Department of Justice less than 1 year, his time consumed in immediate matters of major importance. There is good reason for assuming that he did not dig into the details of Mr. Hoover's history. If he did, he might have supposed that, by taking away the investigation of subversive activities and leaving Mr. Hoover the responsibility for legal crimes alone, he was removing Mr. Hoover from the position in which he could violate American civil liberties.

Hosts of us Americans, men and women, in this hour of a semiemergency legally proclaimed, with a greater emergency threatened, intend to stand by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and by the democratic proposition these men and women shall not be hounded, arrested, and imprisoned, by Federal authorities for their political opinions but only for crimes defined in laws duly enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Inasmuch as our correspondence is strictly germane to that intention, I am thinking of publishing our letters, without however using your name if you object to its use.

I should not have pursued the issues in such a long correspondence if you had not initiated it and seemed so sure of your statements. There is nothing personal in my attitude. The matters we have discussed are more important than either of us and belong in the open forum where our civil liberties must be defended, if at all.

Sincerely.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1940.

Dr. MARY R. BEARD,
New Milford, Conn.

DEAR MRS. BEARD: I have your letter of May 7.

I am afraid that I am constrained to say that the authorities cited by you do not contradict my statement to you that Mr. Hoover did not direct, supervise, participate in, or have any connection with the manner in which the dragnet raids were conducted in the administration of Mitchell Palmer as Attorney General. The quotations that you adduce do not indicate anything to the contrary. Neither do they warrant the interpretations that you seem to place upon them. As I have stated heretofore, Mr. Hoover's functions during that period were limited to the collection and study of evidence, while the raids were in charge of Mr. Flynn, who acted under the immediate direction of Attorney General Palmer.

Reiteration is not emphasis, and yet I can do no more than to reiterate my prior statement.

As I follow our correspondence, it is difficult for me to refrain from noticing the fact that most of your letters seem to shift the ground of the previous discussion, abandoning the point made in my first letter. One necessarily is led to wonder whether you are unconsciously endeavoring to rationalize a preconceived conclusion. If so, it is futile to hope that you may be convinced of your error. Yet in the light of your own and Professor Beard's reputation as historians, I wonder if your attitude in this matter is in accord with the true spirit of historical scholarship.

I hope you will forgive me when I express surprise at your suggestion that Attorney General Stone appointed Mr. Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation without becoming familiar with his qualifications or with his record. Attorney General Stone did not function in that manner, as is well known to his thousands of friends and admirers.

After all, it is a great pity to permit our thinking to become confused in the maelstrom of our own emotions. My letters have been confined solely to the proposition that you made erroneous statements of fact concerning Mr. Hoover personally and the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a body. On the other hand, you tell me that you intend to stand by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and by the democratic proposition that men and women shall not be hounded, arrested, and imprisoned by Federal authorities for their political opinions. This is a sentiment which everyone will endorse, but it has no connection with the subject that we have been discussing. I certainly do not agree with you that our correspondence is germane to this general proposition, which in itself is entirely beneficent. Like so many generalizations, however, it does not advance the specific question that you originally raised and that evoked my protest, namely, the assertion that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been violating the law—an assertion which I emphatically feel is grossly erroneous.

I note your suggestion that you are considering the publication of our letters. I have no objection to my letters being published under my name, subject to the limitation, however, that whichever letters are published they be published as a whole, and that no portion of any letter be excised in the publication. So far as your letters to me are concerned, I need hardly say that they are your literary property, and therefore, you have the legal right to dispose of them as you will. I do feel, however, that as a matter of fairness and justice—and I know that you want to be fair and just—you should hesitate to give to the world your letters containing accusations, which I deem unwarranted, against a high-minded and respected public official and an important Bureau of our Government. Perhaps you feel that being the target for attacks, irrespective of whether or not such attacks are based on thorough investigation, is one of the burdens of public service. If so, I can add nothing to what I have said.

In closing this correspondence, I want to express the hope that I may have occasion some time in the near future to meet both you and Professor Beard again after a great

many years during which I have had no opportunity to see either of you.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF.

Celebration of National Maritime Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered yesterday, National Maritime Day, over a National Broadcasting hook-up, by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today we pay fitting tribute to the mighty strength, progress, and prestige of the American merchant marine. The success story of our merchant marine is a saga of adventure, romance, and drama. Rich in the best traditions of the sea, it has been built up through the years by virtue of American imagination, ingenuity, and industry. It commands the respect of all the world. It has helped to make America the wealthiest, the happiest, and the most progressive nation on earth.

This year, as we observe National Maritime Day, we are more than ever cognizant of the strength and value of this great commercial arm of our Republic. It has always been our pride. Today it is more than that. It is one of our important first lines of defense.

Today we are resorting to all practical means and methods to insure our national peace and security. We are engaged in an all-out program of defense that will make our shores impregnable to attack from without; a defense that will afford a comfortable measure of securit, to all of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. We are steadfastly determined, in the traditional spirit of the New World, to extend a helping hand to the oppressed, the persecuted, and the embattled in other lands when, in the light of democratic ideals, the cause which they defend is just.

This gigantic task to which we have applied ourselves permits of no compromise, no equivocation, no dissension. Complete national unity of all sections, all races, all classes, all religions, all political parties is the indispensable demand of the hour. We can outthink, outwork, outproduce, and, if attacked, outfight any potential enemy or group of enemies if we have mobilized every ounce of energy and initiative available within our borders.

There are two conspicuous schools of so-called patriotic Americanism which today preach the philosophy of defeatism. One group demands that we urge the beleaguered democracies to sue for a negotiated peace and that we participate in such a peace on terms surely to be dictated by the modern tyrants of Europe. The other group scoffs at the possibility of America's invasion from without and constantly charges that we are not building for defense but for a campaign of imperialistic conquest; for active armed participation in one or several of the wars abroad. I reject the implications raised by these sources. The majority of the American people reject them. They spring in many instances from the distorted and warped minds of persons who are either misjudging the temper and background of the American people or whose first allegiance is to leadership far away from American shores.

Our faith and our loyalty are with the leadership of this Nation. This great American merchant marine that we salute today is a reality because men believed in the future of this country and in the dignity and durability of our democracy. It is growing by leaps and bounds under the pressure of the defense program. Its progress during the past year has exceeded many estimates that were made. A year from now it will give pause to the most power-infatuated despot who may be inclined to cast greedy eyes on the Western Hemisphere.

We are building our merchant marine day and night. Into this program of ship construction is going the skill of American labor and the benefits of experiment and research. These ships will be the finest that sail the seas.

They are under construction today in shipyards located along all of our coasts. The magnitude of this construction program will not be fully appreciated until we see more and more ships floating out to sea in the service of our Government. But it is happening constantly and the volume is increasing rather than diminishing.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Rear Admiral Emory S. Land and to his associates in the United States Maritime Commission, whose leadership has conceived and guided to accomplishment this superlative program. Thanks, too, go forth to the private construction companies and to the skilled craftsmen who keep the work going ever forward.

This is, indeed, an epochal year in the history of the American merchant marine. This year will be long remembered, for the complete success of the defense program will chart the course which we will follow in the future. May we build quickly and surely. We all have a precious stake in this race against time. Our one goal is the peace and security of America. In that noble objective we cannot fail.

Campaign Pledges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTH BEND (IND.) TRIBUNE

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Destructive," published in the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of May 18, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of May 18, 1941]

DESTRUCTIVE

Violations of political campaign pledges by successful nominees are not novel. In some instances unsuccessful nominees also have assumed positions after election days that were inconsistent with their campaign expressions. In general, however, such violations and changes have been accompanied by the explanation that they were justified by developments subsequent to the elections. That is, the political principals did not, at least in public, assume a contemptuous attitude toward the citizens who had voted for them.

The case of Woodrow Wilson is especially pertinent because the issue in 1916, as in 1940, was involvement in a foreign war. In November 1916, Mr. Wilson was reelected President after a campaign in which "he kept us out of war" was the Wilson party slogan. Five months later, in April 1917, Mr. Wilson and the predominantly Democratic Congress collaborated in a declaration of war against imperial Germany. The pro-war argument was that conditions had changed between election day and war declaration day. The German declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare was heavily emphasized. To the day of his death Woodrow Wilson never admitted or was tolerant of the charge that he was actually planning full involvement of the United States in the European war while the "he kept us out of war" campaign in his behalf was in progress in the autumn of 1916.

In 1940 Wendell L. Willkie, the Democrat ostensibly drafted to serve as Republican Presidential nominee, warned the voters that if President Roosevelt were elected the United States would be fully involved in the foreign war in 1941. That is, he stuck the warmonger label on the President and, by strong implication, pictured himself as the man who would, if elected, keep the United States out of the war. Mr. Roosevelt, under that strong campaign pressure, gave unqualified pledges against military participation in the European-Asiatic war.

With heavy emphasis on the President's political astuteness up to 1940 some of the journalists who classify themselves as Washington "insiders" are describing him as "embarrassed" now by his strong remarks on the war issue when he was seeking a third term. It seems settled, however, that if Mr. Roosevelt becomes a war President in his third term he will not formally admit that he was a hypocrite as a 1940 political campaigner. Changed conditions or at least an interpretation of conditions as changed will be cited, in that event, to justify violation of a forthright campaign pledge.

What about Mr. Willkie? As a pro-war witness in a congressional hearing this year he was reminded of his 1940 campaign utterances on the topic of war. The official record shows that Mr. Willkie airily dismissed his 1940 statements as mere "campaign oratory." Thus he stands self-convicted of lack of sincerity, to express it conservatively, on the war issue, than which none is more vital, when he was seeking votes.

The American political system can be no stronger than the volume of the people's confidence in it. When successful contenders for public office violate campaign pledges, even with what are intended to be plausible explanations, and defeated nominees for public offices, also with apparently sincere explanations, change their attitudes on vital issues after the elections it is bad enough from the viewpoint of maintaining public confidence in the system. If campaign pledges are not to be honored why should Americans bother to go to the polls on election days? It is infinitely worse when a defeated aspirant to the highest office in the land, the Presidency, almost airily admits to a congressional committee that he was indulging in mere "campaign oratory" on the issue of war or peace. He is in effect trying to destroy the foundation of this republic's political system, public confidence.

The Spirit of American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

ADDRESS BY OSCAR L. CHAPMAN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Oscar L. Chapman on May 18, 1941, in Alton, Ill., at the "I Am an American Day" celebration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout the Nation America today is welcoming its new citizens, honoring those who have achieved citizenship during the past 12 months through naturalization and those native-born sons and daughters who have reached their majority during the year.

We are equally proud of both groups. There is no difference or distinction in the citizenship that you have attained. You are Americans, citizens of a Nation that accords equality to all of its people irrespective of their race or of their creed, irrespective of their economic class or of their ancestry.

It is indeed a proud day in anyone's life when he can say: "I am an American."

For to be an American is not only a great honor, it is also a great privilege, and especially so in these days of dictators. You, as Americans, are free men and women, free to worship God as your conscience dictates, to belong to the political party of your choice, free in your physical being, free in every way that is the right of free men and women.

The haven of the oppressed, America has always been the sanctuary of those seeking religious or political freedom—whether they stepped ashore at Plymouth Rock from the Mayflower or landed at Ellis Island after crossing in the steerage of the latest ocean liner to ply the Atlantic.

All of us—unless we chance to be full-blooded Indians—have ancestors, if we are not foreign-born ourselves, who came to these shores from other countries. If you were foreign-born, that cannot keep you from becoming a real American, in the true sense of that word; and, may I add, if you are a native-born American that does not necessarily make you an American in the true sense of that term. For Americanism—real, true Americanism—is not something that is given you by circumstance of birth, nor is it something that can be denied you because you are foreign-born. Real Americanism is a quality of soul that can be acquired only by devotion to those great principles on which this Nation was founded. You may have been born in America, you may have become a naturalized citizen—it makes no difference which. But unless you are truly devoted to those immortal principles that have made this Nation different, that have made this Nation great, you are not, you cannot be, a true American.

You must love justice, and demand it for all, if you would be a true American. You must love equality, and be willing to accord it to all, if you would be a true American. You must love freedom, not only for yourself, but freedom for all, if you would be a true American. You must be willing to recognize talent, and aid in giving it an opportunity for development, if you would be a true American; not merely the talent that your children and mine may chance to possess, but also the talent of the humblest among us. As a true American, you will practice tolerance, tolerance of another's religious convictions, tolerance of his social and economic convictions, tolerance of his political convictions. You are not a true American, whether you are native-born or foreign-born, if you would deny another the rights that you demand for yourself. A true American is willing to share—no, he demands to share—all the rights and privileges that this free country give him. He asks them not only for himself and for his family, but for everyone, everywhere.

So you see, my friends, whether your ancestors were on the passenger lists of the Mayflower, or whether you, yourself, came to this country in the steerage of an ocean liner—it is possible for you to be, or to become, a true American. Your nativity cannot give it to you, nor can your nativity deny it to you. You must acquire it by a sincere devotion to that magnificent passage in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Dedicate yourselves to that sublime declaration, you new American citizens; and, for those of us whose citizenship may be of longer standing, I say that a rededication, a reconsecration, to those same principles would aid in making us more worthy of the citizenship we possess.

America is indeed the land of the free—and it will remain the land of the free so long as you and other Americans are militantly determined that the liberties which past generations won for you shall be preserved by you for future generations. Freedom is our most cherished possession, but it is also a sacred obligation. It is not merely ours to enjoy and to abandon at will. It is ours to preserve and to protect, and to pass down to future generations undiminished. Unless we do that we are unworthy of the freedom we possess.

Freemen everywhere—not only the freemen of England—are challenged today as never before. We have seen the freemen of many lands make a desperate but futile effort to defend their countries. And now they are enslaved. We have seen the freemen of other nations give up without a fight.

In the first instance, the nations surrendered because they were not adequately prepared to meet their enemy; in the second instance, the nations surrendered without a struggle because they lacked the spirit—the will—to defend their homelands. In both cases the result has been the same—14 nations now lie beneath the conqueror's heel.

So it is evident that a nation—if it is to defend its freedom—must possess two essential qualities. It must have not only the means of national defense; it must also have the spirit—the will—to preserve its freedom. Little Greece had the will but not the equipment; France had her Maginot Line but was lacking in spirit—lacking in will—the morale of France had ebbed almost to the vanishing point.

It behooves us, as American citizens, to inquire diligently into our own situation. We know that great factories throughout this land are working day and night in the production of armament; we know that a mighty army is being drilled, and that its ranks are being augmented daily; we know that shipyards are loaded to capacity as we rush a two-ocean navy to completion.

Our Army and our Navy are being brought to a state of perfection as rapidly as American genius can accomplish the task—and that genius is considerable. It is a task that challenges the best that is in us, but I am confident that America is equal to the challenge, as we are not lacking in resources or in the ability to avail ourselves of those resources.

Where, then, do we stand in that equally important phase of national defense—the morale of our Nation?

We saw proud France, with its mighty army—an army acclaimed as the world's best—crumble and fall. That army, and the nation behind that army, was honeycombed with intrigue. Group was against group—special interests sought and obtained privileges; class was arraigned against class: government, it appears, had ceased to be an instrument through which the greatest good for the greatest number of people was sought; government had become the tool of the few, and all too often the unscrupulous few.

What have we in America done to guard against similar conditions? What are we doing that will make certain that similar conditions will not, cannot occur here.

The morale of a nation is not something that can be brought into being through force; it is not something that we can summon in an hour of national emergency and disregard the remainder of the time. No amount of mechanical skill or inventive genius can produce morale for us as it can produce ships, planes, and other munitions.

The morale of a nation, the spirit of a nation, the soul of a nation—call it what you will—is a quality that requires constant husbandry. It is not a hardy perennial that will flourish and blossom without cultivation.

The morale of a nation—the love which the rank and file of the people bear for that nation—is strong or weak, dependent upon the qualities of that nation and its government.

If that government has failed to be a zealous guardian of its people's rights, if it has failed to protect the weak, if it has disregarded the needs of the handicapped and the unemployed, if it has allowed the strong to pillage, or if it has permitted justice to be corrupted, then one can hardly expect the morale of the citizens to be strong.

If a nation is in such a sad plight, it has already lost its battle for freedom; it has been conquered from within—by corrupt forces—before the invader has turned foot in its direction.

But, fortunately, such is not the case in America.

Here our government has long sought to guard against the very type of moral decay which caused the fall of France. And we did not wait until we were menaced by a military conqueror before precautions were taken.

No; this Government, founded on principles of equality, justice, and freedom for all, has sought—especially in recent years—to make itself worthy of that loyalty which a nation requires of its people—particularly in times of national crisis.

In a time of emergency, the nation has the right to call its citizens into military service in defense of that country. A nation that exercises that right should make certain that it—and the way of life it accords its people—are worth fighting for. The test is whether the living in that nation is worthwhile—whether government in that nation makes certain that its people receive justice—whether there is an equality of opportunity for all—jobs for those who can work—security for those who need it—no special privileges for the few—and whether the civil liberties of all are scrupulously guarded.

A country that does all this for its people will find them willing to make sacrifices, because life in it is worth while.

In recent years our Government has made a special effort to make life worth the living for all of its people, not for just a few of the more fortunate, but for the rank and file.

It has provided for the unfortunate and the handicapped, following the principle that subsistence must be provided for any who cannot work, or who are unable to find work. It has sought, through unemployment insurance, to provide for the worker who, occasionally experiences a period of unemployment. It has endeavored to make old age

secure against want. It has sought parity for the farmer. It has curtailed monopolies whose activities were directed toward pillaging the people by a control of essential commodities. It has legislated against certain pernicious practices.

This record has unrolled before you in recent years. You are as well acquainted with it as I am. And it has been accomplished without real damage to any legitimate business. Of course, some few who were denied swollen profits have complained. But the great majority of the people have benefited. The greatest good has been accomplished for the greatest number, and that is the test of our brand of good government.

But it is our duty, as citizens, to make certain that our Nation always remains one in which life is worth while for all our people.

I believe we have done and are doing just that. Consequently, I am certain that the morale of America—one of the two vital elements in our national defense—is good—that it will stand any strain that any emergency may place on it. We know that the President of the United States is striving mightily to keep war from our shores.

Oh, yes; I know that there are some newspapers in this country which daily tell the people that the President is seeking to lead us into war—which daily find fault with his every act. But we have always had such newspapers. We will always have them as long as we have a democracy, as it is only in a democracy that newspapers are free to criticize public officials. As citizens of a democratic nation we insist on our rights of free speech and a free press. I would be the first to object to any limitation on either of those sacred rights. But one of the duties of citizenship is to know what to believe—to be discriminating. Accordingly, we should bear in mind that some men, and some publications—when they make charges and attacks—are sometimes actuated by purposes of their own—purposes that frequently are not in accord with the public good.

So, I am not concerned, and you should not be, about the tirades delivered against our President, as the majority of the people realize that he is doing all within his power to avert war—that if war comes it will be unavoidable. They also know that if there is any man in America today who can keep war from our shores, that man is the President of the United States. As citizens, however, it is your duty to separate propaganda from fact so that you can act intelligently in appraising the actions of the leaders whom you freely choose.

Now while speaking of the duties of citizenship, let me suggest another phase of this same subject. Inflamed, angry men are seldom able to be useful, constructive citizens in a crisis. Such men cannot reason; they are motivated by passion and prejudice. In this hour of emergency—when our very national existence may be at stake—we should all resolve that calm judgment will govern our course. Let us, then, resolve that we will not prejudge any course of action that is suggested; let us examine it carefully, weigh its possibilities, and then reach a conclusion based wholly on fact—a conclusion in which prejudice and fancy play no part. Good citizenship requires cool heads. Times like these are too dangerous, too fraught with peril, for passion and prejudice.

But a good citizen is not merely one who is willing to sacrifice for his country in time of peril, or one who carefully weighs the facts and allows naught but reasoning to guide his actions. A good citizen also participates—as actively as his circumstances will permit—in the affairs of his community. For America, in the aggregate, is but a multitude of Altons, a multitude of Madison Counties, and a number of other States somewhat like Illinois.

Our Nation will be strong only if our cities, our counties, and our States are strong. As citizens, it is your duty to see that justice, decency, and public administration are not defamed in your local communities; you should support none but honest and capable men for public office, and you should aid such men when they are in public office—regardless of their party affiliations.

We Americans too often possess a cynical attitude toward those whom we have elected to govern us. Perhaps the men and women we have elected would be more apt to justify our confidence if we would continue to support them after they take office.

One of the tragedies of American life is that good citizens too often abandon good men and women after they are in office—we, too, often abandon them to the disreputable elements in a community. Instead, we should continue to be active in our support of all public officials who are earnestly seeking to perform their jobs in an honest manner. Let us then dispel the cynical idea that merely because a man or woman holds a public position he or she is necessarily a "crooked politician." Instead let us see to it that none but men and women of honor and of ability are elected or appointed to public office. For America cannot exist—any more than France was able to exist—unless all of our citizens actively participate to the fullest in public affairs, and unless they insist upon putting and maintaining the very best of character in their government.

Here in Alton, where Lincoln and Douglas concluded that memorable series of debates, where is established one of the oldest colleges in the Midwest, and where today you have great industrial enterprises—here in Alton a citizen should be inspired both by the traditions of the community and by the present greatness of the area of which it is so vital a part. He should be inspired to good citizenship—good citizenship which will give attention and aid to the really worth-while endeavors in your vicinity.

A community's greatness comes not from vast industrial enterprises or productive fields alone. The character of the men and women residing in that community is the prime factor in its greatness. Your schools, your colleges, your churches, your hospitals, your various civic enterprises that seek to better the lot of the handicapped or unfortunate—these are the things that give character to a community; and a community—the same as a man—cannot possess true greatness without character. As an essential element of good citizenship, then, a new citizen, as well as one of longer standing, should devote himself to these efforts.

Today we are devoting more attention to developing qualities of citizenship than ever before. Your own State of Illinois has been in the forefront of this endeavor. Several years ago a division of State government was organized which devotes itself exclusively to Americanization efforts. The Federal Government, too, has done much in this field in recent years, and citizenship and its duties have been taught. I like to recall, too, the benefits that many of our young men have received in the way of a greater appreciation of their citizenship as a result of their services in C. C. C. camps—especially those whose services took them to some one of our great State or national parks.

I need not dwell longer on this subject of good citizenship, its obligations, and its benefits. You of Illinois have taken into your midst greater numbers of our foreign-born than most of the other States.

This community, with its traditions of Père Marquette, of Lewis and Clark, and of Lovejoy, has had a glorious history.

Alton, we recall, was once an outpost in America. From but a short distance away, Lewis and Clark, after spending the winter, set out on the trek that led them across the Great Plains, over the mountains, and down to the shores of the Pacific. That journey was instrumental in winning for America the vast Northwest—in opening up a new frontier. But many years before that, Pere Marquette and Louis Joliet, together with their five companions, paddled their canoes past this site, as they pushed the frontiers of new France ahead. A few miles away, near the confluence of the Illinois and the Mississippi, is that beautiful white cross, standing on the side of a bluff, which reminds us that Father Marquette's interest lay not only in extending the frontiers of a temporal government—but also in extending the frontiers of Christianity.

Perhaps there were those who told Joliet, and, at a later date, told Lewis and Clark that the frontier had been reached. Those hardy men thought otherwise, and won for their governments a vast domain. But my mind dwells on the saintly Marquette, who was seeking not just new lands but new souls. That gentle priest was uninterested in the temporal gains that the voyage might achieve; he was seeking new frontiers of Christianity.

And we of today, if our temporal frontiers have been fully explored, as some have told us, can dedicate ourselves, as did Marquette to seeking new frontiers for our people; not new frontiers washed by unknown oceans as did Lewis and Clark; not new frontiers watered by mighty rivers, as did Joliet; but new frontiers for the soul, the heart, and the mind of men, as did Pere Marquette. And there are many such new frontiers, vast, unexplored opportunities in the realm of human relationships; in fact, we have not started to exhaust the frontiers that are ours. And they will not be exhausted, these frontiers, until we have solved many difficult problems. Before anyone can tell me that our frontiers are exhausted, I insist that he show me that mankind has found some means other than war by which to settle his difficulties; I must be shown that want and privation among some of our people will be no more. Our frontiers will not be exhausted so long as a part of our people have inadequate housing, so long as we have inequality in educational opportunity among the children of this Nation. No; my friends, there are many frontiers touching upon the rights and the needs of men that we have not explored, that we have not developed. Let us win these new frontiers—the new frontiers of happiness—for our people.

The Axis Penetration in South American Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY OSWALD RYAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a speech delivered over the radio some evenings ago by Mr. Oswald Ryan, on the subject The Axis Penetration in South American Aviation. I invite the attention of Senators to this address, because if there ever was an address which should arouse interest in the matter of national defense and our program in aviation, this is one, coming as it does from an outstanding member of

the Civil Aeronautics Board, who is thoroughly familiar with the subject with which he deals. It shows that today Germany has a network of air lines crossing and recrossing South America to such an extent that some of those air bases and air lines are today within 300 miles of the Panama Canal.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen. 1 year after the close of the last World War a group of German and Austrian pilots and ex-army officers established an air line in Colombia. It was German in personnel, management, and control; and it was the first commercial air line in the Western Hemisphere.

That was the beginning of Axis penetration in South America. Today the air map of the southern continent reveals a vast network of Axis controlled and dominated air lines covering 22,000 miles of scheduled routes—only 200 miles less than the total routes of Pan American Airways and all its affiliates in the southern continent. The Axis air lines form a ring around South America, except for the northern coast, crisscrossing the continent from trade center to trade center and penetrating the sparsely settled regions of the interior. From the mouth of the Amazon on the coast of Brazil, they extend down the South Atlantic coast to the southernmost tip of the Argentine; from Buenos Aires they reach westward across the Andes to Santiago on the Pacific coast; from Rio de Janeiro they cross through southern Brazil and Bolivia and, until the first day of last month they stretched across Peru to Lima on the west coast; and they fan out through Ecuador, where their planes fly within 3 hours of the Panama Canal.

Now this penetration in South American aviation cannot be regarded as the spontaneous development of a free and expanding industry. Commercial profit is not and has never been its controlling motive. These air lines either operate in sparsely settled territory where there is no commercial demand or commercial justification for the service, or they operate in territory where the commercial advantages are insignificant as compared with the political and strategic advantages to be attained. The staffs of these lines work in close cooperation with the diplomatic staffs and military attachés of the Axis embassies in those countries. Thus the Axis network in South America is not a commercial enterprise; it is the well-considered instrumentality of a national policy, a policy which is bent upon the cultural and political domination of the South American Continent; a policy which, backed by the financial aid of Axis governments, has the support of one of the most effective propaganda machines the modern world has known.

Can any thinking person doubt that this development constitutes a potential danger to our national and our hemisphere security? The present war has taught us that where a scheduled air liner can fly a military plane can fly—and it can carry troops and bombs. Indeed, many of the planes flown by the German air lines in South America are identical in type with the transports used by the German air force in the invasions of Norway and the Low Countries. Again, some of the landing fields of this Axis network are within bombing range of important United States bases in Trinidad, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and within bombing range of that key to our naval and military defense, the Panama Canal. It is significant to note in this connection that the German air line, Condor, has very recently extended its network to a region in Brazil in which there is no city or town of any importance and no public convenience or necessity to be served. The new route offers no commercial opportunity, it does call for the establishment of landing fields which will be strategically located close to the city of Natal on the bulge of Brazil. Natal, you will remember, lies within 2 hours' flight of the French-controlled fortress city of Dakar on the coast of Africa, and France's new agreement to "collaborate" with Germany gives this fact new and vital significance.

Again, control of these air lines makes it possible for German and Italian pilots to become familiar with the difficult and varied terrain of the southern continent. And the fact that some of these lines maintain photographic sections for the making of aerial maps of the territory over which they fly indicates that this opportunity has not been neglected.

Let me point out another potentiality which is revealed by recent events. The Italian air line Lati, whose manager is Mussolini's son, operates a trans-Atlantic service between Rome and Brazil, thereby connecting the Axis air-line system of South America with the Axis air-line network in Europe. Less than 2 months ago one of its planes made a so-called test flight lasting 7 hours out over the sea from the Brazilian coast. After this flight a heavily loaded Italian tanker dashed out of a Brazilian port in an attempt to run the British blockade. The Government of Brazil was so concerned over this incident that it laid a fine upon the Italian air line for violating Brazilian neutrality and warned the management that another such offense would terminate the company's operating rights.

A similar event took place shortly after the outbreak of the present war. Two British cruisers, the *Ajax* and the *Exeter*, on patrol duty off the southern coast of Brazil, sighted a large plane of the German air line Condor flying at a high altitude above them. It was later established that the German pocket-battleship, the *Graf Spee*, was in the vicinity at the time. The Argentine Government failed to obtain from the plane's crew a satisfactory explanation of the flight and issued an order prohibiting Condor planes thereafter from making any nonscheduled flights without having on board an Argentine Army officer as observer.

Other instances of this kind have occurred; even the efforts of the Argentine and Brazilian Governments have failed to prevent German and Italian air lines in South America from acting as the eyes of the Axis admiralties. There can be no question, therefore, as to the past and potential use of these Axis air lines for purposes of military observation over the South Atlantic; nor can there be any doubt about the great importance which the Axis has placed upon these air lines. The best measure of the value which the Germans attach to their South American air lines lies in the fact that the only German merchant ships which, for some time, have been able successfully to run the British blockade have been two German freighters—the *Lech* and the *Hermes*—which very recently arrived at Rio loaded with airplanes and airplane parts for Germany's most important South American air line.

Can there be any doubt as to the purposes which motivate this Axis enterprise on the southern continent? The German Lufthansa controlled air line in Ecuador recently sought a governmental permit to extend its line to Colombia and to the Galapagos Islands in the Pacific. Those islands offer no commercial opportunity to an air line but they do offer the strategic advantage of being one of the two most important island groups that are located near the Pacific entrance to the Panama Canal.

But while the Axis continues to plan air-line expansion in our southern continent, its activities have been curtailed in some of the countries. Thus the Axis hold on the leading air line of Colombia has recently been broken; the government of Peru on the first day of last month canceled the franchise of the German line, Lufthansa of Peru; and the Bolivian Government is proceeding with plans for eliminating Axis control from the air line of that nation. Our own Government has indicated its willingness to work with other American republics along this line and has been of help in several situations.

But while progress has been made, a vast and important task still remains to be accomplished. It must be accomplished through the common effort of all the 21 republics of this hemisphere.

We of the United States are wisely committed to the defense of this Western Hemisphere. This means that we must defend its frontiers as if they were our very own.

Not only is such a course required by our pledge to the Monroe Doctrine; our own national safety and the safety of our neighbors demand it. It is no longer fantastic to accept the possibility of an air attack upon this Nation should an unfriendly Axis Power gain supremacy in the present war. The Atlantic, particularly the South Atlantic, has become a narrow ocean; the modern bomber has made it so. If this hemisphere should be attacked by hostile planes, Dakar on the African coast in all probability would be the jumping-off place. And if this Nation should be attacked, it would be from South American air bases that enemy aircraft would operate against us.

That is why the aviation set-up in South America is vitally important to the United States. That is why we can no longer safely close our eyes to the fact that there is a Trojan horse in South America and that it has wings that are dangerous to our national life. So long as Axis planes, camouflaged as commercial airliners, are taking off from Axis-subsidized airports and are flying daily over the airways of South America, sometimes within bombing range of the Panama Canal and our vital defense bases, neither our safety nor that of the other 20 American republics can be regarded as secure.

There is but one answer to this challenge. The Axis must be eliminated from the aviation of this hemisphere; the aviation of all the Americas must be made truly and safely American.

Annual Memorial Service of Jewish War Veterans in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

ADDRESS BY COMMANDER HARRIS, OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Commander Harris of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States at the annual memorial service held in New York City on May 18, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today we have gathered here in memorial service, to pay homage to those brave Americans of our faith who died so that democracy might live. With their heroes-in-arms of other faiths, they rest in eternal peace underneath the many battlefields of America and

Europe. But we have not forgotten them. We shall never forget them. For, although their bodies sleep forever, their spirit will always live with us.

Today is a sad day. Many of us have felt the loss of dear ones who made the supreme sacrifice for our beloved land. But it is also a day of hope, of inspiration. Abraham Lincoln expressed such hope and such inspiration when he said at Gettysburg: "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion."

Yes; these American lads we honor today did give the last full measure of devotion to our country. We meet here particularly to pay tribute to the men of Jewish faith who died in the service of America. And yet, somehow we just don't think of them as Jewish soldiers. We think of them rather as American soldiers. That's as it should be.

For they were American boys who heard their country's call and answered. They were not alone—young men from every part of the country, every faith, and every color, answered that call. There were hundreds of thousands of Catholics and Protestants. The Negro people jumped at the chance of serving the Old Glory which they loved so well. Their companies were among the best on the whole western front. And the boys from the mountains and plains of the West, the hills of the East, the cotton and tobacco fields of the South, and the lumber camps of the North, marched off to do battle together. They all did their part. They all were heroic soldiers of the American brand.

Among these were our Jewish lads. Their heroism was of this same American brand and their record was a good one. I happen to have a few figures with me today that substantiate that record in the last war. It is one in which we can all take pride. For while at that time about 3½ percent of the Nation's population was Jewish, 5 percent of the armed forces were from Jewish homes. Two hundred and fifty thousand in number, they left some three thousand four hundred fallen on the battlefields of France. These figures speak for themselves. They speak of the love those boys had for America, for democracy—for the cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion.

We of the Jewish faith have always been a peace-loving people. We have abhorred war throughout our long history. Indeed, the great contribution of the ancient Hebrews to the civilized world was the ideal of the brotherhood of man—the notion, the aspiration, and the faith that men might live among men in peace and harmony. This has always been our Jewish ideal. It was the ideal that bound us together in ancient times and protected us against our enemies. It was a Jewish ideal, and yet—in a larger sense—it was a human ideal.

The Jewish and Christian religions have always been linked by this common concept of brotherhood. The Judeao-Christian ethic inspired men throughout the ages. It made them feel that they were all working together for a common goal—for peace and prosperity and good will. It was a unifying force, and eventually it became a force so strong that a form of government—democracy—was built around it.

For democracy, after all, is merely a form of government which derives its strength—and its whole strength—from the intensity of this ideal. Democracy, without the Jewish-Christian ethic of brotherhood, is merely an empty form of government. But with it, it is the crystallization of human hopes and the effective force for bringing those hopes into reality.

Love of peace is but one of the arches in this structure of human faith. Another is the belief in doing good. That's a simple belief. We all accept it. It might even be said we all take it for granted. Helping one's neighbor, doing acts of charity, helping the weak and the wayward—all these things we accept as human ideals. We Americans believe, too, that man possesses a sort of human dignity, distinct from the physical instincts of mere animals. This is what we mean when we speak of the human soul. We Americans believe, too, that man has the natural intelligence to govern himself—that his best qualities should be encouraged, and his worse habits gradually eradicated. And these things, too, are simple—so simple that we take them for granted.

But there are those in this world who do not take them for granted—those who have been misled by false leaders—nor do they accept them as unshatterable human beliefs. On the contrary these people—and there are millions of them—believe in just the opposite.

They have been led to believe in war—war as an ideal and as a living reality. They have been led to believe in bloodshed, in the desirability of killing as a way out of man's troubles. They have been taught to hate peace, even as we Americans hate war.

They do not believe in doing good. Rather they exalt cruelty and vindictiveness and ruthlessness. They will destroy their neighbors at the command of their leaders. In that way, they are told, and many of them believe, they are serving their state.

Nor do they believe in the divinity of the human soul. They have been taught to exult in the success of their campaign to eradicate spiritual concerns from men's minds. They have destroyed men's consciences and implanted a hunger to serve the state in slavery. In this sort of thinking, religion has no place whatsoever. Religious faith merely would detract—and possibly destroy—faith in the men who set themselves at the head of the state. So the whole concept of God must be uprooted.

We all know who these people are who have been misled—the people of Russia and Italy and Germany and we are all only too familiar with their relentless campaigns against our Jewish people and our Jewish religion. But perhaps some of us do not realize that the attack upon our people is merely the prelude to an all-out attack on all religious sects. In every country of Europe the spreading of anti-Catholic and anti-Protestant feeling has followed on the heels of the assault on the Jews. This spiritual warfare is a ruthless but a tragically logical result of the whole mental outlook of the Nazis, Fascists, and Communists—the outlook that the only allegiance to be permitted must be allegiance to the leader.

It is well that we understand this outlook—it is well that we understand all the varied ideas and prejudices and uninhibited instincts which go to make up the pattern of totalitarian thinking. Whatever we may think of this philosophy, we must face it. It may be illogical, it may be inhuman, and it may be very, very confused. But one thing remains clear. The dictators thinking is directly opposite to our democratic thinking, opposite in every detail, opposite not only in matters of immediate concern, but opposite to the whole Jewish-Christian tradition on which democracy is built. There can be no lasting compromise between the two.

The dictators, at least, are aware of the logic of this fact. They realize that they must combat democracy—must combat human feelings of decency and brotherhood—on every front if they are to maintain their power in the world. And so we here in America are subjected to a campaign of ideas, sometimes so subtle that we are taken in, sometimes so bold that we tremble, but always persistent and unscrupulous. This penetration in the realm of ideas hits here, there, and everywhere.

Sometimes it hits at our democracy as a working system of government. We are encouraged to believe that democracy doesn't really work—that it is a thing of the past—to be supplanted by a philosophy which has been granted a mysterious monopoly over the future of mankind. We are told democracy doesn't work, that it can't work, and we are shown the best ways of preventing it from working.

Sometimes it hits in our communities or in our factories or stores, trying to fan little troubles into far-reaching feuds. There are honest differences between capital and labor, for example, but these are exploited and expanded in order to create disunity and dissension in our land. There is long-standing friction between Negro and white, North and South, rich and poor, young and old—frictions which can almost always be ironed out by a little understanding and good will. But these frictions do exist, and the enemies of democracy are making the most of them. Just as the totalitarian ideal is one of breaking down our institutions—the home, the church, the school system, and the economic system—the preparation for this totalitarianism is also one of breaking down. We can readily enough understand how quickly our country would fall if we became, as Abraham Lincoln said, "a house divided against itself."

It's not the larger differences that are really the important ones. After all, the entire Nation last fall was a house divided against itself when we were either Republicans or Democrats and pretty well excited about the outcome of the Presidential campaign. But were we really divided? No; for on the greatest issue confronting the country, the defense of democracy, we were united as never before.

It's the little differences that are important. The smaller differences that spell the distinction between a weak democracy and a strong one. After all, although we believe in democracy as an ideal, we must make it more than that. We must make it a reality in our lives every moment of the day. The banker downtown, the push-cart peddler on the East Side, the shopkeeper on Broadway, the commuter in Westchester, and the farmer in Dutchess County—must believe actively, wholeheartedly, and concretely in this thing we call democracy. They must all have a feeling that something belongs to all of us, and that something, American democracy, stands before any of the smaller interests of any one of us or any groups of us.

Today we honor those who did feel this democracy; felt it so deeply that they were willing to devote their lives to it. They did not die in vain—for we here today owe the blessings of liberty and self-government to the very men whose memory we honor. But, alas, the fight they fought is never completely won. Liberty is not only a heritage but a fresh conquest for each generation.

And so we who stand in tribute today must dedicate ourselves to that very task. We must join with Americans of every other faith in reasserting the strength of our democratic government and our democratic ideals. We Jews have a stake in democracy, but it is the same stake that every other American has—the continuance of our personal freedom, the existence of our homes and our communities, and the possibility of progressing toward a better and better future for our children.

It so happens, too, that today is by Presidential proclamation I Am An American Day. A man, whoever he is, whatever his faith, who has the precious privilege of being able to say "I am an American" has a possession more priceless than anything else on earth. We must defend this possession and defend it truly, lest we betray the sacred trust of those who gave their lives that it might remain ours. And we must defend it, too, so that those who come after us may be able to say, just as proudly as we say it now, "I am an American."

Manners in the Modern Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Manners in the Modern Style," by George E. Sokolsky, published in the New York Sun of April 15, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of April 15, 1941]

THESE DAYS—MANNERS IN THE MODERN STYLE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

I saw in the newspapers last week that Congressman JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN accepted an invitation to lunch and figuratively spat into the face of his host. Even in an era when manners, like thrift and public morals, are taboo, it did not quite go down.

I know JOE BALDWIN, and I would say, offhand, that by birth, breeding, education, and taste such a performance, in another, would have been utterly distasteful to him. He undoubtedly did it because he has recently become a Member of Congress in an age when nothing matters so long as it produces votes. That is why we have so enormous a national debt, why taxes are rocketing to heaven, why labor leaders run riot over the land, why a learned official was heard to say that he trusts his instinct rather than his conscience.

JOE BALDWIN'S imitation of the vulgar occurred at a luncheon given by the New York State Economic Council, of which Merwin K. Hart is president. It must be noted here that Merwin K. Hart is in bad with the liberals because he supported Franco in Spain. He wrote a book, which is an inalienable right, too often pursued, of every American. From that moment the Communists, liberals, fellow travelers, and their camp followers have been calling him a Fascist and an anti-Semite. Hart committed the error of saying what everybody now knows about Spain before the Stalin-Hitler alliance. Had he waited a few months and had he associated his anticommunism with lip service to aid to Britain, he would have avoided smearing. In fact, he might have been an accepted person in the newly formed anticommunist salons. His crime was prematurity.

So Joe Baldwin accepted an invitation to comment unfavorably on the St. Lawrence River project. The St. Lawrence River project is, I am certain, unrelated to the Jewish question, except as politicians, like Mr. Hitler, can relate the unrelated to anything that has to do with votes. No one required Mr. Baldwin to accept this invitation to deliver a speech. Nevertheless, Mr. Baldwin did agree to speak. He came. He broke bread with his host. He ate his lunch. He was, with fitting compliments due a Member of Congress, presented to a panting audience. Then he opened an address on the virtues of his own undiluted and unprejudiced democracy—while implying that Mr. Hart's was Fascistic and anti-Semitic—with this:

"I have been informed that certain sponsors of the New York State Economic Council hold views on our American democracy and its defense completely at variance with mine. Had I known of these views in advance I would not have been here today and no doubt neither would many of you."

Of course, that is silly. When Congressman BALDWIN wrote those lines he was at home or in his office. Copies were sent to the press. He could easily have stayed where he was. He might have sent Hart a telegram saying that he was busy, ill, indisposed, or that he did not like the contour of Hart's face. He came because he wanted a forum to say what he should not have said at another man's table. He wanted to say it dramatically because it might get some votes in the next election.

Now, I don't like this business of dragging Jews into every kind of personal and political quarrel among the politicians. We Jews have troubles enough of our own, and God help us as much from our friends as from our enemies. This business of calling everybody who, for the moment, is on the unpopular side a Fascist and an anti-Semite is bad business for the Jew. It manufactures anti-Semites. It makes men bitter. It forces them to believe that Jews are persecuting and boycotting them. It makes them vindictive.

I write this because the time has come to say in the open what many of us are saying privately. We wish that those Jews who hold jobs fighting anti-Semitism would let us alone so that we might live among our neighbors in peace.

Merwin Hart has sent me a pamphlet in which appear two letters. Miss Eva Panton of the Bronx writes Mr. Hart to ask why he hates Jews. Mr. Hart replies:

"It seems to me that you gained your incorrect impression of me as a result of a concerted campaign to create the impression that I am hostile to the Jews. Those who direct that campaign are using the cry of "anti-Semitism" recklessly. They serve not the Jews, but the enemies of the Jews. They create anti-Semitism where it does not exist. * * * It is becoming difficult to express any opinion in New York in disagreement with certain Jewish leaders without being branded an anti-Semite. Those Jewish leaders have forced the Jewish question into the highways and byways of American life. I, for instance, had never been faced with the question, Do I or do I not like Jews? Nor did I ask whether a man is or is not a Jew. It seems to me as unnatural in American life to ask such questions as it would be to ask similar questions about those who come from California or Iowa. An American's mind should be free from such questions.

"But these Jewish leaders say in effect, 'You must agree with us on all questions—political, social, economic, international—or we will smear you as an anti-Semite.' I hope that you will believe me when I tell you that they are doing infinite harm to the Jews in the United States. They are the authors of the Jewish question."

There is more to the Hart letter. It is unfortunate that this question should arise in America at all. Americans are not anti-Semitic. They have likes and dislikes, prejudices, and pettinesses even as you and I, but there is no hatred, no ideological basis, no race consciousness such as exists in Germany. There is at the present time an inevitable reflex to the vile propaganda against the Jews that comes out of Germany daily. There is even an imitation of it. And there are sharpshooters who find that there is a dollar or two in the hatred business and who take it up as a profession. But they soon exploit themselves as they do their financial aids and, having become utterly ridiculous, they disappear even from their narrow circles. Nobody has become a millionaire as a professional anti-Semite. Nobody has achieved distinction or glory in such a role.

But that does not mean that Jews should go about indiscriminately labeling men as anti-Semites because they disagree on Stalin, Franco, the St. Lawrence waterway, food for the small democracies, the lease-lend bill, or similar unrelated matters. The time has come to drop this nonsense.

The Middle West and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PROGRESSIVE MINER

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Middle West and War," published in the Progressive Miner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive Miner]

THE MIDDLE WEST AND WAR

The middle westerners are certainly a bunch of dull witted, unimaginative, apathetic, unpatriotic peasants—according to some of the higher-paid columnists and commentators and highpowered politicians along the Atlantic seaboard.

Judging from the remarks of the better, or should we say worst propagandists, we of the Middle West don't even know there is a war or two in progress and that maybe a week from Tuesday planes are going to fly over from Europe and Asia and shower bombs on our peaceful habitations. That'll shake us out of our lethargy. You betcha. Then we'll show the rest of the Nation just how to become hysterical about war.

Why, we of the Middle West are so dumb and ignorant we don't even know the United States furnished the European countries, with the exception of Germany, the money, through our fantastic gold-buying program, to start the glorious war for democracy. We're so ill-informed we didn't know that this country, in increasing the price of gold from $20 to $35 and buying all the yellow metal Japan, Russia, France, and Great Britain sent us, merely gave those countries, principally the latter, as an outright gift $7,000,000,000, and then after we got the gold we buried it in a hole in Kentucky.

We don't even know the United States Congress appropriated $7,000,000,000 to furnish Great Britain with war materials, and that every sort of war implement we produce is being sent direct to Britain to aid it in its fight against Hitlerism. We're contrary enough to believe this country is doing its part in the battle for so-called democracy. So lacking in imagination are we that we don't think the British Isles is going to fall to the onslaughts of the Nazis, and we believe the European war has reached a virtual stalemate.

We're so naive we don't think it's good ethics to supply both belligerents with war materials, such as this country is doing in the case of China and Japan and of Great Britain and Germany. The latter, of course, gets hers through the backdoor—via Russia.

We're so dense we believe the best way to kill democracy is to go to war, and strange as it may seem to the highly intelligent and cultured New Yorkers and Washingtonians that is one of the reasons we are opposed to entering Europe's current showing of the "War to Save Democracy." We can't see the strength of strangling democracy here to fight for it somewhere else. We also entertain the quaint notion that this Nation can't possibly spread democracy throughout the world by force of arms.

We of the Middle West must be a source of worry and vexation to the dear little lovers of

mass murder. We are willing, however, to be reasonable and meet the blood-loving ultra-patriots half way. We will be willing to go to war provided all the prominent columnists, radio commentators, public officials, Army officers, and politicians who are so extremely anxious for everyone else to go, will fight in the front lines with us. What, no takers? Egad, they must be pro-Nazi.

We don't snivel and cringe with fear when Hitler's name is mentioned for the simple reason we are quietly confident the United States can take care of itself very capably when and if the occasion demands it. We learned well the lesson we were taught in joining in on World War I, that is why we are a trifle interested in keeping out of the current conflict.

No Reduction in Nondefense Expenditures Now Apparent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, fast-moving world events have to a very great degree diverted the American people from a realization of the additional burdens of taxation our people must bear if this country is to survive economic chaos. It is inevitable that as our governmental debts—Federal, State, and local—increase our taxes, whenever we return to a pay-as-we-go basis, automatically increase also. It is also inevitable that when our taxes increase the cost of living increases, and automatically the standard of living lowers in exact ratio. The American people are soon to come face to face with the truth of this statement.

Two alternatives are open to the Congress at this time. One is to return to a pay-as-we-go basis so far as nondefense activities are concerned, and to pay at least a part of the defense expense by taxation while such expenditures are being made. The other is to continue the suicidal policy of the last 8 years—of riding along from year to year with ever-present, and usually increasing, deficits. The latter policy has resulted in increasing the national debt from $23,000,000,000 to more than double that sum. In addition to this direct debt of the United States, various bureaus of the Government have been authorized to borrow and spend approximately $10,000,000,000, all guaranteed both as to interest and capital by the Government itself. Thus the real national debt at the moment is ten billions in excess of that acknowledged by the administration, or about fifty-five billions.

The Congress has during the last year appropriated directly, or has issued contract authorizations, in the immense sum of more than $32,000,000,000 for the national defense alone. This figure includes the $7,000,000,000 lease-lend-give appropriation. As this is written, it is understood the President is to ask the Congress for another four billion for tanks and other military equipment. This will bring the program for defense expenditures for this year and next up to the shocking sum of $36,000,000,000.

National-defense work affords the Government an opportunity to eliminate some of the expenditures of various relief agencies. Many of the millions who have been unemployed over a period of years now have an opportunity to become self-sustaining. Any policy of continuing expenditures on a scale comparable to that of the past few years must be recognized as a refusal on the part of the administration to take advantage of the best opportunity it will ever have to put a large part of the unemployed American people back on a self-sustaining basis.

The present tax-increase program, as outlined by the Treasury, contemplates raising three billions, six hundred millions in additional revenue. If this program proves acceptable to the Congress and is finally written into law, the revenues derived from all Federal taxes will be approximately twelve billions, three hundred millions. This figure, in my judgment, represents considerable wishful thinking on the part of the Treasury Department.

The estimated expenditures for the defense program alone vary from nineteen billions to twenty-four or twenty-five billions. Add to this the estimated nondefense expenditures and we find the maximum estimate reaches a figure of thirty-four billions, three hundred millions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942. Subtracting the estimated receipts of twelve billions, three hundred millions, we are faced with the necessity of increasing the national debt by borrowing another twenty-two billions. This sum added to the present debt of fifty-five billions will raise the debt to approximately seventy-seven billions.

There is a rapidly growing demand in the Congress for a radical reduction in nondefense expenditures. It seems to many of us that if the several million able-bodied men now unemployed in industry and other lines of activity are ever to be returned to a self-sustaining basis, it must be done while the present growing demand for labor of every kind exists throughout the country. Certainly the President's proposal to reduce relief expenditures a mere hundred millions is so absurd as to constitute an invitation to the Congress to continue to increase the various appropriations, as has been the case up to this time, instead of bringing about substantial reductions.

Public Health and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM H. RICHARDSON

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief radio speech by Hon. William H. Richardson, of North Carolina, on the subject of Public health and national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From every quarter, during this momentous period, you hear talk of preparedness for national defense. You read about it in the newspapers, you hear it discussed over the radio and by speakers in the public forum.

PREPAREDNESS FOR WHAT?

For whatever may come. For war, if it is our lot to be thrown into the world-wide conflict of arms and opinions that marks this tragic era; for peace, if we continue to occupy the enviable position of nonbelligerency; for the readjustments that some day must result from what is now taking place.

DEFENSE AGAINST WHAT?

Against aggression, if that is thrust upon us; against foes within, as well as foes from without—against a recurrence of those economic distresses that followed the crash of 1929.

To speed effective preparedness, those who are engaged in building our defenses must themselves be prepared. International disturbances bring about difficult situations, but it is the man behind the machine for making the gun who, in the ultimate, must support the man behind the gun. Upon the shoulders of the individual rests the responsibility for mass production, whether against armed aggression or disease.

Individual preparedness, then, is our first line of defense. To bring about a state of adequate preparedness, the various agencies of your Government—Federal, State, and local—are at work, at work in close cooperation, and this cooperation must be strengthened; it must continue without interruption.

Your State board of health, responsible for ways and means of promoting mass health protection, is working in close cooperation with the national-defense program on several important fronts.

On May 25, of last year, just after the Germans had overrun the Low Countries, and following closely President Roosevelt's appeal for immediate preparedness—in view of the gravity of the situation—Dr. Carl V. Reynolds, your State health officer, sounded this note of warning:

"A desperado and his gang are loose in the world. They are running wild, destroying civilization, leaving in their wake death and destruction among innocent, God-fearing people. Our President has called for a program of preparedness designed to give us protection against this sinister force. Mechanized units will avail us nothing unless we enter into a definite program of physical preparedness. Let us not repeat the mistakes of 1917, when our manpower was 33⅓ percent unfit for active military duty. If we must fight to preserve our heritage, let us man our machines of war with men whose eyes are clear, whose hands are sturdy, and whose nerves are of iron."

Again, on June 14, he issued another urgent appeal for physical preparedness, in which he used this language:

"Whatever our material resources may be, we cannot properly utilize them unless they are placed in charge of those who are mentally and physically fit."

In this second appeal, Doctor Reynolds set forth the duties of the individual, the physician, the employee, and the employer.

Yet again, this time on June 20, he declared:

"Delay means waste of both time and opportunity. Procrastination is a thief whose loot is never recovered. Man's physical fitness is essential in war or peace—it is an integral part of preparedness."

During last summer, he addressed the Raleigh Rotary Club and other organizations, emphasizing the importance of physical fit-

ness for national defense, pointing out where the responsibility lies.

But the matter did not end with mere words. Your State board of health put the words of Dr. Reynolds into action, and it has continued to give our national-defense program its 100 percent cooperation in the present crisis, which bids fair to try men's souls, as well as their bodies. The North Carolina board's activities have paralleled those of the United States Public Health Service and other institutions and organizations working with the Government in this grave matter.

The United States Public Health Service is authority for the statement that, during the first World War, venereal disease in the United States Army caused the loss of 7,000,000 days—equal to a full year's absence from duty of 19,000 men. It is estimated today that there are about 300,000 men with infectious syphilis among the 16,500,000 men registered under the Selective Service Act.

North Carolina, through its State board of health, launched an offensive against "the mistakes of 1917" almost immediately following the passage of the Selective Service Act, when steps were taken to induce registrants, through the processes of education, to submit to voluntary serologic tests. The result was that, out of the 448,555 who registered in this State, more than 130,000 presented themselves for these tests. Statistics are now being made up and will be announced in due time by your State health department.

North Carolina's quick and effective work in this matter led an official of the United States Public Health Service, who was quoted in the December 15, 1940, issue of the Raleigh News and Observer, to declare that if all States had followed its lead in this and preceding efforts in behalf of the eradication of syphilis, this entire Nation would now be 10 years ahead of schedule in its fight on venereal diseases.

Immediately preceding registration day, when Dr. Reynolds called a conference of local health officers to explain the plan of procedure in detail, former Gov. Clyde R. Hoey was invited to be present and address the meeting. During the course of his remarks, he said:

"I ask you to envision the beneficial results that will accrue to humanity 5, 10, even 50 years from now, as the result of the program you have launched."

Dr. Reynolds, chairman of the subcommittee of the State and Territorial Health Officers' Association's committee on Federal relations for securing voluntary serologic tests among registrants, pointed out during the campaign and following its successful culmination that the cooperation given by local health officers, the press, and other cooperating agencies proved of immense value.

Your State board of health is now engaged in work along numerous other fronts in the national-defense program. Only recently there was held in the board's auditorium the second annual conference of the North Carolina General Nutrition Committee—which is sponsored by the board of health, through the cooperation of representatives of various other interested groups, including universities, colleges, and governmental agencies.

The purpose of this movement is to ascertain and correct nutritional deficiencies existing among the people of North Carolina in order that they may become physically fit—not only for war, if that should come, but for the vital task of building our homes, industries, and institutions.

The division of industrial hygiene, a conjoint activity of the State board of health and the North Carolina Industrial Commission, is engaged in making preemployment examinations in plants turning out material for the national defense.

The director of this division, who is Dr. T. F. Vestal, will address you over this station at a later date.

Dr. Vestal recently said:

"Let us not be weighed in the balance and found wanting. Let's protect and prepare our industrial forces with the same degree of enthusiasm and patriotism that marks our efforts in behalf of our military forces. Let's do the whole job, and do it in the American way."

I might enlarge on the foregoing national-defense activities to which your State board of health is giving its active support, but time will not permit just now.

As I left for the studio, Dr. Reynolds said:

"Be sure to tell the people that in the near future we will make known to them our activities in the army areas—for the protection of our civil, as well as military, population, in matters pertaining to their physical welfare. This is a gigantic undertaking but essential and cannot be minimized."

Your State health officer, through the proper channels, will advise you, for example, what is being done and contemplated in Cumberland, Onslow-Pender, New Hanover, and perhaps other counties where military preparations soon will be under way.

Public health, ladies and gentlemen, is dedicated not only to the duty of reclaiming the lives of the underprivileged, but also of waging an "all out" war against those diseases and maladjustments which harass God's creatures and make them miss the mark.

And now, until next Wednesday at this same hour, your State board of health bids you good afternoon and wishes you good health.

Balancing the Risks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23, 1941

ARTICLE BY STUART CHASE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Stuart Chase, entitled "Balancing the Risks," published in the Progressive of Saturday, May 17, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

[From The Progressive of May 17, 1941]

BALANCING THE RISKS

(By Stuart Chase)

Two major groups are battling for the leadership of American foreign policy—the "interventionists" and the "isolationists." Already these labels have become fighting words, with a whole string of epithets attached to them. Interventionists are also "warmongers" and "British agents"; isolationists are also "appeasers" and "defeatists." In the middle of this verbal free-for-all stands Secretary Ickes calling everyone who does not agree with him a "Nazi fellow traveler."

In order to keep this discussion on a civilized level, I propose two new labels: "planetarians" and "hemispherists." The planetarians are openly or implicitly for war now. The hemispherists are for rushing the defenses of the Western Hemisphere, and taking a chance on war later.

Each group has its own fellow travelers—a kind of emotional annex. The planetarians have a trailer full of stern moralists who think that panzer divisions can be licked by the strong sword of righteousness, so up and at 'em.

The hemispherists have a trailer full of religious pacifists, and another full of 1790 George Washington isolationists, who don't like foreigners and to hell with them.

DIFFER ON MEANS, NOT ENDS

If we ignore the whooping trailers, we get down to reasonably intelligent folks in both camps, who recognize a fact when they collide wth one. They are honest, patriotic, and sincere Americans who have precisely the same goal—the preservation of the American republic. They differ on means, not on ends. The planetarians put their faith in an east-west axis, with the United States strengthening the resisters of aggression in Europe, Africa, and the Far East.

The hemispherists put their faith in a north-south axis from Greenland to Cape Horn, with the United States taking the lead in defending and directing half the world. The planetarians think that war now is a risky business but that it will better preserve the republic. The hemispherists think that peace now has its risks but will prove a sounder policy in the long run.

This is a reasonable distinction about which reasonable men can argue and come to a decision. If Secretary Ickes and his fellow hog-callers in both camps could be given nice consular jobs in the interior of Tibet, we might get on with it faster. Obviously either policy involves a set of risks. Which is the graver? I have made a short inventory which may help to clear the air. First let us look at: The risks of a hemisphere policy.

1. If we avoid war now, we may have to fight later without the aid of the British fleet and such aid as is now available from China, the Dutch colonies, the free French forces.

2. If we do not act energetically now, the totalitarian powers may overrun the whole Eastern Hemisphere and consolidate their gains. They will then have more men, more resources, more shipbuilding capacity than we shall have.

3. The only hope of saving the little nations is right away before they are locked up in the totalitarian blocs. We risk a great defeat for democracy if we do not go to their aid at once.

4. A hemisphere policy risks the loss of all our foreign trade with the Old World.

5. It risks turning the United States into an armed camp for the indefinite future, waiting for the totalitarians to strike.

6. It risks Axis economic domination of some South American republics, if the hemisphere trade program does not succeed, and a degree of commercial imperialism by the United States if the program does succeed.

Outside of shouts from the trailer about moral risks and moral duties, the above six points are the core of the realistic case against a hemisphere policy. I think they need extensive qualification before final acceptance, but first let us inventory: The risks of an immediate all-out war policy—

1. Such a war will quickly transform the United States into a totalitarian state, with the Government in complete control of the economy, private business relegated to the servants' quarters, a strict official censorship, the Bill of Rights in abeyance, minorities silenced if not prosecuted, Congress reduced to a saluting squad. Unfortunately, this is the only way to fight a full-out war in 1941.

2. We risk war in the Atlantic and the Pacific simultaneously, if the tripartite pact means what it says. We can expect no help from Russia if we attack Japan, under the terms of the recent Russo-Japanese agreement. This starts us off against heavy military odds.

8. We risk the defeat of Britain before we can make our military aid effective. If the British Isles should go down, we then face the unpleasant choice of signing a humiliating peace or continuing the war abroad with no British Fleet to assist us. The chances of our subduing the Continent of Europe and the Japanese Islands, simultaneously, are somewhat worse than the chances of a successful invasion of North America by the totalitarian powers. Both are very slim chances indeed.

4. We risk the immediate loss of the Philippines, all our interests in the Far East, a large part of our foreign trade and foreign investments in the Old World. Foreign trade, you will note, appears in both inventories. The difference is in the timing. We can lose it somewhat faster by going to war than by waiting. In either event the loss of Old World trade cannot be fatal to the Americas. We have every essential resource, including tin and good substitutes for rubber, within the hemisphere.

5. The United States is not yet ready to fight a two-ocean war abroad, either materially or psychologically. Our Navy is still a one-ocean fleet, our Army is in the infantile stage of mechanization, our air arm is still relatively small. When a country sets out to conquer such tough, seasoned customers as Germany and Japan together—with perhaps Russia thrown in—it is a good idea to have something more tangible than rhetoric with which to conquer them. The risk involved in thinking we can conquer with our bare hands because our hearts are pure is one of the gravest any nation can take. Ask the gallant Finns and the Greeks about this. We risk, in short, defeat.

6. If we go to war unprepared and suffer serious reverses abroad, our position in Latin America will be greatly weakened.

7. Four Americans out of five do not want to fight now, and will probably be apathetic if we do fight. It will be necessary for the administration to prove to them that the fighting is getting results. If the results are not forthcoming, apathy may turn into angry disillusionment, with alarming political consequences. So, we risk severe internal dissension.

A FEW QUESTION MARKS

Before coming to any final conclusions, let us spot a few question marks on both inventories. Going back to the risks of the hemisphere policy:

Certainly, it would be better to fight, if at all, with the British Fleet on our side. But who can read the future and say categorically that we must fight the totalitarians later? Suppose Hitler dies, or is deposed by the real managers of Germany? Suppose Germany, or Japan, or both, pitch into Russia a few years hence? Suppose Germany and Japan clash over India or the Dutch East Indies?

We may have to fight later, and should prepare for it to the hilt, but history has too many surprises to justify the word "inevitable" in this connection. The totalitarian powers are reasonably unified now, and will be more so if we attack them en masse; they may or may not be later. They have more men, but their combined industrial plant is no more powerful than that of the United States. Hanson Baldwin, military expert of the New York Times, recently pointed out in Harper's Magazine that we could build more than enough ships for hemisphere defense.

FOUR COUNTRIES QUALIFY

In my opinion, it is already too late to save the little nations as sovereign states. The power age and the bombing plane have made it impossible for any nation to insist on its sovereignty without the military force to protect it and a supply of strategic raw materials within its borders.

Only four countries qualify for sovereignty under this definition today—the United States, Germany, Japan (with resources from China), and Russia. The British Empire is too scattered, geographically, to form a compact fighting unit.

Little nations will have to snuggle under the aluminum wings of one of these four, or build up federations of their own, to which they must perforce surrender their sovereignty. The little countries of Europe can only be saved in some kind of United States of Europe. Have we the plans or the power with which to set this up?

The "armed camp" risk goes for both categories. If we engage in war now we shall get a bigger and better armed camp, with a good chance that it will last equally long.

The Latin-American trade risk also appears in both lists. The hemisphere policy would attempt to meet this danger from the Axis directly, the planetary policy only indirectly.

PROMISES VERSUS DELIVERIES

Let us now qualify the war-risk inventory a little. Perhaps the tripartite pact does not mean what it says, and if we attack Germany we shall not have Japan to fight as well. Perhaps Russia can somehow be won over to our side. This would be excellent strategy, though it might somewhat dent the slogan of a war for democracy.

Perhaps German supplies will give out, or her long-suffering people will revolt. In this event, a conquest of Europe would not be the bloody, costly, probably impossible adventure contemplated. But the internal collapse of Germany is a long, long chance to take.

Perhaps if we go to war we shall find no place in which to fight on a large scale. It will be only a little, limited war of convoys, skirmishes, name calling, and a few long-distance air raids. This will not hurt us much, but by the same token it will not hurt our enemies much. Our prestige, however, will be seriously hurt. We have promised all things and delivered nothing.

CASTING THE BALANCE

This is as fair and just an inventory as I know how to make. As a hemispherist, perhaps I have unconsciously stacked the cards. If so, I invite any honest planetarian to set me right. I will not be impressed by moral objections. The national interest of the United States in the dangerous world of 1941 depends more on fire power than on moral exhortations. The enemy can always be counted on to have as strong a moral case as we have so far as his people are concerned. If he has more fire power, we are sunk.

Examining the two lists of risks, a man from Mars would say that for the United States to go to war now would be to exchange risks which are remote and uncertain for risks which are immediate and of the gravest nature.

Albert J. Nock's Review of "Union Now" Knocks Bottom Out of Contemptible Idea

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ARTICLE FROM SCRIBNER'S COMMENTATOR

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a review of Union Now, by Albert J. Nock, appearing in the May issue of Scribner's Commentator magazine. This review is a well-studied discussion of the much-talked-about proposal for subjugating the United States to Great Britain. It not only points out the dangers of the Union Now movement, but also the fallacious reasoning upon which it is based:

[From Scribner's Commentator of May 1941]

UNION NOW—A REVIEW

(By Albert J. Nock)

Mr. Clarence K. Streit's book Union Now is a literary curiosity. Its spirit is excellent. It is written in such deadly earnest, it is so honest, so sincere, and its sentiment is so sound, that no fair-minded critic could dismiss it lightly. Moreover, it has modesty—modesty with firmness—a rare combination of qualities in the work of any publicist in these days. To approach the book in a right frame of mind, the reader should begin with the last two pages, and then turn back. In these two pages Mr. Streit says in effect that he has done the best he could with his idea, not so well as he would wish, especially in style and arrangement, and his only desire is that others would pick up his idea and do better with it than he can. Mr. Streit shows himself fully aware that the question of who is right or wrong is a very small one, and the question of what is right or wrong is a very big one. No critic could ask better than that.

Mr. Streit is for individual freedom. He is against the current manifestations of rationalism and statism. In this he seems to be quite in the spirit of the declaration's doctrine of natural rights, though he does not discuss the point theoretically. His design calls for the constitutional union of a group of national governments somewhat like our union of a group of States. This union would be for the purpose of providing effective common government "in those fields where such common government will clearly serve man's freedom better than separate governments," leaving the present independent national government to carry on "in all other fields where such government will best serve man's freedom." The union thus formed would be made constitutionally capable of attracting nonunion governments into its group, and in this way ultimately grow into a world-wide governmental system.

In pursuance of this plan the author suggests beginning with a union of what he calls "the North Atlantic democracies," that is to say, the British Empire, the United States, the Low Countries, the Scandinavian kingdoms, France, Switzerland, and Finland. These should unite in a general governmental policy of (1) free trade, (2) common citizenship, (3) common defence, (4) a common currency, (5) a common postal and communications system. Mr. Streit thinks these five points would do for a starter. Others might be added as circumstances required, but these would be enough to be going on with.

Mr. Streit differentiates sharply (and correctly) between his idea of a union and the idea of a league or of an alliance. In the two latter, the state is the unit; in the former, man would be the unit. A league is of, by, and for the state; his union would be of, for, and by man. The union's minimum bill of rights should guarantee "not only those rights of man that are common to all the democracies, but every existing national or local right that is not clearly incompatible with effective union government" in the five fields above named.

Finally, how to bring about this union. First, Mr. Streit says, let unionists unite; let them unite and organize, then evangelize. All like-minded persons in the North At-

lantic democracies should form an international world unionist party, and then each one should devote his talents to spreading the light among his kinsfolk, neighbors, and acquaintances. In short, these persons should form an international pressure group. "Union has the great advantage," according to Mr. Streit, "that its supporters do not need to petition governments or wait on diplomats to get it; they need only turn to themselves and their neighbors." The idea apparently is that citizens of a democracy do not petition their government; they give orders to it. Hence there is no inconsistency where, two pages after this statement, Mr. Streit urges the fine old democratic expedient of writing to your Congressman; he recommends a "post-card plebiscite." These posts cards are not petitions of a servant to a master; they are orders of a sovereign to his ministers. They ask nothing of a Congressman; they merely tell him where he gets off.

The foregoing is the gist of Mr. Streit's work. The rest of the book is made up of exposition, explanation, and the answering of hypothetical objections.

Precisely so. There nevertheless remain a few little complaints against Mr. Streit and his project, which he seems not to have anticipated, and which a critic is, therefore, bound to bring out. In the first place, Mr. Streit is unsatisfactory about his democracies. "By democracy," he says, "I mean government of the totality by the majority for the sake equally of each minority of one, particularly as regards securing him such rights as freedom of speech, press, and association." Among the states he specifies, just where does he find, where did he ever find, that sort of government? Does he find it in England, perhaps, or the United States, or France? Not so anyone else could notice it. Our constitutional Bill of Rights, for example, is as notoriously a dead letter as the laws of the Medes and Persians. Indeed, Mr. Dooley hit the fact exactly when he spoke of the Constitution itself as "applicable only in such cases as it is applied to on account of its applicability."

As far as my observation goes, any state will allow its citizen full rights up to the point where some state interest makes it inexpedient for him to have them, and at that point it promptly confiscates them. The state does not care a button for the principle of liberty, but quite the contrary. It views liberty, as it views all things, in the light of practical policy in its own interest. The more liberties the citizen has, the more he tends to become quiet and docile, so the state has nothing to gain by confiscating them arbitrarily. Our citizens have had many liberties only because the occasions for suppressing them have happened to be few and infrequent. When one arises (as we shall shortly see) our "democratic" state is as quick and ruthless as any to shut down on them.

Pre-war czarist Russia seemed to me one of the freest countries I ever visited. My impression was that if you kept off politics and kept off the Greek Church, you could pretty well think, say, and print whatever you liked. I have often spoken of this to people who knew pre-war Russia well, and they all said my impression was correct. What was true of Russia in those days is as true of one type of state as another; it is as true of the North Atlantic "democracies" as of the South Atlantic "republics." What then becomes of Mr. Streit's discriminations in favor of the former? If none of these democracies, taken singly, has any respect for the principle of freedom, nor governs its totality by its majority for the sake equally of each minority of one—and certainly none of them has ever had the faintest idea of doing any such thing—then what makes Mr. Streit think they will do it when they are signed up together in his union?

This fact rather knocks the bottom out of Mr. Streit's idea at the outset. When all comes to all, his proposal is to put his idea into effect by state action. That is to say, the groups in the various North Atlantic democracies are to bring pressure on their governments, and then these governments are to get together and form a union for the purposes that Mr. Streit describes. This notion is fatuous. It is like a proposal to put pressure on Captain Kidd, Jesse James, Claude Duval, Blackbeard, and Al Capone to get together in a union for the suppression of highwaymanry. Common experience ought certainly to show Mr. Streit that no state has any interest whatever in the kind of thing he wants, but on the contrary has every interest against it. If the pressure on the state were strong enough, his pressure groups would doubtless get something, but what would it be? Exactly what our citizenry got in their precious Bill of Rights. They would get the appearance of what they wanted, not the reality.

Mr. Streit's notion of constitution making seems equally fatuous. He has the eighth-grade schoolbook's conception of our constitutional history firmly fixed in his mind.

If Mr. Streit's plan could be put through, and then if his great union of democracies could be administered by the spirits of just men made perfect, one might think the thing would be worth trying. But unfortunately the spirits of just men made perfect are not available for this job, or indeed for any job. The main trouble with social architects like Mr. Streit, Mr. H. G. Wells, and many others, is that they lose sight of this, and plan their projects altogether too grandiose and hefty for the only structural material they can get to build with.

Mr. Streit thinks he counters on this point, but actually he misses it. He says in a perfervid passage that man's worst weakness is that he has always had too little faith in what man could do. This may be so, but the point here is not what man can do, but what man can be. Mr. Streit's union would be administered by man, and man is simply not up to that much of a job. He can't be enough to do it in accordance with Mr. Streit's intention of a government "for the sake equally of each minority of one." Not too many are up to governing a family in accordance with that intention, let alone a State, a county, or even a village. It is ridiculous to expect it.

Moreover, on Mr. Streit's own showing, his union would be put together and administered by politicians. Well, look at them! How many could you sift out of those now in charge of the North Atlantic democracies who impress you as likely to be interested in "serving man's freedom" or in government "for the sake equally of each minority of one?" How many have shown any more than an electioneering interest in anything? Check the list on our own great democracy, from President to poundmaster, and how many would you bet on as not coming under Ben Franklin's dictum, that the duty of a democratic jobholder is first, to himself; second, to his party; third, to his country? Ben had a lot to do with democratic jobholders and jobseekers in his day, and the breed has not noticeably improved since then.

One has to be realistic about all this when one is assessing a work like Mr. Streit's. The reader should remember that while the first law of human conduct is self-preservation, the second law is exploitation, and the operation of the second law is as powerful and invariable as that of the first. Man's implicit obedience to that law has not once wavered in 6,000 years of recorded history. Next to armed force, political organization is that law's most effective instrument, and provides the largest scope for its action. It dictated the drafting of the American Constitution. It converted the League of Nations (over which as many of us went daft as are now going daft over Mr. Streit's proposal) into a handy pocket weapon for its own purposes. What, really, could Mr. Streit expect? The same kind of men, actuated by the same kind of motives, would be floor managing his union as were floor managing the League of Nations. They would see in it simply an instrument which could be used to help buttress and copper-rivet an Anglo-American imperialism; and if Mr. Streit thinks they would be above using it in this way, I am afraid he must be put down as too pure and simple for this world. Heaven is his home.

As a matter of fact, before his plan is out of its swaddling clothes it has already been knaved into just this kind of disreputable service. Observe those who have organized to promote it. What are they? Trim off the lunatic fringe, which is abundant, and those who share in Mr. Streit's honest ignorance of zealous stupidities, and what have you left? A group of people committed to Anglo-American imperialism, heart and soul. They are the kind of Americans that the Chinese, who see so many of them in the Far East, call "second-chop Englishmen."

As I write this, I notice the announcement of another book by Mr. Streit called Union Now With Britain, which, I judge by its title, may help this contemptible propaganda even more than Union Now. The book is not yet published, so not having seen it, I cannot speak with certainty. Probably since the rest of Mr. Streit's "democracies" are pretty well out of commission, he is trying to make the best of what is left. Union Now With Britain, however, looks to me a lot like buying into an insolvent concern, and I suggest going at it with very long teeth.

Award of Scholarships by University of Arkansas to South and Central American Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to include a copy of a resolution adopted on May 17, 1941, by the board of trustees of the University of Arkansas, which reflects the friendliness that exists on the part of the people of Arkansas toward our neighbors in South America.

Whereas it has been called to the attention of the Democratic Women's Club of Arkansas and in this way reached the public print, at the suggestion of Mrs. David Terry, wife of Congressman TERRY, that as a good-neighbor policy and a friendly gesture in these trying days through which we are passing, that the University of Arkansas should offer some scholarships to students of Central and South America.

Believing this suggestion to be a very important and valuable one at this time, and thanking Mrs. Terry for the suggestion, be it

Resolved by the board of trustees of the University of Arkansas, That six scholarships be offered to brilliant and outstanding students from Central and South American countries, the test and qualifications to be determined by the registrar and the faculty of the University of Arkansas.

Brooklyn Postal Employees' Credit Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief table showing the progress record of the Brooklyn Postal Employees' Credit Union of Brooklyn, N. Y.

The attorney for this rapidly growing credit union, Mr. Nathan Amchan, has written me the following interesting information about this useful agency:

Since April 1, 1941, the interest rate on loans, discounted in advance, has been reduced to 3 percent.

You will be happy to learn that this steady increase in the volume of money loaned is not due to an assumption on the part of our employee-members of additional financial burdens, but rather the anticipation of purchasing commodities for cash, instead of on credit—at the cost of a small interest rate, discounted in advance—now 3 percent.

You will also be pleased to learn that under our credit-union system a borrower's credit is rated by his comakers, who necessarily are careful to properly evaluate need, capacity to repay, and the utility of all loans. Such credit evaluations by the borrowers' comakers are limited only by the sound and seasoned judgment and experience of the credit committee. Thus many loans have been granted to members in numerous emergencies, where one loan is already outstanding and is being repaid. Further, we have been able to make rehabilitation loans to an extent well in excess of any mathematical formula concerning borrower's credit but which are based essentially upon the character of the borrower.

For the large majority of our members our credit union provides an easy and continuous opportunity for systematic saving, many of our employees depositing regularly as little as $1 every pay day. We notice that our credit union, together with the other credit unions operating in our locality, have decidedly influenced the financial institutions in our city to open personal loan departments with low interest charges; our credit union loan rate being to a great measure the community's interest-charge barometer.

The progress of this particular credit union will quickly be observed from the chart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Progress record—Brooklyn Postal Employees Credit Union, Brooklyn, N. Y.

	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
Membership	479	715	975	1,238	1,445	1,606	1,886	2,109	2,255	2,600	----------
Shares	$14,851	$20,224	$44,277	$64,303	$83,913.43	$107,785.48	$181,769.60	$218,819.25	$263,001.80	$360,355.73	----------
Loans	259	550	1,020	1,447	1,729	1,755	2,145	2,570	2,511	3,009	----------
Amount of loans	$22,975	$59,585	$105,700	$162,475	$211,175	$263,485	$410,540	$461,791	$555,331	$614,348	----------
Interest rate (percent)	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	4½	4½	4	3
Dividend rate (percent)	5½	5½	5½	5½	5½	5½	5½	5½	5½	5½	----------
Dividends paid	$205.81	$1,037.25	$1,850	$2,823	$3,846.39	$5,161.50	$7,738.95	$10,636.84	$13,038.22	$17,096.55	----------
Guaranty fund	$340	$797.80	$1,704.92	$3,050.14	$4,595.72	$6,222.65	$8,071.56	$10,370.61	$13,265.55	$16,251.88	----------
Undivided profits (after payment of dividends)	$45.81	$305.72	$806.86	$2,517.64	$4,474.63	$6,123.41	$7,215.67	$9,537.78	$10,218.15	$10,076.99	----------

America and the War—Terms for Lasting Peace

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. OSCAR BLACKWELDER

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, while some of President Roosevelt's enemies are charging him with trying to plunge us into war, and some of his erstwhile enemies and pretended friends are urging him to do so, I wonder if it would be out of order for me, one who has always been his friend, to express the hope that he will explore the possibilities of peace based on the following five points laid down by Secretary Hull.

I insert the five points:

1. Extreme nationalism must not again be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.

2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper.

3. Raw material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination.

4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.

5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries.

If he can bring this catastrophe to a close and save the British Empire and the British Navy intact and restore peace on these terms, he will be entitled to the gratitude of the entire world, now and for generations to come.

It has been said that the last war destroyed a generation of young men. This one is destroying a generation of women and children.

I am glad to note that Senator NORRIS and other strong friends of the administration are coming around to my view on the question of convoys, that we should transfer these vessels to British registry and let Great Britain do the convoying under her own flag. That applies to naval vessels as well as merchant ships. It would enable us to give Britain a greater amount of aid than we could possibly render if we entered the war. For then our commerce would be subject to attack all over the world, and we would be compelled to keep a large part of our Navy in the Pacific Ocean on account of Japan.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, we are in the deepening twilight of naval power as is being demonstrated on every hand, and if this war continues we must by all means put a stop to these strikes that are paralyzing our defense industry and build the strongest air force on earth, because it has become the dominant weapon of war.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered by Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder here in Washington on yesterday.

Dr. Blackwelder is one of the ablest preachers in this country. He is an old-line American whose people have been here for more than 200 years. His forbears fought with Washington in the Reolutionary War, and both of his grandfathers fought under Robert E. Lee during the War Between the States.

The matter referred to follows:

AMERICA AND THE WAR

(By Dr. Oscar Fisher Blackwelder, Pastor, Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., and President, Washington Federation of Churches, delivered Sunday evening, May 25, 1941)

John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg, brother of the first Speaker of the National House of Representatives, was pastor of the Lutheran Church in Woodstock, Va., before the Revolutionary War. In connection with a now famous church service he is reported to have said, "There is a time to pray and a time to fight and the time to fight has come now." Removing his clerical robe there he stood in the uniform of a continental officer. He has been canonized in American patriotic history for that act. If Muhlenberg had the right to do that in the first crisis of American history, we of the modern ministry have the

same right to confess our faith and to affirm his other words, "There is a time to pray."

In this hour Franklin D. Roosevelt presides over the destinies of 130,000,000 Americans. I pray for him daily and not one word I speak tonight would I have you consider a personal or official reflection upon him.

One further personal word. I belong to no committee or lobby related to the war. I owe only two allegiances beyond my family: One, my obligation as a minister to Jesus Christ; the other, my obligation to my country, as an eighth-generation American. In this spirit I speak with you tonight on America and the War—As I See It.

I believe the strongest statements President Roosevelt made in the 1940 campaign and the ones that drew him the greatest amount of strength were when he promised, "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack" * * * "And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

The overwhelming majority of the American people as well as a majority of the Congress are opposed to our going into this war. We are not in the war now as had been most clearly demonstrated by ex-President Herbert Hoover, whose recent speech has not been answered. And Mr. Hoover is perhaps the best friend England ever had in this country. But we are fearful of the play of propaganda upon the average man. Why, for example, did we learn about the *Zamzam* boat a month after it happened? Why the delay from Saturday to Monday in learning about the Hess trip to Scotland? Why does the British Ambassador tour the Midwest where the antiwar sentiment is so strong? Are we fearful because there are not a sufficient number of the Members of the Congress who are willing to speak out?

This is not the time or the place to recite the history that has led to the present sad world picture. However, here we are. There is no one who loathes the acts of Hitler more than I do. For example, our brother in the Christian ministry, Martin Niemoller, is still locked up, as far as we know. That is where many of us would probably be if we were in Germany and where all of us would be if we were in Russia. My sympathies are definitely and specifically with England in spite of her tragic mistakes. But let's look at the facts.

During the debate on the lend-lease bill it was stated over and over and over again that this is a policy to keep the war away from our shores—that it meant "aid short of war." It would never have passed on any other terms. And now that policy has brought us to the brink of war because a determined minority demand that we shall deliver the aid we promised by convoying vessels under our flag. Under that lend-lease bill we did not promise delivery but we have the right to transfer necessary vessels to British registry and let them do the convoying under their flag.

The factual question is this: Does the life and future of the United States of America depend upon our getting into this war? Every normal mind must recognize that it will tremendously aid our future for Great Britain to win—but that isn't the question. Many things are most desirable that are not imperative. Do you believe America can continue as a nation in a world with Hitler? Do you believe America can live in a world with Stalin? I believe this Nation can live regardless of them. I haven't lost my faith in this country. I believe we can continue as a nation even though it has been asserted repeatedly that tyranny and freedom cannot live side by side in the same world. The answer is: They always have. I despise tyranny, but freedom and tyranny have lived together on this planet for 2,000 years. It will take more than military might to prevent their continued existence side by side for years to come.

We are told that we are likely to be invaded next. What's the point of that? The point is that we will not be able to repel that invasion alone, hence we must go in now and have England's help, that we are utterly dependent upon the British fleet in the Atlantic. What is the conclusion of such talk? If America cannot defend herself on this continent against all comers and repel a possible Hitler invasion, can we be expected to retake the continent of Europe which he now holds? If we cannot repel him here, can we overcome him there? I would like to meet a man who can answer that question.

Where would we land an expeditionary force in Europe, anyhow? And to take Europe by air perhaps means more bases than can be built on the little island of England. And taking Europe means fighting France, America's historic friend.

Here is my facing of the facts. Let us see through the agreement of the lend-lease bill in the interest of a greatly desired English victory. Let us do all we are able to do to help her in her desperate struggle. If convoys there must be, let's transfer ships to British registry and let them do the convoying under their flag, but keep the American flag out of the war zone. Let us then say to all men that with the lend-lease bill we stop. We will have done more than any nation ever did for us. We begin now the defense of our own hemisphere. It's high time we do so. We are woefully unprepared. We have been promising aid that we couldn't and can't possibly deliver. Our task from this time forward is in two directions, the first is the defense of this hemisphere. Being responsible for at least an entire hemisphere doesn't look like isolation to me.

I am amazed at the speeches made by some men in the Congress, by some outside, and even by some preachers. These speeches sound like England's promises to Poland, Yugoslavia, and Greece. Let it be emphatically said in reply that we must never be put in position of depending for our principal support on any other nation than ourselves. We have come to the hour when we must see that no other nation can save us. We are strong enough to keep the terrific and destructive forces out of this hemisphere but we are not strong enough to police the world.

In this connection I think the warnings of an outstanding columnist are very wise, "We got into the first World War with negligible taxes and debt and a long unbroken record of Treasury surpluses and superb fiscal strength. We are now loaded with a colossal debt, a crushing burden of taxation, and an 11-year record of staggering deficits." The best we can do beyond the lend-lease bill is to defend this hemisphere.

But our second task as a nation is the burden of this address. I am speaking not as a Member of the Congress but as a Christian minister, concerned with the kingdom of God on this earth. It is as a servant and instrument of this kingdom that Mr. Roosevelt can be a man of destiny and the people of America will be with him to do that. We are not divided on that, but on shooting participation we are hopelessly divided.

It has been said on the House floor during the past week that our President could bring this war to a close if he will bring the pressure of his mighty office to bear. Who else can? He has said again and again and again that he wants to stay out of this war. Let him now move for peace, call a truce, on the basis of Secretary of State Hull's five points laid down last Sunday night.

I find my own convictions magnificently expressed by a resolution adopted at the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ in St. Louis. They respectfully and earnestly petitioned the President of the United States to use the great powers of his office to keep this Nation out of the war now raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa. The resolution continues: "We make bold to present this petition in view of the repeated and solemn pledges assuring the country that the armed forces of the United States would not become involved in the war.

"We note with anxious apprehension that the policy of aid to Britain has carried the Nation to the brink of belligerent participation, and that the country and the President now face a crucial and irrevocable decision which will affect the destiny of America. We affirm our conviction that America's responsibility to the civilization of the future requires the maintenance of her own peace and the preservation of her democratic way of life.

"We implore the President to revive the role of mediator for himself and our Nation, and to adopt no further policy in aid to Britain which will carry the hazard of involvement in the war. The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to belligerent participation, and we look with grave foreboding upon any action by the Government which will plunge a divided nation into war."

If America becomes an active, shooting participant, which convoys under our flag certainly will lead to, where on earth is there a land which can serve as mediator? We cannot be a mediator of peace and a belligerent at the same time. This does not mean that we propose an appeasement which will save ourselves at the expense of other peoples, but it does mean that the strength, prestige, and resources of the United States under God could even yet be used to bring the war to a close.

Mr. President, I commend to you the Master's words, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Here is your mission, here is your opportunity, here is your leadership, I believe, and our destiny as a nation is at stake. Whether we shall be the world's healer and peacemaker constitutes our real emergency. This is our sacrifice. As America assumes the role of healer and peacemaker among the nations, we can build our own moral armament which is a nation's lasting defense.

I call upon the Christian churches of America; I call upon the fathers and mothers of young men; I call upon my brethren in the ministry to help lead this country's present attitude of nonparticipation in war into constructive leadership for peace. This is the work of God.

State Gasoline Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit four simple tables for the RECORD.

The first table indicates the proportion of State gasoline-tax revenue available for expenditure by the State highway departments of each State which now is required for the single purpose of servicing the State highway bonded indebtedness.

The second table tabulates each State's outstanding highway indebtedness.

The third table details the present rate at which the gasoline tax is levied in each State which possesses a 4-cent-per-gallon tax or higher, and shows what the total tax would be in that State if the proposed 1-cent-per-gallon increase in the Federal tax were enacted. This table also discloses what this swollen gasoline tax would cost the consumer on every 10-gallon purchase, and compares this tax cost with the price which the consumer actually would pay for the gasoline he bought if no taxes on the product were levied.

The fourth table presents an index of the relative debt-paying and tax-paying ability of each of the 48 States, compiled by Dun & Bradstreet.

A warm, red warning may be found in these cold, black statistics. Like the hiss of an adder, they forecast danger.

The correlation of the information in these tables discloses a significant coincidence of four important factors—a large bonded indebtedness, a large proportion of the State gasoline tax pledged for service of these bonds, a gasoline tax rate which already is exorbitant, and an extremely low relative ability to pay debts and taxes.

Take the first State on the list, Alabama, for example. In this State, 3 cents of the 6-cent State gasoline tax is allocated to the State highway department. By law, 2 cents of this 3 cents, or two-thirds of the total available revenue from this source, is pledged for highway bonds, and an additional one-half cent is pledged for the service of outstanding notes. At present, Alabama is using 29 percent of its gasoline tax revenue for bond service, but any increase in these obligations will preempt up to 83 percent of all gasoline tax revenue.

Now, table 3 discloses that Alabama already levies a 6-cent State gasoline tax. In addition, numerous counties and municipalities in the State collect their own local taxes on the product. Gasoline taxes actually double the cost of motor fuel to many Alabama consumers.

Obviously, the addition of an increased Federal tax only would compound what already appears to be a tax offense against the Alabama folks who must use their cars in business or on farms or even for a little well-earned recreation.

Less obviously—but just as importantly—an increased Federal tax is going to strike a severe blow at the highway finances of the State. In the first place, taxes already are so high that any increase will have an immediate and depressive effect upon consumption. We know, from experience, that income curtailment results in rapid abandonment of motor-vehicle ownership. One out of every 10 automobiles was forced off the road by adverse economic conditions during the 3 years from 1931 through 1933, and increased taxes may be just as effective in reducing income available for expenditure for gasoline or other commodities as is an economic depression. And when this high tax rate is considered in conjunction with table 4, which shows that Alabama's citizens rank forty-sixth in the entire Nation in their ability to pay taxes and to meet obligations of debt, further evidence is provided that Alabama motorists simply cannot take another tax increase. They simply do not have the money in their pockets.

Suppose the tax is increased, and gasoline consumption falls. With every dollar lost in revenue, the proportion of the total which must be used for bond service goes up. It is not difficult to imagine that, soon, the entire 83 percent of the State's share of the tax would be required to meet indebtedness. No funds would be available for necessary highway construction and maintenance. More bonds would be floated, or else the roads would disintegrate. And the vicious circle would have begun.

A different situation might be described, if it were not for the obvious fact that any tax increases imposed now will be with us for years to come. These are not temporary taxes. He who believes otherwise is fooling himself. And he who is realistic will realize that these taxes will be in effect when the United States no longer is steaming along under the force of an artificial national income of from ninety-five to one hundred and fifteen billion dollars. The real effect of the taxes which now are levied will not be felt until we descend once again into a peacetime economy, and face the brutal task of supporting this burden with our normal capacity and enterprise. And, like taxes, bonded indebtedness and the necessity for highway expenditures are not temporary. They, too, will be with the States when our defense boom has collapsed.

Alabama is not an isolated case. The situation in Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, New Mexico, and Tennessee, is just as dangerous, or worse. Numerous other States may be superior in income rating or tax-paying ability, but nevertheless possess high tax rates or a large indebtedness which combine to signal the fact that an increased Federal tax would jeopardize the State's financial position or cause a serious curtailment in the highway program.

Accordingly, I believe that it would be worth while for every Member of this House to select the States in which he vitally is interested, and to analyze the information in each of these tables with respect to those States. Only by such analysis may it be appreciated that the proposed increase in the Federal tax adversely will affect the finances of a large proportion of all the States in the Union, and eventually will result in widespread economic harm through its effect upon the credit of the States, or in forcing the elimination of necessary highway expenditures from State budgets.

The tables follow:

TABLE I.—*Proportion of State gasoline-tax revenue available to State highway departments now being used for payment of highway bond interest and principal, 1939*

	Percent
Alabama	[1] 28.9
Arizona	None
Arkansas	67.2
California	None
Colorado	27.8

[1] 83 percent of tax available to State pledged by law for bonds and notes. Additional 1 cent of tax allocated to counties may be used for payment of road bonds.

TABLE I.—*Proportion of State gasoline-tax revenue available to State highway departments now being used for payment of highway bond interest and principal, 1939*—Continued

	Percent
Connecticut	16.1
Delaware	24.8
District of Columbia	None
Florida	41.2
Georgia	[2]
Idaho	[2]
Illinois	[3] None
Indiana	[4] None
Iowa	46.9
Kansas	12.5
Kentucky	None
Louisiana	100.0
Maine	31.6
Maryland	[5] 22.6
Massachusetts	[6] 53.3
Michigan	20.0
Minnesota	None
Mississippi	54.1
Missouri	47.9
Montana	[7] 20.8
Nebraska	None
Nevada	[8] None
New Hampshire	[9] 32.1
New Jersey	[9] 21.9
New Mexico	43.8
New York	35.4
North Carolina	28.3
North Dakota	None
Ohio	None
Oklahoma	None
Oregon	23.8
Pennsylvania	15.1
Rhode Island	11.1
South Carolina	25.1
South Dakota	[2]
Tennessee	[10] 76.0
Texas	[11] 35.0
Utah	None
Vermont	17.3
Virginia	1.5
Washington	[12] 2.5
West Virginia	46.3
Wisconsin	28.7
Wyoming	5.9

[2] Less than 1 percent.

[3] 18.7 percent of 2 cents allocated to counties pledged for bonds.

[4] 15.6 percent of cities' share of $2,000,000 allocated them, and counties' share of one-third of tax remaining after deduction of $1,250,000 for general fund and $2,000,000 for cities, is pledged for bonds.

[5] 14.5 percent of counties' share of 70 percent of 1½-cent lateral road tax and Baltimore's share of 30 percent of basic 2-cent tax, of 30 percent of 1½-cent lateral road tax, and of 20 percent of special ½-cent tax for grade crossings, pledged for bonds.

[6] 15.9 percent of $9,600,000 allocated to cities and towns.

[7] Entire 5-cent tax pledged by law for bonds until March 31, 1949.

[8] 16.8 percent of $769,000 allocated to local units pledged for bonds.

[9] 17.7 percent of $5,033,000 allocated to local units pledged for bonds.

[10] Entire 5 cents allocated to State pledged by law for bonds.

[11] 1 cent of 4-cent State tax allocated to counties for payments on county road bonds.

[12] 4.5 percent of $8,068,000 allocated to counties and cities pledged for bonds.

Authority: Compiled from data published by the Federal Public Roads Administration.

TABLE II.—*Total State bonded indebtedness for highways and bridges, 1939*

Alabama	$41,497,000
Arizona	None
Arkansas	141,894,732
California	43,425,000
Colorado	25,968,000
Connecticut	14,668,000
Delaware	9,275,000
District of Columbia	None

TABLE II.—*Total State bonded indebtedness for highways and bridges, 1939*—Continued

Florida	$128,851,844
Georgia	16,000,745
Idaho	311,500
Illinois	121,175,000
Indiana	None
Iowa	$87,692,550
Kansas	19,945,309
Kentucky	None
Louisiana	106,309,877
Maine	28,432,000
Maryland	14,284,000
Massachusetts	23,000,000
Michigan	47,419,000
Minnesota	48,000,392
Mississippi	36,300,000
Missouri	94,990,000
Montana	4,500,000
Nebraska	None
Nevada	157,500
New Hampshire	7,970,000
New Jersey	97,870,000
New Mexico	24,380,000
New York	194,530,000
North Carolina	80,055,324
North Dakota	600,000
Ohio	None
Oklahoma	None
Oregon	16,926,750
Pennsylvania	62,942,000
Rhode Island	5,087,000
South Carolina	59,576,200
South Dakota	None
Tennessee	110,215,800
Texas	89,002,853
Utah	1,000,000
Vermont	4,039,285
Virginia	3,428,000
Washington	8,346,000
West Virginia	76,212,000
Wisconsin	21,786,187
Wyoming	2,885,000
Total	1,923,389,840

Authority: Compiled by American Association of State Highway Officials, reproduced in American Highways, January 1940, p. 17.

TABLE III.—*Significant gasoline-tax rate and tax-cost statistics, by States*[1]

	Rate of State gas tax, cent per gallon	Total gasoline tax if Federal tax becomes 2½ cents	Total price,[2] excluding tax, 10 gallons	Total tax cost, 10 gallons, if Federal tax 2½ cents
Alabama	$0.06	$0.085	$1.35	$0.85
Arizona	.05	.075	1.50	.75
Arkansas	.065	.090	1.31	.90
Colorado	.04	.065	1.31	.65
Delaware	.04	.065	1.03	.65
Florida	.07	.095	1.11	.95
Georgia	.06	.085	1.32	.85
Idaho	.051	.076	1.78	.76
Indiana	.04	.065	1.45	.65
Kentucky	.05	.075	1.30	.75
Louisiana	.07	.095	1.24	.95
Maine	.04	.065	1.08	.65
Maryland	.04	.065	1.26	.65
Minnesota	.04	.065	1.34	.65
Mississippi	.06	.085	1.39	.85
Montana	.05	.075	1.47	.75
Nebraska	.05	.075	1.17	.75
Nevada	.04	.065	1.56	.65
New Hampshire	.04	.065	1.08	.65
New Mexico	.05	.075	1.32	.75
New York	.04	.065	1.09	.65
North Carolina	.06	.085	1.31	.85
North Dakota	.04	.065	1.47	.65
Ohio	.04	.065	1.13	.65
Oklahoma	.04	.065	.93	.65
Oregon	.05	.075	1.41	.75
Pennsylvania	.04	.065	1.02	.65
South Carolina	.06	.085	1.29	.85
South Dakota	.04	.065	1.46	.65
Tennessee	.07	.095	1.40	.95
Texas	.04	.065	1.19	.65
Utah	.04	.065	1.46	.65
Vermont	.04	.065	1.12	.65
Virginia	.05	.075	1.41	.75

[1] Only those States possessing tax rates of 4 cents per gallon or more are included.
[2] 1940 average.

TABLE III.—*Significant gasoline-tax rate and tax-cost statistics, by States*—Continued

	Rate of State gas tax, cent per gallon	Total gasoline tax if Federal tax becomes 2½ cents	Total price, excluding tax, 10 gallons	Total tax cost, 10 gallons, if Federal tax 2½ cents
Washington	$0.05	$0.075	$1.57	$0.75
West Virginia	.05	.075	1.44	.75
Wisconsin	.04	.065	1.39	.65
Wyoming	.04	.065	1.62	.65

TABLE IV.—*Comparative State rankings as to resources—Index of debt-paying capacity compared with income and tax-paying ability*

State	Debt-paying index	N. I. C. B. income 1935	Tax-paying ability 1930
New York	1	1	3
California	2	3	6
Nevada	3	6	2
Massachusetts	4	7	8
Connecticut	5	2	5
Rhode Island	6	5	10
New Jersey	7	9	4
Maryland	8	13	22
Delaware	9	4	1
Wyoming	10	8	7
New Hampshire	11	17	29
Illinois	12	10	9
Montana	13	11	12
Washington	14	18	15
Pennsylvania	15	12	18
Ohio	16	16	17
Wisconsin	17	15	24
Oregon	18	24	13
Michigan	19	14	14
Minnesota	20	19	23
Maine	21	20	31
Colorado	22	21	20
Vermont	23	27	35
Arizona	24	22	19
Iowa	25	25	11
Missouri	26	26	27
Nebraska	27	29	16
Utah	28	31	28
Indiana	29	23	30
Kansas	30	28	21
Idaho	31	32	25
Florida	32	30	34
Texas	33	35	37
Virginia	34	36	39
South Dakota	35	38	26
New Mexico	36	33	38
North Dakota	37	39	33
West Virginia	38	34	32
Oklahoma	39	40	36
Louisiana	40	37	43
Tennessee	41	44	40
Georgia	42	41	45
Kentucky	43	43	42
North Carolina	44	42	41
South Carolina	45	45	47
Alabama	46	46	46
Arkansas	47	47	44
Mississippi	48	48	48

Source: Resources and debts of the 48 States, 1937. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., p. 102.

Faith—The Cornerstone of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address by the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, at the third annual communion of the St. George Association of the New York Post Office, held at the Hotel Astor, New York City, Sunday morning, May 25, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If there is one thing to be learned, it seems to me, from this representative gathering of men who have assembled here today from every branch of the Postal Service, it is the lesson that there are still God-loving men in our midst, despite the ravages of materialism, atheism, selfishness, and crime.

Our country was developed by religious men and women. Its progress has been due in large measure to the deep religious faith of the pioneers, trusting in the help of the Almighty. Faith watches over the cradles of national atheism argues at their graves The founding fathers recognized God at Jamestown, Va., in 1607, and at Plymouth, Mass., in 1620. Our colonists trusted in the power of prayer and all their records bear the name of God. Our coins have the inscription, "In God we trust."

The United States Senate and the House of Representatives have each a chaplain, and every session of Congress is opened with a prayer. An oath is administered to those who testify in all our courts to remind them that they are in the presence of God; that their testimony should be truthful and just. Everywhere we turn we find evidence of the deep faith of our forefathers, and their abiding trust in a Supreme Being.

If we are to continue the work they have begun; if we are to build on the solid foundation they have laid so that we may erect a structure which will withstand the waves of oppression and the winds of doubt, we, too, should be men of faith and trust, men of prayer and humility, men with the conviction that all things are possible to those who follow the rule of justice and practices the precept of honest dealing.

There is no force in the world today, nor has there been in past ages, that can destroy foundations established on the bedrock of eternal truth. At times it may have seemed that the godless were in the ascendancy, that those who sneered at or openly ridiculed religion were the masters of civilization. Time has shown and will continue to show that the enemies of religion and decency, however, are merely actors "who strut and fret their hour upon the stage, and then are heard no more."

George Washington said in one of his addresses: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports." As a matter of fact, there can be no real prosperity, political or otherwise, without religion and morality. The Father of his Country was wise enough to foresee that those rulers who seek to drive God out of the lives and hearts of their subjects are raising up to themselves a dangerous Frankenstein that will bring on their own destruction and the destruction of their people.

As a rule, faith and morality are bound together in unshakable union. There are two opposing standards under which men march—one of which may be described roughly as the law of brutality and the other as the law of idealism. This conflict of ideas exists in the life of government as it does in the life of individuals.

The standard of brutality in human affairs attracts all those who entertain a low concept of order and duty and the possibilities of human nature. It appeals to those who believe that power is the supreme law. It has accomplished nothing in history except the destruction of all that right-thinking men and women hold dear. It never bred a nation,

nor built a city, nor created a civilization, nor inspired a good life.

The law of idealism, on the contrary, has inspired individuals in all ages to the noblest accomplishments of mankind. It has inspired all the great dreams of prophets, statesmen, and poets; it has been the fountainhead from which came the power and might of those empire builders and temporal rulers who fashioned the institutions and monuments which now constitute the glory of modern civilization. Idealism is never lost except when faith and morals are permitted to wither and decay. It has lived through the ages, teaching human beings the lesson that the salvation of nations and individuals rests upon faithful adherence to the higher law of life.

The lesson of what man may accomplish by holding fast to the idealism of the forefathers is too plain to go unrecognized even in this age of force and materialism. But it will accomplish nothing unless we as individuals are ready and willing to accomplish the teachings of Christ in our own lives. Each of us can make a contribution to improve the world by living an exemplary Christian life and giving good example to those around us.

That is what the world needs today; the faith of Christ living in the hearts of men and women and the love of man for his neighbor; whether that neighbor be robed in purple and gold or clothed in sackcloth and ashes. That is the message that goes forth from this gathering today where men have laid aside the routine of business to take part in this service, giving God his rightful place in their lives, and asking His blessing upon all their works.

In the olden times Abraham besought the Lord to spare the world from the deluge if but 10 just men could be found among the people. And God promised Abraham that He would save the world if 10 such men could be found. One sometimes wonders why the Almighty is so patient and forgiving in the light of what is happening in the world today.

I sometimes think that the only bulwark now protecting humanity from universal catastrophe is the host of human souls who gather together on occasions of this kind to pay homage to the power of the Almighty and who join the faithful throughout the world in praying for the gift of Divine mercy. For without that gift, everything attempted by mankind is barren and worthless.

I am glad to be here to join with you in asking God to preserve our country and our people. I congratulate you upon your excellent showing today and I extend to your chaplain, your officers, and your members my best wishes for the continued success of your splendid work.

European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM SIOUX CITY (IOWA) TRIBUNE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have read with a great deal of interest an editorial which appeared in the May 21 issue of the Sioux City Tribune, a daily newspaper of Sioux City, Iowa, where I recently had the honor of speaking to a large and responsive audience. I believe the editorial expresses the viewpoint of the great majority of the people of Sioux City and of Iowa; and I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune of May 21, 1941]

CHOICE LIES BETWEEN PEACE, GUERILLA WAR; F. D. R. SHOULD ACT SOON!

Despite all claims and counter claims of the belligerents, when the pretense and propaganda have been stripped away and the facts stand revealed in the cold light of truth, there is one inescapable conclusion concerning the war, to wit:

As matters stand today, the war is a draw. Germany, victorious on land, has been defeated at sea and air victory has been denied her. Britain, defeated on land, is victorious at sea and is holding her own in the air realm of combat.

The war of movement is temporarily ended, except in the Mediterranean area where, whoever wins, the result will not decide the issue of the survival or defeat of the contending powers.

Aside from what may transpire in the Mediterranean sector, the war threatens to degenerate into a guerrilla struggle at sea and in the air, a struggle which conceivably might be prolonged over a period of years, leading to exhaustion of all participants and possibly involvement of the United States and other nations.

The belligerents face the choice of two alternatives, namely, a pause now to explore the possibilities of peace by negotiation or to continue a struggle to the death which will leave the whole world a shambles.

We Americans particularly owe it to ourselves and to all humanity fully to explore the possibilities of peace before dedicating ourselves to the other course.

Within the next 2 weeks President Roosevelt and Congress must make some momentous decisions. Three courses are open to this country—to get in the war as an active participant, to stay out or to seek an understanding among the major powers.

The rank and file of American citizens do not want to engage in either a declared or an undeclared war. Neither are they content to play an ignoble role while despots attempt to crush out the last vestige of human liberty in this bedeviled world. But they are reluctant to make a decision either way if the necessity for making it can be avoided.

President Roosevelt could lead a united America into a peace movement, whereas a large segment of our citizens would be anything but enthusiastic about going to war over there!

Possibly there is no basis for peace at this time. Perhaps Germany, drunk with victory, would make demands which could not be granted with honor. Possibly Britain is in no mood to make any concession worth while. But—

Germany, through France, and possibly through Rudolf Hess, is making peace gestures. That much is certain.

What could be lost in calling for a showdown?

Why not, before the United States takes any final step, call for a statement of objectives from Germany and Britain alike?

Also, why not state our own objectives?

If the United States is to be drawn into—or thrown into—this struggle, let the people know what they are fighting for and what they might expect specifically to gain by fighting.

The whole war situation needs clarifying. The real issues have been smothered under an avalanche of ambiguities, evasions, half truths, slogans, and glittering generalities.

Why not turn on the light? Why not force both sides into the open? Why not make both sides state their minimum demands upon each other—now?

When that has been done—and not until it has been done—the American people can get a proper perspective of the situation and the issues and base their own decisions upon an intelligent understanding.

Then, if we decide that we should and must fight because there is no other course, let's drop all pretense and go in with everything we can put into the effort.

A currently popular lecturer begins his discourse by asking his audience, "Did you ever live in hell?"

He then tells his listeners his conception of hell. It is, he says, a state of indecision, a situation in which a nation, a business, an individual, lacks purpose, direction, or a foundation for certainty.

The whole world today is living in a hell of indecision, and indecision breeds fear, hesitation, mutual distrust, defeatism, lack of faith, and, finally, despair.

President Roosevelt has it in his power, as no other man on earth now has, to put an end to much of the indecision concerning the American course and the course other nations should pursue.

Calling for a show-down now would not be an act of cowardice, an attempt at appeasement, but an act based on realism and courage.

If Germany will not listen to what Americans consider reason, there is not much question now what the American course would be.

Obversely, if Britain will not listen to what Americans consider reason, she would forfeit all claims upon American support. And that, too, would be as it should be.

But let's fix the blame—now—for further slaughter of human beings and destruction of property and what may happen as the aftermath of war before—not after—war is declared.

Let's know the facts. Let's take the elements of doubt and guess and indecision out of the situation. Let's know where we are going—and why we are going.

No Economic Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE COLORADO SPRINGS GAZETTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on May 19 the Colorado Springs Gazette published an editorial from the pen of Robert H. Wardwell, which is an out-and-out challenge to American defeatists who are afraid that soon Hitler

will put the United States completely out of business. In order that this excellent and timely editorial may be made available to the Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Colorado Springs Gazette]

NO ECONOMIC THREAT

Here is a paragraph with which everyone is familiar:

With only 7 percent of the world's population, the United States has 45 percent of the world's wealth. That wealth is more widely distributed; there is a vastly greater percentage of home ownership here than anywhere else, and an incomparably higher living standard. The United States owns 74 percent of the world's automobiles, 57 percent of its telephones. It has more than half the developed electric power; its industrial potential is greater than all Europe. It uses 42 percent of the world's iron, 47 percent of the copper, 58 percent of the tin, 69 percent of the petroleum, 56 percent of the rubber, 70 percent of the silk; in short, half of all the raw materials the world produces.

We used to repeat such figures with a glow of pride. But it is no longer popular to speak the strength and the greatness of America. Tory leadership has seen to that. The idea today is that the country is puny and weak and in imminent danger of being overthrown by a Nazi militarist. Americans are urged to fight now for freedom, else be isolated and starved in a post-war totalitarian world.

We returned to the statistics for comment on the alternative, for it is fear of the economic consequences of Nazi victory that is fanned in hope it can be made a blazing ember of war. The theme is that Hitler will overrun Europe and Africa, while Japan will gain control of Asia, and that thenceforth the United States will be completely surrounded by enemies who, employing a barter economy, will force this country into submission by pressures which will deny it trade except on totalitarian terms.

We have commented before on the assertion that America cannot compete against slave labor by remarking that it always has.

But there is a prior point to consider. When and if Hitler becomes master of all the world outside the Americas, he will have to consolidate it. Military conquest is only a first step. Economic organization is the essential. Indeed, it is for this that conquest is undertaken. Germany and Japan reach out for territory to exploit. To exploit it they must pacify the peoples and make them self-sustaining. They must provide industry and trade.

And it is the United States that provides the market for half the world's raw materials.

What good is East Indian rubber to Japan if Japan cannot sell it to the United States? Not all the other nations of the world combined can buy it or use it. What good is tea? What good is the silk crop, to which Japanese economy is tied, if the United States, buying 70 percent of all the silk produced, is made a closed market?

When Hitler has taken over European industry, the luxury products of France, the specialties of Scandinavia and middle Europe, where is he going to find markets? Bankrupt nations can't buy such things and little nations don't buy much anyway. How is a world molded to Nazi economy to maintain itself with the country which heretofore has bought half of its raw materials out of the market?

The United States has nothing to fear in a post-war world or from Nazi economy. So long as it maintains its own productive efficiency, it can meet any trade challenge that can be hurled at it.

Tax on Retail Dealers in Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE AND LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Madison, May 22, 1941.

The Honorable WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Member of Congress, Wisconsin,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I am transmitting herewith an enrolled copy of a joint resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature entitled "A Joint Resolution Memorializing Congress to Defeat Legislation Designed to Repeal the Tax on Retail Outlets Handling Oleomargarine."

Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk, Senate.

Senate Joint Resolution 27

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to defeat legislation designed to repeal the tax on retail outlets handling oleomargarine

Whereas two bills, known as H. R. 3753 and H. R. 3754, designed to repeal the Federal tax of $6 per annum on retail dealers handling oleomargarine have been introduced and are now pending in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas in 1940 when said tax was in effect, approximately only 162,720 retail establishments out of a possible 600,000 in the Nation were licensed to deal in oleomargarine; and

Whereas with the tax removed and every retail outlet free to handle oleomargarine without payment of any Federal license fee, it is probable that under the provisions of the proposed legislation outlets for sales of oleomargarine would increase about 73 percent and that the sale thereof would increase tremendously, with a corresponding decrease in the sale of butter; and

Whereas these bills are of extreme importance to the dairy industry, and it is the sense of this legislature that the dairy industry of this and of other States of the Union should continue to be protected by a tax on retail outlets handling oleomargarine, a cheaper and inferior product in competition with creamery butter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to defeat bills H. R. 3753 and H. R. 3754, now pending before it, and urges the Wisconsin Members of Congress to do all in their power to bring about such defeat; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
VERNON W. THOMSON,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Who Is the Big Boss?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, has the Congress surrendered all of the freedom, all of the liberties, guaranteed to us by our Constitution?

Recent strikes in industry, including those in industries engaged in national defense, lead inevitably to the conclusion that unless Congress awakens it is the rankest kind of hypocrisy to talk about carrying the four freedoms to all the world.

Congress has conscripted your boys for military service and, like patriotic Americans, you have submitted. The President apparently intends to use them, to sacrifice them, to carry equality of opportunity—one of the four freedoms he named—to the remotest corners of the world. Yet, here in America, the President permits John L. Lewis and his political associates to deny equality of opportunity, equality of opportunity to work, to millions of Americans.

Read the following telegram from J. T. Wilson, president of a coal company, and the following advertisement of the southern coal operators wage conference:

BLUEFIELD, W. VA., *May 23, 1941.*

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

Quite obviously large majority of Members of Congress must promptly speak and act in statesmanlike manner or Americanism and true democracy will be completely taken from us. Present mine and other John Lewis strike dictatorial situations are distressing examples. Fair government is for all citizens and not just labor unions. Congress should force all officeholders to perform sworn constitutional duties, thus guaranteeing freedom to all employers and employees.

WINCO BLOCK COAL CO.,
J. T. WILSON, *President.*

LISTEN AMERICA

THE WORST IS YET TO COME—UNLESS—

Like every other patriotic citizen, you have worried about the wave of strikes that has swept the country.

You know how seriously they have disrupted the Nation—that they have halted billions of dollars of defense work—that they have already affected, let's hope not fatally, the safety of the United States.

But the worst is yet to come.

Over the head of every American hangs the threat to close down, not one factory or group of factories, but every factory and every industry throughout the land. The threat to deprive us of most of our heat, nearly all of our light, practically all of our railroads, subways, streetcars, and elevators.

Who has made this incredible threat? Who holds the titanic power to make that threat effective?

One man, John L. Lewis.

John L. Lewis has publicly announced that unless the southern coal operators agree to every syllable of his outrageous mine workers' contract, he will strike every soft-coal mine in the country. And this before the Nation has recovered from the disastrous strike of April.

If he keeps his threat, this country, within 15 days, will be without coal. Industry will begin to shut down completely. Railroads will begin to stop. Lights will begin to go out in our cities.

All right, you say, why don't we sign the contract? Here's why:

By the very words of that contract, John L. Lewis will become what so many believe he wants to be—dictator of this country. A man potentially more powerful by far than the President of the United States. A man who holds in the palm of his hand the life or death of every industry, the success or failure of our entire defense program, the comfort or hardship of the bulk of our citizens.

You think we exaggerate?

It's there in black and white, in the contract which we, under threat, are ordered to sign without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." It's there in John L. Lewis' own sinister words. He demands of southern operators a 50 percent greater wage increase than the North will pay. But that—the so-called differential clause—is not, as the public has been mistakenly led to believe, either the sole reason or the chief reason why the southern operators have refused to sign this contract. John L. Lewis demands the power to call unlimited "memorial periods." He demands the right to change entire systems of mining. He demands that all the mines be shut off at one time, for a yearly vacation period, thereby completely stopping the flow of industry's lifeblood, coal.

But that is far from all. By the very words of the contract, he would have the right to strike any and every mine at any time at his own will or pleasure. He would have the right to shut off any and every industry from its coal supply. He would have the right to deprive any and every city of light, heat, and power.

We have already agreed to almost every demand John L. Lewis has made.

We have long since given our 150,000 men a 7-hour day and a 5-day week.

We have given them the check-off for union dues and assessments, and a labor contract which Lewis himself hailed only 2 years ago as the model labor agreement of the world. We've offered, not only to renew this model agreement, but to liberalize it.

As an industry, we have paid higher wages than those given any comparable group of workers in the Nation.

At the request of the President of the United States, we are already paying a minimum basic wage increase of $1 a day—an increase that will almost certainly bankrupt many companies in an industry that lost $35,000,000 last year—that has lost money every year save one for the last 12 years.

But that's our worry, not yours.

Your worry is this:

Shall we, by agreeing to John L. Lewis' demands, sign away the liberty of our country? Shall we place in the hands of any one ruthless, domineering man power to control the security of our Nation? Shall we, with a stroke of the pen, place in jeopardy your well-being, your safety, perhaps your very life?

John L. Lewis is no fool. While America slept, he has craftily gained a death-grip on the one industry which affects the destinies of all others. Now, he is apparently using that death grip to shoot for the dictator's crown.

He called the strike in April. He threatens to call another if he doesn't get what he wants. We can't stop him. All we can do is what we have done—refuse to authorize by contract such dictatorial acts.

No; we can't stop him.

The only person who can stop him is you!

You can. Your voice—the voice of the great American public—has kept this country a free country for 165 years. It can do so now.

Write your Governor. Write your Congressman. Write your Senators. Write the President of the United States. Write the Department of Labor. Write the National Defense Mediation Board. They'll listen to you. Send a letter or a telegram.

Tell these representatives of yours in your own words whether or not you want John L. Lewis to control the industry of this country, and through that power, to control the freedom and safety of every man, woman, and child in the United States.

This is not a matter of tomorrow. This is a matter of today—now.

Here's what will happen in New York if John L. Lewis strikes the coal mines.

Within a few weeks the city's lighting system will be imperiled.

Subways, elevated trains, and commuter trains will be sharply curtailed.

The supply of steam heat and hot water will be greatly reduced.

Buildings may be without elevator service.

Factories will be shut down for lack of power.

Defense activities may be fatally affected.

Southern Coal Operators Wage Conference, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

Representing: Operators' Association of Williamson Field, Big Sandy-Elkhorn Coal Operators Association, Hazard Coal Operators Association, Kanawha Coal Operators Association, Logan Coal Operators Association, Southern Appalachian Coal Operators Association, New River Coal Operators Association, Pocahontas Operators Association, Winding Gulf Operators Association, Greenbrier Coal Operators Association, Upper Buchanan Smokeless Coal Operators Association, Harlan County Coal Operators Association, Virginia Coal Operators Association.

Tribute to Senator Bankhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the Birmingham News of May 20 last there appeared a very-much-deserved tribute to my colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in an editorial captioned "JOHN BANKHEAD'S Leadership." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham News of May 20, 1941]

JOHN BANKHEAD'S LEADERSHIP

Almost every man in public life in this country likes to say that he is a "friend of the farmer," and no doubt most such men do sincerely feel that they are friends of agriculture. Unfortunately, however, not all of them really understand agricultural problems, and some of them do not have the farmer's interests at heart as much as they might.

No matter how many public officials or candidates for office may call themselves friends of the farmer, and no matter how sincere many of them may be, American agriculture knows that its best friend in public life today is Alabama's Senator, JOHN N. BANKHEAD.

JOHN BANKHEAD is the recognized farm leader in Congress, including the House as well as the Senate. He is respected and admired by his colleagues for his knowledge of farm problems and for his earnest efforts to promote the country's agricultural welfare.

Senator BANKHEAD has been a farm leader in Washington ever since he took his seat in the Senate 10 years ago. Very quickly he started making himself felt in the interest of the farmers, and he has grown steadily in stature as an agricultural statesman.

As the author of the original Bankhead Cotton Control Act, of the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act, and of many other measures of far-reaching importance to agriculture, the Alabama statesman established himself as a legislative leader in this field during the years when the great depression bore down so heavily on the farmers of all sections of the United States.

His first Cotton Control Act became the model, in principle, of all succeeding legislation for the regulation of agricultural production, not only in cotton, but in wheat, tobacco, and other major crops.

His measure to enable tenant farmers and sharecroppers to acquire farms of their own stands as a landmark of progress in the fight to overcome the growing blight of farm tenancy.

His was a leading part in the enactment of the highly important 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act, which reconstructed the Federal farm program on the ruins of the original A. A. A. after the disastrous Supreme Court decision of 1936 had wiped it out almost altogether.

All these and other accomplishments by Senator BANKHEAD have won him an enduring place in the history of agricultural development in America.

Last week brought another great triumph for JOHN BANKHEAD as an agricultural statesman, perhaps the most striking tribute to his leadership that he has had. It was the passage of the Farm Parity Act, by which the prices of certain major crops, including cotton, corn, and wheat, will be protected by Government loans up to 85 percent of parity prices. By parity price is meant the price for an agricultural product which stands in the same relationship to industrial prices today that farm prices had in the base period, 1909–14.

For some time in Washington, Senator BANKHEAD has been called "Parity JOHN" by some of his friends because of the long fight he has made for farm parity. It has been a hard fight, as most of his fights for agriculture have been, but he won it when the Senate and House agreed last week on 85-percent parity loans.

Week before last Senator BANKHEAD made a great address in the Senate in behalf of his bill. Then last week, when it was finally voted on in the Senate, only 2 votes were cast against it and 75 votes for it.

And of 18 Senators not voting, it was announced that all but 1 or 2 would have voted for the bill if they had been present.

Thus it was almost unanimous among Democrats and Republicans alike. And thus did JOHN BANKHEAD'S leadership command support for a measure that would have been snowed under at any other time before.

Actors' Equity Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

LETTER TO CHAIRMAN OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE, ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter of mine addressed to Miss Florence Reed, chairman of the nominating committee, Actors' Equity Association, New York City:

MAY 23, 1941.

Miss FLORENCE REED,
Chairman, the Nominating Committee, Actors Equity Association,
New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR MISS REED: It is most gratifying to read in the current issue of Equity of the effort of the Nominating Committee to clear Equity's council of the subversive element which has tainted its former fine reputation. May I congratulate you, as chairman.

So far as I know, this is the first and only effort by an influential and prominent member of your profession to enforce the Equity resolution of last fall that "* * * no member of or sympathizer with a Communist, Nazi, or Fascist organization may be employed by or hold office in Actors Equity Association."

Nothing has come to my attention since last summer to diminish in the slightest my charges in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD against Mr. Loeb, Mr. Hewitt, Mr. Jaffee, et al. Any doubt in my mind as to whether Mr. Hewitt was an unwitting rather than a knowing tool of the Communists is pretty well dispelled by his position in this election.

Actors are engaged in public work. Therefore, their loyalty and integrity become a matter of public importance. Their employment is directly affected by their reputation, whether that employment is in the regular commercial theater, or on a Federal Theater project, or a project to entertain the boys in army camps. As I stated over and over again, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, innocent and deserving actors and actors all over the country are being penalized because the Communists in high positions are not weeded out of the theatrical organizations.

It is incredible that an honest and unselfish man, devoted to the interests of his organization, should drive so persistently for an endorsement which cannot vindicate him (only a public trial could do that), but which would further tarnish the reputation of Equity and penalize hundreds of his fellow actors.

The nominating committee would have been gravely remiss in its duty to the association to recommend Mr. Hewitt's reelection pending hearings on these charges.

As to those who are calling you and me un-American, Miss Reed, a very cursory check of the names published in Equity as supporters of Mr. Hewitt reveals 25 who have well-known records as sympathizers and supporters of the Communist Party. Take only one example, Mr. Charles De Sheim. His affiliation with Communist organizations in Chicago, while he was connected with the Federal Theater project and the Repertory Theater, is a matter of public record. He was among those actors who refused to play a benefit for Finnish relief in January 1939, because of conscientious objections. If time permitted, I could list the records of many more of those protesting the nominating committee's ticket. Since I have other work to do, I hope that the members of your organization will investigate for themselves. It would be most unfortunate for Equity should the good work done by your committee be nullified by the indifference or gullibility of your members.

Mr. McGrath's article is so full of evasions and misrepresentations as to my statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I should be very pleased to send a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering all the material on this matter to any of your members who care to send for it. If you think any of your associates might be interested in this letter I should be glad to have you show it to them.

May I once more congratulate you and your committee on your intelligent and courageous effort to carry out a truly patriotic duty.

Yours most sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the able and distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] on the subject of convoys.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In my campaign for reelection last year I gave my pledge that I would never vote to send a single American soldier to fight on European soil.

I intend to keep that pledge, not by stubbornly voting "no" when it is too late to do anything except fight to save our own homes and firesides—but by doing everything in my power to make the occasion of such a vote unnecessary.

The question of aid to Britain long ago passed the stage of discussion. We are committed to it, irrevocably. We have geared our industrial plant to a war-production basis. We have curtailed our production of consumers' goods to release raw materials for armament. We have sent Britain guns and destroyers, planes, and mechanized equipment. We have appropriated and are spending billions of dollars under the Lease Lend Act. We are opening new plants every day, extending our facilities to the utmost to provide ships, cannon, ammunition. Our entire economy is rapidly being placed upon a war basis.

We know this is being done because our people want it that way. They want to help Britain.

Some want to save democracy in its fight against aggression—some want to save our own country from the disaster which inevitably would follow an Axis victory. Whatever their motive, the intention of the vast majority of our people in all cases is the same—more aid for Britain.

We are giving aid to Britain for one reason only—because we want Britain to win. We have gone into it with our eyes open. We knew when we started that we were building weapons of death for Britain's use against Hitler.

Short of actually releasing the bombs that fall on Hitler's troops and Hitler's factories; short of actually sighting and firing the guns, we, too, are combating the forces—diplomatic and military—which threaten the liberty of mankind on the fighting fronts of Europe.

When we undertook the job of helping Britain to stop Hitler, we undertook to see it through.

We realized the demands upon us would be heavy. We realized they would call for sacrifice. And we realized we would have to take whatever steps were necessary.

We have now reached the point where another step is necessary.

We have done much but it is not enough. In war, not enough is worse than useless.

Our people have good reason to be proud of the magnificent response we have made to Britain's call. We have performed industrial miracles. We have changed over from a peacetime economy to a war footing with a swiftness unparalleled in history. We have started a steady and ever-increasing stream of armaments across the Atlantic.

We must now ask ourselves: Does our duty end there? We know it does not. We know it cannot end short of victory for the forces of democracy.

And we now know, bitterly distasteful as the fact may be, that the arms we create with so much labor, at so great a sacrifice, are not reaching Britain.

Some get through. But far too great a portion never does. It goes down at sea, to appease the voracious appetities of Adolf Hitler's sea raiders, his submarines, his dive bombers, his armed cruisers.

In the face of that fact, we can no longer deceive ourselves. We are not giving aid to Britain in full measure. We are merely saying—"Get it if you can"—when we know we are asking an impossibility.

We are not giving England the tools to finish the job. We are giving up the fruits of our toil and treasure, the pledges of our faith in democracy, to the Nazi pirates of the Atlantic.

Our people will not be satisfied with mere gestures and we can no longer doubt that the steady sinking of merchant shipping is rapidly making our aid more and more of a gesture—less and less of a reality.

I am satisfied that the American people are prepared to face the realities. Once committed to a course of action which they believe to be right, they have never shrunk from its implications or its consequences.

We have all condemned, with righteous scorn, those politicians and privileged groups who "appeased" Hitler by permitting him to ravage one small nation after another.

What of ourselves? Should we fail to do everything in our power to prevent a Nazi victory over Britain, after giving our pledge of aid and assistance, would we not be just as guilty as those whoseshame was immortalized at Munich?

I say we would be for in that event our failure would help to send a great democracy to its destruction on the faith of our unfulfilled pledge to give every aid short of war.

Already our inability to send enough aid, and send it in time, has contributed to disaster abroad. Not long ago, as every well-informed observer knows, we launched a counteroffensive to Hitler's diplomatic drive in the Balkans.

Hitler's was backed by guns, ours by promises—and Hitler's won.

Had we been able to furnish arms instead of diplomatic assurances, the tragedy of the Balkans might not now be written so large in the history of World War No. 2—and Hitler might not be as close as he is today to a "jumping off" place for conquest in the Americas.

On the home front, our unwillingness to face unpleasant facts has encouraged the appeasers in our midst, giving aid and comfort to the "fifth column" and its dupes, the faint-hearted who have lost faith in the American ideal and surrendered themselves to the counsels of despair.

We can avoid eventual war with a triumphant, world-conquering Hitler in one way, and one way only, by giving Britain the weapons to destroy him.

But we must give them to Britain, not to the sea sharks that infest the shipping lanes of the Atlantic.

Had Britain's sea power been adequate to protect the aid we are giving, we would have no problem. But we cannot ignore the fact that it is not adequate.

Therefore, we must NOW make our decision—to forego aid, and fight Hitler after he has immeasurably strengthened himself by defeating England, or to give that aid and risk fighting him now.

I say risk, because it is only risk, for so long as our shipping is unmolested, which means so long as Hitler chooses to obey international law where we are concerned, there is no danger.

We should make up our minds right now that nothing we do is going to make Hitler fight us until he is ready, if ever—and when he is ready nothing we do or fail to do is going to prevent him.

Isolationists and "fifth columnists" have shouted, at every move we made, that we were inviting war. They said repeal of the original neutrality measure meant war. They said the lend-lease bill meant war. They said the destroyer-air base exchange meant war. They said the seizure of Axis ships meant war.

In every case, we did what we had a right to do, under our own laws and the laws of civilized nations.

The isolationists admitted we were within our rights under the law. They had, and they have, just one argument: "You might offend Hitler."

The offending of Herr Hitler is no justification for abdication of our rights. We didn't back down after we offended the Barbary pirates—as President Roosevelt has aptly pointed out—and I see little real distinction.

The simple answer is that we have already given Hitler sufficient reason for annoyance. If he has not retaliated it is not for lack of desire but for lack of opportunity.

Should Britain fall, his opportunity will come.

Bullies have blustered and attempted to intimidate this country before now.

More than a century ago, under President Adams, we convoyed our shipping to Britain when France attempted to blockade us. When necessary, our convoys fought. French ships were sent to the bottom. French ships were seized and taken as prizes.

But France didn't declare war—even after we bombarded French ports in the West Indies. And France then had a larger naval force, proportionately, than Hitler has today.

I do not say Hitler will follow the example of France, but I do say the same considerations will apply.

I mean that he will not risk war on another front unless he is ready, and if he is ready it will be immaterial whether we have been convoying or not.

There has been much evasion of this explosive issue. It is time to end this evasion.

If our war aid can reach England in no other way, we must convoy it there.

I know the President has said that where there is convoying there may be shooting, and where there is shooting there may be war. I agree with him.

But I submit that we are faced with several self-evident propositions which cannot be avoided.

We have a right to manufacture arms for Britain, and we are doing it. If Hitler could stop us, he would.

We have a right to freedom of our commerce on the seas, outside of all war areas not effectually blockaded by the belligerents. We are not exercising that right.

If we choose to exercise it, Hitler can stop us only by acts of aggression—in other words, by making war on us. That threat hangs over us today.

If it prevents us from giving aid to Britain, we must confess ourselves guilty of fear, and permit that fear to affect Britain exactly as the Munich fear affected Czechoslovakia.

Let us face facts. When we try to find alternatives to convoying we find there are none, save submission to Hitler, which is no alternative at all for a people who believe in human freedom.

Hitler has dismembered most of Europe. He is striving mightily to dismember England now. Should he succeed, we are next on the Axis timetable. We cannot afford to wait.

We have promised all aid short of war. It is no more an act of war to ship and convoy armaments than it is to make them. One is as much within our rights as the other.

Shall we make arms, because we know Hitler can't reach our factories, yet refuse to deliver them, because he might reach our shipping? The only possible distinction is that in the first case we feel safe from the consequences, and in the other, we do not.

I do not believe the American people, once they see that distinction, will accept it as valid. They will see it for what it is—fear—and fear alone.

Shall we fear to exercise a right we enjoy as a sovereign nation, and thereby fail in a task imperative to our national security? The answer is "no."

We have the right, and the duty under our most sacred and binding pledges, to place our weapons in the hands of those who are fighting their battle, and our battle, for human liberty throughout the world.

We face the alternative of convoying now—or fighting later.

I say—convoy now.

Life Lines—Highway and Second Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner entitled "Life Lines—Highway and Second Canal."

[From the San Francisco Examiner]

LIFE LINES—HIGHWAY AND SECOND CANAL

The projected inter-American highway linking the United States and the Panama Canal Zone, for which President Roosevelt now seeks an appropriation in Congress is, of course, essential to hemisphere defense as the President says.

It would constitute a supply and communications line to the vital canal which, under war conditions, would make the entire North American Continent easily defendable and probably impregnable against invasion.

As the European conflict has demonstrated, highway facilities for the movement of the equipment of mechanized warfare are as important as the machines themselves.

It therefore seems almost axiomatic that if the United States should be able to keep a moving wall of fighting machines along every inch of the continent, no conceivable massing of foreign power could get or maintain a foothold.

Let such a superhighway be constructed by all means and with all speed, if for no other reason than as Secretary of State Hull has said that it would be of "real value from the standpoint of the defense of the Caribbean area."

But, of course, there are other and monumental reasons for this useful highway, which it is contemplated will ultimately extend over the full 12,000 miles between the United States and Argentina.

The economic uses of the highway would be incalculable in time of peace.

And let us not overlook our ultimate needs in peace.

Congress should certainly comply with the President's reasonable and moderate request for an appropriation of $20,000,000 for this constructive and commendable purpose.

At the same time Congress, and the President as well, should reexamine their attitudes toward the equally vital interocean waterway across Nicaragua.

Should not the United States avail itself of all possible life lines?

Why do we content ourselves with half measures for the defense of this vast American neighborhood which is so important to us and which is so wholly dependent upon us for protection?

Why do we commit the same errors of "too little and too late" in providing for our national and hemispheric safety that have made conquests of European nations possible?

Why do we not utilize every natural and providential advantage for our safety instead of just a few of them, and those few partially and inadequately?

All authorities recognize the vulnerability of the Panama Canal.

Under the precise conditions which exist at this moment, with the bulk of the American Navy in the far Pacific, a quick enemy thrust from the air or easily contrived acts of sabotage could trap our fleets in one ocean.

The proposed Nicaraguan Canal would be a supplementary life line upon which the United States might very well depend in war for the difference between defeat and victory.

Let us not be so concerned with events abroad that we neglect our own important affairs.

Let us link the Americas with a magnificent highway, as the President so well advises.

Let us have networks of air lines throughout the Americas, as is our present sound purpose.

And let us also have two avenues of safe passage between the great oceans which border our continent.

If we do all of these wise things, our American neighborhood will be safe in war.

And when we are free to pursue our peaceful way again, as is our most earnest desire, these same agencies of protection will give impetus to commerce and be the foundation of hitherto unattainable prosperity.

Cigar Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. HAINES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY L. HAINES, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Ways and Means Committee on May 20, 1941:

Mr. Chairman, It is not my purpose to come before you today to oppose any measure that has for its objective additional revenue to the Treasury of the United States, as I fully appreciate the necessity for a tax bill to provide part of the funds to take care of our great program for national defense.

I represent a district where cigars are being manufactured, and probably there are more cigars manufactured in my congressional district than in any other in the Nation. Obviously, I am quite interested in anything that has to do with increased burdens upon that industry.

In the 1939–40 period there were produced in the United States a little more than four and one-half billion cigars retailing up to and including 5 cents each; a little more than 41,000,000 retailing above 5 cents and not to exceed 6 cents each; a little more than 428,000,000 retailing above 8 cents and not above 15 cents each, and so on up to 462,000 retailing above 25 cents each. As you know, we have a graduated tax on cigars based upon their retail value. I have contended for a number of years that cigars retailing at below 5 cents should not be taxed as much as those retailing at 5 cents, and at one time I introduced a bill to correct this unfair situation. Through the courtesy of you, Mr. Chairman, a hearing was given to me on that bill, but I am sorry to say the bill was never considered by your full committee to the best of my knowledge.

In the bill I proposed I wanted one-half of the tax to apply on cigars already retailing at and below 3 cents each, because I believe it only fair that this application be made to these cheaper cigars. I want to be very brief and leave this suggestion with you, Mr. Chairman, because I believe this committee will see justice in what I am about to propose.

If it is right to tax 10-cent cigars double the amount of revenue you tax 5-cent cigars, isn't it equally fair to tax two-for-5-cent cigars, or those retailing even below two for 5 cents, at one-half the tax that the 5-cent group must bear? I want to recommend to your committee serious consideration of this suggestion, and I am rather confident in doing so I am not going to take very much money away from the Treasury of the United States.

At the present time it is impossible for anyone to tell this committee how many cigars are sold at two for 5, three for 5, or 5 for 10 cents, because the same tax applies to each group. I know the interest of every member of this committee in the farmer and his welfare, and I want to say to you from my years of experience in the cigar industry I know that the farmer must have a market for his lower grade of cigar leaf tobacco, and his only market is in this group that can use such types for their cheaper cigars. I understand that about 27 percent of the farmers' crop is in these lower grades, used by manufacturers of these cheap cigars, and when I say "lower grades," Mr. Chairman, I do not want you to understand that the tobaccos are so very much inferior to the other types. All this tobacco grows on the same stem, but in the group there are the top leaves and the sand leaves which are not as desirable for 5-cent cigars, but when handled properly this type of tobacco does produce a good-quality cigar, and it is the smoke for the lower-income group, and it is a source of income to the farmer that he must have.

I think tobacco is taxed heavily enough right now, and the proposal to double this tax on tobacco products seems rather severe to me. However, I think the people I have the honor to represent will not object to the proposal to increase the tax on cigars above the two-for-5-cent group, even though it does cut into their profits tremendously. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that we are producing less cigars today in the United States than we produced 35 years ago, and I say to you that if the cigar industry is to live, and particularly this group who are making these cheaper cigars, it is unsound to put an additional tax burden on them. I know it is going to be pretty hard for the manufacturers of 5-cent cigars to bear a double tax at this time, but I am not here today to tell this committee what they should do. I am simply pointing out to them what I believe to be my duty, and from my years of experience in the cigar business I have no hesitancy in saying to you that the manufacturers of these cheap cigars cannot stand this additional tax. To chase the two-for-5-cent cigars into a higher retail price means those men must start from scratch. I believe this committee would be wise in writing into the bill that you will give to the House a modification of the recommendation made by the Treasury to you, and you would be doing no harm to an industry that is now working upon a margin of profit that only those who make quantities of cigars can stand. At one time there were upward of 25,000 manufacturers of cigars in the United States, 20 years ago, and today there are only a few thousand of them left.

I would like to suggest to the committee, therefore, that section 400 of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 26, sec. 832), be amended to include the following:

"On cigars made of tobacco, or any substitute therefor, and weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand, to retail at not more than 3 cents each, $2 per thousand."

This, of course, would call for a new classification because of the fact that all cigars retailing up to and including 5 cents are in the class A group. Because I believe that cigars maufactured to retail at 5 cents and upwards can absorb the double of the present rate of taxation, I will approve the suggestion by the Treasury Department, but I do so most reluctantly insofar as 5-cent cigars are concerned. It would almost seem that the Treasury Department in checking its regular sources of revenue reached the conclusion that if the tax on cigars is doubled it will double the revenue receipts. There are products, of course, on which such expectations might be approximately fulfilled, but because of the record I am rather confident that cigars should not be included and are not that kind of product. The use of many products is stable, but the use of cigars is an unstable and declining practice which is just now balancing between a comeback and a virtual extinction. For example, Mr. Chairman, several days ago one of the largest, and possibly the largest manufacturer of two-for-5-cent cigars from outside of my congressional district, paid me a visit. He told me that if his firm had to go into the market with their product priced at above two for 5 cents, he anticipated the same experience he had back during the N. R. A. days. At that time their cigars retailed at two for 5 cents, as they do today, but because of N. R. A. codes the cigar was stepped up to retail three for 10 cents. He made a startling statement to me when he said that they had a monthly production at that time of 17,000,000 cigars, retailing two for 5 cents. When this cigar was stepped up to three for 10 cents, the sales declined from 17,000,000 down to 4,000,000. That is simply one example, Mr. Chairman, of what we can hope to expect when we get into the practice of stepping up taxes on a product that cannot stand it. Thirty-five years ago from 30 to 50 percent of the regular cigar output was from three for a quarter up and today, Mr. Chairman, 90 percent of the output is cigars from a nickel down.

I received a letter the other day from a gentleman that I have known all of my lifetime. He is one of the smaller manufacturers in my congressional district, and he produces cigars that retail 5 for 10 cents and 2 for 5 cents. He is terribly worried because he believes that he cannot go into the highly competitive market and step up the price of his product with any degree of success. He realizes the need for additional taxation, but he suggests that this tax be placed upon those best able to pay it. He makes some few 5-cent cigars and is perfectly willing to pay a double taxation. If I wanted to take the time of this committee I could stand here for an hour, perhaps, and recite instances similar to this one.

When I was back home the other day a gentleman came to me stating that he sells tobacco to one concern that usually owes him from thirty-five to fifty thousand dollars. He is quite familiar with the cigar industry and he says, "Harry, I know that these people cannot continue in business if they must pay double the present rate of taxation, as I know full well that their product will not stand an increase in price to the consumer." It is my firm conviction, Mr. Chairman, that the Treasury Department will be sadly disappointed if their recommendation is accepted by this comittee, and I am equally firm in my conviction that the cigar industry will show a further decline in production, which of course reflects itself in tax receipts.

There is one phase of the situation that little concern has been given to, and that is that most of the 5-cent cigars today are wrapped with tobacco imported from the Island of Sumatra. The import duty on that type of tobacco is $1.50 a pound and that tax adds at least $2 additional cost to every thousand cigars. There is no member of your committee, Mr. Chairman, more anxious than I am to cooperate with the Federal Treasury in securing more money from the taxpayers to meet national-defense obligations, and I feel it my patriotic duty to do this. However, I believe we have reached the point in the cigar industry where we should not place additional taxes on these cheap cigars and discourage men of low income from purchasing this product. It is perfectly obvious to each one of us that this will occur.

Please bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that two-for-5-cent cigars are made of domestic-grown cigar-leaf tobaccos. About 90 percent of the tobacco grown in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama goes into two-for-5-cent cigars. Wisconsin farmers' delegation who visited me recently told me that at least 70 percent of their tobaccos go into the cigars retailing below 5 cents. This is also true with Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York Connecticut, and Massachusetts tobaccos, so that from an economic standpoint, insofar as the farmers are concerned, it would be most unwise to destroy a market for them that they need so badly. It is their cash crop and usually the most profitable crop for them. Knowing these facts, from more than a quarter of a century of practical experience in the cigar-manufacturing industry, I appeal to you, my colleagues, to save this cheap-cigar industry and

give them a differential in the tax rate, the same as you give to cigars retailing above that price. To charge the same rate of taxation on two-for-5-cent cigars that you charge on 5-cent cigars, I repeat, is unfair, because you tax the two-for-5-cent group 8 percent against only 4 percent on cigars retailing at 5 cents and but 5 percent on cigars retailing at 10 cents, and even less on cigars retailing above 10 cents each. My suggestion of one-half the tax on two-for-5-cent cigars now applying to 5-cent cigars is equitable from every viewpoint and deserves the complete approval of the Congress.

Views on Public Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

COMMUNICATION FROM OFFICIALS OF ORANGE COUNTY, IND.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication sent to me by the officials of Orange County, Ind.:

We oppose: American involvement in foreign war. Repeal of Neutrality Act. Use of naval force to deliver goods to warring nations. A declaration of national emergency. Gifts, grants, or loans to foreign powers at expense of American taxpayers. Selection of defeated candidates for appointive office. Appointment of foreign-born citizens to high positions in national defense while qualified American-born citizens are available.

We favor: Strong national defense economically secured. Reinstatement of cash and carry system. Investigation of all foreign propaganda agencies. Peaceful attempts to secure Western Hemisphere islands. Frank and honest dealing at home and abroad. We expect our President to keep his pledges. We believe on this basis alone can America unite.

Very truly yours,

OFFICIALS OF ORANGE COUNTY, IND.,
By GARRETT FERGUSON, *Recorder*.

Axis Victory Won't Ruin United States, Kennedy Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the comments of former Ambassador to Great Britain—appointed by President Roosevelt—Joseph P. Kennedy, stated that it was nonsense to say that an Axis victory spelled ruin. The Ambassador wants us to stay out of war in Europe, and so do I. That is the reason for this insertion.

AXIS VICTORY WON'T RUIN UNITED STATES, KENNEDY SAYS

ATLANTA, May 24.—Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, urged tonight that the United States "not be deluded by any claim that self-interest should make us guardians of the peace of the rest of the world."

In an address prepared for the Oglethorpe University commencement exercises, Kennedy said "the crusaders' argument for war is the silliest of all" and asserted that "democracy cannot be imposed by force or otherwise."

"In our very attempt at this colossal crusade," he said, "we would end in failure and disgrace abroad, in disillusionment and bankruptcy at home.

"We cannot, my fellow Americans, divert the tides of the mighty revolution now sweeping Asia and Europe. They were not of our making and they will not be subject to our control, no matter how courageously or exhaustingly we strive to subject them."

He also urged the Nation to beware of slogans and said this country should not become a belligerent "just because we hate Hitler and love Churchill."

Kennedy said he was "particularly unimpressed by the hysteria which I suspect is consciously stimulated by the idea that we are in danger of military attack."

This country was so situated, he said, that "a direct attack on us would require an armada mightier than the power of man could create."

"We have gone to the aid of Britain not only because we believe their cause to be just," he said, "but because the American stake in the present war is the precious element of time. But as a nation we should not let our aid to Britain become the argument for direct involvement."

SEES AXIS VICTORY NO TRAGEDY

The former Ambassador, who recalled that when he resigned he said he hoped to assist President Roosevelt "in his oft-proclaimed desire to stay out of war," asserted that although a British victory would be helpful from the viewpoint of this country's foreign markets, it was 'nonsense' to say that an Axis victory spelled ruin.

"From 90 to 95 percent of our trade is internal," he said. "If worse came to worse, we could gear ourselves to an intelligent self-contained national economy and still enjoy a fair degree of prosperity.

"But that 'worst' must never be permitted to include Axis domination—social, economic, or military—of any spot in the Western Hemisphere. In my definition of the Western Hemisphere I include, I wish to add, any island which is considered by our military experts to be a threat to our security if the Axis Powers possess or dominate it."

Excerpts from Articles by George S. Counts and Sidney Hook Contained in The American Teacher for May 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the American Federation of Teachers. I have continued to be a member of that organization first because I believe in the professional organization of teachers and believe such an organization should be part of the labor movement; and second because I wanted to do what I could to help combat the attempts of a Communist group to control the organization. I am pleased to be able, therefore, to quote herewith from the American Teacher, official organ of the American Federation of Teachers, for May 1941, two passages which are, I believe, as pertinent and searching an analysis of the problem of Communists in America as I have read. I wish every person in the country who calls himself a liberal could read these passages. The first is from George S. Counts, president of the American Federation of Teachers:

The confusion arises in part out of the terminology of politics. There is a fiction that the political struggle moves in a single dimension, that it moves either to the right or to the left. The inference follows that every population distributes itself in some fashion between the extreme left and the extreme right and that all men who incline in the one direction or the other should stand together. By loudly proclaiming themselves spokesmen and defenders of the "left" the Communists have contended that any criticism of them or any refusal to work with them on the part of labor or liberal elements constitutes a betrayal or a weakening of the democratic cause. And many liberals who have failed to think the problem through have accepted this logic.

The effectiveness of our political thought and behavior will be vastly increased if we recognize clearly that democracy as a total pattern bears no affinity to either communism or fascism. It is neither the one nor the other. Nor is it in any sense something midway between the two. Indeed, the course of history is proving clearly that communism and fascism resemble one another far more closely than either resembles democracy. Consequently, for the friends of democracy to open their ranks to the champions of any totalitarian doctrine is to reveal poverty of understanding or hospitality to deception. As a form of government, as a way of life, or as a social faith, democracy is distinctive and unique. To paraphrase the words of Thomas Jefferson, the Communist movement adds just so much of support to democracy as sores do to the strength of the human body.

The second quotation is from an article by Sidney Hook and appeared also in the May 1941 issue of the American Teacher:

But are not Communists sincere, even if mistaken revolutionists? Is not their willingness to sacrifice themselves as well as others evidence of this? The answers is that their fundamental sincerity is only to the Russian state, and that they are revolutionary, nonrevolutionary, or counterrevolutionary, depending upon whether these policies further the interest of the Russian state. The varying program of Communist Parties in Italy, Germany, France, Spain, and the United States are cases in point. It is literally true, therefore, that the Communist Party is not a genuine part of the indigenous working-class movement of the country in which it is active. For its policies are not fashioned in the light of the interests of the workers of that country but exclusively in the light of the interests of a foreign power, Russia. The discovery that the Communist Parties do not hesitate to sacrifice the interests of the workers of different

Columbia catch a substantial portion of the silver and chinook salmon originating from the streams in Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia; and

"Whereas all fishermen operating in the inland waters are being subjected to rigid regulations for the conservation of the species of salmon supporting the commercial fishing in outside waters; and

"Whereas the outside fishing is entirely unregulated, taking unlimited numbers of chinook and silver salmon in any season; and many of them immature: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the present international salmon treaty by expanding the duties of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission to include the investigation of all species of salmon in outside waters from the State of California to Cape Scott on Vancouver Island; and be it further

"Resolved, To provide that commercial fishing in said waters come under the jurisdiction and regulation of said Commission at the time said Commission is given power to regulate the Fraser River sockeye in accordance with the terms of the present covenant; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Washington."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 4

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition Your Excellency and honorable body, as follows:

"Whereas the present National and State social-security laws relating to old-age pensions are steps in the right direction but have proved unsatisfactory, inadequate, inefficient, and subject to many conflicting State and National interpretations, all of which have created uncertainty and doubt as to the time, amount, and payment of old-age pensions; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt has advocated a liberal, uniform, national old-age-pension system; and

"Whereas the nationally known old-age-pension poll indicated that the citizens of the United States favor a uniform, national old-age-pension system with individual monthly payments of $40 and such additional amounts of the Congress may from time to time decree; and

"Whereas the electors of the State of Washington in the recent general election clearly indicated by the passage of an initiative measure that individual pension payments be increased to $40 per month: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to cause to be enacted into law a uniform, national, old-age-pension system along the lines of the desire of the people as expressed in the nationally known poll; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 5

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your assembly and honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the United States Government has embarked on a large-scale and long-range defense program to protect the shores of both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans from attack; and

"Whereas there is an area within Pacific County between the cities of Raymond and South Bend, in the State of Washington admirably situated for the establishment of either an Army or Navy air base or both in that such area is but 15 miles from the Pacific Ocean; lies alongside the Willapa River, it has a channel depth of 25 feet and is at least 1,000 feet in width, thereby making the requested air base accessible to and for seaplanes; and

"Whereas the port of Willapa Harbor is the owner of 300 acres, and is willing to convey a considerable portion of such land for such purposes, and has contributed the sum of $20,000, completely diking the land to the extent of 4½ miles, all of which would give the air base a runway of a mile; and

"Whereas the estimated cost of establishing an air base between Raymond and South Bend, Wash., would amount to less than $175,000: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of $175,000 for the purpose of establishing a military air base between Raymond and South Bend in Pacific County, Wash.; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States; to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States; to each of the Representatives and Senators in Congress from the State of Washington; to the Secretary of War; and to the Secretary of the Navy.

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 7

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition Your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

"Whereas the practicability of the construction of an international highway to Alaska has been under consideration for some years; and

"Whereas the existing water and air transportation routes to Alaska should be supplemented by a through land route to facilitate economic and military connection with that Territory; and

"Whereas the Army and Navy Departments of the United States Government have pointed out the strategic value of Alaska to the North American Continent and the necessity for a coordinated transportation system reaching from the continental United States through to Alaska; and

"Whereas Congressman WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the First Congressional District of the State of Washington, as chairman of the Joint Alaskan International Highway Commission, has made commendatory efforts toward making a through highway from the United States to Alaska an accomplished fact: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to approve and pass suitable legislation for the construction of the Alaskan International Highway for the purposes of providing adequate transportation for defense and development; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

A House memorial of the Legislature of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial No. 4

"House memorial urging passage by Congress of H. R. 1036, relating to the general welfare

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The problems of unemployment and social security are among the most vital economic issues now confronting the people of the State of Arizona, as well as of other States of the Union.

"These pressing problems cannot be solved satisfactorily by individual States, but are national issues involving the general welfare of the Nation.

"There has been introduced in the present session of Congress H. R. 1036, relating to the general welfare, which will, if enacted, alleviate in large measure the economic distress resulting from widespread unemployment and poverty among the aged. Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That H. R. 1036, now pending in the first session of the seventy-seventh Congress, be enacted into law, to the end that deserving old people may be properly cared for and the States relieved of the burden resting upon them in that regard."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 15

"Memorial to the President of the United States and the Representatives from the State of Montana and the State of Wyoming in the Congress of the United States requesting careful consideration and prompt support in the passage of an act providing for the construction of storage of water by the War Department, and that such provisions be made as will assure the people of Montana and Wyoming of water necessary for their present and potential needs for domestic and irrigation purposes by the building of proper dams in the Big Horn River in Montana and Boysen, Wyo.

"The members of the Senate of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (and House of Representatives concurring), respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the War Department, under direction of Congress, made a survey of the Yellowstone watershed and has made its report wherein it recommends that storage be provided at either the Kane or Boysen sites in Wyoming, and that owing to the complexity of the interest involved and the widespread benefit which would accrue from the storage, it is considered appropriate for the United States to bear the entire cost of the new project adopted; and

"Whereas the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors held a public hearing at Billings,

is constantly drinking strength out of new sources by the voluntary association with it of great bodies of strong men and forward-looking women out of other lands. And so by the gift of the free will of independent people, it is being constantly renewed from generation to generation by the same process by which it was originally created. It is as if humanity had determined to see to it that this great Nation, founded for the benefit of humanity, should not lack for the allegiance of the people of the world.

While it is fitting that we should especially emphasize the entrance into the body politic of the United States of those who have just been naturalized, and those who have reached their majority, I do not believe that we should overlook those upon whose shoulders the responsibilities of Government have rested in the past by putting too great an emphasis upon those who have just entered into those responsibilities. But let us on I Am an American Day so arrange our celebrations that all citizens may feel that they are as much a part of the Government and should realize that fact as those relative to whom special dedication is made today.

President Roosevelt's recent message to new citizens sounded the keynote for ceremonies held throughout the country:

"It gives me real pleasure to join in the observance of I Am an American Day which has been set aside as a public occasion for the recognition of all, who, by coming of age, or by naturalization, are attaining the status of citizenship. Great responsibility rests upon those born here who are reaching their majority and also upon those born in other lands who, as new citizens, are taking the oath of allegiance to the United States. Now, they must be prepared to share with millions of their fellow citizens in the responsibilities and duties which are those of all patriotic and home-loving Americans.

It will be their responsibility and their duty to think first of America and at the same time to think in terms of humanity. This Nation was created to insure the things that unite and to eliminate the things that divide. It will continue to be a land of opportunity for native-born and foreign-born citizens. It will continue to offer them the hope, liberty, and justice which have always prevailed in this great democracy of ours.

I join with citizens everywhere in welcoming the more than 2,000,000 American-born boys and girls reaching the age of 21 this year, and also additional thousands of foreign-born becoming citizens by adoption. In return for the rights and responsibilities of citizenship I am sure they will, for all the years of their lives, perform the high patriotic and American duty of supporting their Government at all times in keeping with its principles, traditions, and ideals as a democracy.

Speaking particularly to the new citizens and inferentially to other citizens, I hope that you will pledge yourselves with me to a solemn rededication of citizenship; that you will give more of your efforts, more of your being, and more of your hearts to the task of teaching and emulating Americanism; that you will strive ceaselessly to focus the spotlight of truth upon subversive activities which seek to undermine the foundations of our Nation. By so doing you will illuminate the world with the brilliance of American democracy and demonstrate the sacred character of honest, decent, human elements which, God willing, our Stars and Stripes may forever symbolize.

The exercise of this freeman's franchise is also a duty devolving on all who are entitled to that priceless gift. We hear a great deal about patriotism, Americanism, and kindred virtues, but the very essence of either and all of these is the duty of the citizen to interest himself or herself in the Government of the Nation.

Attention has been called on many occasions by speakers to the fact that the Government of the United States is a democracy. That term means a government by the people, in which the responsibilities of government rest upon the individual citizen, but very few realize that this Government is that of a limited democracy. When the Constitution of the United States was being drawn it was appreciated by those interested that although the majority should rule, there might be times when, due to stress of emotion or hysteria, the majority might override the rights of the minority. Therefore, it wrote into the Constitution certain checks by which the majority could not act without due deliberation and debate. Some of these checks are indicated by the fact that the Constitution grants free speech, free press, the right of assembly, the requirement of a search warrant before officers of the law can enter homes or buildings, and the right of trial by jury. These were all granted by the Constitution itself and cannot be changed without amendments to the Constitution, and these amendments can only become effective after ratification by the necessary number of States. It can readily be seen that this procedure will take some time and consequently the period of hysteria or emotion will have passed and the citizens will have seen the error of their ways.

No stream can rise above the level of its source, and the stream of freedom and Americanism has its source in the selection of the Nation's management through the full and free exercise of the franchise by each and every qualified voter, and I wish to say at this time that each and every American citizen should interest himself in, and study the principles of American government. This can best be done by joining yourself with some political party that does not teach destruction of our form of government, and as a result of the stimulated interest brought about during election periods, you will better understand the basic theories of those principles.

We have been disturbed recently, my fellow citizens, by certain symptoms which have shown themselves in our body politic. Certain men—I have never believed a great number—born in other lands, have in recent months thought more of those lands than they have of the honor and interest of the Government under which they are now living. They have even gone so far as to draw apart in spirit and in organization from the rest of us to accomplish some special object of their own. I am not here going to utter any criticism of these people, but I want to say this, that such a thing as that is absolutely incompatible with the fundamental idea of loyalty, and that loyalty is not a self-pleasing virtue. I am not bound to be loyal to the United States because I live under its laws and am its citizen, and whether it hurts me or whether it benefits me, I am obliged to be loyal. Loyalty means nothing unless it has at its heart the absolute principle of self-sacrifice. Loyalty means that you ought to be ready to sacrifice every interest that you have, and your life itself, if your country calls upon you to do so, and that is the sort of loyalty which ought to be inculcated into these newcomers, that they are not to be loyal only so long as they are pleased, but that, having once entered into this sacred relationship, they are bound to be loyal whether they are pleased or not; and that loyalty which is merely self-pleasing is only self-indulgence and selfishness. No man has ever risen to the real statute of spiritual manhood until he has found that it is finer to serve somebody else than it is to serve himself.

Those engaged in subversive activities of the Government are found in every walk of life, and are the most insidious influences in those activities. The man who stands up and loudly proclaims the fact that he is endeavoring to destroy the United States Government is the man who is easily handled, but the group in our midst who by practices and propaganda tend in the minds of those who will listen to them to change the color of the flag gradually from red, white, and blue to the black background of the swastika and the blue background of the hammer and sickle. This is the type of propaganda that is seeping into our religious institutions, our schools and colleges, and influences the younger generation to look upon this Government as a Government of oppression and encourages the theory that their only salvation is a government along the lines of the Soviet Republic, where the individuality of the person is suppressed and the citizen, who in a democracy formulates the principles of government through its elective representatives, in the government of the dictator becomes a pawn of the government, and is required to do as the government says, instead of being able to tell the government what to do. In the first, he is a nobody; in the second, he is the government. The symbol of our Government is the flag.

A fitting part of ceremonies such as these is a prominent display of the American flag. Far from being a mere piece of bunting, it is a symbol of all that is finest and best in our country. It represents both the Government and the people. The beautiful colors of the flag have come to have a deep meaning. The white of its stripes and of its stars stands for the purity of our motives and conduct. One of the most important objectives to be attained by our country is a clean Government of high political integrity which carries out the will of the people as expressed by them through the ballot.

The red of the alternate stripes is a badge of courage and takes our thoughts back more than a century and a half to the days of Washington's troops at Valley Forge and to those brave hearts who during and since those trying times have given of their strength, and their lives, when necessary, that this Nation might endure.

The blue field which forms the background of the 48 stars representing the States of the Union stands for our pledge of loyalty to a Government which has taken its place in the world as a great democracy.

It is a well-known fact that in these United States the franchise of the citizen is not looked upon with the seriousness that it should be, although in some districts a better interest is shown than in others. For instance, in this vicinity in the last election in which the entire judiciary was elected, less than one-half of the citizens who were registered to vote actually voted. In other words, you can readily see that as far as this district, and no doubt it is true of other sections of the United States, that there is not the proper interest shown by the citizens and that we have a government of the minority.

The many rights and privileges of citizenship carry with them serious duties and responsibilities. If a person insists upon all of the benefits to which he may be entitled but refuses or is unwilling to perform his duties and obligations, he cannot be called a good citizen. The good citizen obeys his country's laws. No government can be strong or successful if its citizens are not faithful to it.

In taking your oath to bear true faith and allegiance to the United States, you gave a solemn promise before God that you would uphold and do your part to protect the Government which the Constitution guarantees to this country and all of its citizens. I am sure that when you leave these colorful and deeply moving ceremonies which have been prepared to do you honor you will have engraved upon your hearts the great obligation which you owe to the faith, loyalty, devotion, and sacrifices of other citizens of the United States, both of the past and present, who have helped to establish and maintain this democratic form of government which we

all so deeply love, and the many rights and privileges of citizenship. It is encumbent upon you, the generation who is not taking up the franchise, to hold high the torch of democracy and keep it well lighted so that it will guide and perpetuate the principles of democracy throughout the world.

In conclusion, let me say that the good citizen in the final analysis in exercising his right of franchise will weigh the various candidates on the scales of past performances from the viewpoint of his reliability, capability, and honesty of purpose and vote and work for the election of those men and women who regardless of party affiliations will make it their solemn duty that this Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the welfare of all its citizens, shall go forward on its God-given mission and not become lost in the mazes of selfish disaster.

If we as Americans will do this, in the words of the immortal Lincoln, this Nation of the people, by the people, and for the people will not perish from the earth.

Plasterers' Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

LETTER TO HON. LELAND M. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAY 9, 1941.

Hon. LELAND M. FORD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In the Appendix of the RECORD at page A2073, under the title of "Plasterers' Wages," I read a letter addressed to a certain man called Lee, wherein a veiled attempt is made to belittle men who work with their arms and body as well as their brains. In the first place, you know, and I have discovered in my law practice, that people who work in cement are subject to a poisoning of a very serious character, which has happened repeatedly. In the next place, the work is extremely strenuous; and it occurs to me that if Mr. Lee or yourself, assuming that Mr. Lee is not a plasterer, were called to do that kind of work, you would want not alone $15.75 a day and $20.25 on Saturday, but you would either want $50 a day or you wouldn't work at all. I also call attention to the fact that plasterers do not work every day receiving a daily wage of $15.75. If someone took the time to investigate the record, they would find that plasterers, throughout the year, average approximately between 3 and 4 days a week. For the amount of work done and its character and danger, it certainly is reasonable.

When reference is made to the fact that "our soldiers in uniform are going to be indignant at the exempted boys receiving as much a day as the men in uniform receive a month," that applies to Members of Congress as well as those who do physical as well as mental labor. It is all well enough for people to sit in judgment upon others and condemn just for condemnation's sake because they hate the man who toils. This was the attitude of those who favored slavery and the people who opposed free public schools on the ground that the poor man should not be educated.

The risk of employment, as a plasterer, is astounding if someone would just take the trouble to look up the record and statistics. One of our great troubles is that too many of the Members of Congress make statements motivated by some unseen hatred, prejudice, and bias. These types make the worst Representatives.

I cannot understand that some do not realize and appreciate that plasterers are just as much a part of humanity as any other people. As to the figures given in the said letter, I know nothing about them except to call attention to the fact that at 6 hours the wage would only be $9 and when they work 9 hours they are certainly entitled to time and a half because their lives are being shortened that much quicker and when they are compelled to work 6 days instead of 5 they are likewise decreasing their average length of life. Some contractors are too mean to hire other plasterers because they are either lazy or for some reason don't want to. I know from information given me, that there are contractors who keep hiring the same individual beyond the 6 hours and 5-day week because of the influence of the contractor, thereby taking away a living from someone else.

However, what do our soldiers in uniform think of the following, taken from certain corporate reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission: The remuneration for 1940 showed L. B. Mayer, of Loew's, Inc., to be $697,048; Eugene G. Grace, president, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, $478,144; George W. Hill, president, American Tobacco Co., $466,415; Hunt Stromberg, Loew's, Inc., $332,267; Nicholas M. Schenck (whose name recently appeared in the newspapers), Loew's, Inc., $318,881; Charles E. Wilson, General Motors Corporation, $278,324; W. C. Fields, actor, $255,000; Paul M. Hahn, American Tobacco Co., $254,849; Vincent Riggio, American Tobacco Co., $251,849; and Charles T. Kettering, General Motors Corporation, $247,965. Mr. Mayer's salary, while slightly in excess of the $688,369 he received in the fiscal year 1939, was still short of the $1,161,753 he was paid in the fiscal year 1938.

There are others receiving smaller sums, but vastly more than $20.25 for working 9 hours in a dangerous and health-wrecking occupation.

These high-salaried boys are also exempted. They do no more for society, and in fact probably not as much, as the mechanics without whom society could not exist.

It is my hope that you will also publish this letter or cause it to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of fairness and justice.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE GELDER.

The Present Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HENRY T. LUMMUS

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Henry T. Lummus, associate justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, delivered at a meeting of the Law Society of Massachusetts on Wednesday, May 21, 1941:

In this crisis—the greatest since this country won her freedom at Yorktown—I cannot bring myself to speak to you of the petty affairs of our profession. I refuse to be crushed by the usual smart retort that I am over the age of military service, for if we have war with the Germans civilians will suffer as much as soldiers. The course of American history must be settled, for weal or woe, within a few weeks. Along every possible course lies deadly danger, and along some courses lies national destruction. Yet all around us are people who talk and act as though the war in Europe were not one in which scientific barbarism seeks to destroy civilization, the result of which Hitler declares will determine the future of the world for a thousand years, but were instead some little quarrel between Ecuador and Peru. People dispose of it with some pert phrase parroted from some demagog, and turn their real attention to the baseball scores or the returns from the race tracks.

I intend to appeal, not to your emotions, but to your common sense, your reason and your patriotism—not the patriotism of fireworks and compulsory salutes, but the patriotism that ponders what course will preserve and defend our American way of life, and then holds to that course through privation, suffering, and, if need be, bullets and bombs.

It is the patriotic duty of every American to look at our situation solely from the standpoint of the welfare of America, without thought of the welfare of any other country. If an American, merely because of his English descent or his love of England, or merely to pull England's chestnuts out of the fire, should advocate intervention or even aid to England, he would be guilty of an unpatriotic act. Only national interests can justify a majority in any country in dragging an unwilling minority into war.

It is equally unpatriotic for any American to oppose intervention or aid to England because of hatred of England or love of her enemies. If an American of old Yankee stock still nurses the hatreds of the Revolutionary War, if an American of Irish descent still lives emotionally back in the times when his ancestors were oppressed by the British, if an American of Italian descent feels sympathy with that beautiful land that was the cradle of modern civilization but has now been dragged by its strutting puppet Caesar down to the level of one of Hitler's slave states, such an American has no moral right to let his emotions weigh a particle in his decision of what course America should follow.

There is a strong group in America, led by 10 Members of the Senate, and called the isolationists, that opposes any effective aid to Britain. Originally they were indifferent as to whether Britain or Germany should win the war. Now they say, mildly, that they prefer a British victory. I do not believe that many of them actually hope for a Nazi victory, though Hitler must be pleased with the aid they give him. Any American who is pro-Nazi is a traitor not only to his country but to religion and civilization as well. I know that some of the isolationists are not traitors, for they have already once risked their lives for their country. Their faults are of the mind, not of the heart. But though the mass of the isolationists are not traitors, every traitorous pro-Nazi is an isolationist.

The isolationists address their arguments to the emotions, not to the intellect. I am not sure whether their leaders are themselves confused, or whether, like Hitler, they

feel contempt for the reasoning powers of the people. At any rate, their stock argument is that our boys must not be sent again to Europe, to fight and die on European soil, and, as they love to put it, to be "ploughed under." Yet every intelligent American knows that England can use no more men in resisting invasion, and that no expeditionary force can be landed on the continent until the Nazis are practically beaten and on the run. The isolationists set up a man of straw and then knock him down.

Everyone who favors a vigorous defense of American interests is called a warmonger, who delights in sending our boys to death. Isolationists talk as though America had a choice between assured and permanent peace, or willful and needless participation in war. They cannot comprehend that we have no such choice, and that if we let the British Empire lose the war we must fight a victorious Germany alone later, whenever Hitler sees fit to attack us. War next year, or in 5 years, would be fully as bloody as war now, and more disastrous. The isolationists never tell us of the boys who will be killed or the mothers who will be bereaved in the last-ditch war to save America to which their course would condemn us. They give no thought to the morrow and see nothing beyond their noses.

Another favorite isolationist rabble-rouser is to attack the British Empire as imperialistic. It is said that the British built up their Empire by force, and that the Germans are merely doing likewise. I hold no brief for England. Some pages of her history, like some pages of our own, show little cause for pride. But much of the British Empire was won by discovery and colonization, and in much of it Britain has worked for peace and justice and individual rights. Never in the history of the British Empire was there anything like the brutal Nazi aggression of the last few years against peaceful and civilized neighbors after lying assurances of friendship. But the whole accusation of imperialism is beside the point. Our only concern is our own national safety. Though her sins be as scarlet, the British Empire and her domination of the seas constitute no menace to America. On the contrary, Nazi domination of the seas would be a constant menace.

We hear a hullabaloo about British propaganda. Britain needs no propaganda among intelligent Americans. The march of Nazi conquest in Europe, the Near East, and Africa, the ruthless enslavement of civilized and unoffending nations, the crushing of religion, of moral values, and of individual rights, all speak louder than anything either the British or the Germans can say.

The isolationists say that the President is breaking his campaign promise to keep us out of war. I feel under no obligation to defend the President, for I never voted for him. But I may say that I am glad that neither of the first two of his opponents for whom I voted is at the helm of state. The attack upon the President is unjustified. We are not in the war even now. But events are moving swiftly abroad, and must move swiftly here. If the President feels less sure than he did 6 months ago that he can defend America and still keep us out of war, he is only feeling what most intelligent Americans are feeling. And the isolationists have only made his task harder.

The isolationists, however, do offer three legitimate arguments that must be met. These are (1) that the Nazis have no evil designs upon America, (2) that they could not harm America if they would, and (3) that the British Empire is lost and American aid would be useless. Let us consider these in order.

Have the Nazis evil designs upon America? In considering this, let us assume that we have deserted England, as the isolationists wish us to do, and that the British Empire has been destroyed. Any rebellion by the conquered and disarmed European countries is an idle dream. With what could they revolt? People cannot face machine guns with clubs, or dive bombers with brickbats. Japan will have moved south, seizing the Philippines, the East Indies, and very likely Australia and New Zealand. Europe and Africa are controlled by the Nazis. The British Fleet has probably been surrendered, for Churchill has fallen and some British Quisling like Sir Oswald Moseley has made the peace. Dire vengeance would have fallen upon English women and children had the fleet not been surrendered. The British Fleet, added to those of Germany, Italy, France, and Japan, could overwhelm ours.

South America is nearer to Africa than to us. It has a large Nazi population, and no such military power or devotion to democracy as to lead it to resist. It would fall into Nazi control within 3 months. Moreover, the peace terms with England would probably give the Nazis islands off our coasts, if not a foothold on this continent itself. Hemmed in on all sides, a rich and juicy prize, can you believe that the Nazis would not wish to make us the most profitable of their slave states? The Nazis would find it hard to stop and settle down. Demobilization of their great army would disrupt their internal economy. They must go on and levy tribute upon other countries in order that the German people may live as a conquering military caste upon the forced labor of the rest of the world.

We have still more evidence of Nazi designs against America. Former German statesmen, now refugees, tell us that the Nazis plan to conquer the world. Hitler himself, a short time ago, in an attempt to keep America quiet and inactive, told us that the German General Staff, after careful study, had decided that an invasion of America was not feasible. Of course, Hitler may have lied, and the staff may have decided that invasion was feasible. The point is, if an invasion of America was not hoped for, why was the German staff asked to study the matter? No one is simple enough to believe that peaceful inaction would save us, any more than it saved Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, the Low Countries, or Greece.

The next question is, Can the Nazis harm America? With the British Empire gone, we are hemmed in on all sides. If the Nazis obtain the British Fleet, they preponderate in sea power at once. If not, they will do so in a few years, for they will control almost all the shipyards of the world. South America and all the rest of the world will be forced to trade exclusively with the Nazis, on terms of barter fixed by them, with the threat of invasion to clinch the bargain. America will be cut off from raw materials, as well as markets, and our foreign trade will die. All the gold in Kentucky with be worthless. A depression so deep and so prolonged as to make the last 11 years seem like prosperity will sap our strength and our courage. Our standard of living will inevitably drop. All the time we must keep armed to the teeth, always on the defensive, never knowing when the blitzkrieg will begin. We shall be crushed by the burden of taxation, and made ready for "fifth column" disintegration. To be prepared for instant action, we shall be forced to adopt a dictatorship. Without a single German soldier landed on our shores, we shall be ruined.

Don't take my word for all this. Let an isolationist answer the isolationists. Senator DAVID I. WALSH, on May 15, 1940, submitted a report of his Committee on Naval Affairs, in which he said: "From all the evidence available it appears that the United States can be defeated and conquered without military conquest of continental United States. Without a navy capable of controlling the sea areas against an enemy, an effective blockade against our foreign commerce can be established and maintained at points thousands of miles from our coasts and well beyond aircraft range. Our outlying possessions will be captured and used against us as advance bases. There will be nothing to prevent the establishment of bases, by force if necessary, in this hemisphere, from which, as well as from aircraft carriers, repeated bombing raids can be dispatched against our highly industrialized areas. * * * With the loss of our outlying possessions, our foreign commerce, and subject to continual raids upon our coastal areas, our ultimate defeat is inevitable. It will be only a question of time, depending on how long our national will to further resist will hold out. Without the power to carry the fight to the enemy, there can be no alternative other than subjugation to his wishes." If we lose the aid of Great Britain's Navy, we shall be in the exact position so vividly portrayed by Senator WALSH, for our own Navy will admittedly be inadequate for a two-ocean defense until 1946 or later.

The isolationists spend much time in showing that the Nazis could not send across the ocean airplanes to bomb us or an army on transports to invade us. What of it? The attack will not come in that way. The approach may be through South America and Mexico, or perhaps through Siberia and Alaska. But sooner or later, unless we surrender and become a Nazi slave state, we must fight for our freedom. And then we must fight alone, with the whole world organized against us.

Our only chance to escape war with Nazi Germany is to help England defeat her. There is still a good chance, for Hitler fears to make us a full-fledged enemy and will avoid actual hostilities with us if possible. Only by successfully aiding England to win can we ever return to our old peaceful way of life, with a reasonable Navy and only a small Army. And if we help England and nevertheless she loses, we shall be no worse off than we should have been had we followed the isolationists' advice, for we shall then stand alone face to face with the Nazis, but with an added year or two for preparation.

The third question is raised by the defeatist argument that Britain is lost and American aid useless. The main expounder of this doctrine is Colonel Lindbergh. Ho can he believe that the still powerful British Empire, having full control of the seas, with the active aid of the United States, cannot resist Germany and at the same time believe that after the British Empire has been destroyed and the whole world dominated by the Nazis, the United States alone can successfully resist them? Whether Britain and America can defeat Germany is a military question. Our responsible military leaders say they can. Nothing in Lindbergh's history gives his opinion upon military affairs or international statecraft any greater value than that of "Wrong Way" Corrigan, who duplicated the only feat that ever gave Lindbergh fame. Neither do I consider Herbert Hoover a military authority. If we put earnestly into the cause our great industrial power and furnish England with more and more bombs and bombers, so that she can make life in all Germany the hell that England has borne, I don't believe Germany can take it. The Germans have always been aggressors, and until this war their own country has met no harm since the days of Napoleon. I do not pretend to be any military expert, but though the Germans are brave soldiers I do believe that under that sort of punishment they will quit. I believe they will quit before a single American soldier is asked to land upon the Continent of Europe.

The isolationists are not only defeatists, they are also appeasers. The surprise visit of Rudolf Hess to England has led to new pleas for a "negotiated peace." When did Nazis ever negotiate? When did they ever wish a real peace? When did they ever keep their pledged word? One might as well seek a

negotiated peace with a tiger. A peace now would only lead England and America to disband their forces and return to normal life, thus becoming helpless before a new Nazi attack. The Nazi idea of peace is seen in the terms recently proposed by Tokyo. If a peace should be made on any such terms, Germany would be at once the ruler of the world. The only effect of this foolish peace talk is to weaken our morale and help Hitler.

Until recently the only response of the isolationists to the Nazi menace has been a loud snore. But the isolationists have recently taken to shouting that we must arm to the teeth for the defense of America. Theirs is a sudden conversion and baptism into the faith of national defense. But they are new and unwilling converts, embracing the faith only for reasons of political strategy, and are hardly dry behind the ears.

Why should America take their advice in anything? They have been stupidly wrong upon every question ever since the Nazi menace loomed. By international law, for centuries, a citizen of a neutral country may sell munitions to a belligerent and deliver the goods in ships, subject only to the rights of blockade, search, and seizure. The isolationist group all voted for the asinine Neutrality Act, which declared in advance of any war that we surrendered our neutral rights, and forbade any American citizen to sell to any belligerent, even one suddenly and outrageously attacked by a well-prepared aggressor. Instead of a Neutrality Act, it should have been called an act to help bandit nations. Of course such silly legislation could not survive the test of reality, and these restrictions were modified early in the war, but against the protest of all the isolationists. If the isolationists had had their way, we should even now be facing the Nazis alone, without allies or friends, for England would have fallen long ago.

The isolationists opposed the cash-and-carry bill as strongly as they did the lease-lend bill. With two or three exceptions, they opposed enlargement of our Navy, once in 1938 and again in 1940. They opposed the Selective Service Act, which was the only means of raising the necessary large army with speed, fairness, and democracy. Our defenses have been strengthened in the last 2 years, but only against their determined opposition.

Yet these are the men who have the effrontery to assume to direct the course of the American people in this hour of crisis. The real sentiments of the isolationists are expressed by Senator NYE, who told us a few days ago that "the British Empire is done for." And as a dose of soothing sirup for the American people, whom he evidently considers children, he added this, the last word in soporific inanity—"And I don't see how that can hurt the United States particularly."

What is America to do in this crisis? Questions of convoys, of seizing ships and bases, of military and naval aid, are all technical questions which are subordinate to the single main question, which is this: Can the United States afford to let the British Empire be destroyed by the Nazis or the Chinese Republic by the Japanese? Answer that question, and then we shall let our military and naval leaders tell us what must be done to prevent such a disaster. I venture no opinion upon these technical matters, for as to them my opinion is as worthless as that of Senator WHEELER or Colonel Lindbergh. But we must see that Gen. Chang Kai-shek has what he needs, and then he will take care of the half-pint gangsters who fancy that they can conquer the east. And we must see that Britain has whatever it takes, even to the extent of naval and military participation, to make sure that Nazi barbarism does not overwhelm her and then surge against us. Whatever is needed, we must give. America cannot afford, America does not dare, to stand by and see the British Empire overcome by a gang of bandits who morally are savages.

We shall not be depleting our strength by aiding Britain. Our strength lies not in planes and munitions hoarded in warehouses, but in the ever-enlarging productive capacity of factories that turn off planes and bombs from the assembly line every hour of the day. Every bomb dropped on Germany by the British weakens the Nazis and helps our defense.

Let us trust our national leaders, the President and his Cabinet, our admirals and generals around whom are gathered the genuine leaders of the minority party like Wendell Willkie and Col. William J. Donovan. They tell us that we must act quickly and decisively in order to save Britain and thereby to save America. Disunion and apathy are dangerous. They destroyed France and nearly destroyed Britain. The isolationist policy of inaction and stupor would be as fatal to national life as diabetic coma is to individual life. Do we love democracy and the American way of life enough to fight for them? Are we determined to die on our feet rather than live on our knees? If we of 1941 have anything of the spirit of 1776 or 1861 or 1917, there can be but one answer. Have done with this fatuous blindness to obvious danger, this senseless huddling behind our boundaries in shivering hope that the dragon may devour all others and yet pass us by. Let us go forth and meet this Nazi monster, play a man's part in slaying him, and thus bring back to the world peace and decency, religion and civiligation for our children and our children's children.

First- and Second-Class Postmaster Ratings, Fourth District of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, more than half of the postmasters serving the offices of the first and second classes in the district I have the honor to represent made grades of over 90 percent on the latest annual inspection.

The Fourth District of Alabama is that district. It has two first- and seven second-class post offices. The postmasters in five out of the nine, earned grades of from 91 to 99.4 percent. With pardonable pride I call the honor roll, as follows:

Piedmont: Harold Sharpe, postmaster, rating 99.4.

Sylacauga: Roe P. Greer, postmaster, rating 95.8.

Talladega: William B. Hardegree, postmaster, and Dexter E. Parks, acting postmaster, rating 95.8.

Jacksonville: J. Thomas Martin, postmaster, rating 91.

Selma: C. Smith Robbins, postmaster, rating 91.

May I challenge any one of you to show such a creditable record made by the postmasters of your district?

It may be that there are other postmasters in the United States with higher records than that earned by Harold Sharpe, but I doubt it. All honor to these excellent servants of the people and their Government, particularly to Harold Sharpe, postmaster of Piedmont, Ala.

Suggested Questionnaire for Poll on the War Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following letter I received this morning, with its enlightening enclosure:

NEW YORK, *May 22, 1941.*

Hon. ED. V. IZAC,
United States House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing you herewith, copy of a letter which I have addressed to Gen. Robert E. Wood, national chairman of the America First Committee, which explains itself.

I sincerely hope that you will at least read this letter through.

Knowing the huge amount of correspondence that you are receiving, this letter calls for no answer, unless you particularly care to respond.

But I do hope that you will at least give its contents careful consideration.

With warm personal regards, believe me,

Sincerely yours,

M. C. MIGEL.

NEW YORK, *May 16, 1941.*

Gen. ROBERT E. WOOD,
Chairman of the Board, Sears,
Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR GENERAL WOOD: I happen to be a stockholder in your company, and it also happens that I have two sons of draft age—possibly you will have the patience to read this letter.

I received a communication from your America First Committee, of which you are the national chairman, requesting me to join the committee and to contribute funds for its maintenance—and you emphasize in huge letters the fact that 83 percent of our American people do not want war.

Now, as a matter of fact, nobody in his common senses wants war—if you put the question bluntly to the country, "Do you want war?" You might as well raise your percentage to 100.

However, there are some things worse than war, and more important than physical safety—if life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness means anything—if conscience and humanity and decency mean anything. But, leaving aside our sense of duty and conscience, let us look at the matter from a purely selfish point of view.

It is altogether a matter of presenting the case to the people in a manner that is fair. If you should say to the people of this country, "These are the extreme possibilities as well as the probabilities.

(1) "Hitler and his Axis friends are on record as battling for world domination, and

his hatred toward this country is only second to that which he feels toward England.

(2) "'Hitler has adroitly maneuvered to isolate country after country before attacking, and if England falls, the United States would be absolutely isolated—alone and friendless in a Nazi-dominated world—with an almost mathematical certainty of having eventually to battle him or be strangulated economically.

(3) "The present war has demonstrated that mechanized superiority is the controlling factor in winning battles—bravery of a country's people alone being negligible without proper mechanical equipment. The United States having the greatest possible facilities in the world for production of mechanized equipment, does your common sense allow you to believe for a moment that Hitler, astute and conscienceless as he has shown himself to be, would for a moment permit us to continue to produce for years mechanized war equipment that we might use ourselves against him, or make available to other enslaved countries who might endeavor to free themselves?

(4) "If England should fall or we allowed her to fall, her immense shipbuilding facilities, as well as those of France, Germany, Japan, and other dominated countries could, under control of Germany, outbuild the United States in ships in a ratio of two to one (according to experts), which would mean eventually the absolute control of the seas and commerce.

"If Hitler should win this war, no agreement with him as to disarmament or anything else would be worth the paper it is written on.

(5) "Admitting as a fact for argument's sake, that Hitler would or could neither land nor attack us here on our native soil for some years, if we permitted England to fall, with the consequent domination of the seas by the Axis in conjunction with Japan, with full access to raw materials, how long do you suppose it would be before they destroyed the Panama Canal or attacked some South American country, compelling us, through our pledged word to them, or our adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, to engage the Axis away from home to our great disadvantage, and in two oceans at once?

"Even if we did not wish to fight, through their propaganda, hatred, jealousy, and economic attacks, they would eventually so humiliate us that if we had only the backbone of a rabbit, we would resent it with arms—war."

Suppose you or your committee or the Gallup poll put a fair and proper questionnaire to the American people—suppose you say, "although none of us want war, still under the alternatives (as enumerated and based on the foregoing paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) do you or do you not prefer war, if decided at the proper time by the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States?"

If we know the character and spirit of the American people, you will find that the answer and percentage in the affirmative will astound you and your committee. As a matter of fact, in this connection I might quote from the newsmagazine Time (May 5, 1941) the result of the Gallup poll on the following question:

"If it appeared certain there was no other way to defeat Germany and Italy except for the United States to go to war against them, would you be in favor of the United States going into the war?"

Answer:	*Percent*
Would favor war	68
Would oppose war	24
Undecided	8

Needless to say, I can neither join your committee nor contribute toward its maintenance.

Very truly yours,

M. C. MIGEL.

P. S.—Kindly take note that this is an open letter.

The Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the National Board of Fire Underwriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow in the city of New York the National Board of Fire Underwriters will celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of its organization. Few people in the country appreciate the far-reaching influence, counsel, service, and usefulness of this national board.

At some later time I expect to outline the help which it has given to the large and small communities in this Nation in the establishment of adequate fire defenses. I shall do this only in order that those interested may know how valuable this service has become. But on today, however, I desire to express my own good wishes to the organization on this important birthday and to speak briefly on its participation in our preparedness program.

A wide variety of problems has naturally arisen in the prosecution of our national-defense program. Problems of industry and of production are acute, but none is more serious than that of conserving the lives of our young men who are called to the service of their country and the materials essential to their training. Solution of problems involving construction and adequate water supply with a proper distribution system and efficient fire-fighting equipment is of the utmost importance in making provision on short notice for housing and training large concentrations of men.

Effective assistance in coping with these problems has been given to the War and Navy Departments by the fire-insurance business through the medium of the National Board of Fire Underwriters. In September 1939 this organization offered its services to the National Government and, upon invitation of the War and Navy Departments, advisory bureaus on fire protection and fire prevention were established in the Construction Division of the War Department and in the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department, where engineers taken from the regular staff of the national board are located. Through the National Board of Fire Underwriters, fire-protection engineers employed by fire-insurance boards and bureaus throughout the country are being called upon for service in the field.

Already a large number of Army and Navy properties have been surveyed and reports of conditions found made to the War and Navy Departments with recommendations in respect to fire protection and fire-fighting facilities. This work has not been confined to the continental United States. It has been extended as well to properties in Puerto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands.

In our opinion, it should also be recorded that these services are being performed without cost to the Government. The National Board of Fire Underwriters has undertaken this work under a dollar-a-year contract at considerable expense to the capital stock fire insurance companies that compose its membership, without any wish for reimbursement, but simply a desire to serve the best interests of the country in which we live.

In reciting these facts it should also be said that the action of the National Board of Fire Underwriters at the present time is fully consistent with the record of its services during the first World War. In 1917 it offered its services promptly, as it has done also at this time; in 1917 its services were utilized in the inspection not only of governmental properties, but also private industries that were necessary to the prosecution of the war. It furnished a great deal of industrial data of vital importance. Problems of extraordinary complexity and detail were presented and solved in safeguarding large concentrations of value in foods and other supplies, and as the result of its work the record of that period shows a minimum of disturbance or loss due to fire.

Its recommendations for safeguarding cantonments, supply depots, hospitals, naval properties, warehouses, terminals, and shipyards—its plans for fire protection and prevention were developed with the utmost thoroughness. As a result, when possession of Army cantonments was delivered to those in authority fire losses amounting to less than $3,000 had been sustained in construction valued at more than $100,000,000.

To a greater extent today than ever before wars will be won not alone on the battlefronts, but through the efficiency of services of supply so necessary to our fighting forces. Production of these supplies is of the utmost importance, but unnecessary destruction of production facilities or of supplies that have already come off of the production line may strike a blow at the most vital part of our national-defense program. Conservation of production facilities and supplies is, therefore, a vital part of production itself, and the services in this respect which are being given so freely by the National Board of Fire Underwriters have a value far beyond our ability to estimate.

It is fortunate that we have such an organization to which our country can look in times of stress and which is able to muster its forces so promptly and carry on its work so efficiently for the furtherance of our national-defense program in this time of emergency.

Oregon and 23 Other States of the Union Memorialize Congress To Withdraw From the Field of Gasoline Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the sub-

ject of Federal taxation of gasoline, I include a resolution adopted recently by the Legislature of my State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress to withdraw from the field of gasoline taxation. Twenty-three other States of the Union have taken similar action. As I have stated to the House on other occasions, Oregon originated the tax on gasoline. We are one of the younger States of the Union and have an extensive road program. We pride ourselves on having constructed and maintained a system of road development equal to any State in the Union, in comparison with our resources and population and territory covered. Unfortunately, the Federal Government owns over 50 percent of the land area of the State of Oregon, which has removed from taxation a very considerable portion of the wealth which otherwise would be available for carrying on State activities.

The tax on gasoline has proven itself to be an admirable tax available to the States and local governments for road construction and maintenance. Many of the States, like my own, have religiously abstained from using any of the tax from gasoline for any purpose other than public highways. Many of the States have incurred large bonded indebtedness on the faith of being able to use tax revenues from gasoline to retire the bonded obligations as well as pay the recurring interest charges. The Federal Government, until recently, held aloof from this field of taxation. There are various tax avenues open to the Federal Government not available to the States and local governments. The Federal Government and the States should, insofar as possible, avoid duplication of taxation upon industries and activities which tend to make the burden inequitable and unjust. The taxes now imposed on gasoline, which is a sales tax, are over 50 percent of the sale price of the commodity, on the average throughout the United States. In some States the burden is considerably heavier. Practically no major industry is as heavily taxed.

This tax falls with particular force upon agricultural communities, because much of the products from the farm must be moved to market by trucks using gasoline. It is true that some of the States in taxing gasoline have given credit to farmers for gasoline used on the farm and not on the highways. No such credit is given by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely urge that we give favorable consideration to the resolution adopted by the State of Oregon, as well as the several other States of the Union, and that not only do we refrain from imposing any additional tax on gasoline, but that steps be taken at once to remove the existing Federal tax thereon so that this one field of taxation so peculiarly available to the States and local governments may be left to them, without interference from the Federal Government.

Under leave heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks the resolution adopted by the Oregon Legislature, as well as a statement recently released by the National Grange, bearing upon this whole subject matter.

House Joint Memorial No. 1–XX

Resolution on repeal of Federal gasoline tax

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has imposed a tax upon all sales of gasoline; and

Whereas said tax has been increased rather than removed, as petitioned by this body in previous legislative session; and

Whereas the State of Oregon and the other several States of the Union have already placed as much tax on said gasoline sales as the traffic will legitimately bear, added thereto the Federal tax is untimely and prohibitive and should be immediately removed; and

Whereas the taxation of gasoline sales should logically be left to the exclusive use of the States as a means of providing funds for administration, road building, and relief programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That this legislative assembly petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to take immediate steps to remove the Federal gasoline sales tax and that, henceforth, such taxation be left to the exclusive control of the several States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward one copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to each Member of both Houses of Congress, and to the Governors of each of the respective States.

Filed with secretary of state January 30, 1933.

THE FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX—A PENALTY ON THE FARMER'S DILIGENCE

The Federal gasoline tax is not a road tax. It is a general excise, and the revenue it yields is used to finance general governmental functions such as national defense. A fair share of the cost of these general functions, of course, is the responsibility of every citizen throughout the country.

The annual payment toward the cost of general Government made by any individual from this source obviously is measured by the amount of gasoline consumed. Some individuals consume more gasoline than others and consequently their tax payments are greater. Use of the gasoline tax to raise revenue for general Federal governmental purposes accordingly is unsound because the distance a citizen travels on the highways or the extent to which he uses his farm tractor or grain thresher is a very poor measure of his responsibility for the cost of such governmental functions.

A TAX ON TOOLS OF PRODUCTION

Not only have motor vehicles been accepted generally as indispensable to maintenance of an adequate standard of living, but they also are used by a substantial portion of the people in earning their livelihood. To provide themselves with food, clothing, and shelter, salesmen, fishermen, farmers, and others depend upon them. The taxation of their operation through the Federal gasoline tax may be compared to taxation of the carpenter's saw and hammer or taxation of the ribbon clerk's tape measure.

The farmer is the outstanding victim of such discriminatory taxation. It has been estimated by several authorities that the farmers of this Nation account for about one-quarter of its total consumption of motor fuel. The farmer uses gasoline to operate the tractor which he uses extensively for the tilling of the soil, the cultivation and harvesting of his crops, and as the source of motive power for driving other implements. He uses gasoline in the engines that power his thresher and his binder. He uses gasoline in his truck and his automobile to haul products to market. And countless other needs are met through consumption of gasoline in connection with earning a living.

INCREASES FARMER'S COST OF DOING BUSINESS

It is not only the big and prosperous farmers who have mechanized equipment to operate their farms. There is competition among farmers just as there is among businessmen. Each farmer must strive for lower and lower costs of production to compete with his neighbor, and because all of his neighbors have mechanized equipment, he must have it too or abandon his farming. Moreover, the really prosperous farmer is more or less a rarity anyway.

The cost of gasoline, therefore, is an important item in the cost of running a farm, probably more important than it is to nearly any businessman. The increase in the cost of gasoline through the imposition of an additional 1 cent a gallon Federal tax would amount to about 10 percent. The fact that a 10-percent increase in farm production costs is most substantial needs no elaboration to be appreciated by anyone who has even a meager knowledge of farming.

Many States, of course, provide refunds or exemptions in their gasoline tax laws for fuel which is not used on the highways, and the farmers who use gasoline in their agricultural implements therefore need not pay the State taxes. The Federal Government's tax on gasoline, because it is an excise rather than a road tax, makes no provision for such exemptions or refunds. The farmers must pay the Federal tax on every gallon of gasoline they consume irrespective of the purpose for which it is used. Even at the present rate of 1½ cents a gallon, the Federal gasoline tax represents a sales tax of 12 percent. None of the general retail sales taxes in the country, however, exceed 2 percent or 3 percent in rate.

AN EXCESSIVE TAX ON THE FARMER'S GROSS INCOME

In recent years, the Federal Government has been spending hundreds of millions of dollars annually to provide relief for the farmers. In 1941, it is expected such farm subsidies will exceed a billion. The Federal Government thereby has shown an appreciation of the farmer's plight. The 1935 census of agriculture showed that the average gross income per farm in several States was well below $750, and this figure included Government payments to the farmers under farm-relief programs. In these States, an additional 1 cent a gallon gasoline tax on the average farmer using 750 gallons of gasoline a year obviously would be most burdensome. But already he is paying a 1½ cent a gallon Federal gasoline tax, so that an additional 1 cent a gallon tax would increase the burden even further. And the longer and harder the farmer works himself and his machines to improve his income, the more gasoline he consumes and the greater burden of taxation he assumes. Does that sound fair?

States whose legislatures have adopted resolutions memorializing Congress to withdraw from the field of gasoline taxation

State and year resolution adopted:

Alabama	1936
Arkansas	1933
California	1935
Colorado	1935
Connecticut	1937
Delaware	1939
Kentucky	1936
Maine	1935
Maryland	1935
Minnesota	1935, 1937
Montana	1933
Nebraska	1935

States whose legislatures have adopted resolutions memorializing Congress to withdraw from the field of gasoline taxation—Continued

State and year resolution adopted—Con.

New Jersey	1938
New Mexico	1935
New York	1935
North Carolina	1933
Oklahoma	1933
Oregon	1933
Rhode Island	1939
South Carolina	1937
South Dakota	1933, 1935, 1937, 1941
Tennessee	1935
Texas	1935
Virginia	1932

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. R. E. THOMASON, OF TEXAS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me at the annual convention of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce at Mineral Wells, Tex., on the evening of May 16, 1941:

Mr. Chairman, members of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, and distinguished guests, you have paid me high honor, which I gratefully acknowledge, in inviting me to address you at your annual meeting. It has been my pleasure and privilege to work closely with you before and since I became a Member of the House.

Your chamber is ever awake to the needs of our people and has done inestimable good in bringing to the attention of the State and national legislatures measures designed to benefit not only our section but the country as a whole.

Your letterhead bears the slogan: "West Texas—Raw Materials Capital of the World." This section produces meat, hides, horses, cotton, wool, mohair, oil, grain, potash, quicksilver. One of the first essentials toward national defense is the assembling of stocks of raw materials and strategic minerals. The value of our products cannot be overestimated at any time, and more especially in a period of stress and emergency. I have taken occasion often recently to urge the Federal Government to obtain information on the location of all possible minerals that are needed for defense and to acquire stocks of these materials in quantity.

From year to year you have grown in membership, in influence, in achievement. I predict for you a future of greater attainment in all that is best and highest for the welfare of this Nation.

One of the projects on which we have been working together for the past 6 years is the creation of the Big Bend National Park. In 1935 I introduced a bill in the House authorizing the establishment of this park, which bill was passed the same year.

The Secretary of the Interior and the heads of the National Park Service have been enthusiastic from the first with reference to our getting this area designated as a national park and have rendered willing and valuable cooperation to that end.

For these intervening years we have been trying to raise sufficient funds through private subscription, or the passage of a bill in our Texas Legislature, to purchase the necessary land and have title thereto vested in the United States Government, as the Government has a policy against buying any land for park purposes and could not be prevailed on to deviate from this policy, much as the Interior officials were interested in having the park established.

The passage in the Texas Legislature within the past few days of a bill appropriating $1,500,000 to acquire the land assures, on the signature of the bill by the Governor, the creation of this park as soon as the area is turned over with clear title to the Federal Government. Thereafter the park will be administered by the National Park Service and all necessary improvements made.

I shall ask Congress for necessary funds for this purpose just as soon as title is vested in the Government.

Geologically, as well as botanically, this area offers most unusual interest, and in portions of the park the scenery is outstanding, as the region of the Santa Helena Canyon. I am sure it will bring thousands of tourists to our State every year.

Much credit is due the Big Bend Park Association for its diligence in this cause and the successful outcome.

It is with a feeling of inadequacy to my assignment that I stand here this evening in the place of that great and sincere man who had been asked to make the principal address at this meeting. Morris Sheppard's sudden and untimely death has taken from us a beloved and trusted friend, and from his State and his country a leader who can ill be spared at a time when we face a greater crisis than in 1917. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, he piloted important national-defense legislation upon which this country is depending today to lead us safely through the present emergency and to preserve to us those liberties for which our forefathers fought and died.

Senator Sheppard was the dean of Congress, having been elected to the House in 1902. During those nearly 40 years he worked with unflagging industry for all that he conceived to be for the best interests of our people. He was absent from sessions of Congress so seldom during his entire incumbency that we may say his attendance on the Senate floor was 100 percent.

Throughout his long and valuable service, I wonder if anyone can guess how many people he helped individually. No one was too poor or obscure to claim his consideration, and none who came to his door for aid was ever turned aside. While giving himself, his thought, and his time to these activities, which, after all, are more or less incidental to a Senator's legislative work, he gave a full measure of study to the great issues before this country, and cast his vote without fear or favor, in accordance with his most profound convictions.

The memory of his blameless life and lofty ideals will be inspiritation to us he left behind to lead lives of nobler purpose.

In the words of Shakespeare, whom he studied in all his spare time:

"His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world, 'this was a man.'"

The question today of most vital concern to us is adequate and speedy national defense, with aid to Britain as our first line of defense. We must have an Army, Navy, and Air Corps second to none and able to meet any aggressor anywhere. We do not at this time have the largest Army in the world, but I hope and believe we will soon have the best.

Let it be understood at the outset that I favor not only leasing and lending but, if necessary, giving to England all the munitions and supplies we can spare her that would not weaken our own defense. She is fighting our fight tonight—and what a brave fight she is making.

Under the direction of that very able officer, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the War Department is working early and late to meet the emergency. I feel you may be interested in having some of the figures on production and the number of men under arms, and I give these data briefly.

The strength of the Army today is 1,290,400 officers and men, the largest roster we have ever carried in a time of peace. Of these 485,900 are in the Regular Army, 290,500 are in the National Guard, and 469,000 are Selective Service trainees. Some 45,000 Reserve officers are on active duty, distributed among the troops.

The total strength of the Army—men in uniform, equipped and housed—on July 1 will be 1,418,000. That is 5 times the size of the Army we had 1 year ago. When Hitler attacked western Europe we had a bare 213,000 men and 14,000 officers.

The big increase has been in the last few months. In September of last year we had only 380,000 men, but that number jumped to over 1,000,000 in 6 months; and 25,000 new men are coming in every week. The 485,900 of these men in the Regular Army are all volunteer 3-year enlistments.

Texas stands at the very top of the roster of the States in the number of volunteers who have enlisted in the Regular Army during the present emergency. From July 1, 1940, through February 1941, 24,248 Texans have joined the colors, as against 18,432 from Pennsylvania and 17,705 from New York, which States are second and third on the list, both having much greater population than Texas.

Texans in the land and naval forces on April 4, 1941: Army, 50,237; Navy, 12,221; National Guard, 13,708; Marines, 2,761; Coast Guard, 89.

In the selective service Texas has 827,201 registered; number of volunteers in class 1–A, after physical examination, plus volunteers already inducted, 12,832; and number inducted to March 31, 20,936.

More than one-tenth of our great Army is now in our State. By July 1 we will have nearly 200,000 men in Texas. Most of these men are in west and southwest Texas.

Time will not permit a break-down by posts, cantonments, and fields, of which there are 22 in our State. The following figures are given as the approximate number that will be stationed at the camps throughout west Texas on July 1: San Antonio, 30,000; El Paso, 28,000; Mineral Wells, 8,600; Abilene, 19,000; Brownwood, 29,000; San Angelo, 1,100; Marfa, 1,000; and Wichita Falls, 3,000.

Early this month the United States Navy comprised 227,089 enlisted men and 21,644 officers, including Regulars and Reserve officers on active duty. The United States Marine Corps, officers and men, was 51,165 strong. That makes a grand total of 299,898.

I do not believe I should be indulging in excessive exaggeration if I gave it to you as my considered opinion that the Navy and Marine Corps are today 300,000 strong. That figure represents, of course, far and away the largest naval personnel that has ever served the colors in time of peace.

We are building an adequate two-ocean navy. It is second largest of the world's navies and none of us can guess as to how great it will have to become to insure full protection of American rights and interests throughout the world.

We have at Corpus Christi a great and expanding naval air station costing $26,500,000. Destroyers, landing boats, mine sweepers, and wooden and steel submarine chasers are being constructed in Texas shipyards, one order

alone, that for destroyers, totaling in excess of $100,000,000.

Defense funds allocated to Texas are as follows:

Estimated value of contracts for matériel awarded to firms having plants in Texas, between July 1, 1940, and February 28, 1941, $133,009,661.

Estimated cost of construction projects to be built in Texas, including equipment of toluol plant, seven camps and one plant make up the total of $126,015,370.

Chief among these are one ordnance plant, 2 aircraft assembly plants, 11 camps or comparable troop-housing developments, 1 harbor-defense project, 2 storage depots, and 7 airfields.

Not included is the amount of money to be spent for food and subsistence by the troops stationed in the State.

Not included is the amount of money to be spent by troops stationed in Texas from their pay and allowances.

Recently I was a guest at the official opening of the new powder plant at Radford, Va. It was ready for operation 3 months ahead of schedule. This plant has a capacity of producing 800,000 pounds of smokeless powder in a single day. This plant will produce in 3 days as much as Hercules Powder Co., one of the largest in the country, produces in a year.

The Charlestown, Ind., plant has begun production and will have a capacity of 400,000 pounds per day.

You have been hearing little but bad news, but I want to tell you something good about the progress of the program.

The War Department is now making a survey to establish an eligible list of 28 more cantonments if and when needed. In making the awards, I feel sure Texas will be given just and fair consideration.

No phase of our defense preparations interests the people more intensely than airplane production. Mr. Knudsen, Chairman of the Office of Production Management, stated recently before my Committee on Military Affairs that 1,214 planes and 3,900 motors were produced in March, and predicted that this figure would be doubled by next year.

The April figures are: Planes manufactured, 1,427; 1,000 machine tools and 10 tanks being produced daily.

There have been awarded 15,000 Army contracts and 100,000 subcontracts.

There are in service at this time in the Army and Navy approximately 9,000 first-line planes of various types.

The production figures for April are 80 percent above those of last December.

I would say that second in public interest are tanks. The light tanks, weighing 13 tons, are being built at the rate of more than 100 per month. The medium tank, which is a very powerful weapon weighing 26 tons, has been redesigned following lessons of war in Flanders and France.

The need for ever larger tanks has been shown by the German campaign in Greece, where 40-ton tanks were used in both mountainous and flat areas. This country is building a supertank of 60 tons. What the limit may be no one can tell, but one thing is sure, no country will excel us in the size, efficiency, or the maneuverability of tanks, which have played such a vital part both in offense and defense in this World War.

We have a relatively small standing army in this country, officered by Regular Army personnel. We have in emergencies always pinned our faith on our great civilian army composed of the National Guard and the Officers' Reserve Corps. I favor amending the National Defense Act so that the National Guard and Reserve officers shall receive the treatment to which they are entitled and also afforded incentive and opportunity for promotions.

The Thomason Act should be amended so that more young Reserve officers would be given opportunity to obtain permanent commissions in the Regular Army. I undertake to say that the great majority of the young officers under this law are equally as fine and capable as those who graduate from West Point.

More than 8,000 young Reserve officers from our senior R. O. T. C. schools will be called to duty on July 1, and I predict that Texas A. and M. College will head the list.

Since the world is rapidly becoming an armed camp, there is no choice but for us to train our boys as soldiers, and it is best to begin early. And since interest in military training is present in almost every high school boy, and each year more schools throughout the country make applications for R. O. T. C. units, I believe we should make arrangements for a material enlargement of our R. O. T. C. program, which would thus become one of the foundation stones of our military strength.

The program right now, instead of being expanded, has been curtailed, for the reason that the Regular Army officers needed to head these units are given other assignments considered more vital to national defense.

There are 529 applications for junior and senior R. O. T. C. units now on file with the War Department, and I have for a long time been urging their approval. Every high school, college, and university in the country that can meet the requirements should have an R. O. T. C. unit, and I shall urge appropriations to that end.

One of the problems now before my committee concerns amendments to the selective-service law. There is a great deal of sentiment throughout the country in favor of reducing the ages from the present limits between 21 and 35 years to a lower entrance limit of 18 years and upper of 25 years, giving the selectee the right to choose the year he will serve.

Perhaps we are not quite ready for this change, and the present law should be given a thorough trial. There have been many inequalities and some injustice in the administration of this act. Draft boards have made different rulings on the same state of facts, and there should be more uniformity.

Since we are to have compulsory military training for 5 years, and probably permanently, so far as we can see at this time, I feel friendly to the suggestion of reducing the age limits. Younger men are more susceptible to discipline and training and make better soldiers. They could get their year's training immediately on leaving school or college and before getting established in a job. Industry would also experience less disturbance.

I am also convinced that medical and dental students should be permitted to finish their school work before being called into service. Skilled workers in munitions plants should be deferred.

I have felt from its inception that the C. C. C. has been one of the most worthy and useful agencies created under this administration. It has built men as well as many enduring works. From the nature of the employment offered, the enrollees were taken into the open country and given out-of-door work. This was especially beneficial to the young men from crowded city areas, many of whom were underweight and came from homes of the underprivileged.

One-sixth of the men now in the C. C. C. are within the draft-age limits. How the draft applies to these men has not as yet been settled but from the best information I can obtain most of these enrollees are given exemption until they have served their allotted term in the C. C. C.

Now that a grave emergency is upon us and our security depends on speediest possible defense, I believe these boys should be immediately put into training that will fit them to take their places in defense industries. On the output of our factories depends the fate of democratic government in the world, and nothing should be left undone to see that maximum production is reached—and reached soon.

Those C. C. C. boys of draft age should not be deferred, but all should be inducted into the service.

The matter of strikes is causing gravest concern among our people, and I have received numerous telegrams and letters advising that the sternest measures be employed to end them.

Well, you and I believe that no individual interest whatsoever should be permitted to slow or hamper this program on which we have embarked, and to the success of which we have dedicated our means and our toil.

It is fitting that mediation and conciliation should be called into the picture and given a fair chance to settle the controversy. This has been done with very satisfactory results quite recently, as with the Allis-Chalmers and the soft-coal miners. There are 400,000 soft-coal miners in the United States. One can then appreciate the magnitude of the accomplishment in realizing what an army has been put back to work in these key industries.

One hesitates to mention legislation to compel a body of workmen to follow a certain procedure or to desist from certain action. The old school maxim that "he who governs himself is governed best" makes strong appeal to all right-thinking people. But where the gravity of the situation confronting this country places speed in production as the price of survival of liberty and democracy, then both labor and capital must settle their differences without stopping that work on which our lives and our safety depend. No personal benefit can be put above our country's welfare.

I feel hopeful, however, that these disputes will lessen. I know that the great rank and file of labor is behind this program, and the labor of Texas has not been encumbered with that reprehensible leadership that has, in many instances, caused righteous resentment among our people, and has cast reflection at times on great bodies of labor in other sections.

The great body of labor is patriotic. They are sending their sons to the service, as well as their employers are. Some of the recent trouble has been provoked by Communist leaders, and they ought to be locked up, and all aliens illegally in this country should be deported, including Harry Bridges and all his ilk. I hope and believe that mediation will solve the problem; but if not, then I favor appropriate legislation along the lines of the railway mediation law, which has worked so successfully. National defense must be paramount to every other consideration, whether it be labor, capital, or agriculture.

Making the tools with which to do the job is the first essential in modern warfare, and it is becoming increasingly apparent that men must be trained in this work by the thousands, to the end that our output of machines, arms, and munitions may reach the point where this Nation leads all nations of the world in production of armament.

I hope and believe it will not be necessary to send an expeditionary force to Europe in this conflict. This war will be won by Britain with the help of American factories, American machines, American labor, American ideas and ideals—provided there is delivery.

One of our businessmen recently declared this a Nation on wheels. A Berlin editor came back with: "But wheels can't cross the ocean." This brings us to the subject of convoys, which is being discussed throughout the length and breadth of the land and in

Congress. The question brings bitter divisions among our people, and every day I receive letters and telegrams on both sides of the proposal.

So far Congress has not given the matter consideration, nor has the President made a statement as to whether he deems it necessary that our Navy be used to guard the supplies which we promised Britain to aid her in winning this war. It is possible that patrols the President has ordered to duty may prove sufficiently effective to get these supplies into English hands, and that this plan will be given time to show what results can be accomplished.

The American people have already taxed themselves in the prodigious sum of $7,000,000,000 to help Britain against the dictators, who seek not only destruction of the British Empire but democracy wherever it exists—and that means us, and don't you forget it.

Tremendous as our national debt has become, and heavy as our taxes are at this time, more taxes must be levied and vastly greater hardships endured than have been known in our lifetime. Sacrifice, toil, and unity of purpose can alone achieve the results to which we have set our faces.

I favor material reduction in all nondefense appropriations and a gradual working of such activities into the defense program, so far as it is possible to do so.

The American people will never consent that their sacrifices shall be made in vain and that the ships bearing our supplies shall go to the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean, instead of the shores of that island which bleeds from wounds inflicted by the archcriminal Nazis, but which is resolved to conquer or die.

The matter of convoys then must be left to future determination, and I am frank to say I do not know whether or not the President will recommend this action, or whether Congress will act favorably should he do so.

But the issue is clear—England loses without our help—and not token help, but more and ever more help—and if she is to win, she absolutely must have those things we can send her across the Atlantic. To see that they get there then is our problem, and it must be solved, or our efforts are vain, our money wasted, and we are left with the prospect of facing alone those powers that speak only the language of bombs in dealing with the nations of the world.

If it develops that there is no way to get supplies and munitions to Britain, who is also making our fight, except to convoy, then I say convoy. Regardless of what it costs, it is the best insurance policy we can buy.

If Hitler should win this war—and I disregard Mussolini, for he is but a corpse held up by Hitler's hands—he would be undisputed master of Europe, a large part of Asia, and Africa. His policy of "divide and conquer," which he has applied in every instance to this time when he has attacked a nation, would be directed to this hemisphere, and his propaganda machine—already working overtime here—would go to every length to foment internal strife among the people of the United States, as well as our neighbors to the South.

If we value our way of life, our freedom of speech, freedom of the press, our heritage of liberty which has come down to us from the revered founders of this Government, we will awake from our dream of security and the comfortable idea that isolation is still possible, and prepare to meet the most unscrupulous, the most inhuman, the most deadly enemy that has ever arisen to threaten the safety, if not the life, of every man who dwells under a free government.

We must prepare to meet him and to aid in destroying his power ere it be used to destroy us. For, believe me, he would crush us if he could, as he has crushed under his iron heel of despotism the free peoples of Europe. His puppets have but lately declared that the United States is a 100-percent enemy, and with Herr Hitler this would call for 100-percent extinction.

If England goes down under the merciless blows he rains daily on her women and children, as well as her docks and factories, then we are next, and none of us need turn aside from the prospect, as a chicken that puts his head under his wing in face of danger and believes he is safe.

Aside from our natural and altruistic wish to hold up the hands of all democracies who have defied the totalitarian juggernaut, the necessity of self-preservation demands that we insure final victory for Britain and the brave men of conquered countries who have escaped to fight at her side. If she loses this fight, we shall find ourselves encircled with enemies that know no law but the law of the jungle. We will unite as one man to meet this threat to our lives and our sacred institutions. We will give of our work and our treasure, and if need be, our lives to the end that our Nation may live to fulfill her great destiny among the peoples of the world and that democracy shall not perish. Though now it lies prone in many lands under the lash of the most powerful and ruthless dictator this world has ever known, it shall, with our help and encouragement, live again.

Eighteenth District American Legion of Texas Urges Unhampered Defense Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

RESOLUTION BY EIGHTEENTH DISTRICT AMERICAN LEGION OF TEXAS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a resolution passed by the Eighteenth District American Legion of Texas, recently assembled in convention at Amarillo, Tex., which is set out below.

Because this resolution springs from one of the most loyal and patriotic groups in all America, and because the sentiments expressed therein are shared by many others in the United States, I wish to direct the attention of the Members of Congress to this expression of genuine loyalty and patriotism from men whom I am distinctly proud to represent in the Halls of Congress.

The resolution follows:

Be it remembered that the Eighteenth District American Legion of Texas in convention assembled in the city of Amarillo, Tex., at its spring session, April 19 and 20, 1941, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolution IX

"Whereas this organization is composed of men who know what war means to our Nation, including its horrible details, and are each individually interested in living in a nation where peace, liberty, and the pursuit of individual happiness is our principal wish and desire; that we believe in the principles of democracy as we know it in America; that we believe in the entire principles of free speech, right to handle our own affairs as free men, including the right to operate our own businesses or join together in any organization for the promotion of our mutual welfare as individuals or as collective organization without the interference of Government function so long as we pursue such actions and conduct under the principles for which this Government was founded; that we believe in the sovereignty of the individual, State, and Nation, as we understand the principles of this, the greatest democracy of all time; yet, we as citizens of the United States of America, and as members of the American Legion and of this organization (the Eighteenth District American Legion of Texas), believe that the time has come in America when the sovereignty of the Nation, as such, must be the primary interest of all of us who love the principles this Nation represents; we believe that interest of the individual who is engaged in the production of materials of war, which the National Government has set in motion, is not superior to the rights, liberties, interests, and financial affairs of those young Americans who have been called to the colors of our Nation to prepare to defend the Nation against those who might assault us within the very near future; that the interest of the individual who will gain financially from the production or manufacture of these implements of warfare is not superior to the interest of the Nation and the young manhood of America now training to use such implements; we, therefore, believe that those individuals in labor organization and the ownership of manufacturing industries should be caused to realize the seriousness of the international relations of our Nation and the necessity for the unhampered completion of our defense program as started by Congress and our President; we believe that much of the delay, strikes, and violence that has been evident in recent months is propagated by subversive elements that have been infiltrated into our country for the particular purpose of delaying, hindering, and stopping the production of these implements of warfare and the delay of our other preparatory efforts toward preserving our democracy, which we feel will be facing us in the immediate future; we believe that our public officials should be aroused to the extent of taking over, if necessary, the production of our defense program and to handle harshly those who would interfere; and in this respect we would offer our services to our Nation in any way we might be able to assist properly to handle such necessary action, to the end that we may promote the cause of liberty, justice, freedom, and democracy, all other interests (personal and financial) notwithstanding: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this convention go on record as above indicated, and that as much publicity as possible be given to the matter herein contained in order that the public may be aroused to a realization of the situation as we believe it to be at this time, to the end that action be had without delay as herein indicated, and our public officials responsible for action be delivered copies of this resolution, including our Congressmen, Senators, and our State and national Legion organizations."

Respectfully submitted this date first above mentioned.

LEWIS M. GOODRICH,
Resolutions Committee.
HERSHEL E. MILLER,
MAYNARD DRAKE.

Postal Employees Merit Benefits of Longevity Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the idea of longevity pay for postal employees is the age-old application of the principle of rewarding faithful and honest service.

It should be distinctly understood that it is in no way a mere increase in salary but is in reality a systematic method of advancing the salary of postal employees according to their length of service.

When it is realized that since 1925 there has been no salary reclassification for postal employees and that meanwhile organized labor has made marked progress in securing pay increases in many trades and crafts, it is only practicing the age-old virtue of being just to the thousands of post-office employees to adopt at this time the longevity legislation providing increases based on faithful service for a stated length of time.

The Post Office Service in the United States has been a criterion for many years. The vast number of postal workers are skilled and educated and are constantly kept alert by the rigid requirements of their work which demand that efficiency ratings must be maintained at a high level.

With postal revenues reaching an all-time high, as evidenced by a recent report of the Postmaster General, it is interesting to note that the total income for January 1941, of $67,882,760, as compared to January 1940, was in excess of $4,000,000. The last fiscal year, according to the Postmaster General, netted a postal surplus of over $18,500,000.

With such an army of faithful and efficient workers as comprises the postal employees of America, I am confident that Congress should give serious consideration to revising pay schedules in view of the fact that for 16 years no attention has been given to this important branch of the Government service.

It is a known fact that the upward trend in living costs has attracted the attention of our Government and that marked increases have occurred in many of the every-day commodities of life.

Postal employees and their families with every other American citizen are feeling the effects of the increase in cost of living and the heavy taxes that are necessary to carry the burden of maintaining an adequate national defense. This is an additional reason among the several advanced in support of the longevity bill.

In conclusion, let us remember that the greatest benefit from this legislation will be reflected in the stimulus to the initiative and the morale of every postal employee who is now facing a stationary pay level after he has reached his highest automatic grade, usually attained in the first 5 or 10 years of service. This rank injustice to the great army of loyal and faithful postal workers in America must be corrected and the remedy is the prompt enactment of the longevity bill.

Florida Ship Canal Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, the Florida ship-canal project again claims the attention of a few Members of this body, for the Rivers and Harbors Committee voted 11 to 8 in favor of the canal, with several of the majority members reserving the right to oppose it on the floor.

When the Senate in March 1936 rejected the proposal to put up $12,000,000 more for the Florida canal project it was thought that the last had been heard of this enterprise. But here it is up again on a favorable report of the House committee.

The assertion that opposition to the completion of the project is that of selfish interest suggests that some facts rather than fancies relative to the situation may not be amiss.

Since the project was first proposed it has been a subject of sharp controversy in which leading citizens of Florida have been involved. Persons of responsibility have declared the proposed canal economically unjustified; they have asserted that it would impose on the State of Florida burdensome expenses of construction and maintenance of bridges and other adjuncts to the waterway. Geologists have reported that such a canal would contaminate underground water, would make it brackish, and so would destroy sources of potable supply and would have a bad effect on the agriculture of the State. Besides, officials of water transportation have repeated that they would adhere to their earlier declarations that they would not use the completed canal. The Board of Engineers for rivers and harbors reports that the reasonable assured present and prospective benefits from a canal across Florida do not establish the economic justification for the large expenditures necessary for its construction. All these arguments against the canal may be waived and there yet remains one indubitable fact that should condemn the project at this time—the fact that the proposed waterway is not a necessity.

Construction of the canal is desired at this time by three groups—some politicians who would benefit by the patronage it would give them, some contractors and innumerable political hangers-on who would get a bite at huge Federal and smaller State appropriations, and some of that part of the public that has not awakened from the dream that the way to make people prosperous is to throw away their money.

Why divert the $200,000,000 that the canal would cost and labor so vital to the production of items urgently needed for defense to the construction of a project which will not be available until 1947? The United States will need every dollar and every man it has in order to produce the ships, the airplanes, the tanks, the guns, and the food that are now and will be required of it.

If the canal is built, its cost will be paid by men and women who can least afford to pay for it. This every Member of this body knows and against those of them who seek to put the canal project through, not against those who oppose the scheme, will lie a justifiable accusation of selfishness in striving to lay on the backs of an already overtaxed people a still heavier load, merely that there may be created more material for the construction and repair of political fences.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the construction of the canal for two reasons; first, I have never been able to have anyone explain to me the necessity for the canal; and second; I believe there is a great hazard to the fresh-water supply of the Florida Peninsula in this project. I have read with a great deal of interest the testimony presented to the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors back in 1937 and apparently some of the proponents do not understand agricultural conditions and necessities in the Florida Peninsula. They do not seem to realize that while Florida has a heavy annual rainfall, 80 percent of it falls during 4 months of the year, and that it must be stored up in the ground for use during the remaining 8 months. One of the greatest crimes committed in Florida during the past 10 years was the creation of hundreds of drainage districts so that today many areas have been so thoroughly drained that the land is practically valueless for agricultural purposes.

If the traffic through this canal will be as heavy as assured by the proponents, a little simple arithmetic indicates that due to drawbridges being up to allow boats to go through, the main highways and railroads will be closed more than 12 hours out of the 24 to allow the passage of boats. With the heavy traffic to and from Florida, both by rail and road during 6 or 7 months of the year, it seems that this would be a tremendous handicap to both the highways and railroads, if they were blocked over 50 percent of the time due to drawbridges.

One of the most ridiculous features of the canal, which does not seem to have been stressed is the fact that it is proposed to cut 27 miles out into the open

Gulf of Mexico in order to reach a navigable depth in the Gulf of 30 feet. It is proposed to build a breakwater on the south side of this cut, which is the shore side. Inasmuch as the cut would run southwesterly from the mouth of the canal, and the most damaging winds are 3- and 4-day northwesters, which, striking broadside, would fill the cut in very few days. I am reliably informed that it costs the Government $385,000 every 2 years to maintain a short cut at the entrance to Tampa Harbor. Based on these figures, what would it cost to maintain a 27-mile unprotected cut out in the open Gulf? I believe the maintenance of this cut would amount to considerably more than any saving that could ever be made to water-borne commerce at present coming through the Florida Straits.

There are, of course, a few business interests, especially wholesalers who supply towns north of the canal, who were formerly opposed to the canal, who are not expressing themselves publicly, due to the black-listing of these wholesalers for their former canal activities.

I believe that St. Petersburg is the only town in south Florida which has advocated the building of the canal, and they, of course, believe that if the canal is constructed they will attract all of the yachts and tourist traffic from Miami and Palm Beach by having St. Petersburg made accessible to such small craft.

For the privilege of expending $200,000,000 of your money, and your grandchildren's money, in building a canal of no economic or commercial value, they would destroy God's most bountiful gift to Florida; that is, its important water-bearing formation of Ocala limestone. No amount of money could ever replace it. The damage to their growers, municipalities and business houses could be measured only in billions.

Great Lakes–St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE MICHIGAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I present for the RECORD the position taken by the common carrier in Michigan, the Michigan Trucking Association, toward the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. This great organization, in connection with the transportation of goods as a common carrier, takes the position that the completion of the seaway would be of very great benefit to the entire Middle Western section and the Great Lakes area of the Nation. The extension of commerce, its aid to national defense, its potential reduction in the cost of the transportation of goods both of the farm and of the factory, will stimulate and increase commerce and serve for the benefit of a very large portion of the people of this country.

Those who oppose completion of this seaway on the ground that its cost is prohibitive and that it would amount to $1,000,000,000 are grossly in error and not in accordance with the estimates furnished by the engineers of this Government. The actual cost to the United States will be approximately $200,000,000 when the sale of power generated incident to the construction of the seaway is credited against the total cost.

RESOLUTION TO THE MICHIGAN MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS FROM THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE MICHIGAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Congress of the United States is soon to consider enabling legislation to set up machinery which will make possible the deepening of the approximately 48-mile bottleneck in the St. Lawrence River; and

Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence channel, as proposed by the plans now before Congress, will link the Middle West and the Atlantic, and will enable the Great Lakes States to make their full contribution to the present defense needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of rehabilitation; and

Whereas our national defense requires full utilization of the construction potentialities of our 21 active shipyards on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas a deepening of the St. Lawrence channel could be completed in time to aid the present defense program and reliable engineering surveys have approved the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and forecast a benefit to the entire Nation; and

Whereas a deep waterway from the great industrial State of Michigan and the middle western section of our Nation, which produces more agricultural commodities and more industrial production than any other section of the country, is vital to our Nation; and

Whereas the Great-Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway is not only a defense measure, but also will provide a most economical method of transportation for the industrial, agricultural, and mining commodities of the Middle West to the markets of America and the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Governors of the Michigan Trucking Association, representing the operators of thousands of commercial motor vehicles in Michigan, That we respectfully request the Michigan Members in the Congress of the United States to enact legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project at the earliest possible time; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Michigan.

Respectfully submitted.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
MICHIGAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATION,
By D. B. SMITH, *Manager.*

Approved May 15, 1941.

Development of the Merchant Marine Vital to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINDER R. HARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, Representative in Congress from the First District of Virginia and chairman of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on the occasion of the observance of National Maritime Day in Washington, D. C.:

Today, more than ever in the past, America needs ships upon the seas. The World War pointed the way but we learned the lesson only in part. We soon forgot. We allowed our merchant marine to become obsolescent and well-nigh obsolete. For many years we ignored the admonition of President Wilson, who said:

"To speak plainly, we have grossly erred in the way in which we have stunted and hindered the development of our merchant marine. * * * It is necessary for many weighty reasons of national efficiency and development that we should have a great merchant marine. * * * It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the seas."

This message of our last war President was in complete accord with the counsel of our first war President, the great Washington, whose prophetic vision saw far into the future and whose words of wisdom become more hallowed as time rolls on. In one of his first messages to the Congress, he warned us that:

"We should not overlook the tendency of war to abridge the means, and thereby at least enhance the price, of transporting productions to their proper markets."

Washington said:

"I recommend it to your serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragement to our own navigation as will render our commerce less dependent on foreign bottoms which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both these great objects."

Theodore Roosevelt knew the needs of the Nation in times of peace and war. Hear him in one of his messages to Congress:

"To the spread of our trade in peace and the defense of our flag in war a great and prosperous merchant marine is indispensable. We should have ships of our own and seamen of our own to convey our goods to neutral markets, and in case of need, to reinforce our battle line."

Let us invoke the spirit of the martyred McKinley, who knew the humiliation which we suffered in 1898 when we had not Ameri-

can ships or seamen adequate for war, when we had to search the ports of Europe for transports and colliers, when we bought war vessels abroad, when we had to enlist landsmen and foreign seamen to man our ships of war, and when returns show that one-third of our naval crews were foreigners. If the countries of which these foreigners were nationals had favored Spain, we would have been short of men and ships.

President McKinley spoke from the travail of trying hours when he said:

"Our national development will be one-sided and unsatisfactory as long as the remarkable growth of our inland industries remains unaccompanied by progress upon the seas. There is no lack of constitutional authority for legislation which shall give to this country maritime strength commensurate with its industrial achievements and with its rank among the nations of the earth.

"We must encourage our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag, built and manned and owned by Americans. They will not only be profitable in a commercial sense; they will be messengers of peace and amity wherever they go."

Today the cry is ships, more ships, and yet again more ships. That call comes now from fighting freemen to whom liberty is yet dearer than life, who prefer death to slavery.

That call shall not go unanswered. Freemen shall not forsake the free. Ships shall be sent. The liberties of the world shall yet be saved by ships.

The Congressional Record Should Be in Every High School in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it was back in 1789 that Thomas Jefferson said:

Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them right.

I have that thought in mind this afternoon as I introduce a bill to change the number of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS that Members of Congress are allowed from the present allotment of 68 to one sufficient to enable them to send the RECORD to all high schools and public libraries in their districts, in addition to the number now provided.

I think that it is fair to say that a very, very small percent of the voters of the United States have ever seen the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Yet the people are the stockholders or owners of America. They should be familiar with the proceedings and the actions of their trustees in Washington. The schools of America should not only study about the Government of the United States but they should study the Government of the United States. I contend that it will not only make better schools but it will make a better Government if the students of America are constantly studying the daily record of our proceedings in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the question may be asked, How can the schools of our country use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? I have given some thought to that subject, and I am convinced that there are many ways in which the high schools of America can make good use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Here are some of them:

1. As a geography project, the instructor could have his class chart and classify the votes on important issues over a period of several months on a sectional basis to determine what effect geography has upon the political trends. An example of this would be to prove or disprove that Representatives from coal-producing areas work and vote against hydroelectric projects. Another example would be the charting up of the geographical effect upon political issues, such as our foreign policy and our attitude toward war.

2. Classes in literature might collect and compile the prayers of the Chaplain of the House and of the Senate for their literary value.

3. History students might be assigned the task of checking all speeches in Congress that made any reference to historical documents to determine whether or not the Congressmen were historically correct in their references.

4. Classes in literature could compile, identify, as to title and authorship, all poetry quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

5. Similar activities with reference to prose quotations could be undertaken by the classes in literature.

6. Each student could be required to record and tabulate the votes of his own Congressman and Senators.

7. Various bookkeeping projects could be undertaken by mathematical classes involving appropriation bills passed by the Congress. I realize that this suggestion calls for wisecracks about the impossibility of keeping track of Federal expenditures. The youth of America better keep track of these expenditures because they, and their posterity, are going to have to pay the bills.

8. Classes in government could read and analyze the debate on both sides of the current controversial issues, as the RECORD came to them day by day and then take their own votes based upon their study of the debate.

9. The class could follow the procedure as suggested in paragraph 8, but in taking their vote they would sit as judges of the debate, as to its effectiveness or lack of effectiveness.

10. The classes in government could have a special group that studied the procedure and rules of Congress so that they could interpret to the others the various motions, points of order, ruling of the Chair, and other parliamentarian situations.

11. Classes in literature could prepare news articles, including headlines, of the proceedings in Congress as taken directly from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

12. Another very effective writing project would be the writing of editorials based upon the classes' news stories of the previous day.

13. After an issue had been studied, directly from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, essays might be written on the subject, Why I Believe That My Congressman Voted Correctly, or Why I Believe That My Congressman Voted Incorrectly.

14. As a mathematics project the class could determine the percentage of the votes for and against the bill, the number absent, the number who did not vote, and the number of excused absences.

15. Summaries of the views of students on either side of controversial issues could be written and the best summaries published in local papers.

16. Classes in government could check every reference to the Constitution of the United States made in debates in Congress, refer to that section in the Constitution, and determine whether or not the speaker was correct in his application.

17. After the debate and vote on an issue of wide importance had been studied by a class from its original source, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the class could have an informal discussion on this subject, of whether or not the newspapers gave to the public the most vital and important facts pertaining to the legislation enacted.

18. A similar discussion as suggested in paragraph 17 could be had with reference to the work of the news broadcasters and radio commentators.

19. Students in business and agricultural courses could be required to collect, preserve, and classify all tables published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, such as tables dealing with volume of business done, imports, prices, and the like.

20. On certain occasions students could be requested to challenge the accuracy and fairness of the tables published, referred to in paragraph 19.

21. The history classes could collect and read all speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD made in commemoration of some historical incident or anniversary.

22. Public-speaking classes could be required to study the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for any given date, and they could assume the role of a news broadcaster and give the highlights of the news as taken from its original source.

23. Mathematics classes could follow the proceedings in reference to any legislation and tabulate the percent of amendments offered to a particular bill that carried.

24. All bills, speeches, and references that in any way affect the State wherein the student resides could be cataloged.

25. Without any particular planning or project supervision, the students of America could thumb through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and get a first-hand knowledge of how the Congress of the United States functions.

In order to maintain our form of government in a world so hostile to it at the present time, eternal vigilance is more

than ever the price of liberty. This liberty can be retained most securely by knowledge and information of the affairs of our Government and the activities of our Representatives in Congress. The free schools, symbolic of our country's interest in education, can be best maintained if the students are made to become aware of the doings of their lawmakers in all possible phases of governmental service. An intelligent understanding of government is the first prerequisite of good government.

Our young men and women need an opportunity to get facts—facts that are not biased and colored by propaganda or censorship. Certainly such knowledge should be presented more extensively to our citizenry. Too often the toga of citizenship is donned all to nonchalantly by our boys and girls when they become old enough to exercise their American privileges. Too often they lack sufficient background to enable them to exert an intelligent interest in governmental affairs.

Surely in a country where, as Henry Ward Beecher said, every man shall have the liberty "to be what God made him," we should bend our every effort to see that the youth of our country is given an opportunity in our schools and in our libraries to know and become interested in their Government. After all, an uninformed citizenry makes a farce of our Republic. And we must remember that information is the raw material of which public opinion is shaped, and it is public opinion that is the backbone of our governmental system. We cannot hope to have an informed citizenry by teaching people after they have reached maturity and naturally have become less flexible toward instruction. We need to reach them when they are the boys and girls in our public schools, when they are the young men and women crowding into our public libraries to spend their leisure time.

Hundreds of young Americans step from our country's schools each June. From our schools to citizenship—that is our view. What is theirs? From school to what? Youngsters are pragmatic. The proof of anything is in its working, and thank goodness, they will always be that way. But it follows, the convictions of our maturity upon the lasting good of the American way are not bound to be accepted, per se, by the boys and girls born in this lean and difficult period of our Nation's growth. Not automatically—not in the face of great domestic uncertainty—and not in a world torn by fervid exponents of synthetic better philosophies. Not for certain.

As Jefferson said so many years ago:

> Man may be governed by reason and truth. Our first object should therefore be to leave open to him all the avenues of truth.

And, as he always related:

> To introduce the people into every department of Government * * * is the only way to insure a long-continued, and honest administration.

Our only strength in America, our only hope of perpetuity, lies in the revelation of the truth of the democratic process—the fundamentals, if you will, of votes, and policy, and the mechanics of law and welfare. Once these things are comprehensively discovered by young Americans, the vitality of their faith and the keeness of their interest will never slacken. To understand the American way is to reject all currently glamorous substitutes. To help provide an understanding of the American way is not only to discharge an essential duty of the Congress to its people, but also to assure a future America the brave continuation of those principles which it too, in its day, will hold dear.

I ask the House of Representatives to make possible the further dissemination of the RECORD so that we may keep our eternal vigilance and maintain our form of Government in spite of the hatred and bloodshed that is being waged on every side of us.

Let us enable the young men and women of our country to have an opportunity to follow, through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the American avenue of truth—an avenue which has not been, and may it never be closed.

An Unfounded Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SHREVEPORT TIMES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times of May 22, 1941:

[From the Shreveport Times of May 22, 1941]

AN UNFOUNDED ATTACK

The statement of Dr. C.-E. A. Winslow, Yale University professor, that America's soldiers are "encamped in Louisiana malarial swamps and adjacent to areas where you will find venereal disease, dysentery, hookworm, and even leprosy" has been knocked down from the malarial standpoint by another Yale professor, H. H. Chapman. Professor Chapman declares that only one illness has been recorded over 24 years among Yale forestry students annually encamped for 3 months in what is now the Central Louisiana Army Training Area.

If that was all there was to it, the matter might be left as merely an academic discussion between two university professors. But Dr. Winslow's charges appeared in a national magazine of especially large circulation among mothers throughout the Nation. It charged that the youths of Wisconsin, Iowa, Michigan, North and South Dakota, and Minnesota in training in Louisiana—actually the Thirty-second Division at Camp Livingston and the Thirty-fourth Division at Camp Claiborne—were subjected to these health menaces.

Such statements give an impression directly contrary to the facts and figures of the United States Public Health Service, the Louisiana State Board of Health, the United States War Department, and the Medical and Engineering Departments of the United States Army. To send such false impressions into the homes of thousands of northern boys now in these camps, and the tens of thousands to come into the Louisiana training area on maneuvers, is little less than moral sabotage. No matter how good the intent of Dr. Winslow may be, or how honest he was in believing what he wrote, the effect of his statement on the mothers and fathers of these boys easily might be one of which a "fifth columnist" could be proud.

Instead of being "in malarial swamps," as Dr. Winslow says, Camp Livingston, where the Wisconsin boys referred to are stationed, has just been held up to the world in a 1,000-word eulogy by the War Department as the model of all training camps from every angle, including sanitation, public health, and military training. Every tent area in it is located on a sloping hillside with perfect natural drainage. The United States Public Health Service inspected and approved the campsite before construction. Any lowlands nearby have been or are being drained and throughout the entire Livingston area there is 100 percent activity in sanitation and health control for malaria and all other diseases.

Camp Claiborne, where the boys from Minnesota and the Dakotas, referred to by Dr. Winslow, are stationed, is not so rolling as to terrain. But, again, the United States Public Health Service has given its full approval, every precaution has been installed, and the sanitation system is worthy of any city in the United States double the maximum population of Camp Claiborne.

If Dr. Winslow visited Camp Polk, now under construction for an armored division, he would find Army engineers boasting proudly of the fine, sloping, hilly terrain which is making possible a sewage system operating entirely by gravity—with no pumping system necessary to carry sewage to the big disposal plants. He might remember, in this connection that New York had to drain a marsh (we call them swamps) to build its world's fair, and that Chicago had to make a river run backward to protect itself from its own sewage.

Dr. Winslow boasts of what he calls New York State's "model" public-health system, citing the low venereal-disease record during Army maneuvers there last summer as proof of its efficiency. New York did do a fine job of venereal-disease-control work in those maneuvers, but why did not Dr. Winslow also state that the official Army records show that Louisiana did a much finer job?

Dr. Winslow's figures show venereal disease among all soldiers in the New York maneuvers at the rate of only 1 case in 1,607 men, but he does not mention that the Louisiana maneuver rate was only 1 case in every 1,842 soldiers. He boasts that there was only one case of syphilis per 30,000 men in the New York maneuvers, but forgets that there was only 1 case per 70,000 men in the Louisiana maneuvers. He boasts that in the actual maneuver area in New York venereal disease was at the rate of only 1 case in 7,333, but does not mention that in the actual maneuver area down here the rate was only 1 case in 1,777 soldiers.

Certainly there are malarial breeding places in Louisiana; they exist in almost every State in the Union. But Vernon and Rapides Parishes—the central Louisiana main training area, reported only 19 cases in 1940. Three were in Vernon, 16 in Rapides. All were civilian cases except 1, in Camp Bureaugard. Certainly we have venereal diseases. It existed on the *Mayflower*, and among Indians before Columbus crossed the ocean.

The point is that we are fighting these things with every State and Federal weapon; that we are constantly on guard in these training areas; and that every mother in the North whose son trains in Louisiana may be certain that he is as well protected as he would be at home. That is what Dr. Winslow should have written.

Food for Small Democracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to extend into the RECORD the following resolution from the House of Representatives of the Sixty-first General Assembly now meeting at Jefferson City, Mo.:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-first General Assembly of Missouri, That the plan and purpose of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies be endorsed and approved; that the ideal of the United States of America of aiding the suffering, starving, helpless victims of war's brutalities be reaffirmed; that our Federal Government be urged to use its agencies to encourage cooperation of the warring nations in order that the helpless victims of the small democracies may be saved from suffering, starvation, and death; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of our United States Senators and each Member of Congress from our State.

Petition Against Involvement of United States in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

PETITION OF CITIZENS OF JOPLIN, MONT.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

Hon. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States:

Because we still remember the years of 1916–18 when our boys went to Europe to save our Nation from war lords of Europe to find later it was just another war, nothing accomplished for the many lives that were lost, only a debt that we are still paying.

We also remember that in your campaign pledges of last fall, that you promised you would not send our boys across the ocean to fight for other nations. We are hereby asking you to keep your promise to us and keep all our boys on this side of the Atlantic.

Sponsored by the Women's Demonstration Club of Joplin, Mont. Signed by citizens of Joplin, Mont. Copies sent to Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Representative JAMES O'CONNOR, and Representative JEANNETTE RANKIN.

Mrs. John Lyle, Mrs. Fred Daleen, Laverne Daleen, Thomas H. Jones, F. G. Boucer, Robert B. Warren, Mrs. O. Hagen, Mr. O. Hagen, Mrs. Cal. Olson, Cal. Olson, E. K. Poppler, Mrs. Earl Poppler, Lois Heydon, Blanche Poppler, P. L. Anderson, William Shane, Mrs. Agnes Resnolbreck, Ole E. Halum, Franklin Heydon, Fred Knoper, Gerald F. Stolvig, Mrs. F. T. Knopes, John W. Duncan, R. E. Hansen, J. B. Plummer, C. M. Freeland, Mrs. Emil Nelson, Mrs. James Vincent, M. Swarthout, Fred Wicklund, Mrs. M. O. Farden, M. O. Farden, Mrs. L. N. Amundson, L. N. Amundson, Berger Johnson, Mrs. Berger Johnson, Mrs. Troy Duncan, Troy W. Duncan, Frank Terwolbeck, Maude E. Miller, Roy J. Miller, Theresa Terwolbeck, Alvin Mansfield, Violet Carlson, Carrie Jabes, Mrs. Wm. Meldrum, Sr., Mabel Thorson, Mrs. H. D. Rolph, Mrs. Martin Hietpas, Mrs. Arvid Snudgren, Mrs. E. B. Hovie, Mrs. Ida Anderson, Mrs. Art LaValley, Mrs. Ed Anderson, Mrs. George Thielman, Mrs. P. L. Anderson, Mrs. Lillian James, Mrs. Betsy Groves, Lallie Rovreit, Mrs. Martha Hyle, Mrs. Pete Sponheim, Mrs. Howard Alley, Mrs. Floyd Hanson, H. B. Wolf, H. R. Hansen, E. W. Seidlitz, Mrs. Jerry Stolvig, A. J. Hyle, Fred Daleen, Mrs. Elmer Duncan, L. E. Duncan, Ray S. Rudolph, Hazel V. Rudolph.

Do We Want a Mass Army?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. SCRUGHAM
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. ROSS A. COLLINS, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Ross COLLINS, which was printed in the Reader's Digest for June 1941:

[From the Reader's Digest for June 1941]

DO WE WANT A MASS ARMY?

(By Ross A. COLLINS, member and for many years chairman of the War Department appropriations subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee)

It is now established that the Germans who broke the French line at Sedan, pushed fingers of steel to the sea, cut off British and Belgian forces in Flanders, and almost in one stroke conquered France's Army of 5,000,000 soldiers, did not exceed 150,000 men. The million or more Germans who followed them functioned principally to occupy the conquered territory.

It is also established that German losses in this stupendous victory were fantastically small. Their losses were small, because their men were safeguarded by speed and armor.

These lessons from the Battle of France have been before us for a year. We know now that the mechanized might of only 12 panzer divisions, aided by a few thousand airplane pilots, inflicted staggering losses and swiftly shattered France's old-style mass Army.

And how are America's military leaders profiting by these lessons?

They are building another old-style mass Army.

They are giving outmoded training to the million and a half men we will have in camps this summer. And they seem to be seriously planning an eventual Army of 4,318,000 men. This spring the Chief of Staff requested of our committee funds for the initial equipment of such a force.

This is all wrong. We don't need a vast Army of the World War kind. I don't see how we could make such a hugh Army efficient, or how we could make use of it. Few of our officers understand modern war.

But that isn't the worst of it. We haven't now, and we can't get for months or years, enough modern and essential matériel to train and equip a mass army.

Even that isn't the worst of it. The most frightening fact is that too many of our highest military leaders aren't even thinking in terms of modern war.

As they plan it, the bulk of our new army will be infantry, cavalry, field artillery, etc. Most of the men will travel on foot. Of our 33 divisions, only one is fully motorized—that is, equipped with motor vehicles to transport men and supplies. Only two are armored and mechanized panzer divisions. As this is written (April 30), the War Department's plans call for the creation of two more mechanized divisions. This is a ridiculously small number. The Germans had 14 panzer divisions a year ago. No doubt they now have more. We have two in training—and two to be created. What chance would those 4 have against more than 14 veteran divisions of Nazi armored troops?

Soldiers are of little value unless thoroughly trained in their specialties. Our masses of conscripts are enlisted for only 1 year; their personnel will be turned over every 12 months. The same is true of the Reserve officers. Under such a system we will never get a real army.

We formerly had five old-style Regular Army divisions. Most of their personnel were distributed to form nuclei for new units when we began drafting men. As a result, 60 to 80 percent of all divisions now, including the National Guard, are recruits—and today we have not one division fit for combat.

I wonder if it is good sense to draft more men than we need and then scatter such military power as we had in an effort to give these new men what at best is only partial training? Compare this with the method of the Germans, who manned mechanized units with their best soldiers and trained them for years to operate alone or in cooperation with the air force before supplementing them with mass troops.

Under our present system, too much time is given to traditional close-order drill and practice in the manual of arms. Men who are to be machine gunners, tank drivers, armored-car scouts, antiaircraft gunners, and so on, are wasting precious hours when engaged in parade-ground marching. The Germans spend little time in close-order drill; their men are trained thoroughly in the highly specialized activities of actual combat.

Here, in America, where we make four-fifths of the world's automobiles, and countless trucks, tractors, and other automotive equipment, where almost every boy is a mechanic and where horse collars are curiosities, our Army has two cavalry divisions and is contemplating two more. Vans are being provided for the horses to ride in, and tanks, with which the Germans have been winning battles, will protect the American cavalry's

horses while en route in vans to the scene of action.

Eventually the War Department contemplates 6 or 10 tank divisions. Would that it had that many now. Eventually we should have at least 25. And apart from those, instead of having, as we do, only 1 other fully motorized division, able to move on wheels at high speed, why shouldn't we have many?

No democracy can afford both a powerful mechanized army and also such a mass army as the War Department is planning. Since we must choose one or the other, and since a mass army is helpless before a skilled mechanized land force working effectively with planes, I believe we ought to demand that our defense plans be revised at once. We should stop drafting men by the million, and concentrate on providing as swiftly as possible a smaller, more manageable army, with a much larger proportion mechanized and armored.

The Army's complaint that tanks are not available for training no longer holds. We are getting no heavy tanks. But light and medium tanks are now coming off production lines in sufficient numbers to train and equip more mechanized divisions.

A compact, intensely trained motorized and mechanized army would give us more firepower, greater mobility, greater armor protection, a more paralyzing punch—many strategic advantages—wherever it may be called on to fight. If we had to fight beyond our shores, we could transport and supply such a force, and it could face on even terms any force brought against it. But we couldn't transport and supply an army of millions of foot-slogging riflemen. And that army couldn't stand up against an enemy's armored divisions.

Suppose a victorious Germany landed troops or stirred up trouble in South America. Our job would be to get there quickly and stamp out this menace to the security of our hemisphere. We know from every evidence of the war in Europe that a small, easily transported panzer force, supported by an adequate air arm, could turn the trick—and save the Americas. It's equally clear that a huge army of old-fashioned infantrymen couldn't be swiftly sent to South America, and wouldn't have a chance against Nazi tanks when it got there.

Suppose the United States itself should be invaded. Again we would need a mobile, hard-hitting, armored air and ground force. As John T. Flynn has pointed out,[1] it is unlikely that an invader could land even 50,000 men on our shores. To overcome that many, would we need three or four million foot soldiers with rifles? Or would we need a few hundred thousand swift-moving armored troops with concentrated fire-power?

Too many of the dominant figures in our Military Establishment have been resting serenely in the sunset of 1918. When the present defense emergency aroused us, they complacently turned to the old post-World War M-day plans, and dragged into a conscript army hundreds of thousands of our young men whom they could neither train (except to march) nor equip (except with obsolete weapons). This was done at the expense of industrial production, for men marching cannot do their part in making implements of war.

But there our young men are now, in huge cantonments, learning how to fight yesterday's wars, and deprived of realistic battle practice with the tanks and planes of the machine-age warfare of 1941.

An army must be paid, fed, clothed, housed, otherwise cared for. Those of us who handle military budgets know the terrific expense of this. It becomes impossible if the attempt is made to arm millions of men with up-to-date airplanes, tanks, guns, and modern motorized and mechanized equipment. The mere maintenance of the War Department's proposed Army of 4,000,000 men would cost $6,000,000,000 a year—not to mention the cost of carrying it into action or the inevitable pension cost afterward.

To me it is incredible that the policy makers of our War Department and Army have not seen the handwriting on the wall. I am only a civilian, but I like to suppose that the good Lord endowed me with at least some measure of common sense. And I happen to have a son of military age. I would shudder every night if real war came to America and if I knew that he was protected only by khaki, had to walk 80 percent of the time, fight when exhausted, and fight with a rifle against armored air and land machines.

For many years I have been doing all I could in the House of Representatives to pave the way for a compact, highly trained mechanized Army, including, of course, a centralized and unexcelled Air Force. Times without number I have tried to hammer home the idea that the mass army was as dated as bows and arrows. For example, on the floor of the House in 1932 I said:

"Mechanization implies the actual use of automotive machines in combat. The purpose of a mechanized force is to provide a fast-moving weapon, capable of wide maneuverability, which combines fire power, speed, and shock to a much higher degree than now exists. It is ideally organized for mobility and surprise.

"The scheme is simply this: Substitute for the 1½-mile-an-hour infantry masses, or the 6-mile-an-hour cavalry, which lack fire power, a fast-moving armed force capable of striking suddenly from one direction, disappearing, and then repeating the blows from another."

That was in 1932. In 1940 the Germans proved appallingly to the world that this conception of a modern army was the right one. But neither in 1932 nor even now in 1941 have a sufficient number of our own Army policy makers looked sympathetically on such facts and ideas. I cannot understand their reluctance, their lack of initiative in demanding progress in this, their own field.

The Germans have been blasting their way to victory with 105-millimeter guns, mounted on caterpillar-tread bases, and facing forward, ready for instant action. Our War Department was content for years with the weak and old-fashioned French 75-millimeter guns, on wooden wheels, towed backward by horses. It was not the Army that demanded rubber-tired chassis for these 75's. Our committee, without request from the War Department, demanded them.

It was not the Army that demanded tanks. I can show you delay after delay, often of whole years, in the use by the Army of funds that we appropriated for tank development.

It was not the Army that demanded funds for the research out of which emerged the flying fortress, our first long-range bombing plane. I take pride in saying that this was my own idea, as was the appropriation that brought it into being. Nor was it the Army that sought adoption of bomber tail guns. They were neither sought nor adopted by the Army until General Arnold became head of the Air Corps, 2 years ago, and forced their adoption.

The inertia that has brought us to our present plight is evident in the fact that as recently as January 31, 1938, the War Department submitted to the Army Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate a considered statement of policy whose first paragraph read:

"Recent wars without question show that the bulk of the operations must be carried on by the traditional arms; that well-trained infantry and artillery, modernly equipped, must form the bulk of arms, and air and mechanized troops are valuable auxiliaries."

The truth is almost the exact reverse of that, as is attested by all first-hand observers of the German campaigns. The Battles of Poland, of France, of Greece, corroborate this statement of a Nazi officer quoted in the New York World-Telegram of April 10:

"The French believed the paramount duty of tanks was to support advancing infantry. We considered the panzer force a weapon whose powerful fire, in combination with its protective armor, speed, and mobility, is superior to all others. We attacked in mass and rushed on in an avalanche, often getting 100 kilometers ahead of our mechanized infantry. Without our panzer units the rapid destruction of the enemy would have been impossible in such a short time."

Neither in recent committee hearings nor in the record back through past years is there much to make one believe that our Military Establishment has ever been eager to accept new weapons.

General Sherman describes in his memoirs his wonderment, after graduation from West Point, that the Army had not adopted the new repeating rifle which sportsmen were using. That was in 1840. It was not until 1865, 25 years later, at the Battle of Franklin, one of the last battles of the War between the States, that a brigade of his army was equipped with the Spencer, our first repeating rifle, instead of muskets.

We entered the Spanish-American War with a service rifle inferior to the German and other rifles used by the Spaniards. We were among the first to invent smokeless powder; but the Spaniards had it before our Army, and at San Juan Hill they far outranged the Seventy-first New York Volunteers who were using black powder.

We invented the machine gun—first the Gatling, rejected in 1862 by our Army but used in the Franco-Prussian War in 1870; then the Maxim, the Lewis, the Browning. The British had used machine guns in the Sudan and elsewhere, and the Germans, Japanese and other armies had them before our Army. When we entered the World War we had only 282 old-model Maxim and 148 Browning machine guns; also 353 Lewis guns, made for British ammunition, not ours.

An American invented the Mills grenade which the British used in the World War. When we entered the conflict our Army redesigned it and was getting factories tooled up to make 21,000,000 of them when a cablegram from American Expeditionary Force headquarters brought the effort to a halt—because the newly designed grenade was totally unsatisfactory.

We invented the caterpillar track. The British were the first to use it for tanks. Later on General Williams, Chief of Ordnance, and General Fuqua, Chief of Infantry, told our committee about the great possibilities of the high-speed Christie tank, the invention of an American. The committee appropriated funds for the purchase of five or six for thorough testing. After General Williams' retirement the new Chief of Ordnance decided to buy only one. Disappointed, the inventor sold the patent rights to Great Britain. Let it be remembered that all modern tanks are adaptations of the Christie.

We invented the airplane, as everyone knows, but the Wright brothers had to go to Europe to find military acceptance of it. Despite the indispensable service of aviation in 3 years of the World War, our Army had only four planes when we entered the conflict.

I cannot find a single instance, all through our history, in which our Army has been the first to adopt a weapon new in kind and to have it ready, in sufficient numbers, for use in a crisis. That record is desperately significant to us now, for the same reactionary mentality is still strong in our defense councils.

As a contrast consider how the Germans took our own inventions, including mass production, and evolved a new way to win wars. They discarded old weapons, old ideas, and

[1] See "Can Hitler Invade America?" the Reader's Digest, April 1941.

old men. With a civilian leader not bound to old-line traditions, a revolutionary youth movement to help him, and young officers and scientists doing their part, they created an army with the maximum of fire power per man, unexcelled speed, 360-degree maneuverability and the protection of armor for the men handling their engines of destruction.

They did this right before our eyes; indeed, they advertised what they were doing.

And now we know the result.

In Europe the Germans have used planes and tanks which operated together so effectively that when their tanks were delayed as little as 15 minutes, or the flanks of the corridors they opened were threatened, their dive bombers and other planes returned to help. They revealed a coordinated training, a precision of communication between planes, tanks, and motorized troops that has scarcely been attempted at our new Army camps.

It takes young men, or men with youth's progressive spirit, to win wars. Napoleon was only 36 when he defeated the Austrians. Clive, Wolfe, and Wellington were world-famous before 40. Washington was 41 when he took command of the Continental Army. In 1862 Grant was 40, Stuart 30, Sherman 42, Sheridan 31. Today, according to Major Wheeler-Nicholson, the average age of German generals is 45 while that of ours is nearer 60.

If, at this moment of crisis, we have at the top too many old officers clinging to old ideas, it is largely because of our system of automatic promotion by seniority rather than by proved skill of leadership under battle conditions. Young officers who are eager for change and improvement offend the red-tape conservatives above them, and drop out, or are dropped as was Gen. Billy Mitchell, prophetic post-war advocate of a united air service. The plodding, negative type of officer, too lethargic to risk initiative and content to wait for routine promotion, thus emerges into our Army leadership. So now we are drafting young men by the hundred thousands, and proposing the drafting of still younger men, to be sent into battle, if war comes, by officers who are not modern battle leaders and who are resistant to the modern methods that might minimize casualties and increase the chance of victory.

New ways must be made obligatory to expedite in time of peace the advancement of young men who have what it takes to prepare us for war. We should test our officers stringently in realistic battle practice, promoting those who handle men efficiently and retiring the inefficient.

Also, for every good reason of European experience and of common sense, the President should establish a separate Air Department at once, to be directed by men who know aviation. They are, as surely as the job makes the man, a breed as different from old-line Infantry officers as the eagle from the pack mule.[2] The War Department's past resistance to the plain necessity of an Air Department is distressingly parallel to its plans for building a mass army which it can neither train nor equip for modern war.

I have long been strongly of the view that organized ways must be evolved to keep our Army on its toes during times of peace. In peace everything conspires to stagnation and Rip Van Winkle slumber. There is little competitive urge among Army officers. Rarely is one of them intimately sensitized to progress in the competitive and ever-advancing world of industry and research and mass production.

I should like to see the Ordnance, Signal Corps, and other technical branches of our Army put progressively less and less dependence on their own research and manufacturing efforts, more on private industry. To illustrate: I don't believe that the Signal Corps knows quite as much about communications as the Bell and General Electric and similar laboratories, or that the Army's metallurgists can compare with those serving our great industries.

Since the Army is shown by the record to slump into complacent inertia in peacetime, my belief is that there should be a group of highly paid nonpartisan industrialists, scientists, and alert civilian executives continuously assigned, with plenty of authority, to study our Army's technical progress and to keep the Army, the President, the Congress, and the country informed about it. This way we might not be caught unprepared every time a war comes.

To win a war against Germany this country must not be content with a military establishment only as good as Germany's. It must be infinitely superior. This must be our goal.

It seems high time, too, that the fathers and mothers of America give serious thought to this whole question. So long as international disputes can be settled only by resort to arms, they should insist that our Military Establishment embrace all the progress that science and invention have given us. For their own sons will be taken away from them, and many of them will be needlessly sacrificed, unless we are adequately prepared to fight with the weapons of today instead of with an inadequate supply of the weapons of yesterday.

[2] See Why We Must Have a Separate Air Force, the Reader's Digest, March 1941.

Air Superiority Will Insure Victory on Land and Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY COL. J. E. MYERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1941, Col. J. E. Myers, United States Army, retired, delivered a radio address over station WWDC in Washington, D. C., which I think it so important that I am asking to have his speech reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I want to thank WWDC for this opportunity of addressing you on the subject of aviation and the necessity for the proper establishment of a Civilian Air Reserve.

Aviation is now in its infancy. It is passing through its growing pains while the hazy minds of men are being slowly and painfully forced, to think, out of the horizontal plane.

The horse-and-buggy cry for a "two-ocean Navy" must now be replaced for the sterner cry for a two-ocean air force as we are made to realize, not through ordinary common-sense deductions, but by the grim reality that no boat can longer float if attacked from the air.

To attain superiority in the air is primarily the function of land-based airplanes, capable of flying thousands of miles. Only in certain situations can airplane carriers supply the planes necessary to obtain any deciding superiority. It is reasonable to expect that bombing ranges will increase to 25,000 miles if the science of flying improves, in the next 5 years, as it has during the past 5-year period, which would make the use of carriers inadvisable, if not impractical. Giant airplanes capable of carrying a regiment of troops may be within the scope of reasonable expectation and it may even be possible that science and invention may yet be the road to peace and prosperity, through the very fearfulness of modern warfare.

Allow me to quote from my testimony before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, given in the summer of 1938. "With our huge airships capable of carrying 24 tons of TNT, our coasts will be amply protected 1,000 miles from our shores. No nation or group of nations would dare attack us from across the sea infested with submarines and torpedo boats, and subject to aerial raids from our shore bases. Why should we build a single $60,000,000 battleship, when a single 10,000-pound bomb might either sink it or cripple its delicate steam system? Are we still to be inert, after witnessing the disgraceful, humiliating experiences of Generals Billy Mitchell, Butler, and Johnson Hagood.

"I am convinced that, if a part of the $2,000,000,000 proposed to be used for building battleships, seacoast-defense guns, forts, etc., were used instead for increasing our fighting aircraft, submarine boats, mobile artillery, antiaircraft batteries, underground hangars, airplane carriers, etc., our country would be better protected and ready for either defensive or aggressive action."

The present invasion of Crete, which was not in itself of prime importance to an advance on Suez, proves the above statements and was probably made to draw the British fleet into a position where it could be destroyed by dive bombers.

Right here I want to emphasize the fact that it is not too late to embark at once on a really effective air program.

First and foremost, we must have a separate air face and a secretary for the air force who will have under his complete control this force, as well as a Civilian Air Reserve.

Time will not permit me to discuss this important matter fully or to take issue with those who would oppose the separate air-force bills submitted in Congress by Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and Representative BEITER, of New York. The immediate passage of these bills in Congress, or some form of them, is vital to our national air defense.

The main objective of the Aviation Defense Association of your city, is to create a state of air-mindedness and air appreciation throughout the nations in the Western Hemisphere in order to effect a unified Pan-American Air Command.

It is necessary to sustain this objective, if we are to preserve our liberty and freedom from Nazi domination and despotism. It is up to you and me to talk and think—America first in the air and on the land and sea.

Loss of control of the air spells immediate disaster. A radio commentator in Greece stated that the Nazi dive bombers blew up one tank after another with incredible accuracy. I leave it to your imagination as to what could happen to any ship, unaccompanied by a proper air convoy. The time will surely come when a constant stream of airplane convoys will be required to protect our shipping and war craft in the Atlantic Ocean.

If lack of time to prepare in the air results in the loss of the Suez Canal and the invasion of England, then war will commence between Europe, Asia, and Africa and the Americas because the people of America and Britain will never surrender.

The fall of nation after nation to the Germans and the sinking of the Italian flagship by the British is proof beyond any measure of doubt that superiority in the air will insure victory on land and sea.

Hence the necessity of establishing a strong coalition of all the American democracies by

every possible means—by radio, special envoys, and the building of great international superdefense highways, etc. The future of civilization and our American way of life is at stake. The die is cast and we must win this war. This is no time for idle talk—if there is any time left to your day, use it to stop this un-American, unpatriotic criticism of our foreign policies. You have time for that—plenty of time now. But how about a little later? Do you know what is in store for America either from within or without? Spare a moment each day for serious consideration of the awful results being brought about by being always a little too late.

We must have an air force sufficiently powerful to protect our Navy and shipping 1,000 miles from our shores and bases and auxiliary civilian air reserve to help repel any invasion by land. We will require thousands of bases and auxiliary landing fields throughout the Americas.

In the first World War, airplanes were the eyes of the armies and navies—since then they have acquired radio ears and they have been so effectively armed with machine guns, bombs, and cannon that they may well be termed the artillery and infantry of the air. They constitute the most destructive instrument of war ever devised by man.

War in America, when it comes, will be fought in the air, it will be won in the air, and it will be won by our regular air forces with the help of the Civilian Air Reserve. The Air Reserve will be the auxiliary force—it will be a reservoir or pool of experienced volunteer fliers, drawn from every possible source, and trained under governmental supervision on private planes equipped with machine guns and bombing racks.

Swarms of these light planes can be launched from the rear of our armies from numerous small airfields, water ways, or even roadsides, from which no powerful Army or Navy machine could be launched. Placed under a unified pan-American command under the Secretary of the Air Force, hundreds of thousands of these planes could make invasion impossible, and they would help form a sentiment for pan-American understanding and solidarity.

There should be no opposition to program for creating a Civilian Air Reserve when it is remembered that this Nation has always depended upon its civilian population in time of war. Therefore, there is no reasonable ground for contending against the use of the literally hundreds of thousands of experienced pilots, mechanics, and other expert persons who are not so fortunate as to be able to pass the rigid tests at our West Point of the air.

The Civilian Air Reserve of the Aviation Defense Association requests that all persons interested in aviation register at once, including men, women, boys, and girls who, though they may take no active part in actual operation of planes, will support our bills in Congress for the creation of the Reserve.

They can support our other aviation bills in Congress for the proper celebration of National Aviation Day on August 19, and take an active part in participation of this annual event, as proclaimed by the President. They can form clubs for model airplane building, airplane contests, etc. They can celebrate Pan American Aviation Day on December 17, which this association also sponsors.

The Boy Scouts of America and the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association are assisting our efforts to establish safe air travel and supporting our congressional legislation as introduced by Senator PEPPER and Representative J. HARDIN PETERSON for the placement of uniform directional air markers on roofs of buildings. In this connection, Representative J. L. JOHNS, of Wisconsin, has devoted time and effort to produce the results already obtained.

In order to provide for the subsidizing of the Civilian Air Reserve personnel and the installation of war equipment on private planes, our association has placed, through the courtesy of Senator R. R. REYNOLDS and Representatives JENNINGS RANDOLPH, J. HARDIN PETERSON, and others, bills providing for this action, and we have the full support of many Members of Congress and patriotic persons of prominence. The bill provides also for the training of this personnel under Army and Navy officers, and it will be remembered that the Germans secured their air superiority through similar methods.

We ask your active support in the Civilian Air Reserve of this organization. Our squadrons are forming now. Help us to establish them throughout the Americas. Help us to make America first in the air and on the land and sea and insure our liberty through sustained air superiority. Procrastination never won a war. Register now in the Civilian Air Reserve for the cause of civilization and the battle of freedom.

Address by Former Ambassador to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY JOSEPH P. KENNEDY AT OGLETHORPE UNIVERSITY, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the following is a very brilliant address by former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy, made at the commencement exercises of Oglethorpe University, Atlanta, Ga., on Saturday, May 24, 1941:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, graduates, and friends of Oglethorpe University, when your learned President, Doctor Jacobs, asked me to speak before this gathering I asked him what topic would interest such an audience. He replied, "By all means, tell us about your experiences in London."

Well, my experiences in London seemed a fairly interesting topic a few months ago. But today one's personal history is out of place in a serious gathering. As we reflect upon the dizzy course the world war has taken in the last 60 days, the swift changes daily occurring in our own Nation, what happened to me in London was quite unimportant.

There were interesting events just prior to the outbreak of hostilities. The circumstances of Munich make a good story. There is some color about the story that in London my garage was bombed twice as was the place in which some of my household lived; and there is interest in the tale of a bomb which blew the car in which I was riding up on the sidewalk. In those days such events seemed to me to be the last word in excitement. In comparison with all the stupendous and strange happenings in Europe recently, however, all these experiences become insignificant.

I spent 8 years of my life in the motion-picture business, and one of the principles of that business was to attempt to appeal to the imagination of the audience with an interesting story but never to make the story unbelievable. I am willing to wager that if any motion picture had filmed Hess' flight to England, most of the audience would have called the plot ridiculous.

If anybody had told us before the war that a large enough army could be moved by airplane across land and water to repulse the enemy, we would have said the tale was a madman's. And if anybody had said that an army of three or four million men—reputedly the greatest army in the world—could be routed from behind the Maginot Line in a couple of weeks, we would have tapped our foreheads significantly. And if somebody said that armies could storm mountains with heavy tanks over roads perilous even for horses, we would not have believed him. But I could go on indefinitely with the story of how the impossible has happened.

In the face of this lightning war, which now unmistakably reveals its true revolutionary character, when there seems to be so much heat and so little light, what is there for young Americans entering into adult life to cling to?

The contending disputants range all the way from those who insist that our present American foreign policy is foolish and futile and that the British Empire economically and politically is beyond our assistance and must collapse, to those who advocate immediate intervention on a theory of enlightened selfishness or because they desire that this country embark upon a holy crusade. And while the debate waxes, confusion increases and national unity eludes us.

In one sense this is altogether deplorable because now more than ever America should give an example of the world of a nation resolute and united. In another sense such disagreements are unavoidable and part of the price we pay for enjoying our American freedoms which, in the last analysis, is what we mean by the declaration: I am an American.

As a nation we have announced a foreign policy and the overwhelming majority of our people have approved it. It is to rearm as swiftly as possible, to give every possible aid to Great Britain, but to stay out of war. How to make that aid effective is the present issue. Shall our Navy escort the ships carrying our war materials to Great Britain? On that score the President has made the issue abundantly clear. He thinks convoying means war, and the American people do not want active participation in this struggle. It may be that eventually the American people will conclude that those who advocate the use of our Navy for the purposes of convoying are correct and that even such a great risk must be assumed in the furtherance of America's best interests. Before that step is taken, however, it ought to be the fervent hope of all of us that there will be open debate based on the real facts given us in utmost candor by our leaders.

It is not enough to say that to be truly Americans we must defend to the utmost the right of our fellow citizens to have their say even though we fervently detest them and their words. There must be more than that. Freedom means free choice and free choice should be made on the fullest kind of knowledge. When after that process the American people have spoken, the duty of a patriot is plain.

But I don't think a commencement is the proper occasion for a discussion of the technical aspects of our foreign policy. The details of our effort to help Britain and to limit the scope of the totalitarian menace make a subject difficult and controversial, but not appropriate for this celebration.

All during my service in London I labored for peace. And when the conflagration began I advocated aid to England but not intervention. Upon my return here I urged that we stay out, and when I resigned as Ambassador I said that I hoped to assist the President in his oft-proclaimed desire to stay out of war. I can think of no more patriotic task and one which should more readily enlist the active support of every lover of liberty.

The American people have a deep-seated antagonism for the forces of evil which the totalitarian states signify. They repudiate their philosophy, their silly racism and their nightmare of world domination. It is not at all surprising to find in our country such widespread hatred for nazi-ism because it conflicts utterly with the American way of life. National socialism lays claim to the whole life of man, to his thoughts, loyalties, and devotion no less than to his money, labor, and his vital spark. Our Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights, however, assert the very opposite and proclaim that man possesses rights which even the state and its leaders must respect. This new paganism proclaims its own beatitudes, which are not those you read in your prayer book. It says: "Woe unto the weak, woe unto the sick. The strong shall possess the earth." Consequently it is easy to see why the American people want ever so passionately a British victory. But they want also to stay out of war.

There are some among us who sincerely believe that the welfare of the United States requires us to become a belligerent. But they give us slogans. They seek to stir our emotions. We should never take such a grave step just because we hate Hitler and love Churchill. Facts are what the country needs, not slogans. What are the facts? What is the state of our own defense? What can we do if we declare war? Where will we land troops? What about Japan? What will be the result of declaring war in terms of our ability to help England?

The people who must suffer and give up their lives are entitled to know all the facts before their judgment can be won over to the interventionist cause. It is a mockery of liberty to withhold from democratic people the essential facts upon which this, the most awful decision of our times, must be based. We must have the completest candor; we must have the fullest disclosure; we must have the freest debate. At times the withholding of vital information from our citizens may be justified, but only rarely, and the burden is very great on those who would withhold any important facts. The very concept of democracy involves the concept of full knowledge and free choice. I say this sharing with our fellow citizens the hatred of German aggression, but believing that no judgment should be made which does not ultimately rest upon the welfare of our own land.

Let me summon a distinguished statesman of the South who put far more eloquently than I can the case against involvement in war. This United States Senator, speaking on the theme of self-government and civilization, said:

"We make a great mistake in supposing all people capable of self-government. Acting under that impression, many are anxious to force free governments on all the people of this continent, and over the world, if they had the power. It has been lately urged, in a very respectable quarter, that it is the mission of this country to spread civil and religious liberty over all the globe, and especially over this continent, even by force, if necessary. It is a sad delusion. None but a people advanced to a high state of moral and intellectual excellence are capable, in a civilized condition, of forming and maintaining free governments; and among those who are so far advanced, very few, indeed, have had the good fortune to form constitutions capable of endurance. It is a remarkable fact in the political history of man that there is scarcely an instance of a free constitutional government which has been the work exclusively of foresight and wisdom. They have all been the result of a fortunate combination of circumstances. It is a very difficult task to make a constitution worthy of being called so. This admirable Federal Constitution of ours is the result of such a combination. It is superior to the wisdom of any or of all the men by whose agency it was made. The force of circumstances, and not foresight or wisdom, induced them to adopt many of its wisest provisions.

"But of the few nations who have been so fortunate as to adopt a wise constitution, still fewer have had the wisdom long to preserve one. It is harder to preserve than to obtain liberty. After years of prosperity, the tenure by which it is held is but too often forgotten; and I fear, Senators, that such is the case with us. There is no solicitude now for liberty. Who talks of liberty when any great question comes up? Here is a question of the first magnitude as to the conduct of this war; do you hear anybody talk about its effects upon our liberties and our free institutions? No, sir. That was not the case formerly. In the early stages of our Government, the great anxiety was, how to preserve liberty. The great anxiety now is for the attainment of mere military glory. In the one we are forgetting the other. The maxim of former times was, that power is always stealing from the many to give to the few; the price of liberty was perpetual vigilance. They were constantly looking out and watching for danger. Not so now. Is it because there has been any decay of liberty among the people? Not at all. I believe the love of liberty was never more ardent; but they have forgotten the tenure of liberty, by which alone it is preserved.

"We think we may now indulge in everything with impunity, as if we held our charter by 'right divine'—from heaven itself. Under these impressions we plunge into war, we contract heavy debts, we increase the patronage of the Executive, and we talk of a crusade to force our institutions of liberty upon all people. There is no species of extravagance which our people imagine will endanger their liberty in any degree. Sir, the hour is approaching, the day of retribution will come. It will come as certainly as I am now addressing the Senate; and, when it does come, awful will be the reckoning, heavy the responsibility somewhere."

These words, my dear friends, were spoken in 1838 by the famous John C. Calhoun, United States Senator from South Carolina. They are as compelling, as fresh, as convincing, and as timely as though they came over the Washington wire this very morning.

Americans, we all know, would defend with their property and with their lives the institutions they so deeply cherish. They would not care for the security assured by a tyrant, no matter how alluring his promises. Americans are the same patriots today that they were in 1776.

But most Americans say, and rightly so, war will not preserve our liberties. We may, with our eyes on the foreign scene, be insensible to the loss of our liberties right here at home.

I am particularly unimpressed by the hysteria which I suspect is consciously stimulated by the idea that we are in danger of military attack. Let's forget entirely the European balance of power and the world balance of power as factors operating for our safety. The world balance of power should make an adventure in the New World a most dangerous prospect for the axis nations.

No country has ever been more fortunately situated for natural defense than is America. The Atlantic and Pacific oceans constitute impregnable bastions of defense. Let me remind you again of the spectacle of besieged England holding the might of the German war machine, the greatest in the history of the world, with but 20 miles of ocean from the continent—holding Germany at bay even with her bases to the south, east, and northeast of England, and those bases connected by a network of communications with the industrial centers of the continent. Look at us, separated from Europe by 3,000 miles of ocean and from Asia by 5,000 miles. We do not believe that any nation could secure a concentration of bases which would encircle us as Britain is now encircled. Even if a few hostile bases could be established on this hemisphere, how could they be kept in supplies and how could lines of communication be maintained? A direct attack on us would require an armada mightier than the power of man could create. Where is the military expert who would say such an adventure is feasible?

We have another line of defense which no American can afford to ignore, and that is our own will, determination, and might. We have made a commitment that this Nation will become one of the mightiest military and naval powers on the earth. The country is as one "all out for preparedness." Every day that passes makes the prospect of an attack less tenable. Until the world comes to a saner sense of peaceful living, we will have barriers against attack that nothing can destroy. A two-ocean navy, a large army, an incomparable air force—all these are on the way. In a short time they will be ours.

We have gone to the aid of Britain not only because we believe their cause to be just, but because the American stake in the present war is the precious element of time. But as a nation we should not let our aid to Britain become the argument for direct involvement.

Anyone who speaks in terms of imminent military danger is doing his country a disservice. The English should be amused when they think of their confident stand against invasion and the hysteria of their friends 3,000 miles away.

We are, after all, a nation with a great history of courageous and successful fighting. We are young and expanding. We have the greatest mass-production technique and machinery in the world. Regardless of how this war comes out, America has a great destiny because she has youth and she has assets which nature bestowed with a generous hand. I believe that, though I believe we shall have to fight harder and suffer more for that destiny in an Axis-dominated world. Let us not forget the American destiny; let us not be deluded by any claim that self-interest should make us guardians of the peace of the rest of the world. The American people's instincts are sound. They want no part of this war despite their fervent desire that the hated National Socialism be eliminated from the earth.

The crusaders' argument for war is the silliest of all. I have the fullest conviction that few countries of the earth by and large want our kind of democracy. Most of them have neither the training nor the tradition for it—not even a proper understanding of it. Democracy cannot be imposed by force or otherwise. It would not last even if we were able to present them with the most up-to-date constitutional democratic system. In our very attempt at this colossal crusade we would end in failure and disgrace abroad, in disillusionment and bankruptcy at home.

Ideas and ideals are, in the last analysis, more pertinent than slogans, propaganda, or armies. If America can hold firmly to her faith in herself, can continue to build a more permanent system of social, economic, and political justice, such an accomplishment will be far more impressive to the world than speeches, promises, or even armed intervention.

We cannot, my fellow Americans, divert the tides of the mighty revolution now sweeping Asia and Europe. They were not of our making and they will not be subject to our control, no matter how courageously or exhaustingly we strive to subject them.

One of the favorite arguments of those who would have us intervene in this World War is to tell us that unless we enter the conflict our foreign markets will disappear. What a callous and materialistic argument for bloodshed. It is claimed that the Germans will reduce Europe and England to one vast German sweatshop and by cheap production drive us out of the markets of the world.

Surely a British victory would be helpful from the viewpoint of our foreign markets. But it is nonsense to say that an Axis victory spells ruin for us. Must this country go out of business in such an event? The whole history of American progress belies such surrender Nature has blessed us beyond that of any other nation with the real wealth that will remain regardless of what happens to the credit structure of the world. From 90 to 95 percent of our trade is internal. We depend less on foreign markets than any great nation. If worse came to worst, we could gear ourselves to an intelligent self-contained national economy and still enjoy a fair degree of prosperity.

But that "worst" must never be permitted to include Axis domination—social, economic, or military—of any spot in the Western Hemisphere. I have sufficient faith in the vigilance and ability of our Army and Navy staffs to feel confident they stand ready at all times to intercept any move which could lead to such a consummation and to intercept it with all the force that may be necessary. In my definition of the Western Hemisphere I include, I wish to add, any island which is considered by our military experts to be a threat to our security if the Axis nations possess or dominate it.

For the life of me, I cannot see the logic of suggesting a course of action which, beyond the slightest doubt, will bring suffering, injury, death, poverty, and human degradation because of a fear of the future, which is founded on pure speculation. For this argument to have any validity, we would have to suppose that the Nazi government, after an exhausting war, could promptly reorganize into a sound economy a continent it now controls through sheer terror.

It is not at all clear that the dream of the old free-trade system can ever be realized. Forces have been let loose on the world and economic transformations have developed in this machine age which may well require even for this country a radical revision of its foreign-trade technique. This, I suspect, might happen regardless of the outcome of the present war. But going to war can in no event be a solution. It would be a clear case of the cure being worse than the disease.

There is no sound reason for criticizing the great body of Americans who insist upon thinking of their own interests. They cannot be blamed for wanting to know, before they plunge into a crusade, regardless of how holy or sacred it may appear, what are the chances, what are the risks, and what is the probable toll in sacrifice, and what is the final result at the end of the road.

For you young Americans entering adult life in such a distorted time, the usual advice seems hollow. The ancient platitudes sound empty. Of course, you must have the qualities of greatness of heart and soul. But today your generation needs character and faith more than all those who have gone before.

You should affirmatively cultivate a suspicion of phrases, of slogans. Beware of the phrase maker. America is deluged by messages. Budding revolutionaries have been stealing our priceless words—"Americanism," "peace," "democracy," and "progress." What such words conceal is now more important than what they reveal.

Words are but skins of thought, but so counterfeited have some of our words become through the deceit of Communists and the technique of Nazis that beguiling phrases such as "new order," "living room," and even "peace" have to be subjected to the most critical analysis lest we find ourselves marching behind false banners.

For example, the word "liberal" has become entirely suspect because of the grossest sins committed in its name. Today many so-called leaders are professional liberals. They would rather be known as liberal than to be right. They have tortured a great word to cover a false philosophy, to wit, that the end justifies the means. Liberalism, your studies here at Oglethorpe have taught you, has never meant a slavish devotion to a program, but rather did liberalism connote a state of the spirit, a tolerance for the views of others, an attitude of respect for others, and a willingness to learn by experiment, no less in social fields than in the physical sciences. Basically, liberalism predicates that man is a spirit and out of his Godlike qualities can come the triumph over the baser instincts that have made him so many times "vile."

In one respect the graduates of 1941 face a more attractive prospect than their fellow alumni of many years past. You will enter the stream of life at a time when the great machine of war is solving for you, for the time being, at least, your problem of opportunity. Already we see signs of labor shortages, increased wages, and rising price levels, all reflecting the quickened tempo that has followed our program of rearmament and aid to England.

But don't, I beg of you, be deluded into a false sense of security because you quickly find a place in the growing American war machine. When that machine slows down, as inevitably it will, you and your generation must face a staggering task. The dislocation which will follow our war efforts will be like nothing that our Nation has ever experienced. The modern technique of war requires such an increase in Government spending, in tax rates, in regulation and limitation of the private sphere of production and ultimately limitations in consumption itself that a return even to our modified capitalism of today will hardly be feasible.

Unemployment will be a threat on an alarming scale. Although there will no longer be futile debate about States rights and the powers of the Federal Government, the vast problem of the credit of the Federal Government will confound you. The stamina of our system and the loyalty of our citizens will be put to the most severe test. Once more will we be faced with the problem of whether youth shall sell itself into State slave service for a pittance as has happened in the States now running the course of revolution.

When the war machine has run down and the economic shock is being felt by every man, woman, and child, new and sweet-sounding slogans will fill the air. Short cuts to Utopia will be advocated on all sides. But out of those trying days that are to come your generation will find the great opportunity to serve your fellow man, to keep steady the democratic processes. Your generation must solve the next great crisis. Your generation will have the responsibility of insuring that the people, through their elective representatives, will have the courage and the intelligence to provide a new prime mover for our economy so that the young will be absorbed into jobs as they come out of school and our system preserve its record of opportunity for youth.

Not only must you seek to alleviate the economic stress by courageous and forthright action but you must preach anew the gospel that orderly progress can only be made in accordance with those traditions of law obedience which have been America's great heritage.

Even though the more abundant life is a goal ever to be desired, it will be revealed as a mirage and as fool's gold; it will become as ashes in our mouth if we compromise with those personal liberties of action, speech, thought, and religion which alone make human life the dignified process our Creator intended it to be.

Perhaps a century from now there will be agreement among historians as to the principal causes which have made our times the shambles they are—two world-wide conflicts in a little over a quarter of a century.

We have seen progress in mechanical things fantastic in their very brilliance, but in the art of living, in that one field which is the test of civilization and which is the first need of human happiness, our world has been a colossal failure. Why is it? We shall not find the answer in simple causes, but I suspect that basically there is a moral explanation. Intense nationalism, man's greed, and the worship of the machine—yes, a little of all of these and more will be found in the diagnosis. But when the history of these times has been written, I hope and pray it will show that the American lads of 1941 did not pave the way for a radical change by fostering class antagonism, that they recognized that the line between the rich and the poor in this country was vanishing, and properly so, in an ever-increasing standard of living, and that they realized and took vigorous steps to spread the gospel of equality. Then will it be said of them that they contributed mightily to giving to all our people a sounder basis for orderly living and that all this was accomplished with the essential liberties still substantially unchanged.

May you bring honor to your families and to your college by the measure of wisdom you will give to the serious problems of tomorrow and by the degree of self-sacrifice with which you face your solemn obligations.

Benefits for Dependents of Service-Connected Disabled Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently looking over the May 15, 1941, issue of the D. A. V. Semimonthly, the official national publication of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, commonly known as the D. A. V., I ran across a very fine article by this organization's national service director, Mr. Millard W. Rice, most favorably known to my colleagues, which gives very pertinent and complete information as to the benefits available through Federal agencies to the wives, widows, children, and dependent parents of World War veterans, living and dead.

The information and suggestions in this featured article ought to be brought to the attention of all the wives, widows, and parents of World War veterans, and, with the hope that many of them may be enabled to become informed as to their rights under existing laws pertaining to wives and dependent parents, I insert the article in full as follows:

[From the D. A. V Semi-Monthly of May 15, 1941]

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

(By Millard W. Rice, National Service Director)

Wives, widows, and children of World War veterans suffering with service-connected disabilities are eligible for certain governmental benefits, rights, and privileges under certain circumstances, as indicated hereinafter.

Wives of World War veterans who receive compensation by reason of service-connected disabilities are entitled to an apportionment of such compensation if they are living separate and apart from the veteran without any fault on their part, in an amount equivalent to 30 percent of the veteran's total compensation where the wife has no minor children, 40 percent with one child, 45 percent with two children, and 50 percent with three or more children. Minor children living separate and apart from their compensated father, without their mother, are entitled to an apportionment of the father's compensation equivalent to 20 percent thereof for one child, 30 percent for two children, and 35 percent for three or more children.

DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCES

Dependency allowances are payable to a World War veteran receiving compensation on the basis of service-connected disability, rated on a temporary basis, but not when rated on a permanent basis, as to his wife, children, and dependent parents. Such dependency allowances are payable to the veterans direct, and not to their dependents, except where an apportionment of the veteran's compensation has been granted by the Veterans' Administration.

Wives of veterans, who receive compensation by reason of service-connected disabilities, or who have some service-connected disability rated as disabling in some measurable degree, even though less than 10 percent, have potential death compensation protection.

It is, therefore, very much to the interest of the wife of a veteran suffering with a service-connected disability to see to it that there is filed, in her husband's case record with the Veterans' Administration, during his lifetime, such evidence as would quickly clear the way for establishing her entitlement to compensation in the event of his death. Such evidence should include a certified copy of the public record of her birth, a certified copy of the public record of the birth of each of her children, a certified copy of the public record of her marriage—as well as certified copies of the public record of all of her previous marriages, and divorces, or deaths of previous husbands, if any, and also of her husband's previous domestic relationships, if any.

Complications, by reason of previous civil and common-law marriages and divorces, too often arise after death, which are very difficult, and, in many cases, impossible to unravel, after death, which could, during the lifetime of both parties have been straightened out, so that the Veterans' Administration would be able to ascertain who was lawfully married to who, and whether an alleged widow is the lawful widow.

Any veteran, who has himself been previously married, or who is married to a woman who has previously been married, should be sure that the woman with whom he is living, and regards as his wife, is actually his lawful wife, and would, in the event of his death, be regarded by the Veterans' Administration as his lawful widow.

COMPENSATION RATES

The widow of a World War veteran who has died by reason of a service-connected disability, if married to the veteran prior to May 13, 1938, and still validly married to and living with him at the time of his death, is entitled to compensation as follows: "Widow, age under 50 years, $38; widow, age 50 years or over, $45; widow with one child, $10 additional for such child up to 10 years of age, increased to $15 from age 10 (with $8 for each additional child up to 10 years of age, increased to $13 from age 10 (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, $20; no widow but two children, $33 (equally divided); no widow, but three children, $46 (equally divided, with $8 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $45 (of both), $25 each, as to the widow, child, or children, the total compensation payable under this section shall not exceed $83." The above amounts of compensation are paid in the event the monthly payment of compensation under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (g) and the monthly payment of yearly renewable term or automatic insurance does not aggregate or exceed the amount of compensation herein authorized, in which the death compensation rates are as follows: Widow, but no child, $15; widow and one child, $20, with $3 monthly for each additional child; no widow but one child, $12; no widow but two children (equally divided), $15; no widow but three children (equally divided), $20 (with $2 monthly for each additional child), total amount to be equally divided. Total pension payable not to exceed $27. Where such benefits would otherwise exceed $27, the amount of $27 could be apportioned as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs might prescribe.

The widow of a World War veteran, who, at time of death, was entitled to receive monetary benefits by reason of a service-connected disability, or who with some service-connected disability (even though less than 10 percent), if she married him before May 13, 1938, and was living with him up to the time of his death—provided that she has an income of not more than $1,000 per year, or, having child or children, has an income of not more than $2,500 per year—is entitled to compensation as follows: "Widow with no child, $30; widow with one child, $38 ($4 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $15; no widow but two children, $22 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $30 (equally divided, with $3 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided)." The total compensation payable cannot exceed $64. Where such benefits would otherwise exceed $64, the amount of $64 may be apportioned, as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe.

DISABILITY PROOF

Proof of the existence of a service-connected disability at time of death may be submitted by the widow after his death. Securing evidence of service connection of a disability, after death, is, however, obviously more difficult than while the veteran is living.

It is certain that there are many thousands of World War veterans not now receiving compensation by reason of any service-connected disability who could, if they would, secure factual affidavit evidence to establish the service connection of some disability of measurable degree. Having established that fact, to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration, will thereby have provided compensation protection for their wives, who, after all, are all potential widows.

Technically establishing the service connection of a disability, even though not compensable because of being less than 10 percent in degree, is, therefore, equivalent to a paid-up insurance policy, which, during the period of eligibility, will insure a monthly income which might otherwise require an investment of from $4,500 to $19,000, yielding 4 percent interest per year, depending upon the number of dependents and their ages.

This law, Public 198, should be an incentive to every wife of a World War veteran to "stir up" her husband to the point of submitting such fact-giving evidence as might be necessary to establish the service connection of any disability which he thinks was caused by his military service, while he is living, so that both he and she may have the assurance and satisfaction of knowing that she and her minor children, if any, will be eligible for such compensation.

Wives can frequently encourage, advise, and assist their disabled veteran husbands in the prosecution of their equitable claims by helping them to secure factual affidavit evidence to prove the nature, severity, and service origin of their disabilities. Many World War veterans, suffering with disabilities actually caused by their military service, have become too discouraged to prosecute their claims for service connection and compensation. By helping her husband to prove the service connection of one or more of his disabilities, the wife would thereby be guaranteeing compensation protection for herself and children.

If application for compensation is made by a widow, otherwise eligible, within 1 year after date of death of her veteran husband, she would be entitled to receive such compensation payments effective as of the date of his death. If she made the application more than 1 year after his death, she would be entitled to such compensation payments only from the date of application and proof of eligibility therefor.

BURIAL EXPENSES

The widow, or the next of kin, of a deceased World War veteran, is entitled to apply for reimbursement of burial expenses, as to the body of the deceased veteran, in an amount not to exceed $100, and is entitled to receive the United States flag used to drape the casket at the funeral.

The widow may arrange for the body of the veteran to be buried in a national cemetery, and is entitled to receive, from the War Department, a marble, stone, or bronze headstone or marker for the grave of the veteran, provided that application is made therefor, within 2 years after the date of burial of veteran, or within 2 years after October 16, 1940, whichever date may be the later.

CIVIL-SERVICE PREFERENCES

The wife of a World War veteran suffering with a service-connected disability, who, by reason thereof, is himself unable to qualify for a civil-service position, may make application for the 10-point preference on a civil-service examination, and would be entitled to the other civil-service preferences, which includes the right to reopen any active register for an examination, once each half year, which would otherwise go to her husband.

The widow of a deceased World War veteran is entitled to receive 10 points in addition to her earned rating as to a civil-service examination, and to the other preferences granted to veterans as to civil-service examinations, appointments, and retentions.

Wives and widows of disabled veterans cannot help but be interested in problems of their husbands, and ought, therefore, to be intensely interested in the legislative, employment, and service programs of the D. A. V., and should consequently be interested in helping to build up the membership of the D. A. V. itself, and of its service-giving Women's Auxiliary.

"Medical Mussolini"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF CALIFORNIA OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION, AND A CHART SHOWING CURRICULUM OF AN OSTEOPATH

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, we have always known that the American Medical Association was the strongest union in the United States. We have

always known that the health of the public has been used as a football by the leaders of this organization. We know that this group has been convicted of violating the Federal antitrust laws, but what we did not know was the extent of this influence into our armed forces. Surely at a time like this we should all stop, look, and listen. I should like to see a very thorough investigation made as to just the extent of this influence and its effect upon the national defense. If we have qualified, well-trained physicians and surgeons, that are patriotic enough to offer their services to their country, why should any single group deprive this Nation of the services of these men?

We have a few members of this body who are very diligent when it comes to criticism of labor unions for much less than is being done by the American Medical Association. It is my hope that this diligence will extend to the group in question also.

I am including a letter that has a real bearing on this subject. I also include a chart that will set to rest forever the argument that these men lack in training:

CALIFORNIA OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, May 19, 1941.

Congressman LEE E. GEYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You undoubtedly are aware of the status of the osteopathic physician and surgeon licentiates in California. We enjoy the privileges of an unlimited license under the business and professions code of our State. California osteopathic physicians and surgeons are interested in serving their country in this national emergency.

We have noticed in the public prints that medical officers have repeatedly made statements that the Army was in desperate need of doctors. In view of this information the House of Delegates of the California Osteopathic Association, instructed the writer and Dr. Frank G. Nolan, graduate of the College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, and captain in the medical corps of the California State Guard, to go to Washington to confer with Robert H. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and Surgeon General Magee of the United States Army concerning commissions for physicians and surgeons holding the degree doctor of osteopathy.

General Magee genially, but flatly, told us that the Army Medical Corps had no place for doctors who hold the degree doctor of osteopathy, regardless of the fact that they are trained, licensed, and practicing physicians and surgeons. We were told that our Government did not want us in our rightful capacity as surgeons, schooled in all phases of medicine, and that those of our men under 36 years of age would be drafted as privates with no opportunity to qualify for commissions as medical officers, administrative officers, or even as technicians. In fact, the Surgeon General referred us to a volunteer organization—the American Medical Association—which is legally comparable to our own, with the statement that the American Medical Association approval would be necessary and tantamount to the opportunity we sought.

To us it does not seem to conform to democratic principles that men who have spent 7 or 8 years or more in qualifying themselves to render a particular service, which at present seems to be greatly needed, should be refused recognition because a volunteer organization (already convicted by the Federal Government of violating the Sherman Antitrust Act) is in position to deprive the Government of the services of eager, capable, physicians (of which there appears to be a reticent supply) because they do not carry a particular brand.

These members appeal to you, Congressman GEYER, through the association I have the honor to represent, to make this a matter of your personal concern, to the end that this situation be reviewed and investigated by an impartial body, and that action in accordance with the found facts be taken in the interest of justice and democracy.

Enclosed is a summary of the educational requirements and curriculum of the College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons in comparision with other educational institutions.

Respectfully,
For the board of trustees,
K. GROSVENOR BAILEY,
A. B., D. O., F. A. C. N.,
President, California Osteopathic Association.

[Enclosure.]

Summary of curriculum requirements taken from current catalogs, 1941

Comparison of hours between the College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons and the University of California School of Medicine, plus the requirements of the California Medical Practice Act and the American Medical Association Council on Education for the physician's and surgeon's certificate]

Subjects	College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons	University of California	California Medical Practice Act	American Medical Association Council on Education
	Hours	*Hours*	*Hours*	*Hours*
Anatomy and histology	715	592	560- 740	560- 740
Physiology	231	224	180- 240	180- 240
Biochemistry	209	256	140- 180	140- 180
Pathology, bacteriology, and immunology	562	496	400- 520	400- 520
Pharmacology, materia medica, and toxicology	198	176	160- 200	160- 200
Preventive medicine, public health, and hygiene	168	144	120- 160	120- 160
General practice, neurology and psychiatry, pediatrics, dermatology, and syphilology	1,381	1,468	800-1,060	800-1,070
Surgery: General surgery, orthopedic surgery, urology, ophthalmology, otology, rhinolaryngology	986	814	520- 700	520- 700
Obstetrics and gynecology	437	282	160- 200	160- 200
Legal medicine	5	16	----------	----------
Medical history and bibliography	11	8	----------	----------
Principles of osteopathy, osteopathic technique, and body mechanics	176	----------	----------	----------
Total	5,079	4,476	3,040-4,000	3,040-4,000

Proof of Service-Connected Disabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE B. BATES
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every one of my colleagues has had the experience of trying to help some of his constituents legally to prove, to the satisfaction of the rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, the service connection of disabilities which claimants conscientiously believe to have been caused by their World War service.

We all know that an equitable claim cannot necessarily be technically established to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration. We have all had the feeling that some of our World War veteran constituents have just claims for service connection and compensation as to which we have been unable to be of any real assistance. Most of the claims, which the Veterans' Administration has denied, have had to be denied officially, because of the lack of sufficient evidence to establish the veterans' contention that his disability had originated in, or been aggravated by, his military service.

I realize that the Veteran's Administration cannot be expected to prosecute claims against itself. It already, in effect, acts as both judge and defendant, and it would, therefore, not be proper for it also to act as prosecuting attorney to assist the veteran claimant in securing damages, as it were, in the form of compensation, from the Veterans' Administration.

There are probably several scores of thousands of World War veterans suffering from disabilities which were actually caused by the hardships, and the stress and strain, of their World War service, who have not yet technically established the legal service origin of such disabilities—probably, mostly because of their failure to realize the kind of evidence needed for that purpose.

I have just run across a special article concerning Affidavit Evidence to Prove Service Connection, which appears in the May 15, 1941, issue of the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly, the official national publication of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, commonly known as the D. A. V.

Written by the D. A. V. national service director, Mr. Millard W. Rice, known to many of us in his previous capacity as national legislative representative for the V. F. W., I think the advice in this article, as to how affidavit evidence ought properly to be prepared, is the best material which I have so far seen on this subject.

Hoping that this will come to the attention of many disabled veterans, who

are in need of this information and the pointed suggestions therein, I have requested the special permission of the House to insert such article in full, as part of my remarks, as follows:

[From the Disabled American Veterans' magazine of May 15, 1941]

AFFIDAVIT EVIDENCE TO PROVE SERVICE CONNECTIONS

(By Millard W. Rice, National Service Director)

Adequate affidavit evidence to establish the service connection of a disability is still, I find, the most perplexing problem for the average veteran claimant of the Veterans' Administration.

There are still thousands of World War veterans, in my opinion, who have not yet technically established their entitlement to benefits from the Veterans' Administration to which they may be equitably entitled, on the basis of service-connectable disabilities. Being equitably entitled to a benefit, however, is not at all the same as being legally and technically entitled thereto.

The Veterans' Administration officials and employees must administer the law in accordance with its provisions, as interpreted through regulations, instructions, legal opinions, and service letters issued by the Veterans' Administration, and as applied according to precedents established in claims involving similar facts. Such discretionary power, as rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration may be permitted to exercise, is limited by the various restrictions established by reason of such precedents, service letters, regulations, and legal provisions.

KIND OF CLAIM

A Veterans' Administration claimant should first analyze the type of claim which he or she has made before deciding upon the type of evidence to be submitted as proof of entitlement to such applied-for benefit. As to certain types of claims, it is necessary only to prove certain simple facts, as specified in the forms provided by the Veterans' Administration for such purpose.

Where the best evidence is not obtainable, the claimant should try to secure the "next best" evidence. Thus, for example, if it should prove impossible to secure a certified copy of a needed birth certificate, because the particular county or State did not at the time of such birth keep any vital statistics records, then it might be possible to secure a photostatic or certified copy of an entry in a family Bible as to such birth, or an affidavit from the doctor or midwife who delivered the child, or, if such better evidence be not obtainable, affidavits from neighbors who knew about the fact that such a person was born at about a certain date and lived under a certain name for such a period of time or, if that be not obtainable, proof as to the age set forth by parents during a decennial census, or by the claimant in his application for enlistment into service, or such other "next best" evidence as might be obtainable under the circumstances.

It has been my observation, however, that there are more veterans who have not definitely proven, to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration, that certain disabilities were caused by or aggravated by their military service, than as to any other type of denied claim.

If a veteran's honorable discharge certificate, or his official medical records while in military or naval service, fails to show the service incurrence or aggravation of his disabilities, the average veteran claimant is very much puzzled as to how actually to prove the service connection of each of his ailments which he conscientiously believes to have been caused by or aggravated by his military service. From whom shall he secure factual proof thereof? How shall he secure the necessary substantiating evidence? What must such proof of service connection consist of?

Under the provisions of section 200 of the old World War Veterans Act, as reinstated, after the infamous Economy Act, by Public Law Nos. 78, 141, and 196, it was, and still is, possible to establish a presumptive service connection as to active tuberculosis, amoebic dysentery, neuropsychiatric (nervous and mental), encephalitis lethargica (sleeping sickness) and spinal meningitis, upon proof that any such ailment had existed in a disabling degree of at least 10 percent prior to January 1, 1925, if other evidence did not clearly rebut such presumption of service origin. It is very seldom possible, however, now more than 16 years after the expiration of such presumptive period, to establish a presumptive service connection under such law.

It is still possible to secure service connection for certain-named chronic constitutional diseases upon proof that such a disease existed in a disabling degree of at least 10 percent, so medically diagnosed, within 1 year after date of discharge from World War service—the so-called administrative presumption of service connect'on. The schedule of disability ratings lists the following as chronic constitutional diseases:

"Acidosis, anemia, primary (all types); arteriosclerosis; beri-beri; diabetes insipidus; diabetes mellitus; gout; hemochromatosis; hemoglobinuria (paroxysmal); hemophilia; Hodgkins disease; leukemia (all types); obesity; ochronosis; pellagra; polycythemia (erythremia); purpura; rickets, scurvy, endocrinopathies; arthritis, deformans; arthritis, chronic; carcinoma, sarcoma, and other tumors; cardiovascularrenal diseases, including hypertension; cholecystitis, chronic, proceeding to gallstone formation; endocarditis, chronic; leprosy; myocarditis, chronic; nephritis, chronic forms; nephrolithiasis; valvulitis, chronic."

Most service connections now established, more than 22 years after date of discharge from World War service, are either on the basis of official record or on the basis of affidavit evidence establishing direct service connection of any such disability.

CONTENTS OF

Direct service connections can and still are, being established on the basis of fact-giving affidavit evidence.

A claimant of the Veterans' Administration should, in submitting a claim, be sure to state his claim in full, lest his failure to mention some particular disability in his claim afterward be used against him as indicating that he himself did not have any such ailment at the time of submitting such claim, and consequently thereby in effect admitting that he did not then have any such disability.

It has been my experience and observation, during more than the last 20 years of handling claims and legislation pertaining to disabled veterans and their dependents, that it is advisable for the claimant himself to prepare a personal affidavit. Such a personal affidavit by the claimant should set forth all of the facts in the history of his claim, should specifically state just what he believes himself entitled to, together with the reasons therefore in detail, and should tell just why he believes the evidence submitted by him should be regarded as sufficient for the purpose intended. The claimant's own affidavit should very carefully set forth all of the incidents of his military or naval service, including hardships, exposure, long hikes with heavy packs, unusual exhaustion or sleeplessness caused by heavy shell fire or what not over a considerable period of time, concussions or explosions of nearby shells, lack of proper food, etc., as well as a description of any suffering or discomfort which he may have experienced by reason of an injury or ailment, just how it affected him, what he did about it, if anything, and why, if such be the case, he is unable to secure any verifying affidavits from his buddies as to the inception of any such ailment. Then he should proceed to state in detail just what he felt like when he was discharged, and if—as is usually the case—his discharge certificate states, "Physical condition: Good", he ought to explain why his ailment was not noted by the medical examiner when he was discharged. He ought to recall just what his condition was immediately after his discharge from service and what he did about it, if anything, and if not, why not. Then he ought to tell the story of the development of each of his ailments from the time of his discharge up until the time such ailment was medically diagnosed by the Veterans' Administration, indicating its nature and severity, and its handicap to him in securing and retaining and efficiently performing the various jobs which he may have had since the date of his discharge.

By going through the process of preparing such a detailed personal affidavit, a claimant will recall many instances, which he would otherwise not remember, where one or more other persons had the opportunity of observing certain facts indicating that he was suffering with certain ailments, thus possibly enabling him to make contact with such person or persons to secure detailed affidavits concerning such facts.

Inasmuch as the claimant generally knows more about his own ailments than does any other person, he should be able in his own affidavit to relate the facts in the detailed history of the development, chronologically arranged as to approximate dates. Preparation of the claimant's own personal affidavit will generally place him in much better position to revive the memories of his friends concerning detailed symptoms and incidents which they may have overlooked or almost forgotten about, and therefore make it more feasible to secure more factual convincing affidavit evidence from such friends.

The claimant should always remember that his own claim is much more important to him than to any other person. He should therefore be willing to go to much more trouble in his own behalf than he has the right to expect from any friend or acquaintance.

It is permissible for a claimant to remind his former associates, employers, or fellow employees concerning certain incidents which occurred many years ago the recital of which in an affidavit might be helpful to the claimant in proving the service connection of a particular ailment, and in proving the relative severity and handicap of such ailment over the period of time involved.

Each affidavit should state in detail all of the pertinent facts known by the person who signs it, that is, the affiant. Complaints heard and symptoms observed by the affiant should be specifically stated and described in detail. The circumstances under which such symptoms were observed should be carefully outlined. The approximate dates of each particular occurrence or observation should be recorded.

The first few occasions when complaints were heard and symptoms noticed should be stated in much greater detail than observations made at later dates, but all of them should be "tied together," so far as circumstances of the affiant may permit.

The expression of an opinion by the affiant is of absolutely no value to the claimant unless it is backed up by specifically stated factual observations used as the basis for arriving at such stated conclusion. It is important to differentiate between personal observation and hearsay. The recital of detailed facts, sometimes considered to be too

small to be important, may be particularly valuable in establishing a link in the chain of evidence to prove the incurrence of a disability during military service, its existence at time of discharge or shortly thereafter, and the continuity of its development from that time up to the time that it was definitely diagnosed by the Veterans' Administration.

Where a claimant has previously handled his claim through some veteran organization or the American Red Cross, and subsequently decides to reopen the claim, it would be well again to contact such service organization to find out if its files contain any evidence which should be filed with the Veterans' Administration, or any copies of affidavits previously submitted, so as to be able to compare same with newly prepared affidavits. Some of the affiants of the affidavits previously considered may be able to prepare new affidavits furnishing more specific, detailed, factual evidence than previously submitted.

FORM OF

It is not necessary, nor even advisable, that a claimant should have his affidavits prepared in legal language. It is more important that the affidavit should state all of the pertinent facts in plain, understandable language. Ordinarily the claimant himself, possibly with some advice from a competent service officer of the D. A. V., or some other veteran organization, can do a better job of preparing convincing affidavit evidence concerning a claim before the Veterans' Administration than can be done for him by an attorney.

Although attorneys generally prepare affidavits in the third person, I consider it better for a claimant, and for those from whom he secures substantiating affidavit evidence, to have each affidavit prepared in the first person. The affiant can tell the story more naturally in the first person than in the third person.

The use of forms furnished by the Veterans' Administration is not, in my opinion, generally advisable, except perhaps in the most simple type of affidavits where only one or two facts can be stated by the affiant.

A person who uses a prepared form is too likely to rely on the suggestions made by the form and consequently does not spend enough time in thinking out the facts which ought to be stated, but merely responds to the suggestions of the form itself. Such prepared forms are nearly always too crowded for space and consequently tend to cause the affiant to tell less than he might have told if he had prepared the statement in his own language without reference to any form.

A good fact-giving affidavit cannot be prepared in 5 or 10 minutes; it requires considerable "thinking back" into old, almost forgotten history. Memories fade with the lapse of time. Frequently the affiant needs to be reminded by the claimant, either by letter or in person, as to certain incidents which might have occurred and which, although more or less inconsequential, so far as the affiant is concerned, might prove to be important in establishing the claimant's contention.

Rather than using prepared forms, it is suggested that the claimant use ordinary white paper. Affidavits should preferably be typewritten, so as to be more easily readable by members of the Claims and Rating Board and therefore more impressive, and so that the claimant may be able to keep copies for future use and reference. It is generally advisable to have the copies notarized, as well as the original.

If the average claimant is at a loss as to how to start with the preparation of an affidavit, the following blank affidavit at least conveys the general idea:

I, John Doe, being first duly sworn, do depose and say that I have known the claimant, George E. Smith, C 1 234 567, during the last ——— years; that prior to his World War service I know that he was working as a ——— for ——— years, and, by personal observation, know that during all of that time he enjoyed good health; that during his military service I met him at ——— on or about ——— at which time he complained to be about ———; I then observed that ———; thereafter I met him about ——— times of each month until and on nearly every one of each of these occasions I heard him complain of ——— and I noticed ———; that on or about ———, after his discharge, I met him, at which time he again complained to me of ——— and I then noticed ———; that on or about ——— I met him again and during our visit I noticed that ———; that from on or about ——— to about ——— I met him on the average of ——— times each month (or each year) and on practically all and each of these occasions I observed ———; also, on practically all and each of these occasions I heard him complain of ———; that because of these several observations on my part, I am convinced that his ailment of ——— was really caused by his military service and that he ought, therefore, to be granted compensation because of such handicapping disability; that etc., etc.

FROM WHOM

If service connection is the end in view, the veteran should obtain at least two affidavits, if possible, from buddies who were in service with him, at least two affidavits from persons who knew him shortly after the date of his discharge and from other persons who have observed his condition, from time to time, since shortly after his discharge.

It may be possible, in some cases, for a claimant to establish the direct service connection of his disability by securing two good affidavits from buddies who served with him, who were discharged with him and who have lived in the same community with him since that time. In other cases, however, it may be necessary to secure many more substantiating affidavits, because of the fact that the claimant shifted around from place to place, and therefore finds it necessary to piece together the evidence obtainable from many different persons who knew him at different periods of time. The important thing is to establish, if at all possible, that the disabilities existed in military service, that they existed within the first few days, or first weeks, or first few months after date of the veteran's discharge, and that they have been developing, with possibly some ups and downs, toward greater severity up until the time of diagnosis by the Veterans' Administration.

The claimant should obtain affidavits from each of his post-war employers and from one or more fellow employees, from his wife, his mother, or other close relatives, and from other persons with whom he may have been closely associated, each of whom may have observed some pertinent facts concerning the nature, severity, and development of his various ailments.

Affidavits should, of course, be obtained from each doctor by whom he may have been examined since he returned from service or, if such medical evidence be not obtainable, from any druggist who may have furnished certain medicines.

All such affidavits should be prepared with the same careful detail as indicated above.

A DOCTOR'S AFFIDAVIT

A doctor's statement should be notarized as assurance of the fact that he is a doctor and that he did sign it, and in order to avoid any suspicion that the statement may have been signed by someone else.

The doctor's statement should include a recital of all of the symptoms, facts, and circumstances and history of the ailments complained of to him by the patient; should include all of the doctor's findings, diagnoses and dates or approximate dates of different examinations, together with other detailed facts indicating the severity of each ailment subsequent to the date of first examination, the type of treatment recommended or provided for, the recommendations made by the doctor to the patient, the doctor's opinion as to the degree of severity of each of the ailments diagnosed by him, his opinion as to their origin and duration, and his opinion as to the effect of each ailment upon the patient's ability to work at his occupation or any other occupation from time to time.

If the doctor does not have a record of his examinations, then his statement should include an explanation of how it happens that he remembers the facts stated in his affidavit, possibly by connecting up approximate dates of examinations by other factors or circumstances mentioned in his affidavit.

The Veterans' Administration frequently sends out an investigator to confer with a doctor who has submitted an affidavit on behalf of the veteran and if the doctor fails to verify what he set forth in the statement which he prepared in behalf of the veteran claimant, the rating agency will very likely completely discount the value of the doctor's statement.

Doctors are prone to submit carelessly prepared affidavits. They should be encouraged to prepare their affidavits carefully, lest a carelessly prepared affidavit jeopardize the claimant's chance to prove the service connection of his disability.

When the claimant asks a doctor to submit a statement or affidavit in his behalf, he ought to explain to him just what he wants and why, and he ought also to explain that the Veterans' Administration cannot take anything for granted and will not even accept the validity of his diagnosis unless the doctor states symptoms and findings in detail on the basis of which he arrived at his diagnoses.

The claimant should remember that the Veterans' Administration can evaluate the affidavits only on the basis of what is specifically stated in each of them, as compared with what is stated in all of the rest of them. The affidavits must be consistent with each other. Contradictory statements in two or more of the affidavits are definitely harmful.

Rating agencies can give no value to opinions, impressions, and conclusions unless they are based upon sufficient facts specifically stated. The value of any given evidence must be determined upon the basis of what it may be considered as proving to the average reasonable man. The claimant should never adopt the attitude that the Veterans' Administration already knows a fact to be true. Each alleged fact must be proven by official record or by evidence which is both material and relevant. A clear word picture should be established in simple, direct language on the basis of actual observations of the affiants.

The claimant's story and his substantiating evidence must sound logical and reasonable and must be such as to be readily regarded as truthful.

If all of the evidence points to the truth of the claimant's contention and if most of the essential facts have been proven, then the Claims and Rating Board members are authorized to give the claimant the benefit of any reasonable doubt which may still exist. The benefit of the doubt cannot be granted if the evidence is only such as points to the possibility of the claimant's contention being true, where the preponderance of the evidence fails to establish the probability of the truth of the facts alleged by the claimant.

It is generally advisable for a claimant to have his affidavit evidence looked over by some service officer of the D. A. V., or of some other veteran organization, before it is finally submitted to the Veterans' Administration. Evidence should not purposely be submitted on a "piece by piece" basis. No pertinent evidence should be held back for later submission. One or more denials of the vet-

eran's claim make it more difficult, than originally, to secure favorable action subsequently on the basis of new evidence. All obtainable pertinent evidence should be submitted at the same time, if at all feasible.

If these suggestions are carefully followed, many more claimants can be enabled to establish the service connection and compensability of their service-connectable disabilities, with direct benefits to themselves, as well as the assurance of pension protection to their wives and children.

If a claimant has been unable to secure a response to a request for a needed substantiating affidavit from someone in another community, he should feel free to request the cooperation of the national or chapter service officer, or other officer, of the D. A. V., the V. F. W., the American Legion, the American Red Cross, or of any other veteran, patriotic, civic, service, or community chest organization—all of whom are ordinarily glad to cooperate in helping deserving disabled veterans to secure equitable adjudications as to their claims.

Address Before Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by me to the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, May 15, 1941:

Let me say to you at the beginning of this discussion that I did not come here merely to say pleasant things to you. I gathered from your invitation that you ladies wanted to know the truth about the situation with which we are faced. I surmised that you felt that you were not being told all, and that you wanted to know some of the facts which lie back of the day-by-day developments in the United States and throughout the world. I came to give you those facts as far as I myself know them. I think, as citizens, you are entitled to know all of the facts that can be given you about the foreign situation, the wars on the European Continent and the Far East, and the dangers that confront us from our own unsolved domestic questions.

Since the ratification of the nineteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, women have been accorded equal suffrage with the men. They have been elected and appointed to high offices in the Nation and in their respective States. Certainly women have demonstrated their intelligence, their ability, and their capacity to sit alongside the men in the legislative councils. They are fully competent to help govern, to assist in the making of the laws, and to aid in working out the problems of state. Today eight of them occupy seats in the Congress of the United States. A very distinguished Member of Congress, in commenting on the general tendency on the part of the public to consider as unusual and surprising the success women have achieved in statecraft and politics, recently said, "Many people seem to feel as though this were an accomplishment not to have been expected." Like my distinguished colleague, I find nothing to be surprised about that this has been realized in our political life, and am therefore not inclined to be as enthused therefrom as are some of my gentlemen friends.

I have believed for a long time that women are becoming somewhat resentful, and certainly a bit bored, by being complimented merely as women rather than being treated as equals of men in intelligence, capacity, and ability in the work of politics and government. That is why I said in the beginning of my remarks that I have not come to greet you with pleasantries nor to flatter you with complimentary phrases. It is my desire to explain to you the situation as I see it, to impress upon you the work that needs to be done, and to suggest to you how you with your club organizations, can do your fair share of this work alongside the men. I am one of those who believe that women do not want assignments of simple, easy tasks on the ground that they are women. I believe the women of America are just as ready to work at the hardest tasks as are the men and I believe they will do their share of the difficult work just as ably, just as efficiently, and just as quickly.

I shall endeavor to deal today with more or less nonpartisan problems. It would be impossible to give you any information about the vital situation, which we face or about any phase or factor of that situation without encountering controversial matters, because there is a very great diversity of views as to whether or not we should get into this war at all; what aid we can give to Great Britain and China without actual involvement; whether we need to aid the other nations in their wars in order to strengthen our own defense; whether we are getting a defense as rapidly, as efficiently, and as economically as we should—hardly a single factor is noncontroversial. There are two fundamental points, however, upon which I think a vast majority of the American people are wholeheartedly united.

The first is that our biggest job is to preserve Americanism. We must maintain and perpetuate what we call the American way. We must preserve and safeguard constitutional government. We must see to it that schemes—clever and subtle schemes—of those who would change our form of government into some kind of a centralized absolutism, whether it be communistic, nazistic, fascistic, socialistic, or some mixture of them, must be defeated. Those schemes have been hatched. Those schemers are at work in this country. In their own private circles they speak openly of the form of government they intend, if possible, to bring about in the economic chaos and social bewilderment which, they believe, will follow the war. The form of government they desire is vastly different from our revered and priceless American constitutional representative Republic.

We do face very, very serious questions of an economic nature after this war is over. Just 1 week ago today Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, speaking before one of the House committees of which I am a member, said, "Now we are going forward into times of even greater peril. * * * Economic warfare, as well as military warfare, is now being waged on all sides of us. There is no certainty that even with peace these aggressive economic instruments will be abandoned by other countries. Nobody can say what kind of international economy will emerge from this war."

Recently the Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Jesse Jones, told the United States Chamber of Commerce that our national debt would reach $90,000,000,000 before we were out of this war. Some of the leading economists of the United States say that the debt will go as high as one hundred and ten or one hundred and twenty-five billion dollars.

Now, the truth of the matter is that the debt might go to $150,000,000,000. Nobody, from President Roosevelt down to some obscure farmer working in an Illinois field, can even attempt to guess the gigantic sums of money we will be compelled to spend now that we have gone into this war or are going into it. Not only are we embarking into this new international adventure with a debt 50 times greater than that with which we entered the first World War, but we are now spending on a scale much greater. President Roosevelt has laid down a doctrine that the American Nation and the American people intend to aid every nation everywhere in the world which is resisting the powers of dictatorship. Of course, he does not mean all dictatorships. He means Hitler and Mussolini and Japan. But when we undertake to finance all of these wars we will have embarked upon a course the cost of which no human can at this time possibly foresee.

We do know that following every great war there have been serious and even cataclysmic economic and political disruptions. The economy of every nation in the world—including our own—will be burst asunder after this war. We will have new economic problems which the world never faced before. They will be of a magnitude such as we have never even dreamed. Sums of money in indebtedness will be involved of such gigantic proportions that humans cannot even comprehend them. Therefore it could very easily develop that in seeking to aid other nations in their wars against dictatorships we might lose our liberties at home. Here in America we may, in the not far-distant future, be called upon to sacrifice our American way of government and of life and submit to a rigid dictatorship at home in order to prevent economic chaos, national bankruptcy, and such a despair on the part of the people as might lead them to embrace some alien doctrine of absolutism. God knows, my fellow citizens, we must avoid that fate at all hazards.

The second fundamental point upon which I think there is in America almost universal unity is the necessity for and our intention to achieve an utterly invincible national defense. The best method by which we can attain that defense is subject to controversy, and I am going to speak in a few moments of this question of controversy because I believe disagreement has a very great place in our American scheme of government and of life. But for the moment I want to address myself to this question on which I think there is fundamental unity throughout this Nation. Whatever peril may threaten us from without has arisen since 1933. Throughout the past 8 years some of the nations of the world have been building armament and training men for what they call a total war. Total war as contemplated by the dictators means the conquest of all the other countries of Europe and the Orient. Most of the small European nations have already fallen to the forces of might and their people subjugated to the will of the conquerors. No doubt others will suffer a similar fate.

There has never been a time in human history, of course—and this applies to the European Continent as well as to the Orient—when some nation or some combination of nations has not been trying to enslave other nations and make them economic serfs. The Continent of Europe since history began has been a battleground. It has been torn by strife. It has been rent by racial hatreds and suspicions and conflicts. It has had all sorts of religious wars. Some of the best students of history believe that wars and conflicts and disagreements and strifes will continue on the European Continent for many a century to come. Others believe that

historic forces are now operating to cement the small and divided nations of the Continent of Europe into one great union which will be militarily and economically superior to any other nation or combination of nations in the world.

However all this may be, we have come into an era when our agencies of communication, travel, and intelligence have so shortened the distances across the seas and throughout the world that there has come about, particularly since the last World War, a very much more closely knit world economy than ever existed before. As you are well aware, there has been no time in history when some nations weren't having a war. Previous to the first World War, however, the countries were so separated by oceans and land distances and by lack of transportation and communication agencies that the economic structure of the world was very loosely integrated. It was like a very ramblingly constructed building, with so much "give" to all of its parts that if one part was shoved out of plumb for the time being it did not too seriously affect all of the other parts. The modern world economic structure which has been built up through international trade and commerce, travel and education, has become like a solid brick building. If you push one beam of that edifice out of plumb you send a shock, a tremor, and perhaps a collapse throughout the entire structure.

Inasmuch as that has come about, inasmuch as the fast ocean liner and the airplane and the cable and the transoceanic telephone have brought about this situation, we must consider this whole question in the light of this new economic integration or interrelation. This has a military bearing. In other words, if any dictator or dictators can cement all of the nations of Europe and of the Orient, with their vast reservoirs of ignorant labor, into a unit, and can direct the great forces of manpower in those nations, he or they cannot only upset but can paralyze our own achievements. Our own economy will be completely wrecked unless we, too, in the Western Hemisphere cement together the nations of the New World.

Now, of course, to do this would mean not the abolition of war, not the end of conflict, but the creation of two new gigantic economic agencies which would either work in absolute harmony and cooperation or go to war for the purpose of the one annihilating or subjugating the other. In other words, instead of two powers as represented by the British Empire on the one hand and the German Empire or would-be empire on the other, we might have, for instance, an American Empire composed of all the countries of the Western Hemisphere cemented together by their common needs and their common ideals, opposed by another collection of nations on the European continent under the direction of one dominant force, such as Germany, for instance, and perhaps even another economic, social, and military structure in the Far East under the domination and direction, let us say, of Japan. Now, whether or not one or two such combined economic and military organisms arise in the world to threaten us, or whether the world remains divided up into small nations which will continue warring with each other, it has become apparent that the United States must cease to be a complacent Nation, depending wholly on its own internal riches and resources and strength to protect it rather than to have a military mechanism for its defense. We realize now that the close integration of the world economy, that the shortened distances between nations, from the standpoint not only of commerce and trade but of war, has made it necessary, finally, that we should have and must have a national-defense mechanism that will be utterly invincible against the aggressions of any nation or any combination of nations which might in the future seek to commit aggressions against us.

I am not going to attempt for a moment to conceal from you the fact that this very necessity of a new and gigantic military agency of defense is itself going to bring grave new problems into the life of every man, woman, and child in the United States. Not only are defense mechanisms such as we now know we must have, expensive to create, they are exceedingly expensive to maintain. There are social as well as financial implications inherent in this whole question of defense which I have not time today to outline to you beyond saying that where there is a great standing army and where the people are military-minded there is always danger—grave danger—that a military despotism may arise to supplant civil government. However that may be, our most immediate need is for a national defense that will be so complete and so powerful that no nation or combination of nations will dare attack us. That defense must not only be military, it must also be economic. If we are to cement the nations of the Western Hemisphere into one solidarity to maintain our American ideals of free government, free speech, free press, free ballot, and free religious conscience, then we must cement those nations together economically. That means that we must finance the backward nations and direct very largely their efforts at progress. We must try to raise their people somewhat nearer to the living levels and conditions and the working levels and conditions and the cultural levels and conditions of the United States of America—and that, my friends, is the gigantic task of the future.

Many well-meaning but uninformed people believe that our efforts toward such an effectual union will be materially lightened because of the fact that politically we think alike and that the South and Central American nations, being republics, will welcome a combination militarily, economically, commercially, and socially with the greatest and most powerful republic on earth. But let us not be deceived on that point either. I think that situation was aptly described in a speech in the House by Representative Bruce Barton last fall when he said: "We persist in deluding ourselves by referring to these neighboring countries as 'republics' or 'democracies.' As a matter of cold fact, you could take all the democracy that there is south of the Rio Grande and put it in a woman's powder box, and it would rattle around. These countries are dictatorships or family possessions or feudal oligarchies. They are not even as much democracies as Chicago or Jersey City." In spite of many obstacles, the President and Secretary Hull have been and are now making commendable progress in promoting closer, more intimate, and more friendly relationships between the United States and the other countries of the two Americas.

I said a moment ago that the building of this national defense would bring new strains and new sacrifices for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Not long ago Mr. Donald M. Nelson, the director of purchases for the Office of Production Management, declared before the United States Chamber of Commerce that the defense program is so tremendous that in the way we handle it, we shall be shaping our future for many years to come.

Whether we like it or not, he said, the program is an instrument of change. He pointed out that, looking farther ahead, we will build up a terrifically unhealthy situation by creating a whole new series of distress localities—territories that have been bled white and lack the human and industrial resources to face the future. Those territories, Mr. Nelson said, will face a let-down "that will make the experiences of our recent depression look mild."

Personally I am not quite so pessimistic as to the future as Mr. Nelson seems to be. I still have a profound faith in the capacity, the ingenuity, and the courage of the American people. I believe that the sons and daughters of those courageous pioneers who came to this country and carved out this great, powerful, rich, enlightened Nation from the primeval forests and the unwatered plains of the North American Continent can still turn to and do a difficult job if they know what that job is and what needs to be done to accomplish it. I believe the American people can meet this challenge of the present and of the future with the same courage, with the same ingenuity, with the same resourcefulness, with the same energy and ability and capacity that they have met all of our problems in the past, provided only that they are honestly and frankly told what must be done. That is why I am making no effort to minimize any of the harsh aspects of the task which now lies before us to provide ourselves with a modern defense mechanism of naval craft, aircraft, tanks, guns, rifles, and whatever is needed to round out a perfect, modern national defense.

Its expense will be stupendous. It will bring privation to and demand sacrifice from the American people. It will, and already has given rise to sharp controversy. There is certain to be much bitterness over the method of building and using this national defense.

Now let me for a moment discuss this question of controversy. There has been propagandized throughout the length and breadth of this Nation somewhat recently the idea that it is unwise, dangerous, and even traitorous to disagree with the officials of our Government about how much shall be spent in military and nonmilitary operations, or what shall be done about patrolling the seas or convoying ships with American naval vessels, or what we shall do about sending our boys abroad again, not necessarily to the Continent of Europe but to other foreign countries to serve in the armed forces.

When the first colonists came to the shores of the North American Continent they did so because they perceived that the lack of freedom of speech, the lack of a free press which in those days consisted of hand-written pamphlets, the lack of religious liberty, the lack of educational opportunity, were keeping them in involuntary servitude. They left their homes and their relatives and all of the civilization that they knew and came to the wild, undeveloped, trackless forests and waterless plains of this continent because they loved liberty more than they loved any ease of life, or any of the advantages that the civilization of that day accorded them.

Our forefathers were keen students of human nature and also keen students of history. They realized that there were but two known ways by which men, associated together in a society, could reach an approximation of truth and justice. One of those ways was by direct Divine inspiration. The other was by a process of proposals, disagreements, discussion, and compromise. Our forefathers knew from their own experiences and from their reading of history that power feeds on itself. They knew that any despot, any dictator, any absolute ruler, not only might lack the wisdom and the benevolence necessary to make a good ruler, but he might also lack that sense of discrimination by which he could choose as his advisers those who would influence and persuade him to decisions and acts which would be in the interest of all the people. In other words, even though it be granted that theoretically the finest form of government possible in the human family is a benevolent dictatorship, the prerequisites of such a benevolent dictatorship are several.

We would have to find the man who would remain benevolent after he became a dictator and attained absolute power.

We would have to find a man who would have almost omniscience in order for him to be wise enough to be a truly benevolent dictator.

And then we would have to find a man who would have the judgment and the discretion to choose as his advisers those who held the same ideals and had the same motives which actuated him. He would have to have that great power of judgment and insight which would tell him when some of his advisers were leading him astray or were influencing him to depart from those ideals which characterized his rule.

And finally, there would be another very great consideration. His would be the responsibility to find and select as his successor, a despot who would be as benevolent, as wise, as discriminating as he had been. In order to do this he might have to renounce his own sons and daughters, go outside the circle of his own family and of his own relatives, and, in contradiction to every human impulse, select some individual as his successor over the protests and the persuasions of his own loved ones.

Our forefathers saw the impossibility of such a situation. They saw the futility of such a hope. Therefore they arrived at the very wise conclusion that, in building the new North American nation, the next best method by which the people might approximate truth and justice, was through a system of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise. They were very wise, those founding fathers, in that decision because out of it has evolved what we call the American way of government and of life. Out of that decision has developed what we call, the two-party system in America. That American way, that two-party system, that method of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise has made us the richest and most enlightened Nation on the face of the globe. It has given our citizens the highest wages and the finest working and living conditions enjoyed by any working people anywhere on the face of this earth. It has made possible for us a religious, an educational and a cultural progress greater than that achieved by any nation or any people on the face of God's green footstool.

We have more luxuries in the United States today—we have finer railroads and highways, we have more automobiles, we have more of everything that makes life worth living—than any other people in the world, and all of it has come to us through the American way. That American way was expressed in the Constitution of the United States which was the organic law and the essence of which was government by the consent of the governed. The Bill of Rights states, in terms, those inalienable rights of the individual and the minorities which must always be considered and respected by the majority. We have achieved all of these vast blessings in a comparatively short period of years as history counts time because we have adhered to our American system of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise.

It has been within the last 8 years—and this has no reference to any administration or any political party—it has been within the last 8 years that there has been abroad in this Nation powerful propaganda that we should abandon the American way of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise. There has been preached the doctrine of a greatly centralized power in Washington whose judgments must not be questioned or criticized by the people. I am frank to say to you ladies today that the greatest danger that faces this Nation, the most sinister threat that confronts you and your children and your children's children, is that very propaganda that there should be at Washington a centralized governmental power which would be above and superior to the criticism of the poorest ditch digger or the sweatiest laborer in any Illinois field.

Whenever any political party, be it Republican or Democratic, whenever any Government officials, be they bureaucrats, Cabinet officers, or even President, successfully place themselves above the criticism of the people, that day the American way of life and government has ended in this Nation and dictatorship has begun. The greatest job that you women have—not only as women, not only as wives, not only as mothers, but as citizens—is to preserve the Bill of Rights and constitutional government, with all the blessings of its liberties and privileges, by fighting with every ounce of intelligence and strength that you possess this doctrine which is advanced that there must be no questioning of the Government at Washington; that there must be no criticisms of the methods of the administration; that the Congress and the people must be told nothing about what is being done, but that they must accept the decisions and edicts and the regulations of the bureaucrats without question.

Yes; our greatest task is to preserve the American way. Therefore we must look with disapproval if not grave suspicion upon any attempt of any public officials high in the administration or anywhere else to enter into personal abuse or to try to assassinate the character of anybody who wants to speak his mind freely and fully as an American citizen about how we are to achieve our national defense and whether or not we should go into war. Disagree as we may with the views expressed by anyone, we still must not lose sight of that fundamental right of every individual to annunciate his convictions freely and fearlessly.

I regret—I think everyone in the Nation regrets—that recently there was an exhibition of personal vilification and abuse by high officials of the Government of a very distinguished citizen because he had dared to express his personal sentiments as to our getting into the European war. Every citizen is clearly and wholly within his constitutional rights and privileges in so expressing himself in peacetime. Every good citizen, every citizen who is jealous of the liberties and the privileges of our American way of life should have the right of voicing his opinions freely and courageously about this momentous question, without any apprehension that high and powerful governmental officials with great prestige will assail his character, his motives, his integrity, and his honor. That is not the American way. That is not showing a true regard for the opinions or the rights of a minority. And I want to say to you again, my fellow citizens, that in that day when we depart from the system and the practice and the tradition of the majority according respect and consideration to the views and the rights of the minority, in that day we shall have abandoned the American way of government and of life and we shall have adopted either an autocracy or a despotism.

There has been a deep division among the American people as to whether or not we should go into this war. We were assured, of course, before November 5 by the platforms of both parties and by both major party candidates that America would be kept out of war.

We were going to aid Britain and the other nations by methods short of war. We were going to maintain our sympathies by methods short of war. We haven't heard that statement "short of war" since November 5. We are being taken into this war. There is no use to try to conceal that fact. Admiral Stark, of the Navy, revealed to the United States Chamber of Commerce a few days ago at Washington that American naval ships are patrolling the seas two or three thousand miles off the shores of the United States. There is a grave question at this time as to whether or not the United States Government may use force to dislodge German soldiers from Greenland. The clamor is arising that we get into this war; that we get supplies to England even though we have to take them on our own ships and protect those ships by naval power. The President himself has said that convoying means shooting, and shooting means war. His statement was correct. Convoying does mean shooting, and shooting means war. But we have to come to an era of hair splitting. We have come into an era when the very meaning of words is changed—one might almost call it an era of weasel words—to use a term coined by Theodore Roosevelt in his day. We are told that we are not convoying ships with American naval craft, but that the American naval craft are patrolling the ocean. We are told through the press by the President that American naval ships can be taken anywhere in the combat zones or not as he may desire in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the Nation.

I will say to you frankly that was not the intention of the Congress. When the $7,000,000,000 so-called lease-lend bill was passed it was specifically and solemnly promised by the administration leaders in Congress that the President had no intention of having American boats convoy shipments of munitions to Britain. Now for the moment, disregarding the merits or demerits of the question, the wisdom or the needs of our delivering our aid to Britain, I think you will agree with me that the American people who have to do the fighting, the dying, the suffering and the paying for any war are entitled to know the truth about whether or not they are being taken into that war. The American people are not weaklings. You women are not weaklings. You can stand and they can stand the shock of the news that we must go to war if go to war we must. The great danger is that we will be taken into war without our knowledge and not know how we got there.

It is interesting to note chronologically how we find ourselves where we are today. After the first World War most of the European nations owed us money. Soon all but one defaulted in their repayments. Realizing that Uncle Sam, as partial recompense for the part he had played in the great war, had been elected to the exalted position of holder of the proverbial bag, Congress in 1934 passed and President Roosevelt signed the Johnson Act which denied further loans or credit to such nations until such time as they had made good their existing obligations.

This act still remains on the statute books. Finland, alone, has maintained its credit with us. In 1935 many of the nations of Europe were increasing their armaments and enlarging their military forces to such an extent that war seemed imminent. Being determined to discourage would-be war profiteers from instigating or promoting our involvement in another conflict, the House of Representatives that year passed the McSwain bill, a measure designed to take the profits out of war. The Senate, however, failed to consider it. A year later both Houses passed and President Roosevelt signed a Neutrality Act containing a provision forbidding the sale of arms, ammunitions, or munitions to any nation engaged in war. Later civil war broke out in Spain, and in January of 1937 the Neutrality Act was amended to apply to conflicts of that character as well as wars between nations. The Neutrality Act, in reality, reiterated and put teeth in the admonition of the Father of our Country to keep forever clear of the perpetual age long and never-ending military conflicts of Europe. In 1938–39 war broke forth on the Continent with all its fury. Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland were the first victims. France and England declared war upon Germany, and within a short time appealed to the United States for

war materials. In the latter part of 1939 the President called a special session of Congress and asked for the repeal of the arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act. Congress complied with his request by enacting a statute authorizing the sale of munitions to belligerents on a "cash and carry" basis. In 1940 Hitler seized Denmark and subdued Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. Italy joined the Axis, and our President made his famous "stab in the back" speech. A conscription law was passed, 50 United States destroyers were turned over to England, the two major political parties declared for "material aid consistent with law and not inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense" to democracies resisting aggression and our Nation abandoned its position as a neutral and became a "nonbelligerent." This year, so far, Congress has enacted a lend-lease bill placing at the disposal of the President more than $7,000,000,000 for aid to nations resisting aggression, and again, 2 weeks ago, authorized him to seize foreign ships now in our harbors (including German and Italian craft) and dispose of them to Great Britain. Within a matter of weeks, or even days, we will probably be asked to officially authorize the convoying by our Navy of these and other ships loaded with war materials to Great Britain. Without doubt, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, already possesses that power, but he is reported as having stated that he does not propose to assume that responsibility without the approval of Congress.

Under the convoy system, strictly speaking, a number of merchant vessels loaded with munitions of war or supplies, as the case might be, start to sea with a number of naval craft accompanying, escorting, and protecting them. The naval vessels range ahead of, behind, and on the sides of these merchant craft, searching for submarines, and looking out for airplanes. An enemy submarine cognizant of the presence of the merchant ships and their convoys could, if it dared, dive under the outer fringe of the protecting vessels, torpedo, or attempt to torpedo, the cargo ships, and then run its chance of escaping the depth bombs which would promptly be dropped by the naval craft. Modern warfare has demonstrated that, instead of convoying ships like coveys of quail, it is sometimes safer and more effective to have the merchant vessels zigzag so that they present a target which is always going off the course that it is at any given moment sailing, while the naval craft at the same time are patrolling the waters of the ocean. In thus patrolling, these naval craft bewilder and confuse the submarine commanders, and in many cases the enemy aircraft. A submarine commander cannot bring his submarine to the top of the ocean and hail a ship and say, "Are you an American warship, or a British warship, or an American cruiser, or a British cruiser, or an American destroyer, or a British destroyer, or an American cargo boat, or a British cargo boat?" To do so would be to expose himself and his boat to being blown out of the water. There is no way by which German submarines or Italian submarines, or German air pilots, or Italian air pilots can distinguish between the destroyers, for instance, which we have traded to Britain and the other boats which we are constantly giving to her and the American boats. Consequently, when our naval craft are sent to patrol the ocean two or three thousand miles from home there is an excellent chance that there will be some shooting, and that some German commander of an air squadron or some German commander of a submarine will make a mistake and sink an American boat. That would be the "incident" which would precipitate us into a shooting war. We are courting just that sort of incident.

I would be less than frank with you, ladies, if I permitted any fear of a criticism that I am verging on a partisan discussion to prevent me from saying to you that we are courting armed participation in this conflict by those naval craft being sent out to patrol the seven seas. Neither do I say it in the spirit of condemnation. I merely desire to emphasize that this policy is fraught with danger and we should reflect upon it with full knowledge of its perils and with our eyes open. No matter what may have been our feelings heretofore, our Nation is definitely committed to a policy of "aid to Britain short of war." We must, as loyal Americans, accept that policy and in a constructive manner, try to accomplish that goal. Whether in pursuance of that objective, the responsibility should be ours to deliver to England the supplies, the munitions of war that she must have to survive, is deeply controversial and is a question that frankly I think cannot be decided by any civilians anywhere. It is a problem that the Members of Congress and our military and economic authorities must study out.

Now what can the women of America, what can women such as you who are organized together in federated clubs, do to help their country in this situation? The first thing that you, as citizens as well as women, can do is to insist to your representatives in Congress, to your servants in high places in the Government, and in your own home communities, that the American way of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise be upheld and maintained and perpetuated. You can insist upon freedom of speech and freedom of press as well as freedom of ballot and freedom of religious views. The late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said in an opinion—and I am not quoting him literally—that freedom of speech meant freedom of the other fellow to voice ideas which you hate. We can see at once that is easy enough for us to be indulgent and to accord freedom of speech to those with whom we agree or who agree with us. The real test of freedom of speech comes when the other fellow voices opinions which we abhor or despise or with which we intensely disagree.

The first essential of maintaining and perpetuating the American way is that the American people be told the truth insofar as the dissemination of the facts is consonant with the public welfare about what is being done in connection with the participation of this Nation in one way or another in the armed conflict now going on in the world. They should be told the truth about defense production. They are not now getting the facts. It is the American people who must pay for it. It is the American people who must make it operate. It is the American people who, if necessary, must die in their Nation's defense.

You, as citizens, as club women, as wives, and as mothers can, and should, demand through your Representatives in the Congress the truth about defense production. There has been a demand on the part of some of the officials of our Government for a so-called voluntary censorship of the news. One of the points on which one of these officials called for such censorship on the part of the newspapers was the presence of British warships in American ports for repairs. It was but natural that not only the newspapers but the people should consider a bit absurd the objection that was voiced to press accounts concerning the entrance of a British warship into a great American port in broad daylight, on a Sunday, with thousands upon thousands of people watching it come in. Yet this administration official demurred most strenuously because a newspaper printed a picture of the event, as though German, Italian, and Japanese spies and agents were not and would not be in that crowd of thousands of people to see the ship come in, and as though they would not have vantage points from which to photograph with telescopic lenses every detail of that crippled British warship.

A voluntary censorship could not be very effective in concealing from any of our potential enemies, such as Germany, and Italy, and Japan, and Russia, any of the very essential facts about the state of our national defense or preparedness. Those facts are not ascertained through the newspapers by the agents of foreign governments. They are attained by much closer observations and much closer contact—much of it social. Censorship, voluntary or otherwise, at a time when our Nation is not at war, is, it seems to me, a dangerous practice. Aside from its being a violation of our fundamental liberties, it could be exercised to screen from the American people failures in our own national defense which those in charge of building it might desire to conceal. Such a voluntary censorship could very readily lend itself to just such use. It could be made a clever and effective way of veiling the facts, however dangerous or however bad they might be, from the American people and excusing their action in that regard, on the ground that to tell the people the general facts about our national defense would be to reveal information of value to the agents of our potential enemies.

You should demand the truth about defense expenditures. Neither the Members of the Congress nor the people are being told the realities about these expenditures. Recently some inquisitive Congressmen started investigating on their own hook. They found waste and incompetency to the nth degree. Congress was shocked by the revelations and an inquiry is now under way. At Camp Meade, in Maryland, close to Washington, the costs of that cantonment have already risen $21,000,000—more than twice the original estimates. The advice of the most experienced engineers was ignored by a general, now retired, who calmly told a congressional committee recently that he didn't like the arrangement of Camp Meade, that he had assumed that troops were being sent over there to train, and that therefore, regardless of the cost of these many millions of dollars, he had ignored the advice of competent engineers, had thrown economy to the winds, and had followed his own ideas about the cantonment, with the results which I have described. That sort of thing ought not to be tolerated in this country, and must not be tolerated any more. As was recently pointed out by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, a new tax bill, which will shock the Nation when the people learn of the rates, is already on the way to enactment. The exactions in the bills which will follow this first one will make the present tax bill appear to be a very simple, mild measure, indeed. We must not forget that waste and graft and inefficiency must be paid for out of the family pocketbook, the same as the money legitimately and prudently spent.

Public funds squandered or stolen or lost through incompetence must be paid for by you women who do most of the purchasing by taking the dollars from your family purse and appropriating them for taxes. They must be paid for in terms of the milk that the baby can't have, of shoes the other children must do without, of the clothes that the fathers and mothers of America must deny themselves, of many family necessities which must be sacrificed. I say to you here and now that we cannot and we must not for a moment tolerate even the thought that any person or any group may be allowed for one day to prey upon the people through the national defense. You should demand that they be run down, exposed to public scorn and indignation, and, if possible, to the penalties of the criminal law.

You can and you should seek from your representatives in the Congress and from your public servants in the administration the

truth about the strikes in the defense industries. We have heard much argument about the comparative figures as to the number of men involved in these strikes, as to the number of man-hours which have been lost in the defense industries as compared with 1917. I must say to you bluntly that conditions today certainly are not as they were in 1917. Some strikes which would have been tolerated then might be fatal to our defense now. Putting it succinctly, if the situation is a half or a third as bad as the President has time and again told the country it is, if our state of defenselessness is anything like it has been described, then there is no time for a single hour's stoppage of the defense work through strikes or any other cause. We do not have the time for one strike, let alone a series of strikes. The Nation's peril and the Nation's imperative need for an adequate national defense ought not to be and must not be made the excuse for employers for taking an undue, unreasonable, or unfair advantage of organized labor. Conversely, the Nation's peril and the imperative need for an adequate national defense must not be made the excuse by leaders of organized labor for unfair or unreasonable demands upon the employers.

The Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, is endeavoring to attain a solution to this perplexing problem. Extensive hearings have been conducted and leaders of industry and labor, Government officials, military and naval experts, and individuals possessing peculiar and extraordinary knowledge of labor conditions both in our own and foreign countries have been called in to give us the benefit of their views. Among these was Hon. William C. Bullitt, recently United States Ambassador to France. I shall read you a couple of pages of his testimony before our committee, and from it you can draw your own conclusions:

"The situation in France which led to the conquest of France by the Germans developed over a period of years, and in reality developed out of the same sentiment that we all share in this country, and that was the very profound desire to have peace.

"The one thing that every Frenchman wanted after the last war was to see a French baby born who could live to the age of 60 without having to pick up a gun to repel a German invasion. And out of that really deep, intense desire for peace came, in the first place, the Maginot line, which the French thought would protect them from all future German invasion and, in the second place, an attitude of mind which was one of not taking any armed action until the last possible moment.

"When Hitler came in on the 30th of January 1933 he began at once his tremendous program of plane construction, which had been planned before he came in by his staff, those members of his staff who were experts in aviation, especially Goering.

"He got the jump by starting in at once at the time on a tremendous program of air expansion. The French, when he came in, had an air force that was completely dominant on the continent. It was a big air force; the planes were somewhat obsolete and were entirely obsolete when put up against the planes that finally started coming out of Hitler's factories.

"In 1933 the Germans began to turn every energy they could into the building of airplanes, but it was not, however, until the end of 1936 that these efforts, great as they were, began to give results. It takes a long time, as we are learning to our cost now in this country, to build up an airplane industry.

"The Germans actually began to get planes in great quantities coming from the factories toward the latter part of 1936. When the German Army entered the Rhineland in March of 1936, the French Army and French air force as well was still much stronger than the Germans, and it could have moved in and destroyed the German air factories which were turning out planes in contravention of the Locarno Treaty.

"They didn't do so largely because of this basic idea not to take up arms and in the hope it was possible eventually to come to some agreement with Hitler.

"That was really their last chance. The moment Hitler had entered the Rhineland and began the construction of the Siegfried line so that France could not invade Germany readily, and the moment a flood of planes began coming from the German factories in the latter part of 1936, it was too late. It was too late to save eastern and central Europe, but this curious illusion existed in France: That they still did not need to turn every energy they had into production because the Maginot line was so strong that Germany could never get across it. The result was they had many manufacturers who did not want to take government orders and contracts for military machines of different kinds; they had a very large series of strikes of different kinds, and French production, at a time when it should have been raised to the greatest possible height to meet the German menace, without anybody noticing particularly, just quietly did not rise at all.

"You had also another element which is often misunderstood, I think—the action of the so-called Popular Front on behalf of the workmen.

"* * * When the Popular Front government came in—I believe, if my memory is not at fault, it was about the month of June or July of the year 1936—there was an enormous number of reforms dealing with wages, hours of labor, paid holidays, a great mass of reforms introduced in one big block, as one big program

"Those reforms were long overdue, and they had the good effect of producing an excellent state of mind on the part of those workmen who were actually loyal Frenchmen. They had no effect in changing the state of mind of the Communists in the factories, whose loyalty was not to France but to a foreign dictator, and who took their orders from that foreign dictator.

"On the other hand, they did reduce enormously French production, because French industry was not organized suddenly to drop hours of labor greatly, and also lots of the manufacturers were very much frightened by these reforms. They said, 'We are not going to expand our factories.' In fact, in some cases they closed their factories.

"The result of this was we had a diminution in production in France just when we needed a greatly increased production to meet this rising German threat.

"There was also another curious development, which was this: That in the factories even working a 40-hour week, in many of the most important factories, especially those around Paris, where there were a great many Communists, that the workmen did not do much work during the 40 hours. They dragged their feet a good deal and did not turn out over so much.

"But that was under the influence of a different sovereign, a sovereign in Moscow, and was not the attitude of the really patriotic Frenchman.

"The result of this whole picture was that without doing anything to produce at war speed when they needed to produce at war speed, the French, because of the existence of the Maginot line, still felt perfectly secure. It was not until 2 months after the war began that the French introduced a Ministry of Munitions which began to organize the production o munitions on a war basis, and had an excellent program for the production of a great many munitions and a great many planes in the year 1942. But France was destroyed in 1940.

"* * * The tragic and almost unbelievable fact is that the French never became really conscious of the common danger until after the Germans had broken through the Maginot line last May. Up to that time they were so certain that the Maginot line was going to keep the Germans off, and there had been so little fighting on that front, that the people were really still asleep. And then came like a thunderclap the realization that the Germans were through the Maginot line; and you then had all the employers, all the employees, workmen who had not been working much, you had them turning to and working incredibly. They worked incredible hours, they would work until they would drop, and they actually produced in the last month, when the Germans already had in their hands a large number of their plane factories, two and a half times as many planes as they had ever produced in a month before from the whole of France, because they suddenly realized that their country was about to be overrun, that their lives were about to be ruined, that they were about to be enslaved, and every Frenchman turned to and did his utmost.

"But it was too late."

What legislation, if any, will result from our committee's hearings which are yet to be concluded, I am not at this time prepared to predict. It is not an easy task to formulate and draft a law that will eliminate strikes. The right of labor to bargain collectively with its employer is a recognized American principle. The right of an employer to discharge disloyal, lazy, or incompetent help is likewise recognized as fundamentally sound.

The right to strike or quit work in unison and collectively because of wages, hours of work, or working conditions has been recognized by our Government and our courts for many years as the legitimate exercise of the only effective weapon that employees possess against unscrupulous and unfair employers. As long as our system of democratic government exists we will continue to have disputes between employers and employees, just as we have disputes between individuals over contracts and accidents and boundary lines. We cannot by legislation eliminate the disputes in either case, but we can set up the proper machinery for their speedy adjudication. One remedy that would go a long way toward reducing unreasonable strikes would be to provide by law for a fair, honest, impartial, and secret vote under supervision of a Government official, whereby every member of a local labor union can, without fear or coercion, express his honest, individual decision as to whether his organization in a given case shall or shall not strike. This would make less potent the influence of gangsters, racketeers, and subversive groups that have all too frequently gained control, through terrorism and intrigue, of organizations made up of honest, loyal, American workingmen. We can outlaw sit-down strikes. They have no place in democratic America and are the product of the type of leadership I have just mentioned. Another practice that has grown up and that has no reasonable justification is the calling of jurisdictional strikes. These are the result of disagreements between a union of a group, such as the American Federation of Labor and one of another group such as the C. I. O. or between two rival unions within the same general organization. Their grievances have nothing whatever to do with wages or hours or working conditions. They are disagreements wholly and solely as to the jurisdiction over certain work between two unions. In some cases strikes have been called, picket lines have been established, and defense work has been stopped because some union member didn't pay his dues into his union.

Such strikes as these are utterly indefensible. You should demand that they cease because it has been demonstrated that only an

aroused and determined public opinion will bring the proper action to put a stop to this plague of strikes which is seriously if not fatally injuring or retarding our efforts to achieve a national defense.

The need for an invincible national defense is too great, is too vital, it is too pressing for us to allow any selfishness or even any mistaken zeal on the part of either employers or employees to interfere with the defense progress. We cannot do as France did. The work must go on.

You should, through your Representatives in Congress and through your servants in the administration, demand the maintenance of free speech and free press. As someone recently said, free speech and fearless expression of thought offer the only method by which we may hope to perpetuate the American way of government and of life.

You should demand the maintenance of free ballots. There should be an end to favoritism and discrimination in the awarding of defense contracts. Such discrimination ought not to be tolerated for a moment. You should and you must demand fairness and justice and honesty in the administration of all relief agencies of the Government such as the W. P. A., and in the agricultural payments and in all of the other functions of the Government both military and nonmilitary. Unless we do this, we may lose our government of, for, and by the people.

You can and you should do all in your power to resist the tendency that has been growing by leaps and bounds over a period of many years to delegate arbitrary and far-reaching legislative and judicial power to commissions, bureaus, and boards that are in no way responsible to the people. You should urge your Members of Congress to support some measure like the Walter-Logan bill that will provide uniform procedure before these bodies and accord an appeal to the courts from arbitrary and unjust rulings.

Our forefathers recognized, and history has consistently supported their doctrine, that political bureaucracies tend to become corrupt and wasteful the longer they are in power. We must always keep in mind the fact that our military defense against any dangers which may threaten us from without could be defeated, our liberties could be lost, and our Nation could be wrecked by agencies and causes within. Keeping in mind the statement made to the United States Chamber of Commerce by Secretary Jones, which I quoted earlier in this address, that we can expect the national debt to go to $90,000,000,000 or more, we cannot forget that economic chaos and national bankrupty are just as dangerous to our American form of government and our American way of life, they are just as threatening to freedom and democracy as any danger from over the seas from any armies of any dictators. These internal dangers, dangers of waste, and inefficiency, and graft, and corruption, and a softening of the moral fiber of the people, are vastly more difficult to detect and are very much more subtle than any military danger which might threaten from without.

Therefore it not only becomes your duty, but it is a work which you ladies can very effectively carry out, not only through your clubs but individually, to stamp out in your home communities revolutionary communism and fascism, and every sort of absolutism that may be proposed. Stand earnestly, actively, aggressively against every argument, against every alien doctrine, against every seduction and every threat to our American way of government and life.

To do that, to discourage and to thwart the efforts of revolutionary Communists or Fascists to overthrow or bring about a change in our form of government and our way of life, we must all work together to oppose class and sectional prejudices and suspicions and hatred and frictions and divisions. We must have national unity in this hour of our peril. National unity, I say. What is it? Really, what is it? Unity is not submission. It is intelligent cooperation. Submission is blind yielding to dictation, whether that dictation be bureaucratic, administrative, or whether it be brought about by inflaming the temper of the citizen. Under such submission nobody dares to disagree. Unity is reached through proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise—the American way which I described earlier in this address. We are all unified as to the need for an invincible national defense. We all want it. But we are not all agreed as to methods which have thus far been employed to get it.

Many of us believe that it can be achieved much more economically, much more efficiently, much more quickly under practical military and naval officials, under industrial managers and honest labor leaders, than under political and social theorists, whose chief concern is to keep themselves in power and to maintain their places at the expense of the taxpayers.

You can and you should demand frankness and candor on the part of the administration about these vital matters which involve the lives and happiness, the security, and the property of this generation as well as those generations which are to come after us.

These, ladies, these are purposes you can help to accomplish. This is work you can help to do. These are ends you can help to promote. Thus you can do your part not only in assisting to achieve an adequate national defense, but in preserving the solvency of the Nation, and in maintaining our American form of constitutional republic and our American way of life.

In these dark hours, when war clouds black out the sunlight of freedom and of happiness and of security in so many parts of the world, the greatest task which lies before the American people is to keep the torch of freedom burning in this great, free land of ours so that it will be a beacon of hope in the years to come to those nations which are being prostrated under the blows of war and whose people are being driven frantic by the horrors of armed conflict.

If we permit the torch of liberty to flicker out in this Nation, if we ever abandon our American way of free government and free life and free enterprise, then indeed will darkness have descended upon the world. If democracy cannot be made to work successfully in this great, rich, enlightened Nation of ours, then it cannot be made successfully to work anywhere on the globe. If freedom, if liberty, if education, if political and religious tolerance cannot be made to function in this land of ours, then they will have failed throughout the world and we will indeed be hurled back into another dark age.

Democracy will work. It can be made to work in America. Liberty, religious, and political freedom, educational and cultural advantages, and material progress can all be turned to the blessing of mankind here in America. We can lead the way back to the ways of peace and plenty and security here in America. We can guide the rest of the world away from war and away from the horrors of mass murder and destruction and back to the ways of concord and happiness. It depends upon us. Ours is the task, my fellow citizens, to do this, to hold aloft the torch of liberty and freedom in the world, and to not fear the criticisms of those who would conceal from the people their plans to annihilate constitutional government on this continent. Let us not in our zeal to aid democracies elsewhere lose it at home. Let us pray together, let us work together, let us hope together, let us have faith together in the future of America and our people.

Peerless Novelty Co., Grand Haven, Mich.

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the consummation of our national-defense program, I am sure we all agree, is of the utmost importance, requiring full cooperation on the part of the governmental agencies having jurisdiction, and labor and industry, as well. In my congressional district, in the city of Grand Haven, Mich., among other prime manufacturing concerns, is the Peerless Novelty Co., whose products are of the highest standard and generally recognized as among the best.

This company is desirous of doing its full part in connection with the national-defense program but is handicapped in doing its part by unexplained lack of cooperation on the part of certain governmental agencies.

For instance, the Peerless Novelty Co. received proposals for bids from the Navy purchasing agent, New York, under schedule 5957 exactly 1 hour prior to the time the same were set to be opened. I have brought this case to the attention of the Paymaster General of the Navy who wrote me on May 20 that information had been requested regarding the reported delay.

This case was followed by a second protest by the company, addressed to the Office of Production Management. I read the following letter of the company addressed to that governmental agency:

MAY 22, 1941.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We are manufacturers of electric soldering irons and as such, we are interested in supplying some of the defense needs to the various Army and Navy Departments. On several occasions we have received invitations to bid the same day the bid is to be opened. As an example we are enclosing an invitation to bid from the supply officer at the United States Navy Yard, Philadelphia. You will note the invitation was mailed at 6:30 p. m. on May 19, and the bid was to be opened at 10 a. m. May 21. We received the bid at 9 o'clock May 21.

We have no idea whether your office can do anything about this, but we believe it is a condition which should be called to your attention because there are rumors that invitations to bid are intentionally being held up to some suppliers in the interest of favoring certain other suppliers. We give you this information for whatever it may be worth.

Your very truly,

PEERLESS NOVELTY CO.,
FREDERICK KELLER, *Sales Manager.*

Mr. Speaker, the company has just called my attention to still a third case and I read the following letter it addressed to the purchasing agent of the Post Office Department:

MAY 23, 1941.

PURCHASING AGENT,
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We appreciate your invitation No. 195 and we would have liked to submit a quotation for the letter box time cards. However, we could not do this intelligently without a blueprint. We requested this blueprint from your department on May 17 but you failed to send us blueprint No. 101. We cannot tell what printed matter is required merely from the description shown on your invitation No. 195.

We believe we are very well equipped to supply this type material and we hope the next time you extend an invitation to bid you can see your way clear to let us have complete information.

Yours very truly,
PEERLESS NOVELTY CO.,
FREDERICK KELLER, *Sales Manager.*

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this short time this morning to call attention to these cases of apparent lack of cooperation on the part of the Government agencies in question in the hope that the situations referred to will not be permitted to recur from now on.

"We Choose Peace"

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, more than 80 percent of the citizens of the United States wish to keep out of Europe's wars. There are admittedly some of our people who favor intervention and all that it implies—convoys, shooting, bloody war.

In 1936 the President said:

If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They will tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to the belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build houses and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that came from a false prosperity.

To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—we choose peace.

Mr. Speaker, tonight the President speaks to this Nation and the world. We already know that the credits extended to warring nations have not solved our unemployment problem. On the contrary, our aid so far has cost the American people billions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, if the President will only "look beyond" in his message tonight he will explain the penalties if we enter war in another continent; he will resound the cries of the American people, "We choose peace."

One Man's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN A. DAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson:

ONE MAN'S OPINION
(By Hugh S. Johnson)

CHICAGO.—The great American wartime paradox—the baffling bewilderment of the mass of sincere, honest and patriotic people—is so strange, so clearly without precedent, that I think it is the No. 1 news story of our time.

The paradox is that, while eighty-odd percent of our people are in deadly opposition to our mixing in foreign wars, a majority, at least, are complacent to every step of this administration that leads us closer to that inevitable end.

One reason that I took a week off to go to the Pacific coast was that I had been told that, while a great majority of opinion in the Middle West is against our participation and even aganst steps leading in that direction, a much stronger faction in the extreme West, as in the extreme East, is of a contrary mind.

To put it shortly and bluntly, it simply is not true. If anything, the vision on the Pacific coast is as clear, if not clearer, than that here in Chicago—the metropolis of the great valley—and that is clear enough.

Aid to stop Hitler by helping to keep a fight going on between us and him? There is hardly a voice raised in opposition. Going farther to engage in methods not "short of war"—it is my observation that there is hardly a voice raised in support.

Yet it is becoming clearer daily to this great inarticulate popular mind that "methods short of war" that are being used are, as that great palladium of American democracy, Wendell Willkie, described them, "just campaign oratory."

Every day every act of Government daily reveals more clearly that this is the greatest gold brick ever sold to a hick country.

We are "hell-bent for war," not on a wave of public opinion but as an act of administrative legerdemain or sleight of hand.

As were some other cynical triflings by our present Government with the faith and loyalty of American public opinion, which were frustrated by their own guile, this is clever, but "too damned clever"—slick, but "too damned slick."

On what does such grudging success as it has had rest? As far as one man can, I have tried to inquire. Briefly, and perhaps with too much generalization and simplification on three sloganeering propositions:

First. That the peace of the Western Hemisphere has depended on the British Navy.

Second. That the Monroe Doctrine is a gift of the British Empire and has been possible only by reason of our dependence on Britain to support it.

Third. That America cannot live in international trade competition with a Germany dominated by Hitler—that he "will abolish gold" and "establish barter of goods produced by slave labor" as a medium of exchange in international trade.

These three things have been sloganeered by radio to such an extent that they alone seem to be the whole basis for such support as there is to our infinitesimal minority war party.

As has been repeatedly pointed out here, and with greater force elsewhere, the first and second arguments are such perversions of historical fact that the simplest recounting of the record of things past is sufficient to explode them. But the third and most frequently repeated—the "international trade and exchange" argument—is what Mr. Justice Holmes used to call an "inference of the unseen"—a prophecy, a philosophical deduction.

George Peabody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, too often do we find that the worthwhile deeds and accomplishments of those who have preceded us down the road of life are soon forgotten. Monuments and other memorials are oftimes erected by appreciative fellow citizens but with the passage of but a few years the reason for and the meaning of these memorials are soon forgotten.

A movement was begun recently by William F. Carlin, of Silver Spring, Md., to revive many of the incidents in the life of the late George Peabody, founder of modern philanthropy, that the great deeds of this great man might be appreciated by his fellow Americans.

Countless Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, including my humble self, have already endorsed the suggestion that a stamp be issued by the Post Office Department in honor of George Peabody, and I am sure many others will join this movement when they read the following condensed biography by William F. Carlin:

George Peabody was born in Danvers (now Peabody) in Essex County in Massachusetts, February 18, 1795. At an early age he moved with his family to Baltimore, Md., where he engaged in business, and attained success as a merchant. Later in life he made an immense fortune as a railroad builder and financier, and his business interests brought him finally to London, where he died November 4, 1869.

Ten feet or so from the tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Westminster Abbey is a

slab on the floor bearing the name of Mr. Peabody, the only American who was ever interred, even temporarily, in that shrine sacred to England's great dead. Later his remains were taken up and placed aboard a British warship, H. M. S. *Monarch*, which, escorted by a French and an American naval vessel, bore them across the Atlantic to their final resting place in the town of Peabody (the name having been recently changed to Peabody in honor of that great citizen), the burial taking place February 8, 1870. The *Monarch* landed at Portland, Maine, and the body was escorted from that city to Peabody by a company of English soldiers, part of the trip being made in a blinding snowstorm.

Such extraordinary honors were bestowed upon a man who was really worthy of the honor, for it can be argued with great plausibility that George Peabody was in a sense the founder of modern philanthropy. It is recorded that he strongly influenced both Johns Hopkins and Enoch Pratt, and his benefactions to education and music throughout the United States are many and far-reaching. His benefactions to Hopkins and Pratt certainly stimulated others. He made gifts to the Peabody Conservatory and Library at Baltimore; to Yale and Harvard Universities for the establishment of museums of natural history, archaeology and ethnology, and his gift to Peabody, Mass., his place of birth was the Peabody Institute and Library. Many other institutions of education in and around his birthplace were the recipients of the benefits of his endowments.

Probably the most important of all of his gifts in the United States was the establishment of the Peabody education fund for the promotion of education in the South, the amount of this gift being in excess of $3,500,000 which prior to the 60's was a fabulous bounty. The principal beneficiary from this endowment was the George Peabody College for Teachers at Nashville, Tenn., which has grown to be one of the leading institutes of learning in the United States, and which has played an important part in the educational advancement of several of the Southern States.

His success in the financial world led him to London, and while there he made a gift to the city of London of $2,500,000 for the establishment of what was probably the first large-scale slum-clearance project in the world. He also paid for the American exhibition at Crystal Palace in London in 1851, and sent a ship in search of Sir John Franklin, the missing Arctic explorer, at his own expense.

One of his most curious deeds, which stands out as a striking example of his sterling character as a citizen, was in 1835, when the State of Maryland was bankrupt, Mr. Peabody, on his own credit, borrowed $8,000,000 for the State and refused to accept a penny of commission.

Queen Victoria, ruler of the British Empire at the time of Peabody, offered to bestow upon him a baronetcy, but he refused the honor, choosing to remain a plain American citizen, so she had her portrait painted by the celebrated Peal, set in a beautiful frame with gold ornaments and presented it to Mr. Peabody. This painting together with a gold box containing the tender of the freedom of the city of London, a gold box from the Fishmongers' Society of London, and a gold medal and memorial from the United States Congress in recognition of the Southern Educational Fund are on exhibition at the Peabody Institute and Library, in Peabody, Mass. Contained in a letter which accompanied his first gift to his birthplace was the expression of his sentiment toward education: "Education—a debt due from present to future generations." This sentiment has been perpetuated as the motto of every graduation class of Peabody, Mass.

To preserve the memory of this generous and honorable citizen a movement has been started in Baltimore to raise $125,000.

Sixth Assembly of the Descendants of Participants of the Campaign, Siege, and Defense of Vicksburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ADDRESS BY COL. WILLIAM CATTRON RIGBY

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the address made by Col. William Cattron Rigby at Vicksburg, Miss., on the occasion of the Sixth Assembly of the Descendants of the Campaign, Siege, and Defense of Vicksburg, Sunday, May 25, 1941. The meeting was held at the Vicksburg National Military Park and Colonel Rigby's address was made on invitation of the Society of the Descendants of Participants of the Campaign, Siege, and Defense of Vicksburg and in remembrance of the services of his father, the late Capt. William T. Rigby, who served with great distinction in the Civil War and at the siege of Vicksburg as a member of the Twenty-fourth Iowa Voluntary Infantry, and who served also with great distinction as chairman and resident commissioner of the Vicksburg National Military Park Commission.

The State of Iowa is indeed proud of the record of the late Capt. William T. Rigby and his family and Iowa is especially proud of his work to bring harmony between the North and the South throughout his long and useful life of service.

The address follows:

Mr. President, Mrs. Bell, fellow members of the Society of the Descendants of the Campaign, Siege, and Defense of Vicksburg, it is indeed an honor, as well as a very great pleasure, to be permitted to appear before you here today, and to realize that I am here with my brother, former State Senator Charles L. Rigby of Iowa, and my sister Grace, Mrs. Edward R. Cameron, whom many of you know so well, on your invitation in remembrance of the services of our father, Capt. William T. Rigby, as chairman and resident commissioner of the Vicksburg National Military Park Commission.

It is in reality a thing in which we may all justly take pride; and I speak now not only on behalf of our family—because, of course, we do take pride in it—but I speak also, as I think I may, in saying this, on behalf of this community, of the people of the city of Vicksburg, and of this great Commonwealth of Mississippi, and of the whole American people. It is a thing in which not only this city and community, but the whole State and the American people, may take just pride, that a northern soldier who had taken part in the campaign and siege of Vicksburg, in the Northern Army, could come down here to this southern city, only a comparatively few years afterward, and living 30 years in this community could so build up friendships here that in his own lifetime the citizens of this city and community should pay him the rare honor of unveiling his bust, on his eighty-seventh birthday, November 3, 1928, on the spot where his tent had stood during the siege. That could not have happened in many countries in this world. The large-mindedness, the generosity, of a community which could do this, is the sort of thing that is the sure guaranty of the success and of the continuance of free government among the American people. That he and his wife should have lived to see that event, was, as I have said, a rare honor; but it was not an honor to the man alone. It was essentially an honor to the ideals for which, as a part of the Vicksburg National Military Park Commission, he had striven; the ideals which he had prized in common with your—and I want to say "our"—revered Gen. Stephen D. Lee, and with others of this community like Colonel Floweree, General Catchings, Senator John Sharp Williams, and many others, and like Captain Guion of Louisiana, Colonel Everest of Illinois, Capt. John F. Merry, of Iowa, Colonel Kunz, the secretary, and Captain Longley, the assistant secretary of the commission, and a host of others, South and North alike, who worked together in a spirit of mutual good will.

As many of you remember, Lt. Gen. Stephen D. Lee, of the Confederate Army, was the first chairman of the commission. In view of his increasingly heavy duties as president of the Mississippi State Agricultural College and in other directions, General Lee chivalrously asked Captain Rigby to take the chairmanship; and they, with the fullest approval of the third commissioner, Colonel Everest, of Illinois, went to work to carry into effect their motto that the park was not to be regarded as a memorial primarily either for the North or for the South; not a memorial, certainly, to the success of the North, and not a memorial primarily to the valor and the endurance of the South; but that this park should be a lasting memorial to the valor of the American soldier, South and North alike.

In that spirit they worked; in that spirit the park was built; in that spirit contributions were made by legislatures and by patriotic citizens, South and North alike.

In tribute to that spirit the citizens of Vicksburg erected the bust to Captain Rigby, not, as I have said, as a memorial to the man alone but in recognition of the ideals which he shared with them of the healing of the old wounds of the Civil War and of the honor paid in common by all the States of our Union, and by every section of the country, to the gallantry and the valor of the American citizen soldier.

After Captain Rigby's death, the Vicksburg Post-Herald, in an editorial, Sunday, May 12, 1929, reprinted a portion of a speech which he had originally made at Marion, Iowa, September 19, 1899, at a reunion of his old regiment, the Twenty-fourth Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and which had already once before been printed by the Vicksburg Herald, only 3 months after its original delivery, in the issue of December 8, 1899. In again reprinting parts of it after his death, the Vicksburg Herald said, editorially, that Capt. William T. Rigby ever labored to bring harmony between the sections, and that it was this spirit that he had infused into the Vicksburg National Military Park. That, and his admiration of bravery among soldiers on both sides of the conflict.

You will, I am sure, bear with me if I read here a portion of that speech, made more than 40 years ago. Captain Rigby said:

"As we remember the stirring 3 years we spent together, we feel that not for wealth to be gathered from all the breweries in the land would we have missed them from our lives. Life, indeed, is measured not by years but my emotion and experience. One moment of that strenuous day at Champion Hill has in it more life, cuts sharper and deeper into the tablet of memory, than years of ordinary existence. Therefore, dear friends, in no spirit of boastfulness, not to

make parade of our services, or to found any claim upon them, but with thankfulness for the opportunity improved, with fond remembrance of the experience shared together, we gather in your city to live for a few hours in the past and to pledge again a soldier's fealty to our beloved country. To make that country greater and nobler, its people more united and happy than seen in the fondest dream of our fathers, was the object for which we fought, is now the high aim on which our eyes are fixed. Not till all sectional bitterness is gone from our midst, not till the hatreds of the war are forgotten by both sides, have we fully attained the ends for which we enlisted and were mustered.

"Every word and act that tends to hasten this, our final victory, finds a response in our hearts, and commendation from our lips. In this, as in all things, we follow our great commander: While armed foes confronted us in line of battle, 'unconditional surrender; I propose to move immediately upon your works.' After Appomattox, 'Keep your horses,' he said, 'you will need them to put in your crops.' We fought not for conquest, not for the victor's right to impose hard and humiliating terms upon a vanquished and fallen foe, but that all our land might be filled with the prosperous farms and happy homes of a united and free people.

"In forming the character and shaping the lives of the future citizens of this great Republic, we fondly hope that the unselfish devotion to duty and the unshaken valor of the volunteer soldier will be a potent influence for good; that the heroism will live in song and story, and through all the years a challenge to patriotism, above the din of party strife, ringing loud and clear as bugles that blow for battle. Nor do we forget that our late foes were brave men and gallant soldiers. Their valor, like the valor of the men of the north, illustrates and adorns the character of the American citizen-soldier. This character, tempered and proved in the crucible of battle, is the pledge and sure prophecy of the greatness of our common country. Looking into the future, may we not say of the coming American citizen: 'His shall be the larger manhood because of the heroic example of the men who conquered with Grant and Sherman and the no less heroic examples of the men who surrendered with Lee and Johnson.' Of this coming American may we not predict that where need is he will know that not suffering, but a faint heart, is the worst of woes?

"In the nobler destiny of our country, in the larger and stronger character of its people, will be found the final compensation for all the suffering and all the losses of the war."

That was said more than 40 years ago, in a time of profound peace in this country. The country was feeling the lift of the victorious War with Spain. The time when another test of the valor and the manhood of the American volunteer soldier might come seemed far away, indeed. But the test did come less than 20 years later. It was gloriously met in 1917 and 1918.

Another test may be now at hand today. As we stand here we cannot know how soon our people may again be called upon to defend our ancient ideals of liberty. But we do know that, whenever the crucial test may come, it will be met with all the valor and all the determination that the American citizen-soldier showed in 1861 to 1865 and again in 1917 and 1918. We do know that, to paraphrase Captain Rigby's words of 40 years ago, we may say, not alone the coming American, but of Americans today, men and women alike, that where need is they will know that not suffering but a faint heart is the worst of woes.

On behalf of my brother and my sister as well as myself, I want to thank you again from our hearts for the opportunity to be here today and for your generous hospitality.

Franking Privilege and Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are so accustomed to think of treaties and Executive agreements as coming alone from the Department of State and the White House that we may well forget the part that the Post Office Department plays in international agreements.

Officially, for example, we are told by an article in the American Journal of International Law for April 1941 about the franking privilege for postal communications with prisoners of war, that there has been little publicity about its benefits. We immediately contacted the Post Office and received this reply:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1941.

Hon. JAMES A. SHANLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHANLEY: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 22, containing extract from an article on the franking privilege for postal communications with prisoners of war from the April 1941 American Journal of International Law. It is noted the article comments that the franking privilege seems to have escaped the notice which it deserves.

The treaty signed at Geneva July 27, 1929 (articles 36 to 38), provides that letters and consignments of money or valuables, as well as parcels by post intended for prisoners of war or dispatched by them, either directly or by the mediation of the information bureaus provided for in the treaty, shall be exempt from all postal duties in the countries of origin and destination, as well as in the countries they pass through; also that each of the belligerents shall periodically determine the number of letters and postal cards per month which prisoners of war of the various classes shall be allowed to send, and shall inform the other belligerent of this number, etc.

The Universal Postal Union Convention (article 49) contains a provision that correspondence (except when it bears C. O. D. charges) addressed to prisoners of war or mailed by them is exempt from all postal charges. That provision appears to be taken from the treaty of Geneva mentioned above.

The Department has given notice with reference to regular mails (section 32, part II of the Postal Guide), that articles addressed to prisoners of war or mailed by them are exempt from all postal charges, not only in the countries of origin and destination, but also in the intermediate countries, and that the same is true of correspondence concerning prisoners of war, sent or received either directly or as intermediary by the information offices which may be established on behalf of such persons in belligerent countries or in neutral countries which have received belligerents on their territory. Notice is given in section 71 of said part II of the Postal Guide, that parcel-post packages addressed to specific individual prisoners of war, either directly or through the intermediary of authorized information offices, shall be exempt from all postal charges, both in the countries of origin and destination and in the intermediary countries, such parcels for prisoners of war to be accepted even though regular parcel-post service for the country of destination may be suspended. Special notices with respect to parcels for prisoners of war were published in the Postal Bulletins of July 12, 1940, and October 4, 1940.

It appears that appropriate publicity has been given by this Department of the availability of service for transmission of articles free of postage for prisoners of war.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, here are some salient facts about our universal union, for which I am indebted to the office of the Postmaster General:

UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION

The first International Postal Conference met at Paris, France, in 1863.

The first International Postal Congress met at Berne, Switzerland, in 1874.

Universal Postal Union Congresses have met subsequently at Paris, France, 1878; Lisbon, Portugal, 1885; Vienna, Austria, 1891; Washington, D. C., 1897; Rome, Italy, 1906; Madrid, Spain, 1920; Stockholm, Sweden, 1924; London, England, 1929; Cairo, Egypt, 1934; Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1939.

The next congress is scheduled to meet at Paris, France, in 1944.

A Victorious Battle—Parity for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, practically the entire time of this Congress in these days of world chaos is consumed in the urgent importance of preparing this country for a war that exists abroad and which may spread to our own beloved country before the end of strife is seen. With that proposition of preparedness I have no fault to find. On the contrary, for several years I have been among the warmest advocates of such a plan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, during my tenure as a Member of this great legislative body I have advocated, in season and out of season, two principles, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will reflect. First, since Mr. Hitler became the head of the German Government I have seen, in my humble way, that he was bent upon world domination and have advocated the preparedness of this country to meet the threat of Hitlerism because I believed that the only argument that Messrs. Hitler and Mussolini would listen to would be an armed force and equipment superior to their own. But even prior to the advent of the doctrine of brute force and fascism as advocated by Hitler and Mussolini, I have consistently called the attention of the House to the ever-increasing dilemma of the farmers of this country and the doctrine of parity payments as its cure. And so today, Mr. Speaker, realizing that if the objective of a well-rounded defense program is achieved, it is essential that we also see to it that our domestic problems are met. The two go hand in hand. For the defense program cannot be realized in its

fullness without a contented and prosperous people to back it up.

PARITY PAYMENTS

But, Mr. Speaker, those of us in the American Congress who have from day to day continuously advocated the principle of parity payments for the basic crops were delighted and heartened to learn that the President on yesterday signed the bill which has heretofore passed the Congress, providing for mandatory loans up to 85 percent of parity on the basic agricultural commodities of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and tobacco. This means that another great milestone along the march of progress to full parity payments has been passed. It means that the President of the United States, who has been charged in some quarters with being lukewarm and indifferent to the plight of the American farmer, has realized the necessity for and the logic of the doctrine of parity payments to the farmers of America. But more than that it means that the southern cotton farmer and the western and eastern wheat farmer, as well as the western corn farmer, is assured of at least 85 percent of parity for his crops. But it means more than that. It means that the loan, plus the cash parity payments, plus the soil-conservation payments in cash will assure the southern cotton farmer of full parity of approximately 16 cents per pound for his next year's cotton crop. Mr. Speaker, I know of no news in this day of bad news that has been as heartening as that which flashed over the wires on yesterday, bearing the good tidings to the hard-pressed farmers of America everywhere that the President had signed the bill. It means a day of great rejoicing in the rural sections of this country. It means stabilization of prices, a sense of security to the farmers, and increased purchasing power. It means a revival in business, which is already on the upturn.

PARITY PAYMENTS GOOD ECONOMY

Mr. Speaker, when this legislation was before the Congress the argument was made that this was no time to increase payments to the farmers when we are so busily engaged in spending money on our defense program. But I have already pointed out to you that the one is a part of the other. And while there are still some die-hards who will continue to criticize the Congress for passing the legislation and the President for signing the bill, I maintain that it is still good economy to enact such legislation. It is good economy not alone for the morale of our people in these turbulent times, but it is good economy because it increases the purchasing power of 25 percent of the American people. I believe in economy where economy should properly be practiced. I believe the membership of the House is familiar with my record for advocating economy in the nonessentials of government. And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, if I may digress, it will be recalled by some of you that I was severely criticized and falsely attacked by some newspapers recently because I did object to the Government furnishing such frills as electric stoves, ice boxes, and appliances of a similar nature to defense workers who receive from $5 to $20 a day, such items to be paid for by the Government while the farmers and other citizens of the country had to go down in their own pockets to purchase such articles. But on the other hand, I have never had much patience with those watchdogs of the Treasury in the Congress who are continuously raising the flag of economy every time the question of financial assistance to the farmers of the country arises.

I dislike to bore you with a repetition of the facts, but to you my colleagues who represent the great cities of this country in the House, I hope you will pardon me if I again emphasize for your benefit that if the farmers of Mississippi and other States of the Union cannot get a fair income for the crops which they produce, they cannot purchase the automobiles, the farm machinery, the clothes they wear on their backs and the shoes they wear on their feet—all of which are manufactured in your great cities. If your interest is only in your city constituents, you can still best represent them by going along with us on this farm legislation, because if my people cannot purchase the products which your people manufacture then your people will soon be out of employment.

DEFINITION OF PARITY

But before I proceed further it might not be amiss to again define just what we mean by parity prices for farmers. Parity price, or fair exchange value, has been defined by Congress as a price level that will give agricultural commodities purchasing power in terms of articles that farmers buy equivalent to the purchasing power of agricultural commodities in the 5 years before World War No. 1. This 5-year period, 1909–14, was taken as the parity period because that was a period in which there was a balanced production on farms, and agriculture was in a fair balance with the rest of the Nation. Or roughly and more briefly speaking, what we intend and mean to do is to place agriculture in a fair and balanced relation with the other industries of the Nation. Parity for cotton today is approximately 16 cents per pound.

For the benefit of all concerned I submit herewith a table furnished by the Department of Agriculture which shows the parity price of the five basic commodities, together with the farm prices of February 15, 1941. This table reflects the fact that cotton is bringing 59.2 percent of parity and gives other interesting data. The table is as follows:

Commodity	Unit	Parity price at Feb. 15, 1941	Farm price 1940 crop	Farm price percent of parity	Farm price, including 1940 A. C. P.	Farm price plus A. C. P. payment, percent of parity
		Cents	*Cents*	*Percent*	*Cents*	*Percent*
Cotton	Pound	15.87	9.39	59.2	10.83	68.2
Corn	Bushel	82.2	62.4	75.9	71.4	86.0
Wheat	Bushel	113.2	67.0	59.2	75.1	66.9
Rice	Hundredweight	231.3	156.0	67.4	161.85	70.3
Tobacco	Pound	20.0	15.7	78.5	16.6	83.0

OTHER COMMODITY PRICES INCREASING

And in this connection I should like to call your attention to the fact that due to the defense program, the high wages being paid industrial workers, the demand for coal, steel, and other commodities, the price of everything the farmer has to purchase is constantly going higher and higher, and can anyone doubt for a moment that with this increased demand for defense that the prices of commodities other than farm products are bound to rise?

The farmer today is receiving around 10 cents per pound for his cotton, whereas parity would be around 16 cents. Compare the price the farmer receives for his cotton with the price that he must pay for some of the items which he uses in connection with his farm. The following table is furnished by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

Parity prices of selected industrial commodities purchased by farmers, Dec. 15, 1940

Commodity	Base retail price to farmers, 1910–14	Parity price Dec. 15, 1940[1]	Actual retail price to farmers, Dec. 15, 1940	Actual as percentage of parity
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Percent*
Mower, 5-foot	47.76	48.24	97.14	201
Binder, 7-foot	138.00	139.00	259.00	186
Paint	1.94	1.96	2.85	145
Lumber, rough	24.94	25.19	46.20	183
Kitchen chairs	.81	.82	1.56	190
Horse blanket	2.47	2.49	3.50	141
Work shoes	2.20	2.22	2.59	117
Barbed wire	2.74	2.77	3.54	128
Newspapers	.1–0.2	---	.3	300
Newspaper adv	5.5	5.5	11.5	201

[1] Computed by multiplying base price × index of prices received by farmers, 101 on Dec. 15, 1940 (August 1909–July 1914=100). The term "parity price" has not been officially used in connection with industrial commodities. They are shown here to indicate what prices of industrial commodities would have been on Dec. 15, 1940, if the relationships with prices received by farmers in 1910–14 had been carried through to the present.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Based on data from Agricultural Marketing Service.

Thus it will be seen that while the farmer is receiving far less than parity for what he produces, he is paying more than twice parity for the implements and supplies which he must have in order to produce his products. Or, to illustrate more graphically, let me call your attention to the fact that the farmer receives 7 cents for the cotton that goes into a cotton shirt for which he pays $1. Certainly this should shock the conscience of those who claim that the farmers are getting along all right. I say to you very frankly that if it were not for some kind of a farm subsidy the farmer could not exist in this complex and complicated age in which we live.

FARM OUTLOOK NOT PROMISING

I realize that there are those Members of the House who feel that due to the industrial boom as a result of the defense program somehow or other the farmer will be able to get along all right. I contend that this is a very narrow, selfish, and unwarranted position to take. The truth is that this program is helping nearly everybody but the farmer. And it must be borne in mind that in this war, unlike World War I, the price of agricultural commodities is not skyrocketing like the price of labor, materials, and other essentials that go into the industrial program. This is largely due to the fact that in the last war practically all

of Europe, in addition to Russia and Japan, was either an ally of this country arrayed against Germany or were neutral. As a result there was a great demand for the products of this country. In this war the situation is entirely different, as practically all of these countries, with the exception of Great Britain, are either allied with the Germans or are under German domination and control. The result is that there is no market abroad, excepting Great Britain, for the wheat, corn, and cotton of the American farmers. So the American farmer who has always depended upon the foreign market for the surplus produced over the domestic market, must now look to the domestic market alone. We all realize that the domestic consumption cannot keep pace with production. And therefore the American farmer has but one source of relief to look to in order that he might receive anything like parity prices for his products, and that is the American Congress.

FARMERS AT LAST SECURING RECOGNITION

Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress who represent agricultural districts have been working ceaselessly for years in an effort to secure recognition of the farmers by assuring them of parity payments for their crops; and because of our untiring interest and efforts we were extremely gratified to learn that this bill had become law. In this connection I should like to quote below from a speech which I made in behalf of parity payments on the floor of this House on March 24, 1940:

Mr. Chairman, last fall the President of the United States called the Congress into extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting a neutrality bill that would keep this country out of war so far as it was humanly possible by legislation to do so. The Congress enacted that legislation. You and I were primarily interested in keeping this country out of war. We said by that legislation that we were willing to make substantial economic sacrifices in order to keep out of war. We did make the greatest and most colossal sacrifice that any powerful nation like ours has ever made in an effort to keep out of war and to prevent millions of young Americans from spilling their blood on the altar of the god of war But may I not point out to you that possibly among the chief sufferers and among those who were called upon to make the greatest sacrifices were the farmers of this country when by virtue of this neutrality law we kept our ships from going to the ports of belligerent nations and required cash payments for our products, thereby lessening the opportunity of the farmers of this country to dispose of their surplus agricultural commodities. Shall we now deny them this appropriation to partially offset that sacrifice? The farmers of America have throughout the ages demonstrated their patriotism and their loyalty to this country from the minutemen of '76 down the years through the last great World War. Let us not, in this effort to prevent this country from becoming drawn into this war, turn the back of our hands to the farmers by requiring them to make all of the sacrifices. I hope in common fairness and justice to t hat great class of our patriotic American citizenship—the farmers of America, who number 25 percent of our population—that this House will appropriate these necessary funds for these necessary parity payments.

CONCLUSION

So, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House, and especially those of you who represent the farming interests of this country, I felicitate you and join with you in expressing the appreciation of the American farmer, who is still the backbone of the Nation and the source of all true wealth, that this bill has successfully passed over the rugged path that all controversial legislation must pass. I rejoice in the thought that your and my efforts in behalf of parity payments throughout the battle of the past several years has at least been temporarily won. But it might not be amiss to point out at this time that the necessity for full and not temporary parity payments is as essential as ever. We rejoice in having won this battle. Let us not desist until we have won the war and achieved the goal of a stable and permanent farm economy of not less than 100 percent parity payments.

Aid for England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

LETTER TO HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, FROM HON. JOSEPH A. CONRY, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from a former Member of Congress, Hon. Joseph A. Conry:

I am appealing to you gentlemen of the House representing liberty-loving constituents to take decisive stand upon this vital matter of securing safe delivery to England of the war material we are now making in our factories, to aid England in its splendid struggle for its own existence and the welfare of humanity. Too often have we heard from well-meaning men the refrain "let us give to England all aid short of war," implying that we are justified in committing every act of war known to the books except making a formal declaration of war. The common enemy of civilization can make war without such antique formality as a declaration of war. We have authorized the expenditure of $7,000,000,000 to be employed in producing war materials for the use of England in carrying on its defense of civilization. Is it a characteristic of our common sense that we will spend all that money watching anxiously for the production of all the material and then when the results of our labor are placed on board a vessel we lose all interest in their final delivery? It is tantalizing, not to say exasperating, to see the result of our effort destroyed by our own negligence. We have promised England to provide a vast supply of arms and airships and other implements of war—a promise going a long way toward upholding the morale of the English people. Was it a qualified promise, indicating that our interest ended when the material was delivered at the dock? An ignoble attitude. All of you gentlemen recall that old phrase "Dead Sea fruit," immortalized by Thomas Moore, the most successful of the brilliant set of Irish literary men of the nineteenth century. In his lovely poem, Lalla Rookh, he wrote of—

"The Dead Sea fruit that tempts the eye
But turns to ashes on the lips."

Are we to liken our supply of war material as so much Dead Sea fruit for England? We are building the weapons to be used in what we believe to be a fight for freedom of conscience, of religion, of speech, and the press. If these words represent the feelings of our soul, we must be vigorous in performance of our promise. Whatever may have been her past failings, perhaps they are plenty in number, England today represents the hopes and aspirations of all free men in carrying on the greatest struggle among people known to recorded history. It is not necessary for me to remind you of the destruction of all the small states of Europe from Norway down to Greece. Their mangled bodies withering in the hot summer sun mean something more than the decay of flesh; they testify to the annihilation of the institutions we love, the church and free school, the right of the individual to regulate his own affairs. And I regret that the subjugated states are not all the small states. There is France, once glorious France, half prostrate by the conqueror's knee, willing to surrender the remnant of her rights, to accept a victor's peace, even if that entails warlike conduct directed at her former allies. In my home State of Massachusetts we are deeply sympathetic with Ireland. It was Captain Gifford, of New Bedford, who effected the rescue of John Boyle O'Reilly, a distinguished Irish-American poet. I believe that 95 percent of the men of Irish ancestry in America are sympathetic with England in this struggle. I am not arguing or even hinting at the matter of Eire turning over any of her ports for the use of England, but I can mention with much satisfaction the reports in the papers this morning of the generous amount of support promised by the President to Eire in ships and food. My purpose in bringing in this matter is to call your attention to the possibility of those ships containing food and medicine intended for the people of Ireland being sunk by Nazi submarines. Are we then to sympathize with Ireland in words, when by acts we could have guaranteed the delivery of all supplies intended for relief? If England, the last bulwark of freedom in the Atlantic, goes down, will the fate of Ireland be at all different from that of Holland or Poland?

W. P. A.—Situation in the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent granted by my colleagues, I desire to insert the statement which I made May 26, 1941, before the Committee on Appropriations.

The statement referred to reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate being granted this privilege of appearing before you in support of increased appropriations for the Work Projects Administration. I favor the request made by Mr. Howard O. Hunter, Acting Commissioner, for an appropriation of $1,250,000,000 instead of the Budget estimate of $886,000,000, which latter sum I fear will prove to be wholly inadequate and result in widespread suffering and distress among our people.

I desire to call your attention to a statement prepared by the Division of Statistics, W. P. A., relating to the State of Washington, bearing date May 14, 1941, which I am inserting at this point.

The statement is as follows:

Month	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,000,000 for continental United States	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,265,000 for continental United States	Average monthly employment during fiscal year 1941
1941			
July	13,500	16,300	23,113
August	11,600	15,800	23,281
September	11,600	15,800	22,287
October	11,600	15,800	22,071
November	11,600	15,800	22,691
December	11,600	16,400	23,877
1942			
January	13,500	17,500	24,604
February	13,500	17,500	25,109
March	12,100	16,800	22,097
April	11,600	16,300	[1]21,000
May	11,100	16,000	[1]18,300
June	10,400	16,000	[2]16,590
Average for fiscal year	[3]11,900	[3]16,300	22,085

[1] Based on employment authorization.
[2] Based on tentative employment authorization.
[3] Estimated.

Estimated need as of May 1, 1941, 24,185.

Employment on W. P. A. projects[1] in Washington by congressional districts,[2] Apr. 30, 1940

Congressional district number:	Number of persons
All districts	20,082
Undistributed by district	2,596
Districts 1, 2, and 6	10,764
District 3	3,064
District 4	1,803
District 5	1,855

[1] Includes W. P. A. projects operated by other Federal agencies and financed by allocation of W. P. A. funds.

[2] As the county is the smallest governmental subdivision for which W. P. A. employment is available, congressional districts are combined where a county is located in more than 1 congressional district.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
DIVISION OF STATISTICS.

MAY 14, 1941.

Gentlemen, as shown by this statement, in my State of Washington the average monthly employment on the W. P. A. for the fiscal year 1941 is estimated at 22,805 persons, and the estimated average for the fiscal year, if only $886,000,000 is made available for the entire Nation, will be 11,900 persons, a reduction of nearly 50 percent. This is too drastic a cut and will throw these people out of employment without any means of obtaining jobs or financial assistance of any kind. Many of these men and women are past the age when they can secure employment, most of them are unskilled, and the national-defense program is of no benefit to them. I have received vigorous protests against this action from the county commissioners of Thurston, Cowlitz, and Grays Harbor Counties, among the largest counties in my district, and, in fact, from all my 9 counties.

Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to a fact of great importance. I am advised that 60 percent of those who are employed on W. P. A. in the State of Washington are working on projects which have been certified as essential to national defense—airports, cantonments, barracks, and projects classified as being related to national defense directly or indirectly. I am told that this percentage of 60 percent in the State of Washington is the highest in any State in the Nation and is due to the vast national-defense program in our State; but it is already an established fact that the persons employed on these W. P. A. projects have not been and will not be employed on the national-defense program—either they are too old or they do not possess the technical skill. To throw so many of these worthy citizens into the streets is certainly not good for our national morale at a time when we should seek to keep our people contented and united and prove to them that democratic processes do function in the interests of their social and economic welfare. I question very seriously the soundness and wisdom of such a short-sighted policy as that, and I question whether it is sound economy. It appears to me to be the very contrary of that, and I do not hesitate to condemn such a policy as undemocratic, un-American, and detrimental to the spirit of our entire national-defense objective.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I therefore urge that you fix the appropriation for W. P. A. for the ensuing fiscal year at $1,250,000,000, the amount which Mr. Hunter states is necessary and needed to give this meager employment to the unemployed men and women of our country, who will otherwise have no source of income whatsoever and face starvation, destitution, and want, which would be criminal folly at this critical juncture in our national history.

Must Clear Up Confusion About Money and Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX CITY (IOWA) TRIBUNE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune:

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune]

MUST CLEAR UP CONFUSION ABOUT MONEY AND WEALTH

Acting under the authority of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Iowa General Assembly, Gov. George A. Wilson soon will appoint a committee of five members of the Iowa State Senate and five members of the Iowa Lower House to conduct an investigation of the economic situation of this good State.

The resolution was inspired by the fact that Iowa, along with the other 47 States of this Union, achieved an all-time peak of income in 1929 which it has not since been able to duplicate. The Iowa legislators want to know how that 1929 peak was achieved and why it has been impossible to duplicate it in the 11 years that have elapsed since 1929.

The statistical record of Iowa's income, like that of the Nation as a whole, reveals some rather startling facts. The 12-year record follows:

Year:	*Iowa income*
1929	$1,227,000,000
1930	1,153,000,000
1931	883,000,000
1932	622,000,000
1933	594,000,000
1934	731,000,000
1935	937,000,000
1936	1,058,000,000
1937	1,090,000,000
1938	900,000,000
1939	986,000,000
1940	1,050,000,000

Had the 1929 level of income been maintained during the 11 years 1930-40, inclusive, Iowa's total for that period would have been $13,497,000,000 as against the $9,782,000,000 actually received, a difference of $3,705,000,000.

That $3,705,000,000, representing the difference between what Iowans actually received in the 11 years from 1930 to 1940, inclusive, and what they would have received in those 11 years had income been maintained at the 1929 level, amounts to about $7,000 for each of Iowa's 550,000 families—say, $5,000 for a home, $1,000 for furniture, and $1,000 for a new car.

Not that each family would have received that exact amount, but the equivalent of that amount would have been received and spent or saved or reinvested by Iowa people.

When we turn to the production and work records of Iowa for the same period, it is discovered that throughout the 12 years under discussion, Iowans produced about the same number of bushels of corn, wheat, oats, and other farm crops, hogs, cattle, and other farm animals, and about the same number of units of factory goods each year. There was some variation in the annual production, but it was not sufficient to account for the vast variation in income. In other words, Iowans have been producing steadily about the same amount of wealth, year in and year out, but they have not been receiving a stable return for their labor.

Clearly, then, the fault does not lie in the production record nor in the amount of labor performed. The variation in the return for our labor and upon our investments must be charged to the pricing system under which Iowans, like all Americans, have been required to operate.

A pricing system which yields such variable and—too often—inadequate results must be the product of misunderstanding of and confusion concerning the fundamentals of money and wealth. It certainly is not the will of society at large that our collective business should yield such variable returns.

Money in itself is not wealth—merely an evidence of wealth, a stored-up order or demand upon the labor of others or goods produced by others. Wealth—real wealth—consists of things, such as crops, goods, land, buildings, etc.

Income is determined by multiplying the units of wealth produced by the price per unit thereof. We thereby arrive at the amount of money due us individually—or collectively—for the products of our labor, investments, etc.

Extraneous matters, such as gold, silver, greenbackism, credit, inflation, deflation, for-

eign trade, etc., have been permitted to dictate prices which have no direct relationship to values. These have confused the people and probably have prevented them from solving their price problems.

The Iowa legislative committee which Governor Wilson will appoint will have a great opportunity to perform an enduring service for society by discovering the cause—or causes—of price fluctuations and the means to put prices on a sound and adequate basis and sustain them at that level.

That must be done before Iowans or other Americans can achieve stable and enduring prosperity. The fact that it never has been done is not proof that it cannot be done. To say that it cannot be done is an indictment of American initiative and intelligence.

Faith in the intellectual ability and integrity of Iowans inspires belief that this committee can, and probably will, measure up to the responsibility which will be imposed upon it. Certainly the facts in our situation constitute a challenge to the best efforts of those whom the Governor will appoint.

Blood on the Tiger's Tongue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD W. CREAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 18, an editorial appeared in the Washington Post suggesting that the President veto the parity loan bill. In one statement it said this administration has already done more for the farmer than any administration in history. With that statement all will agree but it should be remembered that at the time such aid was rendered the farm conditions had dropped to its lowest ebb in history and it took a great deal to get partly back to the place from which the farmer took his long plunge downward.

In another paragraph of the National Capital paper it says:

"To give more subsidies to agriculture would have about the same effect as putting blood on the tongue of a tiger in the hope of satisfying his appetite."

Parity is only another name for equality, and I presume no one would be so bold as to say that he was opposed to equality. It is a fine theory to say that all men are created free and equal, but that is useless unless we help to maintain equality after created. When more than one-fourth of our population—in fact, nearly one-third—receive 8 percent of the national income, what has become of equality?

But the farmer asks now for 85 percent of equality while others receive 100 percent, and for this asking he is compared with a bloodthirsty tiger. From 1909 to 1914 farm prices were nearer on an equality with the prices of things the farmer had to buy. It is this period of time which is used as the base for parity prices, all except tobacco, which has a different date.

Everyone knows that every strike we read about these days is settled by granting higher wages to labor. We also know that these articles made by labor will increase the cost to the farmer. He also pays for the voluntary raises made by capital when they want more profits. Both of these kinds of raises have been recently made, and to leave the farmer without a corresponding raise is just the same as reducing his present farm prices.

It really does not matter about prices, whether they be high or low, so long as there is equality of value in the exchange. If 5 bushels of corn buys a pair of shoes, the price of either does not matter, but when it takes 7 or 10 bushels to buy the same shoes, then we are out of parity and there is no fair exchange of values. The factory gets its parity by reason of the tariff shielding it from outside competition and then, unhampered, it fixes its own price. Labor secured parity by superior organization. The farmer cannot organize like labor and demand his price and the tariff is only of scant benefit.

Alexander Hamilton, the leading exponent of tariff for industry, said the farmer should have from the Government the equivalent of the tariff. In other words, he believed in what we now call parity. However, no move was made to give parity until very recently.

The estimated average return for labor on the farm is 18 cents per hour. How does that compare with labor, no more skilled and no harder work, which receives $1 per hour for an 8-hour day with a rate of $1.50 per hour for overtime?

The editorial also complains that Members from farm districts lug in some angle of the farm question on all sorts of legislation. If they did not, who would? Who is a Member from a farm district supposed to represent? Other interests have their own champions and own spokesmen. When big business got into deep trouble in 1932 and 1933 they came flocking to Washington to get all sorts of relief and received it. When the farmer in equal distress comes to the same place it is regarded as "Putting blood on the tongue of a tiger," so says the editorial.

The farmer gets $3.50 for the wheat that makes a barrel of flour; when it goes into bread by the loaf it retails for $23.60. The same comparison goes with nearly ever other farm product. Now a lot of the finished product of the factory reaches the consumer with only 20 to 30 percent increase for middlemen.

All the metropolitan papers mention the rise in food prices if the farmer gets parity. None ever suggests that any of the many profits of the middlemen could be reduced a fraction of a cent. If the consumer of farm products pays only the percent of raise received by the farmer it will be very slight. His pay is the smallest item in the article bought by the consumer. It is claimed by those in position to know that the parity program will require a loan between two and three hundred millions of dollars. Suppose the latter figure is nearer correct. This program is for corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco linked together. The Federal Treasury collected last year from tobacco taxes $609,000,000—more than double the amount to finance the whole program.

Thirty to forty cents of every dollar spent by the farmer is for the tariff to protect the article bought. Now comes higher wages to be added to that cost. We want the factory to remain protected; we want labor to have a fair price, but why ask the farmer to bear both these items of added cost. All that is asked is that he too may stand on equality in trading values. He cannot sit around the council table like big industry and decide how much will be produced and at what price. He cannot strike and get his price. His only refuge is Congress and by such legislation as the parity-price bill.

The amount loaned by the Government is not lost even if there should be some loss. The Government has the products on which the loan was made. Of course, the Government could not make loans and allow unlimited production. When the parity program is fully organized the Government loans will be very light because the purchaser of the commodity will have to pay at least the parity price to get it, as this only serves as a price booster compelling a minimum price equal to the loan value.

It must always be remembered that all sources of new wealth come from the ground. Look yourself over from head to foot, walk in any store and scan the articles in it and see if you can find even one that did not come from mother earth directly or indirectly. Of course, the shoe is made of leather but the animal it came from fed on the product of the soil. Now the farm products make up the greatest bulk of things from the soil and the farm is therefore the greatest source of new wealth we have.

After this dollar of new wealth is once made and pitched into the stream of commerce this other two-thirds of the population fight over it, some grabbing more and more grabbing less. Capitalists, great financiers, and governments who fail to make ample provision for the fair protection of the producer of the new wealth are penny wise and pound foolish.

God made the country, man made the cities long afterward, when the farms became sufficiently prosperous to support the cities.

No truer statement was ever uttered when W. J. Bryan said:

If you destroy the cities the farms will soon rebuild them, but destroy the farm and within 6 months grass will grow in the streets of every city in the land.

Towns in rural areas fully appreciate this and their leading businessmen cooperate in every way to help farm organizations. The big city is just as dependent but so far removed from the source of their existence that they forget the farmer and his problems.

If we had received even 60 percent of parity prices most farms lost would still have been in the hands of their owners. If we had received parity, soil depletion would not have been so great and land could have been rested and restored by soil-building crops. The Government is now paying for the shortsightedness of long years of neglect.

The Government is not spending any millions running down Communists and

Fascists among the farm population. It is not spending to put down strikes among farmers nor paying for mediation boards to settle the farmer's grievances.

The farmer has been patient, even too patient, in demanding equality or parity. He has accepted his declining conditions in silence; he has seen the farm which his father left him sold under foreclosure and he became a part of the unemployed. Because of these conditions the farm population flocked to the overcrowded cities. Then the Government spent millions for W. P. A. city projects to give him labor. He would not have been there had he shared equality or parity.

It is to the best interest of this Nation that the people on the farms stay there and the tide to the city cease.

Failure to have parity prices in the past cost the Government more later in various forms of relief. More rural electrification and rural road building will help wonderfully to keep folks on the farm; but even that will not solve it until parity price, equality in exchange of commodities, is the law of the land.

Having been booted about and made the economic goat, the farmer asks for equality or parity, and for his appeal to justice for a square deal he is likened unto a tiger with blood on his tongue to inflame his appetite—so says the editor of a great national daily paper in the Capital City.

Now the bears and bulls of the stock market that grow fat on manipulating the markets of farm products may have blood on their tongues to influence their appetite, but not the tiger spoken of. If the tiger is hungry, it is because all the other boys left him shut up so long in the cage of narrow opportunity while they rode the band wagons, enjoying more of life and receiving their parity prices. Equality for all, special privileges to none, must become more of a reality and not a mere slogan. Parity for the farmer is the most needed step now.

Can anyone, anywhere, offer any sound reason why the farming portion of the population is entitled to less pay for his day's work than similar work in other occupations?

Is a man in Congress who stands up and fights for these rights for his people asking equality of opportunity a tiger with blood on his tongue? The farm people do not think so and the farmer does not regard himself as such in asking to be placed on an equality with his fellow man in other walks of life.

For my part I shall always look back with great consolation and pleasure in being on the Committee on Agriculture at the time this long-delayed appeal for justice was heard and granted, notwithstanding the sharp criticisms and epithets of any editors of metropolitan papers.

If we had to wait for some metropolitan papers to raise a voice on our behalf the farmer would sink into total obscurity. I congratulate my farmer friends in at last being able to stand together and secure equality, parity, and common justice. It explodes the old theory that farmers cannot get together and that they neither remember nor appreciate their friends. This may have been the case in the past but not today.

The program is of equal importance to every businessman residing in a farm area.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project Draws Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ARTICLE FROM BUFFALO COURIER EXPRESS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following article from the Buffalo Courier Express which draws attention to an article in the May 22 issue of the Engineering News-Record. This is a weekly periodical with a circulation of over 32,000. Their statements must necessarily be up to date and authoritative. They have recently made a survey of the St. Lawrence seaway proposal and this article quotes from that survey, indicating that such a construction should not be considered at this time when all attention and materials should be devoted to defense work.

The article follows:

NEW YORK, May 22.—Declaring that the St. Lawrence seaway cannot be completed in time for use as a defense measure, the Engineering News-Record said today the project should not be started while this country and Canada are devoted to defense work.

The publication, after a survey of the project, asserts "that because Canada did not want to start the St. Lawrence project while engaged in defense work, the Roosevelt administration, in writing the agreement, made it attractive to Canada by failing to insist on equalization of the diversions of water for power at Niagara and by not calling for international control over the large amount of power that Canada now exports to this country."

The survey showed that export of grain, claimed to be the chief commodity that would move through the canal, had declined steadily since 1928 "and probably will continue to decline" due to the war, the magazine said.

The weekly added that the 27-foot seaway might be outdated before completion due to changes taking place in commerce vessels—as the result of "the sinking of so many ships." Most of the 500 craft being built by the United States Maritime Commission will require more than a 27-foot depth when loaded with bulky commodities.

Mr. Speaker, further objection to the St. Lawrence seaway construction is voiced in the resolution of the United Irish-American Societies of New York, which is also included herewith for insertion in the RECORD. This was forwarded to me by the committee on resolutions for this society and represents a vast number of American citizens and taxpayers who are thoroughly aroused over the exorbitant, extravagant expenditure of Federal funds for the construction of this unnecessary seaway project:

THE UNITED IRISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote of the delegates who attended a meeting of the United Irish-American Societies of New York at Eighty-sixth Street Garden, 160 East Eighty-sixth Street, New York, on Wednesday evening, March 26, 1941:

Resolved, That we, delegates to the United Irish-American Societies of New York, renew our opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway treaty or agreement with Canada, which the President has submitted to Congress with a request that it be approved by a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, instead of by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, as section 2 of article II of the Constitution requires. We oppose the treaty in whatever form it may be considered by Congress for these reasons:

Because it would internationalize United States inland waters, over which it would give a foreign government joint control; because the executive department of our Government has agreed to spend at least three and a half times as much on the project as Canada; because the St. Lawrence waterway scheme, if carried through, would ruin industry and commerce in New York and other United States maritime cities by diverting from them a large part of their ocean traffic, and would wreck established transportation agencies and cause widespread unemployment and consequent distress in several United States cities; because the waterway, under dual control, would increase and complicate the problems of national defense and would build up, by a vast expenditure of the money of the taxpayers of this country, a Canadian electric power subsidy, which would enable Dominion industry to get electricity for about half the price which would have to be paid for it in New York State.

For the foregoing reasons, we, delegates to the United Irish-American Societies of New York, opposed the St. Lawrence waterway treaty or agreement, and we request the Members of both Houses of Congress, particularly those who represent the city and State of New York, to vote against ratification or approval of it and against the colossal appropriation which is asked for the project.

P. QUINN,
For the Committee on Resolutions.

Tree Losses in the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger:

TREE LOSSES STIR NORTHWEST—CITIZENS, STATE, AND FEDERAL GROUPS UNITE AGAINST LOGGING WASTE AND FIRES

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

PORTLAND, OREG., May 3.—With the national-defense program calling for immense quan-

tities of lumber, the people of the Pacific Northwest are seeking improved methods of preserving and maintaining the region's basic resource—fir and pine trees. Conservation has become a major issue in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, which lock in their upland fastnesses half the timber of the United States.

An endless supply of planks and boards is needed for American cantonments, airplane hangars, barracks, and ship frames and fittings. Beleaguered England, too, requires forest products. Logging camps and sawmills are operating far into the dusk. Fly-by-night outfits have sprung up in countless groves. Defense orders take precedence over regular demands. Piles of lumber stretch for miles along docks and railroad sidings, waiting shipment to distant military posts and bases.

Because of this heavy new drain on the woodlands, State governments, private citizens, and Federal agencies have begun a vigorous campaign to check forest fires and indiscriminate, wasteful logging. "Forest defense is national defense" is the slogan of a committee just formed by Governor Sprague of Oregon. "Keep Washington green" is the motto of a similar organization to the north.

GOVERNMENT'S WARNING

Although power from Bonneville Dam has made possible huge new electrochemical industries on the Columbia River, lumber is still the principal pay roll of the Northwest. Drastic thinning out of the trees might result in severe economic dislocations, according to the United States Forest Service, which has warned that certain mill communities will become ghost towns unless the annual rate of timber cutting is brought into balance with the process of new growth

The Oregon Legislature recently enacted the first forest reseeding law ever adopted in the Nation. On lumber companies it imposes what Governor Sprague describes as "sharp but fair restrictions." All pine trees less than 16 inches in diameter must be spared, and in fir logging at least 5 percent of the original timber must be left standing. This is to prevent "cut-out-and-get-out" operations which leave hillsides gutted and bare.

At the present time sawmills, fires, and insects claim 14,000,000,000 board-feet of lumber in the Northwest each year. The annual growth is less than half this, 6,000,000,000 board feet. Although the region is a vast woodland storehouse which contains 900,000,000,000 board feet of timber, not all this is by any means marketable and axes and saws are constantly cutting deeper into the green carpet of the wilderness. Some mills, once stockaded by trees, are now hundreds of miles from their supply.

BASIC REMEDY

As a basic remedy, the Forest Service and the National Resources Committee have proposed that the lumber industry be placed under a program of sustained yield. This would mean that the cut would have to match the growth. Now before Congress is a bill sponsored by Representative WALTER M. PIERCE, of Oregon, authorizing the Forest Service to purchase $60,000,000 worth of the best timber in the Northwest. The timber then would be sold, stick by stick, on a sustained-yield basis.

Some lumber companies and State officials have condemned the Pierce bill as an imperfect solution and an arbitrary extension of Federal authority. However, E. B. MacNaughton, prominent Portland banker and chairman of the Oregon economic council, believes its passage is necessary "to insure continuation of the timber industry during the generations to come."

Crusades against forest fires have been accelerated in all the States of the Northwest. Authorities fear that the dry, sultry days of the mountain summer may furnish opportunity for sabotage. Lyle F. Watts, regional United States forester, has ordered rangers and wardens to redouble their vigilance, and new lookout stations have been built. A survey has been started on how best to safeguard the strategic Puget Sound and Columbia River areas against blazes set by saboteurs.

Ten Thousand Americans of Polish Extraction Pledge Support to President Roosevelt in War Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

RESOLUTIONS BY AMERICANS OF POLISH EXTRACTION ASSEMBLED IN BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolutions adopted by an assembly of over 10,000 Americans of Polish extraction gathered at Humboldt Park in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., on May 25, 1941, in celebration of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution:

Whereas we celebrate today the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption by the Polish Diet in 1791 of the world-famous Polish Constitution of May 3, the first liberal constitution based on sound democratic principles in all Europe; and

Whereas we hold in common with our friends and relatives in Poland, scattered today to all parts of the world, the priceless "blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity" guaranteed to us as citizens of these United States by the American Constitution of 1789 and the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas in this hour of momentous decisions and national problems threatening the continuance of our democratic way of life we stand united and ready to defend and preserve for the world these fundamental blessings of liberty and justice; and

Whereas we appreciate and enjoy religious freedom while, according to reports compiled by the office of Cardinal Hlond, the primate of Poland and the archbishop of Gniezno and Poznan, our unfortunate brothers suffer indescribable persecution and suppression of all religious life in Poland; and

Whereas communistic Russia continues her systematic deportation into Siberia of thousands of destitute men, women, and children who are unable to survive the rigor of hard labor and severe cold; and

Whereas Nazi Germany continues its plan of extermination of the Polish Nation by mass arrests, imprisonments, concentration camps, and execution of national leaders, priests, and nuns, professional men, and young students; also by expropriating and evicting hundreds of thousands of Poles from their land and settling thereon Germans from the Baltic States and the Balkans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this assembly of over 10,000 loyal Americans of Polish extraction gathered at Humboldt Park in Buffalo, N. Y., for the purpose of celebrating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, rededicate itself to the cause of freedom and human rights based on "the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God"; and be it further

Resolved, That we pledge our loyal support to whatever plan of action shall be deemed necessary by our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States of America and by the Congress to employ every means necessary to insure the prompt and uninterrupted delivery to Great Britain and her allies of the material they need from our "arsenal of democracy" for the defense of Christian civilization and the safety of this Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we, as liberty-loving Americans, are willing to make such sacrifices as may be required for the defense of our liberty and the perpetuation of human rights in this world; and be it further

Resolved, That we solemnly pledge our continued aid for the relief of the suffering and the needy, wherever they be in this historic emergency; and finally be it

Resolved, That these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Senators and to our Representatives in the Congress from the State of New York.

Date: May 25, 1941.

Signed:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. ALEXANDER PITASS.
Dr. FRANCIS E. FRONCZAK.
STAN. SIELSKI.
STAN. TURKIEWICZ.
WLAD. KOSZTOWNIAK.
MARTA MAZUROWSKA.

U. S. S. "American Seaman"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ADDRESS BY COMMANDER W. N. DERBY, OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Commander W. N. Derby, United States Coast Guard, on the U. S. S. *American Seaman*, May 22, 1941:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, you who are gathered on the deck of this large oceangoing training ship, the *American Seaman*, will bear witness, I am sure, that she is worthy of the flag she flies. The ladies will note with approval the clean orderly living quarters and the immaculate galley. Those of us with seagoing experience see in the gleaming white paint, the shining bright work, and the shipshape maintenance an evidence of the pride and spirit of the ship's personnel.

This vessel may be regarded as a symbol of the transformation that is occurring in the American merchant marine under the magic touch of the Maritime Commission. Three years ago she was a rusty relic of the last war—a disreputable looking cargo vessel—abandoned, little more than a hulk. Now she's almost a glamor girl with all modern fixings; and I assure you that the transformation is more than skin deep. A corresponding change has occurred in the merchant marine as a whole. From a down-at-the-heel industry, carrying on mainly with weary vessels left over from the last war, it has changed to an energetic and fast-growing part of our national economy and national defense.

But I would emphasize particularly the personnel as dintinguished from the matériel phase of this maritime renaissance. You are familiar with the new ships that are sliding down the ways. Well, how about the crews who are to man those ships?

The *American Seaman* is a fair representative of the training units administered for the Maritime Commission by the Coast Guard. Other units are located at Boston, New London, New York, St. Petersburg, and Alameda. By August another station will open at Hueneme, Calif., and the *American Seaman* will be joined by two other training vessels of the same type—the *American Sailor* and the *Empire State*. Training facilities are provided for officers, radio operators, sailors, engine-room men, and personnel of the steward's department.

I ask you now to go back with me to a clear May day, 17 years ago. At that time I greeted a tall, clean-cut youth just out of high school on his arrival at a training ship in New London. Today he greeted me on my arrival on this training ship and I called him "captain." The recruit of 17 years ago is today Lieutenant Commander Vetterick, commanding the *American Seaman*.

With only slight variations I could repeat the same story relative to the chief engineer of this vessel, Lieutenant Braswell. Looking into the future we may reasonably foresee positions of leadership in the merchant marine for the apprentice seamen on this vessel—today they provide for our expanding maritime personnel—tomorrow they will lead it.

The mission of the maritime service is to provide trained and efficient personnel for our merchant marine. To accomplish that mission we must recruit healthy, vigorous, alert, young Americans of good character—train them in the operation of merchant vessels—and see that they find places in our merchant marine. These young men must be prepared to go aboard ship with a sound fundamental knowledge of their duties, and with a healthy, buoyant attitude toward their job and their country.

In the past 2 years this vessel has received on board hundreds of youths from all sections of the country and has sent them out to the ships of the Great Lakes and the seven seas. With the expansion now in progress thousands of these apprentices will be graduated to man our new merchant fleet. We have numerous letters from ship operators commending our graduates, and we have quantities of letters from the graduates telling of their good jobs at sea in skilled work. They have been trained for that work and they enter into it with a background of discipline, self-respect, and patriotism.

In conclusion, I offer you a familiar quotation from the Bible, from the 107th psalm:

"They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters; these see the works of the Lord and His wonders in the deep."

What Is Wrong With Our World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by myself appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Sunday, May 25, under the heading, "What Is Wrong With Our World?":

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 25, 1941]

WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR WORLD?

(By HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., Member of Congress, Seventh District, Pennsylvania)

In the relationship of humankind, man's violence toward his fellow man is surely foremost among his besetting sins. Not so long ago the Kellogg Pact outlawed "war as an instrument of national policy." Before the ink was dry, most of the signatories to that pact were preparing for the next conflict. Nowadays, like Mark Twain's famous remark about the weather, everybody talks about war, and nobody appears to be doing anything about it, other than to enlarge the scope of war's ruin and desolation.

As a nation we have made much of what we call national planning We project vast schemes for new housing. We plan broad, modern highways, new transportation systems, new methods of traffic control; we have new economic schemes for the more abundant life, new plans for scientific and technological advancement. We even plan for war—some say too little and too late, but we make our plans. What about plans for peace; surely that is worth planning for, too, yet in our recent history but one man has ever launched a comprehensive plan for peace, and his broad vision was thwarted by scheming tricksters abroad, and at home by men of little vision.

At a college commencement in June 1938 I said:

"What can you and I do? Remembering that these United States have never seen more than 33 consecutive years of peace at any time; that the war years come at an average of 25 years apart; that if the future is but a mirror of the past we shall resort again to the 'dread arbitrament of war.' (I was called a pessimist; it seems like optimism now.) * * * Wars are not won. If wars are won, then it is a bitter victory we have been celebrating through the last two depressions.

"So raise your voice against the chauvinist, against the jingo, against the parlor pink or the lecture-hall Fascist These and their kind are the enemies of peace. They can be rendered less harmful by an enlightened, fearless public opinion. And public opinion, never forget, is but the lengthened shadow of enlightened, fearless leadership. For that leadership in the next two decades, this Nation and the world will look in one direction: to the generation now coming of age."

The generation now coming of age. They are 3 years older now and they are registered in the draft. Many of them are already in service, and we are compelled to require that they be taught the arts of war, with the necessary brutalization of mind and heart attendant upon such teaching. I do not say for a moment that we should not be impregnably defended against the aggression of dictators now ranging over most of the face of the earth. On the contrary, such preparation is now unavoidable. In the not too distant future such practice for war may become participation.

But the ironic tragedy of the past two decades has been the absence of enlightened and of fearless leadership, lost opportunities, neglect to take steps in time to forestall the happening of occurrences which, unchecked, have piled up one upon another like the successive scenes of a Greek tragedy played upon a colossal stage.

So once again we are coming face to face with the dread arbitrament of war. No man knows and no man can foresee the outcome. The moving finger of history comes briefly to rest, poised to write of what we said, of what we did, in this hour. The great test of leadership—of American leadership—is near at hand One hopes and wishes and prays that the great moral forces which do certainly exist here and in England and in other democratic bastions of the world may somehow achieve at long last a more endurable and a more worthy future for mankind.

Our confusion ought to be resolved, through free discussion, into a workable pattern for a world at peace; a pattern upon which Americans united can stand.

We cannot dismiss our hopes as mere futile expressions of unattainable idealism; for if these ideals are not worth our devotion and our faith, what is?

Progress Made by Borrowers of the Fifth Kansas District From the Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

LETTER FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Farm Security Administration, through its rehabilitation program for the Nation's rural needy, has arrested much of the physical deterioration that had made serious inroads among our farm population, and has rebuilt and preserved human resources for the Nation's production needs.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Administrator in reporting the progress made by borrowers of the Fifth Kansas District from the Farm Security Administration:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 22, 1941.

Hon. JOHN M. HOUSTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOUSTON: Since the beginning of the present emergency it has been generally recognized that the health, welfare, and morale of our people are vitally important to national defense. Providing for these needs among low-income farm families has been one of the essential contributions of the Farm Security Administration to the Nation's defense efforts during the past year.

We have just completed a special survey undertaken last winter to measure the progress being made by borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. It indicates the gains in terms of money, living standards, and capacity for self-support which have been made during 1940 by handicapped and low-income farm people all over the country. It occurred to me that you might be interested in seeing the figures for your district.

In the Fifth District of Kansas there were 461 active standard rehabilitation borrowers at the end of 1940. The survey showed that the average borrower earned a net income of $676 during the year, as compared with $587 in the year before he borrowed from Farm

Security. In other words, the typical family increased its annual net income by 15 percent.

Also significant are the gains which these people made in net worth, since that is one of the best measures of permanent improvement in living standards. Borrowers in your district increased their average net worth—over and above all debts, including their obligations to the Government—from $1,059 before they came into the Farm Security program to $1,330 at the close of the 1940 crop year. This is a gain of 26 percent.

These figures mean that that Farm Security borrowers in the Fifth District have added a total of $124,908 to the wealth of their communities, and have increased their total annual incomes by $41,070. Naturally this growth in prosperity and purchasing power has been reflected on the books of merchants and other businessmen of the district.

We were pleased to find that borrowers in your district are rapidly repaying their rehabilitation loans. Already $127,723 has been repaid on loans totaling $502,911, although much of the money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years. Throughout the entire country, rehabilitation loans totaling $420,865,050 had been made as of December 31, 1940, and $149,626,442 of this sum had been repaid. As you know, loan funds currently are advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instead of coming from direct appropriations.

In view of the fact that none of the borrowers from Farm Security was able to get adequate credit anywhere else, and that many of them formerly were on relief, we feel that this repayment record is a tribute to the honesty and industry of these needy farm people. There is ample evidence that the great majority of them are getting back on their feet and becoming permanently self-supporting. In large measure, this progress is due to the advice and technical guidance in sound farm and home management which accompanies each Farm Security loan.

For example, we encourage our borrowers to get away from one-crop farming—particularly of surplus crops, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat—and to raise as much as possible of their own food and feed for their livestock. During 1940, the average Farm Security family in your district produced $226 worth of goods for home consumption, as compared with $152 before they came into the F. S. A. program. This produce for home use included 450 gallons of milk per family; 439 pounds of meat; and 235 quarts of vegetables and fruit canned for the winter. This increased production of food did not, of course, add to the supply in the commercial markets, since virtually none of it was offered for sale. It simply meant a better diet, better health, and a rising standard of living for these families.

Often it has been necessary to work out an adjustment of the family's old debts, before rehabilitation could be successful. Local farm-debt adjustment committees have been set up for this purpose. They have no legal authority to compel adjustments, but by bringing the farmer and his creditors together for a friendly discussion, they usually are able to arrange a scale-down of the obligations, reduced interest rates, or extension of the payment period. Such adjustments frequently save the farmer from foreclosure, and at the same time enable the creditors to get substantial payments on what might otherwise have been bad debts.

This service is available to all farmers, whether or not they are rehabilitation borrowers. Altogether debt reductions totaling $543,977 have been negotiated for the farmers in your district. This represents a scale-down of 43.3 percent. As a direct result of these adjustments, $8,589 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

In making this special survey our field employees reported that there are 580 families in your district who are eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans, but have been unable to get them because of the limited funds available.

In addition to the rehabilitation program, Farm Security is carrying out the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which provides a limited number of loans to competent tenants to enable them to buy family type farms.

During the first 3 years of this program, we made 17 such loans in your district, totaling $170,684. This year we expect to make about 6 Bankhead-Jones loans in the fifth district, amounting to approximately $53,130. Throughout the country, delinquencies of these loans have amounted so far to only 2.6 percent, or $23,658; and this has been more than offset by the fact that other borrowers have been able to make advance payments totaling $196,765, as the result of good crops and management.

I am hopeful that this rather detailed report may be useful to you, and if you would like to have any further facts about our program, I shall, of course, be glad to supply them. Sometime during the year I hope that you may find an opportunity to visit some of the borrowers from F. S. A. in your district and see for yourself the efforts they are making to get a new start as independent, taxpaying citizens.

Sincerely,

C. B. BALDWIN,
Administrator.

The Trona Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

LETTER FROM ALKALINE SALT WORKERS OF TRONA, CALIF.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter from the Alkaline Salt Workers of Trona, Calif. This is interesting reading:

ALKALINE SALT WORKERS,
LOCAL NO. 414,
Trona, Calif., May 24, 1941.

Hon. LEE E. GEYER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On May 21, 1941, our union, Alkaline Salt Workers, Local 414, International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, Trona, Calif., mailed to you a resolution calling upon the Government of the United States to take over and operate the strike-bound plant of the American Potash & Chemical Corporation, at Trona, Calif., in the interests of national defense.

As stated in that resolution, the plant has been on strike since March 14 as the result of the company's failure to bargain in good faith and observe Federal labor laws. The strike is being continued because of the company's continued failure to bargain in good faith and continued refusal to even meet with representatives of the union.

Company officials have not met with representatives of the union for the past 3 weeks in spite of the fact that they were instructed to do so by the National Defense Mediation Board, May 3, 1941, and agreed at that time to do so, in spite of the fact that the Mediation Board has several times since that time again instructed the company to resume negotiations, and in spite of repeated requests by the union that negotiations be reopened.

On May 23, 1941, the company sent to you and others a wire in answer to our resolution This wire states, among other things, that the company is not, at this time, selling any of its products to Japan. This fact is due entirely to the effectiveness of the current strike, since the company has, at all times, and, up to the time of the strike, shipped substantial quantities of its products to Japan

The wire also states that the entire matter of this labor dispute is in the hands of the Defense Mediation Board at Washington and has been for some time. This statement is only intended to cover up the company's failure to resume negotiations in accordance with the instructions of the National Defense Mediation Board The wire further states that the only issue between the company and the union is one of preferential hiring and of the closed shop.

This is untrue since there have, at all times, been other important issues and since the union has never asked for a closed shop as that term is commonly understood. The union has asked for nothing more than union security against a conduction of unfair labor practices which have been carried on by the company for the past 6 years, and which have been continued up to the present time, in spite of the National Labor Relations Board orders and court orders and injunctions.

The union has maintained that it required something more in the contract than affirmation by the company that it would obey the Wagner Act. We believe that the Mediation Board is in agreement with this position in view of the company's past labor record.

The issue of wages remains far from solution with the company refusing to grant a wage scale commensurate with local conditions and living costs, commensurate with its ability to pay, and commensurate with basic rates being paid in the better paying large industries.

The company states in its wire that it is willing that a complete investigation be made of the management of the plant, the structure, ownership, business of the corporation, physical conditions of the village of Trona, management of the village and living conditions of its employees; and that the union also submit to an investigation in order to fix the responsibility for the cause and continuation of the strike.

In view of these developments, the union, at this time, requests that a searching investigation of this situation be made by an impartial senatorial committee. The union is confident that such an investigation will reveal that the company, the Merchants & Manufacturers Association, Mr. Paul Shoup, and Mr. J. Stewart Neary are responsible for this strike and for its continuation.

The union has had new unfair labor practices charges pending with the National Labor Relations Board for the past 7 weeks. No investigation of these charges has yet been made by the National Labor Relations Board and we respectfully request that that body be instructed to make an immediate and full investigation of these charges. In view of the company's flagrant disregard of Federal labor laws and Federal agencies, and in view of the company's foreign control and in view of the certification of this case as a national-defense industry, we renew the request of our original resolution that this plant be taken over and operated by the Government.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT O. LAMSON,
President, Alkaline Salt Workers, Local 414, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

Inland to Alaska—Puget Sound-Columbia River Canal Project—Land-Protected Route to North Seen as Defense Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ARTICLE BY MR. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent granted by my colleagues, I am glad to place in the RECORD an article by Richard L. Neuberger, which was published in the Sunday Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., May 18, 1941. It is pointed out in this article that the proposed inland Puget Sound-Grays Harbor-Willapa Harbor-Columbia River Canal which is being resurveyed by the Corps of Army engineers, in accordance with my resolution adopted by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee on March 16, 1941, would stretch from Alaska to a considerable distance up the Snake River in Idaho. It would be the longest such inland-waterway passage on earth, extending a distance of nearly 1,800 miles, and would possess enormous national-defense and commercial advantages. The article referred to discusses the project in detail and reads as follows:

A 64-mile navigation canal connecting the mouth of the Columbia River with the southern tip of Puget Sound. The Rivers and Harbors Committee has just directed the Corps of Army Engineers to review the possibilities of such a project Col. Richard Park, division engineer, announces that the field survey will begin shortly.

"This canal is clearly essential to our national defense," maintains Congressman MARTIN F. SMITH, of the Third Washington District, in which the waterway would be located. "It also would be a great aid to commerce and shipping, but first and foremost it is of real strategic military importance. It would materially strengthen defense of the entire Pacific Northwest."

Money counts for little these days where considerations of defense are concerned, so congressional observers believe there is a possibility the Government may go ahead with a canal which would link the region's two greatest pools of navigation. An inland waterway thus would stretch from Alaska to far up the Snake River in Idaho. It would be the longest such passage on earth, extending a distance of nearly 1,800 miles.

ROUTE COVERED IN FAMILIAR A. A. A. MOTORLOG CAR

Exactly where would the canal go? What territory would it traverse? How would it get between the Columbia and the sound? With these questions in mind, The Oregonian and the Oregon State Motor Association conducted over the proposed route one of the motorlogs which annually feature the travel season. The trip was made in the white-painted A. A. A. car that has become a familiar sight in virtually every county of the Pacific Northwest.

The canal has been ingeniously devised to take advantage of every bit of help the Almighty has offered. Wherever possible it uses inlets, bays, lakes, and other natural props. On its main section, that between Puget Sound and Grays Harbor, the Chehalis River provides the principal artery. All that man must do is deepen the channel and put in locks, but the river furnishes the bulk of the effort.

The proposed canal is in three sections, beginning at Puget Sound and extending southward to the mouth of the Columbia:

1. The canal route leaves the sound at Budd Inlet in Olympia and goes along Percival Creek to Black Lake. Black Lake, long and narrow, then takes up the route. The Black River is the outlet of the lake and the canal extends down this stream to its junction with the Chehalis River at Rochester. The canal then follows the Chehalis in a northwesterly direction through the town of Elma and into Grays Harbor in the vicinity of Hoquiam and Aberdeen. This is by far the bulk of the waterway covering 50 miles.

2. Grays Harbor is the next lap, but the sea and the earth's convolutions of long ago have done the work here and no additional effort on the part of man is necessary. From South Bay in Grays Harbor the canal stretches for 9 miles along the seacoast and enters Willapa Bay near the Tokeland Peninsula.

3. Here again nature is a willing collaborator. Willapa Bay is 25 miles long. Only 5 miles separate it from the Columbia River. Through this last 5 miles the canal route cuts and opens into the river at Baker Bay, not far from Ilwaco. This makes the total distance of the inland waterway approximately 64 miles.

TRIP CAN BE COVERED IN SINGLE WEEK END

Motorlogging this route is an interesting drive and the roads are good all the way. The trip can be covered on a wide rectangle. It starts from Portland to Olympia over the conventional route, and from Olympia westward to Grays Harbor, then down the Washington coast and across the mouth of the Columbia by ferry. Seaside is an inviting all-night stop, and after a game of golf or a sunbath on the ocean's strands, the Wolf Creek highway is an easy 2-hour drive back to Portland. The journey can be conveniently made on a week end, and combines recreation with some sociological research into what may be the Northwest's next big Government project.

The Washington seaboard from Grays Harbor to the Columbia River is not grim and rock-bound like the Oregon coast farther south. Neither is it mountain-barricaded like the Washington coast farther north on the Olympic Peninsula. Its slopes are soft and gentle, and the forests stretch upward in pleasant swales.

LUMBER HAULED MANY MILES TO HARBOR DOCKS

The entire drive from Olympia to the mouth of the Columbia presents a broad picture of the logging industry. On the docks along Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay huge piles of lumber are stacked, waiting shipment to military barracks and Army outposts. Once this lumber was brought in from groves which stretched to the water's edge. Today it is hauled many miles, by truck, by sea, and by mountain railroad. Fire, disease, and the logger's ax have wrought vast havoc in the forests of western Washington.

Once Grays Harbor County, in Washington, was the center of the American lumber industry. Today that center has shifted southward to the fir belt of Oregon. Saw and ax have done their worst in this neighborhood, and the region's best hope is the second growth—the trees which will mature in the future.

Yet there still is hope. As the motorist drives along, he sees new firs beginning to nudge their way into the swath which the ax has cut. In the lush rainfall of the seacoast these trees grow with tropical speed. Soon they will be able to rehabilitate the industry. Already groves of second growth are throwing a carpet of green over patches of burn.

The proposed canal is very much an issue in the region traversed by the motorlog. Scandinavian loggers, Dutch farmers, ferryboat skippers, and owners of little restaurants all take a mutual interest in the undertaking. They believe that it would give their counties new prominence and importance. They look at the project from a recreational as well as an economic perspective, pointing out that owners of small pleasure boats could navigate between Portland and Seattle without having to brave the perils of the open sea.

RIVER IMPROVEMENTS FIT INTO WATERWAY PLANS

The possibilities of the waterway are prodigious. An inside passage already stretches from Alaska's capital at Juneau to Puget Sound. Then the Puget Sound-Columbia River Canal would get boats and barges to Astoria. Bonneville's locks and pool are making navigation feasible all the way to Umatilla and Attalia, particularly since the Celilo Canal was improved early this year. Should Congress approve the Umatilla Dam, as the House Rivers and Harbors Committee recently recommended, boats would be able to twist off up the Snake River past Lewiston, all the way to Johnson's Bar.

This would mean a navigable waterway from almost the Continental Divide to Alaska. Johnson's Bar is at the lower end of Hell's Canyon and is directly below Hat Point in the Wallowa Mountains of Oregon. The canal between the Columbia and Puget Sound would cost $33,921,638. The bulk of this amount would be spent on the stretch connecting Grays Harbor with Olympia, for here 12 locks would be required with a total lift of 90 feet. This would be necessary to get boats back and forth over the passes through the coastal mountain range. The canals along the coast, between Willapa Bay and the Columbia, and between Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor, would be comparatively inexpensive.

Rear Admiral Luther E. Gregory, United States Navy, retired, claims that the project has national-defense aspects which the country cannot afford to ignore. The waterway, he says, would be large enough for half the vessels of the American Fleet. Only the dreadnaughts and cruisers could not use it. Submarines, destroyers, torpedo boats, and other craft would be able to travel inland between the Columbia and the Sound, protected from any enemy force by the shore batteries at Fort Stevens, Fort Columbia, and other strategic military posts.

NAVY WOULD BE GIVEN GREATER MOBILITY

"The canals," says Admiral Gregory, "would allow submarines to operate through either Grays Harbor, Willapa Bay, and Puget Sound, in addition to the Columbia River entrance, and come to the relief or support of any naval unit engaged in battle at the Straits of Juan de Fuca. Vessels moving from Puget Sound would have three other exits into the ocean if the canal was constructed. The cost of one battleship would build the canal, and in time of national danger the existence of the new waterway might easily be worth a fleet of battleships in strategic value."

Two recent developments, according to Admiral Gregory, add to the stature of the canal as a national-defense enterprise. One is the immense expansion of the Bremerton navy yards at Puget Sound. "The proposed waterway would enhance Bremerton's value to the Nation," he declares. The other development is the construction of two huge aluminum plants along the Columbia River. Material from these plants could be transported speedily and cheaply by water to the vast Boeing aircraft factory in Seattle.

NEW DITCH WOULD GIVE NATION LONGEST WATERWAY

At the present time the greatest inland waterway in the world is the 1,000-mile link

along America's Atlantic seaboard between Delaware Bay and Miami. By connecting the Columbia River with Puget Sound and the inland passage to Alaska, the proposed canal would top that route by 800 miles. National defense strategists in the United States have started paying increased attention to canals and waterways. That is why the St. Lawrence seaway, linking the Great Lakes with the sea, is now a major issue before Congress.

An article in the New York Times recently pointed out that part of Germany's military efficiency is due to a vast system of canals and locks. More than 20 percent of the goods of the Reich are carried over inland waters. The Times stated that Royal Air Force bombers have tried for weeks to put these routes out of commission, but that they were not nearly as vulnerable as railroads.

What about the commercial importance of the canal hitching the Columbia and the sound? Is its sole significance from a military standpoint? As the motorlog car wound through the coastal dips and inlets, one could see the products which the waterway would carry.

LUMBER—PRINCIPAL PRODUCT IN CANAL VICINITY

Lumber would be the principal product originating in the vicinity of the canal. In 1933, when the project was first discussed, the Washington State Canal Commission made a survey and announced that 800,000,000 board-feet of logs, 125,000,000 feet of lumber, and 130,000 cords of pulpwood would pass through the waterway annually. Admiral Gregory declares that a 20-mile haul by rail costs $2.50 for 1,000 feet of logs; the same haul by water, he maintains, would be in the neighborhood of 55 cents.

The vast navigation boom on the upper Columbia, coupled with the national-defense emergency, has centered new attention on the contemplated canal. Once the upper Columbia was virtually untraveled. Now the locks at Celilo and Bonneville are busy night and day. Loads of oil are shoved up the river and wheat barges brought down from the inland empire. Much of this traffic, if the canal is built, would originate and end at Puget Sound, and there would be uninterrupted barge traffic all the way from Seattle to the inland empire.

The Army engineers are reviewing the proposed project now, and probably will report soon to the House of Representatives. In the meanwhile the drive along the canal route, via Olympia and Seaside, starting at either end, offers a pleasant and varied week-end excursion Perhaps in the not-so-distant future it can be negotiated by launch as well as by car.

National Taxation of Motor Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ADDRESS BY FRED BRENCKMAN, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative, the National Grange, over stations of the National Broadcasting Co., on the Grange Hour, from Washington, D. C., May 17, 1941:

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has for several weeks been holding hearings preparatory to the introduction of a revenue bill that is intended to raise several billion dollars a year in new or additional taxes to meet the cost of national defense. Roughly speaking, it is estimated that during the coming fiscal year the total appropriations of the Government will amount to $20,000,000,000.

The administration plans to raise about two-thirds of this sum by current taxation and to borrow the other third. It is estimated that existing taxes will produce revenues aggregating $9,000,000,000, while about $3,600,000,000 is to be raised by additional taxation.

We are all aware of the fact that our national-defense program calls for heavy increases in taxation. As the National Grange sees it, such new taxes as may be imposed should be levied as fairly and equitably as possible. These levies should be of such a character as not to destroy our system of private enterprise, upon which the security and well-being of the Nation so greatly depends in the emergency with which we are confronted. On the other hand, no person should be allowed to make any inordinate profits, nor should taxes be levied purely for punitive purposes.

The Grange has long been opposed to a general Federal sales tax, on the ground that it is a tax on the necessities of the people and violates the principle of ability to pay. However, we believe that excise taxes upon a carefully selected list of commodities are justified under prevailing conditions.

One of the proposals pending before the Ways and Means Committee calls for the imposition of another cent per gallon on gasoline, making the total Federal tax 2½ cents per gallon, instead of 1½ cents as at present. The National Grange is not in favor of this proposal.

The highway users of the country are already paying their full and proportionate share of all taxes. In addition to that, they are contributing, in round figures, about $2,000,000,000 per year in special highway taxes of various kinds—Federal, State, and local. This sum is equal to approximately 14 percent of the total revenues accruing to all the units of government in the United States. State and local taxes on highway transportation amount to about $1,500,000,000 a year, while the Federal Government is collecting approximately $500,000,000 a year from this source.

Federal and State taxes combined on gasoline now average nearly 6 cents per gallon. At the present retail price of gasoline, this represents a sales tax of nearly 50 percent.

VITAL TO AGRICULTURE

So far as agriculture is concerned, motor transportation, under modern conditions, is not a luxury but an absolute necessity. More than 1,000,000 motortrucks, or about one-fourth of the country's total, are owned and operated by farmers. A recent survey discloses the fact that with the abandonment of many branch lines of railroads that are no longer profitable, there are about 48,000 communities throughout the United States that are entirely dependent upon highway transportation.

The farmer must have his motor-vehicle facilities, and he does not feel that his use of the highways is a proper and adequate measure by which to determine his contribution toward the cost of national defense.

Some idea of the importance of the motor vehicle to the American farmer may be gained from the records of the United States Department of Agriculture, which show that approximately 27 percent of the butter, 39 percent of the eggs, 65 percent of the poultry, 40 percent of the fruit and vegetables, 62 percent of the cattle, 61 percent of the calves, 68 percent of the hogs, 29 percent of the sheep and lambs, and 50 percent of the mules and horses are now moved from farm to market by truck.

When the revenues derived from gasoline taxes are expended in improving and maintaining the highways there can be no legitimate criticism. However, it must be kept in mind that much of the gasoline purchased by farmers is used as a fuel in plowing, harrowing, threshing, filling silos, pumping water, operating spraying machinery, sawing wood, grinding feed, and for other purposes that do not involve any use of the highways. Many States properly refund the tax to farmers on gasoline used in such ways as have been enumerated. Other States do not make these refunds. So far as the Federal tax on gasoline is concerned, no refunds whatsoever are made. To increase the Federal gasoline tax would, therefore, result in increasing the farmer's cost of production.

COST OF TRANSPORTATION

The cost of transportation constitutes the biggest single service charge that agriculture has to pay. The imposition of an additional Federal tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline would make present excessive transportation costs on farm commodities just that much higher. This would be true of the more than 1,000,000 trucks operated by farmers themselves. It would likewise be true of common- and contract-carrier trucks that transport the products of the farm and which haul supplies consumed on the farm.

The owners of common- and contract-carrier trucks will naturally speak for themselves. But it is only fair to say with respect to them that they are engaged in a highly competitive business. The exhaustive study made by former Federal Coordinator of Transportation Joseph B. Eastman shows that highway users are paying their fair share of highway costs and more. The Eastman report, made public about 2 years ago, indicates that trucks as distinguished from passenger cars are paying more than their share of the cost of improving and maintaining our highways. Assuming the correctness of these findings, it would be just as logical to place a special tax for defense purposes on the coal consumed by the railroads as it would be to place a special tax for defense purposes on gasoline.

The intrusion of the Federal Government into the gasoline tax field cannot be regarded as legitimate. Such appropriations as the Federal Government has made for highways can all be justified from the standpoint of national defense, to facilitate the transportation of the mails, and for other purposes benefiting all the people alike.

SOURCE OF HIGHWAY FUNDS

By far the major portion of the funds that have been expended for the improvement of our highways has come from State, county, and local sources. From 1917, when the Federal-Aid Highway Act took effect, until 1939, the States and their minor subdivisions, excluding cities, spent a total of $29,675,397,000 on roads.

During the years in question, Federal expenditures on highways, which were supervised by the Bureau of Public Roads, now the Public Roads Administration, amounted to a little more than three billions. It should be noted that this includes the money spent for the elimination of grade crossings, forest roads and trails, and the national-park highways.

In addition to the regular Federal-aid appropriations for highways, the Government has also expended large sums for roads through P. W. A. and W. P. A. Lumping all these Federal appropriations for roads together gives us a total of about $6,797,000,000,

of which more than $4,757,000,000 was for relief.

The primary purpose of the relief expenditures was to supply work for the unemployed. In fact, in appropriating emergency relief funds for roads, Congress expressly stipulated that in awarding contracts, provision should be made for the employment of as much hand labor as possible.

In support of the proposition that the gasoline tax properly belongs to the States, it should be kept in mind that under the Federal-Aid Highway Act, the funds appropriated by Congress all go for construction. The cost of maintaining these roads devolves upon the States.

Further than that, the States and their minor subdivisions have issued highway bonds in large amounts, and they are depending principally upon the revenue which is derived from the gasoline tax to pay off these bonds as they mature. The total outstanding highway bonds of the States and their minor subdivisions, not counting the cities, amount to nearly $3,000,000,000. These figures prove conclusively that the gasoline tax belongs to the States.

STATES MEMORIALIZE CONGRESS

The legislatures of half the States, fearing that the intrusion of the Federal Government into a sphere of taxation developed by the States to provide funds for road improvement may have serious consequences on State financing, have memorialized Congress to withdraw from the field of motor-fuel taxation. Congress should certainly heed the voice of the elected representatives of the States in this matter, because they speak for the majority of the people of the Nation.

While everybody recognizes that the revenues of the Federal Government must be greatly increased to meet the cost of national defense, we cannot lose sight of the fact that our State and local governments must likewise be supported and maintained. That the tax policies pursued by the Federal Government during recent years constitute nothing less than a threat to the sovereignty and independence of the States, drying up the sources of revenue upon which they must depend to finance their activities cannot be denied.

The best hope of preserving our democracy lies in maintaining the independence and sovereignty of the States, and this cannot be done by pursuing policies of taxation that will gradually reduce them to impotency and bankruptcy.

In considering ways and means of raising by current taxation as large a proportion as possible of the funds needed to defray the cost of national defense, it appears to be necessary to broaden the tax base and to fairly and judiciously lower the exemption on incomes. As I have already indicated, the Grange believes that no one should be allowed to make any undue profits, whether from defense contracts or in the regular line of business. We do not want another crop of millionaires such as was spawned by the first World War. Congress can take care of this situation by properly graduating the tax on personal incomes, the corporation-income tax, and the excess-profits tax.

In view of the situation with which we are faced, the nondefense expenditures of the Government should be held to the lowest possible minimum without sacrificing any really essential public service. It would be grossly improper and unfair to impose back-breaking taxes upon the people, with the Government squandering public funds to maintain supernumerary employees on the pay roll or in promoting projects that are nonessential and which do not contribute in any way whatsoever to the cause of national defense.

Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the eighteenth annual Mississippi State Sunday at Valley Forge, Washington Memorial Chapel, Sunday, May 25, 1941:

Rev. JOHN ROBBINS HART. I suppose you all know this is Mississippi Day at Valley Forge, and, as you know, Governor Johnson, of Mississippi, has sent to us one of our national leaders, a Member of Congress, Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, Congressman from Mississippi. I think it means more and more to us to know about the men who are leading our country today, and we feel secure in this leadership. I want to assure Mr. RANKIN that he is most welcome to Valley Forge, and, as one of the leaders of the administration, I know he will try to help us in our present world troubles, just as we are trying to help them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to be here today to represent the Governor of my State in these patriotic exercises. In doing so, I feel as if it would not be out of place to call attention to the fact that my ancestors once lived in Pennsylvania. That was 200 years ago. Many years since, some of my people attempted to pay you a visit, or perhaps I had better say a visitation. They had a little misunderstanding over around Gettysburg and had to postpone the visit until a later day.

We are gathered today on holy ground. Here in these sacred precincts, by their sacrifices and their devotions, George Washington and his patriotic band of American heroes laid the foundation for free institutions throughout the world.

Someone has said that Shakespeare was an intellectual ocean that touched all the shores of thought. Washington's life might be called an ocean of inspiration for liberty which has stirred mankind to struggle upward to the nearest perfection in governments that civilization has ever attained.

Victor Hugo once said that nothing dies harder or more thoroughly than an old regime. Tennyson put it a little more mildly, a little more poetically when he said:

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new;
And God fulfills himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

Throughout the centuries the old orders have been changing, and old opinions and old systems have been giving way to new.

Runnymede was one step on the long, hard road toward that freedom and liberty which Washington and his followers were striving for.

The American Revolution brought the greatest changes in government, and in the recognition of human rights, the world had ever known.

All changes have not been made by the sword. In fact, few changes have been made by the force of arms that could not have been made by some other method. Perhaps one of the greatest changes has been made largely by one man—Thomas A. Edison, the man who virtually gave us this electric age.

We are today witnessing another change, from an old order to a new. We are in the twilight, the deepening twilight, of sea power. The day of the domination of floating navies is fading away as a result of the development of the airplane, which is bringing about a new change in world affairs, so momentous that we stand appalled in a changing world.

With this vast change comes America's challenge to her destiny. We do not know what effect this change will have, but I am of the opinion that it will strengthen rather than weaken our country's position in world affairs. Bordered by its two great oceans, with the Gulf of Mexico on the south and blessed with a friendly nation to the north, boundless in its vast resources, it is the strongest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth.

We were told that in the last war a generation of young men were destroyed. I am chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and I have probably witnessed more of the aftermath of that war than any man in public life. While all of the young men who engaged in that war were not destroyed, we find that hundreds of thousands of them have broken down, and are still breaking down, due to their war services, and millions never got adjusted to post-war conditions. So I am inclined to believe with the author of the book on that subject that the World War practically destroyed a generation of young men.

We are now witnessing a conflict that is going far beyond the World War. It is destroying a generation of women and children.

A few years ago there was a boat load of Spanish refugee children brought to this country who had gone through the civil war in that country. I was told by people who saw them that when they heard the buzzing of an airplane they went into paroxysms of fear.

What is to be the life of the children who are now under constant bombardment day and night? They will probably suffer the same terrors. For that reason I have appealed, and I shall continue to appeal, to the leaders of the country who are, by the way, the leaders of my own party, to use their offices to try to bring about at least a truce that will enable them to explore the possibility of peace based upon the five points laid down the other night by Cordell Hull, our great Secretary of State, with whom I served in Congress for many years. These points are as follows:

"1. Extreme nationalism must not again be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions."

I am sure you realize that many wars have been brought about by trade restrictions.

"2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper."

The discriminations in international trade have done more to bring about ill feeling and ill will, than almost any other one element that has entered into world affairs in recent years.

"3. Raw material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination."

If all nations are to live and prosper and work out their own destinies we must not deny to them access to the raw materials of the world.

"4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as

to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people."

If we are going to be fair with the smaller nations we must see that they are protected in their rights, just the same as the larger nations of the earth.

"5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries, and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries."

In other words, we do not propose in the future to have our international affairs dominated by a small group of international bankers, or by the large oil interests, or by large industrial institutions that have their investments in every country in the world.

If they will ask for a truce and the opportunity to explore the possibility of peace based upon these five points, they stand a chance to bring about peace among the warring nations—"a consummation devoutly to be wished." I am afraid if this is not done we may witness a collapse of the British Empire, which would be a world disaster.

Let me remind you also that the best friend we had when we needed one was France. France is now in a most embarrassing position. It was the assistance of France that made it possible for us to gain our independence. We feel toward her as the father did toward his prodigal son, and will be glad to welcome her back into the democratic fold.

I agree with Washington in his expressions with reference to Christianity. You are not going to have peace in this world based upon fear. You are not going to have peace based upon the force of arms. We will have peace, if and when it comes, based upon those great fundamental principles laid down by Washington and Jefferson and which constitute the bedrock of American institutions.

We are told in Holy Writ that the Saviour was once asleep upon the Sea of Galilee when there burst forth a great storm. It seemed for a time as if heaven and earth and sea and sky were mingled in one implacable chaos. The Disciples awoke the sleeping Saviour and told him they were lost. He addressed the troubled elements and said, "Peace; be still." The Bible tells us that "the wind ceased and there was a great calm." That is the only force that can bring permanent peace to this world today. It cannot be enforced by military power.

Throughout the centuries past men like Caesar, Napoleon, Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and others have risen to power, flourished, and passed away, but not one has been able to force his will even upon his own people long at a time. When peace comes the dictator fades away. When we can muster the public opinion of the world behind the ideas of peace we can lead the nations of the earth into a new day of peace and international understanding.

When we can say to the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, and the Stalins, "You are not running things"; say to the large oil companies, financial overlords, and to all the other selfish interests, "You are not running this earth," then we may emerge from this conflict and restore peace to a troubled world.

I would hate to think I am going to live the rest of my life in a world that will have a crepe on practically every doorknob; that will have every park and public place filled with the maimed, the blind, the wounded, and disabled victims of another conflict. These young men, these boy scouts who sit before me, will have other issues to settle, other problems to solve in building a greater country and promoting a finer life. I believe with Ella Wheeler Wilcox when she said:

"Weep not for vanished ages, with their great heroic men,
Who live on history's pages or dwell in the poet's pen;
For the grandest times are before us, and the world is yet to see
The noblest worth of this old earth in the men that are to be."

It may be that the airplane is the harbinger of world peace; that it will put an end to wars between nations that are separated by bodies of water. Let us hope it may help to usher in that golden age of which Tennyson dreamed when he said:

"I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonders that would be;

"Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;

"Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
For the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue;

"Far along the world-wide whisper of the south wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunderstorm;

"Till the war drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world;

"There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

Explanation of War Resolution Adopted by International Convention of Disciples of Christ

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

LETTER FROM I. R. KELSO, MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following explanation of the resolution adopted by the international convention of the Disciples of Christ at St. Louis, Mo., May 7, 1941:

CAPE GIRARDEAU, MO., *May 13, 1941.*

Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZIMMERMAN: Newspaper stories regarding the adoption of a resolution on war, by the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, at St. Louis, Mo., on May 7, are very misleading unless the reader is familiar with all of the facts and circumstances attending the alleged action of the convention in adopting said so-called resolution on war.

The facts relative to the alleged adoption of said so-called resolution on war, by the International Convention of Disciples of Christ at St. Louis, Mo., on May 7, 1941, may be stated substantially as follows:

1. That the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, is not a delegate convention. That ministers of Christ, and other Christian leaders, have the right to freely and fully discuss all great questions that affect the lives of the people, of a community, of the Nation, or of the world, in the light of Christian principles, but they do not have the right to ask for a vote in support of the views of any individual or group of individuals, and when such a vote is taken, it means nothing more than the expression of the opinion of those actually voting in favor of or against the proposition. That the International Convention of Disciples of Christ is not authorized to do anything which might be construed as intending to interfere in any way with the congregational autonomy of the Disciples of Christ.

2. That approximately 1½ percent of the 6,250 persons registered at said St. Louis convention voted in favor of adopting said so-called resolution on war; and that approximately the same percentage of the number of persons registered voted against said so-called resolution on war. That the vote on said so-called resolution was so close that the president of the convention, of his own motion, called for a division, and upon a rising vote of those in favor of the adoption of said so-called resolution, and those against said motion, declared the motion carried.

3. That said so-called resolution on war, was submitted to and acted on by the convention, contrary to and in violation of section 2 article V of the constitution printed at page 209 of the convention program, copy of which is marked "Exhibit A" and hereto attached for convenience and ease of reference.

4. That said so-called resolution was submitted to and acted on by the convention contrary to and in violation of the rules and practice of the convention in the matter of handling of resolutions in the St. Louis convention, printed at page 37 of the Convention Program, copy of which is marked exhibit "B" and hereto attached for convenience and ease of reference.

5. That said so-called resolution on war was acted on contrary to the constitution and rules governing the handling of resolutions in the St. Louis convention (exhibits "A" and "B"), in this:

(a) That said so-called resolution on war was not submitted within the 24-hour limit fixed by the International Convention of Disciples of Christ for the handling of resolutions and other matters of business coming before the convention. That said so-called resolution on war was not submitted until after the subcommittees of the committee on recommendations had completed their work and most of the members of the committee on recommendations had gone home.

(b) That only 24 of the 84 members who had participated in the work of the committee on recommendations were present at the meeting which was held about 5 o'clock in the afternoon on May 6. That said 24 members present at said meeting had remained at the convention after all of the business submitted to the committee on recommendations had been completed in conformity with the constitution and practice of the convention, to take care of matters of emergency, in compliance with the provisions of section 2, article V of the constitution (exhibit "A") hereto attached.

(c) That the president of the convention was never requested to rule, and did not rule,

that the subject matter of said so-called resolution was to be handled by the skeleton committee on recommendations as an emergency within the meaning of the constitution of the convention, prior to its submission to said skeleton committee on recommendations.

(d) That the skeleton committee of only 24 members received said alleged resolution about 5 o'clock in the afternoon of May 6, long after the expiration of the 24-hour limit, and after most of the members of the committee on recommendations had gone home. That 17 of said skeleton committee voted in favor of recommending said so-called resolution, and 7 voted against recommending said so-called resolution, sometimes referred to as a petition and sometimes referred to as a resolution.

(e) That the President of the convention was never permitted to rule that said so-called resolution should be handled as an emergency resolution.

6. That copy of said so-called resolution on war which was submitted to and acted on contrary to and in violation of the constitution, rules, and practices of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, as aforesaid, is marked "Exhibit C" and hereto attached for convenience and ease of reference.

That pursuant to the direction of those voting in favor of adopting said resolution, the general secretary of the international convention wired the President of the United States calling attention to said resolution and the action thereon.

7. That on May 8, 1941, the writer, as a member of the committee on recommendations at the St. Louis convention of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, sent a night letter to Hon. Stephen T. Early relative to the above matters, copy of which is marked "Exhibit D" and hereto attached as a matter of information to be considered in connection with the telegram sent by the general secretary of the convention to the President of the United States.

8. That in the light of all of the attending facts and circumstances, it is clear that, in the closing hour of the last business session of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ at St. Louis on May 7, approximately 1½ percent of the number registered at said convention did, contrary to and in violation of the constitution, rules, and practices of said convention vote in favor of said so-called resolution on war, and that the same was adopted by a narrow margin; that said vote is merely the expression of an opinion of approximately 100 individuals who voted in favor of said so-called resolution, and the expression of an opinion of approximately the same number who voted against the adoption of said resolution.

The above and foregoing facts are respectfully submitted for consideration in connection with the telegram sent to the President of the United States by the general secretary of the convention relative to the action of the convention on the question of war.

Yours truly,

I. R. KELSO,
Member of Committee on Recommendations at the St. Louis Convention of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ.

EXHIBIT A

CONSTITUTION

Article V—Committees

SEC. 2. Committee on Recommendations.—Throughout the annual assembly there shall sit from day to day, with power to appoint subcommittees, a Committee on Recommendations, which shall receive such reports of the various general agencies as may be submitted to it by the convention; shall analyze and scrutinize such reports; shall make such recommendations regarding said boards as it deems wise; and shall submit the same to the convention. To such committee all resolutions and other business shall be referred without debate. It is ordered, however, that no resolution or matter of business, except matters of emergency, shall be considered by the international convention unless it has been presented to the convention in time to reach the Committee on Recommendations at least 24 hours before the last business session of the convention is scheduled to begin. The presiding officer shall rule whether the resolution proposed is an emergency resolution or not. It shall report at each daily business session of the convention; and each item of business so reported shall be approved or disapproved, or recommitted to it by the convention to be revised and again reported.

EXHIBIT B

HANDLING OF RESOLUTIONS IN THE ST. LOUIS CONVENTION

The Denver International Convention adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That no resolution or matter of business except matters of emergency will be considered by the international convention unless it has been presented to the convention in time to reach the committee on recommendations at least 24 hours before the last business session of the convention is scheduled to begin."

In conformity with this resolution and the practice followed subsequently, all organizations or individuals desiring to submit resolutions for the consideration of the St. Louis international convention were requested to reduce same to writing and file the resolution with the undersigned on or before April 21.

Resolutions which may arise after April 21 must be filed by Tuesday, May 6, to prevent such resolution being carried over until next year's convention without action thereon.

As last year, the text of each resolution to be considered by the convention will be placed in the hands of each delegate attending the business sessions.

GRAHAM FRANK,
General Secretary, International Convention of Disciples of Christ.

EXHIBIT C

LXVIII. Resolution regarding America's participation in the war, reading as follows:

"The international convention of Disciples of Christ respectfully and earnestly petition the President of the United States to use the great powers of his office to keep this Nation out of the war now raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa. We make bold to present this petition in view of the President's repeated and solemn pledges assuring the country that the armed forces of the United States would not become involved in the war.

"We note with anxious apprehension that the policy of aid to Britain has carried the Nation to the brink of belligerent participation, and that the country and the President now face a crucial and irrevocable decision which will profoundly affect the destiny of America. We believe that this is not America's war. We affirm our conviction that America's responsibility to the civilization of the future requires maintenance of her own peace and the preservation of her democratic way of life.

"The embroilment of our country in the conflict which is itself devastating civilization will only add fuel to the flames by spreading and cruelly prolonging the war and inviting to our own land the chaos in which the war will surely leave the nations which are participating in it. We implore the President to revive the role of mediator for himself and our Nation, and to adopt no further policy in aid to Britain which will carry the hazard of involvement in the war. The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to belligerent participation, and we look with grave foreboding upon any action by the Government which will plunge a divided Nation into a war which is not America's war."

The committee on recommendations recommends that the resolution be approved with the following words deleted, "We believe that this is not America's war" and (at the close) "which is not America's war"; and further recommends that the resolution be telegraphed to President Roosevelt immediately by the secretary of the convention.

Prepare To Meet the Tax Collector

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit a speech entitled "Prepare To Meet the Tax Collector," which I delivered before the Women's Finance Forum, on May 22, at the Congress Hotel, Chicago, Ill.:

Madam President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it has always been my belief that, fundamentally, the soundest economists in the United States are the women folk. Ours has always been a country of homes. And the budget director-treasurer of practically every home is the housewife. The husband may be the breadwinner, but it is the wife who generally determines how the income can be spent with the maximum possible benefits for the entire family.

She budgets the income, however small, to pay the rent or to pay on a mortgage, to buy the food and other necessities of life, and to see that the children are clad and educated. She is realistic. She knows that over a long period of time expenditures cannot exceed income. She realizes that one must be adjusted to the other. The American standard of living and the thousands of happy homes in our great country are evidence abundant that the American women have succeeded in their tasks.

With this belief in mind, I am particularly happy to have an opportunity of talking to a group of women who are studying the broader fields of finance, and particularly so at a time when the people are about to be burdened with unprecedented taxes to support unprecedented Federal expenditures.

I do not intend to make a partisan speech, but I cannot help but state I have not been in agreement with many of the financial policies of the present administration. Our Government has been extravagant and wasteful. Large appropriations have been made with little or no thought as to how the money might be raised. We are just beginning to face realities. The "blank check" era may have been glorious, but we must now pre-

pare to meet the tax collector. Your Government will shortly be asking you to pay the heaviest taxes in all our history.

Even though Congress enacts the pending tax legislation to raise $3,500,000,000 in additional revenue, the $12,700,000,000 of tax revenue in 1942 will still be $6,300,000,000 short of the estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year.

I believe that today, when our national defense needs are tremendous, deliberate efforts should be made to eliminate or substantially reduce expenditures for items not essential for our defense. If the Government shows a willingness to economize, the American people will gladly make sacrifices in tax payments for the security of our free country.

It is very rare indeed that any politician recommends a reduction in the appropriation for his department or bureau. Time and again they appear before the committees of Congress to recommend an increase in this item or that item in the appropriation bill for their particular department. Congress does not need to invite them. They will come voluntarily. But, unfortunately, they do not voluntarily come to suggest possible reductions. In fact, Congress finds it difficult to get any cooperation from the executive branch of the Government for reducing expenditures.

When the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee he stated that he believed approximately $1,000,000,000 could be saved in the nonessential expenditures. He was asked to recommend specific items for elimination or reduction. It was a legitimate request, particularly inasmuch as the executive branch of the Government prepares the Budget and Congress acts on the Budget recommendations. But, as you may know, the Secretary of the Treasury refused to make any specific Budget reduction recommendations.

It is most unfortunate when we have officials of Government always ready and willing—all too ready and willing—to make recommendations to Congress as to where more money can be spent, but never ready and willing to make any recommendations where money may be saved. The only possible way to obtain economies is for you, the people, to demand it and when your demand becomes loud enough it will be heeded. You are dealing with politicians who, in the last analysis, are subject to your will.

I do not think anyone will seriously contend that our national financial condition is sound, considering that our public debt approaches $50,000,000,000 and that we find it necessary today to build up and maintain a large defense machinery. We could have been more economical during these last several years, and I think we would have been had the people themselves taken a greater interest in the Government's financial affairs and had we had balanced representation in Congress. These two factors: (1) absence of balanced representation in Congress, and (2) lack of public interest in sound governmental financial policies are, in my opinion, the two basic causes for our present-day situation.

As you know, during the last several years and even today, the minority party in Congress is numerically weak. I could point out innumerable instances where the minority party endeavored to eliminate or reduce items of appropriation. The Department of the Interior appropriation bill, which passed the House last week, is the most recent example. Amendments were repeatedly offered from the floor to reduce appropriations only to be defeated by the overwhelming majority. The minority does not have sufficient votes even to force a compromise.

In a two-party system of government, such as exists in the United States, the best interests of the people are served when there is a balanced representation in Congress. The very best results are obtained when there is almost an equality in both the House and Senate, or when one of the Houses is Democratic and the other Republican.

Today there are only 28 Republican Senators out of a total of 96, and 162 Republican Congressmen out of 435. The numerical strength of the minority is such that it can seldom, if ever, block any proposed legislation which is not for the best interests of the constituency. I do not mean to imply that the minority is powerless. It has done much for informing the people on issues and for molding public opinion. I merely wish to point out how an overwhelming majority operates to the disadvantage of the people. Moreover, it must be admitted that on a percentage basis the membership in Congress is not an accurate measure of the public will as expressed in the last election, when the Democratic Party polled 27,000,000 votes and the Republican Party 22,000,000. On a basis of that vote, the minority interests of the country as a whole do not really have the representation in Congress to which they are entitled.

It is more or less inevitable that when a majority is overwhelming that it tends to throw discretion to the winds. It ignores the wishes of the minority. It refuses to listen to its warnings and gives no consideration to its recommendations. Such a majority does what it wishes, when it wishes, and how it wishes. And, I think you will agree, this factor explains why we are today faced with a large public debt and why we have been without a long-range fiscal policy.

The other contributing factor has been the lack of interest on the part of the people themselves. If you think back twoscore years, there was a time that our forebears gave some part of their life to public service. Titles of some sort—"Judge," "Senator," "Congressman," or "Sheriff"—were quite common among businessmen. They entered public service at a personal sacrifice and out of a high sense of duty. They realized the necessity of helping to guide their local and national governments if their own affairs and private interests as citizens were to be safeguarded. In those days men and women of stature, ability, and high purpose made their contribution to the running of the Government.

With the advent of the great industrial revolution during the latter part of the last century, interest in politics ceased to exist. The industrial revolution produced opportunities to amass private wealth. The public mind turned to business affairs, and a regrettable indifference to the affairs of government developed. The people were not concerned about such things as taxes, because at that time the normal growth of the country provided such great income that even low taxes produced sufficient revenue.

The last war brought a tax consciousness among certain groups of our people. The costs of war necessitated new and additional taxes. During the prosperous 1920's, as you will recall, some relief in taxation was given.

Since 1930 the tax burden has been gradually growing. I regret to be the bearer of bad tidings, but, to use a slang expression, insofar as taxes are concerned, "you ain't seen nothing yet." The 1941 tax measure, now under consideration in Congress, introduces an unprecedented tax burden on the people. It will bring a tax consciousness to thousands of our people who formerly had neither conception nor interest in how the Federal Government and local governments obtained their revenue.

As I talk to you the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives is in executive session, writing a tax bill which will be levied on the national income gained this year, 1941. Their studies will result in a bill for taxes which will reach many of us on March 15, 1942. That will be a painful day. And it behooves every man and woman to commence now making preparation to meet the tax collector. For most of us these new taxes will necessitate a substantial readjustment in our standard of living. and we cannot wait until March 15, 1942, when the tax collector knocks at the door for his cash, to make that readjustment.

Before turning to the various proposals for embodiment in this new tax bill it would probably be of some interest to examine the legislative procedure by which this bill will reach final enactment. As most of you are aware, the Treasury Department, after budgeting the financial requirements for the ensuing years, drafts a tentative tax bill and sends it to the House of Representatives for consideration and study. The Senate cannot consider a tax bill until the House has acted.

Our Constitution significantly provides that all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, which body is closest to the people. This provision in our Constitution indicates that the founding fathers recognized that "the power to tax is," as Chief Justice Marshall at one time stated it, "the power to destroy."

When the proposed tax legislation reaches the House from the Treasury Department, the Speaker of the House immediately assigns the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means, which is probably the most important committee of the House. The committee then proceeds to hold public hearings. Witnesses appear before the committee to express their views on the different items of the proposed bill and to make their respective recommendations.

If any of you visit Washington when Congress is in session and the Ways and Means Committee is holding hearings, it would be well worth your time to spend several hours listening to these proceedings. The committee is composed of 25 members—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. They sit like judges behind a long, curved bar in the beautiful room belonging to that committee. The witnesses are called and stand before the members, and, with great formality, present their case.

A witness is generally permitted to proceed without interruption, but any member of the committee may request the chairman for permission to stop the witness in the course of his statement in order to ask him a question. After the witness' statement is concluded, the actual questioning begins. Each member of the committee is given the opportunity to examine the witness.

Not only private citizens appear as witnesses. Members of the Cabinet appear, as well as representatives from the different executive departments and other Members of Congress. These hearings may continue daily for several weeks. When the committee is satisfied it has obtained all the information it needs and that all interests have been given an opportunity to present their case it goes into executive session from which the public is excluded. In executive session the members vote on the items to be put into the bill and the real work of writing the bill commences.

When the bill is completed and reported to the House, the Ways and Means Committee appears before the Committee on Rules to request a special rule for the consideration of the bill on the floor of the House. The Rules Committee is the legislative traffic officer. It determines the program for the House, and it naturally gives priority to bills having the greatest political, economic, and social significance.

The resolution reported by the Rules Committee determines the conditions under which a bill will be debated and considered on the floor. It will report what is known as a closed rule or an open rule. An open rule is one which permits amendments to be offered from the floor by the individual Members, to be approved or rejected by the entire

membership. A closed rule, on the other hand, is one which precludes any amendments being offered by individual Members, although it generally permits amendments to be offered by the Ways and Means Committee itself. This rule is sometimes known as the gag rule, in that the House is obliged to accept or reject a bill reported by a committee in its entirety. It can make no changes.

In all probability the rule which the Rules Committee will report for consideration of the pending tax legislation will be a closed rule. That seems to have been the practice in connection with previous tax measures. This procedure is justified by the House leadership on the grounds that any tax bill is extremely technical, with many interdependent provisions, and that an attempt to write into the bill new provisions when it is being debated on the floor may serve to destroy whole sections of the measure.

After the bill has passed the House it then goes to the Senate Finance Committee for consideration. That committee will again hold hearings and report the bill to the Senate. It may substantially amend the House bill, but it is a fair assumption that at the most only minor changes will be made.

While I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have attended many of its sessions. Three methods of raising almost $13,000,000,000 from the citizens and businesses of the United States are being considered: (1) heavy taxes on business, (2) hidden taxes on commodities, commonly known as excise taxes, and (3) personal income and estate taxes.

I will not go into a detailed explanation of the tax on business. It is of interest, however, that the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board and Mr. Leon Henderson, of the Price Stabilization Committee, both of whom appeared as witnesses, are strong advocates of this form of tax. They believe that most industries will be exceptionally prosperous because of the national-defense orders, and that by taxing away all but an insignificant portion of their profits they believe huge sums of tax revenue will be obtained with a minimum of effort and expense of collection.

One readily appreciates the merit of the suggestion, for no one of us believes that industries should be permitted to make enormous war profits. On the other hand, in applying this tax great care must be exercised in writing the formula and fixing the rate that the tax does not operate to hinder the normal growth of small businesses in the United States. And, I am frank to say, I am most interested in encouraging small business. It is the "little businessman" who is the backbone of our economy. He suffered from the very unwise undistributed profits tax, you will recall, and I insist that the business-tax formulas be arrived at in such a manner so as not to hinder small-business development.

A second group advocate a broadening of the Federal excise taxes. They believe that because of high wages and intense industrial activity induced by the national-defense program, the American public will go on a spending spree and cause an inflation through their demands for consumption goods. Therefore, this group advocates a high tax on luxury items, automobiles, radios, refrigerators. They contend that through this system not only will the Government collect a large amount of revenue but the tax will also operate to curtail the public demand for these articles. It was also pointed out to the committee that this tax can be made to serve as a brake on the ordinary consumption of articles made from materials, such as aluminum and steel, necessary for defense purposes.

Let me say a word or two about excise taxes. As you know, our existing law provides for excise taxes on a number of commodities, such as gasoline, tobacco, automobiles, telegrams, etc. These taxes bring in a larger revenue than any other single tax, and they are easy to collect.

However, the excise tax has two very important disadvantages. One is that the people do not realize they pay it, for the tax is hidden in the price of the article purchased. When the politician is finally forced to levy new taxes, this type of tax is invariably the type he likes. In the words of one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, "this form of taxation is always useful as it gets the feathers out of the goose with the least squawking." As I stated a little while ago, the only way we are ever going to eliminate Government extravagance is by the people squawking. I am inclined to believe that the people should know exactly how much they must contribute to the expense of government. If they were "tax conscious," the politicians in Washington would be less generous in the appropriations.

The excise tax has another disadvantage which I think should be taken into account, and that is that it is not based upon the ability to pay principle but rather falls heaviest on the lower and middle income groups. In other words, the average citizen is the consumer. And I am very much concerned lest the taxes become more than he can possibly bear. Moreover, I want the average citizen to know he pays taxes rather than have them hidden in his articles of purchase.

A third group recommends that the Committee on Ways and Means use a combination of taxes: (1) a tax on business sufficient to take from this branch of our economy all excess war profits; (2) a moderately heavy tax on a limited number of consumption items, the manufacture of which might seriously interfere with national-defense production; and (3) a broadening of the personal income tax base by reducing the exemptions and by increasing the tax rates themselves on personal income and estates. It is urged that by a combination of these three the best balanced system of obtaining tax revenue will be afforded. It is really an extension of our present tax system, and it is my personal belief that the theories of this last group will prevail when the bill is finally written.

But no matter what system is finally decided upon, the administration intends to collect $13,000,000,000, or more, out of the national income of 1941. Our people must now prepare to meet the tax collector. I cannot emphasize this too strongly and too often. The effect of these new taxes, whatever system is adopted, is certain to compel each and every one of us to pay to the tax collector sums of money, directly or indirectly, which we have heretofore set aside as savings for a vacation or for some other family purpose. It might just as well be understood today that our whole psychology of living must undergo a change. The tax burden will be such that all of us must make a readjustment in our standard of living.

I do not intend to bother you with too many figures, but in order to give you an idea of what may be expected I will quote a few taxes that those of ordinary income will have to meet under the proposal the committee is presently considering.

Let us take as an example a single person and a married couple without children. Serious consideration is being given to reducing the present exemption of a married couple from $2,000 to $1,600, and to reducing the exemption of a single person from $800 to $600. This is advocated on the theory of broadening the taxable base.

Under the present law a married man without children who receives a total salary of $3,000, pays $31 income tax. Under the Treasury Department proposal, he would pay $152. If he should decide to set aside a sufficient sum each month, beginning with his next pay in June, in order to pay this tax when it becomes due on March 15, he would have to put aside around $16 each month.

If he is a married man with no children with a salary of $4,000, under existing law he pays an income tax of $70. Under the proposed law he will have to be prepared to meet the tax collector next March with $312. If he begins next month to set aside enough money to satisfy the collector, whom you will find anything but agreeable, he must save approximately $35 a month.

For those who have advanced to an executive position and receiving a salary of $6,000, his tax will be increased from $150 to $700. His monthly saving for the eventful day of March 15 next must be around $77 a month. Even Congress will not be sparing of itself under the new tax proposal. Under existing law a Member of Congress, married, with no children, pays $528. Under the pending proposal he will be obliged to pay $1,628. And he must save at least $180 a month between now and next March.

While it is only of academic interest to most of us, let us take the case of a married man whose income is $20,000 a year. Under the Treasury's recommendation he will pay $4,800 personal income tax and must set aside around $533 each month between now and next March.

The point I have been endeavoring to emphasize is that when the pending tax bill is finally passed and the exact rates are known, each individual should forecast what his income tax will be and begin immediately to accumulate monthly reserves for the purpose. The Government is a hard tax collector. It will demand that payment be made on the dot, and will charge you a 6-percent penalty if you delay in meeting this obligation. I believe the Treasury Department will, in due course, put on a campaign of information and instruction to taxpayers. But what I fear is that our good fellow citizens, many of whom have never been tax conscious, will be shocked and surprised when the tax collector submits his bill and will not be prepared, with cash on hand, to make payment.

This new tax bill will require sacrifices of all of us. It will usher in a tax consciousness. The American people will again take an interest in national affairs. Demands for economy will be stimulated. While we must now pay the costs of our mistakes of yesterday and go through this painful period of sacrifice, I have faith in the American people and our system of government and firmly believe that we will pass through this era of upset world conditions and emerge an even greater nation, purified and strengthened by our experience.

While we are preparing to meet the tax collector, let us also demand that the administration itself sacrifice many of its expenditures not essential in this hour of crisis for our defense.

California National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

COMMENTS FROM VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the California National Youth Administration has earned widespread

public support because of its sane, level-headed administration, its splendid program, and its vital contribution to national defense. The newspapers of California have been among the first to recognize the able and sincere efforts of State Administrator Robert Wayne Burns and his staff to provide the youth of California with work experience which will enable them to get jobs in private industry. From among the hundreds of newspaper comments available I have selected a few which follow:

Long Beach Press Telegram, January 2, 1941, by James Arden Allen: A vital factor in Long Beach's national defense preparation is the National Youth Administration, which is giving young persons an opportunity to acquire experience in various branches of defense-related industries, without competing with private enterprise.

To the average person the N. Y. A. long has been thought of as a program carried out only in the schools.

But the program in the schools is only a part of the National Youth Administration's work here.

Slightly more than 500 students in Long Beach schools are working under N. Y. A., while 876 youths are engaged in the program outside the schools.

Young men in this program are being trained so that they can step into vital defense work—which a great number are now doing.

Young women are receiving experience in mass production methods in sewing and cooking, and are being trained in Red Cross work. Many are engaged in stenographic and clerical work in various offices here.

San Luis Obispo Telegram-Tribune, March 29, 1941: New dormitories and mess halls, together with additional administrative offices, are rapidly nearing completion at the N. Y. A. Resident Training Center situated on the California Polytechnic School campus. These additions will accommodate 120 new youth trainees and will bring the total enrollment of the project to 230 boys. Arrivals will start April 1, and April 15 should see all units completely filled.

Classes in aircraft sheet metal, welding, machine shop, radio, and drafting are offered by the school under the direction of Charles Knott, Dean of Industry, for 4 hours a day, 5 days a week.

Boys are selected on the basis of their aptitude and desire for one of these courses, while the instructors furnished by the school are men selected not only for their teaching ability but because of their past experience in industry and their knowledge of the exact type of training that industry requires. Length of time necessary to complete these courses ranges from 6 months in welding to 18 months in machine shop, with the ability of the individual youth lengthening or shortening the time required, as the case may be.

Thus, the youths assigned to this project are given a chance to develop good work habits on actual jobs at the same time that they are being trained for employment in industry. Their enthusiasm and appreciation of what is being offered them is clearly shown by the fact that more than half of the present group are attending classes from 4 a. m. to 8 a. m. and every one volunteered willingly for this early morning training.

Sacramento Bee, March 29, 1941, by Leland Elam: A dual-purpose program—one that is "going to bat" for national defense in two ways at the same time—has been under way for sometime at the State's forest-service station near Davis. Here, in cooperation with the State department of natural resources, the National Youth Administration is giving 213 superior California youths work experience so that they can obtain jobs in defense industries. At the same time these young men are building equipment for actual use in defense operations.

There are dozens of boys who a few weeks before hunted for a job—any kind of a job—and now they have one each day in the shops at the Davis project. From here, after a few months' training, they are placed in defense-industry positions or take up work in private local firms. * * * Thus the National Youth workers at Davis are turning out a large amount of equipment which the State division of forestry will use to fight fires in the State forests—and that is important also because our State of California defense plan calls for proper forest protection. * * *

All the time these boys are gaining experience to take such jobs in national-defense work or private industry, they are turning out hundreds of jobs for the division of forestry.

Stockton Record, March 12, 1941: A new contribution to national defense—giving young men work experience in metal trades—has been undertaken here by the National Youth Administration and went into operation this week with the establishment of a sheet-metal shop at 625 East Market Street. * * * Representing an investment by the Government of $700, mostly in new machinery, the shop will provide sheet-metal-work experience, and related training in such subjects as blueprint reading, layout work, shop mathematics and the use and operation of power machines. Aircraft sheet metal and welding also are subjects for training in the shop.

Sacramento Union, February 9, 1941: Col. Fred C. Nelson, commanding Sacramento Army air depot, who thought the N. Y. A. out-of-school program "worth trying" in the engineering department on the field, now is "completely sold" on the plan of operation. He said yesterday, "I'll admit I expected quite a few hitches, but so far everything has gone off smoothly and as a consequence, a tremendous problem has been taken off our hands."

Nelson explained: "You see, there is such a heavy demand for airplane mechanics in Government projects and private industry, that the supply simply is not forthcoming. We can't get trained men and we can't get apprentices, because civil service sets up requirements that cannot be met without previous training.

"If this N. Y. A. program had not been inaugurated it would have been necessary for us to open a special employment bureau and a training school. We have other things to do that I deem more important, so you can understand why I'm so appreciative of the N. Y. A.'s handling the job for us—both the hiring and preparation of boys for future positions."

Colonel Nelson, who is a friendly human being rather than the stern military type one might expect, has recommended to Washington, that in order to keep production at the depot up to requirements, the program should be expanded to take in 500 boys and that, during the emergency, these young men should be hired as soon as they have satisfied the mechanics of their ability to take over regular jobs.

Calexico Chronicle, March 14, 1941, by Dorian Stout: No one can complain that the present administration has not achieved major progress in the field of prevention against a second lost generation. Its most conspicuous success has been the operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration. * * * Calexico has reason to know that the N. Y. A. is sound in purpose and sound in application. Broadly, it is devised to train youth in the mechanical arts, to enable ambitious youngsters to learn a trade or profession, or to pursue an education. N. Y. A. boys and girls contributed effort to many phases of the Desert Cavalcade; before that its enrollees performed many of the smaller jobs about the city. * * * And while the city benefits, so will the boys. They will be learning a trade, or trades, and will be more valuable to themselves and to prospective employers. Here is a splendid opportunity extended by N. Y. A. that must be exploited.

San Francisco Call-Bulletin, March 22, 1941: Seven boys bent over a table in the center of the room, seven boys whose fingers worked swiftly and surely and nimbly for * * * national defense.

There were photographs on that table, overlapping aerial photographs of bay area terrain. When patterned together with the necessary hairbreadth exactness, those pictures would form a detailed map for the Engineer Corps of the United States Army.

Here is a brief glimpse of one of the activities of San Francisco headquarters of the National Youth Administration, where practical work experience available to young people in a dozen different fields has been geared today toward national defense.

* * * Throughout the Nation, throughout the State, as well as here in San Francisco young people are working to the end that eventually they may fit into the national-defense program, that some day soon they may be called upon to fill in potential shortages in national-defense industries. * * *

Sacramento Union, February 9, 1941: "You couldn't write anything that would overstate my approval of this N. Y. A. project in which the Army air depot and Grant Union High School are cooperating." William Rutherford, principal of the school, made that statement while discussing the out-of-school program that has put approximately 125 boys into preparatory jobs at the depot and into residence at the school.

"My chief interest is in benefiting youth—in making boys and girls fit into the life of the community as self-supporting, energetic people. While this program is designed only for boys, it is exactly the type I hope schools everywhere will be adopting some day to prepare people for jobs."

Sacramento Bee, March 3, 1941: National Youth Administration workers on the Placer Junior College campus made higher grades last semester than the average attained by the student body as a whole.

The men and women who earned a portion of their expenses on projects set up by Federal authorities had a grade point average of 1.256 against a general student body average of 1.198.

Santa Rosa Press Democrat, February 26, 1941: * * * But jobs are scarce for boys of that age. Changing conditions in industry, business, and even agriculture have made it harder for the youngster to get a foothold.

Our school system is already acting to meet this problem in part by expanding its educational work in the vocational field, and another valuable contribution is being made by the N. Y. A. in its vocational guidance and apprenticeship training.

Atascadero News, February 14, 1941, from Judge Ray Lyon, of San Luis Obispo, superior court, address to the A. A. U. W. (North Cuesta branch): Judge Lyon feels that America's real danger today lies within, in the idleness of youth; so that we need to fear a broken nation and a weakened democracy. We must have leaders in this rehabilitation of youth, and we must attack the problem on every front.

The program offered by the schools, C. C. C., and N. Y. A. should be expanded to afford good work habits.

"It is a big problem," said Judge Lyon in conclusion, "and challenges the best in all of us. The strength and future of our country depends on how we save our youth."

Riverside Press, January 2, 1941: A survey of college enrollment shows no drop in attendance following the increase in military

service. The peak reached in 1930 has not been lowered much in 1940.

University presidents attribute this result to two factors. One is the provision of the 1940 Selective Training and Service Act which permits drafted students to defer the beginning of service until the close of the present academic year. The other is the continuance of N. Y. A. payments. The National Youth Administration enables needy students to stay in school by paying them for a large variety of useful work.

Susanville, Lassen Advocate, May 3, 1940: Operated in conjunction with Lassen Junior College, youths enrolled in the National Youth Administration are given practical forestry experience at the residential project in Susanville.

The college is a forestry school and those boys who otherwise could not afford to attend without some assistance are given the opportunity by working for the N. Y. A.

Virtually all of the boys stand high in scholarship and participate in school activities. Their actual forestry experience assures them of a better than average chance for jobs with the Forest Service when they are through school.

Fresno Bee and Republican, March 12, 1940: The old truism about adversity being the mother of success finds a modern application in the report of a California junior college that students employed on projects of the National Youth Administration make better grades than the average student.

The N. Y. A. is one of the New Deal plans conceived by President Roosevelt to help deserving youths without means to obtain a college education. Projects are provided permitting them to work part time and earn enough to pay board, tuition, and other expenses.

The report finds—as indeed many others have found—that students working their way through college are more conscious of the value of an education and more eager to embrace their opportunities.

Los Angeles Times, October 10, 1939—statement by Father Flanagan: The United States would be wise to increase the activity of the National Youth Administration. To do so means a saving of money in the long run since it is cheaper to make these boys reliable, productive citizens than criminals who are public charges.

San Francisco Call-Bulletin, July 18, 1940: Today, when the youth of other lands is being sacrificed in war, this Nation recognizes the full value of the sound youth program established by the administration. The National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps have enabled our youths to complete their education, have maintained their health, trained them for useful citizenship, and aided them to secure employment.

Our public works have modernized and greatly expanded the Nation's schools. We have increased Federal aid for vocational education and rehabilitation, and undertaken a comprehensive program of defense-industry training. We shall continue to bring to millions of children, youths, and adults, the educational and economic opportunities otherwise beyond their reach.

Los Angeles Neighborhood News, November 4, 1940: The New Deal has helped to conserve Afro-American youth equally along with the other youth of America as no other social agency among us. In a very short time it has reached out all over the country to bring under its protecting wings these youths who otherwise would never have gotten their opportunity.

One hundred and twenty thousand high-school students have been assisted by N. Y. A. during the past 5 years. They have received an average of $6 per month for furthering their education. In nearly every other community in the country are ambitious young Afro-Americans who never would have seen inside of a high school except for N. Y. A.

Los Angeles Examiner, August 15, 1940, by Virginia Hamilton, vice president of Thomas Jefferson Young Democratic Club: There are certain values which cannot be judged from a material standpoint. The idle youths who frequented the pool halls were fast becoming recruits for subversive organizations. The C. C. C. took these boys off the streets and made them into good citizens who frequently have found work in private industry. The N. Y. A. has served a similar purpose and has made possible through educational grants the development of much human ability and skill which is of value to the Nation.

San Francisco Chronicle, June 2, 1940: One of the most laudable projects in operation in the San Francisco community is the toy loan activity of the National Youth Administration and the coordinating council of the city and county, a project described at length on this page a few weeks back.

The work is laudable, primarily, because it has a double benefit. It provides toys for children on a lending plan; and it provides work for somewhat older children—for that part of the Nation's youth one hears so much about, the unemployed part.

Visalia Times-Delta, October 1, 1940: Young men who have been under the wing of the National Youth Administration will be better workmen after they have completed the building the city is to construct for use of the State employment bureau.

All the work on the 60-by-50-foot structure is to be done by N. Y. A. youths under the watchful eye of an experienced supervisor of the organization.

After viewing so much that is done for the benefit of those being assisted by various governmental agencies and units, it is a pleasure to see a practical demonstration of real work which should mean a saving in money to the city and an addition of practical knowledge for those doing the job.

San Francisco News, September 6, 1940: The kid has paint running down his elbow and a smudge of it in his hair. But the older man just laughs and says, "Here, watch me." He paints a wide swath of gray in a single gesture where the kid had left a hesitant streak.

Or—another lad's two hands aren't enough, with the valves to watch in the powerhouse and the temperature indicators shifting, and a pressure gage reading to be taken.

"You do it this way," directs an engineer, and shows a short cut to an easy handling of the job.

In the sheet-metal shop two boys bend over a cutting machine, while an old timer shows them how to operate it.

All over the place, where steamfitters, plumbers, painters, electricians, carpenters are at work, a little knot of boys tag along. Maybe they're a nuisance the first week, but after that they slip aptly into the role of assistant. And soon they are learning how to do a man's work. * * *

This is the National Youth Administration program, as it is working today in San Francisco.

And these hard-working lads who are learning the trades under the guidance of experts on N. Y. A. projects are forerunners of the annual 2,000,000 President Roosevelt hopes to enlist in an immense program of industrial training for the youth of this country. N. Y. A., which has trained young puppeteers and artists, scholars, and musicians, has heard the national cry for preparedness and is slanting its program in this new direction.

The Letterman General Hospital project is the newest under N. Y. A. Here, directly under Army supervision, boys are being taught the exact craftsmanship this country so directly needs.

San Fernando Sun, November 7, 1939 (reprinted in Lancaster Ledger Gazette): During a time when mental-relief and social-aid agencies are being generally and bitterly criticized—and in many cases justly so—it is a pleasant thing to find one agency which is really shooting at its mark, if not hitting it every time. In our estimation, the cleanest and most smoothly functioning of all the Federal agencies is the still new National Youth Administration, which has delivered such excellent local results.

Bob Burns, for years a ranking official in Y. M. C. A. work and at one time the publisher of a country newspaper on which we worked, has varied his strange career still further by recently taking over the State administration of the N. Y. A. * * *

Knowing the kind of work the N. Y. A. has done here so far, and knowing its State administrator for the kind of a man he is, we are able to feel happy about one branch of the governmental relief set-up anyway.

Americans of Jewish Extraction Do Not Act and Think en Bloc—To Charge Them With Doing So Is Unfair

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, there are forces abroad in the world today seeking to enslave all humanity. One of the methods consistently used by the Nazis has been to attack the Jews as the source of all evil. To defend their war to dominate the world they claim that they are fighting against warmongers, egged on by the Jews. Even today they have not abandoned this tone. I refer to the May 21 issue of Facts In Review, an official Nazi publication, which contains the authorized English translation of Hitler's speech to his puppets on the Greco-Serbian battles.

On the plains of Kansas, where John Brown led the battle to keep Kansas free, the Nazi virus has established a serious infection. It manifested itself in Gerald Winrod, who sought election to the Congress of the United States. It finds expression in those who assert that the defense program of this country has been instigated by the Jews. Yesterday on the floor of this House, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a Member charged that the opponents of C. A. Lindbergh, ex-mail pilot, ex-Reserve colonel, and ex-hero, but not ex-Nazi medalist, were the Jews. I quote:

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that Col. Charles A. Lindbergh is getting under the hide of the war crowd. An attempt is being made to overshadow his Philadelphia speech for Thursday night with a LaGuardia meeting for tomorrow, Wednesday night.

Dr. Leon Levy, the president of WCAU, Philadelphia, denied time on the radio to Lindbergh. Samuel R. Rosenbaum, the head of WFIL, also denied him time. David Stern, of the Philadelphia Record, is one of the main sponsors of the LaGuardia meeting. Moe Annenberg, of the Philadelphia Inquirer, who is serving time in jail, is one of the promoters of the war crowd in Philadelphia.

The two men who have helped write the President's speech for tonight are Judge Rosenman and Editor Sulzburger.

It may not be amiss to point out that the chief publicity man for the America First Committee, for which Lindbergh speaks, is Sidney Hertzberg, a Jew who was born and raised in New York City. Before that he was the editor of Uncensored, a mimeographed antiwar publication. Lessing Rosenwald formerly contributed heavy sums to that committee. Rabbi Sidney E. Goldstein is scheduled to speak on Friday, May 30, in a big antiwar rally at which Senators TAFT and WHEELER will speak. The executive secretary of the War Registers League, a pacifist organization, is Abraham Kaufman. Other prominent Jews who oppose the present program are Rabbi Solomon Goldman, of Chicago; Rabbi Isidore B. Hoffman, counselor to Jewish students at Columbia University; and Rabbi De Sola Poole, of the Portuguese Spanish Congregation in New York City, all members of the War Registers League, and in addition Abraham Kaufman, executive secretary of the league. I might also add the name of Dr. Henry Newman, of the Brooklyn Ethical Culture School, who spoke at a large mass meeting in New York recently. The New York offices of the America First Committee are manned almost exclusively by Jews. I could continue the catalog but I think the point is obvious. The Jews are no more unanimous in support of this war than they were in supporting President Roosevelt in the last election. At the last session of Congress I had occasion to stress the fact that there was no Jewish vote, as some people suggested. There is likewise no unanimous opinion among Jews as to the present policy of the Government. Anyone who suggests, or seeks to suggest, that there is a unanimous Jewish opinion with respect to war is serving, however unconsciously, the interests of the Nazis.

Americans of Jewish faith have a constitutional right to think freely both pro and con on any subject. I hope their right to do so is not made the basis of intolerance.

Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

ADDRESS BY THOMAS J. CULHANE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Thomas J. Culhane at Mother's Day breakfast, Sunday, May 11, 1941, at Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

If memory serves me right I believe it was former Governor Groesbeck, of Michigan, who once said, "If mother love ruled the world today, there would be no conflicts, no destruction of human life because of greed, no sorrow because of unrighteous designs," and I am sure you mothers of Washington will agree with me that truer words never fell from the lips of mortal man.

Today we turn back in memory to the days of youth, away from the turmoil of modern life, and reverently bow our heads at the shrine of motherhood. A widespread prayer, a white carnation, a silent tribute to mothers, dead and living—these are the tokens of America's sons and daughters, irrespective of social, racial, or religious distinction, to the sublime influence of the home.

The observance of Mother's Day originated in the mind and heart of Miss Anna Jarvis, a daughter of the State of West Virginia, who thought it would be a beautiful tribute to all mothers if their children would unite on one day in the year and wear a simple white flower in evidence of filial honor and love. As Miss Jarvis expresses it she chose the white carnation "Because its color typifies purity, its form beauty, its fragrance love, its wide field of growth charity, and its lasting quality faithfulness—all virtues of true motherhood."

It was back in 1907 when Miss Jarvis said, on the first anniversary of the death of her mother, "We do so little to help and brighten the lives of mothers that it seems to me the least we can do is to make them universal queens of the May." And it was on the second Sunday in May of that year the first Mother's Day was celebrated in the pretty little town of Grafton in West Virginia.

The following year Philadelphia joined with Grafton in honoring mother on the second Sunday in May and from that day on the thought spread like wildfire throughout the Nation, as Miss Jarvis, in a systematic manner, wrote to the Governors of States, the mayors of our large cities, chambers of commerce, clergymen, Government officials, and heads of institutions and succeeded in arousing their interest to such an extent that in 1909, 45 States, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Canada, and Mexico joined in observing the day by appropriate services and the wearing of the white carnation.

It then became Miss Jarvis' fondest hope that Mother's Day might be declared a national holiday. To this end she worked unceasingly for 4 long years, during which period she met with many disappointments. But on May 9, 1914, her efforts were gloriously rewarded. On that date President Wilson signed a joint resolution, which had been introduced and sponsored in Congress by the late Senator Sheppard, of Texas, and Representative Heflin, setting aside the second Sunday in May as a national holiday. On the same day the President issued a proclamation requesting that the flag be displayed throughout the United States in observance of the occasion "as a public expression of our love and reverence for the mothers of our country."

Each year since then Old Glory has been displayed on Mother's Day from our National Capitol, American consulates, homes, and churches.

With the aid of General Pershing, Secretary Daniels, Admiral Sims, General Foch, and Ambassador Sharp, Miss Jarvis successfully planned the official observance of Mother's Day for the Allied forces of the Army and the Navy during the World War. The largest mail to leave one port for another within a week's time is said to have been the Mother's Day letters in 1918.

Today the celebration is world wide. In far-off Japan, South Africa, Australia, and the British Isles honor is paid to the "patient saint of the hearthstone."

"The people in Mexico City have a wonderful time on Mother's Day," Miss Jarvis tells me. "The Pope sends an official message and much is done there through the church to keep alive the tender sentiment and enthusiasm for mother on her day."

Just this week Miss Jarvis received a letter from Ambassador Daniels from Mexico City in which he comments on the splendid effect the growth of Mother's Day has had upon the lives of our citizens.

The purpose of Mother's Day cannot be otherwise than fulfilled for it will always carry the mind back to a wholesome atmosphere. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Lakes to the Gulf Stream, millions of absent sons and daughters will take this opportunity to visit mother back home, or where such a visit is impossible, will send a tender message of love and greeting.

Those of us whose mothers have gone before will tread lightly the corridors of memory and, although the vision of a gentle presence will return, perhaps to awaken sorrow anew, it will carry with it the power to comfort and endure.

Great men of the world have traced their success to their mothers. Men whose characters have been examples, whose tongues or pens have wrought the battles of righteousness, whose learning has enlightened generations coming after, have always given credit to their mothers.

"A kiss from my mother made me a painter," said the famous artist, Benjamin West, after he had won fame and his pictures hung in royal academies. "When she gazed at my first silly sketch, she praised it and gave me encouragement with a tender kiss. She might well have said, 'Foolish child, why waste your time on such daub?' and so quenched the first spark of ambition."

The mother of Robert E. Lee was once declared dead and was buried in the family vault in Virginia. The next day the old sexton was placing fresh flowers on her casket when he heard a faint cry for help from within. Summoning aid, she was rescued from a living death. Fifteen months later she gave birth to a son who was destined to become commander in chief of the Confederate Army during the Civil War. Many years after, the beloved general said, "I had a most wonderful mother, in wisdom, in love, and in inspiration. God rescued her from the tomb that I might have such a mother."

From earliest memory I can recall the simple tributes of Washington and Lincoln to their mothers. "All that I am or ever hope to be I owe to my darling mother," said Lincoln. Washington wrote in his Memoirs, "My mother was the most beautiful woman I ever saw. I owe everything in life to her."

Thomas Edison once said, "My mother was the making of me. She was so true, so sure of me, and I felt that I had someone to live for, someone I must not disappoint."

An Army officer just yesterday told me a true story that brought to mind the fact that mother is never far away. A doughboy lay dying on a battlefield in France. As the officer gently placed a coat over him, the soldier, through feverish lips, murmured, "Thank you, mother dear, I was so cold. I'm glad you came and tucked me in better."

It was during those dark days of 1917–18 that Augustus Thomas, distinguished playwright, made the solemn statement: "Any war will always mean more to the mothers. It's easy to fight and easy enough to die. Stayin' behind with yer stummick empty and yer hands tied and yer hearts sore and a-breakin' is the perfect torment."

The immortal Beethoven, in speaking of his mother, said: "Ah, who was happier than I when I could still utter the name of mother and it was heard by her?"

These are but a few of the many thousands of tender tributes paid to mother by great men in history.

This year special Mother's Day features will be held behind gray prison walls when various societies will distribute carnations to the inmates of these institutions. Hundreds of

thousands of white carnations will also be distributed to patients in hospitals and some railroad companies will present the Mother's Day flower to their dining-car passengers. A corporation in Philadelphia gives a flower to each of its 2,000 employees on the Saturday preceding Mother's Day to be worn the following day.

So you can readily see how Miss Jarvis' lovely dream came true. It has swept over the land and touched a responsive chord in humanity.

Speaking of the early days of her work, she told me how Mother's Day was misunderstood for a time and became the subject for joke makers, who suggested a day for mothers-in-law, old maids, and other pleasantries.

When she commenced her labor of love and reverence for the Nation's mothers she possessed no resources in the way of wealth or influence. She merely had an overpowering enthusiasm for her idea and her enthusiasm won the world. And with the passing years her ardor has not diminished in the least. Through the Mother's Day Association, founded by her, she is planning the erection of a monument in Washington in commemoration of the mothers and homes of America. In this connection she is leaving no stone unturned to keep her ideal from becoming a "racket." In a letter I received from her this week she said:

"Mother's Day in past decades of my work has grown with you and thousands of other sons and daughters into a cherished, personal, sacred day. Therefore I have always aimed to keep it free from money taint or charity greed, but have not been entirely successful."

Some years ago I asked her how she had accomplished such a great work and she replied: "I simply dropped a beautiful thought out into the world as one drops a pebble into the pool, and the ripples of sentiment and sacred homage have widened until they have reached the edges of the earth itself."

On this beautiful May morning, when dead things of nature have become delightfully alive and old things have grown new, this group has met here to pay tribute to Anna Jarvis, founder of Mother's Day, and to all mothers everywhere, for there is no other who can ever take their place, from everlasting to everlasting.

And now, may I thank you for the privilege of addressing you. To my dying day I shall always cherish as one of my priceless memories the fact that this honor was accorded me.

Taxation of Luxuries Versus Taxation of Necessities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

STATEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI AUTOMOBILE CLUB

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I beg to attach herewith statement of the Mississippi Automobile Club in reference to increased taxation on gasoline, which statement meets with my unqualified approval:

It is true that considerable sums of money today are being spent upon nonessentials and luxuries. If these items are taxed, such expenditures might be curtailed with no harm, and perhaps even with some positive good, to the consumer. If taxation of such items did not result in curtailment of their consumption, the taxpayer would not be in a position to complain of such taxation since it may be avoided so readily and harmlessly.

There are two kinds of nonessential expenditures. One is expenditure for goods and services purchased only or mainly by the rich and the other is for goods and services which may be purchased in considerable quantities at present, but without which the consumer could get along somehow if necessary. Pleasure telephoning, social-club admissions, personal servants, and the like are examples of the first type. Liquor, tobacco, moving pictures, and cosmetics are examples of the second.

It is the second type of nonessential expenditure that has been taxed most generally, for such taxation has been found to produce substantial revenue without harmful effects upon the general public. One man may spend all his money on goods and services which are socially desirable, while another may spend his money for goods and services which are not so socially desirable. Under such circumstances, it is argued that there is some justification for the Government's prevention of as much waste on the part of the latter as is possible and practicable through taxation of his consumption of the less socially desirable goods and services.

Consumption of liquor, for example, is regarded by many as evidence of an ability to support the Government according to the degree to which liquor is purchased. It is accepted generally that a certain percentage of what a consumer spends for this commodity should go to the Government, even though the consumer's income is not sufficient to purchase other articles which are regarded generally as necessities. Unlike food, or some other such essential commodity, whose consumption is indispensable to life itself, the tax upon liquor can be avoided without sacrifice through the consumer's foregoing the pleasure of its enjoyment.

The tobacco tax likewise is predicated on a similar principle. No matter to what degree tobacco may enter into the standard of living, it does not possess the characteristics of a necessity and therefore is the proper object of such a tax. The revenue yield from the taxation of tobacco is sufficiently high and stable to make it one of the most important items in the governmental fiscal structure.

To be equitable and sound, however, the taxing system should draw a line definitely between the consumption of essentials and nonessentials such as those cited above. The consumption of those goods and services which are fundamental elements in the standard of living may be considered essential. Since taxation may discourage the consumption of such essentials, taxes on such goods and services may serve as obstacles to the maintenance of accepted living standards.

Some years ago, when the automobile was a toy of the rich, it was an ideal subject for taxation as a nonessential, as also was the motor fuel used in its operation. Today, however, the automobile is owned and operated by those in the lower income brackets as an essential part of their everyday living habits. In many households, transportation by automobile occupies a place among the necessities of life, ranking close behind food, clothing, and shelter.

Surveys conducted under the supervision of the Federal Public Roads Administration, reveal that approximately 55 percent of the travel in passenger cars is strictly for business purposes. Merchants, farmers, and salesmen are but a few of the classes of motor vehicle operators that depend almost entirely on their vehicles for a livelihood. Moreover, motor trucks account for approximately one-quarter of all the motor fuel consumed in this country in providing the Nation with the superior economies of this essential form of transportation.

In connection with the national-defense program the automobile has become wholly indispensable. Shortage of housing and labor in centers engaged in production of defense materials is requiring assembly of skilled workers from outside areas. Transportation of these workers to their jobs has been facilitated by the private automobile to a degree possible by no other means. Instances of workers consuming 4 hours daily in driving back and forth to work are not unknown.

Ownership and operation of automobiles long ago shed the characteristics that made it an appropriate subject for taxation as a nonessential. Automobile use now is a fundamental element in the accepted standard of living and should be distinguished clearly, therefore, from the consumption of nonessential goods and services for purposes of taxation.

TRANSPORTATION AND DEFENSE TAXES

The American today has four media from which to choose in pursuing his travels. The airplane, the train, the steamboat, and the automobile are available to convey him to any point that he may wish to reach within the Nation's confines. It is due in no small way to the wise policy of public development and encouragement that this great transportation system—the finest and most comprehensive in the world—is available for his use. For the American people long have expressed their interest in all four media and at various times have promoted the development of one or another. They appreciate the place of each in the Nation's economic order, the way that one form supplements another, and they realize, too, that absence or discouragement of any one, regardless of the possible adequacy of the other three, would result in a transportation system which would be quite incomplete.

It is for this reason that in considering an economic sanction upon one form, whether it be regulation, subsidy, or taxation, proper deliberation should be given to the dynamic equilibrium that prevails among the various components of the Nation's transport network. For to favor or penalize one media without regard for the others would not only be discriminatory but contrary to the public interest which has been manifested actively since the formation of the Union. In matters of taxation especially it is imperative that proper consideration be given to the relationship of a levy on a single form of transportation to operating economy and to the effect upon the dynamics of transport.

TAXES ON HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION

Consider highway transportation, for illustration. It is beyond dispute that private and commercial motor-vehicle owners now are paying far more than their equitable share of the cost of highways in the form of State gasoline taxes, registration fees, and other special levies. They also pay all the general taxes paid by other citizens for the upkeep of government—local, State, and Federal—through the normal channels of taxation, i. e., assessments on property, income, business, various commodities, and the like. And in addition each highway user today is paying an average of $15 annually toward the cost of national defense through the Federal tax of 1½ cents on gasoline and the various Federal levies on automotive equipment.

These payments, which are over and above the road use levies imposed by the States and the normal taxes for all branches of government, are now providing some $450,000,000 annually toward the development of adequate armed forces. Of the four existing media, highway transportation is the only form which has been called upon thus far

to bear a particular portion of this defense-tax burden.

A brief analysis of the operating costs of motor vehicles illustrates the effect of these levies upon their operations. The out-of-pocket costs involved in operating a truck, which include driver's wages, gasoline, lubricating oil, tires, and repairs average about 10 cents per mile. Approximately 15 percent of this is expended upon mileage taxes, i. e., levies on gasoline, lube oil, and tires which vary directly with the number of miles operated. This does not include registration fees, special permit levies, nor other imposts which truck operators charge to fixed costs, along with garage, insurance, etc.

The existing defense taxes alone represent about 5 percent of these operating charges. Anyone familiar with the keenness of the competition which prevails among carriers today will appreciate the material advantage which this margin affords to the competitors of highway transportation.

If all motor vehicles are considered, the effect of these levies becomes even more significant. The mileage costs of the composite motor vehicle average around $150 per year, more than $40 of which goes for operating taxes. National-defense taxes, paid to the Federal Government, alone amount to about $15, or 10 percent of the total operating expenses. In order to effect equality of taxation throughout the entire transportation system, it would be necessary either to eliminate the existing defense levies or place corresponding taxes upon the operations of other transport media.

MOTOR VEHICLE TAXES AND HIGHWAY COSTS

It is claimed sometimes that motor-vehicle taxes are offset by highway expenses incurred by various units of government, and that highway users are enjoying a public subsidy. As previously mentioned, the defense taxes under discussion herein are in addition to the special road levies which highway users contribute for the development of road facilities. Inasmuch as these taxes are for development of an adequate Army and Navy, any consideration of road costs and their relation to motor-vehicle taxes is extraneous. It is worthy of mention, however, in this connection that Chairman Joseph B. Eastman, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in his comprehensive study of public aids to transportation, found that highway users pay more than their equitable share of costs, while rail, water, and air transport are enjoying sizeable public subsidies.

THE DECLARED POLICY OF THE CONGRESS

The welfare of the Nation's transportation system today depends upon equality of treatment toward all forms of transport and the maintenance of equal opportunity among them. A national policy embracing this attitude was declared by Congress only a year ago in the Transportation Act of 1940.

"It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation * * * so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices."

Considering this policy, does it seem proper that highway transportation should pay, as it now is paying, a defense tax amounting to 10 percent of motor vehicle running expenses, while other transport media go scot free? Highway users are not adverse to bearing a proportionate share of defense costs, but they do feel that it is discriminatory and in violation of principles of equity and justice to place them under such a handicap in the competitive market.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION INDISPENSABLE TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Approximately one-quarter of all the gasoline is consumed in motor trucking, which certainly is indispensable to the defense program. The superior economies of such transportation unquestionably are playing an ever more important role in the current defense effort, so that any increased tax upon the gasoline consumed for this purpose merely would increase the cost of transportation of materials essential to defense and hence seriously handicap such effort. Even in normal times, studies by the Federal Public Roads Administration indicate, approximately two-thirds of the operation of private automobiles owned by farmers is for business purposes. This group of the population incidentally accounts for approximately 30 percent of all the passenger cars. Obviously the farmer will play an indispensable role in the provision of adequate foodstuffs in any defense effort. But he would be penalized heavily through increased Federal taxation of the gasoline which he consumes.

Even in the case of residents of urban areas, these same studies show, in normal times slightly more than half of the operation of passenger cars represents business pursuits. There is compelling evidence, furthermore, that this percentage is increasing rapidly as a result of defense needs. One of the chief obstacles to satisfactory progress of the defense effort, it is known quite generally, has been the serious shortage of adequate housing facilities in the vicinity of industrial areas upon which there is the greatest dependence for fulfillment of the defense program. In New York, for example, widespread newspaper publicity has been accorded 200 skilled workers who drive back and forth daily to Bridgeport, Conn., the round trip consuming 4 hours. Only recently there has been considerable discussion of a projected public housing project in New Jersey which is being constructed especially for occupancy by defense workers and which, for physical and economic reasons, must be located some 17 miles from the plants in which its prospective residents are employed.

The same general trend is being shown in similar highly industrialized areas in other parts of the country. Certain specific illustrations might be cited. It appears, for example, that 82 percent of all the workers in Youngstown, Ohio, a steel center, drive to work in their own cars or ride with fellow workers. In Midland, Mich., a chemical center, the figure is 92 percent, and in Glendale, Calif., an aircraft center, it is 87 percent.

Of the 3,442 municipalities in this country with a population in excess of 2,500, it has been found that 2,130, or approximately two-thirds of the total, possess no system of mass transportation whatever. Their residents are required, therefore, to rely for transportation solely upon their own private automobiles.

This definite proof of the direct dependence of industrial workers upon their own automobiles for transportation to and from their work seems to check quite closely with known facts concerning the ownership of automobiles by income groups. In normal times approximately 52 percent of all the car owners have a weekly income of less than $30, and a cumulative total of 70 percent have a weekly income of less than $40. Only 12 percent have an income of more than $60 per week.

It seems quite clear that higher taxes upon the gasoline consumed in such traveling would cause a serious disruption in the existing transportation facilities upon which defense workers must depend in moving to and from their work. In fact, it is not too difficult to envisage how such added costs would contribute to the current agitation for higher wages to offset the effect of the increased tax. Such taxation, therefore, probably would tend to nullify directly much of the effort which is being expended currently in attempting to stimulate progress of the defense program.

ADDITIONAL DEFENSE TAXES

The additional levy on gasoline now being considered by the Congress would widen the tax differential between highway and other transport agencies. Such a levy would have a most adverse effect upon highway transport, therefore, and only could be detrimental to the welfare of the transportation system as a whole.

If equality of treatment is to be maintained, it would seem proper to place similar levies on other transport so as to produce approximately equivalent revenue from those sources before any further increase in highway levies is considered. Actually, such taxes would have far less impact upon the operating economy because of the broader traffic base over which they could be distributed.

Not only would this accomplish the desired aim of the Congress to produce a tax yield commensurate with the cost of national defense, but it would be in accordance with the declared congressional policy of fair and impartial treatment to all transport agencies. Such a step also would be in the best interests of the shipping public, for it would maintain stability in the transportation field and preserve the status of the motor-transport industry, a public convenience and a necessity.

Labor and the Defense Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the President's speech last night with great interest. After thinking it over, however, I am somewhat confused as to just what he means or just what he wants Congress and the country to do. I say this absolutely without any criticism of any kind, but am simply seeking information. I believe I am in the same position as millions of our people in this country. We try to be good Americans; we are willing to forget partisanship and party lines, for the first consideration of the safety and welfare of this Nation above everything else.

I wish the speech had been more specific, and I think many of my people feel the same.

I hope, under the unlimited emergency, the President means that from now on he will not permit the unscrupulous, subversive labor leaders, who have never had the welfare of the average worker at heart, much less the welfare of the country, to destroy our defense program by continued strikes. I hope, further, that he means that the average workman, whom I believe to be as patriotic as the President or myself, will no longer be exploited by these same subversive interests. I hope also that he will send an order down the line to his executives who are handling the defense program with instructions that will stiffen their backs and will cause them to cease dilly-dallying, cease compromising those things that are wrong which have resulted in the loss

of over 2,000,000 workdays in our defense program.

I hope that he will point out to these same executives that there is a tremendous difference between that which constitutes real diplomacy and moral cowardice. Too many of his executives have given in on principles that were right and have delayed our defense program, and then have sought to hide under the cloak of diplomacy, saying they were diplomatic when in reality it was simply moral cowardice. This line of action has been the greatest aid to those who would sabotage our program, and I, as one American representing many, call for a cessation of such procedure.

I hope this is accepted in the spirit in which it is meant, and that is to be helpful, but I do believe that there are some things that should be no longer tolerated in this country.

Air Power Superiority Over Sea Power

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt's speech last night did not contradict my contention that instead of convoying these vessels under our own flag we should transfer them to British or Canadian registry and let the convoying be done under the British or the Canadian flag.

I rose, however, to call your attention to the fact that another contention I have made for the last 18 years was confirmed on yesterday, when British air power proved its superiority over sea power in the sinking of the German battleship *Bismarck*. Ever since Billy Mitchell sank the *Ostfriesland* in Hampton Roads in 1922, I have contended that we needed the strongest air force on earth and that the time was approaching when domination by sea power would be a thing of the past. That time has arrived, and I hope this administration will do what the President suggested last night, and that is to put a stop to these strikes and speed up production for our defense industries and build the greatest air force on earth.

In one of its leading editorials headed The Lesson of the *Bismarck*, the New York Times this morning says:

> But though the destruction of the *Bismarck* is a great triumph for the British, it is far from a triumph for traditional sea power. For this brilliant stroke would obviously not have been possible without the air arm. It was aircraft that sought out and found the *Bismarck* after pursuing warships had lost her. It was aircraft that delivered the fatal torpedo blows that slowed the *Bismarck* down, sent her spinning helplessly in circles, and made the business of finishing her off by torpedoes from a cruiser almost a perfunctory matter.

What we have been witnessing on the island of Crete further, and tragically, emphasizes the superiority of air power over sea power.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting an article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, one of the best informed men on aviation in the world, entitled "The Twilight of Sea Power."

The matter referred to follows:

[From the American Mercury of June 1941]

THE TWILIGHT OF SEA POWER

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

Our great two-ocean multibillion-dollar Navy, now in construction, should be completed 5 or 6 years from now, just in time to have all of its battleships scrapped. The smaller and swifter units and the undersea craft may continue their auxiliary tasks under the shielding wings of air power; the rest will be consigned to the museums of outlived weapons along with the bow and arrow and the blunderbuss. As a primary, self-sufficient branch of national defense, fleets will be finished. References to naval might as our "outer defense" or "first line of defense" will seem echoes of a far-off past. The complacency with which we once relied on such slogans will seem as tragic and incredible to Americans as reliance on Maginot Lines must now seem to Frenchmen.

To those who have not caught up with the revolution in war strategy brought about by the advent of air power, this may sound like exaggeration; to naval die-hards it will sound like blasphemy. Yet, a little patient consideration of facts already in high relief on the landscape of the present war will reveal that I am merely setting down the inescapable conclusion we must draw from recent experience. As we approach the end of the second year of the second World War, it is startlingly clear that the navies of all nations have already and irretrievably lost their function of strategic offensive action. They still play a defensive role, against other navies, but only in waters as yet beyond the reach of aviation. As that reach is extended, with the rapid enlargement of air-power range, the margin of defensive usefulness shrinks, and it is quite possible to foresee the inevitable vanishing point.

The moment when air power can reach across oceans as easily as it now bridges narrower waters will mark the final elimination of sea power as a primary element in warfare. The rate at which aviation is expanding its range under the impetus of the war leaves no doubt in the minds of aeronautical experts that the Atlantic will be wide open to the full fury of aerial assaults from one shore to the other within 2 or 3 years. It is generally conceded that technically it is already possible to bomb America—or for America to bomb an enemy—across the ocean. Our own Douglas B-19, with its range of nearly 8,000 miles, and the Martin flying boat now being designed for far greater distances, hint at the potentialities of massive long-range bombing in the near future.

In my own carefully considered view, the ultimate round-the-world range of 25,000 miles, enabling a nation to strike at any point of the globe in any direction, is, at most, 5 years away. When that is achieved, there will remain no major tactical task heretofore entrusted to navies which has not been swallowed up by aviation.

The lessons of the war now in progress cannot be shouted down by rhetoric invoking the glories of naval history. It is a matter of sense, not of sentiment. The towering fact is that fleets can no longer approach hostile shores which are guarded by first-class aviation forces. For centuries the chief job of navies was to carry war to the enemy; to attack the outer ramparts of a country, its coastlines and harbors and fortresses. Now that job has been taken over almost entirely by air power. In the last 2 years enemy shores have been entirely denied to fleets, except on a hit-and-miss basis that merely emphasized the new state of affairs. We have seen dramatic naval attacks recently on Genoa, Brest, Tripoli, and other harbors. In every case, however, the attacking battleships simply took advantage of poor visibility or advance information that enemy aviation at that point was inadequate, exploiting the element of surprise. There is nothing in common between such surprise raids and the bold, continuous naval seiges of the past.

In Norway, after a costly baptism of aerial fire, the great British fleet, for all its overwhelming superiority, withdrew and stood by helpless—at a safe distance—while Nazi invaders, shielded by their air force, crossed the Skagerrak into Norway. After a costly attempt to land and maintain expeditionary troops on the North Sea coast of the Scandinavian Peninsula, the fleet retired to escape aerial destruction. Since then it has not been able, despite Germany's naval weakness, to take offensive measures against any portion of the Nazi-held Continent. Except where the R. A. F. is powerful enough to control the air overhead, the British Fleet must maintain a respectful distance from hostile shores—that distance being determined by the range of the enemy's aviation.

The fateful point of the story is that the picture would not be materially different if the British Navy were a dozen times bigger, and if Hitler did not possess a single battleship. So far as direct, offensive initiative against enemy soil is concerned, the role of navies has not merely been diminished—it has been ended. Only nations and regions without proper air defenses are still in any measure vulnerable to naval attack.

The "miracle of Dunkirk" has been credited by some superficial enthusiasts to the British Navy, because the physical transport of the evacuated troops was made on barges, ships, and other surface craft. Though himself essentially naval minded, Winston Churchill does not make this egregious mistake. Soon after the event, he acknowledged that "in the fighting over Dunkirk * * * we undoubtedly gained a local mastery of the air" and that "this embarkation would not have been possible unless the enemy had resigned all hope of air superiority at that point." It was, as Mr. Churchill specifically admitted, the reverse side of the situation in the invasion of Norway, where Nazi aviation held control. The sharp contrast between Hitler's mastery at the Skagerrak and his frustration at the English Channel indicates that air strength, rather than naval strength, has become the yardstick of a nation's might.

The most impressive fact about the long Battle of England, from a purely tactical point of view, has been the virtual elimination of the armies and navies of both adversaries. It has been an all-air battle, with the elder services immobilized and reduced to mere spectators. Single-handed, the R. A. F. has fought off the air invasion. Not all the power and courage of the fleet could have saved the British Isles from aerial annihilation had the air force been unequal to the task. The R. A. F. has fought the battle in English skies, and by carrying the war to the enemy objectives on the Continent. Even the systematic bombardment of Hitler's so-called invasion ports and air bases near the coast—targets easily within reach of naval guns—has been carried on exclusively by British air power. Thus it is neither the army nor the navy, but the R. A. F., which has dammed the flood tide of millions of mechanized German troops.

The grip of cliches on the mind of man is not easy to break. In England, as in our own country, the notion that "the country's chief defense is its navy" has acquired the force of a commandment handed down from Mount Sinai. Doubtless it is being repeated through sheer habit in the British Isles now, even while air power is so strikingly their main reliance at this juncture. But we need only imagine the R. A. F. out of commission—not

a ship could then reach England, for all that the Admiralty could do. The approaches would be as Nazi-dominated from the air as the Skagerrak and Kattegat Straits. Not a battleship could survive under the roof of enemy aviation long enough to interfere with German plans for invasion or for unhampered annihilation of England without benefit of invasion.

II

In the Mediterranean the fleet has chalked up some spectacular operations. On analysis it appears, however, that naval activities in the old style were possible only because of the dismal inferiority of Italian airplanes. British units were able to take the offensive because even their airplane-carrier aviation was a match for Italian land-based planes, whereas normally land-based aviation easily vanquishes ship-based planes. But the whole picture began to change as soon as genuine air power was brought into play with the arrival of Hitler's luftwaffe in the Mediterranean. The Nazi aviation debut in that theater of war was made with the memorable assault in the Straits of Sicily, where a British cruiser was sunk, a destroyer damaged, and the aircraft carrier *Illustrious* put out of action. It signalized a new phase. Thereafter the British Fleet could function only in places outside the range of Nazi aviation or under the protection of adequate R. A. F. aircraft.

British sea power has been practically eliminated from the North Sea. Whether it can remain in the Mediterranean depends not at all on its own size or skill but on whether British or Axis air power will dominate the Mediterranean skies. Whatever its value in terms of national morale, tactically the destruction of the Italian Navy means little under present-day conditions. Assume that the last Italian ship has been sent to the bottom of the Mediterranean, but that Hitler's aviation has captured full domination of the air overhead. That sea would then be utterly untenable for the "victorious" British Navy which would have to retreat from the aerial menace even as it did in the North Sea.

Let us enlarge the focus of this picture to the breadth of the Atlantic. Already the western portion, within the range of German air power, has been made a no man's land by long-range airplanes, though Germany has as yet an extremely inadequate number of this type. The proportion of British tonnage sunk from the skies grows with every week, and in the area under the Nazi air threat the R. A. F., rather than surface convoys, provide the only real protection to commerce.

Now imagine the range of air power expanded three to five times—as it inevitably will be in the next few years. The Atlantic then becomes another Skagerrak, every bit as vulnerable as the North Sea. Unless they have land-based aviation better than the foe's, navies must then escape from the Atlantic—even if that foe were entirely without a navy. America will then be in precisely the same strategic position as the British Isles today, with the Atlantic Ocean equivalent to the English Channel, and its control, like control of the Channel today, depending on relative aviation strengths.

There will no longer be any warrant in common sense for carrying striking power across the ocean to an enemy slowly, by battleship, when it can be carried faster, more cheaply, and more effectively by battleplane. In any case the battleship would be unable to perform this strategic errand unless and until air power cleared the skies over the ocean of enemy planes and maintained a canopy of overhead protection for the fleet. The latest capital ships being built by our Navy cost about $100,000,000 each—a sum that could pay for the construction of 250 bombers capable of flying to a European target, dropping their explosive loads, and returning. Since each of the 250 could carry at least 20 tons of explosives—as much as 40 German Stuka dive bombers now deliver—their striking power would be equal to 10,000 Stukas. Since the raid on Coventry or the worst single raid on London involved only some 500 bombers, this in turn is roughly equivalent to nearly a month of such raids. Such, in simple arithmetic, is the economic equivalent in air power of a single capital ship.

I am not minimizing the actual part played at the present moment by the British Navy in keeping open supply lines to the British Isles from the outside world. It functions freely and fully—both in blockading the enemy and defending its own merchantmen—beyond the reach of aviation. But the Navy is able to do so only by reason of the insufficiency of that reach, and is consequently being more and more restricted in these functions. Obviously reflecting official opinion based on close-up official information, Mark Sullivan recently stated in a Washington dispatch on wartime shipping: "But submarines are not now the only enemy; they are not the major enemy. The major enemy now is bombing planes."

Moreover, it needs pointing out that the vital, if passive, defensive task of keeping shipping lanes open has been placed on the Navy by the special and peculiar situation of the battle area. A comparatively small island, lacking essential natural resources and foodstuffs, England must rely on its foreign trade. If the British Isles were self-sustaining—in the measure, let us say, that the United States is self-sustaining—the British Navy would lose also this vital present-day function.

The statement is often made that though sea power may have been canceled out in part in the British Isles, it is paramount for America on account of our geographical location. Exactly the reverse happens to be the case. Think of the British Isles expanded to the size of the United States and economically self-sustained, no longer in life-and-death dependence on overseas supplies. With the passive job of protecting ocean commerce reduced to the vanishing point, our Navy, no matter how colossal in size, would then remain unemployed while mastery of the air—the battle of the United States of America, parallel to the battle of Britain—was being decided.

One of the ablest of our military commentators, Hanson W. Baldwin, in a recent magazine article defending traditional naval ideas, points out that "today an insular power like Britain, close to a hostile or potentially hostile continent, cannot provide that secure base which is the one indispensable requirement of sea power." He credits the change to "a world made narrow by the plane." From this he argues that the United States, surrounded by oceans, "can and does provide such a base," and that therefore "our future greatness lies upon the great waters."

The flaw in this typically naval-minded reasoning is that it assumes aviation will remain frozen at roughly its present stage. It does not recognize that the world is being further "narrowed by the plane" every day, so that American insularity is as doomed as Britain's insularity. In 2 or 3 years, if not sooner, that doom will be a fact on our Atlantic shore and within 5 years on the Pacific shore as well; just about the time, that is, when the new two-ocean Navy on which men like Mr. Baldwin pin their faith will have been completed. It is the inadequate range of air power which still makes America "that secure base which is the one indispensable requirement of sea power." This minimal condition for the very existence of sea power, obviously, will fade out as soon as the range has become adequate.

Perhaps you have seen a lake being drained, crowding the fish into its contracting center where fishermen can scoop them up without effort. Even thus the progress of air power is "draining" water areas from the periphery inward, driving navies to the ever more shrunken center, seeking desperately to evade the tightening ring of doom. Soon it will be all "dry," with no margin of escape from air power. Today we are witnessing the twilight of sea power. Tomorrow the whole epoch of modern history conditioned by that weapon will be ended.

III

A number of basic claims made by aviation strategists have been so emphatically confirmed that they may now be set down as axioms of war science in the new air-power age:

1. That surface forces, including naval units, cannot operate if the sky above is in enemy control. This, as we have noted, was made startlingly evident in the Skagerrak and in the North Sea. It is a principle vividly on view in a European continent practically without naval defenses, yet inaccessible to the powerful British Navy because of a Nazi ring of air power.

2. That aviation carried along by the fleet itself is ineffectual against hostile land-based aircraft. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that land-based planes, type for type, are superior to aviation based on ships. The latter are necessarily encumbered with special gadgets for taking off and landing, paid for in quality of performance. (A portable "umbrella" of their own aerial protection, of course, does enhance the strength of naval units for action against other naval units.) The attempt of the British Fleet to meet Hitler's land-based Luftwaffe off Norway with ship-borne aviation proved so disastrous that it was not repeated, except against inferior Italian aviation. The spectacle of the crippled *Illustrious* limping off from Malta for sanctuary in Alexandria, soon after Nazi aerial strength entrenched itself in Sicily, is almost a symbolic representation of this principle.

3. That only air power can effectively fight air power. Antiaircraft artillery is unequal to the task; at best it provides an additional hazard by confining the attackers to a higher altitude, thus interfering with the accuracy of their aim.

Taken together, these principles spell finis for sea power. They mean that fleets can exercise their old domination only in the rapidly narrowing areas still beyond the grasp of air power. Elsewhere they are barred by hostile aviation. They cannot depend on their own ship-borne airplanes, which are foredoomed to defeat by land-based planes acting independently. The whole consoling theory of sea power supplemented by aviation thus collapses; air power reduced to an accessory position, harnessed to an older and slower and no longer self-sufficient weapon, is certain to be defeated by genuine untrammeled air power. These principles mean that the destruction of harbors and the covering of troop landings on enemy shores, until now prime functions of the Navy, have become primarily the province of aviation. They mean that even the convoying of ship-borne commerce is continually more limited to stretches of sea beyond the reach of aerial forces. The direction, as well as the extermination of submarines, is a job now increasingly taken over by aviation; undersea craft thus tend to become an auxiliary of air power rather than of navies.

An ever larger portion of sea commerce is likely in the near future to be carried by airplanes, not by vessels. In intrinsic value, if not in weight, transoceanic air commerce is destined in the nature of the case to surpass surface commerce. Even now most bombers are delivered across the ocean on their own power, and pursuits could readily have been built to do likewise. One of our foremost aviation engineers, Grover Loening, in a recent article in National Aeronautics, shares the writer's view that transoceanic commerce is destined to go increasingly through the air. "In the immediately 'predictable future,'" he wrote, "transportation of most armament materials, of all troops and personnel, and practically all light or heavy loads of destructive munitions, will

have to be transported and deposited by air in order to win a war across the Atlantic."

It has been estimated that the British Isles need 25,000 tons of imported foodstuffs daily. Five hundred planes like the B-19 modified for transport, designed to carry 50 tons each, could keep the islands supplied more expeditiously than any surface ships and would, moreover, be accompanied by their own defenses against raiders. The inexcusable fact that mass aviation transports are not available can be traced primarily to the ingrained intolerance of the naval mind in Britain, as elsewhere, against encroachments on its traditional functions.

But even transport by slow surface ships can be protected against enemy attack far more efficiently from the air than by surface convoy. Once the water highways are policed by friendly air power, commerce will be able to move under those canopies of aviation. The offhand assumption that ships must be protected by ships, trains by other trains, etc., is at bottom absurd. There is no better form of defense for traffic on any surface, land or sea, than a strong roof of aerial might overhead.

The type of strategic thinking which continues, through inertia, to rest on the old assumptions of sea power—though they belong to an epoch that is coming quickly to an end—constitutes a brake on the full growth of the new first line of defense—air power. Minds that have not caught up with this reality are incapable of grappling with the problems of national defense in the real modern world. No matter how brilliant their strategy, it is earth-bound at a time when war has soared into a new dimension.

Modern military aviation, having clipped sea power of its offensive functions, leaves it strategically crippled. This represents a fateful milestone in the history of war making and therefore a turning point in the power relations of the major nations. The implications of the event add up to a fundamental change in the history of the immediate future.

Previously, sprawling world empires rested in the first place upon superior naval might. Neither the governments nor the admirals of the world have as yet conceded openly that there has been a revolution in this respect. Nevertheless, that revolution is in full tide. Already neither the home grounds nor far-off colonies can be considered impregnable, or even defensible, merely because a nation possesses magnificent sea power. If those areas are within bombing distance of the enemy, they are vulnerable, regardless of how large a fleet theoretically guards them.

Only air power capable of meeting the potential assailant's aviation can guarantee safety. That means, in effect, that every outpost of empire, if it is to survive, must be given the protection of aviation that can be reinforced instantaneously so that it will match the air power of the nearest enemy. And what is true today will be a hundredfold more important tomorrow, when the reach of the air weapon will be enlarged to cover territories now comparatively immune. By the unequivocal logic of this new situation, the empires of the near future will rest not on sea power, as heretofore, but on air power.

By the same token, existing empires, including that of the United States, will no longer be able to rest back on blind faith in adequate navies, unless they are equipped to conquer and to hold the skies under which fleets can move. These empires are like great edifices, outwardly strong and impressive. Those familiar with their interior structures, however, know that they are built with wooden beams which in time have become dry-rotted and termite-eaten. If we want to save the structures, there is no alternative but to replace the old-fashioned and outlived wooden beams with powerful steel beams. The wooden beams—which is to say naval strength—are unequal to the new tensions put upon them, and the steel beams of air power must be substituted.

The work of replacement is frantically under way in Britain under pressure of the war. In America, the urgency of the problem is not so apparent to military leaders wearing the blinders of traditional strategic ideas; in addition, we are lulled into a false sense of safety by broad oceans. But we, too, must speed up the work of replacement. We must relinquish the illusion of safety and accept the reality of the changed conditions. And the time to start is now. The major European nations have been too preoccupied with immediate short-range needs to devote themselves to the long-range air power of especial significance in relation to America. So far as that type of equipment is concerned, therefore, we will be starting from scratch with those nations if we start now in the race for air power supremacy.

Always, through history, new instruments of war making have changed the balance of power in the world. Those who possessed gunpowder while their neighbors still depended on bows and arrows had the decisive advantage. No amount of protest or weeping on the part of bow-and-arrow traditionalists could alter the situation. The advent of air power likewise must change a world where force is still the basic ingredient of international relations. The changes which it dictates, indeed, will become manifest sooner and over a wider area because the latest weapon is swifter, farther reaching, and more deadly.

The lesson of the story in relation to our own national security is too obvious to need laboring. Aviation has already wiped out the strategic offensive potentialities of sea power and is itself taking over the offensive. At the same time the remaining defensive functions of sea power are being restricted as the progress of aeronautics goes forward. For the moment, it is true, military aviation has made the United States defensively stronger, since it has made us inaccessible to the navies of other nations. We all wish it could be true forever. But we dare not shut our eyes to the fact that this is a highly temporary advantage—a transition stage.

Our temporary immunity is crumbling. The threat of enemy air power acting as a long-distance offensive weapon, holding the menace of total destruction for its targets, is emerging. Only our own air power—strong, truly independent, built in conformity with the new strategic realities—can offer us adequate protection.

I am not arguing for the immediate scrapping or limitation of naval strength. While naval utility has been seriously restricted it has not yet been entirely wiped out. In the transfer of reliance from one weapon to another there is a transition stage where overlapping is not only natural but necessary. Navies can still fight other navies, and there are other nations whose strategic thinking and planning, perhaps in fatuous imitation of American procedure, remains naval-minded.

What I am arguing for is a broader, more modern approach to the whole problem of America's national security; one that recognizes the changes in the science of war making enforced by the growth of military aviation. With recognition of the deepening twilight of sea power no longer avoidable, it seems to me suicidal to make navies and an outmoded naval strategy the foundation of American national defense. Those who insist upon leading America in that direction are heading us for military disaster. They assume a fearsome responsibility before the judgment of history.

City of Worcester Municipal Auditorium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. PEHR G. HOLMES, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech to be delivered by me this evening on the occasion of the presentation to the city of Worcester, Mass., of the murals in the memorial chamber of the Worcester Municipal Auditorium:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, this is a memorable occasion for the people of Worcester in that it marks the culmination of a long campaign to establish a memorial worthy of the memory of those who went forth from our beautiful city in times of great national danger to battle for the cause of human liberty and the American way of life. Sons of Worcester have fought, bled, and died on the battlefields of every war, beginning with the one to establish American independence, and in all of them displayed great bravery.

It is indeed a high honor to be invited to take part in the exercises here today. None of us realized back in January 1917—when, in my first inaugural address as mayor of Worcester, I recommended to the city council the need for a municipal auditorium—that war was so close at hand.

With the far greater problems which the outbreak of the World War imposed upon us, the matter of a municipal auditorium for Worcester was laid aside for the time being, but it was my pleasure to revive the project shortly after the armistice of November 11, 1918, when I again addressed the city council in my capacity as mayor, and recommended that we build a memorial auditorium in memory of the men and women of Worcester who had laid down their lives in defense of that sacred emblem whose stars and stripes have been baptized in the best blood of American manhood.

This noble edifice is an enduring monument to our heroic dead, to the people of Worcester, and also to the memory of those who have at various times served on the Worcester World War Memorial Commission, of which our distinguished and respected fellow citizen, Mr. George F. Booth, is now chairman.

I have seen something of the horrors of war from the time when the first two boatloads of casualties from the bloody battlefields of France landed at Ellis Island in 1918, to be nursed back to health by the loving hands of a grateful people. The late Carl Bonney, who was chairman of the Worcester war chest fund, accompanied me on that trip, and he, too, was shocked at what we saw. We came away depressed by the sad sight, and both of us then expressed the fervent hope that America never again might be called upon to take part in such a bloody and devastating war. Nothing can erase that picture of misery and suffering from my memory.

In common with every city, village, and hamlet in the land, Worcester had sons who returned badly wounded, gassed, and mentally sick.

It is sad to contemplate that some did not return but now sleep the long last sleep in the poppy-clad fields of Flanders. As Americans we take comfort in the knowledge that a grateful people have erected suitable memorials where they fell, to commemorate their heroism and self-sacrifice. They died that America might live, and we can never forget the sacrifice they made for us. Theirs was the supreme test of loyalty and love of country.

This auditorium perpetuates the memory of those who bravely went forth from Worcester and did not return. You will observe that on these marble walls are carved and lettered in gold the names of the men and women of Worcester who made the supreme sacrifice in the late war. They were placed there for coming generations to see that those who went on before were not afraid to fight and, if need be, to lay down their lives for American ideals and American traditions, thus fulfilling the legend which appears above their names, "They ventured far in the cause of liberty." Their memory is enshrined in letters of living light and will live so long as there is a spoken and a written language.

The beautiful murals which adorn the walls of this memorial chamber depict the purpose and strength of America; our willingness to suffer and sacrifice for the land we all love. There comes to us a feeling of pride and inspiration as our eyes rest upon the large mural in the center, which depicts a united people and portrays the great resources that have made us the mightiest nation on earth. I am particularly struck with the scene in the center, where stands a young American—healthy, robust, vigorous, unafraid—holding aloft the beloved flag of our land. There he stands, confidently facing the future, willing to make any sacrifice to preserve the American way of life.

That, my fellow citizens, typifies the spirit that is America—the spirit that is not afraid to venture, to suffer, and to achieve. It was such as he, and that noble young American woman standing at his side, who made possible the pacification and development of the great country we all love. They came from a great and hardy stock, who in the centuries gone by left their homes in the old lands and bravely set sail on uncharted seas, gladly braving the hidden dangers of the deep that they might go to the New World to help establish a new order of things, where there was to be equality of opportunity for all, where despotism and tyranny were to be unknown, where they were to be free to follow the dictates of their conscience.

And how gloriously they builded, upon a foundation that is as enduring as time. From the first boatload that landed on Plymouth Rock a little more than 3 centuries ago we have expanded into a Nation of 132,000,000 free Americans, whose accomplishments are the marvel of mankind. Today there are millions in the oppressed and war-torn countries of Europe who would gladly come here and cast their lot with us if they but could.

We, as custodians, hold the great land that is America in trust for future generations and it is incumbent upon us to hand that precious heritage down to those who are to follow after us, a better and a stronger nation, if that is possible. Let us today, on this great occasion, rededicate and reconsecrate ourselves to the preservation of the American way of life, to the maintenance of constitutional government, and to the perpetuity of the greatest free republic of which there is recorded history.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL RAILWAY CLUB, OF BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution. This group comprises some 1,300 members who oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project on the grounds that it is uneconomical; that it is not necessary for national defense; that power needs could be filled more quickly and cheaply than through this proposal; that existing transportation facilities are adequate; that savings in transportation costs are not truly represented; and that the plan should be handled as a treaty and not as an agreement.

Whereas there has been presented to the Congress of the United States a proposed agreement between the United States and the King of Great Britain on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, to provide for the construction of a channel from the head of the Great Lakes to the Gulf of St. Lawrence for the use of ocean-going vessels, also the construction of dams, power plants, and other appurtenances necessary thereto. This plan is known as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas proponents of the subject estimate that the total cost will be $457,000,000, of which the taxpayers of the United States will be called upon to pay $284,000,000 and those of Canada $173,000,000. This estimate is wholly inadequate in that sufficient allowance has not been made for interest during construction on the money borrowed to build the seaway; no allowance is made for deepening and other work necessary for ocean vessels to use harbors of Great Lakes ports and that the estimate does not allow enough for contingencies. Furthermore, attention is called to estimates and actual construction costs of similar projects; viz, Chicago drainage canal, estimated, $16,000,000; actual cost, $53,000,000; Suez Canal, estimated $30,000,000; actual cost, $80,000,000; Panama Canal, estimated, $160,000,000; actual cost, $375,000,000; and

Whereas proponents of the project contend that it is necessary for national defense. The proposed agreement calls for the project to be completed not later than December 31, 1948. If this project is so necessary for national defense, certainly 7 years hence will be too late for any effective use to be made of the seaway for this purpose. Furthermore, if this project were undertaken at this time, it would divert material, money, and labor, both skilled and unskilled, from the defense program. There is also the feature of the vulnerability of the seaway to sabotage; and

Whereas it is stated that the power to be derived from the project is urgently needed for defense industries. Attention is called to the fact that steam generating plants could be constructed quicker and cheaper than the power development phase of the project; and

Whereas existing transportation agencies are adequate to handle present and additional traffic produced by the national-defense program; and

Whereas the proposed agreement is not in keeping with the spirit or intent of the Constitution in that it is without doubt a treaty and should be so introduced into Congress; and

Whereas the Central Railway Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., composed of 1,321 members, oppose this proposed seaway and power project on the grounds that it is uneconomical; it is not necessary for national defense; the power needs could be filled quicker and cheaper than proposed; existing transportation facilities are adequate and the savings in transportation costs are not truly represented, and that the plan should be handled as a treaty and not as an agreement: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Central Railway Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., assembled at executive meeting this 17th day of April in the year 1941, respectfully request that our Senators, Representatives, and members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs take cognizance of the above statements and all other evidence heretofore produced and any other evidence produced in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and defeat the proposed agreement when it is voted upon: And be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator JAMES M. MEAD, Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, Representatives WALTER G. ANDREWS, ALFRED F. BEITER, members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the above resolution was duly adopted at a regular executive meeting of the Central Railway Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., on the 8th day of May 1941.

J. G. ROHLMAN,
President.
M. D. REED,
Secretary.

Renominating an Able Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 15, 1941, as a personal tribute to Mr. Justice Alfred H. Townley, of the New York State Supreme Court, who is now completing his fifteenth year as a member of that tribunal.

Justice Townley, whose friendship I have enjoyed for many years, is one of the most distinguished jurists of the State of New York, and I take great pleasure

in bringing this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. As a member of the appellate division of the supreme court of my State, he presides with rare grace and brilliance. He has earned the greatest tribute that can be bestowed upon a public servant by two major political parties—their mutual nomination—and I sincerely hope that the recommendation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York in this respect will be carried out.

On the facade of the New York State Supreme Court Building there appears the following quotation:

The true administration of justice is the firm pillar of our Government.

Mr. Justice Townley truly eptomizes the spirit of this quotation and the administration of justice in our State may well be entrusted to the hands of such an honorable and distinguished citizen for many years to come.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 15, 1941]

RENOMINATING AN ABLE JUDGE

The lawyers' associations that have urged the renomination on both tickets of Mr. Justice Alfred H. Townley, of the New York State Supreme Court, are at the same time paying tribute to an individual and furthering a principle. Judge Townley is finishing his fifteenth year on the Supreme Court. He has shown himself to be reliable, intelligent, and straightforward. A Democrat originally appointed by Governor Smith to fill the place of Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER when the latter resigned from the bench to go into the United States Senate, he was subsequently nominated by the Republicans as well as by the Democrats in the election that took place in 1927. His independence and high character have won him the approval of both parties.

The principle that the bar associations are furthering is that a judge of the supreme court who has served a term with distinction shall be nominated by both parties to succeed himself. In this manner he is freed from party obligations and his independence is still further assured. The term on the State supreme court is 14 years, with the proviso that the retirement age is 70. In Mr. Justice Townley's case he would, if endorsed by both parties, continue in office until his retirement. The advantages of this when the man's record has been excellent are so obvious as to need little elaboration. It is to be hoped that he will receive the renominations he has so well learned, and that in this manner the precedent will be still further strengthened of continuing the services of such men without regard to party politics.

The Conflagration Nears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Clapper from the Washington Daily News of May 27, 1941:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 27, 1941]

THE CONFLAGRATION NEARS

(By Raymond Clapper)

We say good-bye now to the land we have known. Like lovers about to be separated by a long journey, we sit in this hour of mellow twilight, thinking fondly of the past, wondering. Words seem almost an intrusion.

What tomorrow will bring we do not know. We only know that this golden day is slipping inevitably from us, clutch at it as we will. We have had our troubles. Sometimes we were poorly clothed and poorly fed. But always tomorrow was full of promise. Hardship would diminish. Happiness would grow. Progress was the fixed law of life. We never doubted it, even when the going was rough.

As I write this, President Roosevelt is preparing his fireside talk. From England comes the call for help, a desperate call for more and more and more. Most of the men now looking over Mr Roosevelt's shoulder as he writes want him to answer that call. Germany's naval chief warns us that already we are engaged in warlike actions with our naval patrol. He warns us to go no further. Laval, that dark stooge of Berlin, warns us to stay out. Japan, sensing that we may go in, begins to wriggle to find some way of escaping the Axis bargain to go in if we do. I don't know what Mr Roosevelt has decided to say. But we are moving toward war, not away from from it. The only uncertainty is how much faster we shall move from now on.

Whether we go to war or not, we shall act more and more as if we were going to war. Our lives will all be affected by this. Our ways will change drastically, whether or not a drop of blood is lost.

Habits must be changed. Peacetime ways have to be sacrificed. For years dozens of materials will be almost completely monopolized by war needs and there will be little left for civilian purposes. Even Senators and Congressmen in some instances may have to give up their automobiles and move to small living quarters, for taxes are going to rip sharply into the lives of every family above the very lowest level of living. For this year and next we have set aside $40,000,000,000 for war production. More may be added to that. Already we are planning to spend far more than we spent in the last war. Labor, still living in a dream world of constantly rising wages and constantly shorter hours, is going to wake up very soon with a terrific shock.

I mention only the more pleasant aspects of the future and pass over the heavy hearts, the separated families, the young careers that will have to wait, those inward wounds which are more numerous than the wounds of the battlefield.

Regimented people. Regimented trade. The waste of war. The millions of days of human labor to make the guns, the shells, the planes, the tanks, and the ships. The huge plants useful only to manufacture weapons of slaughter. That's our future. It will be the same whether we go into the war or not.

It's been a grand life in America. We have had to work hard. But usually there was good reward. We have had poverty, but also the hope that if the individual man threw in enough struggle and labor he could find his place. Man has gained steadily in security and dignity, in hours of leisure, in those things that made his family comfortable and gave lift to his spirit. Under his feet, however rough the road, he felt the firm security of a nation fundamentally strong, safe from any enemy, able to live at peace by wishing to. In every one of us lived the promise of America.

Now we see the distant fire rolling toward us. It is not being put out. It still is some distance away, but the evil wind blows it toward us.

So ends our reverie in the twilight over the dear, dead days.

Defense to the Utmost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. OVERTON BROOKS, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me in the city of Shreveport, La., over radio station KRMD:

I have just returned to Louisiana and I have sought this opportunity to speak to you again on the question of national defense. It was about a year ago that Congress embarked upon the present great national-defense expansion program. During this time we have appropriated some $24,000,000,000 for this purpose and we have summoned the utmost energies of the Nation to the completion of this one accomplishment—that of giving to America its fullest protection in this dark hour of peril. At this point it is appropriate for you to ask what progress has been made and are we satisfied with what has been accomplished in this time?

The Nation now has 1,200,000 men under arms in camps scattered throughout the length and breadth of the country. We are now approaching the time when all camps presently authorized will soon be completed and men will be properly housed in them. Your Congress has provided proper clothing and equipment for these 1,200,000 men in the Army and at least has provided guns and munitions sufficient to carry on the basic training of modern defense. As far then as the actual building of camps and the induction of men into service with clothing and equipment, the national-defense program is nearing the completion of its first phase.

Industrially, the program has not made such good progress. It is true that industrial plants have been established and have been built in this defense program during the past year, but much yet remains to be done in the way of providing the necessary munition plants, powder plants, and airplane factories. It was my pleasure, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, to attend recently the dedication of the great smokeless powder plant just completed by the War Department at Radford, Va. In this great arsenal of democracy 300,000 pounds of smokeless powder will be manufactured each day, and in the making of this powder it is interesting to know that 150,000 pounds of cotton linters obtained from the cotton fields of the South will be used. In the great plant approaching completion at Charleston, Ind., it is planned to make 600,000 pounds of gunpowder each day and to use 300,000 pounds each day of cotton linters taken from the fields of the South.

You may ask, "Are you satisfied with this progress?" No I am not satisfied; the War Department is not satisfied, and the Navy Department is not satisfied. None of the na-

tional-defense officials are satisfied with the progress, for we are attempting to do in 1 year what it has required Hitler 8 years to accomplish. And during the time we have used in getting ready, the international situation has turned incredibly worse. It is dark and the question arises in the minds of all of us as to whether or not in spite of all of the aid which this country is giving (and this aid should be increased in every way possible) can England survive the present year of German blitzkrieg warfare.

Before I left Washington the other day the talk was current that there should be a further expansion of our defense program, even to the point of providing an army of 4,000,000 men. They say that more cantonments, more munition plants, and more implements of defense are needed because of the growing crisis which has placed the greatest dictator of all times in control of the whole of the continent of Europe, with England groggy and taking the worst punishment that ever a great nation has been forced to receive; and Congress may be called upon before adjournment to vote upon such a program.

About 10 days ago the House of Representatives passed a resolution—Resolution No. 162—authorizing the Military Affairs Committee to thoroughly investigate every part of our Army preparedness program. During the 10-day recess which we Congressmen were supposed to use to rest up this Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member, held daily hearings examining into the progress being made. For this purpose the committee has been divided into three subcommittees, namely: (1) On aviation, upon which it is my privilege to serve; (2) on real estate and construction; and (3) on ordnance equipment, guns, and ammunition. The committee itself as a whole has been taking evidence on the question of seeing how far the defense program has been injured by industrial unrest. We should complete these hearings soon, but I promise you that before they are completed no phase of the national-defense program shall fail to receive the most searching and yet patriotic investigation of our committee.

During the course of these hearings which I have just mentioned one of the witnesses testified regarding the Allis-Chalmers strike. He referred to the fact that after many days of strike, during which the factory was closed down and all of the efforts of the Labor Department had failed and the Mediation Board seemed not to be making much progress, the War Department and the Navy Department sent a telegram to both the management and the workingmen of this plant urging them to reopen the factory immediately and warning them in event it failed to reopen that the War Department would take over and operate this plant. In closing this telegram a quotation from the Bible was used. It was, "Agree quickly with thine adversary." I do not know what effect this quotation taken from the Bible may have had upon the sober-thinking judgment of management and labor, but I do know that the strike was settled and the plant reopened within 4 days. Old laws and old rules are often the best, and this verse, although first spoken 2,000 years ago, has all the vitality and power that it possessed then.

My campaign slogan for reelection was, as you know, "Defense to the utmost." I believe it is just as full of meaning today as it was when I used it in that campaign. These are dark days—perhaps the most critical which you and I, my friends, will ever live to see—and if we are to survive as a democracy with our cherished institutions which millions of us have already fought to preserve, the defense program must continue without interruption. Before the turn of the century a great President—President Cleveland—used the words in reference to the Postal Service that, in spite of all troubles rain, sunshine, business or economic, "the mails must go through." This statement applies with even more force to the national-defense program, and everything which serves to hinder, retard, or stop this program must be eliminated in our God-given desire to put our Nation in position to weather this terrible storm.

I am reminded of the old adage of the father who handed his son a bundle of twigs and asked him to break them. The son struggled and struggled but could not break this bundle. The father then handed the son each twig, one by one, and the son easily broke them in many parts. In unity there is strength. One by one the great dictator, Adolf Hitler, has taken the nations and broken them as that son did those little twigs. Had these nations stood together, they may have resisted the armed might of that pagan emperor. Now he is in control of all Europe, and Greece will most probably surrender in a few days. It would not be surprising to see the British withdraw from the Mediterranean as they fight to preserve their supplies of ammunition and food in the British Isles.

I sometimes think that some of our people do not fully realize how desperate is the plight of the world today. The period of time when we can continue "business as usual" is about at an end and we must all be prepared now to make vital sacrifices which really hurt if we are going to preserve our Nation free from attack and our homes and our families safe and inviolate. At this critical hour in the affairs of this Nation there is no place for dissension and discord within the Nation. There is no place for communism, fascism, or the bund. These things must be stamped out as we would stamp down a rattlesnake. We must be united and present a united front in solving easily the most important problem that confronts us—national defense. As one therefore who is familiar with our national affairs I call upon you, my friends, you the people of Louisiana and of the United States to join together with one thought and one voice of patriotically preserving the United States of America by giving us the national defense which will guarantee that Hitler, although successful in Europe, must fail when he enters the Western Hemisphere.

Subversive Activities in the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT F. JONES, OF OHIO

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Member of Congress from the Fourth Ohio District, Hon. ROBERT F. JONES, over station WRC Monday, May 26, 1941:

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We know there are people in the United States who seek to undermine the allegiance of the American people to their country and their faith in its institutions.

We are determined that they shall not overthrow our form of government. Wherever we find them we must resolve with all of the will and action at our command that we shall expose and suppress their insidious campaign among a free people.

Our common enemy believes in the exaltation of the state over the people. Their leaders are trained in Moscow, Berlin, and Rome, at the feet of the masters who have blacked out the four freedoms in Europe. Their political beliefs are a religion; their activity a fanaticism; their tools are hatred; and their weapons revolution. Their skill is street warfare and their accomplishment confusion and frustration.

Before coming to Washington I had never expected that these wild-eyed zealots of a new order in America would be found in the shadow of the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial. Yet, in January 1939, the Dies committee found them in Washington, D. C. Yes; found them on the pay rolls of your Government and mine.

The Dies committee published their names, their salaries, and the departments in which they worked. Their salaries from $10,000 a year down can leave no doubt that they occupy positions of power in the Federal Government.

The telltale of their philosophy was the membership list of the American League for Peace and Democracy—a Communist-controlled organization. Do you remember the publication of the list was labeled a "sordid procedure"? The officers of the league quickly denied that it was controlled by Communists. Many Federal employees claimed they were innocents taken for a ride in this communistic vehicle.

I am sorry for those innocently duped by their superiors on the pay roll. We owe a solemn duty to the innocent to separate the sheep from the goats. Remember the Dies exposé of the American League for Peace and Democracy was in January of 1939, and soon this Communist-front organization folded up.

Since that time Federal employees have been approached by Communists or their fellow travelers to join new organizations. They are solicited during working hours. Small-salaried clerks and stenographers are urged by those in the higher brackets to join new communistic organizations. The membership campaign is so open that it may be assumed there is approval higher up.

Some members of the press have attended meetings of these organizations. In many instances the speakers have sought public office on the Communist ticket. In one meeting the speaker exhorted the growth of communism in China amid frequent applause. In one of these organizations to which many of the Federal employees belong, 10 members of the executive committee signed a letter published in the Daily Worker asking for closer cooperation with the Soviet Government. They approve the "purge trials" of Russia and they seek permission to place the Communist Party column on the American ballot.

After the Dies committee exposed the Federal employee members of the American League for Peace and Democracy, Congress passed a law to separate from the pay roll those who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. The law provides if a person denies by affidavit that he is such an enemy, he is absolved from guilt unless other evidence is adduced against him.

Convinced that Communists and members of subversive Communist-controlled organizations are still on the pay roll, I drafted an amendment to the Department of Justice appropriation bill earmarking $100,000 of F. B. I. funds to be used by them to ferret out the Federal employees who advocate or belong to groups who advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government by force. The amendment passed the House with only one vote against it, on April 3, 1941.

On April 5 I wrote to J. Edgar Hoover, asking for his support of the Jones amendment.

On April 11 J. Edgar Hoover wrote the following letter to me, which I quote:

"MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I received your letter of April 5, 1941, with which you enclosed a copy of the speech which you made in the House of Representatives on April 3, 1941, in offering an amendment to the Department of Justice appropriation bill, making available from the Bureau's appropriation for 1942 the sum of $100,000 for investigation of Federal employees in all departments.

"In view of the fact that the handling of all matters pertaining to the Department of Justice appropriations before the Senate Committee on Appropriations will be in charge of Mr. Matthew F. McGuire, the assistant to the Attorney General, I am taking the liberty of transmitting to him a copy of your letter to me.

"With expressions of my best regards, I am

"Cordially yours,

"J. EDGAR HOOVER."

I have received no communication from Mr. McGuire, Assistant to the Attorney General, to date. On last Friday I tried to reach him on the phone and left my telephone number for him to call me. On Saturday I again tried to reach him by phone, and I have received no word from him at this time.

However, on May 5, Mr. McGuire appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee. He was asked, after the substance of the Jones amendment was recited to him:

"Now, I just want to ask someone here whether or not that item is necessary for the work which it specifies shall be done?"

Mr. McGuire answered, "No, sir; it seems to me that that suggested amendment is really covered by section 504 of the Appropriation Act which reads as follows. Then he read the congressional act I have already discussed.

Has this congressional act eliminated the enemies of the American way of life from the Federal pay roll? Let us see how effective it is in the Department of the Interior.

Secretary Ickes and E. K. Burlew appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House on April 16, 1941. I read from the hearings:

"Mr. JONES. Are there any employees reported by the Dies committee to belong to un-American organizations or subversive groups who are still employed in your several departments and agencies of the Interior Department?

"Mr. BURLEW. Yes.

"Mr. JONES. Please explain what disposition you have made of the accusations against those reported by the Dies committee?

"Mr. BURLEW. In one instance, where there were sufficient charges of the Dies committee on which to make an investigation, the former First Assistant Solicitor of the Department of the Interior personally reviewed all the allegations and concluded that they were not supported by facts.

"Every employee in the Department has been required to state whether or not he or she belongs to a subversive group.

"All the emergency employees under the Relief Act have answered 'No' to the following questions: 1. Are you a Communist? 2. Are you a member of any Nazi bund organization?

"All the employees on the regular rolls have answered 'No' to the following question: Do you have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States?"

What efforts has Mr. Ickes' department spent to search out our enemies? They were not elected, they are on the pay roll as long as he wishes them. He absolves himself by asking them questions. He discharges his obligation to his country after his solicitor investigated one. Thirty-three others apparently were never investigated by his department.

Communists are encouraged by Stalin to deny they are Communists. They are urged to lie when asked. They are told to perjure themselves in court. When Mr. Ickes or any other Cabinet Member is dealing with Communists, he must know that their word is as useless as a broomstick to a soldier.

After hearing Mr. Ickes' assistant's answer to my questions, you will not be surprised to know that last Saturday morning, the clerk of the Dies committee told me 80 percent of the original 1939 list are on the revised Dies list.

One Federal employee drawing a $4,000 annual salary on the original Dies list, owns several thousand dollars worth of Soviet bonds, and draws dividends from them. To their knowledge, he owns no United States Government bonds.

I am informed further the general counsel of the Bookshop, another Communist-dominated organization, owns Soviet bonds. He is assistant general counsel of one of the independent establishments of the Government.

No; the congressional act is not effective when Cabinet members are satisfied with a Communist's "No." When there is a lapse of patriotism to discover and relentlessly pursue the Trojan horses on the Federal pay roll, this work of the Dies committee is nullified.

The Jones amendment provides that the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall investigate these enemies and report to Congress. The untiring public service, the outstanding accomplishments and the unquestioned patriotism of J. Edgar Hoover commands the respect of every American.

I am compelled to believe J. Edgar Hoover does not now have the funds to make such an investigation. Again I refer you to the Interior Department hearings.

I asked:

"Has the F. B. I. made a report to you of the truth of charges against them, or any of them?" referring to the Dies list.

"Mr. BURLEW. No."

Two years ago the list was published and on April 16, 1941, no report from the F. B. I. to the Interior Department. J. Edgar Hoover just does not have the funds, or he is stopped by his superiors.

If communism is so far entrenched in the Federal Government that the Department of Justice must oppose the Jones amendment and stop Edgar Hoover from searching out the common enemy on the public pay roll, may God spare us.

I oppose nazi-ism, fascism, and communism. Their philosophies are equally dangerous to America. Paying them public funds is a contemptible thwarting of the Dies committee, in whose work an overwhelming majority of 130,000,000 Americans have faith and confidence.

We dare not let the administration appeasers of the Communists appoint and keep communistic organization members on the public pay roll.

Tomorrow the President may take another step toward war. If he sends our boys to Europe and we win, as win we must, once we are in the war, what an injustice to the boys whose blood we spill in the European meat grinder, should an American, Otto Kuusinen, organize these communistic cells and attempt to overthrow our Government by force, while the second A. E. F. is away.

The Jones amendment will again be voted on in the House.

If you are convinced that J. Edgar Hoover and his men can help to cut away this cancerous growth in our Government, will you please write your Representatives now to vote for the Jones amendment to the Justice Department appropriation bill?

Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that at the recent annual meeting of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, May 3, 1941, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], appointed by me from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was elected chairman.

The Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy came into being as a result of the act of April 16, 1937, and to date four successive Boards have functioned. In the first effective year, 1939, Senator Royal S. Copeland was chairman. The year following, I served in such capacity, and last year Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY was chairman. The membership of the Board of Visitors is composed entirely of Members of Congress. The Vice President of the Senate appoints one Senator, three Senators are derived from the Senate Committee on Commerce, the Speaker of the House appoints two members, while the remaining four members are designated from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. The chairmen of the respective House and Senate committees are ex officio members, but if unable to serve may appoint others in their stead.

From its inception every recommendation made by the Board of Visitors, which in its annual meeting has obtained first-hand information regarding the academy, have been approved. In a number of instances these recommendations have caused appropriations for necessary expenditures sometimes of considerable extent to better existing facilities.

The Board has always found itself enthusiastically supporting the Coast Guard Academy because of the excellence of its curriculum which has been sponsored by an advisory committee consisting of leaders in the field of education, of the administration of the academy, its instruction staff, of the splendid and well-kept physical plant and on account of the democratic and efficient system of obtaining cadets after a competitive examination open to all qualified young men between the ages of 17 and 22 throughout the United States.

A cadetship in the academy leads to a bachelor of science degree and a commission as ensign in the United States Coast Guard.

Due to the present emergency, entering classes have been increased to include 150 cadets. This enlargement of the cadet enrollment has of necessity caused a certain amount of new construction, for

the original building plans did not contemplate a cadet corps in excess of 200.

The corps of cadets is composed of youths of high scholastic and physical standing from which will be selected the future officers of the Service. As a school for a military service, the system of administration and discipline at the academy is accordingly military in character. Its purpose is to develop the qualities of leadership upon which the success of the Service largely depends. For this, two instruments are available—the cadet battalion ashore, and the cadet practice cruise at sea. The 4 years' course of instruction is basically scientific and engineering in character, and in addition to classroom and shop, and instruction at the academy in the various military drills, cadets are sent to sea on practice cruises on cutters before graduation. Upon graduation, the cadets are commissioned as ensigns and assigned to active duty at sea and thus begin their career in the Coast Guard.

The officers of the first revenue cutters, as the Service was then known as the Revenue Marine, were commissioned from the merchant service and many of these had served in the Continental Navy during the Revolution. For a period of 85 years officers were obtained from the Navy and the merchant marine, but finally the Secretary of the Treasury, John Sherman, in 1876 secured passage of the law establishing the cadet system, and the first examinations for cadetship were held in Washington that year. For a number of years training of cadets was conducted upon training ships. Later a school of instruction was located at Arundel Cove, near Baltimore, and in 1910 the school was transferred to Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn. In 1932 the present academy was completed at a cost of some $2,750,000 and is on a scenic location on the Thames River at New London, Conn., opposite the submarine base of the United States Navy.

Upon graduation the cadet is commissioned as an ensign and is launched on a career in a Service dating from 1790 when Alexander Hamilton, recognizing the need for protection of the revenue, secured the passage of a bill to authorize the building of 10 cutters at a cost of about $10,000. It was easy for Hamilton to recognize the need for protection of the revenue, because from the earliest colonial days shipbuilding, shipping, and fisheries were important factors in the development of the Colonies. The colonists were seafaring people by nature, and the forests had provided unlimited shipbuilding material, and the shipping trade offered large profits. It is realized that the War for Independence almost destroyed the American merchant marine; however, the new United States Government faced with the practical nonexistence of treasury and a large debt, needed the restoration of a merchant marine and the establishment of a tariff which could be enforced.

Since the collection of the revenue was a function of the Treasury Department, it was logical for the cutters built by Alexander Hamilton, and the service founded by him to be an arm of that Department. Its close ties with the Customs Service has bound it with the Treasury ever since.

As time went on the saving of life and property became a collateral duty with the Coast Guard, for this is a natural function of any police agency, especially at sea, where the obligation to rescue those in peril has become traditional. The Coast Guard has grown and its duties have expanded, however, its function has become that of the Federal maritime police force which is to enforce all Federal laws on navigable and territorial waters of the United States and to promote safety and security to vessels which use our waters for legitimate commerce and pleasure; to have all Coast Guard stations and vessels prepared for active war duty with the Navy and to organize yachts and small craft, and to train their crews for duty in case of national emergency.

The Service, which at its inception had 10 small cutters, has grown to its present size where it is composed of a fleet of some 260 cutters, consisting of vessels over 65 feet in length to the largest cutters of 327 feet in length, carrying 5-inch broadside batteries, a large number of picket boats, lightships, and other auxiliary craft, with an aviation wing comprising 10 air stations encircling our coasts, 197 active Coast Guard life-saving stations, and requisite training stations, repair and supply depots, and with facilities for the maintenance of approximately 31,000 lighthouses, buoys, and other aids to navigation.

To operate this fleet and shore establishments, the Coast Guard consists of a personnel at the present date of some 22,000, divided between commissioned officers, chief warrant and warrant officers, enlisted men, and civilian personnel.

Progress Made by Farm Security Administration Borrowers of the Twenty-Second District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. HAINES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

LETTER FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a letter received by me from the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, Mr. C. B. Baldwin, reporting the very fine record of the farmers I have the honor to represent in meeting their obligations and because of the aid given to them, enabling them to make gains in their net worth, all of which indicated the value of this service to our people.

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 21, 1941.

Hon. HARRY L. HAINES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAINES: Since the beginning of the present emergency, it has been generally recognized that the health, welfare, and morale of our people are vitally important to national defense. Providing for these needs among low-income farm families has been one of the essential contributions of the Farm Security Administration to the Nation's defense efforts during the past year.

We have just completed a special survey undertaken last winter to measure the progress being made by borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. It indicates the gains in terms of money, living standards, and capacity for self-support which have been made during 1940 by handicapped and low-income farm people all over the country. It occurred to me that you might be interested in seeing the figures for your district.

In the twenty-second district of Pennsylvania there were 173 active standard rehabilitation borrowers at the end of 1940. The survey showed that the average borrower earned a net income of $959 during the year, as compared with $736 in the year before he borrowed from Farm Security. In other words, the typical family increased its annual net income by 30 percent.

Also significant are the gains which these people made in net worth, since that is one of the best measures of permanent improvement in living standards. Borrowers in your district increased their average net worth—over and above all debts, including their obligations to the Government—by $554, or 41 percent, since coming on the program.

These figures mean that Farm Security borrowers in the twenty-second district have added a total of $95,830 to the wealth of their communities, and have increased their total annual incomes by $38,685. Naturally, this growth in prosperity and purchasing power has been reflected on the books of merchants and other businessmen of the district.

We were pleased to find that borrowers in your district are rapidly repaying their rehabilitation loans. Already $69,173 has been repaid on loans totaling $173,781, although much of the money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years. Throughout the entire country, rehabilitation loans totaling $420,865,050 had been made as of December 31, 1940, and $149,626,442 of this sum had been repaid. As you know, loan funds currently are advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instead of coming from direct appropriations.

In view of the fact that none of the borrowers from Farm Security was able to get adequate credit anywhere else, and that many of them formerly were on relief, we feel that this repayment record is a tribute to the honesty and industry of these needy farm people. There is ample evidence that the great majority of them are getting back on their feet and becoming permanently self-supporting. In large measure, this progress is due to the advice and technical guidance in sound farm and home management which accompanies each Farm Security loan.

For example, we encourage our borrowers to get away from one-crop farming—particularly of surplus crops, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat—and to raise as much as possible of their own food and feed for their livestock. During 1940, the average Farm Security family in your district produced $351 worth of goods for home consumption, as compared with $248 before they came into the F. S. A. program. This produce for home use included 411 gallons of milk per family; 539 pounds of meat; and 393 quarts of vegetables and fruit canned for the winter. This increased production of food did not,

of course, add to the supply in the commercial markets, since virtually none of it was offered for sale. It simply meant a better diet, better health, and a rising standard of living for these families.

Often it has been necessary to work out an adjustment of the family's old debts, before rehabilitation could be successful. Local farm-debt adjustment committees have been set up for this purpose. They have no legal authority to compel adjustments, but by bringing the farmer and his creditors together for a friendly discussion, they usually are able to arrange a scale-down of the obligations, reduced interest rates, or extension of the payment period. Such adjustments frequently save the farmer from foreclosure, and at the same time enable the creditors to get substantial payments on what might otherwise have been bad debts.

This service is available to all farmers, whether or not they are rehabilitation borrowers. Altogether, debt reductions totaling $154,956 have been negotiated for the farmers in your district. This represents a scale-down of 20.3 percent. As a direct result of these adjustments, $7,820 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

In making this special survey, our field employees reported that there are 1,187 families in your district who are eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans, but have been unable to get them because of the limited funds available.

In addition to the rehabilitation program, Farm Security is carrying out the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which provides a limited number of loans to competent tenants to enable them to buy family-type farms.

During the first 3 years of this program, we made nine such loans in your district, totaling $65,274. This year we expect to make about four Bankhead-Jones loans in the Twenty-second District, amounting to approximately $25,307. Throughout the country, delinquencies of these loans have amounted so far to only 2.6 percent, or $23,658; and this has been more than offset by the fact that other borrowers have been able to make advance payments totaling $196,765, as the result of good crops and management.

I am hopeful that this rather detailed report may be useful to you; and if you would like to have any further facts about our program, I shall, of course, be glad to supply them. Sometime during the year, I hope that you may find an opportunity to visit some of the borrowers from F. S. A. in your district and see for yourself the efforts they are making to get a new start as independent, tax-paying citizens.

Sincerely,

C. B. BALDWIN,
Administrator.

President Roosevelt's Radio Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith an editorial appearing in the New York Times today. The editorial is entitled "A Call to Action," and is in commendation of the radio address delivered by President Roosevelt last night on the world crisis.

This address was perhaps heard by more people in the United States and throughout the world than any other address delivered in history, and the able editorial of the New York Times, I think, reflects the sentiment of the majority of the American people with reference thereto.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times of Wednesday, May 28, 1941]

A CALL TO ACTION

President Roosevelt struck a mighty blow last night for freedom. In an address that will take its place among the great state papers of this country he summoned the American people to resolve their doubts and dedicate themselves to action. The words he spoke will ring around the world. They will echo in the Axis Nations. They will serve notice on these enemies of our democratic institutions that no threats of a German admiral, no risks of involvement in this war, no possible combination of power that the Axis can bring against us, will swerve us from the course on which we have embarked. We are determined to put in the hands of our loyal friends the weapons of self-defense. To those loyal friends, wherever they are fighting—and above all, to the men and women of Great Britain, now engaged in a heroic defense of their own island, and, no less, of our own way of life—the President's words will bring fresh strength and added courage. For the message they carry is that the great democracy of the United States does not stand aloof from this fight for freedom—remote, disinterested, and indecisive. Instead we say, in the words of Mr. Roosevelt, that the time has come to declare at home "that an unlimited national emergency exists" and, on the broad Atlantic, that we intend to "reassert the ancient American doctrine of freedom of the seas."

By whatever standard it is judged, this is sound and necessary policy for the United States. The declaration of a state of unlimited national emergency will cut a short way through problems which have seemed insoluble; it will facilitate the mobilization of the full creative force of the Nation—its immense productive genius, its inexhaustible resources, its reserves of capital and labor—for the supreme effort that lies before us. The determination of the President to reassert the traditional American doctrine of freedom of the seas pledges us to see that the supplies which we produce actually reach the battle lines for which they are intended. These policies put us squarely on the side of those who are fighting our own battles. They discard, as utterly unrealistic, all faith in Hitler's broken word, all hope of a "negotiated" peace which would in fact make Hitler master of the world. They reaffirm our steadfast policy of all-out aid to the democracies—a policy based not only on the saving faith of American idealism but "on hard-headed concern for our own security and for the kind of safe and civilized world in which we wish to live."

We believe that the course to which Mr. Roosevelt pledged this country last night, and the action he has taken, will have the endorsement of the vast majority of our people. There has been no division of opinion among Americans on any fundamental question. Except for a handful of spiritual aliens so small as to be utterly negligible in a nation of 130,000,000 people, the whole country is united in its deep desire to preserve our democratic way of life. It is united in believing that this way of life is now in danger, our desperate haste to arm is proof of that. It is united in believing that the source of this danger lies exclusively in the ambitions of the Axis Powers. It is united in its passionate hope for a British victory. These are the articles of our faith, the fundamentals of our policy. Our only disagreement has been on ways and means of using our great strength to best advantage, and this disagreement itself must now be resolved in the light of the President's powerful portrayal of the alternatives that lie before us.

Mr. Roosevelt has seized a great moment in history to speak to his countrymen with candor and courage. His words carry a confession of faith, a summons to duty, and a call to action.

The Automobile in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

DATA COMPILED BY THE NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following data compiled by the National Automobile Dealers Association, which shows the part the automobile is taking in national defense:

THE AUTOMOBILE IS UNCLE SAM'S BIGGEST TAX PRODUCER

The automobile industry, which has been the most dominant influence in raising the standard of living in this country, is also the Nation's largest producer of tax revenue. Statistics on the widespread use of the automobile industry to raise taxes furnish the basis of the fourth study made by the National Automobile Dealers Association in its series to show the importance of the automobile in the national economy and national defense.

"The automobile is a source of huge tax revenues for both the Federal and State governments," the N. A. D. A. study points out. "The Federal Government imposes taxes on the automobile itself, and the parts and accessories that go with it. In addition, both the Federal and State governments derive taxes from gasoline, and many States add a sales tax to the automobile purchased, while all of them charge registration fees.

"With the exception of 1938, taxes on the automobile have increased every year since it was first singled out for government revenue. In the last 10 years, taxes per motor vehicle in use have increased 50 percent, so that today the percentage of motor user taxes to all taxes, from all sources, is 11 percent.

"Based on the increased activity of the automobile last year over 1939, when a new record was set, estimates of tax collections in 1940 are made as follows:

State gasoline tax	$868,000,000
State registration receipts	450,000,000
Federal gasoline taxes	248,000,000
Federal excise taxes	134,000,000
Personal property and tolls	56,000,000
Municipal and county taxes	16,000,000

"These separate sources aggregate the record-making sum of $1,772,000,000 without including an estimated amount of $105,000,000 in general retail sales taxes in 25 States.

When compared with the 1939 automobile tax bill of $1,636,549,000, the 1940 estimate appears surprisingly conservative.

"Thirty-eight percent of all tax revenue of the 48 States is paid by motor-car operators, and gasoline taxes constitute the largest single item of revenue. Originally, the State gasoline tax was imposed to help bear the burden of building roads, but the huge amounts obtainable from this source supplied the first opportunity to use motor-car taxes for general purposes. Thus about 16 percent of these taxes are diverted by the States.

"When the United States entered the first World War, Congress utilized the revenue-producing possibilites of the automobile by imposing an excise tax. This was discontinued in 1929, restored again as an emergency measure in 1932, and the rate boosted for defense purposes in 1940.

"Thus an emergency automobile tax remained as a permanent tax for 9 years, producing approximately $1,000,000,000. Proposals to increase it from 7 to 25 percent seek to continue it in effect as a source of revenue for defense expenditures.

"What does taxation of automobile transportation mean to the motorist? It means that on a per-car basis, the average new-car purchaser has to pay $40 in taxes of various kinds before he is allowed to use his car on the highways.

"Add to that, 32 cents of every dollar he spends for gasoline, together with taxes on any accessories he may install in his car, or parts replaced, and he may be near or well over the $55.83, which has been estimated as the average tax for the 31,800,000 cars in operation in 1940.

"To the tax-producing value of the automobile industry should be included more than 40,000 automobile dealers, thousands of gasoline stations and suppliers, all paying substantial sums from their business operations."

America in a World at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY CHESTER C. DAVIS

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Chester C. Davis, member of the National Defense Advisory Commission, on the subject America in a World at War. This address was delivered on April 7, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I do not know what gift of foresight or understanding it was that inspired the leaders of the Military Order of the World War who founded Army Day. Their action was particularly remarkable because of the times during which it was taken. The year 1928 witnessed the first formal observance of Army Day. That year also marked the approximate center of two decades during which the thought of the United States was of peace, not war; when every suggestion of planning or preparation for war stood hopelessly discredited.

I think that point will bear elaboration. An eminent contemporary authority wrote: "The year 1928 saw more practical progress toward the elimination of war as a factor in international relations than had ever before been made." In August of that year the Kellogg-Briand peace treaty calling for the renunciation of war was signed at Paris by 15 world powers. These high contracting parties solemnly declared "in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another." In January of the year following, the United States Senate ratified the peace pact by a vote of 85 to 1. In July the treaty was proclaimed at Paris with 62 nations as adherents.

So I say it is indeed remarkable that a group of men, in a year that marked the apex of our blind trust in international good will, successfully dramatized a gesture of respectful attention to the Army of the United States. I pay tribute to those leaders of the Military Order of the World War through their representatives here tonight. Their instincts were truer or they saw the world more clearly than did most of us.

It is essential that we take this background into account in attempting to appraise the position of the United States on the international scene today. We meet tonight on the twenty-fourth anniversary of the day on which the United States entered "the war to end all wars." Twenty years ago this Nation turned its back upon Europe and its difficulties in what appeared to be resolute renunciation of any responsibility for what happened there in the future. We withdrew from Europe and all her works at a time when our staying in might have altered the history of the world; when farsighted leadership rising above the hatreds of the World War might have resulted in progressive adjustments which would have rendered Hitler impossible and might have averted the present world catastrophe.

I do not say that this is so. What might have happened had our course been other than it was lies in a field of speculation where no man can be positive or dogmatic. This much, however, we now know—those superficial gestures of peace, overlaid upon seething pressure against the restrictions and rigidities of the post-war order, were meaningless and nonrealistic.

During those two decades, we, as a people, were certain of many things. But hindsight is an humbling teacher—we now can see that we knew too many things that weren't true. We lived in a world that we now realize did not exist at all.

Since then, one by one, the foundation stones of our thinking in international affairs have crumbled. One of the last to go was our conviction that a nation which minded its own business and respected the rights of its neighbors would be left free to develop and enjoy its own way of life unmolested.

That rule hasn't worked in Europe or Asia. Few can be found who are certain that it will work here. The rule of ruthless force and power which replaced it is being exercised throughout the world. There is no limit to the application of the new rule except the limit imposed by fear of another and a greater force.

This, then, is the lesson current history teaches the United States: Wealth and resources, mountains of gold, and millions of acres of factories are not power in the equation that is known over three-quarters of the world today. They can be organized into power—until then they are nothing but bait.

We can honestly disagree over the early likelihood of serious war being launched against the United States at home from either Europe or Asia, but we cannot disagree with the proposition that the likelihood recedes as our armament advances.

This is a new concept for many of us. It calls for the adjustment of individual lives to national effort on a scale we have never before dreamed of. A colossal horror is astride the world compared with which our individual problems and troubles become petty. Its swift growth did more than blot out the peaceful Scandinavian democracies and the well-ordered life of the Low Countries. It inevitably has changed the pattern of our own existence now and for the future. The stark fact stands out that we are an important part of a world which is at war. We are holding cards in a game in which our whole industrial and agricultural life is involved.

The nature of war has changed. Before Napoleon, wars were fought by relatively small and usually professional armies as a side issue while life and business in a country at war went on pretty much as usual. Beginning with the Napoleonic Wars this easy-going conception of limited professionalized conflict began to change. Each successive war has witnessed a greater concentration of the human and material resources of the belligerents back of the army and navy. But it remained for Germany during the decade of the twenties to evolve and during the thirties to effect the idea of total mobilization for total war.

Let us stop for a moment and reflect on what this thing called "total war" means. It means that no dividing line exists between military operations in the field and civilian life behind the lines. It establishes one national goal and one goal only—that of victory. It is prepared to sacrifice everything that does not contribute to that objective. It assumes that the modern army is no stronger than the industry which equips it with the complex machinery of modern conflict, or than the farms which feed it. It places all of these on a war footing. It subjects management, labor, and farmers to military discipline—and military rations. I suppose it is logical, therefore, that modern war considers the civil population just as fair game for military attack as soldiers in the trenches.

There is much in the idea of total war which Americans unconditionally reject. Total war, as the dictator states define it, means the complete and utter sacrifice of individual freedom and individual rights. But the preservation of the right of the individual to think, speak, and worship as he chooses is the heart of the principle this Nation is arming to defend. We have the same task as the dictator nations of welding our economy to the building of defense machinery. We are challenged therefore to demonstrate that we can make full use of our manpower and our material resources and at the same time preserve the essential rights of the individual and the institutions which we value.

I believe we can do this job and do it as a democracy. We can organize and execute an armament program beyond anything the world has ever seen in any country, and preserve the essentials of our freedom for posterity to enjoy. But we cannot do it without sacrifice, and we cannot do it without changing our viewpoint on many things. Let me mention some of them.

Industrial management must expand capacity to produce essential materials for defense and civilian requirements notwithstanding its quite understandable apprehension over the peacetime use of the new facilities.

Labor must supply the manpower which this effort requires, and do it without contributing substantially to the vicious spiral of rising wages, costs, profits, and prices which could work deadly impairment of national efficiency in the job at hand.

Both industrial management and the leaders of organized labor must be prevented from taking advantage of this national crisis as an opportunity to try to increase their comparative advantages one over the other. The Nation must not and will not permit their disputes to stop the vital flow of production.

If we are to do this job well and to preserve the basis for our future freedom, no participant in production can be permitted to enrich himself as a result of this national effort and the expenditures that go into it. If we make extraordinary profits we must expect to turn them back to the Government through taxation. We must expect to divert our savings by whatever extent is required to the financing of this program.

This whole subject is too vast and the time is too short to treat it adequately. I can only hope in this talk to throw a flashlight over the scene and perhaps illuminate for a moment some of the aspects that have interested me particularly.

In the remainder of my time I want to talk briefly about three things: First, the problem of the location of our defense industries so as to make full use of our labor and physical resources where they are; next, the effort that is being made to spread throughout the country the work arising from defense contracts which in the first instance are concentrated in the hands of the very few; and finally, some principles that arise in connection with financing our international effort.

When the National Defense Advisory Commission was organized last summer I expressed the view that new industries required under the defense program should not be located in areas where existing industries essential to defense are now concentrated when there was any possibility of placing them elsewhere without sacrifice of speed and efficiency. It was clear that this was the only way in which new reservoirs of unemployed labor and resources would be tapped without uprooting families and shifting them thousands of miles into communities where ebbing of the armament effort would leave them stranded.

The plans for war production which had been made prior to the emergency were not based on such a principle In carrying out the program up to date some progress toward decentralization has been made, but I am afraid that on the whole we have followed the same pattern of regional concentration that was followed in 1917 and 1918. Then we handicapped our effort by shortages of labor and transport and left an aftermath of overconcentrated industry. I am afraid that we will again reap some of the same harvest of economic and social consequences.

New facilities and new production are now being authorized for the United States and for aid to England. I am hopeful that the armed services and the defense authorities will do a better job with these than has been done heretofore. I do not mean that the plants and facilities that have already been located will not produce efficiently the materials and the implements they are designed to turn out. By a better job I mean that the additional units yet to come will be located where they can tap resources of materials, facilities, and men heretofore untouched.

On the human side and to minimize the aftermath, it is important that we avoid so far as possible drawing men from the mountains and the prairie, from farms and interior cities and towns to crowd them into industrial centers hundreds of miles away. It is far better to leave as many as possible on farms and in the villages but give those with low incomes opportunities for employment in industry. This would lessen the immediate need for housing and provide a measure of security when the emergency has passed.

That the location of defense plants up to date has in many respects been unsatisfactorily done from the standpoint of industrial decentralization is not due to any lack of interest or sympathy on the part of the Army or the Navy or the national-defense authorities. The trouble lies in the lack of planning for this national crisis. That is not surprising. For 22 years the business of the United States has been peace, not war. Now the whip of speed has forced decisions which might have been avoided if this country had had an understanding of what lay ahead, and the organization to make its survey and its plans in advance.

My experience with plant locations on the Defense Commission has convinced me of one thing: As a nation we had never planned for a national job of these dimensions. The very organization of the Army itself had been based upon conceptions of warfare that were shown to be obsolete by the blitzkriegs of less than a year ago.

Modern warfare is no longer only a question of numbers of men and numbers of guns. It is also, to an ever-increasing extent, a question of industrial organization, of technical and scientific skill. Private industry naturally develops on lines applicable to present-day manufacturing and commerce that do not necessarily meet the needs of modern armament. The Army at its arsenals has carried on limited experimental work in peacetime devoted mainly to the old type of warfare. There is an ever-widening gap between them which needs to be filled. Humbly, as a layman, I risk the suggestion that to direct this work the Army needs within its own organization a large number of the best men who can be drawn from civilian life into its service, a strong and permanent body of technically trained men who know the problems that have arisen in this new kind of warfare even though they haven't been trained to direct men to march and shoot. I believe provision should be made now and never abandoned for such a dignified career branch of the Army with adequate rank and compensation to work in advance on problems of this character so that the country need not again be caught with inadequate plans.

Speaking to the southern Governors at New Orleans a few weeks ago I made reference to the fact that out of eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts for war materials awarded between June 13 of last year and February 15 of this year 80 percent had gone to 62 companies or interrelated groups of companies; between 40 and 45 percent had gone to 6 closely interconnected groups; and between one-fifth and one-quarter had gone to 2 groups of companies of closely connected ownership.

These are the companies that were best equipped with experience and management to attempt the different phases of the colossal job we have on hand. But the defense authorities clearly recognize that if the manpower and the facilities of the country are to be brought fully to bear on the job of production, the corporations and firms holding these prime contracts must spread the task of production through subcontracts as widely as possible over the land. As most of you know, an organization is being perfected under the direction of the Office of Production Management through which the Army and the Navy and the other defense authorities are going to try to do an effective job of spreading the work covered by these contracts. This is going to require a lot of attention and a lot of work from all of us. In one way or another the end must be accomplished.

I have stressed the fact that our primary problem is the immediate mobilization of our physical resources and manpower for the maximum production of the things necessary for our own defense and to aid the democracies that are resisting aggression. The subsidiary problem is to mobilize our dollars to meet the huge costs of these efforts. I say "subsidiary" because it is easy for the financial community to overemphasize the financial aspects of the program.

There need be no serious difficulty in raising the funds that are needed and I hope there will be none. All classes of our population are anxious and willing to bear their fair share of the financial burden with the same spirit of sacrifice and patriotism displayed by those who have entered the armed services.

The program will be financed partly by funds raised by taxation and partly by funds that are borrowed. These two methods should be looked at together; they are parts of the same problem. In each, from the standpoint of our general welfare, there are good ways and there are bad ways of raising the required money.

The methods that are chosen should be such as will restrain tendencies toward inflation now; and they should contribute toward the continued full use of our labor and resources when the time comes that our defense expenditures may be curtailed.

It is possible to pay much, perhaps far more than we think, of our defense costs by taxing as we go. I believe thinking people everywhere have applauded the announcement by the Secretary of the Treasury that he will strive for a program that will raise through current taxation a very high proportion of our defense expenditures.

The choice of methods of additional taxation is enormously important from the standpoint of economic consequences. If we are willing to act courageously, much can still be done to increase income-tax revenue by increasing rates and by spreading the base to reach new and numerous income groups. These changes can be made without departing from the principle of the ability to pay. It seems to me that it is important to avoid heavy consumption and sales taxes at this time. The country may have to come to them when it approaches a condition of full employment, but the general sales tax is an inflexible and not a selective way to raise money. It hits consumption that should be expanded as well as that which should be contracted. Another trouble, it may be difficult to modify or get rid of consumer taxes in the post-defense period when it becomes desirable to expand rather than contract consumption.

Notwithstanding all that may be done to meet defense costs through taxation, a great deal of new borrowing is going to be necessary. The lag in tax collections would require heavy borrowing for the immediate future even if theoretically we could levy taxes heavy enough to pay all defense costs. Here, too, there are right ways and wrong ways to raise money. The borrowing should be in such form as to reach and attract savings of individuals and institutions; it should discourage, so far as possible, further loans or investments by commercial banks.

The Secretary of the Treasury has announced the new program of savings issues carefully devised to appeal to practically all levels of income and occupation. These new securities are ideal to meet the general objectives I have mentioned for the borrowing program. I am sure that the country will respond wholeheartedly to these offerings and that the people of the Eighth Federal Reserve District will be in the forefront when the lines form.

In conclusion, I wish, with your permission, to turn to a more personal note. I meet you tonight as one who hopes to sink his roots in the rich soil of the Mississippi Valley and stay. While I have never before established my residence in what is known as the Eighth Federal Reserve District, I have always—except for my temporary sojourn in Washington—lived on the rivers whose waters flow past your door. This is the heart of the agrarian economy of the United States. Almost any agricultural product can be grown and nearly every agricultural problem can be found within its boundaries. It is a

privilege to be asked to share in the promising future which its soil, its climate, its mineral and transportation resources, and its splendid people combine to guarantee.

In the critical times that are ahead of us there are tasks which everyone of us can help to do. I am glad I am going to have the opportunity to work with you in meeting them.

Intervention In War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able address delivered last night over the radio by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Americans of 1941, the people of the United States face today one of the greatest issues in their history—the question whether or not they shall intervene in the war now proceeding between Germany and the British Empire. It is a question which will affect the peace and happiness of our children and our grandchildren for many years to come. On that question there is a great difference of opinion among the people of the United States. The war party—and I do not mean to identify this with either political party—believes that we must join now with England to destroy Hitler for fear that Hitler may destroy the United States. The peace party believes that the only way to insure peace is to build a defense so adequate that no one will even consider an attack on this country across the broad wastes of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. They believe that intervention in the European war is futile, and will involve us for years to come in the utter confusion of European conflicts.

There is only one way in which this question ought to be determined under a democratic form of government. The Constitution provides that only Congress can declare war, and rightly so, because the Members of Congress are the most direct representatives of the people whose vital interest is at stake; rightly so, because no nation should go to war unless a majority of the people approve that action. The President has no right to declare war whether a national emergency exists or not. It follows inevitably that he has no right to engage deliberately in military or naval action equivalent to war except when the country is attacked.

There is another reason why this great issue today must be submitted to the people. Less than 7 months ago the President gave his pledge, "We will not send our Army, naval and air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack." The Republican candidate was equally emphatic. He said, "The American people do not want war. They have no idea whatever of joining in any conflict whether on the Atlantic or the Pacific. They are determined to keep America at peace. In this determination I stand with them. I am for keeping out of war." We now face the fundamental question whether we shall abandon the position of both political parties in the last election. Surely that cannot be done without submitting the question directly to the representatives of the people.

The President's broadcast last night was a disappointment to millions of people because it still avoided the basic issue. It still indicated an intention on his part to push further and further toward war without consulting the people. In recent months there has been a tremendous growth of public sentiment against war and against convoys. Because the President sensed that feeling, he carefully avoided any direct advocacy of convoys or of war. He talked of patrols and defense and freedom of the seas. His arguments with regard to Hitler, if they are valid at all, are arguments for war, but he did not dare to advocate war itself because the people are opposed to it. His speech contains vague threats of aggressive, warlike action to be undertaken in his sole discretion. He hints that the term "defense" will be interpreted by him to mean the occupation of islands 3,000 miles from our eastern shore, within 400 miles of Africa, belonging to a neutral nation. In short, he is suggesting that he may, in dictator style, take warlike action without submitting to the people whose vital welfare is concerned the question whether or not we shall go to war. That is not democratic procedure.

The President's broadcast, as usual, contained an attempt to smear those who honestly disagree with him in principle on questions of vital policy. It was accompanied by a declaration of unlimited national emergency, which is already being used by the war party in an attempt to silence the voices of those who are convinced that war would be a terrible mistake. As a matter of fact, the so-called declaration of unlimited national emergency has no legal effect whatever. It does not enlarge his powers in any way. The President has the right to state his opinion that such an emergency exists, and to appeal to all groups of the people to cooperate in the national-defense program. But there is nothing in the Constitution or the statutes which give him the authority to declare such an emergency, and his proclamation gives him absolutely no powers which he did not have a month ago, or in fact, a year ago.

There are a number of statutes which give certain powers to the President in time of war, such as the authority to take over the railroads. Those powers cannot be brought into existence by any declaration of national emergency by the President. There are various other statutes authorizing the President to do certain acts under various emergency conditions, and many of these he has already exercised, as in the case of the neutrality proclamation and the enlargement of the Army. The few that have not been exercised, such as the possibility of taking over the radio, could have been exercised on a simple Executive order months ago, without any declaration of unlimited national emergency. It is said that he can now confiscate the industrial plants, but this power was given to him in the Selective Service Act without any necessity of his declaring an emergency. It is suggested that he can now extend the time of the draftees beyond a year, but this extension can only be made by Congress. He cannot now give Leon Henderson power to fix prices any more than he could before the proclamation was issued.

I hope that the declaration of unlimited national emergency may be of some assistance to the morale of the defense program, but the idea that it is a declaration of war, or anything like a declaration of war, or causes any suspension of civil rights, is an hallucination. The question of war and peace is still before the people of the United States. The President has shown his unwillingness openly to flout their desires. It is still the solemn duty of those who believe as I do to urge upon the people the reasons why this country should keep out of the European war and avoid any action of its military or naval forces which amounts to war.

Two reasons have been used by the war party during the past year to justify our going to war with a nation that has not attacked us, in violation of the principles which every political party has advocated since the World War. The first is that if Britain should fall, Hitler would overwhelm the United States. The second is that Hitler would destroy our trade. The President denounces Hitler and all his views with his usual effective eloquence; and I agree with him entirely about Mr. Hitler and his views, except that I think that Hitler's own self-interest would deter him from undertaking any attack on the United States. But I notice that the President does not claim, as do Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson, that this country would be helpless against a Hitler attack. He knows that our Navy is twice as strong as the Italian and German Navies combined, and that the Italian Navy is not suited for action in the Atlantic. He knows that a navy, to attack successfully across 3,000 miles of water, must be twice as strong as the defending navy. He knows that the navies of Europe are steadily decreasing in power as the war proceeds, through the sinking of powerful ships, and that we are rapidly increasing the strength of our Navy. He knows that our Navy is today the most powerful navy in the world, and will be for years to come. The whole argument of the war party that Hitler can conquer the United States or dominate the seas that surround us has just about faded into the discard.

But the President now lays more stress on the danger to our trade. He says that Hitler would fasten an economic strangle hold upon us. He threatens the American workman that his wages and hours would be fixed by Hitler. The whole argument is an effort to frighten people into an emotional war fury. To anyone who sits down and examines calmly the real facts relating to our foreign trade the conclusions of the President are wholly unjustified.

During the 2 or 3 years before the war, our total exports amounted to approximately $3,000,000,000, while our national income was approximately $60,000,000,000. This amounts to about 5 percent of our national income. The other 95 percent arose from sales and services within the United States. Of the total exports, less than one-tenth, or approximately $300,000,000, one-half of 1 percent of our national income, went to South America.

Between seven and eight hundred million dollars went to North America, mostly to Canada, and it is somewhat difficult to see how this is going to be cut down by the Nazis. It is utterly ridiculous to suppose that our trade with South America or Asia, or even Europe, will be wiped out. In spite of our hostility to Japan, she has been one of our best customers. What will Japan do with her silk except sell it to us? We take over half of the Brazilian coffee crop. What is Brazil going to do if she does not sell it to us and take our goods in return? Even if the Nazis dominated the Dutch East Indies, there is no way for them to dispose of the rubber produced there except to sell it to us.

People who talk of trade interference confuse the conditions of war and peace. Of course, if we are at war with Germany, our trade will be interfered with, as it already is, and as it will be in the event of any war. That is one of the bad things about war. But so long as the Germans make war on us, they will hardly be in a position to build up the permanent trade connections which are necessary to injure our peacetime trade. On the other hand, if they wish to compete with us for trade, they will have completely to make over their war economy, which now absorbs the greater percentage of their industrial activity, and tool up their factories for peacetime production.

Undoubtedly when peace is made they will be dangerous competitors in the world markets. But let us face the facts with regard to our foreign trade. It will not be destroyed, but no matter who wins this war it will not prosper for many years. In any event, the impoverished peoples of Europe will have to work for starvation wages for a long time. Those people will have very little with which to buy our goods. They will undersell us in many countries and with relation to many articles. But that is the result of war, not of German victory. If the British win, there will be the same competition from the British, and from the Germans as well, for surely we aren't going to prohibit German exports.

Let us look at the condition which will exist after the war. We will have the largest Navy in the world, entirely able to see that our ships can go anywhere they wish to go. We have many means by which we can promote our trade. Outside of price competition, we are infinitely better equipped than the Germans will be. We will have more wealth and more gold. If the Germans infiltrate, we can infiltrate.

The people who talk about the destruction of trade are utterly inconsistent. Sometimes it is claimed that the Germans will marshal all the buying power of Europe, and approach the Argentineans, for example, with the demand that they sell their wheat for 2 cents a bushel. Of course, that assumes a control over the buying power of England and France and other European countries which is simply impossible to imagine. But it is the situation imagined by those who favor the South American cartel. Some of the war crowd use just the opposite and inconsistent argument. They say that the Germans will be so kind to the Argentineans that they will sell them German goods for practically nothing, with a government subsidy. Frankly, if it is worth our while, we can do the same. There are hundreds of ways in which to promote our trade after the war. I do not think the American people, calmly considering the alternatives, will ever go to war against a country which has not attacked us because some day that country may be a successful competitor for foreign trade. We will lose more in 2 years of modern war than we will gain in 20 years of foreign trade.

The President says we could not dispose of our agricultural surpluses. That can hardly be due to Hitler, however, because we have not been able to dispose of those surpluses for a number of years. It is much more due to the A. A. A. policy than it is to Hitler. It is said that Hitler will insist on buying our surpluses for a low price. Why under the New Deal we are already paying export bounties on wheat and cotton, and selling them far below our market. Many farmers feel that a two-price system, maintaining the domestic price at parity, and selling the surplus for anything you can get for it, is a sound solution of the surplus problem.

I believe that because of the war, and regardless who wins, our foreign trade may fall off by as much as half a billion dollars. That will make very little difference indeed to the general prosperity of the United States. But suppose our imports of rubber are cut off. Today we can manufacture synthetic rubber. It will cost more, but it will put thousands of men to work in a new industry to replace those who can no longer work in the corresponding export industries. New markets in this country would replace foreign markets, not quite so profitable perhaps, but approximately the same. We import large quantities of vegetable oils. Suppose they were cut off. All of them can be produced in the United States, and will replace on many farms the surpluses of wheat and cotton which it is not profitable for us to raise today. The President says that we do not burn all the petroleum we can pump, that our oil exports will be cut off. Of course, they won't be, but Secretary Ickes has repeatedly urged that we cut down the production of petroleum and save some of it for future generations of Americans. If we could not import silk we could get on with rayon, and increase the number of men working in that industry. I certainly do not advocate any trade isolation, and I regard any such reduction of trade as wholly improbable, but I say the loss would be largely compensated. That loss would not be an important factor in the prosperity of this country, compared to the loss which can result from unsound fiscal and economic policies within the country, like those we have seen in recent years.

Undoubtedly a British defeat would require us to spend more on the Army and Navy, but, as far as I can judge, a completely adequate defense could be maintained at a cost of $3,000,000,000 a year more than we were spending on the Army and Navy before the war. That is less than the annual New Deal deficit was for many years. The elimination of waste in nondefense expenditures would take care of a good part of it. In any event, we face a considerable part of the additional expense. We are going to have a two-ocean navy and a large air force no matter who wins the war.

This is not today a pleasant world. It will be less pleasant if the British are defeated, but there is not the slightest reason why, with sound domestic financial and humanitarian policies, we should not be a great and prosperous democracy. We certainly shall be infinitely better off than we shall be if we undertake the task of maintaining the balance of power in Europe, of policing all the small democracies of Europe, and engaging in every war which arises in that distant Continent.

The President's broadcast introduces into the picture two new conceptions. He says, "We reassert the ancient American doctrine of freedom of the seas." He says that all our history has been tied up with those words, and that we have striven and fought in defense of freedom of the seas. I am afraid he would not pass a history examination. Apparently he interprets this doctrine to mean that we can insist that our war supplies and materials on belligerent and neutral vessels shall freely go to England.

But the doctrine of freedom of the seas was something very different. Originally it applied to freedom of the seas in time of peace as against the claim of various nations that they had a special proprietorship in various seas and oceans. No one disputes that freedom of the seas today in time of peace. In time of war, however, the freedom of the seas was always substantially modified. Belligerent vessels were always subject to capture and destruction by the other belligerent. Neutral vessels were subject to capture if they were carrying to a belligerent contraband of war, such as our lease-lend materials. On the other hand, any goods could be shipped from one neutral country to another, and foodstuffs could be shipped in neutral vessels even to belligerent countries without being subject to capture.

The old doctrine of freedom of the seas practically came to an end, however, during the World War, and it came to an end through the establishment of the British blockade. We had violent arguments with the British about the seizure of food ships en route to Belgium and Holland. Finally we yielded, and recognized the right of a belligerent to prevent in any way possible the delivery of any materials to its enemies. We are assisting today the British blockade of all Europe, including enemy, neutral, and occupied countries, in complete violation of this good old American doctrine of freedom of the seas. The President apparently is using this attractive phrase as a justification for convoys or patrols, because the people have turned "thumbs down" on convoys, and freedom of the seas sounds more palatable. It means to him only the freedom of the United States to send munitions of war to Great Britain on British ships, something it never meant at any time in our history. On the other hand, if he is going to back up the real doctrine, he will have to insist on the right of American ships to carry foodstuffs to Spain and Portugal and France, and even to the occupied democracies of Europe. Up to this time, he has refused to insist on our right—yes, and our duty—to take such shipments to starving peoples.

The other term which is freely used in his broadcast is the word "defense". It is well settled that the President has the right to defend the United States without action by Congress, but that he has no right to undertake aggressive warfare. The broadcast shows an intention on his part to stretch the word defense to acts which are clearly acts of aggression. Again he is apparently trying to avoid the necessity of consulting Congress on the fundamental question of war and peace. He suggests that he is pushing patrols into the Eastern Atlantic, and that he might find it necessary to seize the Azores and Cape Verde Islands as a measure of defense. He is prepared to interpret any German occupation of these islands as an attack on the United States, and even suggests that German activity against British shipping off Africa is an attack on the Americas. He doesn't mention Dakar, but rumors that we are about to occupy Dakar are floating about freely in Washington.

If I understand English, it is perfectly foolish to say that Germany has attacked us. If there is one thing Hitler is carefully avoiding at the present moment, it is an attack on the United States. It does not make sense to say that a seizure by us of the Azores, 2,500 miles from this country, or of the Cape Verde Islands, 3,000 miles from this country, is defense of the United States. Think what defense can be made to mean under this definition. Having occupied the Cape Verde Islands, we would then have to occupy Dakar in order to defend the Cape Verde Islands. To defend Dakar we would have to push on into French Africa. In order to defend the Azores we would have to seize Lisbon. The whole argument sounds to me very much like the Russian allegation when they attacked Finland, that the great Soviet Empire was acting in self-defense.

Conditions may arise if we should enter the war, under which the seizure of the Azores or Cape Verde Islands might be a wise policy, but let us not deceive ourselves into regarding it as defense. It is an aggressive act of war, and it is one which cannot possibly be taken under our Constitution without the approval of the people of the United States in Congress assembled.

All of this talk of defense and freedom of the seas is an effort to circumvent the feeling against convoys. The President himself has said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war," and our people do not want war. Our patrols may mean shooting, and the seizures of islands may mean shooting, and that shooting would mean war. The issue before the people is the same as it has been: Shall we or shall we not enter the war against Germany? It is no longer an issue of aid to Britain. We are aiding Britain to the extent of our ability, short of joining in the war. Our lease-lend materials are today arriving satisfactorily in Britain. Less than 4 percent of those materials have been sunk.

The President says that ships are being destroyed faster than they are being reconstructed, and that this presents a great threat to British safety. The British at the beginning of this war had 17,000,000 tons of merchant shipping. They acquired 8,000,000 tons of neutral and allied shipping. Today they have left in the neighborhood of 20,000,000

tons. Recently that shipping has been destroyed at the rate of about 5,000,000 tons a year, but the British and American replacements, according to the President, amount to half of that destruction. That means a net loss of 2,500,000 tons a year. After 3 years more the British will still have 12,500,000 tons of merchant shipping, which is sufficient to keep open the trade routes to Great Britain. The amount of materials and airplanes and guns which are supplied to England depends much more on increasing our production in the United States, and reorganizing our Government, and checking strikes than it does on convoys. The advocates of convoys, like the advocates of freedom of the seas and of aggressive defense, are not so much concerned with seeing that England gets our supplies as they are with taking steps which will inevitably involve us in the war.

I have heretofore explained at length the reasons why I feel we should not become involved in Europe. That involvement is utterly futile. It must be years before we can hope to invade the European Continent and defeat Hitler. It must be years before we can obtain the air bases from which we can bomb Berlin. By supplying the British with bombers, I hope they can in time do to the German cities what Hitler has been doing to the English cities. When that time comes, no doubt, Britain can make a more satisfactory peace than she could today. But if we declare our goal to be the crushing of Hitler, the setting up of the independence of all the small countries of Europe, it will take untold lives and untold fortunes. Even if we are successful, we will have to police all Europe if Germany is not to rise again. Europe has been engaged in war for thousands of years, and will be so engaged for thousands of years to come. We cannot settle their problems, if we would. They must work out their own salvation.

Our interference in 1917 did not solve their problems, largely because we did not understand them. Our recent interference in the Balkans did not solve their problems. We encouraged the Yugoslavs to oppose their Government and defy the Germans, with the sad result that their country was invaded and their capital, and thousands of their citizens, destroyed. We encouraged the Greeks to refuse to consider any peace with Italy and Germany. When we said we would help those peoples, they thought we meant what we said, and had the power. They took the promises of the American Minister literally and expected to see guns and tanks and American soldiers to help in their defense. What part did our Government play in the ill-fated British expedition to Greece? Surely that was not undertaken without the approval of the President. Was our General Staff consulted, and did it advise the support of such an expedition? Or was it approved on the amateur advice of unofficial representatives? When the lease-lend bill was being considered, Senator VANDENBERG pointed out that it would make the President power politician No. 1 throughout the world. How far are we responsible for the death of 15,000 gallant British and Anzacs who never left the soil of Greece? We in America can't understand the problems of Europe. Our interference is not only futile, it is almost inevitably stupid and more likely to hurt our friends than our enemies.

It is all very well for the President to announce that "we will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression, freedom to every person to worship God his own way, freedom from want and freedom from terrorism." If he means that we will send our ships and our boys to every country in the world to insure those freedoms, then he is announcing an impossible policy and one which can only lead to the destruction of America.

There is only one way in which we can insure peace and happiness to the people of this country for years to come. That is to defend the line of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans against every aggressor and build a defense so strong that no one will even dare to attack. As long as peace prevails in this country we can steadily improve the prosperity and standard of living of our people, as we have been doing for a hundred and fifty years. We can do it through democratic processes. We can show the people of the world that our four freedoms are possible in the United States even with the world at war; and that they are not inconsistent with national strength and power. It is entirely consistent with that policy that we extend in every possible way, short of war, aid and assistance to those nations which are unjustly attacked and to those nations whose ideals are close to ours.

By such a policy we could unite today all of the groups and interests of this Nation. National unity would be easy to achieve if the demand for an aggressive war is abandoned. I am convinced that if the question is submitted to the people by referendum, or if it is submitted to Congress, a great majority will speak for peace and aid to Britain, but against war. If I am mistaken, I am quite prepared to support without stint or qualification the wishes of the majority of the people declared by Congress; but I deny the right of the President to take us into war against the wishes of the men and the women and the children in the cities, in the towns, and on the farms of America.

Commemorating Annual Plum Creek Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HUGH A. BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA, AT LEXINGTON, NEBR.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered today by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] at Lexington, Nebr., commemorating annual Plum Creek Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens, it is a genuine pleasure to be with you today and to join in this memorial to those sturdy pioneers who made Plum Creek their trading point during the early days of the opening of this part of Nebraska and adjoining territory. Most of these early settlers have gone to their reward, but it is fortunate for us that there are still a few of those early pioneers who are still among us to give us inspiration to meet the issues of today like they faced what seemed impossible tasks when they came to settle these prairies and rich valleys. Their hardships were severe and many lives were shortened because of the severity of those early experiences. My own mother was taken in her early thirties, leaving father and four youngsters to fight it out alone. Many of the old neighbors around Cambridge, over on the Republican River to the south, are here today and recall those bitter experiences. My greatest pride today comes from the ownership of one of the homestead places near Cambridge, where the first home was a dugout, later to be replaced with a sod house, and where now is located a model home with all modern conveniences. We, today, have our joys, our happiness, our liberties, and our homes because of the great sacrifices of the early pioneer, because each individual did his part in building up a great nation. He made his contribution by working for the best interests of his community—his family. He wasn't quite so inclined to take on all the troubles of the whole world as we seem to be today. I am inclined to believe it's going to require the same kind of old-fashioned devotion to duty to one's own community and family today to get ourselves back on the road to normalcy as was required in the pioneer days to overcome the great problems facing the early settler. Devotion and sacrifice. This community developed because of the loyalty and devotion of its citizens. Likewise other communities grew strong because of their sturdy manhood and womanhood. Thus our State became strong and our Nation grew to its marvelous stature among the nations of the world. But it all came from the devotion, sacrifice, and loyalty of the individual citizen to his community, his home, his own.

I mention briefly these lessons we learn from the experiences of the pioneer because I want to apply them to problems facing us today.

Conditions may change; but principles never. We will be a strong Nation when our States are strong; the States are strong when their towns like Lexington are strong; and communities like this are strong when their citizens are loyal to all their civic and family obligations.

Rather than lose sleep because of a madman ravaging in Europe, I would be concerned because both the civil and economic liberties of our towns and our individuals here in America and right here in Nebraska are threatened, threatened not by foreigners but by bureaucrats within our own country. Within the Halls of Congress today there are discussions on matters that affect us seriously as individuals and, naturally, the decisions arrived at will affect our strength as a Nation. I don't like to talk in riddles or in the abstract; I like to illustrate what I am driving at by calling your attention to what's happening to another community right here in the fertile Platte River Valley.

A few days ago, I received the following telegram from the citizens of Minatare, Nebr., reading as follows:

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Great Western Sugar Co. definitely announced today Minatare factory will not operate this year due to acreage curtailment. This makes a large, modern factory idle and many men out of employment. Naturally a serious blow to our community. We offer suggestion that the Government commandeer the set-up for defense purpose; for instance, it would make an ideal munitions factory. Ample floor space, fireproof warehouses, and could be converted without disturbing the sugar equipment. The factory is equipped with ample steam boilers, engines, and generators capable of 2,100 horsepower with a completely equipped machine shop. All buildings on Burlington spurs. Ample water supply and coal-storage facilities. Many houses will be vacated as well as large dormitory. Please place these facts before proper authorities for early investigation. We believe this lay-out avails the Government of a real opportunity for manufacture of munitions at minimum cost with little delay in starting operations.

L. P. LUPHER.

MINATARE, NEBR. *May 8, 1941.*

I have read the entire message to you, but, frankly, I am not greatly concerned about trying to convert a sugar factory into one to manufacture munitions of war. I am far more anxious to endeavor to alter the conditions that require the factory to be closed down. Doesn't it seem to you the height of folly to reduce sugar-beet acreage to the point where factories have to close down, when as a matter of fact we don't produce more than one-third of our own requirements. If pushed to the utmost, we couldn't produce more than one-half of our needs. Then, why the restrictions? Why not be as practical in this national policy as we must be as individuals if we are to succeed?

Minatare, Nebr., has a population of some 1,100 upstanding Americans. It is distinctly a rural community, not unlike hundreds of other towns in Nebraska and the West, except that Minatare fortunately has been able to offer employment to a substantial number of its residents at a beet-sugar factory established there 15 years ago. To a degree, which it is difficult to realize in the industrial and more thickly populated East, Minatare and the community surrounding is entirely and completely dependent on agriculture and the beet-sugar industry for its well-being and livelihood. Not only are the workers in the factory and sugar-beet farmers concerned, but merchants, professional men, and businessmen have a direct stake in its successful operation. The company which operates the factory is the largest single taxpayer in the town of Minatare, and the largest single taxpayer in Scotts Bluff County, which is Nebraska's third county in population. The factory operation, therefore, is directly related to the group activities of the community, such as the maintenance of schools, roads, and public health.

Recently, the company which operates the factory reluctantly announced that it was going to be shut down, that it could not operate in 1941 as it has in each of the years since 1926. It will not run this year because efficient operation has become impossible under the conditions imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act of 1937. The acreage of sugar beets which the Secretary has decreed may be grown this year is so restricted and the prospective supply of sugar beets is so small that the operation of the factory cannot be justified. As a consequence of the Secretary's decision, workers, farmers, merchants, and the community generally must suffer, and this at a time when America is in the throes of a vital all-out national-defense program.

Here is an anomalous situation. Because of drastically reduced acreage, a factory in Nebraska must be closed, with resulting unemployment, while at the same time the Government of the United States, through the Export-Import Bank is lending $11,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to finance the production of an additional 400,000 tons of sugar in Cuba, a foreign country. And Minatare is not alone, for the acreage restrictions which are being imposed on the beet-sugar industry this year undoubtedly will force the closing of other factories in western States. This certainly is "hemispheric solidarity" with a vengeance. American workers in Nebraska are to be thrown out of employment and greater employment opportunities are to be created for peon labor in the tropics.

Last year farmers of the United States planted 979,000 acres of sugar beets. This year their plantings, under Secretary Wickard's ruling, must not exceed more than 820,000 acres, a reduction of more than 16 percent. This cut in acreage was ordered, to quote the announcement of the Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture, "because excessive stocks of beet sugar have accumulated following record production in the domestic beet areas during the last 3 years." Yet it is necessary to point out that these stocks accumulated during years in which the acreage planted to beets was under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture. They were not created through overplanting, or because of any violation of the provisions of the Sugar Act. On the contrary, they were accumulated in strict compliance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

When the Secretary of Agriculture announced last December that he intended to reduce sugar-beet plantings to 820,000 acres, the West arose in vigorous protest. Beet-sugar growers and processors, businessmen, chambers of commerce, and Members of the Senate and the House objected that the reduction was unnecessarily harsh, that it would force the closing of factories, cause unemployment, and otherwise dislocate the economy of the beet-producing States. Their arguments went unheeded until a growing shortage of shipping space and rising prices brought some members of the administration to a realization that it would be wise and sound to free sugar-beet acreage and to encourage the largest possible production in 1941. Various agencies of the Government considered this proposal for weeks, but it was finally rejected on April 19, for a reason or reasons not made public, the drastic restrictive limitations were continued, and the beet growers and the beet-growing West were left without relief and precisely where they were 4 months before.

In recent years a great deal has been said about the expansion of the beet-sugar industry in the United States, but in this instance there is no question of expansion. The question is not whether a factory which has been running for 15 years shall be permitted to produce more sugar, but whether it will be permitted to produce at all. The Department of Agriculture has forced the answer to that question, for the factory wheels will be motionless and the skilled factory labor idle. And this in a period of the gravest national stress and emergency. Diversion of fertile acres from the production of an essential foodstuff like sugar to surplus crops like potatoes, corn, and wheat is neither sensible nor wise, and in no sense compatible with an all-out national defense. Skilled and satisfied workers enjoying splendid living conditions under full American living standards are to be summarily thrown out of employment.

That some such situation as the present one would eventually arise was foreseen 2 years ago by my colleague, Nebraska's senior Senator [Mr. NORRIS], when speaking in the United States Senate March 23, 1939, with respect to the quota for the beet-sugar industry, he said:

"Fundamentally, Mr. President, I think it is wrong to have a quota on an agricultural product of which we cannot produce enough to supply home consumption. That is true of all sugar, both cane and beet sugar. We cannot produce enough sugar to satisfy the American people. Why should we have a quota in a case of that kind which prevents the production in America of that agricultural product in order that we may take in the quota of some foreign country? I understand that we have quotas for Ecuador, Brazil, and Cuba, and that we are not permitted to produce sugar in the United States if our production conflicts with the production of sugar from those other countries.

"Mr. President, I cannot see any justice in that theory. Fundamentally, it seems to me it is absolutely wrong to deny to our people the right to produce a product when the consumption of that product is always greater than the amount we can possibly produce. It seems to me that that theory cannot be defended on any fundamental ground of reason or logic."

I agree entirely with the position of my colleague. There can be no sane reason for restricting the production of a nonsurplus commodity at home, particularly at a time when we are encouraging and even financing the production of the same commodity in overseas Latin America. Least of all can there be any justification for restricting and reducing this production in the face of an ever-increasing lack of shipping space to bring sugar to our consumers from foreign overseas producing areas.

The United States has embarked on an all-out national-defense program. Farmers in Nebraska and throughout the land, all our agricultural citizenry, will cooperate if soundly encouraged and if opportunity is given them in this great program. There will be no national unity in an all-out national defense without the wholehearted and full cooperation of the 25 percent of our population who live on our farms. The Sugar Act should be reviewed by Congress without delay. The basic continental sugar quotas should be increased at least to the point that our farmers can produce and our industries can process beet and cane sugar approximating their respective capacities. A fair treatment of agricultural producers requires this. The all-out national defense of America demands it.

And so it is. To have a strong America we must ever recall the spirit of the pioneer. In their fights against the elements of this prairie country no man dreamed of depending upon someone else for his protection. Each man did his part, and together they built this great America. With each of us doing our part patriotically, with loyalty, devotion, and sincerity, we must of a necessity have a strong community like Lexington which followed the early Plum Creek days. With strong communities we will have a strong Nation, doing its part in building the peace of the world.

The Sundown Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Richard Neuberger on the subject The Sundown Patrol.

There being no objection, the article was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUNDOWN PATROL

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

In these dark and troubled times there is very little news that is encouraging. However, in the Pacific Northwest there is a story to tell which should bolster our spirits. It is the story of the development of the Columbia River and how it has panned out.

The development actually began in 1933, but got its original impetus in September of 1932, when Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, campaigning for the Presidency, declared at Portland, Oreg., that "the next great hydroelectric development undertaken by the Federal Government must be that on the Columbia River."

As a result of this, Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams were authorized. Immediately there were howls of protest. Congressmen from metropolitan districts in the

East cried out that countless millions were to be wasted in the wilderness. The Treasury would be raided for worthless monuments. Private utility companies began a campaign of propaganda, a campaign claiming that these dams were utterly useless and unnecessary.

MORE LIGHT FOR LESS MONEY

"Let's look at the record," Al Smith once said. That is pretty good advice here. Bonneville Dam is now completed. Transmission lines fan out from its powerhouse like the rays of the sun. Grand Coulee will be finished as soon as workmen lay the parapet.

Already the huge structure, most massive edifice ever reared by man, is three times the bulk of the Great Pyramid of Egypt. Within a few weeks a generator spinning out 108,000 kilowatts, the biggest piece of machinery in the world, will be in operation at Coulee.

Today, dozens of communities in the Pacific Northwest have reduced light and power rates because of these dams. Some of the communities have enjoyed huge reductions because their municipal plants purchased juice from Bonneville.

In other communities private power companies have reduced rates to forestall the purchase of Bonneville power. And in still others, the people have voted to replace utility corporations with public systems using Bonneville energy.

AIDING NATIONAL DEFENSE

When the colossal dams first were proposed by President Roosevelt, Senator George W. Norris, Senator Charles L. McNary, and other public-power advocates, critics immediately shouted that there would be no one to purchase the hydroelectricity. They said it would go begging; that the big dams would be as valueless as the Egyptian pyramids they were surpassing in size.

These arguments have been refuted a dozen times. New aluminum plants just completed along the Columbia River are producing a third of the Nation's aluminum. These plants use Bonneville and Grand Coulee power, and their output is relieving a serious shortage in the vital airplane industry. Were it not for the aluminum factories on the Columbia—the first such factories, incidentally, west of the Mississippi—American military planes would be greatly retarded in both quality and quantity.

DEVELOPING A "PROMISED LAND"

Grand Coulee will irrigate and reclaim 1,200,000 acres of land. At present this soil is arid and barren. When the immense project first was authorized, a Congressman said there would never be the slightest use for this new agricultural area.

Since that time a dreadful series of droughts has seared the Dust Bowl. Thousands of men and women from Oklahoma, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and Kansas have had to move westward in search of new homes. A few weeks ago Secretary of Agriculture Wickard told a Senate committee that the farms to be irrigated at Grand Coulee were among the few places these wanderers could settle.

Improved water transportation has long been the hope of many Americans—military experts, farmers, and tourists. The military men want routes which cannot be bombed. The farmers want low freight rates. Tourists want picturesque ways of travel. Bonneville Dam has turned the Columbia River into a great navigable artery.

Big barges loaded with oil now reach Attalia, 300 miles from the Pacific, and come back downstream crammed to the gunwales with wheat from the inland empire. This is the only water passage through the vast mountain range which extends along the Pacific seaboard from Alaska to the Panama Canal. Bonneville has the highest lift locks on earth, locks which hoist a boat 66 feet in 15 minutes.

There have been many disappointments in recent years; disappointments at home and abroad. We have watched civilization silently depart from Europe and Asia, and she is now beating a hasty retreat from Africa. Yet one of the great domestic enterprises in our own country, the "T. V. A. of the far West," has proved as successful as its counterpart in the South. For that much we can give and take thanks in these gloomy hours.

Bonneville Power Breaks Bottleneck in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the hurdles of national defense is the production of sufficient hydroelectric power to meet the needs of defense construction. Fortunately, the big hydroelectric plant at Bonneville, in my district, was sufficiently advanced when these war orders began to pile up, to furnish large blocks of electrical energy for these much-needed activities. Chief among the requirements is aluminum. It is the base material for any air program. We have learned that to be successful in modern warfare, airships in mass production are necessary. They may only be produced with an abundant supply of aluminum. Last year the production of this light metal represented about 425,000 kilowatts of equivalent electrical capacity. The best information available is to the effect that the Axis Powers are producing 2½ times this amount of aluminum.

Up to the middle of March the Bonneville Administrator had executed prime power contracts totaling 270,450 kilowatts, of which six industrial consumers are taking or will take 226,500 kilowatts. Recently, the Office of Production Management requested the Bonneville Administrator to make available 80,000 kilowatts of additional capacity for the production of aluminum. This request is in addition to the 165,000 kilowatts of power now under contract to the Aluminum Co. of America. This Bonneville capacity of 245,000 kilowatts will produce approximately 245,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. This represents about 59 percent of the total aluminum produced in the United States during 1940 and approximately 30 percent of the present national-defense demands. Thus Bonneville, together with the power soon to be produced at Grand Coulee, will break the bottleneck in needed hydroelectric power in carrying forward our defense program.

Power for the production of aluminum, however, is not the only major defense activity being prosecuted in Oregon. Since July 1, 1940, contracts and expenditures aggregating approximately $161,000,000 have been made by the Federal Government with Oregon concerns for the manufacture of defense material and equipment in Oregon. Included in these contracts is one for $46,500,000 with the United States Maritime Commission for 31 cargo ships, and an additional contract with the same Commission of $19,800,000 for 12 additional ships. One contract calls for the construction of steel mine layers, with an expenditure of $24,000,000. There is also now under construction at Hermiston, Oreg., an ordnance depot, involving expenditure of $10,200,000. These are in addition to the work now being carried on on the airport bases in Portland and Pendleton and the Tongue Point air base, at Astoria.

Under leave granted, I include the following recent news releases from the Bonneville Power Administration, showing additional contractual commitments by the administration for Bonneville power:

BONNEVILLE POWER BUILDS SHIPS

More federally generated Columbia River power was scheduled to go to work today to speed the country's national-defense program with the execution of a 10-year contract for the sale of between 6,000 and 10,000 kilowatts of Bonneville-Grand Coulee Dam energy to the Oregon Shipbuilding Co., of Portland, Oreg.

The contract, executed by Edgar Kaiser, president of the shipbuilding company, now engaged on Government ship contracts at its new yards on the lower Willamette River, south of Portland, will be signed in the next few days by Power Administrator Paul J. Raver.

Power deliveries to the shipbuilding plant will begin Friday, May 23, with an initial service of 1,000 kilowatts. At the end of 1 month deliveries will be increased to 2,500 kilowatts; at the end of the second month to 5,000 kilowatts, and at the end of the third month to 6,000 kilowatts. The contract provides for power deliveries up to 10,000 kilowatts if that amount is required by the company. Payment will be made on the basis of 75 cents a month per kilowatt of demand plus 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour of actual power usage.

"This agency's ability to serve a vital defense industry at a time of national power shortage is a matter of considerable satisfaction to us," D. L. Marlett, acting Bonneville administrator, commented. "It proves the principle that government and private enterprise can work together, and it is new proof of the soundness of building power facilities in advance of market demand."

The shipbuilding contract was the fifth executed by the power administration with defense industries, which include electrometallurgical and electrochemical operations throughout the Pacific Northwest. Total contract demand by such agencies at present is 252,500 kilowatts.

To date the power administration has executed 42 contracts with all types of distribution agencies and industries. These agreements commit the administration to deliver 308,855 kilowatts of Columbia River power.

BONNEVILLE POWER BRINGS LOW RATES

New low rates for consumer members of the Nehalem Valley Cooperative Electric Association of Clatsop County, Oreg., will be put into effect with the next bills rendered, the Bonneville Power Administration was informed today.

The new rates, recommended by power-administration engineers, will represent reductions in customers' monthly bills ranging from 9 percent for minimum-bill users to 22 percent for average use of 50 kilowatt-hours monthly. They are lower than rural retail rates now in effect in other parts of Clatsop County, excepting those for customers using less than the energy included in the cooperative's minimum bill.

The cooperative has been receiving power from the Columbia River system since February 1941. First rate reductions have awaited

completion of the Rural Electrification Administration's investigation of the cooperative's operations.

The new rate schedules follow:

FARM AND HOME

First 50 kilowatt-hours at 5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 50 kilowatt-hours at 3 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 100 kilowatt-hours at 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 100 kilowatt-hours at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Over 300 kilowatt-hours at ¾ cent per kilowatt-hour.

Minimum bill, $2.50.

COMMERCIAL

First 50 kilowatt-hours at 5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 100 kilowatt-hours at 3.5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 350 kilowatt-hours at 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours at 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 13,500 kilowatt-hours at 0.8 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Over 15,000 kilowatt-hours at 0.6 cent per kilowatt-hour.

For customers with demands larger than 10 kilowatts there is an additional charge of $1.30 per kilowatt of demand in excess of 10.

Minimum bill, $2.50.

The Nehalem Valley Cooperative was one of the first R. E. A. projects organized in the State of Oregon, and was the seventh such agency to buy Columbia River power. It serves about 330 customers in the upper Nehalem River Valley. Headquarters are at Jewell, Oreg. The electricity is bought at wholesale from the Bonneville Power Administration at the Government's optional prime power rate of one-fourth cent per kilowatt-hour of monthly use, plus 75 cents per kilowatt of monthly demand.

Mr. Speaker, it was the purpose of the Congress that the power generated on the Columbia River should be furnished throughout the entire area contiguous to the generating plants at the lowest possible rate consistent with the amortization of the plants, repaying to the Government, with interest, the entire outlay made by the Government in the erection of these projects. Notwithstanding, this program is being strictly adhered to, power is now being furnished throughout this area, as shown by the releases I have set forth, at a rate which is the lowest in power history in the United States, and will ultimately save the users of hydroelectric power many millions of dollars.

Against War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

ADDRESS BY LILLIAN GISH

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Lillian Gish, stage and screen star, delivered before the Executives' Club, of Chicago, Friday, May 9, 1941.

President HAROLD O. MCLAIN. One of the terrible attributes of a war economy is the submergence of accuracy and truth and the elevation of distortion and falsehood under the name of propaganda. Propaganda is now recognized and employed as one of the most powerful and deadly weapons of warfare. Our speaker, now, knows a great deal about propaganda from her firsthand experience with it in the last war.

You all know Miss Lillian Gish. Regardless of the enormous theatrical and moving-picture productions which have blossomed in the last decades, I suppose general opinion would still regard The Birth of a Nation as the most outstanding moving picture of all time and, of course, Miss Lillian Gish was the outstanding personality in that picture.

Most of you have no doubt seen Miss Gish recently in her delightful production in which she is appearing here in Chicago entitled "Life With Father." You know also that Miss Gish has been effective and devoted in her public appearances for the cause to keep America out of this World War. She has taken her stand at some sacrifice, because, as you no doubt appreciate, the theatrical profession is largely dominated by influences which are anxious for the United States to participate in this world struggle. Miss Gish has a deep conviction which she courageously expresses concerning a subject she knows, and we are delighted to have Miss Gish tell us now of her experiences and her views. I am happy to introduce Miss Gish to you. [Applause.]

Miss LILLIAN GISH. Please let me talk to you, not as an actress whom you may know from the films or the theater, but as an American citizen who is deeply concerned about her country.

I belong to no group, nor organization, outside of Actors' and Radio Equity, the International Women's Peace League, and America First. I was baptized and confirmed an Episcopalian by Bishop Leonard of Ohio. Because we were very poor, I began working at the age of 5 and have been earning my living in the theater or on the screen ever since.

In 1936 I voted for Mr. Roosevelt, wrote and delivered my only political speech for him on The Women of 1936 program, which Mrs. Curtis Bok sponsored.

My platform is pro-America and antihate. I didn't vote in the last election, as I felt both candidates were more interested in other countries than in their own. This conviction is shared by many of my countrymen here in the Middle West, where I have been for over a year. Had we had a candidate last November running on an all-American ticket—one who would have settled our own internal problems, who would have armed this country and made it stronger than any other and used that strength to keep us out of war, I believe he would have been elected.

Naturally, all of us would like England to go on ruling the world, as she has since she seized Canada from the French in 1759, but we still believe George Washington was right when he said "The nation which holds toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interests."

This country was founded by a brave people, who were willing to suffer untold hardships to escape from the eternal wars of Europe. Take my own average case. My mother's people were French Huguenots who came here in 1632 and settled in Deerfield, Mass. They intermarried with the Scotch, English, and Irish. By the time my mother was born they had moved as far west as Ohio, and she was christened Mary Robinson McConnell. In 1733 one Mathias Gish left Luxemburg and came to Philadelphia, and bought land in Lancaster County, Pa., where he settled as a farmer.

These people and their descendants helped to build this great land and have fought for its freedom. This background, I am sure, is similar to the background of many of you who feel a deep respect for our country. And now, for the second time in 24 years, we are being propagandized into a war that is no more our business now than it was in 1917.

Everyone over 30 remembers how we were screamingly told then that we were fighting for our liberties and to make the world safe for democracy. It was to be a war to end all wars. Just go ask some of our poor wrecks of men in some of the badly equipped, understaffed, and forgotten veterans' hospitals about that. Or let me tell you how I helped to sell the idea of hate to the American people.

FIRST WORLD WAR FILM PROPAGANDA

When D. W. Griffith was in London early in 1917 with his film Intolerance, he was approached by Lloyd George, Lord Beaverbrook, and the heads of the British and French propaganda departments about making films to interest Americans in fighting for them. They told him that they thought the films were more powerful than the press for spreading propaganda.

Mr. Griffith agreed to undertake the assignment and began assembling his players. Being very young at the time, imagine my surprise to find myself on a boat bound for France, even before the soldiers got there. My mother and I sailed for England on the first camouflaged boat to leave America after war was declared in April of 1917. We sailed with the first contingent of doctors and nurses sent from the Presbyterian Hospital in New York. My sister, Dorothy, sailed a few weeks later with General Pershing on the *Baltic*.

We remained in England and France for 6 months. We were sent up front with the French. As there were only three in my family—my father having died when we were children—mother insisted upon going everywhere with us. She was 36 years old at the time, and suffered such a severe case of shell shock that she is an invalid today as a result of it. But we got 86,000 feet of film, with everyone working for us from the King and Queen of England to the French and British common soldiers, before we sailed for home late in October. From this material we made three pictures. Perhaps some of you may recall them. There was a 12-reel film, called Hearts of the World, which was the story of a little girl living in France, who was about to be married to a French boy when the war broke out and he became a common soldier.

You may recall two of the most effective scenes in this picture. One after the girl sees her home and mother and grandfather blown to bits before her eyes, loses her mind, and goes roaming along the battlefield, hugging all that is left of her wedding veil, when she stumbles upon her fiancé wounded and unconscious, and goes to sleep peacefully at his side. The other scene shows three small French children, left alone with their dead mother, digging her grave and burying her without help.

They were most effective scenes, calculated to stir the emotions of the Americans so that they would be willing to fight and die for the cause. The Great Love was the story of English bravery while under fire from the Zeppelins. The Greatest Thing in Life was the story of an American snob being drafted and finding himself in a shell hole in no-man's land, with a dying American colored soldier in his arms. The colored man, in his delirium, thinks the other man is his mammy, and asks her for a farewell kiss, which our

American snob gives him, thereby learning something of the brotherhood of man. These were good stories, and deeply moving ones.

The only trouble with them, however, that we could find when we ran them 6 or 7 years ago, was that the Huns, as the Germans were then called, and the Beast of Berlin, the favorite title those days for the Kaiser, the man who was destroying civilization and our liberties, were so villainous and dastardly that the audience, looking at the pictures, screamed with laughter. Every time a Hun came near me, he knocked me down, kicked me, or beat me with a cat-o-nine-tails. Now, with propagandized hysteria at its present peak, who knows but what the audience that shrieked with such glee, might not take these films seriously again?

GRIM WAR REALITIES

We were in many air raids in London. I remember the first daylight raid. When the planes came over, flying 18,000 feet high, they looked like little specks in the sky. They hit a school in White Chapel. The bombs, coming from such height, went through the building to the ground floor and kindergarten classes before it exploded, killing 95 children around the ages of 5 and 6. We arrived on the scene to watch the mothers and fathers as they looked for the arms, legs or bits of their children. I couldn't attempt to describe in detail what we saw.

Mr. Griffith gave us orders that when we were not actually engaged in rehearsing or working on the films that we were to spend our time at Waterloo or Victoria stations to watch the farewells of the people or the wounded arriving. He said, "You want to be actresses? There never was a time in the history of the world when you could have a better chance to study human emotions off-guard."

I think it is safe to say we learned more of life in those 6 months than we could have learned in a lifetime of average living. Curiously enough, when we were in France, within easy range of shelling, we didn't suffer from fear as much as we had expected, as there the bombardment was constant, night and day. Usually, you got used to it after a few hours, and unless shelling broke very close, you somehow didn't seem to mind. Then, too, there were dugouts. We were billeted in the deep cellar of an old destroyed house, and living on flagloy, the baby lima bean of France, and we had the constant interest of getting unbelievably real and exciting scenes for our pictures. Perhaps, had we been older, it would have taken a greater toll of our health, as it did of our mother's.

RESPECT FOR THE ENEMY

One thing we noticed above all else in England and France, was what seemed to us a lack of hatred for the enemy. The English papers were full of editorials about the bravery of the Germans. They were burying with military honors the airmen brought down over England, as we were told they were paying equal respect to the British airmen brought down over Germany, because they admired bravery above all else.

We felt that a country with such sportsmanship could never be whipped, as they made every effort never to underestimate the strength of their enemy. I remember when we got back to America late in October 1917, the people asked us in all seriousness if it were true that the Germans cut off the hands and legs of old people and crucified little children. If you remember Sir Phillip Gibbs' book that was published in the early twenties, you will recall his admission that these stories were sent out for propaganda purposes. After 6 months' reading and hearing the healthy respect the English and French felt for their enemy, we were ashamed of the point of view of our own people. But in Europe, war is part of life; the people have always had it, they accept it, and don't get hysterical as we do.

I am not proud of the part I played in spreading hatred. Hate is an unhealthy and impractical thing. It has a way of acting as a boomerang to those doing the hating.

HISTORY IN THE MAKING

Since that time I have lived and worked in Europe for 8 years. I saw history made in Italy. Mussolini marched into Rome, October 22, 1922, with his bloodless revolution, and we arrived in Italy the last of November that same year to make Marion Crawford's The White Sister and George Eliot's Romola.

We watched that country where Florentines hated Romans, Romans hated Florentines, all of them hated Neopolitans, and so on, change from a divided nation of bad roads, where trains scheduled to leave at 2 o'clock were lucky to start at 4, telephone service so slow it was quicker to send notes by hand, gradually unite and become efficient. There was the great Catholic Church, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, there was the Italian royal family. Many mornings we passed the little King of Italy on his way to work as we were on our way to the studio. For 2 years we watched the gradual change in Italy, and when I was last there, some years ago, I found it had become as united and efficient as any other modern country.

I was to watch history being made again. This time in Germany. By 1928 the propagandized hysteria had been forgotten and Americans were flocking to Germany and Austria, some as tourists, some as students. I went there with my mother and her nurse, hoping to find superior medical aid, as she was, and still is, an invalid from the last war. Also to work on a story for the films based on the life of Theresa Newmann (of whom you may have heard), the peasant girl of Konnesreuth, with a stigmata, who suffers through the Crucifixion every Friday that isn't a feast day. Hugo von Hoffman, the Austrian poet, was to write the story, and the great impresario, Max Reinhardt, was to direct it. I had not been in Germany long before I was struck by the sense of sadness in the people. When I asked about it, a Rumanian friend, Dr. Kommer, explained that the people were so heavily taxed for the next 56 years that they felt there was no hope for them, their children, or their unborn children, and all because they had made a peace when not an inch of their soil had been invaded, and had been promised a just peace.

I watched this for 6 months, when I returned to work in America. My mother remained in Germany for a year, then on to England for 6 months. But we both know now that the finest medical aid is to be found here at home.

BEWARE OF FALSE SLOGANS

I returned to the center of Europe nearly every summer for the next 10 years. By 1930, in Germany, I saw shoulders straightening, young men looking hopeful, and heard strange words like "anti-Semetic," which were not in our vocabulary.

In 1932, the change was so apparent to an outsider that I was begging some of my good friends to come to this country, which was freer from racial prejudices. But they laughed at me, and said that it couldn't happen there.

I was in France, and saw that great country grow soft, demanding more and more, while working less and less. I was there during their sit-down strikes.

Many of my French friends told me at that time, that only the Spanish revolution had saved the French from the same fate.

In 1938, I was in Czechoslovakia, where the Czechoslovakians told me not to worry about their little country—it had too many friends to let anything happen there. Now, I see my own country marching to civil war, and there are still people saying it can't happen here.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF WAR

We believed in the last war and we won it but what good did it do anyone? We had 346,000 dead and wounded, an over-all cost of not less than $45,000,000,000, prohibition with its attendant hypocrisy, lawlessness, and gangsters, 10,000 bank failures, and a depression from which we have not yet recovered.

If there were any good that came to us out of the last war, I would like to know what it was—and we won that war. Mr. Wilson had a triumphal tour through Europe as savior (and he certainly was their Santa Claus), but we, the people, paid with blood, and tears, and suffering. The late F. Scott Fitzgerald once wrote that France was a land, England a people, and America a willingness of heart. Everyone knows that an Englishman has only one real love affair, and that is with England.

Of course, if what Maj. Al Williams said a few weeks ago is true, that you cannot get the American people to think, we may, with all this concentrated pressure, be forced into war; but if there is any foresight or justice in Washington, they will put it to a vote and let the people who have to pay for it decide.

If you were to believe what you hear and read, you would wonder if America is concerned at all with the problems a world war would bring to her own country. Why not bring freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want to our own land before we set out to bring it to those of other lands?

It seems to me that the only sane voice coming out of Europe at the moment is Pope Pius XII, who believes that a peace is better for the world today than a peace next week, next month, or next year.

Surely this is a time when every American citizen over 21 years of age must go deep into his conscience and decide for himself if he loves some other country better than he loves America, or hates Germany more than he loves America, or loves the United States most of all. If he loves some other country, my advice would be to go to that country and offer his or her help. If he hates Germany more, I cannot advise him, but if he loves this great land most, let him today, while there is still time, be a citizen worthy of the name and do something to keep us out of ruinous war, even if it is only a penny postal card of protest to his Congressmen and Senators.

Or perhaps he may follow me and join this committee, so appropriately named "America First." [Audience stands and applauds.]

In Defense of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Saturday Evening Post

of May 31, 1941, entitled "In Defense of the People."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of May 31, 1941]

IN DEFENSE OF THE PEOPLE

The seeds of propaganda are like natural seeds. You cannot expect the seed of the touch-me-not to grow and bring forth a thorn tree. Nor was it reasonable to expect that—

"The United States today is at peace and it is going to remain at peace"—
implanted in the American mind October 30, 1940, or—

"Your President says this country is not going to war"—
implanted November 2, 1940, or—

"The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war"—
implanted November 2, 1940, all by the President, would in the spring of 1941 produce a unified passion for war.

The lend-lease law was from a seed secretly planted in the garden of the Government's mind. The people knew nothing about it. Suddenly in the winter it was revealed to them full grown, and they were dazed. Yet even as they looked at it they were told it was not what it appeared to be. They were to trust their Government, not their senses. It was not a law to get the country into war; it was a law to keep it out of war.

While it was on passage through Congress under this false representation, the reporters at every White House press conference asked the President the question the Congress was asking in vain, What would he do with the extraordinary powers about to be conferred upon him? His replies were jaunty, evasive, or sarcastic. They pointed out to him that within the powers of the lend-lease law he could give away American warships. At least it was not prohibited. He replied that neither did the law prohibit the President of the United States from standing on his head in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue; and was there anybody who supposed he was going to do that?

Very soon after the enactment of the law he transferred to Great Britain a fleet of Coast Guard cutters, and after that, such a thing as the transfer of a motor-torpedo-boat fleet was a piece of news that the newspapers could put on an inside page.

When it had its lend-lease law safely in the drawer, the Government was ready to get into the war. The people were not. Each time the Institute of Public Opinion inserted its sampling instrument and drew it out, the temperature reading was low. Government by Gallup poll has its embarrassments.

A trick of the gardener for getting something he did not plant is called grafting. It requires very deft procedure. So did grafting war upon the no-war tree. Let us, therefore, observe it.

On April 8 the New York chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies announced a rally to be held in Madison Square Garden, New York, to "prepare the mind of America for the next step—if it should be made necessary, not by us but by Hitler—the convoying of our goods across the Atlantic." That was saying to send in the flag if necessary.

Knowing that this extraordinary committee had hitherto unerringly forecast "the next step," many people still were unbelieving. They remembered that the Secretary of the Navy, testifying for the lend-lease law before the House Foreign Relations Committee, had said about convoys under escort of American warships, "No, no; in my judgment that would be an act of war"; and especially they remembered that the President himself had said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

On April 15, the Secretary of War, testifying before a special committee of the Senate, said: "Our forces must be prepared for the possibilities of war in many and varied terrains, it being quite uncertain in what part of North or South or Central America, or even possibly other regions, it ultimately may be necessary to use them."

Other regions. That was startling. But after all, this was only the Secretary of War, and people remembered that on October 30 the President had said, "And while I am talking to you, mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

On April 18, at a White House press conference, the President expressed deep anxiety over the fact that the American people were apparently not aware of the country's peril. The reporters added that the President was very guarded in his exchanges with the correspondents on the subject of convoys.

On April 19, by an act of fission, a group of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies resolved itself into a Fight for Freedom Committee, under a manifesto, saying that if Hitler did not sink America's aid to Great Britain, he was beaten; and that if he did, we were beaten. "This means," it said, "accepting the fact that we are at war, whether declared or undeclared." Once we accept the fact that we are at war, it said, "we shall at last find peace within ourselves." Senator CARTER GLASS, who had long before declared himself for war, accepted the chairmanship of this committee, and you would know, therefore, that its utterances would be candid and forthright. And this, we admit, was like an oasis of emotional and intellectual integrity.

On April 20, however, the Gallup poll showed still a low temperature reading—67 percent of the people saying "No" to naval aid to Great Britain, for fear that would mean shooting.

Convoy.

That was still the dangerous question.

On April 25 the New York Times led its front-page summary of the international situation with this paragraph: "Indications that the United States Government is preparing American opinion for the major step of convoying war materials to Great Britain emerged last night in the speeches delivered by Secretaries Hull and Knox."

The Secretary of State said, "Aid must reach its destination in the shortest of time and in maximum quantity. So ways must be found to do this."

That could hardly mean less than convoy and escort and to face the shooting. What else? And yet he did not quite say it.

The Secretary of the Navy, who while the lend-lease law was on passage announced that he was against transferring any more of the Navy to Great Britain and then immediately changed his mind, in his speech that same night said: "We have declared that the fight that England is making is our fight. We have likewise affirmed that the enemies she is fighting are our enemies. * * * we are in the fight to stay. * * * We have irrevocably committed ourselves. * * * Having gone thus far, we can only go on." And he adopted the words of the Fight for Freedom Committee, saying, "Hitler cannot allow our war supplies and food to reach England—he will be defeated if they do. We cannot allow our goods to be sunk in the Atlantic—we shall be beaten if we do."

Before this the Post had said it was too late to talk about staying out of a war we were already in; that we were already so far in that there could be no turning back but with humiliation and defeat. People did not believe it. For saying it we received a great many letters of grieved and indignant protest. Well, here was the Secretary of the Navy saying it for the Government, and that was a shock. If we turned back, we were beaten; therefore we could only go on. And yet he, too, avoided the fatal word—convoy.

The next day, at a White House press conference, the reporters questioned the President on these two speeches, one by his Secretary of State and one by his Secretary of the Navy. The President said he believed they spoke for a majority of the American people. But did they speak for him? To that he replied, "Yes; yes."

Was it then to be inferred, the reporters asked, that the Government had made up its mind to adopt the convoy system under escort of American warships? No. The Government, said the President, was not thinking of convoys. It had thought of another word—patrol. The "American neutrality patrol" would be extended. How far? He was glad somebody had asked that question—how far? It would be extended as far as was necessary, even beyond the Atlantic into the seven seas. On the difference between patrol and convoy, he said United States warships on neutrality patrol would be like the scouts that went ahead of the wagon trains in pioneer days on the plains to watch for savages. He was asked what the scouting warship would do if it sighted the savage on the high sea. He supposed it would relay the information back to the wagon trains.

After the words of the Secretary of the Navy the night before—words endorsed by the President—imagine an American neutrality patrol.

There we leave the record. It is a record of the Government treating the American people as if they were children.

More than that, it reveals a Government not sure of itself and afraid of the people, blaming them for a confusion in which they did not involve themselves, impatient with them for believing so many things that were not so that when the time came they could hardly believe they were in a war their Government was pledged to keep them out of.

Never did the Government tell the people they were in the war until it could say to them it was too late to turn back, or that to turn back would mean national defeat.

In defense of the people, we say, let the blame for disunity lie where it belongs. And yet the people are somewhat to blame. Knowing better, they believed a campaign book.

The Tennessee Valley Authority and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

PRESS RELEASE BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority referring to the national-defense activities of that corporation.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate, and of others who may read this release, to the fact that it is almost beyond the power of imagination, considering all the circumstances, to realize what has been done by the Tennessee Valley Authority in the way of furnishing power for national-defense purposes. For instance, the statement says that in furnishing to the Aluminum Co. of America power to make aluminum they had a contract commencing in 1936 by virtue of which they furnished to the Aluminum Co. 30,000 kilowatts yearly of firm power. However, in order to keep that company going, they have been furnishing 150,000 kilowatts, which is 120,000 kilowatts above the amount called for by the contract. The Authority at the present time has power commitments of about 600,000 kilowatts, but it is averaging an output of 750,000 kilowatts. It is also conveying power from private companies of which eight are mentioned in this statement—from the place of generation to the place where it can be used and is being used now in national-defense operations.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The consumers of electricity in the Southeast can assist in the national-defense program by conserving electrical energy, the Tennessee Valley Authority announced today.

National-defense requirements have placed a tremendous strain on power systems of the Southeast, both public and private, but elimination of all unnecessary or wasteful uses of electricity will help meet the demand.

Drought conditions have caused a serious reduction in power available from the Aluminum Co. of America's generating plants and the T. V. A. is making every effort to provide enough power to make up this deficiency and continue the company's Alcoa plant at full defense production.

The Authority at the present time has power commitments of about 600,000 kilowatts, but it is averaging an output of 750,000 kilowatts. The excess is going almost entirely into the production of aluminum at the Alcoa, Tenn., plant of the Aluminum Co.

The Aluminum Co., a customer of the Authority since 1936, has a contract with T. V. A. for the purchase of 30,000 kilowatts of firm power. During the last 3 months the Authority has provided the company with power at the rate of about 150,000 kilowatts, or 120,000 kilowatts above the amount called for in the contract.

In the last month of this period, the Authority has provided the company with an average of about 175,000 kilowatts, or 145,000 kilowatts in excess of the contracted amount.

The Authority is now engaged in emergency construction to provide more power for the production of aluminum and for other national-defense uses in the Southeast. The projects, Cherokee Dam, on the Holston River, and a 180,000-kilowatt steam plant at Watts Bar, together with installations at downstream dams to use Cherokee storage, will add about 300,000 kilowatts to the T. V. A. system.

The Authority has advanced the construction schedule on the steam plant so that the first two units of the steam plant, aggregating 120,000 kilowatts, will be ready for operation November 1, instead of in February.

Other steps by which the T. V. A. is assisting in bringing power to Alcoa for production of aluminum are:

1. Cutting off of three of the four electric furnaces in the phosphate fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals, freeing approximately 20,000 kilowatts of power.

2. Plans are under way for the construction of a 154,000-volt transmission line from Norris to connect with the Kentucky Utilities Co., at Pineville, Ky., and the Kentucky & West Virginia Power Co., at Hazard, Ky., to bring power from these sources to the defense industries.

3. Carrying out arrangements by which eight privately owned electric utilities will transmit off-peak power to the Authority for transfer to the Aluminum Co. plant. The companies participating are Appalachian Electric Power, Arkansas Power & Light, Kentucky-Tennessee Light & Power, Kentucky Utilities, Carolina Power & Light, Duke Power Co., Georgia Power, and Alabama Power.

Veterans' Legislation—Memorial Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, let me call attention to the fact that we had a World War a few years ago. The World War Veterans' Committee does not have the privilege of presenting bills from the floor as the Invalid Pensions Committee has, and therefore we have been unable to get consideration so far of our bill H. R. 4, to take care of the widows and orphans of veterans of the World War. We also have a bill to increase the pay of the totally disabled men and to take care of the veterans who are now disabled by old age.

I want to serve notice on the House now that I am going to make every effort to get the Rules Committee to give us a rule and that I shall object to any further suspensions of calendar Wednesday until we get this bill before the House.

If I cannot get the bill before the House in one of these ways, or get it up under suspension of the rules, then I shall have to resort to a petition.

MEMORIAL DAY

I appreciate what the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] said about Memorial Day, the day on which we pay tribute to our heroic dead. In that connection let me again remind the House that Memorial Day did not start with the order of General Logan in 1868. It was started by the Daughters of the Confederacy at Columbus, Miss., on April 25, 1866, when in decorating the graves of the Confederate dead they also decorated the graves of the Federal dead. Although the war had been over less than a year and Federal drumbeats echoed throughout the South, it brought from the pen of the Honorable Francis Miles Finch, a distinguished New York jurist, a little poem called The Blue and the Gray that will live as long as the Stars and Stripes continues to float over a free people or as long as the southern heart is stirred by the strains of Dixie.

This poem was first published in the Atlantic Monthly of September 1867, under the following caption and explanation:

THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

The women of Columbus, Miss., animated by nobler sentiments than are many of their sisters, have shown themselves impartial in their offerings made to the memory of the dead. They strewed flowers alike on the graves of the Confederate and of the National soldiers.—New York Tribune.

The example set by these noble women so impressed the American people that it prompted the setting aside of one day in each year for the purpose of strewing flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of the dead and, as I said, inspired Judge Finch to write his immortal poem, The Blue and the Gray, in which he said:

By the flow of the inland river;
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave-grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead.

Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the one, the Blue;
Under the other, the Gray.

These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat,
All with the battle-blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet.

Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the laurel, the Blue,
Under the willow, the Gray.

Concluding, he said:

No more shall the war cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red;
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead.

Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Love and tears for the Blue,
Tears and love for the Gray.

John Fletcher Lacey

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in these days when wealth and natural resources are being destroyed in Europe and even in America, the rules of thrift and foresight seem for the moment almost hopelessly outmoded. I desire to call attention to the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of a distinguished citizen of my own State, Maj. John Fletcher Lacey, known by men and women everywhere as the father of our Federal conservation movement.

Major Lacey was born in New Martinsville, Va., now West Virginia, on May

30, 1841, just a century ago. As a brave soldier and a distinguished citizen, it is a fitting coincidence that the anniversary of his birth should become the day when each year we pay tribute to those illustrious warriors and public servants and those loved ones who have gone before.

John Fletcher Lacey migrated with his parents, John M. and Eleanor Patten Lacey, to Iowa in 1855, when he was a youngster of 14. Like Lincoln, his education was self-acquired. He once said:

When I was a boy in Virginia there was no schoolhouse in my town. A flood had carried it away, but the jail remained and was generally unoccupied; the debtor's prison in the second story was always empty, so the school was resumed in the jail.

It was under handicaps such as these that the youth of early America received the rudiments of learning. But their education was completed in the school of experience. Honesty, frugality, and industry were their schoolmasters.

Young Lacey early answered the call to arms for the preservation of the Union. He rose from private to lieutenant, was then elevated to Assistant Adjutant General United States Volunteers, and then brevetted Major of Volunteers on March 26, 1865, "for faithful and meritorious service during the campaign against Mobile."

Major Lacey was united in marriage with Martha J. Newell, of Oskaloosa, Iowa, September 19, 1865. With the war ended, he entered into the practice of law at Oskaloosa during the same year. He was named city solicitor in 1869 and his record as an attorney was a successful and an honorable one.

Like many public-spirited citizens of his native State, Major Lacey early became interested in politics. He was elected member of the Iowa House of Representatives in 1870 and served as a member of the city council of Oskaloosa in 1880–81. His interest in politics continued and his reputation as a statesman grew. He was elected a Member of the Fifty-first Congress (1889–91) from the Sixth Iowa District and served, too, in the National House of Representatives in the Fifty-third to the Fifty-ninth Congresses, inclusive (1893–1907). He was temporary chairman of the Iowa State Republican convention in 1898.

In addition to his other duties, Major Lacey found time for writing. He was the author of Lacey's Iowa Digest, 1870, and of Lacey's Railway Digest, 1875–84. In 1913 he was appointed a member of the advisory board on migratory birds.

It was during his long and illustrious service in Congress that Major Lacey won himself the title of father of Federal conservation. He was one of the pioneers in the national conservation movement. He worked for it from its inception. The legislation which bears his name was not something just handed to him by a bureau chief or department head for introduction in Congress. He was an authority along conservation lines and a conservationist not only in heart but in mind as well. He formulated bills, investigated, studied, and urged conservation outside Congress as well as within the walls of the National House. His reputation as a sponsor of Federal conservation soon became Nation-wide. His counsel and his assistance were sought by conservationists from every part of the United States. I think it appropriate that I mention some of his important activities specifically. Among the measures which he wrote or handled in the House of Representatives were the following:

1894, bill protecting game in Yellowstone National Park; 1897, first Lacey bill protecting birds; 1899, second Lacey bill protecting birds; 1900, third Lacey bill protecting and regulating importation and interstate shipment of birds, known as the Lacey Act; 1900, bill for buffalo refuge in New Mexico—failed to pass; 1902, appropriation for purchase of buffalo for Yellowstone National Park, act authorizing importation of eggs of game birds for propagation, Alaska game law; 1904, act protecting birds in bird reservations; 1905, act establishing Wichita Game Preserve in Oklahoma—the first national game preserve—approved January 24, 1905; transfer of forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture; 1906, National Monuments Act.

In 1907 Major Lacey led the fight to maintain the Biological Survey, and in 1909 he provided important assistance in amending the Lacey Act.

It may be stated that the Lacey Act which was approved May 25, 1900, is the cornerstone and foundation of the entire structure of Federal conservation. On it have been built the present important and valuable fish and wildlife service of the Nation.

Major Lacey died at Oskaloosa, September 29, 1913. His interest in conservation and in wildlife did not terminate with the ending of his service in Congress. He frequently, in his later years, made the trip to Washington at his own expense in the interest of some legislation needed to carry on the conservation program.

Such in brief were the services of Major Lacey, soldier, lawyer, author, statesman, and father of the American conservation movement. While the years of his early youth were spent in the great Commonwealth of Virginia, it is with pride that I note he grew to manhood in the great Middle West, drew inspiration from and performed his valuable public service as a citizen of my own State of Iowa. His works are not sufficiently known to this generation of Americans. Let us take occasion to commemorate them on this Memorial Day, which marks the one hundredth anniversary of his birth.

In closing I beg to quote one paragraph from an address delivered before the Oskaloosa High School by Major Lacey on May 31, 1912, a little over a year before his death.

I am an optimist. * * * The bright side of a picture is the one most worthy to look upon. I take pleasure in believing that the last of May is the loveliest in the year; * * * that the American Republic is the best country in the world; that Iowa is the fairest and best State in the Union; that Mahaska is the finest one of the 99 counties; that Oskaloosa, though not the largest, is the best city in the State.

The Honorable Walter M. Pierce

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that tomorrow will be the eightieth birthday of one of the most active and one of the most valuable Members of this House, the Honorable WALTER M. PIERCE, of Oregon.

Governor PIERCE has rendered a most signal service throughout his long and useful career, and, as I have often said, he has done more for the people of the State of Oregon than any other man I have ever known in public life.

The Clerk of the House says it is an all-time record for a man to be elected to Congress after reaching his seventieth birthday, to serve here for five terms, being reelected four times. Maj. Charles M. Stedman, of North Carolina, was the only other man to be sworn in after reaching the age of 70, but he was elected at 69. He served in the House 19 years. Never before has a Democrat represented the Second Oregon District in this Congress. Our colleague is a real Democrat of the old school. He was Democratic national committeeman from Oregon during his early years in Congress.

Side by side, my colleague, WALTER M. PIERCE, and I have fought for public power, for public ownership and distribution of electricity. I have found him, as we have all found him, a good fighter, vigorous, active, tolerant, friendly, and kindly. He is a good forgetter, too, and when the battle is over he bears no ill will. His genius for friendship has made him warm friends in this House. Watching the Governor read without glasses and rushing around to get bills through, we feel inclined to say, "80 years young."

I said we had fought side by side for public power, and I take satisfaction in the fact that I have been with him in his big fight in Congress for support of the Bonneville project and the preservation for the public of the great electric power stream which flows from it. The Representative has made a series of speeches on public power which have stimulated interest in public ownership throughout the Pacific Northwest and, in fact, throughout the entire Nation. In those speeches he has presented a remarkable sequence of arguments for public ownership and distribution of electric power. They are a source of statistical and factual information which will long be of value. His background and experience have made him a strong member of the public power group in Congress.

He entered the light and power business as a sideline, building and operating a system which was later bought by the Power Trust. He learned the game.

Many years ago he became a public-power advocate and a foe of monopoly, especially as related to essential public utilities, forests, and other natural resources. Twenty-five years ago our colleague organized a people's power league designed to further the use of the Columbia for power and transportation. He has pioneered in this movement which will mean so much to the future.

Our colleague serves on the important Committee on Agriculture, where he has usually been the only member from the far West and from a great wheat-growing section. His speeches on agriculture form a real contribution to the subject which so vitally interests him now from the legislative aspect, and has so long interested him because of his associations with farming and farm organizations. Although he was graduated in law from Northwestern University and practiced law 10 years, his life has been devoted chiefly to farming, as a livestock and wheat grower. He loves cattle and wheat fields and farm life and farm people.

Oregon has magnificent forests—the finest left on our continent. The preservation of these forests is one of the major interests of the Congressman. He has served for the past few years on the Joint Forestry Committee, and, as an outgrowth of the hearings and the work of that committee, he has prepared a series of bills setting forth fundamentals of forest conservation through Federal and State cooperation.

The Governor's political career began in his early youth when he was elected to county offices. He was twice sent to the State Senate in Oregon, serving in that body 8 years, and was Governor for 4 years. He led a strong and winning fight for the income tax in Oregon, for market-road legislation, and for educational measures of vital importance to the State school system.

Always a liberal, he was closely identified with the popular government movement in Oregon which resulted in the initiative and referendum, direct primary, and the popular election of Senators. Oregon, "the political experiment station," was the first State to put into operation direct election of Senators, paving the way for amendment to the Federal Constitution.

No mention of Congressman PIERCE would be complete without recording his lifelong interest in education. He was a teacher in Kansas and in Illinois and arrived in Oregon a boy of 22 with a trunk full of good books. He continued teaching and was county school superintendent two terms. He was a stimulating teacher, long remembered and loved by students. He fathered much educational legislation and is especially proud of the Oregon Soldier's Education Act. Enacted from his bill after the World War, this law provided for State payments on college expenses for returned soldiers. For nearly a quarter of a century Mr. PIERCE was a member of the board of regents of Oregon State College.

Our colleague delights in his private library. He has a fine background of history and economics; he is bookish and intellectually eager. He likes to apply the knowledge gained from wide reading, and this is apparent in the series of his speeches recorded in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His friendliness often takes him over to the Republican side for visits, so on his eightieth birthday the good wishes of both sides of this House are generously meted out to him.

Someone said:

'Tis the sunset of life gives me mystical lore,
And coming events cast their shadows before.

In the long years that are stretched out before him I trust there will be just enough clouds to make a glorious sunset and that the shadowy figure of WALTER M. PIERCE will stretch across the State of Oregon to transmit his memory to generations yet to come.

May he be abundantly blessed with those things which Shakespeare says should accompany old age, as honor, love, obedience, troops of friends.

Anniversary of Birth of General Grant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS, OF TEXAS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the ninety-eighth anniversary of the birth of General Grant, I made some remarks in this Chamber, a sort of tribute of a southern man to General Grant whose military achievement had won for him the respect of the soldiers of the South and whose magnanimity had won for him the affection of the southern people.

Last week there died near my old home in Tennessee Mr. John Henry Gunter, the last Confederate soldier in that section of the State. He and my father were boyhood friends. They enlisted at the same time as privates in the Thirty-second Tennessee Regiment. They were each wounded in the Battle of Missionary Ridge. My father, who was promoted to the captaincy of their company, told me that John Henry was a brave soldier and a fine man. I know that he was a great citizen, a great man.

Mr. Speaker permission having been given, I tender to be reprinted, the address referred to, and with great respect and deep affection dedicate the address in which reference is made to the Confederate soldier to this grand old man, who lived honorably and usefully his nearly 98 years on the farm where he was born, respected and loved by all the people who knew him.

The request made is also not without the hope that it may be helpful at home and that possibly somewhere, sometime, in this war-torn world this example of Grant and the universal tribute to his magnanimity and decency may tend to shame the bloody deeds of brutal men.

The address follows:

SPEECH OF HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS, OF TEXAS, APRIL 27, 1920

NINETY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GENERAL GRANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 30 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 98 years ago today Ulysses S. Grant, commander in chief of the Union Army during the decisive battles of the Civil War and eighteenth President of the United States, was born.

My colleagues may be curious as to what impulse should have prompted me, a southern man, true to the traditions of his people, the son of a Confederate soldier, proud of his father's service and sacrifice, to offer now words of commendation for the service and in commemoration of this leader of the military forces arrayed against my own people, this chieftain who forced the surrender of the immortal Lee at Appomattox.

A few months ago by the merest accident I came across the records of General Grant's testimony before the Judiciary Committee of the House in 1867. This testimony gave to me a new insight into General Grant's attitude toward the southern people and a clearer understanding of the peril in which he placed himself in order to protect them at a time when he alone could do it and of the service which he rendered the Nation by that protection.

I realize fully that I am on dangerous ground today, but I would despise myself utterly if danger of being misunderstood should cause me, in silence, to permit this day to pass while every sentiment of gratitude and of justice bids me speak, especially as there is no legislative program today. [Applause.]

I speak because I am a southern man; because I love my people of the South and am grateful to those who served them in the hour of their distress. In the darkest hour which ever hung its shadows over the Southland, General Grant was the friend of my people and the servant of the highest interest of my Nation. [Applause.] I speak because I love my Nation and its unity, my Nation and its people everywhere. I speak the gratitude of a southern man, and in behalf of my Nation I speak the profound appreciation of one who believes himself to be a patriot, through whose patriotism there runs no line of sectional cleavage. I honor the memory of Grant not only for the magnanimity shown Lee and his army at Appomattox, but for the fact when Lincoln had fallen General Grant was the only man in the Nation with the power to defend who had also the purpose and the courage to defend those who had been the military leaders of the South; those whom the South, bleeding and exhausted, could no longer defend. General Grant stood between them in that terrible crisis and that breed of human jackals not peculiar to the North, not peculiar to any time or to any people, which always follow in the footsteps of brave men in conflict. They were demanding that Lee and Johnston and others of Confederate service and fame be delivered up for humiliation and punishment. There would have been no danger if Lincoln had lived. When Richmond was captured, Lincoln's attitude was epitomized in a story which he told, the point of which was expressed in the words, "Let 'em up light." Lincoln understood, but Lincoln was gone.

The South was helpless. There were many noble, generous men of position and influence in the North, but there was but one man left in all the broad confines of the Nation

who both willed to protect and who had the power to protect my people and preserve for my Nation that thing of inestimable value, the possibility of that to which we have attained today—a Union; not of States held together by words and force merely, but a Union of people, of people so united in purpose, in interest, in love for each other, and in loyalty to a common flag that no discord can penetrate their solidarity even to test the strength of the Federal compact. [Applause.] This might have come in some other age, but Grant made that possibility for this generation.

He made it possible for us to do that which the framers of the Constitution, if they could have taken all the words of all the languages of all the ages and from them extracted all the elements of their strength and fashioned them into a declaration of perpetual, indissoluble unity, could not have done. He made it possible for us to put the cement into the sand, to supply that which among a free people must constitute the real cohesive element in government.

We southern people recognize Grant as a great general, but it was not in military conflict that he was greatest. General Grant was a great military leader at Appomattox, but he was greater when the battle was over. [Applause.]

This is the picture: Sheridan was in front of Lee's decimated, hungry, exhausted army. Meade was on his rear and right flank, and Ord on the south. Grant knew that the end had come. On April 7, 1865, he opened negotiations with Lee with this remarkable communication. I quote:

"GENERAL: The result of the last week must convince you of the hopelessness of further resistance on the part of the Army of Northern Virginia in this struggle. I feel that it is so, and regard it as my duty to shift from myself the responsibility of any further effusion of blood by asking of you the surrender of that portion of the Confederate States army known as the army of northern Virginia."

Lee replied with the request for "the terms you will offer on condition of its surrender," on the same date. On April 8 Grant replied:

"I would say that, peace being my great desire, there is but one condition I would insist upon, namely, that the men and officers surrendered shall be disqualified for taking up arms against the Government of the United States until properly exchanged. I will meet you, or will designate officers to meet any officers you may name for the same purpose, at any point agreeable to you, for the purpose of arranging definitely the terms upon which the surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia will be received."

In reply Lee declined to meet General Grant solely "with a view to surrender the army of northern Virginia."

On April 9 General Grant replied that he had no authority to treat on the subject of peace.

At sunrise on the 9th, Gordon had found himself unable to open up the way for the retreating army, and General Lee dispatched the following note to General Grant:

"GENERAL: I received your note this morning on the picket line, whither I had come to meet you and ascertain definitely what terms were embraced in your proposition of yesterday with reference to the surrender of this army. I now request an interview in accordance with the offer contained in your letter of yesterday for that purpose."

The desired interview was given by General Grant. The two commanders met in the village of Appomattox Courthouse.

It is probable that no scene like that was ever before witnessed. In order to appreciate how remarkable it was we must bear in mind that not only was the army of General Lee about to be surrendered, together with its general, one of the greatest military geniuses of all times, but the South had reached the end of its resources. Grant was the absolute master of the situation. His hands were free, his will was supreme. He could have driven the dagger of humiliation into the heart of his defenseless foe, but instead he voluntarily stipulated, I quote:

"The officers to give their individual paroles not to take up arms against the United States until properly exchanged and each company or regimental commander to give a like parole for the men of his command. The officers to retain their sidearms, private horses, and baggage. This done, each officer and man will be allowed to return to his home (note this language), not to be disturbed by United States authority so long as they observe their parole and the laws in force where they may reside."

These terms were made with Lincoln's approval. In addition to these terms Grant instructed his commissioners designated to receive the surrender of Lee's army to permit the private soldiers to take away the horses to reestablish themselves on their farms and directed that the hungry men being paroled should receive the rations which Lee requested for them.

During the whole of the negotiations those who were present tell us, and so does General Grant himself, that Lee was compelled more than once to direct the attention of General Grant to the business which had called them together. On that occasion this rugged man of many battles demonstrated a tender deference and a profound respect and sympathy for General Lee, which appeals to the gratitude and to the affectionate regard for Grant of every true southern man [applause]; and not only do I feel that gratitude as a southern man, but as a citizen of this Republic who has never felt estranged from it, I realize that General Grant's conduct on that occasion, and especially during the 2 fateful years which followed, more than anything else has made it possible for the hearts of the southern people to thrill, as now they do, with real vital love for the selfsame flag which waved in final victory that day over Appomattox bloody field. The facts permit not a shadow of doubt. [Applause.]

That day, when the battle was ended, and the stars and bars, the proud emblem of the Confederacy, was furled forever above the broken fragments of the lost cause—that was the day and the occasion which challenged Grant in magnitude of possibility of service, not merely to the distressed, helpless people of the South, but to our common country, as no given battle had challenged him. He arose to the full limit of the possibilities of that day, and in so doing reached a height sublime among the servants of his country which no man since his day has had the opportunity to measure up to. [Applause.]

I am not unmindful of the fact that no true soldier unnecessarily could have humiliated Lee at Appomattox or failed in consideration for the brave men who surrendered with him there. Lee challenged, his character and military genius compelled, respect and sympathy from every brave man, and no man unafraid to die for what he believed to be right could have failed in honor to the hungry, naked, brave-hearted men who were with Lee at the last. But Grant's treatment of Lee and his men at Appomattox was more than that. Only the bravest of the brave, inspired by true nobility of soul, could have done all that Grant did that day. I know of no parallel in the military history of the world. [Applause.]

But Grant's service to my people, and his defense of them did not end there; time will not permit the tracing of this heroic figure through the maze of the 2 terrible years—terrible for my people and dangerous for the Nation—when Grant, practically alone, with his prestige and power and at the peril of their loss, defended the men who had surrendered to him. [Applause.]

But I cannot close without giving you another glimpse of Grant. A scene which properly to portray would challenge the greatest genius of a Shakespeare. This is the setting:

The conflict between Congress and President Johnson had reached a crisis. Hot burned the flame of public passion. The Judiciary Committee of the House, laying the predicate for the President's impeachment, called General Grant as a witness. He faced a committee of northern men. To the North were the victors; to the South the vanquished. All that Grant had ever received had come from the North. From the northern viewpoint the South had been in rebellion and its people traitors.

President Johnson from many sources had been criticized for not having brought the southern leaders to trial and to punishment. That had become a definite subissue in the general controversy. I shall ask to be printed in connection with these remarks excerpts from General Grant's testimony on that occasion, and as you read, if you will, having in mind the temper of those times and General Grant's peculiar circumstances, you will see him before that committee, and as he was during those times, standing out in colossal proportions, as heroic a figure as the history of any age has produced, and you will all see clearly how great a debt the South owes, and now, since the smoke of conflict has rolled away, and we can see the truth, you will see how great a debt a reunited people owe to this man whose natal day we celebrate.

[Excerpts from General Grant's testimony before the House Judiciary, July 18, 1867]

"Q. * * *.

"A. * * * I frequently had to intercede for General Lee and other paroled officers, on the ground that their parole, so long as they obeyed the laws of the United States, protected them from arrest and trial. The President at that time occupied exactly the reverse grounds, viz, that they should be tried and punished. He wanted to know when the time would come that they should be punished. I told him not so long as they obeyed the laws and complied with the stipulation. That was the ground I took.

"Q. Did you not also insist that that applied as well to the common soldiers?

"A. Of course, it applied to everyone who took the parole. * * *

"Q. You looked on that in the nature of a parole and held that they could only be tried when they violated that parole?

"A. Yes; that was the view I took of the question.

"Q. That is your view still?

"A. Yes, sir; unquestionably.

"Q. Did you understand that to apply to General Lee?

"A. Certainly.

"Q. That was your understanding of the arrangement which you made with General Lee?

"A. That was my understanding of an arrangement which I gave voluntarily. * * *

"Q. You considered that the like terms were given by General Sherman to the armies which surrendered to him?

"A. Yes, sir; to all the armies that surrendered after that.

"Q. And you held that so long as they kept their parole of honor and obeyed the laws they were not subject to be tried by courts?

"A. That was my opinion. I will state here that I am not quite certain whether I am being tried or who is being tried by the questions asked.

"Q. Did the President insist that General Lee should be tried for treason?

"A. He contended for it.

"Q. And you claimed to him that the parole which General Lee had given would be violated in such trial?

"A. I did. I insisted on it that General Lee would not have surrendered his army and given up all their arms if he had supposed that after surrender he was going to be tried for treason and hanged. * * *

"Q. Did the President argue that question with you?

"A. There was not much argument about it; it was merely assertion.

"Q. After you had expressed your opinion upon it, did he coincide with you?

"A. No, sir; not then. He afterward got to agreeing with me on that subject. * * *

* * * * * *

"A. The conversations were frequent after the inauguration of Mr. Johnson. I cannot give the time. He seemed to be anxious to get at the leaders to punish them. He would say that the leaders of the rebellion must be punished, and that treason must be made odious. He cared nothing for the men in the ranks—the common men. He would let them go, for they were led into it by the leaders.

"Q. Did you not give your opinion at all that amnesty ought to be granted to those people to any extent?

"A. I know that I was in favor of some proclamation of the sort, and perhaps I may have said so. It was necessary to do something to establish governments and civil law there. I wanted to see that done, but I do not think I ever pretended to dictate what ought to be done.

"Q. Did you not advise?

"A. I do not think I ever did. I have given my opinions, perhaps, as to what has been done, but I do not think I advised any course myself any more than that I was very anxious to see something done to restore civil government in those States.

"Q. Did you recommend certain generals of the Confederate Army to the President for pardon who fell within the exemptions?

"A. Yes, sir; I recommended General Longstreet, I think, a year and a half ago; and, although I cannot recollect the names of anybody else, I think I recommended several others.

"Q. Do you recollect recommending J. G. French, a graduate of West Point?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. What part did he take in the rebellion?

"A. He was a brigadier general.

"Q. Was he a graduate of West Point?

"A. He was; and a classmate of mine.

"Q. Do you recollect recommending the pardon of George H. Stuart?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. What part did he take in the Confederate service?

"A. He was a general, and commanded a brigade or division. He took no very conspicuous part.

"Q. Was he a graduate of West Point?

"A. I think so.

"Q. He was not a classmate of yours?

"A. No, sir; he came along after me.

"Q. Do you recollect P. D. Roddy, said to be a rebel brigadier general?

"A. Yes, sir; I do not recollect what my endorsement was in Roddy's case, but I know that if I had it to do over again I would recommend his pardon very quickly, and I presume I did so. If he is not pardoned yet, I would be very glad to sign a recommendation for him now.

"Q. Did you ever advise the pardon of General Lee?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Were you ever consulted on that question by the President?

"A. I do not recollect having had any conversation with him on the subject. I think it probable that I recommended verbally the pardon of General Johnston immediately after the surrender of his army, on account of the address he delivered to his army. I thought it in such good tone and spirit that we should distinguish between him and others who did not appear so well. I recollect speaking of that and saying that I should be glad if General Johnston received his pardon on account of the manly manner in which he addressed his troops.

"Q. By the CHAIRMAN: You supposed his pardon would have a good effect?

"A. Yes; I thought it would have a good effect. I am not sure whether I spoke on the subject to the Secretary of War or to the President.

"Q. By Mr. WOODBRIDGE. What did you mean by saying that the President's views afterward changed?

"A. I meant to say that while I was contending for the rights which those rebel paroled soldiers had, he was insisting on it that they should be punished. My remark was confined to that particular subject.

"Q. By Mr. THOMAS. You have stated your opinion as to the rights and privileges of General Lee and his soldiers; did you mean that to include any political rights?

"A. I have explained that I did not.

"Q. Was there any difference of opinion on that point between yourself and President Johnson at any time?

"A. On that point there was no difference of opinion; but there was as to whether the parole gave him any privileges or rights.

"Q. By Mr. ELDRIDGE. He claiming that it did not and you claiming that it did?

"A. He claiming that the time must come when they could be tried and punished, and I claiming that the time could not come except by a violation of their parole. I claimed that I gave them no political privileges, but that I had a right, as military commander, to arrange terms of surrender which should protect the lives of those prisoners. I believe it is conceded by everybody that I had that right. I know that Mr. Lincoln conceded it at that time."

I also include a most interesting letter.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 29, 1920.*

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with great emotion your speech in the House of Representatives on the anniversary of the birth of General Grant. You eloquently uttered the feelings and sentiments of all old Confederate soldiers in regard to General Grant. I have the honor of being one of them, having been a member of Company B, Second Maryland Infantry, McComb's Brigade, Gen. Harry Heath's Division, of A. P. Hill's Corps.

The Federals broke through Wilcox's Division of the same corps at Hatchers Run on the 2d day of April 1865, and that morning we started on our retreat toward Appomattox Court House. We had marched 7 days on the retreat, with a pint of raw corn issued to us for rations every day until the morning of the 9th of April, when, upon emerging from a skirt of woods upon an open field at the top of a gentle hill with a slight valley below us, we beheld the Federal line of battle drawn up upon the opposite hill with skirmishers advanced and our own skirmishers facing them, about 250 or 300 yards apart. We felt sure we were about to charge them when, to our amazement, we were given orders to stack arms. One of our men exclaimed, "We are going to surrender." Capt. John W. Torsch, who was commanding our regiment, all our field officers having been killed or wounded, promptly ordered him under arrest; but in a very little while the reality became known and within half an hour Confederate and Federal soldiers were all intermingled.

Not an insulting word was uttered upon either side, and in little groups they began discussing the different battles they had been in against each other, and the Federal soldiers freely admitted that we had given them hell in the most of them.

General Grant ordered beeves from his own Army to be driven into our camp, and when they were butchered we cut slices of meat off the carcasses, stuck them on the ends of our ramrods, thrust them in the fire, and ate the meat without any bread. The commissary wagons had not been able to keep up on the rapid march.

In a little while we saw a squad of horsemen coming from the Federal lines and saw that it was a general and his staff. It proved to be General Lee coming from General Grant's headquarters. He was in full-dress uniform, boots and spurs beautifully shined, and as erect on old Traveler as is his statue in Statuary Hall. A day or two afterward we heard that General Grant apologized to General Lee for being in fatigue uniform, saying his headquarters wagon had not been able to keep up. When the men recognized General Lee, both Confederates and Federals lined the sides of the road as he passed along with his hat lifted above his head, the Federal soldiers cheering him as lustily as the Confederates.

Now, Mr. SUMNERS, begging you to excuse me for having troubled you with this little narrative of a great event in history, which I have hastily jotted down from memory, "et quorum pars parva fui," I wish to express to you my thanks and appreciation for your eloquent speech on General Grant's anniversary and subscribe myself.

Very truly yours,

A. W. NEALE.

[Applause.]

In properly estimating General Grant's service, not to the sections—North and South—but to a Nation reunited and conscious of the value of its national solidarity, it is necessary to bear in mind that the southern people at the time they seceded from the Union and at the time of the surrender believed they had a constitutional right to secede. They were conscious that in responding to the call of their respective States they had responded to the impulse of patriotism and not of treason. They believed their invaders and not themselves guilty of wrong.

Regardless of opinions on the point, it matters not such a people so believing, if ever to become dependable, helpful allies of those against whom such belief is held, must have something around which to build their allegiance. Suppression cannot make a people dependable; coercion is ineffective in that regard. Love alone can do it, and love is not a thing which can be put on and taken off at will, like a coat. It must be inspired by the object toward which it is directed. Patriotism is not of the head; it is of the heart. [Applause.]

When the poor, hungry Confederate soldiers rode in home where death and desolation reigned they were on old horses and mules, some of them were, which General Grant had allowed them to take. They told the people that General Grant had permitted them to have these animals. That fact, at that time, balanced with mighty weight against the load of bitterness and hatred with which the heart of the country was laden. We cannot estimate the possibility of that for the future good understanding between the sections. And when they learned in the South that General Grant seemed sad and depressed, as Grant himself states when he was receiving Lee's surrender, and the soldiers told the people at home that Grant stopped the firing of the cannon in celebration of Lee's surrender, and then when Grant with his mighty influence and unconquerable purpose defended their leaders against the violation of the terms of their parole there was put into the bitterness of the souls of the southern people, which they felt against the North at an hour when it would be most effective, this antidote of magnanimity from General Grant, the military chieftain of the North. [Applause.]

I am glad, and so are the southern people glad, that the institution of slavery is gone. The price for its riddance was terrible; that it had to be paid is a reflection upon the leadership of that time, but that price, if nothing else would have sufficed, was not too great to rid ourselves of that thing which was destroying the superstructure and the very foundation of our civilization. [Applause.]

I will not apologize for the Confederate service of my father nor the act of secession on the part of the Southern States. Neither will the southern people apologize, nor need they apologize, but I am glad beyond words to express, and the southern people are glad, that the Union is not divided. [Applause.]

Wonderful history of a wonderful people. Here I, the son of a Confederate soldier, stand in my place in the Federal Congress. About me there are my colleagues from the South, practically all of whom, except the grand old man of North Carolina, Major Stedman, who himself wore the gray, are sons of Confederate soldiers, and now, in very truth and in fact, without reservation or qualification, we hold all we have, every drop of our blood, dedicated to that flag, glorious emblem of a united people. We, my brethren, North and South, by this achievement write a new chapter in the history of the world. [Applause.]

During the great war just ended, insofar as I know, no suspicion of disloyalty in a single instance attached itself to a Confederate soldier or to the son or daughter of a Confederate soldier. I am proud of that fact, and I challenge the history of the world for its parallel. How much Grant helped only a southern man can appreciate.

I saw these old men, with the fire of patriotism shining through their age-dimmed eyes, bring their sons and their grandsons to the flag of this Nation and sending them forth to die in its defense. I claim for my people no superior merit. My father taught me profound respect for the brave soldiers who came down from the North. My own association has taught me the worth and the sense of justice of northern people.

Ours is not to forget but to understand, not to forgive but to measure by the correct standards. One of the most remarkable spectacles in human history—one of the most difficult for an outsider to understand—is that of these old soldiers of the South, kindling the enthusiasm, and leading the procession of the sons of the South, marching to the defense of the same flag which Grant had carried at Appomattox. I would not detract from their glory. I am proud of them beyond words to express. [Applause.] The Nation ought to be proud of them. But I know how much Grant helped; I wonder if the North realizes what difficulties lay about the Confederate soldiers, unheeded, and what appeals to prejudice, involved in their experiences, fell on unresponsive ears, in that hour when the Nation called. Will you not go back through the intervening years to that day when the politicians of the two sections had wrought their work of disunion and view the situation from the viewpoint of the southern soldier? Then you can realize what Grant did. The southern soldiers faced then the choice and only the choice of fighting with their States to repel invasion or of joining the invaders of their homes. They had not originated the idea of secession. It was declared in this Chamber first in 1811 by Mr. Quincy, of Massachusetts. These statements are not made either in criticism or apology. They are just facts—facts which constitute the historical background and make understandable the psychology of the South and the importance of what Grant did. The first representative assembly to declare the right of a State to judge of the Constitution and to act upon its independent, sovereign judgment was the Hartford convention, held in 1814.

Mr. Winthrop, of Massachusetts, whom the people of that State sent to the seat of the great Webster, redeclared this right just 16 years before the Southern States seceded.

In 1843 it was declared by a group of northern statesmen. I quote:

"We hesitate not to say that annexation (of Texas) effected by any act or proceedings of the Federal Government or any of its departments would be identical with dissolution. * * * Not only inevitably result in dissolution of the Union but fully to justify it, and we not only assert that the people of the free States ought not to submit to this but we say with confidence they would not submit to it."

The States represented by these gentlemen did not secede, probably because it was beginning to become evident then that the section of which they were a part was coming into control of the Federal Government. But they did declare the identical doctrine of the southern secessionists, for the putting into execution of which Southern States 17 years later were invaded and ravaged by the States which these gentlemen represented at the time they signed this declaration. This address was signed by John Quincy Adams, ex-President of the United States; Seth M. Gates, of New York; William Slade, of Vermont; William Calhoun, of Massachusetts; Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio; Sherlock J. Andrews, of Ohio; Nathaniel B. Borden, of Massachusetts; Thomas C. Chittenden, of New York; John Mattocks, of Vermont; Christopher Morgan, of New York; Joshua M. Howard—probably J. M. Howard—of Michigan; Victory Birdseye, of New York; Hiland Hall, of Vermont, all Members of the National Congress at the time they signed the address. This was the historical background.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired

Mr. HUDGSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be given 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his colleague may have an additional 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Confederate soldiers were conscious of the fact that they sought no conquest nor the exercise of coercion. They sought only to withdraw from the Northern States, between which and themselves there had developed unending bitterness and controversy, only the right of self-determination and self-government. They sought only to exercise a right which northern men had often declared to exist, and for which declaration no northern statesman had ever been repudiated by his constituency. I mean no offense. These things may be observed not only from the southern but from the general viewpoint.

Down upon the South came the host of the North with the sword in one hand and the torch in the other, for such are the instruments of war. The flag of this host was the flag of the Nation, the selfsame flag to which in the late war these old soldiers made the supreme contribution. When they made it there were upon their bodies the scars inflicted in the name of that flag. In its name as fair a land as ever the sun shone on, their own, their native land, had been made desolate.

When the fortunes of war had written its decree against them, that flag waved over their country the emblem of conquest and suppression. Beneath that flag the carpetbagger, the agent and representative of the National Government, pillaged this people in safe protection. No commission of restoration had ever borne to them the spirit of helpful human sympathy to build again in the ravaged theater of war.

The hand of the Federal Government when extended in their direction held no bounty, it was the hand of the tax gatherer, by the authority and power of that flag enforcing contributions from their poverty for those who had brought to them a visitation of death and a judgment of subjugation.

In a sense they had been ostracized, and for years after the Civil War traitor and treason had been the characterization which many of those who presumed to speak the Nation's voice uttered with reference to them; and yet, when the Nation called, I saw these old soldiers fight their way through these barriers, bringing with them all they had, their money and their young men, bone of their bone and blood of their blood, to lay upon the altar of the National Government. I want to emphasize that I claim for them no merit which I am not willing to concede to the Union soldier; and in that statement, which I make without reservation, I pay to the Union soldier the highest compliment which lies within the possibility of my command of words. The very qualities which made it possible for them to do this would have made it impossible if Grant, instead of doing as he did at Appomattox, had reversed his conduct, and if he had failed in his protection of Lee in that tragic hour in the Nation's life when passion sat in the seat of justice and Lee, the idol of the South, had been judicially murdered.

I do not want to speak extravagantly of General Grant on this occasion. It would be absurd to claim for him the major part of the credit for the attitude which the South sustains toward the National Government. The southern people and the northern people have wrought the situation; but I do not exaggerate when I declare that General Grant preserved for us the possibility of doing that in this generation. Nobody will charge me with being sectional or intensely partisan, but as I search my own heart I declare it to be my deliberate judgment that if, in addition to what had been done to the South in the name of the National Government, Grant had not in its name done as he did at the time of the surrender and the things had been done which Grant prevented, the great-grandsons of the Confederate soldiers would have been in the Nation, but not of it. That is my deliberate judgment.

I am grateful to General Grant not only for what he did for my people of the South, but I am grateful to him for preserving for me and my people the possibility of feeling toward our Nation as we feel today. That was his great service. He preserved that possibility. I want my people of the South to see him, and I want the Nation to see him in the great crisis, sublimely magnificent in his humanity, in his understanding, in his sense of justice, and in his dauntless courage.

And may I not be pardoned if I confess gratification that incidentally we are brought to where a close-up view of the old soldiers of the South may be had, where, from their viewpoint, the vision may run back through the years of conflict and reconstruction, and we may see them when the Nation called breaking through the entanglements of wrongs inflicted, and wrongs imagined, of conflicting sentiments and dark uncertainty, into the clear light of a newborn national patriotism, bringing in their hands the resources of the South and about them the fighting men of the South. [Applause.]

Some day some man on that side of the aisle who comes from the Northland, with the spirit of Lincoln and the courage of Grant, will stand in his place here and will tell the world of the obscured facts of history which place the soldiers of the Southern Confederacy, as such, high among the world's patriots and heroes. We of both sections have too long hidden the clarifying and prejudice-eradicating facts behind the

curtain of sectionalism. One people we were, one people we are and ever shall be, led at one time by circumstances into a great tragedy and placed in that conflict by the accident of environment upon the sides which we respectively occupied. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. How different might have been the story, gentlemen, if General Grant at Appomatox, instead of applying the balm of sympathy, a sort of first-aid to the terrible wounds of mind and soul, more terrible in some respects than their wounds of body, had driven the dagger of humiliation into the souls of those men who felt then that they had sought to act within their rights and had been invaded and pillaged and coerced by the North, for exercising a right which many of the northern leaders had often asserted and threatened to resort to.

How differently might have been the story if General Grant had not held back those who sought to reach the person of Lee, Joseph E. Johnston, and others of Confederate service and fame, until the sense of justice of the North could break away from the grip of prejudice which the war had fastened upon both sections.

As President Grant was the victim of evil times and of evil men, but as Commander in Chief of the Federal Army he saved the States from political disunion, and then by his magnanimity and courage he made it possible for us, for you, the sons of Union soldiers, and for us, sons of Confederate soldiers, and for our fathers, to form now so solid a Union among ourselves, in purpose, in sympathy, in mutual interest, in common love for a common country and a common flag that no sectional discord can ever again reach through even to test the strength of the Federal compact. This is glory enough and service enough for any man.

As the son of a Confederate soldier, proud of the service and the sacrifice of his father, as one who believes himself to be a patriot through whose patriotism there runs no line of sectional cleavage, with gratitude for the service which General Grant rendered to our common country, with gratitude for his magnanimity to my people of the South in the hour of their darkest distress, and for his protection of them in the hour of their utter helplessness, I have asked the privilege of making this statement on this anniversary of the birth of General Grant. [Loud applause, the Members rising.]

America's Air Force Our First Line of Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, any man who has had the illusion that our first line of defense was the British Navy, or the navy of any other foreign country, certainly has had that illusion dissipated in the last few days, with the battle of Crete, in which the air force of Germany almost destroyed a large portion of the British Navy, and in the battle of the Atlantic, in which the British Air Force destroyed Germany's most powerful battleship, the *Bismarck*.

The people I represent are disturbed over the fact that our first line of defense, which is our air force, is suffering as a result of strikes in our defense industries. They are worried over the fact that our program of national defense is being slowed down by these strikes. I received this morning a letter from Governor Johnson, of Mississippi, a former Member of this House, in which he asks why something is not done about these "damn Communists."

Governor Johnson further says:

Why should my child, who is only 21 years of age, be taken into the Army to do the menial labor necessary about the camps and to drill and do everything else that a private has to do for $21 per month, when many of the defense workers, that is, men who are working on defense projects, are striking and interfering with other people working on defense programs? I think they are the worst enemies that we have.

Any man who interferes with the Government's projects to defend itself is a traitor. The failure of the Government to control such situations is injuring the morale of the people of this country. I am astonished that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States will not control them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Governor Johnson expresses the views of an overwhelming majority of the people of Mississippi. Every Member of the House knows that I have done everything I could to stop these communistic activities in our defense industries.

Pleas to Union Fail to Release Potash Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond L. Hoadley, which was published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 29, 1941:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 29, 1941]

PLEAS TO UNION FAIL TO RELEASE POTASH SUPPLY—CALIFORNIA STRIKE, NOW IN ELEVENTH WEEK, THREATENS NEEDED NAVY SUPPLIES

(By Raymond L. Hoadley)

Despite urgent appeals from Sidney Hillman, Codirector of the Office of Production Management, and other defense officials, neither the Naval Research Laboratory nor industrial defense plants have been able to secure much-needed chemicals from the strike-bound Trona, Calif., plant of the American Potash & Chemical Co. The strike, now in its eleventh week, was certified as a defense strike by Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins to the National Mediation Board on April 29. Meanwhile all efforts to persuade the Congress of Industrial Organizations Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union at Trona to permit the removal of defense material on hand at the plant have been unavailing.

The naval laboratory, it was learned yesterday, needs 40 tons of potassium chloride, chemical grade, for confidential use. American Potash is the only American company making this material and naval officials first took up the matter with the Office of Production Management about a month ago. The union also has refused to release a large quantity of borax and boric acid requested by Corning Glass Works, Corning, N. Y., makers of optical products, radio insulators, and other defense articles, while Maywood Chemical Co., Maywood, N. J., has made repeated appeals to Government officials for lithium salts—essential in the manufacture of submarine storage batteries—of which American Potash & Chemical is the sole source of supply.

DELAWARE CORPORATION

The Trona Co. makes a number of chemicals directly associated with defense and is one of the country's largest producers of borax, boric acid, and potash. It is a Delaware corporation, largely owned by a syndicate of Dutch and English bankers, whose holdings are understood to be impounded because of the war.

The C. I. O. union was recognized last December as the bargaining unit for the company's 1,200 employees, and subsequently a list of proposals were submitted to the management which included a closed shop, preferential hiring, unilateral arbitration of grievances, right to strike during the life of the contract, and a wage scale ranging from $1 to $1.50 an hour.

The company, in turn, offered to raise wages from 62½ cents an hour for Mexican and 67 cents for white common labor to 75 cents for both, while the mechanics' and machinists' pay was changed from $1.05 to $1.15 an hour. The latter rate, company officials say, is the same amount demanded by west coast shipyard machinists now on strike. The strike was called on March 14, with the closed shop and preferential hiring generally admitted to be the principal issues in dispute.

Besides the United States Conciliation Service, the Mediation Board was brought in to settle the strike. Both sides were called to Washington from April 29 to May 3 for conferences and a mediation panel is still attempting to end the dispute.

VERIFICATION REQUIRED

When the strike started the company had on hand a 2-month supply of borax, 1 month's supply of boric acid, and stocks of chemical potash and lithium salts. In reply to the requests of defense officials that some of these materials be released for armament and aid-Britain purposes, it is understood the union replied that under no circumstances would any cargo be released unless the union is fully satisfied of the defense need and that any representations would not be accepted without verification of the evidence tendered, regardless of its source.

Dies committee representatives have asserted that they have "uncontrovertible proof" William Gatley, a union leader in this prolonged tie-up, is a member of the Communist Party. Representative JOE STARNES, Democrat, of Alabama, exhibited in the House on Monday photostatic copies of alleged Communist registration books containing Mr. Gatley's name. Mr. STARNES

charged at that time that the strike was being carried on under Communist influence. He assailed Reid Robinson, head of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, and Robert Lamson, who appeared before the mediation board for the strikers, and warned that "we are confronted with organized treason masquerading under the guise of certain C. I. O. unions." He termed the strike "a case of sabotage of our national-defense program."

Maywood Chemical Co. takes the entire lithium salt output of American Potash & Chemical Co. In answer to an inquiry yesterday concerning the strike, M. J. Hartung, vice president of Maywood, said, "If we had those salts it would very much speed up completion of substantial armament orders, for whose shipment both the British and Navy officials are pressing." Pointing out that there is no other place to get this material, Mr. Hartung said that the strike was "delaying and slowing up" these defense and export orders, whose nature he declined to disclose.

In the case of the Corning Glass Works, it was learned that three of six melting units producing borosilicate glasses were shut down 2 weeks ago, throwing several hundred employees out of work. The three other units, through cooperation of priority officials in O. P. M. and other borax makers, have been kept in operation on a wide range of defense products, including gage glasses, chemical ware for the medical departments of the Army and Navy, explosion-resisting globes for ship and submarine lighting, running lights for the Navy, Coast Guard, and aircraft. Material supplies are low and should one or more of these units be forced to close down it would take from 3 to 8 weeks to get them back in operation.

The shortage of bulk supplies of borax due to the strike is becoming more acute generally in the glass industry, according to the American Glass Review. McKee Glass Co., of Jeannette, Pa., is cited by the authoritative trade magazine as one of the plants with defense orders that may have to close down. Other companies mentioned as reporting a shortage are Macbeth-Evans Co., Charleroi, Pa.; Kopp Glass, Swissvale, Pa.; Anchor Hocking Glass, Lancaster, Ohio, and Consolidated Lamp & Glass, Coraopolis, Pa. Kimble Glass Co., Vineland, N. J., is reported as another company with defense orders that has felt the shortage.

Whom Will the United States Intern?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, in further emphasis of the spirit of intolerance which is growing in the Nation by threats of our actual involvement in war, already inspired articles are appearing which reflect the acute division of our people. We have millions of good Americans descended from foreign stocks of various kinds and they are just as good citizens as others who would reflect upon them cruelly if we are to become involved in war. Many of us recall the bitterness of 1917 and 1918 when prejudice ran rampant.

Can it be possible that anyone would seriously suggest that the rank and file of such organizations as the America First Committee and Keep America Out of War Committee should be scrutinized and perhaps interned by Federal investigators? Can it be possible that the rank and file of such organizations as Federal Union which openly advocates the overthrow of our Constitution and a a union now with foreign nations will be unmolested if war comes while prejudiced officials will inflict their venom on patriotic organizations which are opposed to war and actively support our present form of government and our free American institutions?

Many will be shocked to know that plans are being considered to intern millions of good Americans and in this connection we call attention to the following article appearing in the May issue of this year in the magazine the Living Age, written by Stephen Naft:

[From the Living Age of May 1941]

WHOM WILL THE UNITED STATES INTERN?

(By Stephen Naft)

Infinitely more complex problems of internal defense will confront the United States if it enters the war than it faced during World War No. 1. Chief among these problems will be that of internment of individuals hostile to American intervention once they have been apprehended, which may not be so simple a task. In 1917-18, on the one hand there were certain abuses in the internment procedure followed, while on the other there was also a considerable quantity of sabotage committed by aliens who should not have been at large. The problem of locating dangerous aliens, or those potentially dangerous, and the various measures that should be taken to guard against sabotage is one of vast complication. Common sense dictates that mob action and antialien hysteria must be prevented, but at the same time it is obvious that a serious outbreak of industrial sabotage could nullify America's war effort and win the struggle for Germany.

It is well to remember that World War No. 1 was a war of nations, and that so far as the problem of aliens was concerned agents of the Department of Justice had only to maintain surveillance over German nationals in this country; the number of German-Austrians, Bulgarians, and Turks in the United States during that period was negligible. The present war, however, is not one of nations alone. It is a war of conflicting ideologies, and the potential enemies of this country cannot be easily ranged according to their national allegiances. There are, for example, a certain number of American citizens who, consciously or otherwise, are enemies of the democratic status quo, and some of these are third-generation Americans. In other words, the ideological loyalties and enmities in this world revolution are a much more potent factor in the situation than that of mere national loyalties.

In point of fact, there are only 5,000,000 persons classified as aliens in this country. But there are approximately 12,600,000 foreign-born residents here, many of whom continue to live in their own native, transplanted environment, and millions of them read newspapers (and propaganda publications) published in their own languages and printed here. For many of them, American citizenship has meant no more than handing over $5 to a clerk of the Department of Labor, that sum representing insurance against deportation.

According to the last published census (1930), the total number of individuals in the United States classified as "white, foreign stock" was nearly 39,000,000. It should be noted that in "white foreign stock," the Census Bureau includes those individuals of American birth, one or both of whose parents are foreign born. Of this total, 6,873,000 originated from Germany, with 1,609,000 individuals of German birth, and 4,547,000 originated from Italy, of whom 1,790,000 were born in Italy. It is obvious that the United States cannot consider, in the event of war, interning some 11,500,000 persons of "foreign stock" or, for that matter, even the 3,400,000 individuals who were born in Axis Nations, although that is precisely what has been done by all of the present belligerents, even in the case of naturalized citizens.

By reason of our number of aliens, and of naturalized subjects of Axis Nations, the task of the United States, should the necessity of interning them arise, will be a more arduous one than in any of the nations now at war. There is no simple mechanical or statistical operation by which the Federal Government could put all enemy aliens behind barbed wire; even if it were feasible, the result would be both grossly unjust and inefficient. By far the majority of American-born individuals here of German and Italian stock are interested only in earning a better living than they were able to in the countries of their origin; that holds true also of the foreign-born Germans and, particularly, of foreign-born Italians. Only a small percentage of this fraction of the population is interested in politics. The fact is that a substantial number of the Italian and German immigrants in the United States are more determined and fanatical enemies of the Fascist regimes in their native lands than are some native-born Americans who, until recently, freely expressed the belief that Hitler and Mussolini were public benefactors in their respective countries.

It may be safely assumed that few Jewish immigrants from Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia would represent any threat to a United States at war with the Axis. Of all the inhabitants here of foreign stock, only the few thousand Japanese can be regarded as loyal in a body to their ruler. Except in their case, consequently, the question of loyalty to the United States must be studied independently of geographical origin and naturalization documents.

It is not alarmist exaggeration to say that, should war come to the United States, the danger from enemies from within will be considerably greater than during the last war—and in the latter period, there was certainly no lack of sabotage committed by agents of the Central Powers. To take a sensational case: During the night of July 30, 1916 (more than 8 months before American entry into the war), most of the residents of New York and New Jersey were awakened by the explosion of 2,000,000 pounds of dynamite on Black Tom Island, in New York Harbor; the detonation was heard as far away as Camden and Philadelphia. Every window in Jersey City was shattered, as were most of those in downtown Manhattan and Brooklyn. Damages were estimated at $14,000,000. That German agents were responsible for this gigantic act of sabotage was the finding of the German Mixed Claims Commission which, in 1939, awarded damages to American plaintiffs.

There were hundreds of other, less spectacular, acts of sabotage both before and after Black Tom. Repeatedly, sticks of dynamite, equipped with detonating fuses, were uncovered aboard American cargo ships carrying war supplies to the Allies. Explosions destroyed parts of the Du Pont powder plants in New Jersey and Delaware, and the Hercules Powder Works and the Atlas Powder Mixing Plant were razed by sabotage. That these acts of destruction were planned and executed by German agents—while this Na-

tion was still at peace—was eventually proved by seizure of correspondence between the agents responsible, Dr. Heinrich Albert, commercial attaché of the German Embassy at Washington, and the notorious Capt. Karl Boy-Ed, the German naval attaché. British agents found documents lost by the irrepressible Franz von Papen then military attaché at Washington and Mexico City, disclosing sums paid to enemy agents and the sabotage assignments given to them. The United States Government found evidence proving conclusively that German agents were plotting to blow up the main locks of the Welland Canal, connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, through which munitions were carried from this country to Canada.

Most of the agents who committed or planned this sabotage acted solely for reasons of the monetary reward. But the situation that may now confront the United States is more serious. For every hired saboteur active here during World War I, there will be at least dozens of scores of voluntary, enthusiastic saboteurs who will act from what they regard as their principles and convictions, and who will be less likely than hired saboteurs to reveal their accomplices, if caught. The estimate has been made by the Department of Justice agents that there are between 20,000 and 50,000 determined Nazis and non-German pro-Nazis in America, who are expected to attack the security of the United States. Whatever their actual number may be, it is clear that they belong to all nationalities, that some of them are native Americans who will work either out of sympathy with totalitarian ideals or because inspired by hatred of England.

There is no doubt that the F. B. I. is in possession of a fairly accurate list of the most active and fanatic Nazis in this country. Many of them, incredibly enough, have revealed themselves by open display of swastikas, by the wearing of Storm Trooper uniforms (before that was forbidden in some States), and by their attendance at various Nazi camps in the United States. Others belong to organizations—whose names are almost all prefixed by "American"—that ostensibly stage demonstrations of "harmless sports"—these take the form of target practice, group instruction in the handling of explosives, night hikes which stage mock guerilla warfare, etc. Lists of such organizations have been published many times since their first enumeration last year in the bulletions of the Committee for Cultural Freedom and in various volumes on the "fifth column" in America—some of which admittedly are worthless pulp productions. The entire list of such groups would occupy more pages than space permits, but typical among them are such organizations as the American Nationalist Party, the American Nationalist Labor Party, the Deutsche Frontkämpferschaft (German Front Fighters), the Deutsch-Amerikanischer Zentralbund, Deutscher Kulturkampf Bund, German-American Civic Association, German-American Citizens Alliance, German League of Honor in America, Institute of Germans Living Abroad, Reichskrieger Bund, etc., etc. In addition to these groups, which do not deny their Nazi allegiance, there are various lesser societies which are either openly Nazi or which disguise their allegiance by half-hearted measures. Typical of these groups are the League of Sudeten Germans in America, the Steel Helmets, Friends of New Germany, the One Hundred Percent American Organization, Swastika League of America, the Ludendorff Bund, the Von Mackensen Drill Korps, Loyal Aryan Christians, and so on. Some of these groups serve as a "front" for pro-Nazi associations operating in secret.

There is a good reason to believe that the lists and other data of the F. B. I. are now sufficiently complete that leaders in the more dangerous of these groups could be interned before they might execute large-scale sabotage, although it is true that there already have been a number of explosions and fires of decidedly suspicious origin. Other "candidates for internment," as it were, would certainly be found by the F. B. I. among the editors and contributors to various Nazi and Fascist newspapers and weeklies in the United States.

The various groups in America of Fascist Italians, whose activities even now are of particular interest to the F. B. I. as well as to State, municipal, and county authorities, are organized along much the same lines as the Nazis. There are a large number of pro-Fascist organizations here which only differ in the degree of their militancy—for example, the Circolo Morgantini, Circolo Rossoni (Rossoni, a former I. W. W. leader in the United States, and publisher of a syndicalist weekly in New York, is now a member of Mussolini's cabinet), Dopolavoro Dux, Circolo Nazionale Impero, Lictor Federation, etc. Several radio stations in this country, among them WOV in New York and WMEX and WCOP in Boston, for a considerable time had Fascist broadcasts, and if war comes, such speakers as Negri, Neri, Capozzucchi, Forno, Garofalo, Cammarota-Cammi, Scotti, Guidi, Giannantonio, Gallucci, and a few others will doubtless be silenced by one or another means. (These speakers and their activities were the subject of a study by the American Council on Public Affairs, published last year.)

Until recently there was a tendency to regard Italian Fascists in this country as potentially less dangerous than their Nazi equivalents. There are indications that this view, in official quarters, is undergoing a marked change. It is recognized that Fascist agents here may be less experienced in terrorist acts and in sabotage methods than Nazi agents, but certainly recruits in considerable number could be found in the Italian gangster underworld here.

The two large Italian-language dailies in this country, Il Progresso Italo-Americano and the Corriere d'Italia, with a combined circulation of about 100,000, have supported the aggressive policies of the Axis, although they no longer declare themselves openly Fascist. The publisher, Generoso Pope, a member of Tammany, succeeds in the astonishing feat of supporting Mr. Roosevelt on one hand and Mussolini and Hitler on the other. If the United States enters the war Pope will certainly declare that he is for America first, in the same sense as the America First organization. That metamorphosis was performed during the last war by the New Yorker Staatszeitung, which was rabidly pro-German until America entered the war, when overnight it plumped for the Allies.

In the Spanish colony in the United States there is very little allegiance to the regime of the Spanish Fascists, or Falangists. There is a minimum of pro-Franco feeling among Latin Americans in the United States, probably none among the Puerto Ricans, and certainly not much among native-born Spaniards in this country. The few active Falangists can be easily traced by their association or connections with the several Falangist publications in this country, among them the Cara al Sol.

Officials who will decide who is to be interned will be compelled, in the event of war, to consider with some seriousness the ranks of those of Irish birth, or descent, who are followers of Father Coughlin. The latter, it will be recalled, vigorously defended those members of the Christian Front in New York City who last year were arrested for theft of firearms stolen from armories. Their leader, a German Nazi, committed suicide before their acquittal.

The question will arise, inevitably, what Americans of native birth might be regarded as dangerous by the Department of Justice in the case of war. Britain has not hesitated to intern those of her nationals who are Fascist sympathizers, among them Sir Oswald Mosley and his followers. It is to be expected that this Government will adopt the view—as in the last war—that discretion dictates the isolation of some Americans. Leaders of outspoken American Fascist organizations upon whom the eye of the Federal authorities will fall, will certainly include such individuals as Lawrence Denny, the "theoretician of American fascism," Maj. Gen. VanHorn Moseley, George Deatherage, James True, Dudley Pierrepont Gilbert, George W. Christians, Robert Edmondson, William Dudley Pelley, chief of the Silver Shirts; Joseph E. McWilliams, leader of the Christian Mobilizers; Gerald Winrod, who publishes the Defender, and Charles Hudson, who publishes America in Danger. There are other "super-patriots" of the same predilection for fascism who issue pamphlets arguing for fascism who issue pamphlets arguing that the President, Mrs. Roosevelt, and most high officials of the Federal Government are all "fifth columnists," and kindred fictions. While some of their members are well-meaning people who are not fully aware of the objectives they support, the rank and file of such organizations as the America First Committee, Keep America Out of War Committee, and particularly the Communist-controlled American Peace Mobilization Committee and the Yanks Are Not Coming Committee will be scrutinized by Federal investigators.

There are other elements which, although now professing violent opposition to the Nazi and Fascist regimes, might prove even more of a menace to the Nation's war effort than many more outspoken opponents of this Government. These are the Communists, the third totalitarian group. They are, of course, opposed to all aid to the democracies at war, and in their propaganda they demand the stoppage of all American aid to the belligerents, which at present means Britain. If we go to war, the Communists' propaganda will doubtless be suppressed, as it now has been in England. Moreover, the F. B. I. is well aware that many Communists are active in the C. I. O. unions whose members are at work on defense contracts, and that some of these Communists may be expected to obey implicitly Moscow orders to hamper this work. Representative MARTIN DIES, whose record for accuracy is not impeccable, recently estimated that about 8,000 Nazis are employed in direct or subsidiary war industries in the Middle West. It is recognized at Washington that while Communist workers belonging to the C. I. O. might not commit sabotage more serious than intermittent sit-down strikes, the Nazi workers (most of whom are naturalized citizens) would not shrink from direct acts of destruction. There is reason to believe that the F. B. I. knows where every one of these Nazi workers is employed and where he (or she) resides.

The United States has experienced one world war, and there is at least surface evidence that a few lessons have been learned. If the country declares war, past history has shown what measures may be adopted against indiscriminate antialien hysteria. Even in the World War, the Government was able to distinguish not only between friends and enemies at home, but also between dangerous and harmless nationals of enemy countries. Perhaps too much credence at that time was given by the Secret Service to the tens of thousands of anonymous or signed denunciations from private citizens of individuals suspected of espionage. Spy hunts became a national pastime, and too often were undertaken by private citizens only for purposes of venting their personal animosity. A letter written recently by Attorney General John J. Bennett, of New York, to Gov. Herbert Lehman suggests that, if war comes, better judgment may be exercised than was the case almost a quarter century ago.

"We have many letters listing as subversive groups, every German society and

business organization in the State. Others complain that American-born sons of naturalized Germans are permitted to serve in the armed forces of the United States. Many are patently spurious and were designed clearly to impress us with the knowledge and the detective skill of the writers.

"The hysteria that was generated during the last war with its injustice and its injuries to American methods is still vivid in our memories. It should not be permitted to spring up again."

Action on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHILTON (WIS.) TIMES-JOURNAL

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Chilton Times-Journal, published in the city of Chilton, Wis., and edited by Mr. William McHale, has for many years maintained a courageous and enlightening editorial policy that has truly reflected the thought and attitude of the great rank and file of our people.

In its issue of May 22 appears an editorial entitled "Action on the Home Front." I consider this editorial exceedingly thought-provoking and one which should have the widest distribution. I am pleased to incorporate this editorial as part of these remarks.

[From the Chilton (Wis.) Times-Journal of May 22, 1941]

ACTION ON THE HOME FRONT

It must strike the thinking people of this country as a strange paradox to read the voluminous news stories and hear the unending radio discussions dealing with the gravity of the crisis which the Nation faces and read and hear, on the other hand, about the number of strikes that are holding up the preparedness program. One is compelled to wonder whether the internal situation does not hold a threat almost as grievous as that from outside. For unless the people of this country, and especially employers and employees, can get together and place the country's welfare above individual profits and wages, our Nation faces dark days.

We have been faced with an emergency now for a year, but no definite labor policy has been laid down. The great majority of strikes are based on demands for higher wages. In most cases the arbitration of them consists simply in granting part or all of the wage increase asked. Last week the National Mediation Board granted the entire wage demand made by an auto union against General Motors. With the Government agency sympathetic to the union's demand, there was nothing General Motors could do but accept. As most of the defense contracts are on a cost-plus basis, the bill for this vast wage increase will be passed on to the taxpayers. The action sets the stage for similar demands in other plants and probably for future demands by that particular union.

The wage increases are reflected in increasing costs of manufacturers. The farmers realize this and they want better prices for their products. The Government obliges by boosting loan values on the principal crops. Presently the laborers will be able to say that the cost of living is going up and may use that as the reason for a further wage increase. And so the spiraling process goes.

It would be unfair to the great majority of the workingmen of America to assume from the strike epidemic that their patriotism is measured by wage dollars. The great majority of the workers are, without a doubt, as ready to do their part and make sacrifices for the defense of their country as any other section of the population. Employers also have evidenced a willingness to do their share on a moderate profit basis. Anyway the income tax will practically confiscate large profits.

Why this lack of harmony and teamwork at a time when this country should be united and devoted religiously to the job of building the kind of defense that we are so capable of building? The answer is politics. Labor is powerful at the polls. No political party wants to antagonize the workers, even at this critical time when production delays threaten to imperil the Nation's safety.

It is a time when we need leadership that will place the national welfare above politics, leadership that will junk consideration of future votes to insure our future right to vote.

What is needed is so obvious that the man in the street can see it. The people are aware of the Nation's peril from within as well as from without, notwithstanding the sirupy words we hear about all being well. They are waiting for someone who has the vision and courage to speak out against the sordid dollar bickering. They will rally to the support of such a leader, and it is a pretty safe guess that with them will be the majority of industrial workers, that great body of men who would welcome a check on the wave of wildcat strikes.

To the casual observer it would seem that a small group of radical labor leaders have the Government hypnotized into believing that they express the will of the rank and file of the workers. If someone in authority could forget politics long enough to challenge this, he likely would be surprised at the response from all sections of the population.

We tried to cure the depression by the simple expedient of borrowing and spending, and it didn't work. We are trying to promote a defense program by pacifying agitators with a wage increase as often as they ask for it, and it isn't working and won't work. It is time that we realized appeasement at home may be as disastrous as appeasement abroad. It is time for action on the home front, time to adjourn domestic bickering and unite to meet the foreign threat.

Worse Than War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Roy L. Smith, editor of the Christian Advocate, official publication of the Methodist Church:

[From the Christian Advocate of May 29, 1941]

WORSE THAN WAR

It is a common thing to hear it said these days that "there are some things worse than war." And the statement is true.

The destruction of cities, the impoverishment of populations, the sinking of ships, the sacking of libraries and art galleries, and the waste of natural resources during the last 2 years have combined to total the most staggering losses the race has ever known.

In other wars the soldiers at the front have bled and died. The conflict has been between armed forces, prepared for the struggle. But in this present horror, little children, the aged, the defenseless and helpless civilians have all been in the front lines. The number of casualties among the unarmed forces, with the possible exception of the Balkan campaign, have been greater than among the armed forces.

It is beyond the power of the human mind to compute the terrible record of hunger, disease, sufferings, fears, and tragedy which the war has written. The physical energy that has been consumed is without estimate. But even when all the agony and tears have been reckoned, and when all the losses of property have been accounted for it must still be admitted that there are other evils more evil than the deaths of men on the battlefield and the destruction of great and beautiful cities.

According to the Christian interpretation of life, there is no greater wrong than the debauchery of the human soul. Because we believe that man is made in the image of God we also believe that any debasement of humanity is a crime against the divine plan.

To plant hatreds in the human heart which corrode away the godliness of man is to work a worse havoc than to infect his body with a virulent disease. To turn nation against nation and race against race is to multiply the woes of the world and postpone the dawn of the spirit of brotherhood for a thousand years. It is to build barriers higher than the Andes, and separate men by gulfs more impassable than any known sea.

Nothing is dearer to the heart of the Christian than human liberty and freedom. The long history of our faith, reaching back almost twenty centuries, has been one unremitting struggle for the right of the individual to be the master of his own soul. Much worse than death is the enslavement of a soul that has the mint-mark of divinity.

Nothing can be more repugnant to the Christian conscience than to surrender the right to worship God in the pure air of freedom. Nothing is more contradictory of Christian idealism than life which is dictated in its every aspect by a state which acknowledges no authority higher than its own.

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," our Master said, and the whole Christian enterprise has proceeded upon the principle that purity of heart and cleanness of soul is the goal toward which all children of God must strive. To fill the souls of men with the lust to kill, to stamp out all humanitarian sympathies, to order hordes of men by the millions to kill and to destroy is to brutalize the most glorious creature God ever created.

The glory of our American civilization has appeared in the opportunity it has accorded to all men to choose their own life work, their own form of worship, their own interests, and their own political principles. In spite of our failures to establish justice in all its forms and to provide privilege on an entirely equitable basis, our success in these directions has caused the exploited and the depressed of all the world to turn longing eyes in our direction and pray to whatever

gods they worshiped for the chance to get to America and be free.

To sequester property, to dictate to free men how and where they shall work, to forbid youth the right to marry and rear children, to spend the accumulated treasure of a nation, to transform men of liberty and training into cogs in the machine of the state, to ration men's food, to prostitute all the human resources of a nation to the operation of the machinery of destruction—this is worse than war.

Everything that the modern civilized man enjoys as a benefit of civilization is the product of the administration of life through organized government. To destroy government is to destroy the very institution that has protected us thus far in the enjoyment of those rights with which we were endowed by the fact of our creation at the hands of God.

To weaken the confidence of men in the plighted word of their government, to undermine the faith of men in the righteousness and virtue of those who rule over them, to betray sacred trusts under the authority of military necessity, to make it impossible for men to believe in the most sacred institutions of their own making, to cause humanity to lose faith in itself and its capacity to govern itself in righteousness and equity is to sin against the race far more grievously than when we kill men's bodies.

The Christian faith, of all the great ethnic religions of the world, looks for the golden age of humanity to come sometime in the future. It is the only great world religion that does not turn the eyes of men back to a glory that is gone. Christians for 1,900 years have prayed, under the instructions of their Master, "Thy kingdom come." Our eyes are on the future.

To destroy the hopes of men and to send them back to welter and blood in utter despair is worse than mere killing and burning. To cause them to lose faith in the power of righteousnes to triumph, and in the survival value of goodness, is to destroy the fountains of greatness and glory.

To transform a nation of peace-loving, sober, kindly people into a mass of hating, imprecating, bombing, vengeful, frenzied, and fanatical individuals is worse than snuffing out their lives and leaving their bones to whiten unburied on battlefields.

Terrible as are the sins of the aggressors, it has always been true that the most fiendish fighter drags the bravest and the worthiest down to his level. Because he bombs our hospitals we bomb his. Because he torpedoes hospital ships flying our flag we drop incendiary bombs on the residential areas of his cities. Because he descends to bestiality we undertake to subdue him by greater ferocity.

It is perfectly true that there are other things that are worse than war, and, in the words of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, "war produces every one of them."—R. L. S.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, cheer up; it's to be a jolly war.

There really is such a thing as being scared stiff.

Our Bunker Hill can never be east of the Atlantic.

It is flattering Hitler too much to emphasize civilian defense.

The Chief has his new-made chance to show courage with labor in defense.

We'll bet Adolf never crosses our deadline if we don't cross it ourselves.

The ability of the Queen's fleet and planes to run down the *Bismarck* is refreshing.

A continued militant opposition to war will help the President to keep his promise.

Reducing W. P. A. one-third and tripling war production is in line with our new social gains.

We are not going to have unity for war over there until we declare it in the democratic way.

If we are going to command respect for the Monroe Doctrine, we must not stick our necks out too far.

The next thing for unity will be radio censorship, and even before an overt act is committed against us.

If Lindbergh had lied about what he was privileged to see in Germany, he would now be at the head of our air forces.

We agree completely with the message in that the wider the Nazi land effort the greater the danger to themselves.

If we hold our fire until we see the whites of their eyes, there is a big chance that there won't be any eyes there.

Corwin Hatfield, of Vermillion, writes not to shed salty tears over "the silenced peoples of Europe," for they are used to it.

One thing we didn't like about Woodrow Wilson as President was that he talked too much. That is the cause of most fist fights.

Franklin Roosevelt's fear of Hitler, of course, helps him to increase his own authority and to demand of his subjects that they "take loyal part from this moment forward."

Aviation and the Future Welfare of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon it was my pleasure to have participated in the appropriate and largely attended exercises incident to formal ground breaking for the municipal airport for the city of Cumberland, Md.

This project, just now getting under way, will cost more than $2,000,000, and when completed will give that trading territory one of the finest commercial airports in the country.

The port itself is located on the West Virginia side of the Potomac River. In the matter of its location there was the fullest cooperation between the officials of the sister States. Such splendid understanding is particularly important in this ever-enlarging field of aeronautics.

My address on this occasion follows:

The lifeblood of a nation is its trade. To exist at all it must produce and sell its produce or its people die. To become great it must create markets for its production both within and without its borders. Even in the midst of war only a nation in its death throes would fail to prepare for peace and peaceful trade. That preparation may go no further than organized thinking by groups of experts. It may extend to the approved continuance of commercial activities, carefully selected for their post-war values. This is true today in both England and Germany. It is true to an even greater extent here in the United States, since we are yet so much less involved and hampered by war activity.

One lesson that the present war has taught us—a lesson that our airmen have been trying to pound into our heads for a long time—is that the future of world trade is inexorably bound up with the development of flying. The nation that has the best and the most planes, the best and the most highly trained pilots, the best and most ingenious designers, laboratory technicians, and productive capacity will, at that time, be in a favored position. But many other factors will enter into the problem. There must, above all else, be the national ability for long-range vision in a field that is so new to the thinking of the average citizen that he can only be educated to it over a period of years.

AIRPORTS ARE MAIN STREETS OF AVIATION

This airport that we are dedicating today is a symbol of what is ahead. An airport is the Main Street of aviation. Without it there can be no flying. To the city that possesses it, it becomes the focus of radiating lines of communication with other cities, other States, other countries. Through it the city has extended its circumference of living into the far reaches of the earth. The same might be said of other means of transportation but for the time element. Aviation has shrunk the earth to miniature dimensions. It has ended all normal conceptions of isolation. We have been told a great deal lately of the dangers to the United States in terms of flying time—that our great metropolitan areas are within easy bombing range of such and such a place; that our oceans no longer protect us. If this is true in time of national emergency—and it is bitterly true—then it will be equally true in another sense when there is nothing to fear from the skies above us. The nations now engaged in the cyclonic struggle abroad, because of the sacrifices they have made—in manpower, money, and commerce—will be all the more intent on reconstituting themselves in the markets beyond their borders. They will have developed aerial equipment and trained pilots to an extent that will give them immediate reason to make use of these resources in swiftly gaining those markets. They will do everything possible to win in that new battle of commerce.

WE MUST BUILD GREAT AIR FLEETS

And if we are not awake then to the new necessity, if we do not plan ahead for it now, we will be left very far to the rear of the procession. There was a time in our history when our foreign commerce was melting away before our eyes, because we had no real merchant marine comparable to that of other countries. We were an infant in world affairs, but we had the native shrewdness to realize what we needed—ships and more ships, the best and the fleetest

possible. We built them, and the racing clippers went out across the world, under their clouds of canvas, to put the United States into the head of the procession.

We have been slow to recognize new international developments too many times in the past, but we cannot be slow this time. We can no longer satisfy ourselves by complacent regard of our riches at home. To a greater extent than ever before, we are a part of the world economy. We reflect its rising and falling curves with terrible rapidity. The balance of our foreign trade is practically always now the difference between profit and loss. Whether we like it or not, we must do what our forbears did and send our winged clippers searching the earth for the trade that will keep us lusty and growing.

We were 10 years late in beginning to try our wings in foreign air after the last war. Germany, England, Holland, and France were that much ahead of us when we entered the field. But we have made up for lost time. We have today the greatest flag service abroad in the world—46,000 route miles. We circle the southern half of the hemisphere, cross the Atlantic and Pacific, tap the Hebrides and the China coast. But that is only a bare start. With the secret plans on the factory drawing boards now—no mere draftsman's dream, but ships ready to leap into the air as soon as they can be built, we can emulate the story of those magnificent, tough clippers of old and maintain ourselves at the head of the procession. But it will not be too easy even then.

A MILLION PILOTS TO BE USED

One of the most encouraging facts in the picture is the number of highly trained pilots we will have available. In January 1939 we had just short of 23,000 certificated civilian airmen. By July 1, this year, we will have 100,000. That does not include the thousands of Army and Navy fliers who will come from the service schools. The day is not far distant when the total will number a million. These men are keen, young, eager, in love with their profession. They are among the world's finest. They will want jobs—they will not be content to go into offices and factories as groundlings, not after living so long in the freedom of the sky. If we are farsighted and intelligent, they will not have to—we shall need them for our urgent business elsewhere. They will take the place of the clipper crews of the older days and will bring home cargoes of treasure from far places.

And there will be need of others among them to carry our domestic cargoes here at home. The air transport industry here has just begun. In 1940, it flew 1,264,468,615 passenger miles. But at that it carried only about 1 percent of our population. The amount of air express and mail loading was infinitesimal.

ALL MAIL CARRIED BY AIR

Let me give you a look into what is ahead. All first-class mail carried by air—at a cost to the Government much less than is now being paid. You'll put an ordinary 3-cent stamp on your letters and they'll go by air. All the lighter cargo flying, with time cut so materially and cargo planes so increased in size and carrying capacity that the cost there will be no higher than it now is by rail. Passenger rates as low as 2 cents a mile—the present rail rates—because of the larger and more efficient planes and the tremendous increase in numbers of people flying. The family plane as cheap, as common, and as safe and easy to operate as the family flivver. Startling? Yes—but entirely provable.

That is where this airport of yours takes its place. I have called it the main street of aviation. It is just that. For the aviation of the future, we must have many thousands of airports, large and small, military and commercial, and private. Every one we build now, when they are so vitally necessary to our defense, is a dollar put into the bank of that future.

What do we have now? Increasing traffic problems, increasing safety problems. About 2,300 landing fields of all types, ranging from those that are little better than farm pastures to a handful with the finest runways, lighting, control, and other vital equipment. It has taken a long time to make the country realize how badly we need to improve and extend this airport system. We should have 1,500 more—not 10 years from now but within the next 2 or 3. Not any old fields, but planned, built, and managed on the basis of the ships that the factories will be turning out before we know it.

AIR TRAFFIC SHOWS BIG INCREASE

The Civil Aeronautics Administration, under which the national airport program is handled, in 1940 offered to Congress a long-range plan. It had watched commercial air traffic increase 136 percent between July 1938 and December of last year. It had seen the rapidly mounting certification of pilots as the civilian pilot-training program did its work. On top of all this, following the course of the emergency, it saw the military forces, to take care of their expansion, move into over 100 of the best fields. It seems hard to believe, but while all this was taking place the number of usable airports decreased by 33.

Because of these facts, action was imperative. Last October Congress appropriated $40,000,000, of the nearly $600,000,000 the C. A. A. had estimated as the cost of its plan, to be used for improvement or construction of not more than 250 fields necessary for defense. This program is well under way at nearly 200 sites. The sites were selected after conferences between the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce. Most of them, for strategic reasons, are concentrated around the perimeter of the country. For the next fiscal year a bill now before a conference committee of the Senate and House will give the C. A. A. an additional $94,000,000 to continue and expand this defense program.

IMPROVED AIRPORTS MUST BE BUILT

We have been extremely fortunate in all this, that as one good result of the depression the make-work program for the idle included another $200,000,000 spent on airports. That has been our backlog in the work now going on. But all of it adds up to a fraction of what we will have to do. The time will come, and come before we realize it, when every city of any size will not have one airport, but a series of them, designed for different purposes and different classes of planes. The private fields will be planned for safe and convenient pleasure and tourist flying; the military planes, fast and difficult to handle, will keep to their own areas; the air liners will, like the ship in Kipling's poem, a "lady" who will mage her more leisurely landings on spacious, obstruction-free ports. This division of purpose will be effective not only for efficiency but for safety as well.

Because the defense motive is so completely uppermost in our minds now, we are liable to forget that what we are building will be commercially valuable after the emergency has passed. But it is, as I have said before, only a beginning. The time must come when every city and town has overnight mail service, coast to coast. When the air liners come into every city of a size to justify their stops on an economic basis, and the smaller communities receive air-mail pick-up and feeder-line service suitable to their needs. When you can take the family plane and fly off to your favorite air park for a week end of fishing, even though it is hundreds of miles away. Or take a transport on a round-the-world cruise of a couple of weeks as casually as you took a steamer trip before the war.

ALL WILL PROFIT BY AVIATION

That is why you are dedicating this airport today. You are taking the first step for your city into active participation in the air age. Every one of you will benefit by it—the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker will prosper from this new freedom of communication. And that freedom will bring other freedoms with it and a new and greater growth for the democracy we are now defending. The wings of the eagle grow strong.

Tributes to Gutzon Borglum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the death of Gutzon Borglum March 6, 1941, called forth a most remarkable outpouring of editorial tributes to his life and work. Since the last years of his life were devoted to the shrine of democracy, the great American memorial at Mount Rushmore, in which he was commissioned by the Congress, it is appropriate that portions of those tributes should be preserved in the RECORD. Accordingly, under permission given by the House on the day of Mr. Borglum's death, I offer the following excerpts:

[From the McLaughlin (S. Dak.) Messenger]

A PRODUCT OF THE WEST

Borglum, the great sculptor is dead. His carving in granite on majestic Mount Rushmore, in the Black Hills of South Dakota, will endure until the dawn of doom. Gutzon Borglum was a product of the West. He was born in what is now the State of Idaho, where the border meets Utah. His father came from Denmark, a refugee following the Prussian War of 1864. Borglum as a youth displayed talent for art. His father sent him to the Thorvaldsen Royal Academy in Copenhagen, Denmark, where he received his initial training in marble. Following, he studied in Paris and other art centers of the world. He came to South Dakota and met Doane Robinson, at that time State historian. Mr. Robinson was interested in the sculptor's work in Georgia. Following other meetings Mr. Robinson conceived the idea of a memorial in the Black Hills. When President Coolidge spent his summer vacation in the Black Hills, in 1927, United States Senator Peter Norbeck suggested the idea to Mr. Coolidge. The President was impressed. At the following session of Congress funds were provided to carry out the project. Thus came about the world's greatest memorial in South Dakota.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star-Journal]

WORLD'S MOST DURABLE MONUMENT

No nation or civilization—not Egypt with its Pyramids, nor China with its Great Wall, nor England with its Stonehenge ruins—has a more durable monument than the one the late Gutzon Borglum hewed for the United States in the granite of Mount Rushmore in South Dakota's Black Hills. Beside it such man-made edifices as the Empire State Building or Rockefeller Center are tinsel toys.

Geologists say the huge figures of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt may erode about an inch every

thousand years, but faces 60 feet high will begin to look only slightly weathered after 20,000 years, by which time they will be about four times as old as the Pyramids are today.

[From the Lemmon (S. Dak.) Tribune]

SHRINE OF DEMOCRACY

Borglum was the genius who created the heroic granite heads of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt on a mountain top in South Dakota's Black Hills. For the past 13 years he had poured his soul and his energies into the undertaking. He had pleaded with Presidents, argued with Congressmen, and braved the hazards of rocky slopes to shape the memorial, and he gloried in the colossal task.

Borglum called the big undertaking—the heads alone are 65 feet from crown to chin—the shrine of democracy. It was his conviction Americans would worship there a thousand years hence absorbing the spirit of vigorous freedom these Presidents fostered. Each curve and hollow was designed to stand 100,000 years of weathering.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader]

ONE OF WORLD'S WONDERS

Rushmore today is something more than just a chiseled rock. It is a vivid realization of a majestic American dream. Borglum, the dreamer and the creator, drew out of the rugged mountain the picture he framed in his own mind—the mammoth busts of four extraordinary American citizens—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt.

There, for all time, these quiet faces supreme in their size and in their conception, will gaze out upon America to inspire in all who see them a fresh and vital appreciation of the principles they emblazoned in the history of this Nation.

Rushmore was the enterprise that Borglum himself appraised as his masterpiece. He had other claims to fame, to be sure artistic achievements of sufficient quality and renown to set him apart. But they are dwarfed by Rushmore, which is already established in the public mind as one of the wonders of the world.

[From the Edgemont (S. Dak.) Tribune]

WILL SPEAK OF LIBERTY

Borglum is no more but his memorial in these Black Hills will live for centuries yet to come to attract liberty-loving peoples from all parts of the world. They will stand before the shrine and mediate the true meaning of democracy—the worth of liberty, of freedom, and of free action. They will reflect what it takes of energy, and of blood, to gain and to preserve for ourselves and for posterity America's prized liberty and freedom.

[From the Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion]

SOUTH DAKOTA MISSES HIM

While South Dakota will always remember Mr. Borglum for the role he played in the creation of the Mount Rushmore Memorial and the resultant publicizing of the Black Hills and the State, this work was but a small part of this creative art, of which there are examples in many cities in so many parts of the world that he was an international figure in sculpturing.

He will be genuinely missed by South Dakota where there is a feeling of deep regret that he could not have lived to see the completion and final dedication of the national shrine he created on Rushmore.

[From the Pierre (S. Dak.) Capital-Journal]

A WORLD ARTIST

The death of Gutzon Borglum takes from the world one of its great artists. There is no great museum of sculpture which does not recognize his work, and some of the outstanding monuments in this Nation are the result of his genius. His most colossal work of course is the group on Mount Rushmore in the Black Hills.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Guide]

SCULPTOR'S GREATEST WORK

Borglum will not see Rushmore completed. The models he made are, however, complete, and his work will be carried on by his son, Lincoln. He left perfected plans and the transfer can be made, though he, himself, will not be here to direct it. Of course, his master touch will not be there to put on the final finish, but let us hope that his spirit will be here to hold the chisel and to strike the hammer.

Rushmore, of all the great works of the sculptor, will be Gutzon Borglum's shrine. Into it he poured his soul and his genius. From it he will gain world-wide renown and a chair among the world's most famous and noted artists.

[From the Lead (S. Dak.) Daily Call]

ARTIST'S CONCEPTION REALIZED

Borglum lived to achieve his dream, for even if those huge, calm stone figures never were touched again, their meaning and significance is there forever in imperishable granite for posterity. The fine carving on those expressive faces, which appear to gaze across the centuries with the aloof wisdom of time, is completed. Whatever remains to be done is concerned with fininishing the hands and the coats of the figures, or extraneous features of the project, such as the hall of records. Those four faces are finished, and they convey the meaning of the memorial—the essence of the artist's conception.

[From the Camp Crook (S. Dak.) Range Gazette]

HIS WORKS WERE COLOSSAL

Borglum, whose best known work was the nearly completed Mount Rushmore memorial in the Black Hills of South Dakota, was one artist whose work could be described as "colossal" without fear of overstatement. Countrysides were his studios, weather-beaten mountains his granite blocks and dynamite and power-driven hammers and chisels his tools of art.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American News]

SCULPTOR'S MEMORIAL, TOO

Despite Borglum's international fame as a sculptor, the colossal Mount Rushmore Memorial in the Black Hills surpasses anything of its kind in contemporary artistry. Intended primarily, of course, to honor the memory of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt, the memorial, incidentally, brought lasting fame to the sculptor—fame which, even though secondary to the United States Presidents, is not to be minimized.

[From the Lemmon (S. Dak.) Leader]

RUSHMORE—AMERICAN SHRINE

Mount Rushmore will be his monument. It is there today because of his desire to create in the heart of America a memorial typical of the Nation itself, one that would endure forever where the atmosphere is always clean and fresh, where the surroundings are always beautiful.

He told us once that it was his desire that Mount Rushmore might become not only an outstanding scenic spot, but a shrine that would provide peace of mind and soul and inspiration for everyone who loved America. The master left before his work was finished, but his chisel has made a mark that will be both a beacon and an inspiration to all patriots through the ages to come.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times]

TRADITIONS OF UNITED STATES IN STONE

A man whose stupendous artistic visions were equaled by his enormous capacity for executing the work was Gutzon Borglum, the sculptor whose career has endured at the age of 69. America always will be a better place artistically and patriotically because he lived and labored. Not only was his outdoor work—hewed out of the faces of mountains—colossal. It was inspiring. It preserved the tradition of the United States in imperishable stone.

Borglum's work in many other forms has entered definitely into the sculptural destiny of America. He literally has earned a grateful remembrance along with the immortals he brought forth from stone.

[From the Mankato (Minn.) Free-Press]

INTEGRITY OF SPIRIT

His teachers used tiny hammers and chisels; Borglum expressed himself with dynamite and blasters and the hewing of hundreds of thousands of tons of stone. He expressed himself also in a life of utter art independence, and the refusal to take anybody else's word for it. That, his career told, was the artist's way

He was revered by sculptors and painters as a genius, and his work in many galleries and parks in America will be the best monument to his fame; but he will be remembered also in print because of the integrity and independence of his spirit. To him art came first, and for the authenticity of his place in the world he fought against Presidents, States, influential societies, powerful groups, all of which came at the end to respect and honor him.

[From the Buffalo (S. Dak.) Times-Herald]

WILL CONTINUE TO GROW

Mount Rushmore is proving one of the greatest attractions in the Nation and will continue to grow as people come to realize the wonderful work of Borglum in transforming the side of the mountain into giant figures of our noted Presidents.

[From the Black Hills Weekly, Deadwood, S. Dak.]

THE CANVAS INCOMPARABLE

Gutzon Borglum, his tanned, weather-beaten face turned to the ever-constant winds of Mount Rushmore, will carve no more on the granite side of the mountain on which the faces of Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Teddy Roosevelt will gaze out unperturbed over the peaceful pine-clad hills and valleys for half a million years to come.

Long after even the location of his final resting place is forgotten, the memorial will remain his shrine of democracy, his monument to the country which gave his penniless Danish parents their chance, the country which gave him his start, his opportunity to study, to work in a land of freedom, to become an international figure, and the power and the ability to carry on the fight for freedom.

But the national shrine at Rushmore will know him no more. No more will his short, stocky figure, his eyeglasses dangling from their button, swing energetically into the cage that carries his workmen from the studio across to the mountain. No more will he take readings and measurements from the studio model to transfer them to the gigantic structure on the mountain.

No more will his bright eye twinkle merrily as he approaches some stranger at the studio and asks his opinion of the memorial.

To some men are given oils and canvas for their paintings; to others clean white paper and ink; to others, the celluloid film. But to Gutzon Borglum had been given the canvas incomparable; a majestic granite cliff, over 6,000 feet above sea level, with a limitless background of cloud-drifted, blue sky. In enduring rock, which will outlast his youngest critics by millions of years, the figures which he carved on Mount Rushmore must be his masterpiece.

Into them so simply that their meaning is at once apparent he put all the force of his character, all the beauty of his art, all the dignity and power of the four men who typify periods in the development of the democracy. All this fits into the background of mountain and sky. It was a collossal undertaking, one that required patience and courage and deep sense of the artistic.

All these things appear on Mount Rushmore. "The figures of these four great men, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Teddy Roosevelt, are within the granite," the sculptor once said, "it is my duty and my privilege to remove the granite so that they may be seen."

Physical Defects of Young Men Drafted Into Military Service Should Be Corrected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to read news dispatches today in which Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Deputy Director of Selective Service System, is quoted as advocating corrective measures be taken immediately to remedy the physical disabilities discovered during examination of draftees.

In this connection I include at this point the text of a letter in which I recommended that such action be carried forward, following receipt of his letter to me in which suggestions were requested. The communications follow:

MAY 19, 1941.

Brig. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Deputy Director, National Headquarters Selective Service System, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: I appreciate your letter of May 16 in which you express interest in the comments which members of Congress might desire to make on the operation of the Selective Service System.

It shall be my purpose to contact certain officials of the draft boards in my congressional district and get their reaction to the operations of the Selective Training and Service Act. I shall be glad to forward constructive suggestions to Captain Keesling, whom you have appointed as assistant operations executive.

It has been brought to my attention that 43 percent of the men examined for military training have been found ineligible for service due to physical disabilities. I believe that the large proportion of these have had trouble with their teeth. It would seem to me that a definite program should and must be undertaken to correct these physical shortcomings just as soon as possible. It is not enough to find the trouble, but attempts should certainly be made to improve the physical condition of these refused men. That procedure would seem to me to be the part of a good national policy, vital to our continued preparedness program.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1941.

The Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 has been in effect for some months and during that time we have been bending every effort to secure the smoothest and most efficient possible operation of the Selective Service System.

We have, of course, been confronted with innumerable problems, and we will be faced with additional problems from time to time. However, we believe that we are satisfactorily solving these problems as they arise.

We have received many helpful comments and criticisms from time to time from Senators and Representatives, and have answered the many inquiries they have submitted concerning the operation of the Selective Service System.

We will welcome your comments, criticisms, and inquiries concerning the operations of the Selective Service System, and we shall endeavor to furnish you with satisfactory explanations and answers.

I have recently appointed Capt. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., as legislative officer for the Selective Service System in addition to his other duties as assistant operations executive, and he will be available to cooperate with you in the above matters.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Deputy Director.

Mr. Speaker, I have as yet had no formal reply to my letter of May 19, but indicative of General Hershey's attitude are excerpts from the following news stories which appeared today in the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News.

The Post story follows:

HERSHEY SEES USE FOR MEN DRAFT REJECTED

Of approximately 400,000 registrants found unfit for general military service, at least 200,000 can be used for limited service, and perhaps half of the latter group are capable of rehabilitation for full service, which task should be done by Government agencies, Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, of the Selective Service System, yesterday told the National Nutrition Conference for Defense.

General Hershey, Deputy Director, national headquarters, did not specify what agencies might undertake the task, but inquiries among Government officials at the meeting indicated that the Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Division of the Office of Education have been suggested.

"The 200,000 who are fitted for limited military service create a special problem. * * * I do not believe our people will continue indefinitely to accept avoidance of military obligations by the class to which I have just referred," General Hershey said at the afternoon session at the Mayflower Hotel.

IT'S A NATIONAL SHAME

On the basis of rejections for service, "we are physically in a condition of which we nationally should be thoroughly ashamed," he said.

General Hershey said he believes "it will be necessary to place the responsibility for the rehabilitation" of rejected registrants directly upon the Government.

"I realize that there are agencies in the Government at the present time which might be modified to serve as rehabilitation agencies—their part in the rehabilitation of the general public may or may not be feasible, but for this group liable for military service voluntary methods will not suffice. In the interest of public morale, these individuals should be compelled to render service to the Nation. In the public interest they should be improved physically while they are performing this national service," General Hershey said.

"I realize the tremendous task which has been placed upon the War Department by the necessities of the past year," he continued. "I am aware of the task which the induction of 100,000 or 200,000 limited service men would impose on an already overburdened agency. I am aware of the financial responsibilities which may accrue to the Government by the acceptance of below-standard men. On the other hand, there seem to be no other agencies capable of carrying out this task in a manner which will insure that the Government shall require service from the individual, while at the same time effective measures are undertaken to improve the physical condition of the individual," General Hershey said.

Martha Strayer, writing in the News, says this:

Brigadier General Hershey, speaking yesterday at the National Nutrition Conference, Mayflower Hotel, advocated Army induction for class I–B's (men found fit for limited military service, with minor physical defects) whose defects are correctible.

He would resort to forced correction of such defects, first inducting the men into the Army and assigning them to noncombat work which would relieve physically fit soldiers for combat duty.

Grand total of I–B's out of 1,000,000 physically examined, General Hershey reported as approximately 200,000. Of this total 120,000 were placed in the limited service classification by local doctors, and 55,000 more after examination at Army induction stations.

"Many of these individuals have every appearance of an able-bodied man," the draft head continued. "They are known in their communities as individuals capable of performing physical labor, or of participation in activities that require a reasonable amount of physical proficiency.

"We are confronted with the necessity for rehabilitation for members of this group where it is possible to better their physical condition and to attempt to discover an efficient place in defense for those with uncorrectable disabilities. * * *

ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGE

"There is work which can be done by limited service men that will relieve combat units from tasks which must be done, but whose doing interferes seriously with the training programs of these men inducted into service, for advantage to be gained by having these men inducted into service, for as they become rehabilitated they can take their places in combat units. * * *

"Noninduction of the limited service group constitutes a grave morale problem which will tend to increase. Measures must be taken to require service of these individuals and their development to a physical condition where they can do full physical duty if inducted. In general, this cannot be accomplished by voluntary efforts of the individuals concerned."

Association of Consistent Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

LEAFLET DISTRIBUTED BY ASSOCIATION

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following leaflet put out by the Association of Consistent Americans in my district:

ASSOCIATION OF CONSISTENT AMERICANS,
ADEL, GA.

To Every Loyal American:

Realizing that every true American citizen deplores the apparent communistic influence over labor and inherently desires the practice of consistency in the matter of our preparedness program and national-defense efforts because of the grave peril we now face, and that each of them would like to contribute in some way toward the correction of this inconsistency in administration, this organization has been inaugurated.

The primary purpose is, of course, to acquaint the administration with that which is in the minds of the American people, believing that if the demand is great enough and sufficiently widespread it will obtain the desired result.

We are calling upon everyone that will to write to the President and to their respective Senators and Congressmen.

We are calling upon those that will to set up an organized group in their respective communities to see that the will of the people in that locality is properly expressed and presented to the administration.

Will you please appear before civic clubs, Legion posts, parent-teacher associations, and other such organizations and secure their cooperation in acquainting the President and the Congress with what is in the mind of the American public?

Your efforts in this regard will not only be a source of real joy to you as a patriot but will be appreciated by the millions who are equally perturbed over the conditions existing. Though we are facing a war unto death and destruction, our greatest enemy today is right in our midst because of utter inconsistency.

Respectfully yours,
ASSOCIATION OF CONSISTENT AMERICANS.

ASSOCIATION OF CONSISTENT AMERICANS

We believe in the fairness of the selective draft and in collective bargaining for labor, but we believe our Government should not permit a mere handful of men to completely nullify its effort toward preparedness. Our boys in the Army, who are expected when the time comes to make the supreme sacrifice, are not permitted to strike and lay down their arms and quit; neither should those engaged in the manufacture of the implements of war, so essential to our boys, be allowed to strike—lay down their tools and quit.

We do not believe the strikes now taking place in our industries are promoted by labor itself, but by certain leaders who are engaged in a movement wholly alien to the best interests of our Government.

We believe that Congress should exert its power in the same manner toward labor in defense industries as it has toward the flower of American manhood in the Army of defense by putting an immediate stop to strikes, or disband the Army and send our boys home.

ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION

Name: The name of this organization shall be Association of Consistent Americans.

Purpose: To bring to the attention of the American people the inconsistency present in our program of national preparedness and to seek its correction.

To remove the stigma upon our democracy which permits the conscription of the flower of American manhood to be sacrificed on the field of battle at a wage of $21 per month and at the same time permit the leaders of those engaged in the manufacture of the essentials of warfare to promote strikes and through mass force nullify the efforts of our Government and the American people, though they are being paid the highest wages paid labor by any nation on earth.

Plan: To enlist the voluntary service and influence of every loyal American citizen in the creation of a widespread demand for consistent treatment of the Nation's defense efforts.

To provide the means through which the President of the United States and the Members of Congress may be informed as to the mind and attitude of the electorate of the Nation on the matter.

To call upon those of like mind to immediately give expression to their thoughts on the matter by communicating with the President and their respective Senators and Congressmen, and to set up in their respective localities a voluntary unit for the purpose.

Membership: Open to any American citizen who is willing and who desires to express himself on the matter. There are no membership dues, fees, or other obligations involved.

Slogan: Stop strikes in defense industries or disband the Army and send our boys home.

We have instigated a chain letter, a specimen of which is shown below, which is proving very effective. While chain letters are somewhat passe and are frowned upon by many, the matter is of sufficient importance for us to forego our dislikes of chain letters, as it provides the means of reaching many who would not otherwise take part in the movement. Get as many of these letters written as possible.

This is strictly a patriotic movement; no funds are solicited; every citizen pays his own expenses.

SPECIMEN CHAIN LETTER

ADEL, GA., April 16, 1941.

Americanism versus Communism

DEAR FRIEND: Shall we permit 1 percent of our total citizenship to damn the other 99 percent?

Shall we, the 99 percent, stand idle and permit the utter sacrifice of our boys on the field of battle, because of the utter disregard of our Nation's peril by the 1 percent who are permitted to promote strikes and otherwise delay the Nation's defense program? As true American citizens, our answer is emphatically no.

We do not believe that the strikes now taking place in our industries are promoted by labor itself, but by certain leaders who are engaged in a movement wholly alien to the best interests of our Government.

We believe in the fairness of the selective draft and in collective bargaining, but we believe our Government should not permit a mere handful of men to completely nullify its effort toward preparedness. Our boys in the Army, who are expected, when the time comes, to make the supreme sacrifice, are not permitted to strike or lay down their arms and quit, neither should those engaged in the manufacture of the implements of war, so essential to our boys, be allowed to strike—lay down their tools and quit.

We believe that Congress should exert its power in the same manner toward labor in defense industries as it has toward the flower of American manhood in the army of defense, by putting an immediate stop to strikes, or disband the Army and send our boys home.

Will you please write a personal letter to the President, mailing copies to your Congressman and to your Senators, expressing your views on this matter and under your rights as an American citizen, demand immediate correction of this injustice. Do it today, for time is precious.

Will you also copy this letter, or approximately so, and mail to each of five or more of your friends. Enlist other of your friends to do the same. If possible, set up a voluntary group in your locality to push the matter. In letters to friends, please add P. S. below, and sign as this letter is signed, if you will. Thanks.

ASSOCIATION OF CONSISTENT AMERICANS.

Value of a Public-Utility District in Distributing Electric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WALTER M. PIERCE, OF OREGON

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1941, I made an electrical transcription for the use of the radio station at Baker, Oreg., urging the people there to vote to establish a public-utility district.

The following are the words of the transcription:

From the Capitol of our country, I speak to the citizens of Baker County, Oreg., who are considering whether they shall make ready to use Bonneville electric power. There is just one way to get that power at a cheap rate. That is to vote now to establish a public-utility district. The question before you May 27 is not whether you shall take over a private business. The question is whether you shall decide to conduct your own proper public business and enjoy its profits. The question is whether you will, for no consideration of value to you as citizens, continue the practice of giving away to eastern investors your most precious and profitable municipal right. Unquestionably, the franchise given a private utility for a monopoly on furnishing electric light and power is the most valuable asset Baker County people have or could hold for themselves. The fight the power company is putting up to keep that asset shows that they think it is something of real value. It is a gold mine.

Most private utilities are Wall Street controlled. That is not true of Baker County, but it is an absentee ownership. Make it a home-owned and home-controlled business. The home people are not rich enough to pour great sums of money into this campaign to regain the rights they once relinquished. Just think—the Federal Power Commission reports over a million dollars spent within the last 5 years, in our section, to keep our people from using the privileges which are theirs by law, and to keep them from gaining the profits which should be theirs as a right.

It is not safe to put off until some future time the establishment of a public-utility district. Bonneville power will soon be at your door. If you once let the profit-seekers get you down, you may have a hard time getting back into the ring.

You would have it all to do over—money, time, energy lost. Take the business over now, and remember, that my last Bonneville act amendment reserved half the Bonneville power for public districts only until January 1, 1942. It was difficult to get that extension through Congress. We certainly cannot get money for a transmission line to Baker County if you vote "no" on public-utility district. Take Bonneville power now or see yourselves the slaves of a private utility company. That would be going backward and it would be expensive to Baker County.

BE AS SMART AS ALCOA

The Aluminum Co. of America is one of the strongest financial institutions in the world. It has an immense plant at Niagara Falls valued at more than $200,000,000. Why did it come to the Pacific coast and locate at Vancouver, Wash., just below Bonneville? I will tell you, friends, why Alcoa came West. Because Bonneville has the cheapest power in the world and they are smart enough to take advantage of it. No one has to persuade them to use Bonneville power. They use it because it saves them money. The bauxite, from which the aluminum comes, is imported from South America. It is turned into alumina at Mobile, Ala., and then taken to Bonneville, where it is, by electric current, made into aluminum. Think of it. They carry that material over a great part of our hemisphere to reach Bonneville electricity, which the Government now offers to carry to Baker. The Reynolds Metals Co., another big manufacturer of aluminum, has located on the Columbia River in order to get cheap Bonneville power. Why is Pepco of Portland pressing Bonneville for contracts for more power? Because they can make money from it. Bonneville power can be bought in Baker County, and make money for you, if you organize your public-utility district. You can have it on the same terms at which it is being bought by the Aluminum Co. or Pepco. Are you going to miss the opportunity that Mellon's company and Pepco were smart enough to grasp? Think of the millions of tons of valuable mineral ore in the Baker hills that can and will be processed in electric furnaces in Baker County when Bonneville power is available at $17.50 per kilowatt year. Think of the hundreds of acres of land which can be irrigated by pumping if the power is cheap enough. Think of the possible byproducts of the lumber industry. Power cannot be had cheaply enough except through a public-utility district buying Bonneville current. The development ahead of you is marvelous, not just a defense project, but a permanent prosperity. Have an industrial survey made at once and learn just how far Baker can go in building a great future.

THE TAX MYTH: WHO PAYS UTILITY TAXES?

Nothing is urged harder, nor more unjustly, against public distribution of electric energy than nonpayment of taxes. The facts of the case are that the private utilities pay no taxes. No money comes from outside Baker County to pay their taxes. That is part of the money which you have already contributed in exorbitant rates. The private utilities are tax collectors charging a mighty high fee for their services.

The State Utilities Commissioner fixes their rates high enough so taxes will not interfere with their profits. Remember, the Oregon law provides that the P. U. D. shall be assessed and taxed in the same manner and for the same purpose as the properties of the private power company. No part of the local system would be exempt, the false statement of the company, notwithstanding. As earnings increase, taxes increase. As rates go down earnings do increase, because so much more power is used.

On page 17 of the Eastern Oregon Light & Power Co.'s pamphlet telling you why you should delegate to them the rights and profits of your electric business, they give a table showing how their taxes have increased. In 1915, the company paid $8,820 in taxes; and for 1941 they claim to have paid $124,000—not in Baker alone, but for their entire system, and for all kinds of taxes, Federal, State, and local. We all know that there has been very little additional property construction by the private utility since 1915; therefore, the big increase in taxes must have been largely increased income taxes, showing conclusively the excessively large and increasing income over expenses which the company has enjoyed for the last 25 years.

The furnishing of electric current is the finest business in all the world. There are no bad debts. There is a small pay roll, no big investment, no competition. Everyone wants the service—an expanding market. Who else has such a business?

Taxpayers of Baker County, that profit belongs to you, and it has been unjustly taken from you by the high rates of the private company, under franchise privileges you lent them. Thank Heaven, it was a loan, and you have the legal and moral right to take it back. They talk about the little franchise tax they pay. Just own that franchise yourselves, and you will be glad to pay the taxes on it. All their taxes on Baker County properties are under $30,000. Yours would be the same, and you would never feel them.

Is the private power company really concerned about what you will lose in taxes if you establish a P. U. D.? No; it is really concerned about what you will gain in profits.

DO P. U. D.'S LEVY TAXES?

They tell you that thousands of dollars in taxes have been imposed by P. U. D.'s in Oregon. Not many thousands, my friends, because P. U. D. law in Oregon prohibits the levy of more than 2 mills on each dollar of assessed value. This is to be used for organizing and development expenses, and ordinarily ending as soon as revenue begins. Just as soon as a public power distribution system gets into action it becomes a money maker and levies no taxes. It is so exceedingly profitable it makes no fuss about taxes. Milton, Canby, Cascade Locks, Forest Grove, McMinnville, plenty of places in Oregon, can open their account books to prove this to you. That little preliminary tax to start you up in business is nothing compared to savings in rates beginning the very first year. It will be spent to help you—by your own friends. The tax argument is just a bogey put up to scare you. I never heard that the people of Baker were particularly timid. I do not know why anyone should expect them to be cowards now and run from a bogey. Remember, too, that the rate reductions so widely advertised in Oregon have all been forced by Bonneville and by threat of public ownership. If you vote yourselves into helplessness, there will be no more rate reductions.

RATE REDUCTIONS

In this same circular, put out by the private utility, rate reductions are shown. In 1925 they claim to have had an average residential rate of 8.46 cents, and they claim to have reduced that to 3.88 cents per kilowatt-hour, still twice as high yet as Canby rates, and Canby now has $20,899 in its surplus fund, and no debts. Remember, when you vote, friends, that the 3.88 cents, the average residential rate in Baker County, is 20 times what your P. U. D. will pay, wholesale, for power. The private utility is still exacting excessive profits on the electric energy they are delivering through your meters. Your people are not able to afford all the current they could use.

DOES PUBLIC OWNERSHIP COMPETE WITH PRIVATE BUSINESS?

This is not a case of the Federal Government "competing with its own citizens"; it is a case of a private monopoly fighting to control the citizens and hold the rights which belong to the public. It is the greatest private monopoly the people have tolerated—to their own undoing and their own great loss.

A community which votes for a public cooperative electric-distribution system is not interfering with private business. When the private business campaigns against a P. U. D., that private business is interfering with the community. The community has the sole right to determine who shall run its most profitable business, which is a natural monopoly and does not admit of any competition. Except for electric power, practically every community has decided to take over the natural monopolies or public services. The only reason all our communities have not taken over the electric monopoly is that the electric monopolies beat them to it. The private utility companies are not locally owned and not locally controlled. The profits go to absentee owners who do not live in the community and who contribute nothing to it.

A P. U. D. is nothing more than a cooperative organization to distribute electric power. It is similar to a city government or a school district. It is no more socialistic than a public school, a public road, a public fire company, a public sewerage plant, or a public water plant. The only difference is, and that is why private business attacks the P. U. D.'s, that the P. U. D.'s make so much money for the people. Profits make the difference. Under a cooperative system the profits go to the people of the community, to whom they rightfully belong.

The private company has no large investment in its Baker County properties. The community gave that company its values, which the community created. The private company has no rights there which are not given by the community. This election is for the purpose of determining whether you give these large profits to someone else or whether you take them for yourselves.

PROFITS FROM PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

There are many kinds of profits under public ownership—reduced rates, wider use of electricity, and rich earnings, even under low rates. These earnings pile up so that at the end of a few years the city actually owns its entire electric system, free of debt, and still coining money.

Public ownership builds community capital. Any community which continues under a private system is not buying anything of permanent value when it pays its rates. It is subject to higher rates, absentee control, skimpy use of electricity, and never owns anything. A community which invests in a P. U. D. has its rate payments applied on ownership. It is like buying a house through rentals. The rates are immediately reduced, and even those low rates make it possible to own something. The public-ownership locality is building something.

There is no guesswork about public power. Its success is not doubtful. Successful operation has been demonstrated. Any section which votes to continue under private ownership votes its belief in its own incompetence. Certainly Baker County has people just as competent as the people elsewhere in Oregon who have faced this power issue and made a success of public ownership. There are people ready to manage the system who are just as competent as those who have operated the private utilities.

The labor employed would undoubtedly be the same or even more, because of the extension of the system. The conditions under which labor works in public systems have been made fully as advantageous and usually even more so, than those in private systems.

DO PUBLIC-UTILITY DISTRICTS OPERATE?

Those anxious to make profits out of the electric business in Baker County tell you that public-utility districts never operate; that people vote them, but they never amount to anything. Now, if that were true, I am sure they (the private companies) would not bestir themselves to attempt to block a public-utility district. It costs them thousands of dollars to campaign against a public-utility district. If it were true that public-utility districts do nothing but levy taxes and never sell electricity, there would be no use of a campaign against them. They point to Union County as an example of delay. I suspect that the citizens of Union County may be awaiting your vote to determine joint action in negotiations. Delay in other public-utility districts in our section has been caused partly by the fact that private power systems and the public-utility districts do not cover the same territory, but overlap, so that negotiations must be conducted by several public-utility districts jointly. The first step is not so easy as are the later steps.

The facts of the case are that there are 28 county-wide public-utility districts in the State of Washington serving about two-thirds of the State's population. The cities and public-utility districts there have been successful. They got an earlier start. They have financed the purchase of private electrict properties by issuing bonds, payable solely out of utility revenue. They have reduced rates; they have set aside moneys to be used in the communities in lieu of taxes. Their low rates have served as yardsticks which have compelled millions of dollars of rate reductions by private companies.

Oregon just passed its revenue bond law in 1939. Our public-utility districts in Oregon are getting ready to operate, and they will be humming very shortly.

WILL THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DO IT FOR YOU?

I hear that the private utilities have been telling the people of Baker there is no need for voting a public-utility district, because the Federal Government will buy and operate the local electric distributing systems. That might not be constitutional. The Government wholesales electric power. The only legislative provision even discussed is that the Bonneville Administration be allowed to acquire the private holdings for the purpose of selling or leasing them to the public power organizations already formed to distribute electric current at retail. No responsible person ever suggested that Bonneville should operate local distributing systems. The business of the Bonneville Administration is to generate current and carry it over transmission lines to its retail market. If Bonneville should be authorized to buy private systems, Baker County could not profit unless it had formed a public-utility district to distribute electricity locally.

STATE HYDROELECTRIC COMMISSION ESTIMATES

Competent, reliable, and neutral engineers of the State Hydroelectric Commission say that in 30 years, without considering any changes in rates, the public-utility district will pay for itself, set aside a depreciation fund sufficient to keep the properties efficient, pay taxes on the same basis as the existing private companies now pay, and give the people of Baker County a total net gain of $3,426,877—almost unbelievable, but easily proved. Every user will make savings in rates, and thus he will become part owner in valuable property.

Have confidence in that report of the Oregon State Hydroelectric Commission which followed the duty given it by law and made a careful report on the feasibility of a public-utility district in Baker County. That report, made by competent engineers, showed that over a 30-year period you could accumulate a surplus of over $2,000,000. Is not that "acres of diamonds"? If you do not earn it on a public system, the power company will earn it on a private system.

HIGH RATES AND LOW POLITICS

Why are rates cheaper under public ownership? Partly because the public system borrows money more cheaply. Also because the public system needs no slush funds, no advertising, no contributions to the Edison Electric Institute, and no large payments to owners off in the East.

THE TWO WORST THINGS ABOUT PRIVATE UTILITIES ARE HIGH RATES AND LOW POLITICS—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP TAKES THE POWER BUSINESS OUT OF POLITICS

The final appeal of the private companies will be made to you over the radio. It will be dictated by self-interest and private profits. They surely have a right to be heard, but the basis of their arguments should be clear to all concerned.

Citizens of Baker, the streets and roads belong to you. You have given the use of them to the private utility and outside interests for their financial benefit. Through your gift, they have for many years enjoyed a perfect business; you have paid for it. Buy them out; pay a reasonable price for the equipment that you can use; take it for yourselves, and you will own the finest business in Baker County.

It is an assault upon your sovereign rights for them to attempt to coerce you into continuation of that valuable grant or franchise. The time has come to have and to hold for your own well-being the right to provide and distribute electric current to your citizens. By retaining this right you will secure for yourselves great profits through cheaper rates and accumulated capital investment. Baker County's richest gold mine is the electric current distribution system which should belong to its people.

ACRES OF DIAMONDS

If there are questions I have not answered, I am sure you will find them answered in the Baker County edition of the Oregon Grange Bulletin. Many other points I have covered in my speech, Acres of Diamonds, mailed to some of you and available for anyone.

You remember the famous lecture about the man who hunted the world over for diamonds and came home and found acres of diamonds right on his own farm. That describes it.

LET'S USE BONNEVILLE

Bonneville gives us our acres of diamonds, and they are brought to our doors by the Government.

Town and country are united in this project. Any city which tries to shake off the country people will soon find itself rather lonesome. Together they can bring untold benefits to the community.

CANBY POINTS THE WAY

Eighteen years ago I became Governor of Oregon, and at that time the little village of Canby, about the size of Haines, was just getting under way to distribute electric energy cooperatively. The town has never owned a generating plant. It has always bought its electricity wholesale—first from a private company, now from Bonneville. During the intervening years, this village of about 1,000 people has paid for the distributing plant and all the debts on the water plant. They have paid just about one-half the rates charged in Baker, and they have a cash surplus in their treasury, surplus earned from their power plant, of $20,899.

I would hate to think that my friends of Baker were not as intelligent and enterprising as the citizens of Canby.

I put their story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4000, a few days ago.

Remember, when you go to the polls on May 27, vote "yes" for Baker's P. U. D.

Local Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

LETTER FROM NEBRASKA STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Nebraska State School Boards Association:

THE NEBRASKA STATE SCHOOL
BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
May 19, 1941.

Hon. CARL CURTIS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Association of School Board Members sees evidence every day of a growing effort to intrench Government relief agencies in positions of an educational nature. We believe that many of the educational projects carried out by Federal relief set-ups may have some value, but we believe that they should be kept at an absolute minimum for the following reasons.

1. The W. P. A., the N. Y. A., and to a lesser degree the C. C. C. were organized as relief and work projects and should, especially in the case of the first two organizations, be confined to that field.

2. Each of the three organizations has a separate administrative and supervisory staff of high-salaried people who are unnecessary and in many cases not trained or successfully experienced in supervisory and administrative work.

3. The instruction in some of these educational projects is in some cases carried on by unqualified and uncertified people.

4. The cost per individual in each of these three separate agencies is tremendous when compared to the cost per pupil in the public schools. This will be borne out by figures, if they can be secured.

5. There is a crying need for greater Federal aid for schools in the South and in the Middle West, because more children per capita may be found in these areas and less wealth is found in these areas. If even a fraction of the funds now expended in W. P. A. and N. Y. A. educational projects could be allocated to the schools, it would enable them to do much to improve their vocational education. We would further point out that there already exists in each State a department of public instruction. There is absolutely no need for two or three other supervisory agencies. However, we would favor a strict accounting by the Federal Government for all funds expended. This could be done with a very small fraction of the present administrative and supervisory officers employed under W. P. A., N. Y. A., and C. C. C.

6. We further believe that there is being conducted determined effort to centralize the control of educational forces in agencies which have their centers in Washington. We believe that this centralization of educational efforts is not in keeping with good democratic government, and we believe that people will greatly oppose it when they become acquainted with the real situation.

7. We believe these agencies when operated as educational projects are not in harmony

with the theory of democratic, locally controlled education.

This organization opposed educational projects conducted under W. P. A. and N. Y. A. We would also urge careful investigation for the claims that have been made for education in C. C. C. camps. We would urge that in every camp a report be made on the number of these boys who are actually productively employed and who show evidence of real training. We would urge a study of the cost per individual trained in W. P. A. and N. Y. A. educational projects. The W. P. A. and N. Y. A. projects were set up as relief work projects. They should be kept in that field for we believe that their efforts in the field of education have been wasteful, inefficient, and contrary to the principles of American public education. We urge the allocation of funds now expended in W. P. A. and N. Y. A. educational projects to the use of the public schools in the Nation in order that the opportunity for public education be equalized and that the funds result in training by people who are properly certified and qualified to carry on the education of American youth.

Under existing conditions, unless something is done to support the public schools and eliminate competition from political and bureaucratic organizations for funds, we foresee a time when free public schools, the bulwark of democracy, will be pushed into the background to make way for agencies whose primary purpose is to promote special interests and bureaucratic control. We urge you and every other Congressman to do all in your power to remedy this situation. We are not opposing relief agencies organized for the benefit of the unemployed worker but we do stand opposed to the use of such agencies as a screen for building up two or three additional educational systems.

Respectfully yours,

W. F. HEMPHILL,

Secretary-Treasurer, the Nebraska State School Boards Association.

Joint Session of Pennsylvania State Legislature Celebrates Americanism Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania observes May 1 as Americanism Day, and that day is celebrated throughout the State by fitting and appropriate ceremonies.

The legislature by resolution unanimously adopted set aside a part of the afternoon of April 30 for a joint session of the house and senate and arranged a most interesting program in anticipation of the following day's State-wide observance of Americanism Day.

It was my very proud and happy privilege to join with the legislature, the Governor and his cabinet, various State officials, and my colleague, the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, and to participate in those ceremonies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address, which I delivered on that occasion:

You have graciously invited me here today to participate with you in these ceremonies in the anticipation of tomorrow's observance of Americanism Day.

You have asked me to say a few fitting words. This is difficult, for great men, great Americans, have spoken great words for their beloved America long before any of us were born.

So let me as an humble man speak a few humble words today.

We are gathered here this afternoon, not as partisans but as patriots, not as lawmakers but as citizens. We have assembled here not to denounce others or to speak too boastfully of our own accomplishments but rather we have come here to speak earnestly together as Americans.

The American ideal is not one of great riches, buying a lavish progress from servile nations.

The American ideal is not one of power, tramping feared and unmolested throughout the world.

The American ideal is not that we shall all be kings but that we all shall be free men.

Our forebears and our comrades fought that they might have as good a chance as any and that all might have as good a chance as they.

They fought that they and their children—and their children's children—might have a homeland which would set a new course in the world, a course of decency, friendship, and democracy.

They had in mind no marble halls or dainty luxuries.

They had in mind work-hardened hands, modest comforts, proper rewards for their leaders and a dignified decency of life for their followers, including even the least fortunate.

They fought that their son's dreams, that your boy's dreams and my boy's dreams, might come true; they sacrificed for a country where he might gain the ambition and the desire of his heart.

They struggled so that their aspirations, their aims, their impulses, their very life might have expression. They loved this country and this land for the opportunity which it gave them—whatever might have been their origin—to rise to the fullness of manhood.

They gave this country a new philosophy of Government, founded upon the theory that government to be practical and to be ultimately successful should be conducted in the interest of all the people and be participated in by all the people regardless of their station in life or their ownership of property. They believed that the entire people could be trusted to do justice better than any one man or group of men. For such a theory makes for safety in government and for orderly progress instead of revolution.

Officers of the American Legion, Post No. 51, and of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 47, of Uniontown, Fayette County, are with us here today. And it is just and proper and fitting that they are. For it was in that western city of Pennsylvania that Americanism Day was first conceived by the veterans of that community.

Some of their comrades never returned from the fields of France, and too often do we hear it said that their struggle was in vain. All too frequently has it been said—and I might add, said sneeringly and disparagingly—"they died to make the world safe for democracy."

Well, my fellow Pennsylvanians, I believe they died to give us a respite to carry on the American ideal; to carry it on toward a perfection for which we must always strive. Those patriots and our forebears died to make or to preserve our Nation.

They died to protect our freedom and our liberty.

They died, whether 25 or 165 years ago, to insure that the children of today and tomorrow and next year—children as yet unconceived and unheralded—might live in the American way.

They died that we might have a free America in 1941, whose greatness we might be free to observe tomorrow.

But let us not boast of our Americanism unless Americanism is truly in our souls. We intend to preach Americanism tomorrow but what is it?

We know it does not exist, that there is no such thing unless it is in our souls.

It is the spirit of our country. It is the never ending searching of the mind and the heart and the soul for an ideal, for the thing that is better. It is high in the heavens and has come to us from the very throne of the living God.

You are men of the people, the makers of laws, the living symbols of our democratic way of life. You are the people's representatives, and into your keeping is entrusted the safety, the welfare, and the liberty of the people of Pennsylvania.

But you have a greater responsibility even than this. A more sacred trust has been imposed upon all of you. For in the soul of each of you is a spiritual quality which represents your Americanism. It is finer and better than the individual himself. It is that quality which makes us discontented to stand still; which compels us to push ever forward and onward; which prompts us to strive for perfection and the unattainable.

That is the very essence of Americanism, for America is truly an aspiration.

We must secure it within our hearts, every last one of us; we must develop a passion for Americanism, not only because Americanism is the living, vital spirit of this Nation, but because it is one of the most uplifting things that has come to man's soul from our omniscient Creator.

On the European Continent today democracy, the kind of democracy so sacred to us in America, is dead as a doornail, "gone with the wind."

There are only two basic systems of government in the world today. One is the theory of natural rights, and that is democracy. The other goes by the high-sounding title of totalitarianism.

It all boils down to Americanism versus the other thing—call it communism or nazi-ism or fascism—but it is easier to say liberty or tyranny, right over might.

In the fateful struggle which has enveloped practically the entire world, in which the destiny of civilization will probably be determined, the issue is clear, for the ideals which we cherish have been shattered and destroyed and trampled into the earth in foreign lands.

The fight is for the vindication of the individual, if need be, against the world; the triumphant proclamation of God in your conscience; the complete blackout, the final destruction of all "isms," with their cold, brutal absorption of men and women in the remorseless schemes and ambitions of a soulless state.

A few years ago the President saw the danger ahead and spoke these words: "America hates war. America hopes for peace. Therefore America diligently searches for peace."

What has happened in the world since the President uttered these words? Peaceful peoples who sought and hoped for peace—just as we do—have seen their countries overrun by the mad dogs of nazi-ism, their freedom and liberty and way of life destroyed.

During those fateful months, before the war, the President was striving for world

peace. He raised his voice time and time again in an effort to halt the mad rush of foreign dictators. He endeavored to calm them before the world became embroiled in this present mess. He sought to have them settle their difficulties around the conference table.

But the dictators heeded not. They closed their ears to reason. They turned their backs on God and marched their mighty legions to the four corners of the European Continent.

After war was declared the President labored to avert a similar tragedy in the western world.

Again and again the President warned the American people of the smoldering fires abroad and of the need for adequate defense at home only to have his opponents accuse him of warmongering.

During those years your President had the vision and the foresight to warn America to build its defenses, and yet the opponents of his foreign policy ofttimes reached into the garbage cans for political hatred and abuse.

I believe it is high time to throw off the cloak of complacency, forego our smug security, and cease minimizing the dangers of economic and military aggression on this side of the Atlantic.

Why? Because there is a very real danger, a living, actual menace. Let us not be lulled to an eternal sleep by an appeasement refrain.

Each conquered nation in Europe was deliberately encircled by the Axis Powers before the pincers were applied and invasion attempted. And during the process of encirclement, the misguided isolationist groups of each of them counseled against the risk of helping their neighbors. Hitler, therefore, embraced them individually and with little difficulty finally conquered a continent.

Don't disregard these vivid lessons taught by recent European history. Don't say, "It can't happen here." It can.

Two years ago, the Nazis were hundreds of miles distant from Turkey and Suez and Dakar and Syria. Now they, too, are encircled.

Liberty has been blitzkrieged on the European continent and hate and intolerance have ascended the throne where once reigned freedom and justice and human happiness. But even more important, democracy and Americanism are on trial in our own land.

Undercover organizations are fanning the fires of hatred and sowing the seeds of discord and appeasement among our people.

They work quietly, desperately, busily, to stir up and spread throughout the land false doctrines, crude and cruel hatreds designed to split our Nation and obstruct and slow up our national-defense efforts.

These subversive elements, alien in their origin and foreign in their loyalties, are penetrating into every activity of our people. They have attached themselves to peace groups, joined civil liberty organizations, wormed their way into pacifist committees, associated with those who preach prejudice and intolerance. They have played race against race and religion against religion, and have had the effrontery to participate in the affairs of civic and patriotic organizations.

Our people are ofttimes contaminated because they do not realize that we are at the crossroads; they do not yet comprehend that total victory for the Axis Powers in Europe lengthens the shadow of war across the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific.

With what joy Hitler and Stalin and the military of Japan must witness the progress of their emissaries in dividing our people; in fact, they are giving generous space in their newspapers and periodicals to every attack made upon the President and his foreign policy by Americans of high and low estate; every utterance of the appeaser brings new rejoicing to the dictators; every vicious assault upon the White House is sweet music to the Communist and the Nazi.

What large comfort these derogatory and abusive attacks upon the President and our Government give to Hitler, for it plays right into his hand. He joyfully joins in the struggle to divide our people and soften America.

If Britain falls, America stands as the final safeguard for democracy.

The foreign policy adopted by your Government has been predicated upon such premises. We desire and we hope to maintain peace in the Western Hemisphere, but we have not been blind to the forces of war and destruction which were let loose upon the world. We are building our defenses strong and impregnable so that we will be secure from any attack.

I believe that this Nation has arrived at the very definite conclusion that there can be no just and lasting peace anywhere in the entire world—or for that matter any free or democratic way of life—if the forces of aggression are triumphant in this war.

And, therefore, we have thrown the entire industrial and economic strength of our Nation on the side of democracy and freedom.

I do not believe that Great Britain is fighting our war, but I do contend that Great Britain is fighting for a just cause, a democratic cause, and as long as she holds out the Western Hemisphere should be safe from any frontal attack. And I believe this to be a cause and a war in which we are vitally concerned as to the outcome. Yes; I am convinced, too, that it is in our national interest that she survive.

How can we enforce the Monroe Doctrine with a one-ocean navy if she goes down tomorrow; how can we possibly preserve the American standard of living if all the rest of the world is doing business with slave labor; how can we maintain the free way of life for ourselves if all the rest of the world is in bondage?

How can we live alone and compete and survive in a dictator-ridden world unless we, too adopt a dictator economy and build and maintain continually a military machine equal to theirs? How can we avoid the maintenance of an armed camp in America for generation upon generation? And how can America's business and American labor stand up under the appalling and hitherto undreamed-of taxation which must inevitably follow?

That there is a certain risk involved in doing what we have done, I admit. But there would be a much greater risk in doing nothing in the face of a combination of dictator nations which have already overrun 14 independent countries. Your Government has charted the course for America, and there can be—there will be—no turning back. We have determined that we must not—we will not—be encircled as were those 14 fallen nations; that we must not—that we will not—allow the gaping jaws of the dictator's pincers to snap shut on the United States of America, for we recognize the character of this world aggression; we recognize that it is a living menace, not only to the American way of life but to Americanism itself.

The President has held true to this course, and I believe this course is least likely to lead us over the brink of war—is most likely to preserve the American spirit from crucifixion upon the swastika of hatred which the foreign infidels have prepared for it.

America has become the world's hope that the spirit of democracy will continue to live and breathe and flourish; it is the champion of liberty and religion and right as against tyranny and might and intolerance. Hers is the voice which carries comfort and faith to peoples all over the earth who, though in temporary slavery, still cherish and believe in and hope again for freedom.

May God in His infinite goodness and wisdom prevent the horror of war from spreading over here. May He watch over the American spirit which itself came from His bountiful heart. May He give our President the strength and courage to carry on and spare him to keep us at peace and lead us all out of the maze of world destruction, this valley of death and tears, into the bright sunlight of hope and faith and contentment.

Hovering about us here today, consoling us, counseling us, must be the undying spirit of our fathers and of all those who have served America in the years that have fled, for they all had a burning passion for their beloved country and an all-consuming hatred for oppression and aggression.

My friends, let us hold high the flying banners of faith and loyalty and courage, sure of the nobility of our cause, sincere in our devotion to principle; let us on the morrow, Americanism Day of 1941, rededicate ourselves to the American spirit and make America more worthy of all our dreams.

Galveston—Romantic and Greater Galveston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY ROSELLA H. WERLIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Galveston on the Gulf shore of Texas has long been noted as a pleasure resort as well as a great commercial port, daily visited by the ships of the leading maritime nations of the world. The city is situated upon an island known in legend and in song as Treasure Isle. It is connected with the mainland by two causeways across the bay, 2½ miles in length.

Three large military fields have been established on the mainland within a few miles of Galveston. In these fields and in the permanent military and naval establishments in and near the city, more than 100,000 men are being trained in the arts for the defense of this country.

These defense establishments are being visited daily by the relatives and friends of the men engaged, coming from nearly every State of the Union. They are all, of course, interested in the splendid pleasure and recreational facilities afforded on the beach along the 7½-mile sea wall and promenade in front of the city.

Mrs. Rosella H. Werlin has written a very interesting historical and descriptive sketch of Galveston. It is of general interest, and especially to those contemplating a visit to their relatives and friends in the military service. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include Mrs. Werlin's interesting article.

GALVESTON—ROMANTIC AND GREATER GALVESTON

(By Rosella H. Werlin)

Bathed by a glowing sun, fanned by the chameleonlike waters of the foamy Gulf of Mexico—azure in the sunlight, silver in the

moonlight—swept by the continued fragrance of countless species of tropical foliage—multicolored oleanders, scarlet poinsettias, snow-white magnolias, roses of every hue and blend, honeysuckles, jasmine—nature truly did love Galveston to shower it as it did with these most glorious of beauties known to man.

Historically, this island city dates back to 1528 with credit falling to Cabeza de Vaca as the first white man to touch these shores. Only by 36 years did he follow in the wake of Columbus' immortal trans-Atlantic achievement.

Then in 1686 that French explorer La Salle laid claims to this land for his kind and country, naming it San Louis. But this proved a short-lived honor; for in 1777 the area succumbed to Spanish sway with the glorification of this achievement—which later translated itself to Galvestown and finally to Galveston.

Nature and destiny joined forces to make Galveston what it is today. Approximately 32 miles in length and varying from 1 to 2 miles in width, this island lies about 2 miles off the southeast shore of Texas in the Gulf of Mexico.

Galveston's role is inseparably linked with the exciting story of the Lone Star State and its colorful rule under the following six flags: Spanish, French, Mexican, its own Republic, the Confederacy, and the United States.

Here the second Republic of Texas was set up in 1836, and here President Burnett and his Cabinet established headquarters until the announcement of the victory of the battle of San Jacinto—a story which every Texas schoolboy knows by heart—when Texas freed itself from the yoke of Mexico, April 21, 1836.

The present Galveston celebrated its one hundred and second birthday last December 9, dating its inception from the purchase of this area from the First Congress of the Republic of Texas by Col. Michel B. Menard. He then organized the Galveston City Government, which is now recognized as the oldest surviving association in the State.

Galveston's noted wide streets and broad boulevards persist as proofs of the founder's architectural genius and keen foresight. In planning the city, Menard furthermore set aside ample tracts for such public institutions as schools, hospitals, parks, playgrounds, and esplanades—making for an ideal cultural and social center.

His own century-old home, The Oaks, still stands today as a landmark of yesterday's grandeur and a shrine for all those steeped in Texas lore.

Because of its natural harbor and ideal setting, the city early enjoyed a wave of prosperity, growth, and development. Even the ill-fated 1900 storm merely served as a torch in firing its brave citizens with a more determined spirit of forging ahead undaunted.

Securing the services of an engineering board, with the aid of city, State, and Federal funds, as well as private capital, approximately $13,000,000 was expended in completing three projects which rank among the greatest of engineering achievements in the United States. Only recently with the serious flood damages on the northern seaboard, Galveston's accomplishments were cited as a model example for study purposes.

These included, first, the building of a solid concrete, 7½-mile sea wall, ranging from a height of 17 to 21 feet, and built upon piling driven into the ground for 40 feet. Paralleling the Gulf of Mexico, this wall not only serves as a protectorate but provides an ideal boulevard 100 feet in width for passing throngs and motorists. It offers a colorful rendezvous, indeed, for the thousands annually flocking to this resort.

Secondly, followed the gradual process of grade raising, with the entire city being filled in with sand to the level of the sea wall's height. Here, again, the spirit of its loyal citizens was evidenced when its property owners willingly contributed further finances and cooperation in fulfilling an arduous task of several years' duration and which involved millions of dollars.

Thirdly, came the completion of a 2½-mile causeway—one of the longest in the world, linking this island to the mainland at an estimated cost of $3 000,000.

As a means of further handling that rapidly increasing traffic parade, another $2,500,000 causeway, financed through county, State, and Federal aid and paralleling the first one in location and construction, has just been completed. Not many cities, if any at all, of Galveston's size can boast of two arteries of such magnitude and grandeur.

Incidentally, it was in 1901, shortly after the reorganization, that Galveston established a commission form of government, with a mayor as city manager, assisted by four commissioners. Still functioning under this same system, Galveston holds the distinction of having the first and oldest commission form of government in the country.

Commercially, Galveston maintains the unique position as America's port of quickest dispatch, its natural harbor providing a 40-minute steaming outlet to the sea. Here a docking facility of 37 piers affords space for 100 oceangoing vessels and here a range of 69 steamship lines, including the well-known Clyde-Mallory Line, flying flags from every nation, ply in and out the harbor.

What a vision as proud ocean liners, their mighty turbines throbbing, slip into the quays with travelers from overseas; as tramp ships, shouldering the spray, plough down the channel to Cairo, Singapore, and Capetown; as little fishing vessels, the mosquito fleet, put out to Bolivar Point at sunrise.

Galveston holds title as the world's largest sulphur port, one of the largest cotton ports, as well as for handling more grain and flour than all other Gulf ports combined. Here, too, is situated the country's largest export grain elevator, with a storage capacity of 7,000,000 bushels, the Galveston Wharf Co.

Here, a thousand and one cargoes come and go, including steel, iron, and, oh, yes—bananas—lots of bananas. Two of the world's largest banana companies use these facilities all the year 'round.

The Intracoastal Canal, a valuable adjunct to the port of Galveston, makes it possible for shippers to send bulk cargoes by waterway to and from all navigable river or canal ports in the Middle West and East.

Five trunk-line railroads are at Galveston's disposal, including the State's oldest railroad, which was organized and incorporated here on February 7, 1853, and is still operating under its original charter. The Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railroad, employing hundreds, maintains its main headquarters here.

Galveston also has an excellent airport.

Among the city's permanent industries are included Texas' only nail and wire manufacturing company, the State's largest brewery, a flour mill, rice mill, iron foundries, cotton-bagging firms, 6 insurance companies, Affiliated National Hotels—the second largest system of hotels in the United States, operating 35 hotels, totaling over 10,000 rooms, in 10 States—and 10 concentration and warehouse companies.

The county of Galveston embraces a large section of rich agricultural land, with field and truck crops constituting an important source of income.

This area has also recently struck oil, with several large oil fields now actively in operation.

Galveston leads the State with many "firsts" and "oldest," a few on its roster being the Galveston Daily News, oldest newspaper, established in 1842, having also the first telephone; the first hospital, St. Mary's Infirmary; the oldest medical school, which is a branch of the University of Texas; the first training school for nurses, established at John Sealy Hospital in 1894, the first orphanage; the first privately owned bank as well as the first national bank; the first gas lights; the first cotton exchange and board of trade; the first Y. M. C. A.; the first chamber of commerce; the first post office; and the first customhouse, with Gail Borden as collector of the port.

Incidentally, it was here that this same Mr. Borden invented condensed milk.

Besides, Galveston ranks tops as a playground and sportsmen's paradise.

Here the beauties of nature or the bounties of man's nurture ever beckon—depending on one's mood and inclination, one's taste and temperament.

Treasure Isle—that's what Galveston is called.

Here summers cool and winters mild, combined by a year-round even temperature, make this a rendezvous for the traveler seeking relaxation or the tourist in quest of recreation—its annual mean temperature hovering at 69.9 degrees.

Here a variety of diversions stir the blood to action—bathing in the rolling Gulf, boating, golfing, hunting, horseback riding, and fishing. A variety of 51 edible fish tempt even the most amateur of nimrods, whereas for the expert angler tarpon aplenty venture to these shores.

Or here one may revel in sheer relaxation, lounging on the glittering beach, by basking in the sunlight, perhaps watching with delight the ever-present clusters of sea gulls as they gracefully wing their way about, noisily chattering to each other—or perhaps beholding the more tame ones swoop down and nip off morsels of bread extended them by friendly hands.

The free-from-pollen salty Gulf breezes make Galveston a haven for hay-fever sufferers, its colony numbering persons from the country over.

For the lover of the esthetic, the boulevards with overhanging bushes of varihued oleanders offer a picture of rare enchantment. Ranging from the most delicate tones of pink to the deepest shades of orange—nowhere else do they flourish in such profusion. Periodically, new specimens spring into being—the latest named in honor of the President's visit—blending from a soft golden tint to a deeper hue of bronze.

Galveston is known as the Oleander City.

But it is romantically that Galveston plays one of its most thrilling roles.

For it was on these very shores that the South's most famous and glorious pirate—Jean Lafitte—set up headquarters. Calling this area Campeachy, he built himself an imposing castlelike mansion, from where he defied the world for 4 hectic years, living like a lord in feudal splendor, until 1821.

Here he issued orders to prey upon Spanish vessels, relieving them of their golden cargo, and to levy tribute on commerce in the Gulf—a privilege accorded the buccaneer by virtue of letters of marque furnished him by Mexican revolutionists. This was the hour when the Mexicans were attempting to break away from Spanish rule. And Lafitte waxed prosperous—extremely so.

But one day the steel grip slipped and his men captured and burned a United States merchant marine. Lafitte apologized and even hanged a man or two as proof of his "honorable" intentions. But after a second offense, Uncle Sam refused to be content and demanded his complete abandonment from these parts.

Legend has it that in the still of the night, he and his men did slip away, burying their entire fortune underground near what is now called the site of the Three Oaks. Perhaps he planned to return to claim the stake, but

death is said to have overtaken him in Venezuela in 1826. He left no heirs.

And though a century has passed, sagas of buried treasure still continue to drift up and down this seaboard. And there are those who say that when the moon rises above Galveston Island like a ground round golden ball, and the green waves kiss the shore in the silver light, the ghost of Lafitte walks these sands again, his wide cape whipped by the tropical winds, his sword and cutlass glittering in the moonlight, and his lean, tanned face ever toward the sea to feel the beat of the winds against it, with the whip and tang of salt sea spray against his sailor's breath.

That's why Galveston is known as Treasure Isle.

Menace of Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

LETTER OF HON. SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter by former Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill from the New York Herald Tribune of May 26, 1941:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, May 26, 1941]

MENACE OF DEBT—LOCAL CLUBS SUGGESTED TO COMPEL ECONOMY

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Your readers probably need nothing more than your able editorials to remind them of present debt and tax burdens. But what of the future? And have any of your readers ever figured out their share of these mounting public debts?

Let's begin with the city of New York. According to the World Almanac your municipal debt is $2,428,400,000. That is approximately $329.03 for every man, woman, and child in New York City. Or, $1,645.15 for each family of five.

Next, there's the State of New York. The debt is $490,172,000. That means $36.65 more for every human being in New York City. Or $183.25 for each family of five.

But the worst is yet to come—the Federal debt. At present it is $47,231,000,000. Your city's share is $2,652,686,502, which is $359.43 for every person in New York City, or $1,797.15 for a family of five. Each billion dollars of public debt takes $7.61 out of the per capita pocket of every person in New York City.

Now combining the Federal, State, and municipal debt, the share of each man, woman, and child in New York City would be $725.11, or $3,625.55 for a family of five.

Long before the present emergency is over the Federal debt may be $100,000,000,000. And some Washington forecasts reach $140,000,000,000. When the debt reaches $100,000,000,000, New York City's share would be $5,616,377,099. Should it reach $140,000,000,000, New York City's proportion would be $7,862,927,939.

The Nation cannot scrimp on defense and preparedness, but it can and should economize elsewhere. The Committee for Constitutional Government has compiled debt-burden data covering communities of various sizes throughout the Nation. It urges citizens everywhere to bestir themselves by urging their Representatives in Congress to prune and pare the ordinary Budget as Mr. Morgenthau has suggested. The ordinary expenses of the Federal Government should and can be cut $1,000,000,000 annually, but it is unlikely that Congress will act unless citizens speak emphatically.

That they may speak emphatically on this and upon other matters which vitally affect our form of government and our system of competitive enterprise, our committee favors the organization of local constitutional clubs. This organization, which is chartered in the District of Columbia and is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, educational institution, will be glad to hear from responsible, public-spirited citizens who wish to form local affiliates. Further information on this subject and upon public-debt burdens may be had by writing to the Committee for Constitutional Government, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL,
Chairman, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.
NEW YORK, *May 18, 1941.*

Hawaii and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. KING
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL W. KING, DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the substance of the following address made by me before the Washington Medical and Surgical Society, Washington, D. C., at its spring banquet held May 10, 1941 at the Mayflower Hotel:

I am happy to be here tonight to have this opportunity of discussing with you some of the problems of the Pacific area. My subject is Hawaii and the national defense. Recent developments and the tension throughout the world make the subject one of general interest.

Of course, I realize that the general American public has always had a friendly interest in Hawaii as a glamor spot, an exotic, tropical land of the hula and the ukulele, which came under the American flag somehow or other about the time of the Spanish-American War.

Perhaps our tourist bureau oversold the glamor of Hawaii in its desire to attract visitors to the islands, and rather left a distorted picture of America's outpost in the Pacific in the minds of the average mainland citizen.

But I do not desire to destroy all of your illusions about Hawaii; nor undo all of the splendid work of our tourist bureau in making our mainland compatriots Hawaii-conscious.

Hawaii is a beautiful land of great mountains, deep valleys, and high plateaus—of beaches and coves and rugged cliffs. Above all, it is a green land—hillsides and valleys and coastal plains alike verdure covered all the year 'round. It is a grand place to play, to loaf, or to work.

The climate and the humidity are subtropical rather than tropical. Lying in the middle of the North Pacific, the surrounding ocean and the trade winds from the northeast mitigate the full effect of the sun. Our thermometer never reaches 90° F. and rarely goes below 60° F. The average range is from 65° to 85°, a mean of 75° F.. Easily accessible heights bring colder temperatures, until at about 5,000 feet elevation we can enjoy—if that's the word—frosty mornings; and on our highest mountains go skiing in the snow that covers their peaks.

The average citizen of Hawaii, while enjoying life perhaps somewhat more leisurely than his mainland equivalent, does, however, work for a living and is preoccupied with the pressing problems common to us all. From our industry, as a part of the economic life of America, over a hundred million dollars' worth of commodities are produced and sold in mainland markets, about 60 percent of which is sugar, 35 percent pineapples, and 5 percent miscellaneous, including coffee and other products. With this income we buy from mainland factories and farms all that we require to maintain an American standard of living.

Being included within the American tariff barriers we spend our money exclusively in home markets. The United States Treasury gets its share of this interstate commerce in Federal taxes to the tune of several millions every year, a larger amount than that paid by any one of a number of States, varying from 12 to 19. Over the years this contribution—if the Bureau of Internal Revenue's collections can be called a contribution—has exceeded Federal expenditures in Hawaii for local purposes in the ratio of four to one, a total credit of over two hundred millions in the forty-odd years since we became a part of the United States. Our trade, as an offshore unit of the Nation, helps maintain an American merchant marine, only American vessels being permitted to carry our goods and passengers to and from other American ports.

So much for the economic picture, important to us locally and therefore of some concern to the Nation, to the extent that we are a part, even if but a small part, of that Nation. But it is in the strategic field that we become of vital importance to the Nation, and a matter of concern and interest to every American citizen.

A glance at the map of the Pacific tells the story. Hawaii dominates the North Pacific. It could hardly have been better located for America's purposes than if we had selected the very place in the ocean for Pele, the Hawaiian goddess of volcanoes, to spout forth her lava from the sea's great depths. It lies closer to the continent of North America than to any other large body of land. Its ownership by a foreign nation would present a continuing menace to the United States as a possible base for an attack on the west coast. Its control by the United States, while advancing our frontier 2,000 miles into the Pacific, is on the whole a defensive asset, because of the great distances from Hawaii to any foreign nation. It is therefore as the western outpost of our defense that Hawaii is invaluable.

From Honolulu, to the north and east, within a radius of less than 2,500 miles, every day a shorter distance in time, lie the principal ports and bases of the Pacific coast, from Alaska to Mexico. From Honolulu, to the northwest, through west, to the south, within a 2,000-mile radius, lie islands that are ideally located as advance bases of our western outpost. The early naval visitors to Hawaii recognized this strategic location, and suitability as a naval base, from which a fleet could control all the approaches to the west coast of America. Because of their reports, and America's other interests in the islands, Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State in 1842, announced as the policy of America, the

benevolent interest of the United States in the destiny of the then Kingdom of Hawaii, and warned other powers to keep hands off. From Webster's time to 1898, the drift of events and the ties of trade and commerce brought Hawaii ever closer to its great neighbor. The Spanish-American War simply hastened the inevitable, and consummated through voluntary annexation the incorporation of Hawaii as a part of the United States.

Fortunately, Hawaii contains, besides the advantage of its position, a great land-locked harbor on the island of Oahu, in which an entire fleet can be berthed for repairs and the replenishment of supplies. Also, in the Hawaiian group there are roadsteads and other anchorages in which the fleet can lie at anchor, ready at a moment's notice to proceed to sea and seek the enemy.

Over the years since 1898, at a steadily increasing pace, these natural facilities have been improved and equipped, until today Pearl Harbor is one of the great, if not the greatest, fleet naval bases in the world. Its docks and piers, its repair shops and stores, its ammunition depots and fuel supplies, will keep a fleet ready for action at all times to intercept any attack on our Pacific coast.

As the use of air forces has increased, the Pearl Harbor base has been augmented by air bases, both in Hawaii and advance bases in the islands nearby, forming an arc that covers Hawaii from the northwest to the south. Midway, 1,200 miles to the northwest; Wake Island, another 1,000 miles in approximately the same direction; Johnston Island, 700 miles southwest; Palmyra Islands, about 1,000 miles due south; and now American Samoa, also south, about 2,300 miles from Honolulu, form a screen of naval air bases through which no enemy can expect to pass without detection. Some of these bases will also harbor submarines, whose operations will further hamper any enemy approach.

For the protection of this great naval base from raids or from an attack in force when the fleet might be elsewhere, the Army has made of Oahu one great fortress. The Hawaiian Department of the United States Army, complete in all arms—air forces, both bombing and fighting; coast artillery, field artillery, motorized infantry; and the various specialized combat troops, all under one commander, a lieutenant general—is prepared to fight off any attack. The military force of the United States Army in Hawaii has been increased as the demands of modern warfare showed the need for new arms and new methods and is today, if not completely up to full strength, so close to it as to present but a minor problem of logistics.

The military picture, therefore, in Hawaii is highly satisfactory. I speak as a layman and make no pretense of being an expert because of my 20 years' service in the Navy. It is a matter of public information that in Hawaii we have shown some foresight and have prepared ourselves in large degree for what may come. Hawaii is today about as impregnable a fortress as human ingenuity can make it. Some parts of the full program of defensive works are still under construction, some equipment and manpower may yet be needed, but military preparations, any more than any other human activity, are not ever-static, and such supplementary increases and additions will always be necessary. The important fact is that the main job is done, and Hawaii is ready as America's outpost to serve its purpose—to harbor the fleet and to protect the fleet base against any eventuality in the Pacific.

Our defenses in other areas of the Pacific are perhaps not quite so nearly completed. But in Alaska, at Dutch Harbor, on the island of Unalaska, a great naval air base is being built which will, together with Pearl Harbor and Midway, close this northern approach effectively. Other bases, both naval and Army, will provide the defenses, too long overlooked, to completely block this side door to America.

Now may I go back again to Hawaii itself, the green-clad land of romance and charm, in the euphonious Hawaiian phrase "ka pae aina o Hawaii nei." Hawaii is more than a military outpost, as proud as its people are to fill that function. As large as Connecticut and Rhode Island together, a fruitful land, blessed by nature with many great advantages, where human industry has developed a stable economy, supporting 400,000 people, Hawaii will always be the home of several hundreds of thousands of American citizens, producing its quota of the national wealth, paying its share of the costs of the National Government, as well as maintaining at its own expense its local government. Wars come and go, but humanity goes on forever. Sometimes peace reigns, and our thoughts return to the vocations and interests of peaceful pursuits. It does not increase Hawaii's efficiency as a naval base to disregard the reasonable aspirations of its people. It will not hinder the value of this outpost to accord its people the same treatment, no more nor less, that would be accorded any other group of American citizens similarly situated.

The great American people whose word is the final law, have a right to know about Hawaii, and about its citizenry, because we, in this Pacific Territory of the United States, do hold the fort for the Nation. Too often lately there have been articles and even books about Hawaii that would imply that all was not well in the paradise of the Pacific. Usually such statements are based on misinformation or only partially correct information, and are written from the viewpoint of those who desire to write dramatically, without too much regard to accuracy.

There are two or three pet bogeys which our critics emphasize, the principal one being the racial constituency of Hawaii. We are a mixture of races, of course, just as America as a whole is a mixture. Lack of immunity to the diseases of civilization nearly destroyed the native Hawaiian people. When immigration apparently became necessary for the expanding industries of Hawaii, it was just as inevitable that such immigration should come in the main from the Orient as it was that Europe should send its people into America to fill its empty places.

Now there is no need for any further immigration, and our task is to weld together into one common allegiance all the peoples of our Nation. In this task Hawaii has done better than many other parts of the country, and our people, regardless of the country from which their parents came, are, I assure you in all sincerity and with the utmost emphasis at my command, as loyal to the United States as any other like number of Americans.

There are less subversive activities in Hawaii, less teaching of un-Americanisms and ideologies than in many other parts of the Nation. We are in more danger from "sixth columnists" than we are from "fifth columnists." The "sixth columnists" who preach hatred and suspicion between Americans, array race against race, class against class, and who use race as a test of patriotism rather than character and behavior, cause more disunity than the disciples of totalitarianism or the agents of foreign governments. Perhaps that is equally true on the mainland.

True, we have the transitory evidences of recent immigrations in the continued use of various foreign languages and the retention of some old country customs; but this is a common practice with all immigrant groups throughout the United States. Time changes all these hold-over habits; the younger generation accepts the American pattern of life; and in a very few years, as the life of a nation is measured, our immigrant people are indistinguishable from the older stock.

Of course, I know that the principal point of attack on Hawaii's loyalty as an American community is its Japanese population. Some utterly ridiculous statements are made as to their numbers, their activities, and their conduct. In fact, they comprise about 37 percent of our total population. About 8 percent are aliens, denied by our own laws from being citizens, an elderly group, rapidly passing off the scene through natural causes. The remainder, about 29 percent, are citizens by birth; about one-half of whom are still in their childhood, comprising a group almost entirely of the second generation native-born. They are, without the shadow of a doubt, as loyal as any other Americans. Perhaps I can best support this affirmation of my own conviction by quoting Lt. Gen. Charles D. Herron, for many years on duty in Hawaii, and until recently the commanding general of the Hawaiian Department of the United States Army. In Collier's Weekly of October 19, 1940, General Herron authorized the following direct quotation:

"The Army is not worried about the Japanese in Hawaii. Among them there may be a small hostile alien group, but we can handle that situation. It seems people who know least about Hawaii and live farthest away are most disturbed over this matter. People who know the islands are not worried over possible sabotage. I say this sincerely after my years of service there. I am sold on the patriotism and Americanization of the Hawaiian people as a whole."

It is not sufficiently realized that Hawaii is not only the western outpost of our military defenses, but is also the outpost of American culture and civilization, and has been such for 100 years or more. American missionaries brought Christianity to Hawaii in 1820. From that time on the influence of America and of its institutions spread steadily and thoroughly throughout every phase of Hawaii's life.

We adopted universal, free, and compulsory public education when Dr. Horace Mann was a prophet without honor in his own country. Our business firms were founded by men from Boston and New York, and later California. Our legal practice is based on the common law, and our governmental institutions are modeled after the best mainland practice. English was the language of Hawaii before annexation, taught in the public and private schools and used throughout the islands.

This pattern of American life, this devotion to American ideals, caused President McKinley to say, in transmitting the treaty of annexation to the United States Senate with his approval: "Under such circumstances annexation is not a change, it is a consummation."

No alien influences, no ineffective agents of foreign governments, whose activities are undoubtedly known to the agents of our own Government, can change Hawaii from the American way of life. The principles of liberty and justice on which this Nation is founded have too strong a hold on the hearts and souls of the people of Hawaii to permit any divergence from the straight path of loyalty to the Nation of which we are so proud to be a part. Our future lies entirely within the American orbit. As a part, and not a mean nor an unimportant part, of this great Nation, we expect to fulfill our destiny in the traditional American manner, a destiny which can have only one ultimate goal for a community such as ours, set off as we are into a separate and distinct entity, self-reliant and self-sufficient in our local affairs, and contributing our full share to the national welfare, and that is Statehood.

Congressional Redistricting in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

RESOLUTIONS BY THE CITY COUNCILS OF EVERETT AND MALDEN, MASS.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Everett hereby go on record as protesting the gerrymandering methods being pursued in the redistricting of the congressional districts of this Commonwealth, if the method being pursued is carried through democratic government as it is understood in our Commonwealth will have been utterly disregarded and the rights of minorities as guaranteed by the constitution of Massachusetts violated, we urge a fair and honorable redistricting with due regard for the rights of all our citizens.

The city clerk is hereby directed to transmit copies of the foregoing resolve to President Goodwin of the senate, speaker of the house of representatives Christian Herter, Representatives Davis, Whittier, and Skerry.

COUNCILMAN DEVITO.

In common council, May 5, 1941, passed.

In board of aldermen, May 12, 1941, passed.

This resolution was presented to his honor, the mayor, for his signature on May 14, 1941, and at this writing has not been returned by him with his signature. He has until May 25, 1941, in which to sign.

RESOLUTIONS BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF MALDEN, MASS., TO THE GREAT AND GENERAL COURT

Whereas the Constitution of the United States declares that a census of the Nation be taken every 10 years; and

Whereas a census was taken in 1940 showing a decrease in the population of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

Whereas, as a result thereof, said Commonwealth of Massachusetts will be represented in the National House of Representatives in 1943 and for the next 10 years thereafter, by a delegation of 14 Members instead of 15 Members; and

Whereas the Great and General Court of said Commonwealth of Massachusetts shall construct 14 new congressional districts comprising 308,000 people of the population for each district; and

Whereas, there have been published proposals for redistricting said Commonwealth of Massachusetts into 14 congressional districts; and

Whereas, if said proposals were enacted into law, they would constitute gross inequities, dishonest politics, autocratic misuse of power in an attempt to carve out one of said districts for the sole benefit of one man; a vicious disregard of the franchise and a bold attempt by a political party to control the people in the National House of Representatives: Be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Malden, in a regular meeting held in the council chamber of city hall in said Malden on the evening of Tuesday, May 13, in the year 1941, does most respectfully implore and importune the Great and General Court of said Commonwealth of Massachusetts in its wisdom and fairness to construct 14 congressional districts based on a logical, compact grouping of cities and towns with similar interests; and be it further

Resolved, That the great and general court guard itself against establishment of boss rule by diabolical political interests who would establish congressional districts predicated on party control by linking cities and towns together that are dominated by one political party; and be it further

Resolved, That the great and general court, in its wisdom and fairness, guard itself against the dismemberment of cities and towns whose majority of voters are of other political extractions, to enhance the political ambitions of any one man who is so undemocratic and un-American in his tactics as to boldly attempt to carve out a congressional district for himself; and be it further

Resolved, That in this period of contemporary history where daily the world is being apprized of brutal assaults on small nations; where a mighty military machine is stamping out liberty and freedom and the sacred right of the franchise; that Massachusetts is in the forefront for the preservation of democracy and will not countenance such tactics in these times; and be it further

Resolved, That the wishes of the voters for adequate and equitable representation in the National House of Representatives be complied with; that as a result of the redistricting the charge of evil political manipulation cannot once again be raised against our great Commonwealth; that Massachusetts has forever repudiated the dubious honor that has been conferred upon her for being the birthplace of the nefarious and diabolical gerrymander.

Public Ownership and Distribution of Electricity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

LETTERS BY HON. WALTER M. PIERCE, OF OREGON

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, public ownership of essential public utilities is being considered in many sections of our country. In the Pacific Northwest, the movement has been greatly stimulated by the availability of power from Bonneville Dam. An election for a public-power district recently took place in Baker County, Oreg. I wrote my friends there, giving some of the reasons for supporting the project. I desire to include that letter as a part of my remarks and to add to it my reply to an adverse editorial in a Baker paper:

FRIENDS IN BAKER COUNTY: As many of you know, I have made a study of the electric-power business and was at one time an operator of a company In this letter I am replying to those who have written to me in regard to the important subject of voting "yes" or "no" in your public-utility district election, May 27. Certainly, you must inform yourselves. My printed speech Acres of Diamonds, answers many points raised, and I have prepared a radio statement in reply to other queries.

You are being charged an extortionately high rate for electric energy. Even with reductions, forced by the threat of public ownership, you are still paying double what you will pay if you organize your own public-utility district.

The Bonneville transmission lines are now in Pendleton. Money has already been appropriated and allocated to construct the lines across the mountains into Union County, which has voted the public-utility district. If at this election you vote down the public-utility district, you will set back your own county many years—and for the benefit of whom? The absentee stockholders of the private utility. City people will surely swing along with the country people rather than to throw them down for outsiders.

The roads and streets of Baker County belong to you. Pay the private company for that part of their equipment you can use. They claim a tremendous investment. Much of that money has been very unwisely invested. I know for I invested part of it myself.

There is not a private plant operating in Union County that can continue to operate in competition with a Bonneville rate of $17.50 per kilowatt-year, and I think the same condition exists in Baker County.

Forest Grove has standing idle a modern $100,000 generating plant, with Diesel engines, because they can buy Bonneville power cheaper than they can manufacture electric power with the cheapest of fuels.

An opportunity of this kind comes once in a lifetime. Should you vote down the public-utility district, the Bonneville transmission lines will stop in La Grande. You cannot afford to see your neighbors and friends in Grande Ronde Valley benefiting from Bonneville power, furnished there as cheaply as at Hood River, while you remain a vassalage of private interests and pay twice the rates paid by those who seized this great opportunity.

At the rates offered you, hundreds of electric pumps can pump water for irrigation. Byproducts of lumber can be used. This country needs the strategic metals that are in the Baker hills. They can be made available with cheap power. Without it, they will lie unused. The ores can be reduced through electric furnaces right there because your public-utility district can sell you Columbia River electricity at a rate that cannot be duplicated anywhere in the United States—$17.50 per kilowatt-year.

One of the strongest financial companies in the United States, the Aluminum Co. of America, has already invested millions of dollars at Vancouver, Wash., for the purpose of electrically treating alumina, which is made in Mobile from bauxite brought from South America to be transformed into aluminum where electric power is cheapest. They pay heavy transportation costs and haul ore thousands of miles to reach Bonneville power. That company already has under contract more than half the electric energy generated at Bonneville and is clamoring for more. They want to monopolize Bonneville as they have Niagara.

Do not let the private utilities, for their own gain, deceive you and mislead you. Remember, their chief campaigner advised the companies not to be "afraid of the expense—the public pays." You are footing their bills now, while they fight your right to your own business. Do not let them get control of all the power of Bonneville.

Fortunately for you, under my own amendment, half that power is reserved for cooperative associations, until January 1, 1942. If you organize now, you can contract for it before the time expires. No one else can do that for you. Bonneville can, by law, sell at wholesale only. Public ownership does the rest.

The year I became Governor, the little town of Canby, about the size of Haines, was just getting under way to distribute electric energy cooperatively. Since then Canby has had rates of about one-half of what you have paid in Baker. They own their plant, which is free of all debt. They have always bought power wholesale, but have been enabled to make greater rate reductions since contracting for Bonneville power. They have $20,859 surplus in their treasury. I would hate to think that my friends of Baker County are not as intelligent and enterprising as the citizens of Canby.

There is no record of bankruptcy of a public power plant. They usually help to pay the other public debts. Winnepeg shows a capital and surplus of $42,888,330.

No wonder those who are working the gold mine are making a desperate fight to save it. Remember, that mine belongs to you.

WALTER M. PIERCE, M. C.

To the Editor of the Baker Herald:

I have read with absorbing interest your editorial published in your valuable paper of Tuesday, May 13, 1941.

For the future prosperity of Baker, still I urge that at this time, while you have the opportunity, you make arrangements to distribute Bonneville power cooperatively by voting your public-utility district on May 27. The question before you is not which way you prefer to get Bonneville power but whether you will get it at all.

DEBTS

Your first objection to the public-utility district is that you are in debt; therefore, you must vote "no." If that were a valid objection, this Government would cease all defense expenditures and aid to England, because this Government is heavily in debt. Baker, you say, is in debt; therefore, do not buy a new fire engine, although it may be five times as effective as the old one. All those who have felt the grinding weight of public or private debt agree with you that debts should not be piled higher, except for pressing necessities.

The first and most pressing question always is, when creating a debt, either public or private, "What is to be done with the money"? Will the income pay interest and amortize or pay off the debt within a reasonable time? If the debt be public, one of the questions asked is, "What advantage is it to the community; what civic value has it"?

You mention the city natatorium of Baker. Well, the good citizens of Baker could have known before investing their money in a bathing establishment that money so invested was always lost. The "investment" was made for welfare and not for gain.

If the citizens of Baker had exercised foresight and forethought, and had taken over the electric light system for one-half million dollars, which if I remember correctly, was what the Eastern Oregon Light & Power Co. paid, they could have owned something of real financial value. If you had done so, your city debt would now be paid, and you would own your own distributing system free of all obligations. You allowed a gold mine to be sold for a song, and you have paid dearly ever since.

My dear Mr. Editor, you display your lack of knowledge of the electric-power business when you compare a bathing establishment with the distributing of electric energy.

The roads were a good investment. They could, however, have been built with very much more economy. They were built too rapidly, without sufficient knowledge and often with bad engineering, like the original road down Burnt River Canyon. Ten million dollars could have been saved the State of Oregon if Baldock, present highway engineer of Oregon, had been allowed to push, earlier, his plan of holding macadam with oil. Yes, the roads are a good thing, but we paid mighty dearly for them.

RATES

I notice that you are not convinced that the rates will be lower. "There are none so blind as those who will not see." Figure it out for yourself. The Government, through Bonneville, offers you power at $17.50 per kilowatt year. A kilowatt is 1,000 watts, and that offer means that you can have 25, 40-watt lamps burning 365 days and nights, for 1 full year, for $17.50, with that power delivered to your two substations in Baker on the low side of the transformer. Your ordinary storekeeper does not use that much current. Of course, that is the wholesale rate.

Figure it another way: The cost is less than 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. Take a 40-watt lamp. You can burn it 24 hours a day for 1 full month for 6 cents, two postage stamps—of course, a wholesale rate. That is the price for which your public-utility district can buy Bonneville power.

An ordinary 10-horsepower motor will take a little over 8 kilowatts to run it. You can run a 10-horsepower motor a night and a day for 38 cents, or for one 8-hour shift for a little over 12 cents.

I repeat for the thousandth time that the cost of electricity is not in the generation; it is hidden in the distribution. You in Baker are using power possibly brought from Black Canyon or American Falls in Idaho. Both of these plants were constructed by the Government with reclamation money. Both have been turned over for operation to the Wall Street utilities. That power can be generated in the Snake River and at Black Canyon just about as cheaply as it can be generated at Bonneville. There is very little difference. The profits are in the distribution. Because the distribution is in the hands of a private utility, rates were kept high. I would never advise the operation of an inefficient plant. I am sure that neither plant in Union County can operate against a Government rate of $17.50 per kilowatt-year. I am not so sure about the generating plants in Baker County.

"BUSTED" POWER COMPANIES

You never heard of a "busted" power company that had been properly managed. Yes, they have gone broke, but by manipulation, as is the case of the Portland plant. Compare Portland with Tacoma or with Winnipeg, Canada.

I have just received today a certified report from Winnipeg, a city which owns its own power. Their rates are, and have been for 25 years, about one-half of what yours have been in Baker. The city has a population of 100,000. They generate their own power by hydro. They have quite an expensive and long transmission line. The entire plant has cost more than $42,000,000. They have charged off the deadwood, and the value of the property now stands on their books at $28,129,197. Take their sinking fund and apply it on their debt and they owe only $9,000,000. You could not buy it today for $50,000,000. They have done all that practically since the E. O. L. & P. has been furnishing you juice in Baker. They have paid taxes every year, and they have charged about one-half the rates that you have paid.

The last report shows that they are using 4,912 kilowatt-hours per installed meter. I do not know what you are using in Baker, but I presume about 1,000 kilowatt-hours per installed meter. A recent report from Portland shows that they are now using 1,518 kilowatt-hours per installed meter. Think of it! In Winnipeg, Canada, they are using nearly three and one-half times as much electricity per meter as they are using in Portland, Oreg., and nearly five times as much as you are using in Baker. Why? Because electric energy in Winnipeg, Canada, is cheap. They have not gone broke. Neither has Tacoma's public plant. Portland's private plant is bankrupt and has ruined thousands though it operated in the richest territory in Oregon. Did that have such fine management?

Publicly owned utilities definitely present a better financial record than those privately owned. The reason seems to lie in the fact that the privately owned utilities in the United States have become the prey of holding company manipulation, speculation, and management.

LABOR

There will be plenty to do for all the employees of your present company as public-utility districts always try to employ the capable, trained men who know the system. Should you vote your public-utility district, you will do twice the business you now do, and more.

JUST LOOK AROUND AT THE PUBLIC PLANTS

You are not convinced that rates are lower under public power plants? On behalf of the House public power bloc of the Seventy-seventh Congress, I hereby offer to pay your railroad fare to Eugene, Forest Grove, or Canby if you will go to one of these Oregon cities, spend a day, study the plant, examine the books, and then return to Baker and write an honest account and publish it in the same detail as you did your editorial. I will personally pay your hotel bill if you will make that trip. You certainly need an education.

The Eugene record ought to cause every editor in Oregon who pleads the cause of the private utilities to blush with shame. The citizens of Eugene are no more intelligent than those in Baker, but they had different leadership, and they informed themselves and were free people.

About the time the E. O. L. & P. acquired your distribution system, Eugene, then about the same size as Baker, commenced to distribute its power and generate it on the McKenzie River. They are out of debt, or practically so. You could not buy their plant for $5,000,000. Their rates are less than one-half of what you pay in Baker. Baker had this same opportunity but threw it away for "a mess of pottage."

INTEREST

I see interest bothers you. Indeed, a Baker P. U. D. can borrow money at a cheaper rate than any private utility. Should you vote your P. U. D., you will be able to borrow money by pledging only the revenue. A public power plant in Los Angeles taught the financiers of the East that nothing was safer than utility bonds, with revenue, alone, pledged to pay interest and amortization.

TAXES

I am surprised that an editor of your intelligence and ability should again bring up the tax bogey. Can you still believe that the money paid into your county treasury by the private utility came from outside of Baker County? Do not forget this public-utility district is to be your organization, the same as your school district and the same as the city. It is not "another private utility." You state that the E. O. L. & P. paid $7,100 franchise tax. Your public-utility district can pay the same thing; they will get the money from the same people—the rate payers; and your public-utility district can pay much more because, when you own your own plant, you will not need to donate, as private utilities donate, freely to political activities.

You state that the public-utility district has possibilities for political favoritism. What about your city government? What about your school district? The only difference is that your public-utility district will make money.

WATER AND DEADWOOD

A private utility never reduces its obligations; it adds to them. The statement of the E. O. L. & P., through their own report, should convince any fair-minded man that there is "something rotten in Denmark." They state that in 1915 they paid $8,820 and now they pay $124,000 taxes. We all know that there

has been very little advance in property taxes since 1915. Then their tremendous tax increase must have been in income taxes. It proves to any unbiased person that the private utility has an enormous and increasing income, and has enjoyed it for 30 years.

Do you expect the E. O. L. & P., will voluntarily squeeze the water out of their capital? I do not know how much water they have. I do not know how much deadwood is carried on their books, nor how much they are overcapitalized. Take a ride with me down Pyles Canyon into Union. You will see an old transmission line which I built more than 30 years ago.

You can always tell my line by a short cross arm at the top of the pole extending in only one direction with one wire on it. That line cost $1,000 a mile to build. I carried it on my books for $1,000; sold it for a thousand. It tied Grande Ronde Valley with the Rockcreek plant, for I owned at that time one-third of the Olive Lake contract, and I needed the power.

Close to that line, approaching it in several places, you will see a new line—better construction. I am told it brings the power from the Snake River and Black Canyon and connects up with American Falls. I have been told that the line stands on the books of the E. O. L. & P. at $15,000 a mile, and the insulators on the cross arms have a value, on the books, of $90 apiece. They are just bits of hardened clay. Of course, the new line cost more than mine, but not 15 times as much. The rates you pay are based on these inflated values.

When I bought the distributing system in La Grande, I paid $10,000 for an abandoned plant on the Grande Ronde River. There was an old building there, a dam, and a water wheel not in use. A fire burned the building; the dam went out in a flood. When I sold the Grande Ronde Electric, that old plant went in at $10,000. I wonder if it is still carried on the books of the E. O. L. & P., and if it has been for the past 30 years. This is the kind of "investment" that rate payers have been paying interest on everywhere, Baker and Union Counties not excepted.

These lines were built about a third of a century ago. Is it not about time that we had an honest-to-goodness evaluation of these properties which formed the capitalization for the private utility?

BUYING ELECTIONS WITH MONEY

You wonder why Spokane and Clatsop County voted against the public-utility district. The reason was the use of money in unstinted amounts by the private utilities to deceive the public. We have sworn testimony and a report from the Federal Power Commission that more than a million dollars has been spent by the utilities in Oregon and Washington in the last 5 years to kill the public-utility districts. The Federal Trade Commission here in Washington has another report that their investigation showed that the Edison Institute, which speaks for the utilities, spends between twenty-five and thirty millions annually to put over their plans and prevent public ownership of electric utilities. The public is misled by propaganda.

THE GOVERNMENT CANNOT OPERATE LOCAL SYSTEMS

Your last objection is prompted by the fact that you suspect Congress will pass legislation which will take from you the burden of distributing the Bonneville power. Rest assured, my dear editor, you never can get the advantage of the cheap Bonneville power unless you distribute Bonneville power cooperatively. That statement about the private power company passing on the benefits of Bonneville cheap power is just the bunk. Under their system of distribution and organization there would be no benefits.

There is no truer representative of the people and of public power than Senator BONE, of Washington. He knows all the tricks and schemes of the private utilities. He has not introduced the bill about which so much has been said, but no bill can provide for the Government operation of any local system. No one ever proposed such a plan. It would be unconstitutional. There is merely discussion about acquiring entire systems to resell to local public districts. Any such bill may have a rather rocky time being passed through the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Do not rely on Congress to do the detailed work for you. You must show some indication that you are willing to meet the issues yourselves. It is true that Congress remembers very vividly that the Commonwealth & Southern sold their properties in eastern Tennessee for $20,000,000 more than they were worth. There is not going to be any repetition of that in the Pacific Nothwest.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Think of what the Columbia River and its tributaries can do for our favorite Pacific Northwest. This marvelous power stream and its tributaries can be made to develop from feasible hydro projects 20,000,000 kilowatts. That is one-half as much power as is now developed everywhere in the United States. Can you not realize the "acres of diamonds" that lie all around you?

For long years I have believed that the Wall Street special interests would steal the Columbia River. I still fear that will happen. They are so selfish, so unscrupulous; they have so much money and know how to use it for false propaganda; it is so hard for the people to organize, and there are so many doubting editors, like yourself, that the odds are long in favor of the private interests. Oh, what a shame if our magnificent heritage should go to Wall Street interests as Niagara went to Mellon.

The Aluminum Co. of America is now firmly entrenched just below Bonneville. Your opportunity to claim, as a matter of right, your share of the one-half of the power of Bonneville, which was reserved for public organizations until January 1, 1942, depends on this election. Of course, if you declare you do not want the cheap power of Bonneville in Baker, that is your privilege and you can shut it out. It is now in Pendleton, and it will be in Grande Ronde Valley. I have seen to that part of it.

Never have the words of Shakespeare been more applicable:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat;
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures."

Ninth National Eucharistic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, world-wide attention will be focused on the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul during the ninth national Eucharistic congress, June 23 to 26, 1941.

The central figure at the 4-day assembly will be the papal legate to be appointed by His Holiness Pope Pius XII as his personal representative.

A total of 130 archbishops and bishops and 10 abbots already have accepted the invitation of Archbishop John Gregory Murray, of St. Paul, to attend the national congress. Ninety-five of the archbishops and bishops will come from points in the United States, 10 from Canada, 5 from Mexico, and 1 each from China and Jamaica.

More than 150,000 persons from outside the St. Paul Diocese are expected to journey to the Congress to join the 300,000 Catholics within the diocese.

Since 1881, when the first international Eucharistic congress was held in Lille, France, there have been no less than 34 such events. The most recent was at Budapest, Hungary, in 1938. three international Eucharistic congresses have been in the Americas: Montreal, Canada, 1910; Chicago, United States of America, 1926; and Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1934.

Explaining the origin and significance of a Eucharistic congress, the Very Reverend James M. Reardon, pastor of the Basilica of St. Mary, Minneapolis, and general chairman of the Congress, said:

The material side of a congress is easily visualized. We have been accustomed to hear of congresses of various kinds. The idea which the word generally calls to our minds is that of a gathering of politicians or scientists, but we know that an orderly assembly of people brought together for any specific purpose constitutes a congress.

In the present case there is question of a Eucharistic congress, of an assemblage which centers and focuses its activities on that divine institution, the Holy Eucharist, the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. This is the central idea of a Eucharistic congress, whether its scope as regional, national, or international.

World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

LETTER SUPPORTING H. R. 3318

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter written to me concerning H. R. 3318, to extend domiciliary and hospital care to World War veterans of the United States merchant marine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]?

There was no objection.

WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

APRIL 26, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR D. HEALEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEALEY: The Congress now has before it H. R. 3318, which you were

so kind to introduce. When enacted, this bill will authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish domiciliary and hospital care and medical treatment to World War veterans of the United States merchant marine. It is plain that a grave injustice has been done these veterans who served so splendidly during the World War; the Congress has failed during all these years to properly and adequately recognize them. It is my sincere hope that the present session of Congress will rectify this injustice.

The young men of 1917–18 who enlisted and served in the all-important and vital service of the United States merchant marine have never received any recognition for their service, which service was deemed of such importance to our country that the Sixty-fifth Congress appropriated $6,250,000 for recruiting and training men.

It was President Woodrow Wilson who issued the call to the young men to enlist in the United States merchant marine. He said: "It was a patriotic duty of young men to join this important service. The men who go down to the sea in ships have become an important factor in our national life. Their services are extremely essential in handling the ships to carry our soldiers in safety to Europe, in transporting the munitions and food supplies for their maintenance, and the material for the sustenance of the armies and peoples of the countries with which we are associated. No more honorable or serviceable task can come to any of our people than that of manning our merchant marine."

Secretary of War Newton D. Baker said in 1918: "Service in the merchant marine is absolutely vital to the success of winning the war. You can confidently say to the young men who have enlisted in the merchant marine, it is a matter of great delight for me to be able to come as in a sense responsible for the Army and say that the Army needs just this kind of cooperation. The War Department has a very deep interest in the recruiting of seamen for the merchant marine so that that great calling of the past and very necessary calling of the future may have permanent outlook. I have recently returned from Europe, and I had an opportunity to observe the sailors, the movements of the cargo. In the first place, I will say to you that a vital necessity of the continuance and increase of the American military abroad for the purpose of winning this war lies in adequate cargo transportation adequately served. So that if there be any patriotic obligation upon men anywhere to win this war it rests upon all of us who are in any degree associated with the business of getting Europe the supplies which are necessary for the maintenance of our great Army over there. Therefore it is one of the highest patriotic obligations. Our military operations in Europe are, of course, constantly on the increase. The increasing capacity of our troops, transport ships, and cargo ships enable us to place in Europe a very much larger number of troops than have hitherto been placed there."

Admiral Sir John Jellicoe, of the British Navy, said in November 1918: "The officers and men of the American merchant marine have founded during this war a new and glorious tradition in the teeth of undreamed of peril. While there has been glory and official honor for the Army and Navy, merchant sailors have been taking their chances down in the forehold and in the lifeboats and on pieces of wreckage in the freezing North Atlantic waters."

Rear Admiral William S. Sims, of the United States Navy, in his lecture before the Lowell Institute, on December 11, 1930, praised the officers and crews of the American merchant ships who transported supplies across the Atlantic during the World War. Admiral Sims said, "The skill and seamanship of these sailors was something that amazed naval officers, and they proved themselves to be seamen in a sense that naval officers never have the opportunity to become. The courage, initiative, and a sense of responsibility, skill in handling ships of all types, and noteworthy seamanship characterized the merchantmen. I'd like to see a bunch of 30 naval officers trying to handle 30 heterogeneous ships as the merchantmen did. Without the merchantmen's skill, courage, and loyalty the war could not have been won."

While rightfully there has been glory, official honor, and recognition for those who served during that period in the Army and Navy, it is regrettable that the valiant service rendered by the men of the merchant marine, who in countless instances were engaged in the same duties as the men of the United States Navy, has been permitted to go without recognition all these years since the cessation of the hostilities of the World War.

The enlisted men of the United States merchant marine in carrying out their precarious duties on the high seas were at all times subjected to the same hardships, suffering, and dangers as those enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard and the United States Navy. But, while the two latter great services of the United States have been fully recognized since the World War, the men of the merchant marine have suffered through the failure of Congress to take proper action in their behalf; that the Congress should have done so is shown by the significant fact that it was a prerequisite to enlistment in the merchant marine that the applicant be a full American citizen. This regulation, as is well known, was not in force in either the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard. Thousands of aliens were permitted to enlist in these branches of the service and are receiving benefits which are denied American citizens who served in the merchant marine.

Seamen of the merchant marine faced the piratical submarine and the torpedo, not once but again and again as a regular part of their duty, and countless numbers of them were shipwrecked, crippled, killed, drowned, or frozen to death.

The service rendered by the wartime merchant-marine sailors was of tremendous value in the proper carrying out of America's part in the World War, for it was this service that was in truth the main connecting link between our source of supply in the United States and our battling troops on foreign soil. Had the merchant marine failed in its duties it would have been impossible for this country to have brought about the final victory.

The merchant marine was a medium of contact for the fighting forces of the A. E. F. who were at least 3,000 miles from their base. The merchant marine ran the much needed troops and tonnage, rifles, amunition, planes, food, clothing, medical, and other supplies across mine-filled and U-boat infested Atlantic Ocean. These boys, for a great part were only boys, gave their all in answer to the call of their President, Woodrow Wilson. Many lost their lives; others suffered mental and physical tortures. They were the men who manned the American ships that were sent to Davey Jones' locker because U-boats maintained a certain liveliness in the high seas. They were the men who, because of a torpedo finding its mark, usually in the boiler rooms of the ships, were boiled alive by steam from exploded boilers and ruptured pipe lines. They were the survivors of sinking ships in the midocean whom crews of German submarines failed to aid. They were the men aboard ships whose fighting defense was a naval gun crew that did their level best to fight off an attack with guns located on the fore and aft of the ship main deck. Many times these guns were under the firing range of the guns of the U-boats. Some of the ships did not even have a gun for protection. Sometimes they ran the gantlet through the submarine zone and had protection of a convoy. These veterans were men who saw dangerous war service without an even chance to fight back.

Official records show that there were 156 American merchant ships sunk by the enemy to 19 American naval vessels in the World War of 1917–18. This speaks for the hazards that the merchant-marine men suffered.

And today in this present European war it is the merchant marine that is playing the same important part as it did in the World War of 1917–18.

Let me emphasize, H. R. 3318 does not in any way seek pensions, bonus, or compensation benefits of any kind. It simply calls for a just recognition of the valiant service of the men of the merchant marine by granting domiciliary and hospital care to those veterans who became service disabled and who find it impossible as age advances to adequately or properly care for themselves.

Don't let it go down in history that the Government of the United States failed to take care of these boys who are in need of medical care due from disability which they received while serving their country.

We hang our heads in shame when one of these veterans goes to burial, because our Government has not seen fit to furnish a flag to drape the casket of a real American.

The report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on this bill to the House committee on veterans' legislation said: "The matter of including the particular group of civilian employees referred to in the bill for hospital, domiciliary care, and burial benefits is one for the Congress primarily to determine."

So, in asking the Congress to enact this bill, we feel that we are asking that an injustice be corrected.

Sincerely yours,

WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE.

NICHOLAS CEFALO,
Legislative Representative.

It Works Best When It Works Both Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

LETTER FROM THE MISSOURI RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATIONS, INC.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter from the Missouri Retail Hardware Association, Inc., signed by its secretary, Mr. Louis C. Kreh. It is a typical example of true American patriotism, and a fine expression of the willingness of our people to make sacrifices for our defense efforts, and, likewise, a demand on the part of the people that the Government and the Congress do their part. I am most happy that the Missouri Retail Hardware Association take the position that they do.

THE MISSOURI RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 23, 1941.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
Representative,
House Office Building Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PLOESER: Officials in Washington are asking this association to use its leadership to make members of the hardware trade

realize that "business as usual" must be forgotten for the period of the present emergency.

We are glad to comply with these suggestions, for we realize that materials and productive time must be released for defense purposes and that consumers must have money with which to pay heavily increased taxes and to purchase defense bonds and that in many instances these ends can only be attained through a reduction in purchases for normal purposes.

These programs will call for sacrifices and operating difficulties on the part of businessmen, but we feel sure that the overwhelming majority will bear them willingly in order that we may safeguard our United States democracy.

But businessmen are saying, with sound logic, that Congress also must realize that "business as usual" is out of the picture for the duration of the emergency and that it should evidence its awareness of the situation by reducing to the fullest extent governmental appropriations which might be entirely satisfactory during a more normal period.

Unless there is evidence of leadership in this direction on the part of the Congress, businessmen are certain to become restive under these emergency conditions and less liable to willingly cooperate with the various programs of our Government. The action of the President in recommending a reduction in appropriations for relief is a commendable step in the right direction, but certainly goes but a small way toward effecting the economies in usual governmental expenditures which these times demand.

I can say to you with certainty that the members of this association, as well as other businessmen, will heartily appreciate the personal efforts you may make to materially reduce expenditures in other than our needed defense activities.

Yours very truly,

MISSOURI RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION.
LOUIS C. KREH, *Secretary.*

Logan-Walter Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE OREGON STATE BAR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by including a resolution of the board of governors of the Oregon State bar at Eugene, Oreg., May 17, 1941, approving and recommending the enactment of legislation embodying the principles expressed in S. 674 and H. R. 4238, commonly known as the Logan-Walter bill, which was vetoed by the President at the last Congress. The resolution follows:

Whereas the bar of the State of Oregon has heretofore placed itself on record as heartily approving the Logan-Walter bill passed by the last Congress, but vetoed by the President; and

Whereas there are now pending before the present Congress two bills which embody the principles approved by the bar and expressed by the said Logan-Walter bill, to wit: S. 674 and H. R. 4238; and

Whereas the board of governors of the Oregon State Bar, both individually and based upon the previous action of the Oregon State Bar, are of the firm opinion that the principles embodied in said pending bills are consistent with the fundamental theories of democratic government and of our established system of law and are necessary to the preservation thereof and to the basic rights of the American people: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved by the board of governors of the Oregon State Bar, That it does approve and earnestly recommend the enactment of legislation embodying the principles expressed in Senate bill 674 and H. R. 4238; and further

Resolved, That the secretary be and hereby is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

Attest:

F. M. SERCOMBE, *Secretary.*

Resolutions of Western Massachusetts Association of Mayors, Selectmen, and County Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.
May 5, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR D. HEALEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ARTHUR: Last Saturday afternoon the Western Massachusetts Association of Mayors, Selectmen, and County Commissioners, of which I am president, had the biggest meeting in its history. At that meeting they passed the two enclosed resolutions.

As a Representative of the State of Massachusetts in Washington, I know you will be interested in these resolutions and so I am passing them on to you for your information.

Yours very truly,

ROGER L. PUTNAM, *Mayor.*

Resolved, That the Work Projects Administration be continued in its present form for the fiscal year of 1942 and that emphasis be placed in the elasticity of operations with particular reference to national-defense projects;

That it is the sense of this meeting that a vote of commendation be given to the present Administrator, Denis W. Delaney, of the Work Projects Administration program in Massachusetts, for its service to the individual counties, cities, and towns during the past year.

Resolved, That the conference of mayors, selectmen, and county commissioners in meeting at Westover Field, Chicopee Falls, Mass., commends the excellent work experience training program of the N. Y. A. in Massachusetts and its assistance to our cities and towns under the able and effective direction of State Administrator John L. Donovan, Jr.

We urge the Congress of the United States to expand further this worthwhile program in Massachusetts in order that our youth may obtain needed work experience in the mechanical and other trades to prepare for the national-defense emergency.

Flood Control Needs on Fall River, S. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANCIS CASE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a statement which I made before the House Flood Control Committee concerning the needs for a flood-control project on Fall River at Hot Springs, S. Dak.

The statement follows:

FALL RIVER PROJECT, SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have spoken to several members of the committee individually, and understand that projects which were included in H. R. 9640 of the Seventy-sixth Congress may again be placed in the bill the committee is preparing, I shall not take the time of the committee for a lengthy statement. I understand also that the board of engineers has renewed its endorsement of the project which was favorably recommended in the report embodied in House Document No. 655 of the previous—Seventy-sixth—Congress. So, I wish merely to review the facts briefly and state the reason for the urgency of this project.

Fall River is formed by the junction of Hot Brook and Cold Brook, immediately above the city of Hot Springs. The river flows the entire length of the city and forms one side of the main street, known as River Avenue. The city auditorium, the county courthouse, the principal business buildings of the city, including some large stone hotels and a large hospital, are built on River Avenue, all in a narrow river canyon. This situation grows out of the natural development of the city around the springs of warm mineral water which give the city its name and occasioned its beginning.

The two watersheds which feed into the canyon above the city drain large areas of rough, mountainous country, peculiarly subject to sudden "flash" floods. The rate of run-off is indicated in the very name Fall River. It drops 25 feet to the mile, while the run-off from the mountainsides above the stream bed amounts to many times that, of course. This means that rain and thunderstorms in the mountains above the city can hurl the water down upon the city within a very few minutes and without warning. This has happened in the past and, as the Army engineers' report says:

"The occurrence of a maximum probable flood would cause damages in excess of $1,000,00 and might result in serious loss of life."

The history of recent floods gives sharp emphasis to that conclusion. In 1884, 5 years after the city was started, a flood took several lives. The engineers' estimate of probable life loss in a maximum flood is 60 lives. Floods have come with serious losses of property through the years. The city has gone

into debt many times attempting to curb the river with retaining walls. It has done all that it could. But in 1937 a flood took out the Northwestern Railroad, which came up Fall River and entered the city from the south and east. It also damaged but did not totally destroy the sole remaining railroad, the Burlington, which comes down Hot Brook and enters the city from the north and west, with yards and warehouses immediately below the junction of the streams at the north end of the city.

Aside from the very large public interest in this situation, owing to the large property and life values at stake, the Federal Government has a special and direct interest. That arises because Battle Mountain Sanitarium, a facility of the Veterans' Administration, is located at Hot Springs, with nearly 1,000 members, domiciliary and hospital cases. Battle Mountain facility is heated by a coal-fed heating system. That coal formerly came in on both railroads. Now only one remains. One feature of the project recommended by the engineers is a flood-control dam up Hot Brook Canyon that would protect both the railroad and the city. It is urgent that this be built at the earliest possible date, lest the Federal facility lose its coal service from that source, which would mean increased cost of maintenance, to say nothing of possible critical danger.

The project contemplates two control reservoirs and channel clearance and widening through the city. Each unit is needed and each will contribute definitely to solving the problem. Engineers point out that, should such a cloudburst occur as did occur in 1937 and again in 1938 and center on the mountains between these watersheds, instead of hitting one of them as happened in 1937 and 1938, a flood loss of tragic consequences would take place. In 1938 a portion of the water fell over into the Beaver Creek watershed, and, although that watercourse is in the rural area, two lives were lost. Had that water fallen on Hot Brook and Cold Brook instead of on Cold Brook and Beaver Creek, and had it come at night, scores of lives would have been lost. Hot Springs' population in the 1940 census is 4,083, instead of the 3,000 noted in 1930 and used in the committee report of last year. I earnestly urge the inclusion of the Fall River project, and want to thank you for your consideration.

Utah State Agricultural College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the commencement exercises of the Utah State Agricultural College at Logan, Utah, on May 31, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is an opportunity for which I have long waited.

As part of our pioneer lore, we learned that when President Heber C. Kimball spoke a prophecy he admonished his congregation to see that his prophecy came true. He concluded with the remark that when a prophet utters a prophecy, it is the duty of the people to see that the prophecy is fulfilled. That story is repeated for a reason.

At a meeting of the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the Interparliamentary Union in Budapest in 1936, I told the delegates from two score countries that the law creating the American land-grant colleges, with their laboratories and experiment stations was probably the outstanding single event in the educational history of the world. It marked the American acceptance of the twofold theory of education essential for the preservation of a democracy based upon a trained citizenry. The idea was this: Take the university to the people; train them in theories of government and the knowledge of economic possibilities, thus bringing a life of fullness, plenty as to physical requirements, abundant as to spiritual needs. Now, what I want you, as graduates of one of the great land-grant colleges, to do is to live in such a way that my words in Budapest will be proved true.

When the legislature of the provisional state of Deseret passed a law providing for a university, it was not doing a unique thing, but was rather reflecting that spirit of democracy in America which was felt by all wherever America caught the spirit and purposes of the fathers. Read our history. The Revolutionary period produced the ideals and theories which evolved into the American public-school system. Two years before the victory at Yorktown, Jefferson wrote his bill for the establishment of public education in the State of Virginia. Jefferson knew well the essence of democracy when he wrote, "No nation is permitted to live in ignorance with impunity," and "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." Even our experiment stations had their origin in Revolutionary times, for when Jefferson established the University of Virginia he suggested that 6 acres of land be set aside for the cultivation of "exotics of distinguished usefulness and accommodated to our climate"; then he named plants and trees of great economic value from the four corners of the globe, including teak, Indian rubber tree, and seeds from Brazil. Jefferson invited one of the great European learned societies to move to America, for he saw in it not just a new reverence, but the new birth of the desire of all nations—a civilization based upon knowledge and intelligence. Washington—and, in fact, most of our great founders—accepted this spirit, as is proved by the Ordinance of 1787 with its land grants for education.

Our national leaders at times have lost the true meaning of America and her mission to make life more abundant for men, women, and children, for Buchanan vetoed the first land-grant college act. But Lincoln, in the midst of the struggle to save what the fathers had founded and as an aid in the preservation of a civilization based upon knowledge and intelligence, saw—as Americans see today—the worth of liberty when threatened with its loss, and signed the Morrill Act, which brought us our present land-grant college systems.

Utah's educational situation today is, though, quite unique. We have not its duplicate anywhere else in our Nation, and it accounts for a scattering of Utah's youth in parts far away from home. There are, of course, other factors. But here in the northern half of our State are 3 major higher institutions of learning, feeding roughly 350,000 people. Three hundred and fifty thousand people will not assimilate the graduates of 3 major institutions. The result is that many of our leading youth go elsewhere to live. They leave at a time when their productive capacity—to a politician, productive capacity means ability to be taxed—starts, and their share of community upbuilding goes elsewhere after the State has seen them through their years of training. The loss of this leadership might in time spell comparative doom to a community. It is at least something we in Utah should be thoughtful about, but that is not to be my point this morning.

Inspired by this occasion, I accept here and now the thesis that Utah's contribution to the Nation is to develop and train the future leadership of the Nation. Why not? Have we not in our veins the blood of community builders? Have we not the heritage of American spiritual and cultural ideals? Have we not faith in God's purposes? Have we not seen the desert blossom as the rose? In the blood of every one of you flows a heritage of service to his country, his fellowmen, and his God, which bespeaks a planned and purposeful life.

"He that would bring home the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him."

Suppose, then, we accept the facts as they are. Let us say that many of you will leave Utah. If you are to fulfill my prophecy and become the leaders of the Nation, just what is this wealth of the Indies you must carry with you? What, beyond the heritage we have already mentioned, which is, after all, the heritage of any of our Utah boys and girls, is your peculiar heritage as graduates of the Utah State Agricultural College? I have said you are to be leaders of your Nation. Let us turn to Jefferson to get your particular mission in that leadership. He seemed to be thinking of the graduates of the Utah State Agricultural College and their worth to their Nation in 1941 when he wrote:

"The pursuits of agriculture are the best preservatives of morals."

"Corruption of morals in the mass of cultivators is a phenomenon of which no age nor nation has furnished an example."

and

"Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if He ever had a chosen people, whose breasts He has made His peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue. It is the focus in which He keeps alive that sacred fire, which otherwise might escape from the face of the earth."

We must have more than these simple words of Jefferson to get their real meaning. His philosophy of life, which reflects the best there is in Americanism, starts with the Aristotlean notion that man is destined for society, that his morality is part of his nature, and that there is but one code of morals for man whether acting by himself or collectively as a nation. Do we not see, therefore, that those men who have grasped the real meaning of America are those who, like Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson, have stressed the spiritual values of American life, men who have seen the spiritual mission of America in this world? Just as the American Union, in the final analysis, depends upon spiritual values for its continued existence, just so the world must have faith in the things of the spirit and accept the power of morals among nations, as we do among individuals.

On the American dollar are the words 'In God We Trust," but Americans trust much more than God. They trust their courts; their Supreme Court has no way of enforcing its will but it is the most powerful court on earth. They trust their Congress, even though Congress has the right to judge its own Members and throw out those whom you elect, to cut down your judges and impeach your President, to declare war, to take your life, and destroy your property. They trust their President with powers of unbelievable magnitude. They do all this because they know the strength of a spiritual and moral value.

As you pass through life, know this: That men who preach faith in the purposes of God, the need of spiritual and moral values preach in vain and with a devilish meaning when in their sermons they cite the teaching of Jesus, "Unto the least of these," but make fun of the poor and work to retard those who would overcome poverty. Beware of the man who preaches sacrifice, but lives his life in keeping with Cain's unkillable question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Beware of the man who preaches social service and contributions to community causes, who would isolate himself and kill all combined effort by "minding his own business."

You are, then, to be the preservers of the country's morale! But you are, too, to be the Nation's experimenters.

While in France, Jefferson wrote:

"Perhaps I may render some service by forwarding to the society such new objects of culture as may be likely to succeed in the soil and climate of South Carolina. In an infant country, as ours is, these experiments are important. We are probably far from possessing, as yet, all the articles of culture for which nature has fitted our country. To find out these will require abundance of unsuccessful experiments. But if, in a multitude of these, we make one useful acquisition, it repays our trouble."

Jefferson realized, too, the tremendous importance of this experimentation, this finding of "new objects of culture." He is speaking to you, graduates of the Utah State Agricultural College, when he says:

"The greatest service which can be rendered any country is to add a useful plant to its culture. * * * One service of this kind rendered to a nation is worth more to them than all the victories of the most splendid pages of their history."

Perhaps one example will serve to illustrate. You can give me many more:

When we were in Japan the soybean furnished bulk for our morning soup, as it did for most of the poor of that land. Since then, through experimentation, the lowly soybean has been found to have a multitude of uses, ranks with our "strategic and critical materials" in importance. It has played its part in the industrialization of our farms. It brought vital readjustment in the Corn Belt, made continued farm life possible when something had to take the place of food for 10,000,000 horses replaced by machines in the 30,000,000 crop-acres and 15,000,000 acres of pasture now made useless. I am told there is no phase of our life that the soybean does not enter.

But I am getting out of my field. You, though, have spent 4 years learning these facts. Further, you have found new plants for Utah, grasses for her ranges, desert plants to keep this glorious desert blossoming and productive. Our pioneer fathers knew the importance of agriculture; the Spanish padres knew it; you and I know it. You have chosen the agricultural college because you realize it. Your contribution is to glorify and dignify agriculture by placing it on a basis where intelligence will be rewarded, by helping the country and small-town people to enjoy social and cultural opportunities with all.

In the modern world no vocation can retain its dignity which does not provide financial independence and opportunity for cultural improvement. This means making the activities of rural America financially profitable and bringing to its people the music, art, drama, and literature enjoyed by the urban dweller. In this worthy undertaking the Government can help by constructing roads, extending rural electrification, and establishing, close to the place of production, depots for storage, reception of surpluses and stock piles; but the extent to which the Government's help is useful depends on you.

Perhaps I have just tapped the reservoir of such ideas. But that is what I want to do. You are those who are to make the reservoirs, conserve, experiment, create, fulfill a long-dreamed-of destiny.

Did I hear someone say, "This is all very well, but hardly practical. Half of us are going to be taken in the draft. The world is in turmoil. This is no time to be talking about new plants, new ideas, experimentation."

Right. These are not ordinary times. The world is turned upside down and peril faces us on all sides. Still, never did a class face so many opportunities for constructive life work and contributions to constructive planning and thinking. You are blessed to be entering upon life with such a challenge, when so many avenues of adventure and constructive service are open to you. You are facing times of danger, but youth has never feared danger; and if you will serve man and promote his welfare it is always a time of danger.

Now, when men are learning to hate one another more each day, now is the time to teach the world another way. Now is the time "not to join in hating, but in loving." What stream of thought and history this quotation brings.

It was Sophocles, back in the days of Greek drama, who caused Antigone to lament, "Not to join in hating, but in loving."

Gibbon, speaking of Trajan, in his Decline and Fall of Rome, said: "As long as men applaud the destroyers of peace, men and property more than they applaud the builders of civilization, the world will not honor peaceful developments."

On April 3, 1941, Senator ADAMS, of Colorado, declared on the floor of the United States Senate: "I pointed out to the Members that there was no difficulty in securing appropriations not only of millions of dollars but of billions of dollars if they had for their purpose the destruction of human life and human property, and if the amount was large enough; but we could not get through the conference committee an appropriation of $10,000 for scientific research."

Early in Chinese history there was an attempt at interstate organization for peace. Actually some fifty-odd states joined in a league of nations, and the period of the warring states, where struggles had gone on for centuries, seemed to be coming to an end. The prime minister of one of the largest states pointed out that peace had been maintained by a balance of power between the states for so long that that theory and that practice should not be abandoned and that anyway this—500 B. C.—was no time for experiment.

A few weeks ago a Senator of the United States, speaking in a hearing being held for the purpose of gaining sentiment in regard to the ratification of an international convention, made the claim that this was no time to present a treaty, the world was in a chaotic condition, and the leaders of most of the nations of the world would not respect a treaty; therefore, we should not ratify it. What he was saying was that we should make no stand for right because many were not respecting the right.

I might go on citing incident after incident to show that there have always been those who have been opposed to any constructive effort to better men's condition. It is never a good time to attempt to help others. Zoroaster, Confucius, the Great Buddha, and Jesus all learned that lesson.

Those were the world's four greatest failures. Jesus died on the Cross almost universally rejected. Zoroaster was so completely lost that no one knows today in which century to place him. The Great Buddha's simple teachings were so corrupted by his followers that the truths he taught and lived would have died for all time had not another revitalized some of his teachings 500 years after his passing into Nirvana. Confucius failed as a prime minister, a brain truster, a historian, a preserver of religion, a teacher of kings, and had to die surrounded by a few poor followers who accepted the simple thesis that through morality and the rectification of one's life both men and the state can be saved. These were the great failures. There are others: Washington, for he died with the unhappiness which one reads in every sentence of his Farewell Message. Jefferson, who, because he was a philosopher knew many of his efforts would fail, but who wrote before his death, "You and I shall look down from another world on these glorious achievements to man which will add to the joys even of Heaven." Lincoln and Wilson—failures, yes, when we see them living for the present as we do. But they did not live for the present. They knew that life is more than Shakespeare's Seven Ages of Man, when "second childishness and mere oblivion, sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything" "ends this strange, eventful history." They knew that life begins when one gets in tune with the infinite and makes his purposes those of his God, his country, or his fellow men.

In times like these when men must seek wisdom and guidance from those who seemed to live great missions in working out eternal purposes for man's well-being, the words of the Father of our Country ring true today, so true, in fact, that they might be words of advice to this generation. That our Nation is heeding that advice must give great satisfaction.

In addressing his fellow citizens of the Senate and the House on January 8, 1790, Washington said:

"Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention, that of providing for the common defense will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace. A free people ought not only to be armed but disciplined; to which end a uniform and well-digested plan is requisite; and their safety and interest require, that they should promote such manufactories as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly for military, supplies. * * *

"Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one, in which the measures of government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community, as in ours, it is proportionably essential. To the security of a free constitution it contributes in various ways; by convincing those who are entrusted with the public administration, that every valuable end of government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people; and by teaching the people themselves to know and to value their own rights; to discern and provide against invasions of them; to distinguish between oppression and the necessary exercise of lawful authority between burthens proceeding from a disregard to their convenience and those resulting from the inevitable exigencies of society; to discriminate the spirit of liberty from that of licentiousness, cherishing the first, avoiding the last, and uniting a speedy but temperate vigilance against encroachments, with an inviolable respect to the laws."

Edmund Burke said, "When bad men combine, the good must associate else they will fall one by one an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle." These men, by their lives, caused the good to associate and men have been saved from "sacrifice in a contemptible struggle."

Around whom will you rally? For what will you join? That is for you to decide. America offers you many loyalties. Which will you take?

What is there in human nature that makes Antigone's wail so consistent with world history? When was there a good time to be thoughtful about improving conditions? The irony of history is that in the moments of chaos we generally have the best thought because then there is necessity for constructive thought and action. Who would be foolhardy enough to suggest that the time was

ripe for experimenting with a great concept of government, such as our Federal Union, with the States in the condition they were in 1785, 1786, and 1787? Were not Washington and his associates merely foolhardy adventurers and experimenters? Was 1775, before the Colonies had become really united, while they were actually at war, and while the Continental Congress surely did not represent the unanimous opinion of the people in the Colonies—was it a happy time to go flaunting political thoughts about liberty, about man's having unalienable rights, about separating from the motherland, about proclaiming and accepting the doctrine of the right of revolution? What about the time when conditions were so perilous that men who accepted the theory I have just quoted from Burke, that the good must associate together or they would die unpitied in a contemptible struggle, made this theory colloquial by mentioning over and over again if they did not hang together they would hang apart? Should Woodrow Wilson have accepted Clemenceau's advice, which was almost word for word the same as the old Chinese Prime Minister's, that we had better stand by the balance of power and think of world organization experimentation at a better time? In the light of circumstances, the cynical among us will say, "Why, yes; because Woodrow Wilson's ideal dreams have not come true." But whose have? That which is a failure in this generation may be a great success in the next.

One of the former presidents of this great institution used to end most of his talks to the students by repeating, "Man does not live by bread alone." Why, no man lives at all until he learns how to live outside and apart from his immediate necessities. Eating, drinking, and breathing are not living.

Was 1850, the time the Utah pioneers attempted to organize, a happy time for experimenting with a university.? You remember that John Taylor returned from France in the early fifties, bringing machinery for our industrial beginnings and articles for use as aids to the instructors in the projected University of Deseret. This action on President Taylor's part is an illustration of the early American concept of democracy—that the training of the citizen and the development of industry must go hand in hand. The teaching aids were not used for 15 or 16 years and the machinery failed of its purpose because the trained personnel to run it was not available. What a lesson in social, educational, economic, industrial interdependence we see here. This Nation today needs the lesson John Taylor's homecoming should have taught our people.

Your institution lives today because Abraham Lincoln was not afraid to experiment, was not afraid to turn his back upon the doctrine of a predecessor, that the Constitution of the United States did not delegate to the Federal Government the responsibility of educating the people. Maybe it did not; but thank goodness Abraham Lincoln saw that it did not prevent such delegation and accepted the theory that what the Constitution did not prevent, the Government might do if it was in the interest of the general welfare. Can Lincoln ever die? Not so long as the Constitution endures because he, like John Marshall, saw that the Constitution was set up to endure for the ages and must become a living thing if it was to grow, develop, and become the companion of the people in the fulfillment of ther common efforts and their national destiny.

Back to my Budapest talk and your duty to make me a prophet—does anyone know of a single experiment that has brought so many blessings to so many people as the establishment of the land-grant colleges in the United States? They brought the fulfillment of one of Jefferson's dreams, the carrying of the university to the people, the making possible of the great experimental laboratories dealing with soils, with life, with seeds, with livestock, and that greatest of blessings, the bettering of life in and around the home.

We are today in the midst of world chaos because the lessons of the past seem to stand for naught. Men are uniting for war and destruction. They are cynical about joining for peace and construction. Out of this turmoil and strife must come the nucleus of a better world order. Let us have union for peace. Government's chief aim must become the good life. Living must count. The concept of liberty is a concept of life; it is not a concept of death. The free man must be a man of purpose, a man of plan, a man of experiment, and an everlasting seeker of the truth. The new world is dawning. Are we prepared for it? It will never come except by our efforts, and there will never be a better time to make our efforts count. I have often wondered why even the angels in heaven were never given to know when the Lord would come again. I think I know now. I believe that when once man understands in the fullest what liberty means, what dignity comes to the free man, that then he will know that he must be a partner with the gods in working out eternal plans. How could the angels know when men would arrive at that stage? The new world will not be one imposed upon men, but it will be one that men will work out. God, I am sure, is ready to be man's partner, but are we willing to be His? I have spoken of Jesus as one of the failures. But He was not; it was man who failed. None of the four great men I mentioned really failed; the failure was on the part of their generations. I wonder now if that was not Heber C. Kimball's meaning? Jesus and the others were ready for a partnership with the eternal. Man rejected the chance. A wise partner will not take the chance of a second rejection—too much is at stake. No; not even the angels can know—but man can. Free man, inspired by the new concept, "The glory of God is intelligence," will act only with intelligence. Such action means planned action, action after knowledge, action with a purpose. That is the life your school has taught you. If intelligence is God's glory, and if intelligence means action after planning, planning after deliberation, and deliberation after thought—all three making for purpose—and since God works in harmony with the great scheme of things, thus depending upon man's partnership, why not bring God's glory down to earth and say, "The glory of man is intelligence," that God's will may be done here on earth, as it is in heaven.

Free men working toward the eternal purposes of God is my concept of the glory of intelligence.

War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask permission of the Senate to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered over the National Broadcasting System Saturday night by the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], dealing with the question of war and peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am very proud to be speaking tonight under the auspices of the America First Committee.

I remember the long fights upon the so-called neutrality bills. When the first one was before the Senate I made some remarks which I prefaced by a little couplet from Dryden. This was as follows:

"Such subtle covenants shall be made
Till peace itself is war in masquerade."

I early sensed from occasional newspapers, different correspondents, and columnists, whither we were drifting. The little couplet I often had in mind, and during the few years that have intervened its truth became more apparent. I have lived to see my utterances in opposition to war justified. It's true that today insidiously the propaganda has crept upon all of us, and finally we see it so deftly administered that like a rare anesthetic it almost overcomes us. In the shock of the poison the jingle has ever been in my mind—

"Such subtle covenants shall be made
Till peace itself is war in masquerade."

As we look back we can realize how gradual was the development; how artfully planned, until now we stand aghast on the very brink of war.

At the very commencement of the remarks I made in the speech referred to, I said:

"At the outset, Mr. President, I wish to say I am not a Nazi-ist, I am not a Fascist, thank God, I am not a Communist, and I do not believe, to employ a much misused word, in the ideology of any one of those particular groups. I belong to nothing of that sort; I abhor them all. I detest dictators, whether they are actual or potential, and wherever they may be."

And time has intensified this opinion.

Lest we forget, I want to recall with you for a moment the passage of events that lulled some of us into a false security.

In 1935 the President, in San Diego, said:

"In the face of this apprehension the American people can have but one concern and speak but one sentiment; despite what happens in continents overseas the United States of America shall and must remain as long ago the Father of our Country prayed that it might remain, unentangled and free.

* * * * * *

"We not only earnestly desire peace, but we are moved by a stern determination to avoid those perils that will endanger our peace with the world."

And then following this in sequence was the speech of the President at Chautauqua in 1936. He then said:

"We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war."

And again in the same speech:

"I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen 200 limping, exhausted men come out of line—the survivors of a regiment of 1,000 that went forward 48 hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and of wives. I hate war."

How we've reechoed the words of the President, "I hate war."

And then a change came o'er the spirit of his dreams, and in 1937 we find him giving utterance to these words:

"It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading.

"When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in

order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease."

In 1939, in his message to Congress, he said:

"Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people."

Here was the genesis of the expression "methods short of war" of which we heard so much until the passage of the lease-lend bill.

And then—I omit the intermediate utterances because of lack of time—came the hypocritical, ill-begotten, misnamed lease-lend bill, conceived in deception and carried out in hypocrisy.

Don't you remember how every man in favor of this lease-lend bill stated it was designed to prevent war from ever coming to us, that its purpose was distinctly to keep our country out of war, and how our puny voices in dismay and contradiction went unheard? How from all over the country came the expression "short of war," that no one would explain, and none could? We were justified in charging the sole use was by reiteration to lull our people to sleep. Ever since the bill was passed, the expression "short of war" has been abandoned, and we have seen within recent days the horrible efforts of the warmongers to begin a new theme that involved the very antithesis of what they assured the American people would not occur, until now America stands at the cross roads, one of which takes us upon our peaceful way that we may live our own lives; the other of which is the road lighted with the flames of war and into which we fear we will be driven.

The most momentous of the President's promises made to us was solemnly, oh so solemnly, given just before election:

"And while I am talking to you, mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance.

"I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again:

"Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Many, many times, by quotation from the Democratic platform and otherwise has the President assured the people that he would not take us into war and, even more solemnly, that our boys would not be sent into any foreign wars. The people had the right to rely on these assurances. They did rely on them. Let the people make the other party to the promise keep faith.

I recall to you but a few of the statements in all of those made by the President in which he asserted in the most positive fashion: "Your President says this country is not going to war." The President's speeches were hinting at the possibility of war, but when the President was questioned concerning these statements, categorically, he repudiated them. If explanation were needed for the simplicity of the people or any defense of their gullibility it is furnished in the current number of the Saturday Evening Post under the title "In Defense of the People." I wish I could read the whole article to you that you might admeasure the blame and either attach it to a bemused, confused, and too-trusting people, or to one who kept locked within his bosom his intent.

And now having settled, so far as words can settle, the blame attached to either party, let us pursue our theme. Shall this great, peace-loving country that is not a party to the war, that had naught to do with its original declaration, be pitchforked into the brutal conflict from which we have nothing to expect, and everything to lose? It is asserted that we must take sides with all the gruesome horrors in defense of one belligerent, or else we'll be seized by the other and subjected to the most awful indignities.

Bluntly, frankly, the issue at stake here is whether we'll go to war. On the one side are a smattering of good citizens, the vociferous little puppets of J. P. Morgan and Co., a large part of the press, practically all the columnists, the newspaper correspondents, all crying for war with Germany and against Hitler; on the other side is the great inarticulate mass of citizens like you and me, of Americans who love their country, whose thoughts are ever first for it, and who, at all hazards, will protect it.

Judging from the newspapers these last named are in the woeful minority, but we, whose correspondence is large, know that the exact opposite is true. We, who are only Americans, with no other thought than the preservation of America, pray God to help us do that which would be for the best interests and welfare of America. So, to Messrs. Morgan & Co. and their satellites, and to all the other members of the crew clamoring for war, we say introduce your declaration of war in the Congress of the United States and submit it to the test—the only test we have—of our people's representatives. Don't confuse the straight issue of war with an attempted declaration by the President alone. Don't confound it with a Presidential pronunciamento which means, if it means anything, that he will convoy ammunition and aid to Britain. Don't becloud it with the pretense of "freedom of the seas" nor by left-handed implications of repealing the Neutrality Act, all by the way forgotten and forsaken as soon as made. Let us have a straight-out determination of whether we will declare war on the Axis Powers. Let the resolution for the declaration of war be introduced by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. How better and braver it will be for those who are demanding war to present their resolution and let it be tested instead of waiting in the dark and skulking in the hope that some incident will arise upon which they could predicate such a motion. We'll meet as best we can such a resolution and pray God He'll keep war from this country.

And first, in fairness, let us examine some of the reasons on both sides. We can omit our desire to aid Britain for our people have expressed themselves upon that, always, however, with the proviso that it should be "short of war." It may be that the recent declaration of the President may be construed as blotting out "short of war," but no word has emanated from him that the phrase so often used by him, that was in the mouths of all of his supporters for many months, has been eliminated. Moreover, it was demonstrated upon the argument upon the lease-lend bill that Britain was receiving a maximum of goods and weapons from us. To give her more would denude ourselves of the most essential weapons of defense, and perhaps even Messrs. Morgan & Co. would stop short of that. The arms and essential weapons furnished Britain constitute by far the greatest proportion our industries could produce. But grant that all of the production of this country could be sent to England and our own defenses wholly denuded, we would not have a tithe of what was necessary to win. The first great obstacle to our entry into war, therefore, would be unpreparedness. Let any man who knows state the contrary and subject himself to a 5-minute cross-examination, and the correctness of this statement will be demonstrated. Now, do we want to be put to the hazard, when we are not a party to the war nor in any manner connected thereto, this great, peaceful country of ours, with all that it means? A merciful providence might continue to shower His blessings upon us and enable us to succeed by a miracle in winning such a war. Assume it to be otherwise, however, and that the aphorism of Napoleon—"That God fights on the heaviest side of the heaviest battalions", would again be proven—where would we be? The blackest picture now unjustifiably painted by the warmongers, and the little people who are crying for blood, would be pale in comparison.

Viewed from every angle, war now could be nothing more than disastrous. It is pretty to hear the head of the Government boast about what we have done in terms we do not understand, and our readiness to repel any attack from any quarter. It makes us all proud to hear him tell about our two-ocean Navy now, and that how it would, as we all know, give a good account of itself in case of war; but it is terrible to realize the fact that we have not as yet a two-ocean Navy and that it could not do what is claimed for it. We'll have a two-ocean Navy in time, but ships, like glamour, are not readily built. It will be claimed that this is a hard-headed, cold-blooded view to take of the situation, and that England is bleeding to death in the meantime; but we are doing everything that we can to help England, and no amount of boasting about what we know is not yet complete will enable us to do the job. So, what is better, to continue to help Great Britain, or to boast of our strength and our uncompleted armies, knowing their weakness and unpreparedness. No amount of wishful thinking will alter it. But until we must come to grips, it is silly, indeed a crime, for this country to gamble with its precious heritage. In the language of Dean Hutchins of the University of Chicago, "We simply will be committing suicide." This is no defeatist view, but a plain statement of facts.

In his speech on Tuesday night the President, in my opinion, first, himself, declared war, and told the terms upon which he would wage it. Secondly, he agreed that he would convoy, or otherwise take to Britain, the goods, ammunition, and guns intended for her. Again he revived what he, himself, eliminated, the doctrine of the "freedom of the seas." And, lastly, he went blithely on his way with his four freedoms and is going to enthrone them upon the whole world. How he is going to do it is a deep, dark mystery, but he speaks as if it were easy of accomplishment and gives never a thought to the agony and the anguish and bloodletting that will have to accomplish it. In all this he did not once mention the Congress of the United States. The Constitution makes the Congress, and only the Congress, the one part of our Government which can declare war. The Constitution provides clause II, section 8, article I:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war * * * ."

He speaks with the confidence of a Hitler or a Mussolini in all these things, and with a certainty that puts to blush even these two braggarts. Does he feel so confident of the Congress that he can utterly disregard it? I admit that he has some cause for this feeling of supreme confidence, but let us hope when it comes to the serious matter of declaring war Congress will assert itself.

The evidence is highly preponderant that until we shall have prepared ourselves it would be folly to get into this war. Remember, we have not declared war, and war has not been declared against us. We have given ample occasions by acts that are directly designated "acts of war" to Hitler to declare war against us. If he continues to refrain he gives us a breathing spell which we must utilize in our preparation.

We have touched but faintly upon what war would mean in our present unprepared state. It is the horror, and the blood letting, the maiming and the killing of youngsters that appeal to me. I thought when the President made his Chautauqua speech that the same thoughts were impelling him to fortify his soul against war. In this I was mistaken; or, if not mistaken, the splendid pulse beats that actuated him then lasted but a brief period. Now, apparently, he is talking of war without realizing the consequences of a war where America is the principal figure and it is American blood

to be shed. It is enough that war would mean the shedding of innocent blood in such fashion as we have never known before, but if this does not touch my listeners tonight, think of the material that war would cost. I shall not pile Ossa on Pelion in estimating the value of the material things; but if we have war, win or lose, we'll reach a period in our finances of inflation, or repudiation, either of which would mean financial ruin and chaos.

But there is something far greater that we'll encounter on the way. You may see it glossed over in the recent speech of the President, perhaps unwittingly, or perhaps from habit formed of power. You have seen him with a speech prepared in collaboration with an eminent friend of his, and an English playwright, as the newspapers report and of which I have no criticism. You have seen how somebody in his entourage reaches out for drama, and has all of the nations of South America represented. Sparse was the representation of our own citizens, numbering over 130,000,000. You who heard him on that occasion over the radio could measure the power and the pride with which he talked. In the excitement of the moment, or the drama that was put on, he forgot this great pulsating democracy of ours, except to say that we would never consent to accept, and would not permit a Nazi shape of things to come. Of course, we'll never accept the Nazi shape, nor permit Nazi things to come. Americans have never yet been so cowardly as to permit Nazi regime, or any other, to work its will. The President in his eloquent address told of countries Hitler has conquered and has occupied. He mentioned Tripoli, Libya in Africa, his threat of Egypt, and the Suez Canal, the Near East, and even the Indian Ocean. Are we going to fight in all these countries?

If the intention of the President was to prepare us for that sort of fight he should have said so in so many words, and the American people would have girded their loins for the fray. But there was the evident intent to frighten us with the statement that the Cape Verde Islands are only 7 hours' distance from Brazil by bomber or troop-carrying planes. They dominate shipping routes to and from the South Atlantic. And he closes on this point with the statement that "control or occupation by Nazi forces of any of the islands of the Atlantic would jeopardize the immediate safety of portions of North and South America, and of the island possessions of the United States, and of the ultimate safety of the continental United States itself." A large program he maps out for Hitler, and even a larger one for ourselves. If all of the ills that he describes should befall us, we must put forth a superhuman effort to prevent them. How many soldiers will be required? How big will our fleets have to be? The ordinary man listening to this speech will conclude that we must be prepared to send men required to meet the Nazi in Africa, in Egypt, at the Suez Canal, and the Near East, to take Dakar, the Azores, and the Cape Verde Islands, to say nothing of the war we must carry on in continental Europe for the purpose of rescuing the oppressed nations there, and above all, for the rescue of Great Britain. What a stupendous task he maps out for America. It may become necessary that we should fight nearly all of the nations of the earth, and that we should conquer them, but God forbid. And, above all, we should know, and have the right to know, if this is the program of our President.

But, what will become of our United States of America while we are pursuing these Herculean tasks. We have seen, little by little, power concentrated in one man's hands. We have soothed our perturbed spirits by pretending that those powers were needed to be thus concentrated in order to meet the crisis, but when you are meeting crises on practically all lands of every continent, what will become, the ordinary citizen will ask, of the good old United States. It is no reply to talk in generalities, and in enigmas of sacrifices that must be made. What is to become of your Government, Mr. American? Is it not plain that all this fighting on every shore, and in practically every country will mean but one thing, perhaps, the destruction of a dictatorship in other lands, but the certainty of the creation of a dictatorship in our own. You may live under a beneficent despot the rest of your days if you desire. I prefer the good old American way, and I will protest and fight to the bitter end. You cannot with this plan that apparently is mapped out for you, escape a dictatorship and perhaps worse. If ever there was a time in the history of this country when it is the duty of Americans to stand forth and be men it is now. It will soon be too late, and then the outstretched hands of liberty may no longer join yours.

The propaganda is abroad today in far greater volume than ever before. We were subject during the last war to it, and the books which have been written since by the men who were guilty of it have exposed it. The same technique, though immensely improved, has been adopted now, and every man in this country feeling an inferiority complex, and subject to the dictates of the English, is in favor of it. Not only that, but whole flocks of titled Englishmen and English women, have gone about our country lecturing and wheedling us into war. The British Ambassador himself set a bad example as openly he has gone from city to city in its behalf. Societies under all sorts of names have been formed. Where the money comes from to support all of these the ordinary citizen can only guess, but it has been spent without stint during the past 10 days. Full-page advertisements have been carried by our newspapers calling upon authoritative action and citizens to contribute. In this country I would not shut off a single one of these people because of the precious regard I have for the right of free speech, but when an invidious epithet is applied to Colonel Lindbergh, and pious Philadelphia closes its halls to him, I think that it is quite time that America cries out against this sort of thing.

Now I am fully aware that to speak this way opens me to the charge of Nazi, and, because it is viler, of being a copperhead, but some of us were made of such stuff that we won't be frightened, nor cajoled when the liberties that are ours—the sacred, personal liberties, are attacked. All of our precious civil liberties will be lost in the mad adventure and the fantastic enterprise. It is only a step now to forbid free speech in this country, and the minority of our citizens who are so enthusiastic for Britain would justify it, and perhaps the concentration camp would follow; but there are some of us who laugh at a concentration camp and who are old enough to spend the rest of their days in one laughing.

The four liberties for which the President so eloquently appealed, and which Anthony Eden so weakly reechoed, would have but a sorry chance of existence if we would march our armies from Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strand.

Mr. Eden must have spoken with his tongue in his cheek as he recalled India with its teeming millions, with its distress and want, or he may have recalled that the President began his campaign in this country with a note of fear. I can recall in one of his addresses with an imagination worthy of Orson Welles, the President painted the picture of cities of the Middle West being attacked by Hitler's bombs, and really, just after that speech he had the particular territory feeling rather jittery. He has since artistically preached fear, while decrying it. He has said there is nothing to fear but fear, and then, in bold lines, he has drawn the picture of fear so that our people will feel it.

Dictatorship and war together marched very early in this Government, and have led us step by step, along the dangerous road until today we can reach out and touch it, and its fury burns into our very souls. Dismayed, betrayed, we reel and stagger as we realize that the subtle plan is about to flower. The masquerade is over and we now know that God had no place amongst them. The Grecian god Pan reigns instead. We find him perched high upon their banners, pipes in hand, playing as he never played before—the great maestro. How deftly he tempers his tunes from the soothing lullabies to shrieks of groundless fear, sudden and furious, and we now awake to find our Nation facing death. And what of the warmongers? Let all of us Americans enroll. Let us form our battalions and, hand in hand, face them, and as we go forward, buoyed by the trumpets of peace, let us sing with David his Forty-sixth song. You remember this:

"He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire.

"Be still, and know that I am God; I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth."

National-Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. STOKES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article on our national-defense program by Richard L. Stokes, which was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

LAGGING PRODUCTION HAMPERS ARMY-NAVY EFFORTS FOR DEFENSE—FLEET ALONE STANDS READY TO HANDLE ANY EMERGENCY—PLANES, ARTILLERY, AND MUNITIONS FAIL TO APPEAR IN QUANTITIES LARGE ENOUGH TO BRING ANY FEELING OF SECURITY

(By Richard L. Stokes)

A year ago this month Germany invaded the Low Countries and broke out upon the Atlantic coast line. Including $7,000,000,000 for lease-lend aid to Britain, a fabulous total of $44,000,000,000 has since been appropriated, authorized, or recommended in a program of national defense which ultimately will cost more than $50,000,000,000, or two and a half times the amount spent on our armed forces during the first World War.

Business corporations, on each December 31, generally publish reports of their activities during the 12 months then concluding. By analogy, the end of the first emergency year would seem a fitting moment at which to cast an account of successes won or reverses endured.

Such an appraisal is a task of no small difficulty. Speaking at Columbus, Ohio, on May 2, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT announced that "the Republican Party can serve a useful purpose by pointing out defects in the defense program as it develops, and submitting constructive suggestions as to how it

may be improved." Yet, a few days ago, Senator TAFT confessed that he has found it impossible to obtain any specific factual information, either military or naval. He is compelled, declared he, to fall back upon the Federal Register, a Government publication which prints daily statements of expenditures in all departments, and upon a weekly press-agent bulletin called Defense, which is the organ of the Office for Emergency Management.

Of similar tenor is a story told of Secretary of War Stimson. Trusted Senators and Representatives are sometimes favored with secret information under pledge of confidence, while a reporter known to be reliable may learn almost anything he wishes, but "off the record." A person whose lips had been thus sealed begged Stimson to loose the bond. The request was denied. The visitor asked whether the Secretary did not think Hitler knew all about the matter in question. "Hell, no," Stimson is is said to have retorted, "Why, I, myself—it took me 6 months to find out what was going on."

REPORT ONLY TENTATIVE

In view of the plight acknowledged by men like Stimson and TAFT, the "annual report" on defense progress undertaken herewith can hope to be little more than tentative. Many of the figures given were approximations to begin with, and they change from week to week and even from day to day. It may be said, however, that all items enumerated are true, generally speaking, to the best of the writer's knowledge and belief.

The United States Navy is probably the strongest sea force in the world. It is incomparably the furthest advanced of America's defense arms. However, it shows no decisive increase of strength over that of May 1940.

The Army will attain its primary objective of 1,418,000 officers and men by June 30. But it has suffered a grievous decline of combat quality through the breaking up of professional divisions into instruction groups, scattered throughout the citizen army. The country's land forces today are half trained and half equipped. Another year will be required to forge them into effective troops.

Monthly output of military planes rose from 500 in May 1940 to a new high of 1,427 in April 1941. Yet this upward rush of production has been little reflected in Army and Navy air strength because of the diversion of aircraft to Britain and other democracies.

AIR CORPS WAITS UNTIL 1942

The Army and Navy together, during the last 12 months, were able to increase the Nation's air power by no more than 2,404 planes, including trainers. Their present combined strength is about 7,476 planes of all types. The Army Air Corps may not be ready for war on its own account before late in 1942, if then.

Out of $44,000,000,000 available for defense purposes it has been found possible to spend only $5,000,000,000 and contract for $14,020,000,000 more in orders placed.

After a year of feverish effort the United States has mustered for defense production not more than half its available resources of man-hours and machines. During the first 4 months of 1941 alone some 10,000,000 man-days were lost through strikes in defense industries.

ORGANIZATION LACKS HEAD

The end of the first emergency year finds the defense organization still without a head. During this period the National Defense Advisory Commission faded from the scene. Its successor, the Office of Production Management, is now swamped among 10 other groups of equal rank. A third candidate for leadership, the Office for Emergency Management, is not a policymaking but an administrative body.

Confusion of purpose and irresolution of policy in the highest quarters are held to be deep-seated maladies of the defense program. There exists as yet no omnipotent executive body such as the War Industries Board which President Wilson set up in 1918 under the chairmanship of Bernard M. Baruch.

Mr. Roosevelt has not sought legislation enabling him to vest in defense agencies control of vital implements like transportation which is still in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and like oil and coal, which continue to be administered by the Department of Commerce.

It should be stated in fairness that May 24 is perhaps an unfortunate date for the proposed reckoning. At this time many strategic operations are on the verge of coming into full activity. Admission is freely made that the story might differ in marked respects if the telling were delayed 4 or 5 months.

Taken into account are the circumstances that, except for the Navy, our defense program started not far beyond zero, and that a vast undertaking has been set afoot with at least the beginnings of energy and dispatch.

Those who gaze on the program's point of departure exclaim that miracles have been wrought. Others, with eyes fixed on the world crisis and its volcanic ascent, give way to consternation.

The year's progress may gain relief if placed against a background of the Nation's ultimate defense objectives, which, of course, were not to be completed but were initiated during the opening 12 months. They can be described only in grandiose terms. Contemplated is a two-ocean navy greater than history has yet beheld and capable of imposing its will throughout the seven seas; a navy of 3,500,000 tons, consisting of 32 battleships, 18 aircraft carriers, 91 light and heavy cruisers, 365 destroyers, 185 submarines, 15,000 planes, and 17,000 pilots; a navy to cost, with shore facilities and equipment, far in excess of $10,000,000,000.

Projected also was an army of 1,418,000 to start, with a possible increase to 4,000,000; an army profusely equipped with the most modern appliances and trained to the minute; an army to have at its maximum 10 armored divisions, 65,000 planes, 130,000 airplane engines, 17,000 heavy guns, 25,000 light guns, 13,000 trench mortars, 9,200 tanks, 33,000,000 loaded shells, 300,000 machine guns, 400,000 semiautomatic rifles, 1,300,000 single-shot rifles, and 210 camps and cantonments; an army, in short, to cost something like $40,000,000,000.

NAVY READY TO FIGHT

Alone among American defense arms, the Navy is prepared at this moment to embark on modern warfare with a good chance of success. According to a recent report of Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, it is "probably the strongest single sea force in the world."

Counting two new battleships not yet with the fleet, the United States at present could throw into war 17 capial ships, 6 aircraft carriers, 37 light and heavy cruisers, 165 destroyers, 109 submarines, and approximately 2,000 tactical planes. The personnel on May 1 was 249,727 as against 150,592 on June 30, 1940.

Despite all hullabaloo over a two-ocean navy, for which Congress has approved or authorized a total of $7,583,694,783, only a few keels of the proposed super-armada have yet been laid. From earlier programs derived all accessions of combatant strength delivered to the fleet during the last year. They comprised exactly 1 cruiser. 1 airplane carrier, 15 submarines, and 49 destroyers. But two 35,000-ton battleships, luckily begun 4 years ago and recently commissioned, are to join the line in July and August or September.

DEPLETED BY TRANSFERS

Owing partly to transfers of destroyers and small craft to Britain, the American Navy entered the second year of emergency with only 43 more ships, including auxiliaries, than it possessed when the Germans smashed through to the Channel ports and placed England's control of the Atlantic in jeopardy for the first time in centuries. Contracts have only now been let for 40 modern destroyers to replace 50 old ones traded to Britain. The new boats will be commissioned about the end of 1942.

Actually under construction at shipyards are 66 out of 360 combat and 104 auxiliary ships currently on order. In addition, 260 vessels are technically under construction, meaning that plans are being drawn or parts manufactured. Competing for the country's limited shipways are 661 seagoing commercial vessels.

It is generally accepted that American naval aviation is without a peer in quality, though the quantity leaves much to be desired. Unlike the Army, which for 15 years has vacillated between air- and liquid-cooled motors, the Navy has consistently supported the former, with the result that it has developed in the Vought XF4U–1 a heavy, long-range fighter which has been declared by Rear Admiral Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, to be America's fastest airplane.

The Navy has elaborated three main types of aircraft known as land and pontoon planes and flying boats. The first comprise dive bombers and pursuit craft, including an extremely fast seagoing fighter engined with a 2,000-horsepower motor, which is thought to be a naval type unmatched anywhere.

The flying boats are long-range patrol and bombing craft. About 300 are now in service, while 590 others remain at the stage of being on order. A few of those in use, with deliveries that began last fall, have a maximum range of 5,000 miles without bomb loads or can fly 1,000 miles with 4 tons of explosives and return unloaded. Most of the 300 can fly 3,000 miles nonstop, or 1,000 miles with 2 tons of bombs and back empty to base.

Though intensive efforts have been made, the Navy during the year has achieved only a start toward its objective of 15,000 planes and 17,000 pilots. Between July 1, 1940, and May 1, 1941, according to a statement last week by Secretary Knox, the total of naval planes of all types on hand increased 1,304, from 2,172 to 3,476. However, deliveries multiplied more than tenfold in the first 4 months of this year over those in the corresponding period last year. The respective figures are 79 and 996.

The increase of naval pilots has been something like 1,340, from 2,900 on May 23, 1940, to approximately 4,240 on May 1, 1941. During the last 10 months the student entry rate for pilot training mounted from 100 to 500 a month and is expected to reach 800 in July.

Three-fifths of current deliveries are trainers, which add no immediate support to the fighting forces. Tremendous demands on the aircraft industry by the Army and Great Britain make it problematic whether the Navy's air-expansion schedules for 1941 can be met. These call for a net gain of 3,710 planes during the year, bringing the number to about 6,300 on January 1, 1942. During 1941 the hope is to raise the total of Navy pilots to 5,993.

Notwithstanding months of triumphant publicity over the lease of eight operating bases in the Atlantic and Caribbean, the Navy possesses as yet no prime outpost in the Atlantic and is compelled to base itself on three continental establishments along the East coast—at Boston, New York, and Norfolk.

In the Atlantic, at present a chief danger spot, is a fleet of some 125 vessels, including several modern cruisers, two aircraft carriers, and a number of destroyers and submarines. It is built around the Navy's 3 oldest battleships—*New York*, *Arkansas*, and *Texas*, none of them capable of standing in the first line—and the semidemilitarized training ship *Wyoming*.

The Asiatic Fleet, based on the Philippines, our outpost nearest Japan, has not

been strengthened during the year. It still consists, apparently, of about 25 cruisers, with destroyers and submarines, as well as a minor force of patrol planes. Regarding Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, anchorage of the country's main sea force, naval officers have complained to congressional committees that the channel at the entrance is so narrow that one big ship, scuttled at the right spot, could bottle up the entire Pacific Fleet.

The six aircraft carriers now in commission consist of the *Lexington* and *Saratoga*, converted 33,000-ton cruisers, fast but aging, and too unwieldly for successful operation; the 14,700-ton *Ranger* and *Wasp*, small, slow, and weakly armed, and two modern vessels, *Yorktown* and *Enterprise*, with a speed of more than 30 knots and displacement of 20,000 tons each.

No fortification or armament has begun as yet on the bases covering our Hawaiian front, namely, Samoa, Guam, and Wake, Midway, Palmyra, Johnson, and Canton Islands. Personnel of the naval station at Tutuila, Samoa, is currently 857. The only expenditures at Guam, about $4,000,000, are for the purpose of making its harbor safe for naval and particularly commercial aircraft.

SUDDEN NEED FOR AUXILIARIES

Between the end of the first World War and 1938 no auxiliary ships were built for the Navy. In 1940 there rose a sudden need for large numbers of repair ships, tenders for destroyers, submarines, and aircraft troop transports, cargo, store, ammunition, and hospital ships, tankers, ocean tugs, fleet mine sweepers and mine layers, net layers, and antiaircraft vessels.

Today there are in service only 175 of these auxiliaries, while 85 major auxiliary craft are under construction. The Navy has purchased from the Maritime Commission 48 commercial ships, including 12 tankers capable of carrying 72,000,000 gallons of oil at 19 knots.

In case of operations this summer against Atlantic outposts such as Martinique, the Azores, or Dakar, the spearhead would be the Marine Corps, a body with high and ancient traditions of valor. Though normally stationed ashore, it is an integral part of the Navy. It is a composite force of all arms—infantry, artillery, tanks, aviation, antiaircraft batteries, engineers, and signal and chemical troops.

Its personnel is fixed by law at one-fifth of the Navy's authorized enlisted strength. The 19,000 marines of June 30, 1940, have grown to more than 45,000 at present, including mobilized reservists. In line with the modern aim of multiplying fire power, the corps has abandoned its historic brigade formation and reorganized on a basis of two divisions of the Army's new triangular type. Each is to consist ultimately of 14,000 men and an air wing of 307 operating planes. There are also six battalions of 750 men each, heavily armed with artillery and machine guns. Their function is the defense of naval bases.

For fresh equipment needed, including 72 field guns, 78 tanks and aviation matériel, the two marine divisions are short in the sum of $40,000,000, only now being placed on order.

ARMY MEETS OBJECTIVE

When the defense effort started a year ago, the Regular Army consisted of 243,500 officers and men. Through federalization of the National Guard and the Selective Service Act, the Army consists today of about 1,324,800 officers and men, and is expected easily to meet its first objective of 1,418,000 by the end of June.

The 6 divisions of 12 months ago—5 infantry and 1 cavalry—have grown to 30, including 27 of infantry, 1 of cavalry, and 2 armored divisions. In process of organization are a second cavalry division and 2 other armored ones.

Despite this impressive expansion, Secretary Stimson himself announced in a recent address that "at least a year will pass before we can have an Army and air force adequate to meet the air and ground forces which could be brought against us." It is generally agreed that the Army, as it now stands, is only half-armed and half-equipped.

In two respects—Garand rifles and machine guns—the Army is far ahead of schedule; in fact, the first stage of its program of semiautomatic rifles is now virtually completed. Four new machine-gun plants will be in operation by July. But grave misgivings are possible as to field artillery, antiaircraft and antitank guns, aviation, and tanks.

USING 1917 WEAPONS

For field artillery it seems probable that for months or years to come the Army will be obliged to depend chiefly on weapons inherited from the first World War. These included a few monster 240-millimeter howitzers, about 1,000 155-millimeter Schneider howitzers, a number of 75-millimeter howitzers, and something like 7,000 French 75-millimeter field guns. The number of the last has been depleted in a measure undisclosed by batteries sent to England to replace equipment lost in the retreat from Belgium and France.

The larger howitzers, provided with motor mounts, are still effective weapons. The 75-millimeter field guns have undergone an expensive process, in which their firing mechanism was modernized and their wooden wheels were replaced with rubber tires. But this famous weapon, relied on by the French to stop the German armored advance, failed utterly at its task, and is now regarded as hopelessly outmoded. The Army has decided to use it as armament for medium tanks. Only a few sample vehicles have been thus equipped. Before it can be installed on a large scale the 75, as a tank constituent, may well become obsolete against new processes of hardening steel, and particularly against cannon of larger caliber now being used in armored vehicles abroad.

In Poland, toward the end of 1939, the Germans appeared with a novel 105-mm. howitzer. Its range was less than that of the 75, but it threw a heavier charge. With a high trajectory, it was designed to fire over obstacles like hills and drop projectiles on troops, artillery or tanks sheltered behind them.

For reasons mysterious to some observers, the Army decided also to develop a 155-mm. field gun with flat trajectory. The first of these was delivered May 15. With a weight of 30,000 pounds, it rides on 8 pneumatic tires and can average 30 miles an hour behind a tractor. It is expected to reach a production of 2 a week by the fall of 1942. At that rate, the program of 400 of these weapons would be completed in the summer of 1946.

The principal antitank gun at present is a 37-millimeter model which the Germans released 2 years ago because they had developed a better weapon. The Army needs at least 6,500, but the current output is only 12 a month. The 37 is ineffective against heavy tanks, will stop a medium tank up to 800 or 1,000 yards and is deadly against light tanks.

TANK PRODUCTION

With light tanks now rolling off the assembly line at a rate of 15 or more a day, difficulties are regarded as ended with respect to these 13-ton vehicles. They are armed with 37-millimeter cannon and machine guns. The latter wreak havoc against unprotected troops, but are unable to penetrate the armor even of another light tank. Out of 5 manufacturers with contracts for 26-ton medium tanks, 3 have only just finished their first models.

The new $20,000,000 Chrysler plant expects to begin turning out 10 medium tanks a day in August. The Army's program for this type at present is 1,800 vehicles. The German heavy tank is said to weigh 80 tons. The first American 60-ton tank is expected to enter production next fall and reach quantity deliveries 9 months later.

While the Navy uses 5-inch antiaircraft cannon, such weapons of this category as the Army possesses are almost exclusively 3-inch guns, ineffective above 20,000 feet. After prolonged thought and labor, the Ordnance Department brought forth a 90-mm. antiaircraft cannon, of which today there are only four experimental samples in existence. It cannot attain quantity output for another year.

The Army also desires 6,200 or more 37-mm. automatic antiaircraft cannon, for use against low-flying planes. Current production is 20 a month. More than a year ago it was discovered that both Allied and Axis planes were using 20-mm. automatic cannon in addition to machine guns. The first weapon of this style ever made in the United States was delivered May 16, 1941. Quantity production is promised for next fall.

BOMBER OUTPUT LAGS

On May 12 Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, deputy chief of staff for air, announced that the country's output of military planes in April was 1,427. It is believed that 60 percent were tactical planes and 40 percent trainers. Out of every 10, 7 were exported, chiefly to Britain. General Arnold's figure is thought to conceal the fact that production of heavy bombers is lagging, with an output of between 50 and 60 a month. These powerful ships, in great numbers, are held to be a vital necessity to both the United States and Great Britain.

A year ago the Army Air Corps had 3,322 pilots and 1,894 cadets in training. Today it has almost 10,000 pilots, a gain of about 6,778, while 15,000 cadets are under instruction. But during the same period its complement of planes of all types increased only 1,100—from 2,900 to about 4,000.

With resonant publicity, the Air Corps has announced a program of 30,000 pilots to be trained each year. But the first graduates of its 7,000-a-year program of last October will not begin to come out till next month. The initial class of its second program of 12,000 pilots a year began instruction in March, and will be graduated next November.

AIR VERSUS LIQUID COOLING

Aviation progress in the Army has been handicapped by a long and bitter controversy over the merits of liquid- and air-cooled motors. The latter develop greater horsepower for each pound of weight. The former lend themselves to perfect streamlining, but their plumbing apparatus is held to be more vulnerable to enemy fire than a self-sealing gasoline tank.

The Allison division of General Motors hopes to be turning out 1,000 airplane engines a month by the end of this year. The Buick and Studebaker plants, with contracts for aviation motors, cannot begin production earlier than the summer of 1942. The Packard and Ford factories are to be ready this July or August.

Secretary Stimson declared not long ago that only 650 out of 4,000 planes in the Air Corps were of first-line quality, and that none was up to battle standards of the second World War. A report reaching the writer is that an early type of flying fortress, the B-16, is used in heavy bombing instruction; and that the Army's best fighting planes, numbering 309, have a speed of perhaps 350 miles an hour, 1 machine gun each and 1 small-caliber cannon.

MUNITIONS FOR MONTH

Regarding munitions, the Army is said to have enough on hand to fight on the modern scale for about a month. According to rumor, the quantity now in the Canal Zone is insufficient to sustain barrage fire longer than an hour. Construction of munition plants is ahead of schedule, but in this respect it will be next spring before we see the light of day.

An Appeal for Mediation To Save Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. LOUIS LUDLOW, OF INDIANA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, with America on the verge of war, there is Nation-wide interest in a resolution I have introduced proposing that Congress request the President to arrange to offer the services of the 21 republics of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator to end the war.

I wish to read to the House supporting telegrams I have received from two of the world's greatest churchmen. One is from Cardinal William H. O'Connell, beloved and revered leader of the Catholic Church. It reads as follows:

BRIGHTON, MASS., *May 22, 1941.*

Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Read your letter and enclosures with deep interest. There is no doubt in my mind that the American people desire a cessation of this stupid and brutal war, and I may add that no one can doubt their desire to keep out of the conflict.

Cardinal O'CONNELL.

The other telegram is from Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the Riverside Church, New York City. It is as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 26, 1941.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I strongly commend your resolution to promote peace by calling a conference of the American republics to offer the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator. This is the only hopeful and constructive way I see out of the present crisis.

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.

I personally believe that events have now taken such a shape that the President of our country has it within his power, through mediation proceedings, to bring peace to heartbroken humanity, and that by appealing, if necessary, to the people of the belligerent countries over the heads of the dictators he can induce all warring nations to agree to a peace formula based on Secretary Hull's five points and fashioned in the mold of justice, which alone can insure permanent peace to the world.

I believe that in the present posture of the war and the world's affairs our President is confronted with potentialities of service to mankind greater than ever came to any man in the history of the world and beyond all human calculation. These potentialities can be realized only by asserting leadership for peace. If he can do these things, the world will lay its garlands at his feet and he will be entitled to a monument higher than the Himalaya Mountains as humanity's greatest benefactor.

By unanimous consent of the House, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered on this subject Wednesday night, May 28, over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System. It is as follows:

THE PEACE SIDE

My subject tonight is the Peace Side. One of the beautiful things about our form of government is that all sides may be heard in the forum of debate. I realize that by choosing this subject I shall not add to my popularity among those who are thinking more in terms of war than in terms of peace. I am not a pacifist as that term is opprobriously misapplied. I believe in building up our national defense so impregnably that no aggressor nation, nor any combination of aggressor nations, would ever dare attack us. And I believe, as I think all true Americans believe, that we should fight to the last dollar of our resources and the last drop of our blood to defend our priceless heritage of free government if ever we are attacked. Though there are many worthy antiwar committees and organizations I am not a member of any of them. I may identify myself as an independent, individual crusader for peace. If the resolution for a referendum on foreign wars, which I first introduced in 1935 and which I pressed to a vote in the House in 1938 had been adopted, there would not now be so much uneasiness throughout the country among the countless thousands who are living in constant dread that events will drag us into Europe's never-ending wars and they can do nothing about it.

With so much war hysteria in the air and so much war propaganda confusing public thought, a voice for peace may seem like a voice crying in the wilderness. Yet I know there are millions upon millions of the common folks whose ears and hearts are attuned to peace and who will hear the peace side gladly.

Governments want war and peoples want peace. This is the universal rule of history and I have no doubt it is true this very night that the people of every land are yearning for peace. For the people all around the earth are weary of war. They are weary of its appalling destruction; weary of its suffering and heartbreaks; weary of the pain it puts in the hearts of mothers. Woodrow Wilson, the scholar, spoke in harmony with the eternal verities when he said:

"I have known of governments making war on governments, but I never knew of peoples making war on peoples."

I wonder whether, through all the maze of propaganda, the common people of America, the plain, ordinary, God-loving people, are not seeing the war situation more clearly than the war inciters. They read of German atrocities in England, the brutal bombing of women and children, the destruction of monumental buildings, hoary with antiquity and entwined throughout the centuries with the dearest affections and memories of the British nation, and then the kaleidoscope changes and in the mountain passes of the Balkans they see dead German boys piled high in windrows, some of them mere children. War is not pretty on any of its fronts. As this potpourri of grief and woe flows to our people, hour after hour, over the radio, many of them are thinking how much grander is the word "love" than the word "hate." A common expression is "Oh, God, can such things be?" Probably many are recalling the deathless sayings they were taught at the feet of a Christian mother:

"Thou shalt not kill."

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

The typical good honest American citizen hears the heart-rending news from the hells of Europe, Africa, and Asia, and thanks God for America. He has never become indoctrinated with the foreign poisons and ideologies that murder democracy and enslave the human spirit. He lives above the miasmas of hate. The more he sees of the foreign picture the more he thinks of America. He loves his family and his church and his neighborhood, and he appreciates the opportunity which his children enjoy under the American flag to grow and bloom. He is at his very best when the ties of home begin to press and strain against his heart. He craves no part in Europe's endless wars. He is for America first, last, and all the time. He has a great, consuming pity for the victims of man's inhumanity to man, but he does not choose to risk his heaven by involvement in foreign complications.

The heart of the world has bled long enough. It is time to stanch the flow, and I intend, in this brief address, to propose a plan whereby I think it might be possible to bring this war madness to an end under the leadership of our great Christian nation. With that thought in mind I have introduced a resolution (House Concurrent Resolution No. 20), which proposes that with the President of the United States as the leader, the 21 republics of the Western Hemisphere shall be requested to offer their services as a mediator to settle the troubles of the Old World, out of whose loins the New World sprang. My resolution is pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Its text is as follows:

"Whereas it is the overwhelming desire of the American people that the United States shall remain at peace with the world and free from foreign entanglements, while it faithfully performs its duties as a good neighbor; and

"Whereas if the world ever needed a peacemaker it needs one now; and

"Whereas with war engulfing a large portion of the globe and threatening to draw other nations into its vortex, there is a real opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its sincerity as a good neighbor by assuming the role of a peacemaker; and

"Whereas there is a possibility, faint though it may be, that the New World under the leadership of the United States, might be the means of freeing the Old World from the miseries of war and reestablishing peace and tranquillity on earth: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President shall be requested to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world.

"SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution shall be known as the peace resolution of 1941."

I believe the best thing that could happen to the world now would be successful mediation to stop the war, to be followed by reconstruction on a basis of fundamental justice.

Happily, Secretary of State Hull, the friend and idol of the American republics, in his recently enunciated five points, has presented to the world a splendid foundation for postwar reconstruction, based on fundamental justice. Secretary Hull's program of peace aims shines like a great beacon light to guide a weary world. From his five points justice holds forth its radiant promise for final peace in a war-torn world, as follows:

"1. Extreme nationalism must not be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.

"2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so

that international trade may grow and prosper.

"3. Raw material supplies must be available to all nations, without discrimination.

"4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.

"5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries."

In his statement of peace aims Secretary Hull caught and put on paper the vision of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the great American democracy. It is a vision of God, the Architect, the loving Father of us all, creating a cosmic commonwealth of infinite beauty and making it ready for His children. Vast, fertile plains to yield the things that sustain life, great rivers that flow in majesty to the seas, cascades that dance and sparkle in the sunlight, mountain slopes that rise in towering grandeur to the very feet of the Creator. Vineyards and orange groves, and the sunshine and the shadow chasing each other over waving fields of wheat and corn. In the depths of the earth God deposited untold billions of tons of coal to warm the human family, in the waterfalls he placed power without limit to drive the wheels of commerce. All things that make for prosperity, welfare, and happiness of the human race are embraced in God's gift to man on the morning of creation.

The Creator of this beautiful world made plenteous provision to sustain the lives of all the millions that might ever inhabit it. There is enough land lying uncultivated and fallow to support all human beings on the earth, if they would but forget their hatreds, put down their guns, and go to work. When the present cataclysm is over there must inevitably be a large-scale readjustment that will take into consideration the economic needs of the entire human family.

With wisdom and vision that cannot be challenged, Secretary Hull has recognized this fact, and has offered a basis for world readjustment on which it would be possible, with some additions and elaborations, perhaps, to create a new world of mutual respect and peaceful relations out of the ashes of the present conflict.

But his plan, ideal as it is, is not self-operating. Something must be done to start it. My suggestion is that Congress should adopt my peace resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 20, and then, backed by the 21 American republics, the President should offer Secretary Hull's five points to the warring nations as a tentative basis on which they can get together and stop the war.

The success of such a move is heightened by the love for Secretary Hull which exists throughout the entire Western Hemisphere. Very properly one of the cardinal aims of our foreign policy has been to solidify the Western Hemisphere, and if I am a judge we could bind the American republics closer than ever to us if we were to make them our happy partners in a sincere effort to bring peace to the world. They would be delighted to cooperate with us in such a significant humanitarian movement.

The time to mediate is now, before we get dragged into war, and the one man in the whole world to initiate mediation proceedings is the President of the United States.

Mediation would not be a new role for us. Over 35 years ago another Roosevelt—Theodore—proposed mediation which brought to an end the Russo-Japanese War, saving untold numbers of lives and incalculable property damage.

We are friends of England and she has our deep sympathy, and we abhor Hitlerism and all its stands for, but we will render her and the world a disservice if we encourage a continuation of the war. In my opinion neither side is going to win in this war. Hitler cannot invade England and the British cannot invade the Continent. If the war continues it will settle down into a long stalemate, each side trying to wear the other down by attrition and only the Lord knows how long the saturnalia of death and destruction will continue. If we get sucked into it Japan and France and probably Russia will join the Axis against us and American boys not yet born will be on the firing line before the war is over. The America we have known, the land in which the rights of the citizen have always been exalted above the military will disappear and our country will become a vast armed camp.

My resolution was introduced on February 27 last and I could fill many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with letters and telegrams I have received in support of it. One California group has started out to secure a million signatures to petitions urging its passage. Many of the great minds of the church, bewildered but seeking as always to keep contact with the hand of God, are giving the resolution their solicitious attention. I have before me a telegram I have just received from Cardinal O'Connell, that grand old man of the Catholic Church, saying:

"There is no doubt in my mind that the American people desire a cessation of this stupid and brutal war, and I may add that no one can doubt their desire to keep out of this conflict."

I have also just received a telegram from another great religious leader, Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the Riverside Church of New York City. He says:

"I strongly commend your resolution to promote peace by calling a conference of the American republics to offer the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator. This is the only hopeful and constructive way I see out of the present crisis."

What I am suggesting now is that the time has come when the people of America should take a hand toward bringing about peace in the world. After all, it is the people who have to suffer and die in war. After all, it is the people who have to bear the burdens and the costs and the unspeakable griefs of war. It is a people's question. The President is entitled to know how you, the people, feel about it.

Though the referendum on overseas wars was defeated, there is in this country, founded on popular rule, a way still left open by which the people may express themselves on the war situation and that is through the right of petition. Let the people of America be sufficiently alert in exercising this fundamental and inalienable right and they can have a determining influence toward ending the war. By so doing they will encourage the peoples of the dictator countries, who have no right of petition, to overthrow their governments and end the mad orgie of bloodshed and slaughter. It costs only 1 cent to send a postal card, 3 cents to send a letter, and a moderate sum to send a telegram. If ever the cost of a telegram was justified, that time is now. Hundreds of people have written to me in anguish, saying:

"I want to help the cause of peace, but I feel so helpless. What can I do?"

This is my answer: Every person in America can help in the cause of peace if (1) he will write or wire to his Congressman and to the Senators from his State urging the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 20, the Ludlow peace resolution, and (2) if he will not stop with one effort but will keep on writing and wiring, and (3) if he will write to a dozen or more of his friends and neighbors, asking them to petition their Members of Congress to support the resolution.

This outlines the mechanics by which the force of public opinion can be marshaled in a supreme effort to assist in terminating the age of butchery and bringing about the peace of the world. The resolution I have introduced will remain in a musty pigeonhole forever unless it is brought out of committee by the aroused force of public opinion. I hope those who hear me will lose no time in sending their appeals to their Representatives and Senators, for the situation is acute, and this is not a matter of local and transient interest, but of vital importance to the entire human race. Your action in this direction will help to counteract the terrific pressures that are being exerted to force the President into war. The world is crying for America's leadership in the cause of peace.

High among the snow-crowned Andes Mountains the face of Christ shines in the bright sunlight. To my imaginative mind, the heroic statue of the Prince of Peace, on the borderland between Chile and Argentina, sends out on the ether waves of love and friendship its mute appeal for the mediation resolution I have introduced. That statue is deeply rooted in the sentiment of the American republics, because it was erected by the two nations to celebrate an accord that was reached after long and intense bitterness. It stands in towering majesty on a spot 13,000 feet high. It can be seen for a hundred miles and all who come near it are enthralled by its beauty and grandeur. The story of the Christ of the Andes has been told many times, but to a world stricken with war, or living in constant fear of war, it cannot be told too often. The statue bears this inscription:

"These mountains must crumble to dust before the Argentines and the Chileans shall break the peace which they have sworn to maintain at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer."

Would it not be a grand thing if the moving hand of history were to write into the record of civilization this memorandum:

"In the year 1941 a great Christian President of the United States, with the assistance of the 21 American republics, brought a warring world to the feet of Christ, the Redeemer."

Is it not worth trying?

Stopping Hitlerism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. KENNETH McKELLAR, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interview published in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., soon after the President delivered his recent broadcast. This interview was given by my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who

has been quite ill, but who is rapidly recovering, and has recovered to such an extent that he can comment belligerently upon the affairs of the world. I ask that the interview be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

ONLY UNITED STATES CAN STOP HITLERISM, MCKELLAR SAYS, ENDORSING F. D. R.

The United States is the only power on earth that can stop Hitlerism "and the sooner we realize it and take steps to stop him the better it will be for our country and for the world," Senator MCKELLAR said yesterday in fully endorsing President Roosevelt's radio address of Tuesday night.

The Senator also scored loss of defense production by strike and urged the settlement of such strikes through tribunals set up by the Government.

NEED FOR GREATER AID

"Defense production must not be held up for a moment by these differences between employer and employees," said Senator MCKELLAR in discussing ways of bringing about greater aid for Britain.

Recently released from the hospital, where he underwent a major operation, the Senator is recuperating at the home of his brother, H. C. McKellar. He has been a staunch supporter of the administration's aid-to-Britain program, and prior to his leaving the hospital stressed the need for actual deliveries of goods to Britain.

"President Roosevelt, in his characteristic and matchless style and voice, last night gave an accurate and vivid history of the present war and America's tremendous interest and peril in the outcome of it. I agree fully with his facts as recited and just as fully with his conclusions as to our duty as a Nation at this time," said the Senator.

"As I recall, the Congress, and I believe the American people, were practically all a unit in giving our aid to England last year, and the greatest difficulty was as to the nature and extent of the aid. We have already spent billions, and are continuing to spend more billions of American money in manufacturing guns, tanks, airplanes, and other war materials for her, much of which will be a silly and useless gesture unless we deliver these materials promptly to her as soon as manufactured.

"RECALLS SENATE SPEECH

"If she cannot provide safe transportation of these materials across the Atlantic, we must deliver them to her. I recall I made a speech in the Senate last January favoring delivery of these materials to England by America if she could not get them otherwise, and I am still of the same mind. To leave them here unused would make us a laughing stock and might cause England and eventually ourselves to lose to Hitlerism.

"If Hitler is not stopped and continues to succeed in his mad designs of world conquest, he will, of course, eventually attack America, and destroy our free institutions and take away our precious liberties. As I look at it, we are the only power on earth that can stop him, and the sooner we realize it and take steps to stop him, the better it will be for our country and for the world."

"The greatest loser in this country by the success of Hitler and Hitlerism will be labor, which he has uniformly enslaved. In this country labor has reached its highest success, and I would hate to see it lose the gains it has made. The next greatest loser will be capital, which his new order destroyed. It would seem, therefore, that these two interests in America would be the first to realize their danger of Hitlerism.

"STRIKES MUST STOP

"I, therefore, as a friend of labor, join the President in urging the uninterrupted production of ships and other war materials. Strikes in plants making defense materials must stop. Differences between employer and employee must be settled not by stopping work, but by tribunals set up by the Government, or all will be lost. Defense production must not be held up for a moment by these differences between employer and employee, which differences must be settled by establishing governmental agencies.

"Again I say I talk as a friend of labor and, of course, I believe in the capital system.

"I am in the fullest accord with the President's address and his plan, and I hope I may soon be well enough to return to Washington and give him every aid I possibly can."

On Our Way, Where?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the commencement address delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas, at Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa, on June 2, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because this is one of the memorable days in your lives and the lives of your fathers and mothers, I deeply appreciate the honor you do me in asking me to make the graduation address at Simpson College.

In these earth-shaking times you will not expect from me mere pleasantries. Such occasions as this fail of their purpose if they do not contribute to the better understanding of the realities confronting us. And there is probably little time left for such speeches.

Tuesday night it appeared that the great debate on war or peace now was closed. That the proclamation of unlimited national emergency in connection with the President's speech meant the time had come for us to close ranks behind the President, as we always do when facing a foreign foe.

Today, after reading the reports of the Presidential press conference following his speech, a press conference which was announced for the purpose of clarifying the speech, it is clear that the President himself has not made up his mind. As long as expert White House reporters are debating what he meant in his speech and in his press conference the next day, the issue can still be debated. Therefore, the debate is still open.

The President can lead me into closed ranks, but he cannot hint me there, or scare me into them. This is not mere oratory on my part. I supported his vigorous and forthright statements when the flag was fired on at the sinking of the *Panay* and at a time when some of those who are now shouting for war were shouting for the Ludlow resolution.

The best-trained reporters cannot agree as to the meaning of the President's speech and the meaning of what he said in the press conference the next day in relation to it. Therefore the country must reach the conclusion the President still believes we can help England in ways that will not involve us in war. The country must also reach the conclusion that the war party in America is trying to read into the President's speech actions that are not there. Their attempt to give the country "the rush act" is revealed in many instances of overstatement and the twist of the adjective in attempting to analyze the President's beautiful prose.

Long ago I considered all the possibilities of a Hitler victory. I considered living in a regimented world his victories might require, for a while.

Frank Knox and I went all over these tragic possibilities, and others, and their danger to our country, in several conversations ending just about a year ago today. He reached one conclusion; I another. And apparently the President does not yet share Secretary Knox's views of what should be done.

Never once have I wavered in my belief that we should arm to the teeth but stay out of armed participation in this European war. Having considered all the possibilities that have happened, I have not been stampeded by their occurrence. I refuse to get the cart before the horse.

Before we go a step further we should know the actual status of our national-defense equipment. To send men into the field untrained and unaccustomed to their equipment is sheer murder. I, for one, want to know how much training our men are receiving with the equipment they will use in actual combat, if engaged in combat.

Before we talk about getting into war, and talk about carrying the four freedoms to all the world, let us know whether we have got something to fight with, and if we have not got it, when are we going to get it? This is all important to me. That use of the words "potential strength" in the President's chat sounded disturbingly reminiscent of "on hand and on order."

Then there is something else, all important also, that is not being discussed. We don't know whether the English policies, when victory comes, will be the old imperialism balance of power that tolerates no other nation in the world, or whether her policy is to be one of reconciliation, or of repression. It was neither after the World War.

I don't think you can put a mighty people like the Germans into shackles permanently. Yet some of the English Cabinet Members' speeches indicate that line of thought. I have not seen any authoritative enthusiastic reaction from the English to Secretary Hull's tangible and constructive four points recently "offering a broad program of world economic reconstruction." In fact, the implication of their silence would indicate disagreement.

The Engish send their idealists over here, like Lord Halifax, but when we sit down around the treaty table we always find a lot of hard-boiled realistic traders, who want to eat their cake and have it too. So before we go into partnership with them, with every prospect of carrying the big end of the load, let us understand all the facts. Not only of what we are going to fight with, but what we are going to fight for. And as far as I am concerned, I want something more tangible than the four freedoms, and something more satisfactory than we have received from the English so far, in statement of their policy.

So long as we are simply helping England with material aid, we have no right to ask her

establish a new order, we have a right first to state her terms. But if we are going into partnership with her to save the world and to know her policies, and on what terms she will make peace.

Of course, as I have said many times, we cannot live upon a high plateau aloof from the rest of the world. Of course, the world is made smaller by the airplane, and of course war has been revolutionized by the airplane. But all this does not completely eliminate geography.

One of the all important things for us, that we hear little if anything about these days, is the situation in South America.

Now Dakar—Dakar, Africa—is picked as the jumping off place to Brazil for the Nazi invasion of the Western Hemisphere. Well, Dakar, Africa, is French territory at the present. But, waiving that, get down your maps and figure out how far Dakar, in Africa, is from the real base of operations, Germany. There isn't a military or naval expert in the United States that will challenge the statement that the real base of operations is in Germany. Consider then the distance from Germany to Dakar, in Africa. Consider the woefully inadequate transportation facilities, the enormous quantities of equipment, munitions, guns, food, and men that would have to be transported from Germany to Dakar—Dakar, Africa—before they were even started for Brazil. For even though the airplane has revolutionized warfare, it has not eliminated the doughboys. And all this material and all the ships and all these millions of men would have to be assembled in Dakar, Africa, 4,000 miles from their base of operations in Germany. And still 1,600 sea miles further to go, to their objective in Brazil.

And what about our good and powerful friend Brazil? What are we doing to reach an understanding with her? If there is this mutual danger, it would seem that both countries could find it possible to work out a cooperative agreement that would be of mutual benefit. In fact, that is the purpose of the several declarations of the American States. This is a question of infinite importance to the American people.

As a matter of fact, we have a base in British Guiana. This is one of the bases that we acquired in the destroyer deal. If we go ahead and swiftly develop this base, we will have materially improved our defense position, and will be in a strong position to cooperate with neighboring countries against any threat of attack from over the seas. A report on the progress of our defense preparations on this base is of great importance to the American people.

There is really less potential menace from Hitler today than there was a year ago. Despite his victories, he has been knocked about considerably. He has lost many men and ships in the last year. The German people are just 1 year nearer the limits of human endurance all peoples possess. While our defense production is just getting into its stride. Our Navy is increasing. We have the industrial production, the resources, the manpower, and what is more important, we operate from "the impregnable security" of our own base, if we stay in this hemisphere.

I once asked an old "hoss" trader how he made up his mind what a "hoss" was worth. He replied, "I walk around him once, and trade on the first impression."

The first impression of the American people was to stay out of the European war. Gradually, step by step, a little group who were determined from the first that we should enter this war, have attempted, by clever maneuvering, to change the people's first impression.

For a long time they concealed from the people their true beliefs and intentions. Some are still trying to deceive us with the illusion that war would not mean bringing into American homes the suffering, the destruction of life and dreams, the return of crippled and decaying men in place of the lifelong hopes these homes sent forth.

I do not know of a greater attempt in all history to deceive the American people as to the consequences of their decision and the consequences of what we are doing, than the record, both in and out of the administration, during the present European war.

Wars cannot be won by half-way measures. We cannot fight a war limited to naval and air action as we have been told. We cannot underwrite Hitler's defeat without sending into action across the seas millions of doughboys. Never for 1 minute have I wavered from that view of the realities of war.

Wars are not won by bluff and bluster. They are not won by clever diplomatic moves. It is plainly evident that the war party in the United States is magnifying the difficulty of defending the Monroe Doctrine, just as they minimize the enormous difficulty of Hitler in attacking it successfully.

It may well be, if we do not change our national habits, that the future historian will refer to your generation as seeing the end of the Republic.

It may well be that the anarchy of today will produce despotism tomorrow. That has been true before in the world's history. The most recent example was in Germany, when a puzzled and discouraged people turned from the republic they had tried to nazi-ism in their search for security.

If anyone is confident that the roots of our democracy are so deeply planted that there is no danger of such a thing happening here, let him take a look at these roots and see if they are in a healthy condition. Already Executive rule has been substituted for the three branches of government. The President's proclamation of unlimited national emergency, and the failure in his speech to mention the Congress, practically brushes aside the Congress, and the President can virtually govern the country by Executive order. The fact that the President has confused the country as to exactly what he meant to do should not deceive us as to what he can do, supported by war hysteria and a blank-check majority in Congress and a friendly Supreme Court.

Therefore, for the period of the unlimited emergency, we have not in form but in reality seen the end of the Republic. That its restoration will automatically occur cannot be taken for granted. We have to consider, among other things, the administration's record of unwillingness to surrender emergency powers. And we have the administration's record of short cuts.

We find a fatalistic acceptance of the inevitable. On all sides we have heard it said frequently in recent months, "It's no use to fight against war, because Roosevelt can get us in whenever he wants to."

We have already accepted, in our thinking and legislation, the basic tenet of nazi-ism—that everything is dependent upon government.

In this transition period between a laissez-faire capitalism and something else, we failed to tackle the hard job of achieving social progress without the entering wedge of totalitarianism.

In the hurry to expand government to meet new economic conditions too many administrative short cuts were condoned for the sake of the objective. And we have been making that a regular practice. Too many are now condoning a short cut to war and to national defense, involved in the Presidential proclamation of unlimited national emergency. It was strange to see exultation on the part of some for the way Congress was ignored in the last fireside chat. By firm and capable management we could have had the necessary national-defense production without resort to such extreme means, and certainly Congress should have the opportunity to debate the war issue in advance, instead of being permitted at the last minute to do so simply as a matter of form.

There is an old moth-eaten principle that has been misused in the attempt to stop much good legislation. But it is a good rule, that we should have a government of laws, not men.

The better the lawyer the less he will pretend to advise you on what the Government may rule tomorrow or next day on dozens of questions affecting everyday business relations. A concrete ruling today on a definite and specific point may be changed tomorrow. No one knows "where he is at," as the saying goes, because power was delegated to men without any blueprints of laws to follow. The judgment of each bureaucrat is his law.

We are stirred by the flouting of the rights of the minority in Nazi, Fascist, and Communist countries. Yet we have tar and feather parties, lynchings, and suppression of free speech in various parts of the United States. Already the attempt is being made to paste the label of "unpatriotic" on those who still dare to debate the issue of war.

In other words, in these things I have mentioned and in other ways we have been steadily weakening our checks upon the majority. And this in all other republics, of ancient and modern times, has resulted in dictatorship, of the right or of the left.

The self-reliance, the fortitude, and the sense of equality necessary in the type of citizen this Nation requires, if the Republic is to survive in this world of dictatorships, are not being developed by the New Deal, nor are they developed by arrogant plutocracy that acts, when in power, more or less like glorified pawnbrokers. In the past 8 years we have learned to look to Washington instead of to local communities to pay the bills of civil projects. One blank-check appropriation after another has rendered Congress and the local chambers of commerce equally supine. New Deal idealistic absolutism was praised by liberals as a substitute for ruthless plutocratic absolutism, without any thought of the destructiveness of both to the idea of government by reference to the people.

And it has not yet dawned upon the liberals of the country that social progress with totalitarianism is still totalitarianism. That in a world returning to despotism in the name of social gains we should be particularly careful to preserve the social gains by strengthening the Republic, instead of weakening it by short-cut methods pursued in the name of a holy cause. For 8 years now we have followed the theory of government that the end justifies the means. If the objective is humanitarian, if the cause is noble, why worry about the methods used to reach the goal? If democratic traditions and concepts were destroyed, when by more careful study and slower, more expert statesmanship they could have been maintained with the same social gains, what's the difference? In other words, social gains were not inimical and of themselves destructive to the Republic, as a lot of stuffed-shirt reactionaries would have us believe. But the way they are accomplished, the short cuts resorted to in the process of achieving them, are very disastrous to the idea of reference to the people for authority to proceed. And once that idea is destroyed the Republic is destroyed, and you have a gradually growing despotism.

Our problems are many sided. No question is exclusively economic or political or social. The very complexities, the willingness to follow openmouthed the honeyed words of one leader, was too much for the people of Italy and Germany. But if there was honey in his phrases, they were backed up by sufficient daring and determination to put fortitude into his people.

The entire world, in utmost reality, is being ruled by four men: Stalin, Churchill, Hitler, and Roosevelt. And England, Germany, and the United States are in the fix

they are today from these same conditions, by a "national distaste for facing difficult, complex facts, the national yearning for an easy way out, and a general desire to reap the benefits of collective action without swallowing the prescriptions of Dr. Marx."

I don't think the principles of Dr. Marx are workable. I do think our present habits lead straight for a dictatorship of the right. Already in a few ways that I have briefly mentioned, we have undermined the structure of the Republic. I think we are headed for a long, long war—2, 5, 10 years maybe—for one step farther and there is no turning back until we win. When we do win, which we will in the end, we will be bankrupt, along with the rest of the combatant world.

To all this, add executive rule, and you will perceive, I hope, that the task of restoring our Republic is not automatic and simple, but extremely difficult. It can be done only with determined effort on the part of all the citizens.

For us in our thinking to accept as permanently granted these powers the President has assumed, or his acts under them as beyond criticism, would be a colossal disaster to the Republic.

You are not looking for the easy way. All you are looking for is opportunity. Hold fast, then, I say, to the old-fashioned religion of hard work, sobriety, and frugality, true attributes of strength of character which your country must have in its citizens of today and tomorrow. Never have I wavered in my confidence and belief that the character of the American people, in the end, will meet whatever test may come.

There is more to life in America than anywhere else in the world today. We must be worthy of it. I believe we are. But any people, no matter how sturdy, must have leadership of strength and determination that will encourage them, and if necessary make them sacrifice a part in order to preserve the whole.

Federal Acquisition of Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

LETTER FROM CHARLES R. FENWICK

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the question of the acquisition of land by the Federal Government for military purposes has created some serious problems in a number of the States.

I have received a very interesting letter from Hon. Charles R. Fenwick, a very influential member of the House of Delegates of Virginia, making certain suggestions which appear to me to be worthy of the fullest possible consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 24, 1941.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been very much concerned with the Federal Government acquiring land in the State of Virginia, both in Arlington and Caroline Counties and other portions of the State. I realize that in the present emergency concessions and sacrifices must be made, but I believe that they can be accomplished in an orderly manner and without disrupting the sovereignty of the State and its citizenry. Section 8, clause 17, of the constitution reads:

"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

When the United States acquires title to lands by purchase with the consent of the legislature of the State the Federal jurisdiction is exclusive of all State authority (*U. S. v. Unzenta*, 280 U. S. 138). Buildings constructed within the States and under this clause are exempt as instrumentalities for the execution of powers of the General Government, and such control of the States as would defeat or impair their use for that purpose. It is necessarily temporary, to be exercised only so long as the places continue to be used for the public purpose for which the property was acquired or reserved from sale. When they cease to be thus used the jurisdiction reverts to the State (*Fort Leavenworth Ro. Co. v. Lowe*, 114 U. S. 525).

(NOTE.—In later years such land has invariably remained the property of the Federal Government and been converted into parks and for other uses.)

Federal jurisdiction being exclusive, private personal property thereon cannot be taxed by the State (*Surplus Trading Co. v. Cooke*, 281 U. S. 647; *Nikes v. Commonwealth*, 144 Virginia 618).

There is no provision in this section of the Constitution against reservations as to how the land should be used or other restrictions in connection with the consent by the legislature (*James v. Dravo Contracting Company*, 302 U. S. 134). It is not unusual for the United States to own within a State lands which are set apart and used for public purposes. Such ownership and use without more do not withdraw the lands from the jurisdiction of the State (*Surplus Trading Company v. Cooke*, 281 U. S. 647).

The phrase "places purchased" limits the National Government to one mode of acquiring exclusive legislative authority over land within a State, namely, by purchase with the State's consent; when land is acquired any other way as by cession, any conditions may be annexed to it, not inconsistent with the public use contemplated. So a State may impose a condition that jurisdiction may be retained by the United States only so long as the place is used for the purpose specified; it may continue its laws in force and do so so long as they do not conflict with necessary acts of Congress. It may provide that civil and criminal processes of State courts may be executed therein; but where a cession has been made subject to certain conditions, the United States takes entire political jurisdiction, save as expressed in the conditions (*Chicago, R. I. and P. R. Co. v. McGlinn*, 114 U. S. 545; *Palmer v. Barrett*, 162 U. S. 399).

Consent or ratification by the State is necessary to the acquisition of exclusive jurisdiction, but it is necessary for no other purpose and cannot be required in order to permit the United States to exercise its rights of eminent domain (*Chappell v. U. S.*, 116 U. S. 499).

Under this last provision the Federal Government can promiscuously acquire lands without the consent of the State legislature, although it does not acquire exclusive jurisdiction. Such procedure is the most damaging and unless exercised with discretion can demoralize a community and destroy a political subdivision of a State.

Two suggestions are made:

First, that the Federal Government, through its proper authority, consider with the State the particular problem, and if such land is acquired, it be on a lease-lend basis so that at the end of the emergency, or when no longer used for the particular purpose, that it will revert back to the State in the case of purchase under the terms of the Constitution, or to the individuals when acquired through eminent domain.

Second, that land be selected as far as possible not in cultivation, or of the submarginal type. There are today thousands of acres in Virginia not under cultivation, or if cultivated so submarginal that the tillers cannot earn a living. The removal of families from such land onto fertile, tillable land would mark a great advance in the State and at the same time fill the wants and needs of the Government. It is realized that some sites desired for a particular purpose may not be available in such localities as mentioned but certainly this matter should be given every consideration before fertile farms are removed from cultivation and the homes of people destroyed when other measures are available.

I would greatly appreciate your giving this matter consideration and discussing it with the proper authorities.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES R. FENWICK.

Confederate Memorial Address, Arlington National Cemetery, Sunday, June 1, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALL DOXEY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WALL DOXEY, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me yesterday, June 1, 1941, on Confederate Memorial Day at Arlington Cemetery.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Major Smith and all the heroes who wore the Gray, Major Van Swearingen, ladies, and gentlemen, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, regrets beyond expression that it is impossible for him to be with us this afternoon and deliver the main address as had been planned.

Therefore, I, pinch-hitting for Senator BILBO, shall read the address he had prepared for delivery on this Confederate Memorial Day.

Once again we are gathered to commemorate the memories of our Confederate dead, though mindful that our feeble services of commemoration cannot hope to do justice to their unsurpassed valor, self-sacrifice, and devotion to principles. It is altogether fitting that these annual memorials be held in reverent tribute to our Confederate heroes, as an expression of everlasting gratitude. It is our sacred obligation to perpetuate for the rising generations a spirit of appreciation of

the terrific price paid for a glorious united democracy such as we cherish today.

When we speak of the heroes of the Confederacy, we refer not only to those renowned military leaders whose names are indelibly engraved on the scroll of time. Not to those alone, for our homage extends to even the humblest soldier of the ranks though he may sleep in an unmarked grave with naught but the green growths of earth and the morning dew to adorn his resting place. We include, by all means, the noble women of the Confederacy whose heroism and untold sacrifices entitled them to lasting fame.

Memorial Day is an occasion of sublime inspiration and solemn reflection, especially so at this time when the specter of war stalks over half the globe; when the whole world is confronted with danger.

The significance and solemnity of the event are intensified by the locale. This sacred shrine supplies its own reflections and evokes its own plaudits.

Here at Arlington tens of thousands of the brave dead of American wars sleep in honored dust, where magnificent marble preserves memories and proclaims the worth of as valiant heroes as the world has ever known. More than 21,000 of them were soldiers of the Civil War.

Here rests the Unknown Soldier of the World War—"known but to God."

"The name of him whose body lies before us took flight with his imperishable soul. We know not whence he came but only that his death marks him with the everlasting glory of an American dying for his country, and greater devotion hath no man than this. He died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in his heart and hope on his lips that his country should triumph and its civilization survive."

Here at beautiful Arlington lived the peerless General Robert E. Lee, commander of the Confederate armies, whose military genius immortalized him as a paragon to be emulated down through the years by military men of this Nation and of nations across the seas.

The cause of the Confederacy is commonly designated as "the lost cause." I have never liked that designation. It seems inappropriately associated with a cause defended by men who have been as conspicuous among men as the cause for which they gave their all will be forever famous among events.

It seems misapplied when we so confidently believe that whenever the last great account of humanity shall be written, in the bright annals of those who have best served and glorified a great Nation shall be found the names of General Lee and Stonewall Jackson and those other brilliant leaders of the Confederate forces. Their eulogies will be spoken on through succeeding ages when we who speak them now shall be forgotten.

Historians are rather well agreed that superb military capacity, fortified by the unrelenting zeal of the Confederate soldiers and their people—this alone—was the thing that sustained the southern armies throughout 4 long years of bitter war. In every other respect, overwhelming odds were pitted against the South from the very beginning; numerical odds of at least 3 to 1, a vast disparity of resources, an overwhelming superiority of sea power, in favor of the antagonists.

The so-called lost cause has taught us some unforgettable lessons. In between the lines of Civil War history are to be found our most convincing sermons on the necessity of "all out" preparedness by any people confronted with potential aggression. Military genius, Spartan courage, and undying zeal are not enough. War is a cold, cruel, ruthlessly practical business. Preparedness to the limit; preparedness to match in numbers and in kind the instruments and the forces of the adversary is the only kind of defense worthy of the name.

In defeat the men in gray were as heroic as they were valorous on the battlefield. Footsore and sick at heart, the Confederate soldier buttoned up his faded gray jacket and turned his steps toward home. Ragged, half starved, enfeebled by hunger, exposure, and wounds, he pulled his gray cap over his tired brow and began the slow trek homeward. At the journey's end, he found there his once happy and prosperous home war-scarred or in utter ruins; his farm desolated; his livestock killed; his barns and cupboards empty; his economy destroyed; his money worthless; his gracious way of life swept away.

The courage and ingenuity of the Confederate soldier and has family in the struggle for reconstruction form many an epic chapter in the history of the Nation. Permit me to borrow a few words from the illustrious Henry W. Grady, of Atlanta, who lived during the Reconstruction period. I quote Mr. Grady:

"Surely God inspired the Confederate soldier in his adversity. As ruin was never before so overwhelming, never was restoration swifter. The soldier stepped from the trenches into the furrow. Horses that had charged Federal guns marched before the plow, and fields that ran red with human blood in April were green with the harvest in June. Women reared in luxury cut up their dresses and made trousers for their husbands; and, with a patience and heroism that fit women always as a garment, gave their hands to work. There was little bitterness in all this. Cheerfulness and frankness prevailed. From the ashes left us by Sherman, that able general who was a kind of careless man with fire, we have raised a brave and beautiful city; and, somehow or other, we have caught the sunshine in the bricks and mortar of our homes and have builded therein not one ignoble prejudice or memory."

All wars have been severe upon the women in an invaded country. The burdens and perils of the fine women of the Confederacy were especially heavy. In addition to assuming the home responsibilities of men gone to war, the women spun and sewed for the soldiers. They deprived themselves of food that it might be sent to the Army. A plan was launched by those good ladies of the South to cut off their hair and sell it to Europe as a means of raising funds for the army. The project failed of consummation only because it was impossible to run the Federal blockade. Every day was one of privation and sorrow. They experienced the horrors and privations of war all about them, but faltered not. When it was all over those gracious women were the very first to kindle a spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation. To them goes the credit for having inspired the National Memorial Day by their beautiful custom of laying flowers upon the graves of Union as well as Confederate soldiers. I am pardonably proud that Mississippi women were the originators of that custom.

Francis Miles Finch, of New York, who served under Grant as a revenue collector, wrote his immortal poem, The Blue and the Gray, upon hearing that the women of Columbus, Miss., had strewn flowers alike on the graves of the Confederate and of the Union soldiers.

"These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat;
All with the battle blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet.
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the laurel the Blue
Under the willow the Gray."

It is a happy commentary on Americanism that so many splendid steps have been taken by descendants of the Blue and the Gray to close the chasm of separation; that we have today a nation so indivisibly united that it can never again be torn asunder by sectional differences. Americans all, joint heirs of a grand legacy bequeathed us by our founding fathers.

Just a few days ago the Descendants of the Participants of the Campaign, Siege, and Defense of Vicksburg held their sixth annual assembly in historic Vicksburg, where descendants of both sides meet annually to clasp hands in eternal friendship.

Still another link will be welded into the chain of unity when, on day after tomorrow, Beauvoir, the Mississippi home of President Jefferson Davis, will be dedicated as a national shrine.

Confederate veterans one by one have passed away. The thin gray line grows ever thinner. As each one goes forth to that Valhalla of the valiant dead, we bend in affectionate sorrow over his bier, realizing that soon the last of his ranks will have passed from the earth. To the few of these venerable gentlemen now in the land of the living we extend hearty felicitations. May their remaining days be crowned with joy and tranquillity; and when the trumpet call of eternity shall summon them to join their comrades on the other shore, may they go forth happy and triumphant in the glory of their valor.

May we, all of us, resolve to emulate the fortitude and heroism of those whom we honor today. Let us all, as true Americans, prove worthy of our precious heritage by giving our last full measure of devotion to the preservation of a glorious united America consummated with their hearts' blood.

Exercises at Arlington National Cemetery, May 30, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

PROGRAM OF EXERCISES

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the exercises at the Arlington National Cemetery on May 30 and to witness the impressive ceremonies conducted by the board of directors of the Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Day Corporation.

The ceremonies were solemn and dignified, and the committee is to be commended for the fine and patriotic nature of the exercises.

The following is the printed program, which gives not only historical information regarding the national cemetery but also the program and other interesting facts:

1941 MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

(Cut)

Approach to Memorial Amphitheater and Tomb of Unknown Soldier

THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC MEMORIAL DAY CORPORATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Day Corporation was organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, November

17, 1938, by the united action of the District of Columbia Departments of the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the American Legion. A few months thereafter the Department of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War was admitted into constituent membership. The corporation was formed for two specific purposes: (a) To decorate the graves of veterans buried in Arlington National Cemetery and other local and national cemeteries in the District of Columbia; and (b) to hold fitting memorial services on Decoration Day. Memorial services of this character have been held annually by the Grand Army of the Republic since Memorial Day was established, May 5, 1868. Four representatives from each organization constitute its board of directors, no one of whom receives any compensation for his services. The expenses of the corporation when not partially defrayed by an annual appropriation from Congress are borne by small contributions donated by public-spirited citizens who are interested in honoring the Nation's service dead and who value the sacrifice and offer of sacrifice made by those who have followed the flag. The legacy of today and the heritage for posterity come from their sacrifices.

"Whenever a people forgets its worthy past, the day will come when it will not have a past worth remembering."—Dr. Henry Nelson Snyder, president, Wofford College.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC MEMORIAL DAY CORPORATION

Officers

President: James G. Yaden, past department commander, United Spanish War Veterans.

Secretary: Arthur C. Fowle, department adjutant, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Treasurer: Harry F. Patterson, past department commander, United Spanish War Veterans.

Assistant treasurer: Ralph N. Werner, past chapter commander, Disabled American Veterans.

Vice presidents: John M. Kline, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic; Charles W. McCaffrey, past department commander, United Spanish War Veterans; Daniel E. Campbell, past department commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars; William Leo Collins, past post commander, the American Legion; Ralph L. Chambers, past department commander, Disabled American Veterans.

Directors

Grand Army of the Republic: John M. Kline, department commander; John T. Ryan, past department commander (deceased); E. D. Godfrey, past department commander (deceased); William F. Dorsey, past department commander.

United Spanish War Veterans: Calvin B. Lucas, department commander; James G. Yaden, past department commander; Harry F. Patterson, past department commander; Charles W. McCaffrey, past department commander.

Veterans of Foreign Wars: Leonard J. Bacon, department commander; Daniel E. Campbell, past department commander; Arthur C. Fowle, department adjutant; George G. McLeish, past department commander.

The American Legion: William H. Hargrave, department commander; William Leo Collins, past post commander; William T. Slattery, past department commander; R. L. Zwinglas, past department vice commander.

Disabled American Veterans: Joel D. Thacker, department commander; Ralph L. Chambers, past department commander; Ralph N. Werner, past chapter commander; E. Claude Babcock, past national commander.

HEADQUARTERS GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1868.

GENERAL ORDERS NO. 11

(Cut)

Maj. Gen. John A. Logan

I. The 30th day of May 1868 is designated for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country during the late rebellion and whose bodies now lie in almost every city, village, and hamlet churchyard in the land. In this observance no form or ceremony is prescribed, but posts and comrades will, in their own way, arrange such fitting services and testimonials of respect as circumstances may permit.

We are organized, Comrades, as our regulations tell us, for the purpose, among other things, "of preserving and strengthening those kind and fraternal feelings which have bound together the soldiers, sailors, and marines, who united to suppress the late rebellion." What can aid more to assure this result than by cherishing tenderly the memory of our heroic dead? We should guard their graves with sacred vigilance. All that the consecrated wealth and taste of the Nation can add to their adornment and security is but a fitting tribute to the memory of her slain defenders. Let pleasant paths invite the coming and going of reverent visitors and fond mourners. Let no neglect, no ravages of time, testify to the present or to the coming generations that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a free and undivided Republic.

If other eyes grow dull and other hands slack and other hearts cold in the solemn trust, ours shall keep it well as long as the light and warmth of life remain in us.

Let us, then, at the time appointed, gather around their sacred remains and garland the passionless mounds above them with choicest flowers of springtime; let us raise above them the dear old flag they saved; let us in this solemn presence renew our pledges to aid and assist those whom they have left among us a sacred charge upon the Nation's gratitude—the soldier's and sailor's widow and orphan.

II. It is the purpose of the Commander in Chief to inaugurate this observance with the hope that it will be kept up from year to year, while a survivor of the war remains to honor the memory of his departed comrades. He earnestly desires the public press to call attention to this order and lend its friendly aid in bringing it to the notice of comrades in all parts of the country in time for simultaneous compliance therewith.

III. Department commanders will use every effort to make this order effective.

By command of:

JOHN A. LOGAN,
Commander in Chief.

N. P. CHIPMAN,
Adjutant General.

COMMITTEES FOR MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES, 1941

General arrangements: E. Claude Babcock, chairman, and chairmen of committees listed below.

Arrangements at Arlington: Daniel E. Campbell, chairman.

Audit: Leonard J. Bacon, chairman.

Broadcasting: Ralph L. Chambers, chairman.

Finance and budget: Ralph L. Chambers, chairman.

Flowers: William T. Slattery, chairman.

Invitations and tickets: James G. Yaden, chairman, and department commanders.

Parade: Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox, grand marshal; William Leo Collins, chairman.

Program, music, speakers: James G. Yaden, chairman; Harlan Wood, vice chairman; and department commanders.

Public relations: Howard S. Fisk, chairman.

Reception: Department commanders.

Supplies and printing: Howard S. Fisk, chairman.

Tomb of the Unknown Soldier: Heywood N. Saunders, chairman.

Transportation: Ralph N. Werner, chairman.

Ushers and seating: Daniel E. Campbell, chairman.

WREATH-LAYING CEREMONIES, TOMB OF UNKNOWN SOLDIER

Heywood N. Saunders, master of ceremonies

11 a. m.: Ceremonies at Arlington Mansion, G. A. R.

11:30 a. m.: The President of the United States.

11:35 a. m.: G. A. R. Memorial Day Corporation; James G. Yaden presiding.

11:40 a. m.: United Spanish War Veterans; Calvin B. Lucas presiding.

11:45 a. m.: Sgt. Alvin C. York, aide-de-camp; Joseph C. Menendez, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

11:50 a. m.: Veterans of Foreign Wars; Leonard J. Bacon presiding.

11:55 a. m.: The American Legion; William H. Hargrave presiding.

12 noon: Disabled American Veterans; Joel D. Thacker presiding.

12:05 p. m.: Woman's Relief Corps; Mrs. Myrtle Burke presiding.

12:10 p. m.: Ladies of the G. A. R.; Mrs. Bess Pearce presiding.

12:15 p. m.: Daughters of Union Veterans of Civil War; Mrs. Amelia A. Yoder presiding.

12:20 p. m.: United Spanish War Auxiliary; Mrs. Betty Bassett, national president, presiding.

12:25 p. m.: United Spanish War Auxiliary; Mrs. Pauline Thompson presiding.

12:30 p. m.: Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary; Mrs. Ethel Sendlak presiding.

12:35 p. m.: The American Legion Auxiliary; Mrs. Helen M. McCabe presiding.

12:40 p. m.: Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary; Mrs. Mary Hargraves presiding.

12:45 p. m.: Wreaths by Veterans Auxiliary, Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Units. (Time and formation to be arranged by master of ceremonies.)

Admission and seating committee (for services within amphitheater): James W. Lyons, Sons of Veterans, chairman; James F. Kehoe, the American Legion, vice chairman; Harry E. Shilling, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES, NATIONAL AMPHITHEATER, MAY 30, 1941

Musical selections: American Legion Boys' Drum Corps, 12:10 p. m. (R. H. Viancour, director; W. R. Clifford, leader). Fort Stevens Post, Drum and Bugle Corps, 12:20 p. m. The United States Marine Band (Capt. William F. Santelmann, leader), 12:30 to 12:45 p. m.

1. Assembly (12:45 p. m.): Bugler, United States Marine Corps Band.

2. Call to order and presentation of colors: John M. Kline, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic.

3. Introduction of James G. Yaden, president, Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Day Corporation, presiding officer.

4. Invocation: Rev. Howard E. Snyder, department chaplain, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

5. Star-Spangled Banner: James Melton, United States Marine Corps Band accompanying.

6. Memorial Day oration: Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

7. Elegie by Massenet: James Melton, United States Marine Corps Band accompanying.

8. Remarks: Sergt. Alvin C. York, representing the Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States.

9. Selection: United States Marine Corps Band.

10. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address (recitation): Harlan Wood, past department commander, the American Legion.

11. Selection: United States Marine Corps Band.

12. General Logan's order establishing Memorial Day: Joel D. Thacker, department commander, Disabled American Veterans.

13. God Be With You Till We Meet Again: James Melton, United States Marine Corps Band accompanying.

14. Taps: Winifred Kemp, United States Marine Corps Band.

15. Benediction: Rev. William H. La Roche, department chaplain, United States War Veterans.

The National Guard of Honor, the American Legion, Capt. Ernest E. Kennard, and Veterans of Foreign Wars Honor Guard, Capt. William A. Downs, officiated with massing of colors.

The national broadcast of these services is made possible through the courtesy of the National Broadcasting Co. and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

(Delivered at the dedication of the cemetery at Gettysburg November 19, 1863)

(Cut)

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as the final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this; but, in a larger sense we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but we can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

EXCERPTS—DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness, prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions do, in the name, and by authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare. That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.

SOLDIER'S SOLILOQUY

(By Lucille Kendall Griswold)

Here, for long years I've lain.
In winter's cold and snow; in summer's rain.
A "soldier dead"—unknown—unclaimed.
In dusty files, a record bears my name, and to the right of it, three words—one bold—now growing dim,
Conceal my fate.
Once I was man.
Once, flesh concealed these bleached and weathered bones.
Once, I had power to breathe, and move, and think—but thinking, gave thought only to the "glory"—never to the broken homes of War.
Little dreamed I, that in a misty dawn-light yet to come,
Death—roaming a blood-drenched battlefield,
Would find me, and finding me,
Would claim me for his own.
But, that morn came, and here am I, alone—yet not alone.
My soul, by God's good grace, unchained and free to roam
Returns to me, and thus—with eyes long sightless—still—I see
The sunset—and the dawn
I hear the beat of soldiers marching—marching on.
Some of them to death: some to fame, and some—God!
Make man tolerant! Let war cease!
Or some of them, years hence when these poor bones are gone to dust
Will be as I am now—a skeleton—a memory
Three words—"Missing in action"—written dimly in a record
Just beside a name.

(Cut)

THE ARLINGTON HOUSE

(Custis-Lee Mansion)

Arlington National Cemetery was established by order of Secretary of War Stanton, June 15, 1864. It now comprises 408 acres, with 10 miles of paved roadways and 3 miles of paved sidewalks. It contains over 50,381 burials of service men from all of our wars and conflicts. Burials now average 4 a day. Over 1,284 were buried during the year of 1940. These service men come from every State in the Union, all of our foreign possessions, and 24 foreign countries. Men of the North and South hallow this sacred ground and sleep in peace together. In 1940 approximately 1,510,346 visitors viewed the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the World War. It is estimated that 2,000,000 persons visit the cemetery each year. The Memorial Amphitheater was dedicated May 15, 1920, and the Unknown Soldier of the World War was buried November 11, 1921. There were 319 wreaths, 29 sprays, and 2 medals laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by various veteran, patriotic, and civic bodies during the year 1940.

AMERICA

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing;
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrim's pride,
From every mountain side
Let freedom ring!

Our father's God to thee,
Author of liberty,
To thee I sing;
Long may our land be bright,
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by thy might,
Great God our King.

Prairie States Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are asking many questions about the farm-forestry projects which have been under way in our prairie States. I will endeavor to answer some of these questions.

First, it should be known that the projects have the official name of Prairie States Forestry project. Formerly the Shelterbelts.

These projects were started under Executive order in 1934. It is comparatively new, but the 6 years of experience we have had indicate it is highly successful.

We now have 14,146 miles of field belts on 22,691 farms in North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.

We have now planted over 164,000,000 trees, and the project is so popular we cannot keep up with the requests.

Although much of the planting was done during the drought period, only 3 percent rejects is the record. In other words, 90 percent of our plantings will grow into acceptable windbreaks.

The items of value derived from these projects are almost too many to mention. Briefly, they mean protection to the land, crops, improvement of living conditions on the farm, and will help to solve our migration problem.

The main protection is against winds, blizzards, and drought. The projects solve the blow problems on our prairies. It somewhat solves the problem of evaporation and wind control.

It is bringing to us fuel, fence posts, wildlife, and even wild fruits. As a shelter for livestock and domestic fowl it has already proved its worth. One proof is the report of its effects for turkey protection in the blizzard of 1940.

You who live in localities where there are forests may not realize that we in Nebraska know something about trees. We are the tree-planter State of the

Union. We are the home of the late J. Sterling Morton, founder of Arbor Day. We have had lessons from our pioneers who took up tree claims and planted the trees from which we have cut much wood. You may be amazed that in 1934 Nebraska produced nearly $2,500,000 worth of wood products cut in our State and used mostly for fuel on the farms and towns and cities and for fence posts. We know and appreciate the value of a tree in Nebraska.

This is not a haphazard program. For 6 years the Forest Service has given us the technical advice and through this cooperative program we have definitely learned what kind of a tree will grow in our peculiar soil. This is the technical service which we must have to continue this meritorious project which I consider a real national-defense program. It will have to be the farmer who is to supply the food for our fighting men. Give him this chance to continue working out a problem which will be of great benefit to us when we face the post-war problem.

Think of it—only 6 years and we have trees which are 35 and 40 feet high. We are already cutting fuel and fence posts. We see the return of wildlife and the nesting bird. We see the farmer enjoying picnics and community gatherings in the shade of trees which never grew there before. We find livestock and farm homes protected against blizzards and we find better crop conditions due to the presence of trees which protect the land from hot winds and storm.

We seriously believe that much of our migration problem can be solved by the continuation of this meritorious project. We firmly believe that already these projects are bringing great value to our farming sections. If these projects had been started 50 or even 25 years ago we believe untold millions of dollars could have been saved to our land by the stoppage of erosion and land damage.

So successful has been this project and so popular it is with our people that last year 12,000 people, including farmers from 21 States, gathered together to visit and inspect these projects and to proclaim the success of this method of tree planting on the prairies of our Nation. No better argument can be made here today in favor of this work than the statements made by the farmers out there in those States who today are asking you in the name of better life on the farm and in the name of national defense to continue this work.

I include herewith a telegram I have just received from the American Farm Bureau indicating the worthiness of these tree-planting projects and also an informative article on same by Mr. Paul Roberts:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 2, 1941.*

Congressman KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives:

Hope it will be possible for House to provide increased funds for farm forestry without jeopardizing other appropriations as this is important part of conservation program.

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

[From the Land Policy Review for April 1941]

WHO PLANTS A TREE PLANTS PROTECTION

(By Paul H. Roberts)

The Prairie States forestry project (the shelterbelt project) was initiated in the fall of 1934 under an Executive order. Since then, about 14,000 miles of field shelterbelts from 5 to 10 rows wide have been planted on more than 22,000 farms in North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and northwest Texas.

Land and crops are being protected from the damaging effects of wind; small amounts of fuel and fence posts are being cut; in a few instances farm buildings have been moved from exposed locations to the protection of the belts; farmers' wives are putting up jam made from the wild plums; and school children and farm families are picnicking and otherwise enjoying the shade and greenery of shelterbelts planted during the past 6 years.

A great deal of skepticism attended the initiation of this work. It was widely publicized, but the nature of the work and its purposes were not well understood generally. Some foresters looked askance at it, and some still do, no doubt, at least as it may be considered a part and parcel of American forestry. Plains foresters, however, generally acclaimed the idea, and Plains dwellers, who from bitter experience with blizzards and everlasting wind, mostly were firm in the belief that shelterbelts of trees offered a sound means of affording protection from the damaging effects of wind and of improving living conditions.

Skepticism has not been entirely dispelled today, but the miles of shelterbelts distributed over 100 or more farm communities attest that shelterbelts are an integral part of Plains agriculture.

The idea of a shelterbelt north and south through the Plains had been proposed from time to time since early settlement, and the idea generally seems to have been to provide a bulwark of trees against the encroachment of the desert upon the fertile Plains. Apparently the suggestion that gave rise to the present project was that narrow belts of trees be planted at fairly regular intervals through the central portion of the Plains from the Canadian line to the general locality of Lubbock, Tex.

This general idea has undergone considerable adaptation to local physiographic and climatic conditions and to the needs of individual farms, but the idea of a systematic pattern for large areas of soils suitable for tree planting is still being carried out.

Viewed from an airplane or as might be charted on a map, each community concentration of shelterbelts would appear as an incompleted network of parallel and cross belts. In parts, the individual farm and even separate 40-acre fields have become completely enmeshed in the pattern; in others there are blank areas or disconnected segments of the pattern, but it readily becomes apparent that when the pattern is completed each will have a place in the whole scheme of interrelated protection, whether the individual belts run east and west, north and south, or "andy goddling" along contours and stream courses.

The determination of the general area in which shelterbelt protection would do the most good was based upon careful surveys, exploratory work, and correlation of known factors. Briefly this is the transition zone between short-grass, permanent range land, and the long-grass prairies. In other words, the western limits of the area, often referred to as the bread basket of the Nation judged necessary to maintain as permanent agricultural cropland, lie east of the so-called Dust Bowl areas. In this transitional zone agriculture has proved successful in the past, but unprecedented drought and other conditions have upset the balance under which farming, to be successful, must operate. It is significant that there has been a definite concentration of the F. S. A. grant cases in this same "high tension" zone. It is an area where the margin between ability to remain on the land and failure may be very slight.

WIND AND RAIN

Broadly speaking, two climatic factors—moisture and wind—are of primary importance to Plains agriculture. The two overlap at some points, as for example: Wind accelerates soil moisture evaporation and hence influences the effects of precipitation.

There is probably little that man can do about precipitation as such. A great deal can be done about saving it for growing plants, and notable strides in that direction are now being made. If all of it were saved, however, there would still be the problem of the wind, and it would still be an important problem. Probably most people think of wind erosion when one speaks of the wind problem on the Plains because of the dust storms of recent years, and, while wind erosion does take a tremendous toll in the form both of land deterioration and human distress, it is not by any means the only ill attributable to the almost constant winds which characterize the Plains country.

One of the important adverse effects of wind associated with the erosion problem, and one that can largely be averted by properly established shelterbelts, is the factor of "blown out" crops. In the southern plains it is not at all unusual for a cotton farmer to have to replant his field anywhere up to three or four times before he finally gets a stand, and there is a sort of grim witticism among them to the effect that when they plant the first time they are "only practicing."

THE BLOW PROBLEM

In the great winter Wheat Belt many farmers have to fight blowing out of the young wheat crop during the early spring months. Often they run their chiseling or listing equipment day and night during bad storms. Farther north, when corn and spring wheat are the principal crops, the blowing is mostly over before planting time, although occasionally late storms do injure crops. Throughout this area the blow problem must be met by working the land to hold it, whether or not crops are produced. This is a severe drain on the resources of the farmers.

It is well known, of course, that evaporation, at least from a free-water surface, is accelerated by air movement, and that the rate of loss of moisture from the surface of the soil by evaporation is much greater where wind has a clear sweep. There is one other feature of evaporation that is also important, however, and that is transpiration from growing plants. Ever since agriculture began on the Plains, people have noticed and recorded the fact that during the period of critical hot winds that sometimes cut the corn crop in half within 2 or 3 days, crops in the lee of tree windbreaks, bluffs, or other barriers do not fire so readily as those subjected to the direct sweep of the hot wind.

Livestock do better when sheltered from cold winter winds, and they do even better in the lee of windbreaks than they do in sheds. The Montana State Agricultural College investigated and discovered that feed requirements for cattle wintering in the protection of trees were less than for those fed in sheds or in the open. There are also, of course, the very great considerations of human comfort in protection from the wind in summer and winter, and the fuel savings when farmsteads are well protected from the winter blasts.

FUEL

Aside from wind control, shelterbelts and plantations have other definite values on the Plains. One of them is in the production of wood for fuel and other farm purposes. Fuel particularly is a considerable and unavoidable item of expense to Plains farmers, particularly in the Northern States and in this "high-tension" area. Eighty dollars to $100 of fuel grown on the land, instead of being purchased, may go a long way in spelling the difference between success and failure. Moreover, wood and wood products in excess of the farmer's needs find an ever-ready market, and they have the virtue, to a great extent, of being available for harvest when the farmer needs the money. Many a Kansas farmer has tided himself over a financial pinch by cutting posts from his Osage orange hedge for the market, and many another throughout the Plains region has sold cordwood for city fireplaces to get some ready cash.

In the 1934 drought, between $2,000,000 and $2,500,000 worth of wood products were cut in Nebraska, mostly for fuel wood and fence posts.

WILDLIFE

Influence on wildlife, particularly game and insectivorous birds, is another important factor in connection with Plains tree plantations. This was not fully appreciated until the shelterbelt-planting program got under way. Lack of cover rather than feed appears to be the limiting factor in wildlife welfare in this region, and the shelterbelts become thickly populated with both perching and ground-nesting birds just as soon as the trees become large enough to support a nest or to furnish cover.

This protection is important also to domestic fowl. Turkey growers suffered serious losses during the Armistice Day blizzard of 1940. A Norfolk, Nebr., paper reported that losses were greatly reduced where the birds were protected by shelterbelts.

Besides their purely utilitarian value, the shelterbelts also have a high esthetic value. They are oases in a flat country—oases widely appreciated by all farm folk, but especially by children who escape from thousands of barren rural schoolyards to the shelterbelts to lunch and play during the noon hour.

Last summer 1,200 Kansas farmers from 20 counties gathered at the first shelterbelt planted in that State for a picnic lunch and ate from a table a quarter of a mile long set up between the rows. At Neligh, Nebr., 12,000 persons attended a forestry field day sponsored by 21 towns in north central Nebraska

HOW TO GROW TREES

Not all of the Plains is adapted to tree growing, at least on the broad scale demanded of shelterbelts for field protection. The western areas are too dry, even where the soils are friable, except where they be furnished with supplemental water. Even within the zone where average precipitation is sufficient there are large areas where the soils are too thin or too heavy for trees to make acceptable growth. The area, however, where shelterbelts can be made an effective aid to agriculture is still large.

In all belts a number of different species are used, for two principal reasons. It is necessary to have low-growing species to stop the sweep of the wind as the taller trees mature, and to stop and hold snow within the belt. The other is to avoid the possibility that some epidemic of disease or insects might wipe out a shelterbelt because it is limited to one or two nonresistant species.

It is important to use racially adapted strains in growing trees on the Plains, a fact that has not been sufficiently taken into consideration in the past.

One other prime consideration in growing trees here is that they must be cultivated as meticulously as any crop. During the first few years on any site, and perpetually on many where the water table is low, trees depend upon the moisture in the top 2 or 3 feet of soil; if this moisture is pumped out by grass and weeds as fast as it accumulates, the trees will not flourish. In a few cases in the early days of the project, belts were planted along the partition line between two farms, half of the belt being on one side and half on the other. Occasionally one of the farmers did not take good care of his half, although his neighbor did, and the difference in survival and growth is clinching proof that a secret of success is careful cultivation. Of course, cultivation is not needed after the branches of the trees meet and thus shade out competing herbaceous vegetation.

A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

The program is carried on under a cooperative arrangement with the landowners. Generally speaking, the Forest Service grows the stock and plants it, and the farmer prepares the planting site, furnishes the necessary fences, and cares for the plantation. Actually, because the project is operated entirely through the use of W. P. A. funds, some hand labor (like fencing and hoeing) is performed on the belts by W. P. A. labor. Special machinery has been developed and is sometimes lent farmers for cultivating. Poison materials are furnished the farmer to control rodents. The Forest Service furnishes the technical advice to the farmers in the care of the belts, and for 1 or 2 years subsequent to the initial planting replaces such losses as appear necessary to assure the establishment of an effective shelterbelt.

As mentioned previously, the project uses only W. P. A. money, no specific appropriation having ever been made for it. A definite proportion of the funds must be used to employ relief labor, and the remainder is not enough to carry on the project effectively. To make up the difference counties and municipalities where the program is being carried on help out by furnishing warehouse and office space, trucks during peak periods, and services and supplies of other kinds.

THE FUTURE

The project began its planting work in the spring of 1935, but because of the lack of suitable planting stock only 129 miles of belts were planted on 263 farms. That year the project established its own nurseries, and since that date has planted 14,146 miles on 22,691 farms in the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and western Texas. A total of 164,000,000 trees has been used, including replacements.

Of this, 462 miles of belts, or 3.2 percent, have been written off the books as failures, due either to some fault of location or lack of care by the cooperator. Others will be written off as time goes on, but it is expected that about 90 percent of the belts will grow into acceptable windbreaks.

The shelterbelt planting program is not a panacea for all of the ills that afflict the Plains region, but it is a necessary ingredient in any prescription for a stable agriculture on the Plains. If the program had been initiated 50 years ago, or even 25 years ago, untold millions of dollars worth of permanent damage to the soil would have been avoided, thousands of farm families would now be in a stronger financial position, and the problem of migration from the area would not be nearly so great.

As far back as 1880 the Kansas Horticultural Society said in its annual report: "Those settlers who planted shelterbelts and groves are fixtures on their land, while those who never planted trees have pulled up stakes and gone elsewhere."

Many farmers have "pulled up stakes and gone elsewhere" since the Kansas historian of half a century ago voiced his lament; if planting trees will help these people to carry on as contented citizens and producers of wealth, surely the path is plainly marked.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, OF INDIANA

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I made in the city cemetery at New Castle, Ind., on Memorial Day, May 30, 1941, which address follows:

My comrades, ladies and gentlemen, we meet on this Memorial Day, when the people of our country are sad, indeed. There is another threat of war before us. The grim determination of war and the resultant disaster which follows—the greed of ruthless destruction of life and property which becomes an incident thereto—make strong men stand and weep. Our mothers are made firm and resolute in this presence by their fervent prayers for peace. Our people want peace, they do not want war. Their fervent hope is that our American boys may be made useful in the arts and trades of civil life, and that their efforts and energies may be devoted in the future to constructive forces for good and not to the destructive forces of war.

These are some of the elements of thought which this very hour impels. The silence of these tombs which are about us reflect the solemn sentiment of peace. The argument of the warmongers and the urge of the interventionists are not heard here. The voice which comes from the grave is the voice for peace. There is a plea for construction in our Nation, not destruction. That is the voice we hear in this solemn presence today. These comrades, ours, who rest in this beautiful cemetery, seem to cry out to us at this moment.

"To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high—
If ye break faith with we who die
We will not sleep, tho' poppies grow
In Flanders' fields."

Thus, we are reminded of our great responsibilities as American citizens in this hour of peril. This responsibility is ours—it cannot be subordinated—it must be met with the firm determination to stand fast for our country. Every American will meet that responsibility.

In the solemn sentiment of this hour, we are caused to reflect upon the epitaph written upon the simple marble slab which marks the last resting place of the great designer and builder of St. Paul's Cathedral. The nobility of England were buried in that beautiful edifice, and their sarcophagus is adorned in splendor and in beauty. Yet, the designer and the builder designed his last resting place far in the basement, where all was dark, and the simple sentence written upon the plain and unadorned marble slab which marks his place, reads:

"If you would seek a monument look about you."

Today we meet in this beautiful cemetery—the very ground is hallowed about us—and we witness the marble markers which stand in reverence and in silence, guardians of the places where rest all those who have made their faithful contribution to the great progress of our country. Many of them have

participated in our wars of the yesterday; others have aided materially in the development of our Government, both State and National; there are those who have witnessed those trying days of our independence—when the Declaration of Independence was adopted and our Constitution became our fundamental law, and the beacon light of liberty and freedom turned the darkness into light. All have made their worthy and lasting contribution to our Nation and to our form of government. We think of peace, as we meet here; we think of peace as we reflect upon those words today:

"Our monument is our Nation. Our memorial is our country."

We meet at a time when sacrifices are made upon every hand. These are serious days in which we live. Yet, to those who have given their all for their country—to whose who are no more among us—we pause for this day; we place the token of love and memory upon their graves; we shed our tears for them; then we turn to our earthly tasks again.

We meet in the shadow of these tombs, and the very sacredness of this spot reflects the solace and the beauty of peace. We are sheltered by the dome of heaven, temporarily safe from the destructive forces from without. The last resting place of our friends, and of the veterans of all our wars, mark the place of our communion. They sleep while the people do them honor. May they rest in peace!

We have had our wars. They are in the past. Every American prays unto God, today, that we have no more of war. We are a peace-loving people. We are united, I am convinced, that our Nation should continue in the path of peace. May it ever be so.

These are ominous days in our country. The souls of men and women are sorely tried. While we meet in this atmosphere of calm and sober reflection we are conscious that we are yet spared from assaults coming from without. We express our thanks today that the Western Hemisphere remains at peace. May that peace continue throughout the future years.

We shudder as we know the Eastern Hemisphere is aflame with war; nations have been invaded, and have fallen; men have given their last full measure of devotion for their country; death, destruction, and devastation may be found on every hand; men and women, and little children, who are noncombatants, constantly pray that the war may soon end and that their country may be saved. Even those civilians meet a similar fate with those who are actually and actively engaged in the war. The war lords continue to pursue their daily task of war and death. The curse of mastery, the unalterable desire of acquisition, and the unthinkable purpose of satisfying a selfish desire—all of these elements, spurred on by the lash of the fervent desire of personal domination and individual dictation, cause this cruel war to continue.

We witness the very sad plight of those nations which are involved in this war; their destiny is yet unknown, and their future is dark, indeed. The demands which may be made upon the people of those nations is yet in secret contemplation. What the tomorrow may bring to their untold suffering we cannot tell. Their future is shrouded in mystery.

There are other people in Europe whose outstanding bravery stands as a shining example of their faith in their country. They are yet holding fast. Every American offers a fervent prayer today that they may be victorious. The nightly raids of bombing planes, which come with the certainty of the darkness, have failed to deter them in their defense of their nation. May they have the courage to continue to resist the assault of the dictator and his hordes. The fathers, mothers, and children of that nation, with a morale as firm as if made of bands of steel, face each rising sun with a prayer upon their lips "that the war will soon end and that their country may be saved." What a tragedy to behold. Their country—their native land—may be destroyed or taken. Their homes may be lost. Their very lives are in the balance. They face the untold cruelty of war and the ravages of the dictator who seeks to dominate. I know their prayers will be answered. Thus we view the present.

Yes, we are yet at peace. No one can forecast our future. I am constrained to say, in this exalted presence, that the fathers and the mothers—the people of our country—express the deepest sympathy for those nations. It is our hope that the destructive forces of the aggressor nations may be transformed into constructive forces for good. Our forefathers and mothers—the pioneers in our Nation—would that the savagery of those who seek to conquer or destroy other nations, that a new philosophy of life may be designed throughout the world, may be quickly changed into the promotion of peace. The creed of our forebears, many of whom sleep the eternal night which will carry them into the light of the new-born day, which was inspired by the goodness of their souls, which is now carved in matchless script upon that tablet which endures throughout the endless space of time, speaks to us: "Let us have peace."

They have loved liberty and freedom, as we have known it in our Nation. It was theirs to enjoy our American way of life. They molded the thought that these should be perpetuated. Throughout their lives they developed the thought that "this is my own, my native land"—and they thought in terms of "the United States of America first." Here they lived, they raised and educated their children, they developed our splendid institutions, they worshipped their God as they might choose, and they made their contribution to our Nation. They knew that the path which leads to war is a false path to liberty and freedom.

As these pioneers would speak to us today, in the face of a world crisis, may I offer as their counsel the words which they would doubtless give—"Keep our country at peace, if possible. If we are attacked, then we will defend our native land, our homes, and our institutions, even to the last man."

Then comes the tomorrow. No one can contemplate what it will bring. As a united nation, we will meet it. We will never falter. We will devote our efforts and our energies in the development of our national defense—each doing his full duty for his country—making that defense so sound and so strong that we may be able to repel any attack of any foe. Ours is not a thought of aggression; ours is not a policy of invading any foreign country or of sending our boys upon foreign soil to fight the battles of another nation; but ours is a policy of national preparation to enable us to defend ourselves in case an attack is made upon us. The present war is not our war. We had no part in its making. Our nation did not participate in any overt act which brought about this war. We have been engaged in the development of the arts and trades of civil life within our own borders. Those who live here and who have an apparent desire to rush our country into this awful carnage in Europe and Asia should be reminded by the great mass of our people, who believe that we should think of the United States of America first, and that we should prepare for our own defense, in case of attack, and meet our own problems at home.

These are sad and serious days. As we face these livid problems, as we meditate over the future, we pause to pay our tribute to the dead. All those who have gone before have made their worthy contribution to our Nation; those venerable men and women who have fought for our country and for the preservation of our ideals sleep while the war continues. They inspire us in our earthly work. We revere their memory. Our universal sadness is expressed at this hour by the solemnity of this occasion, and as we shed our tears and tenderly place our flowers upon each silent mound, we know—

"So still they sleep
Beneath yon verdure deep;
On hill, in vale, by brook and lonely farm;
A scattered army they
Until the day
The bugles of the angels sound alarm!

They died to save
And but their grave
Is left to us the living, we who bow,
And place a chaplet on each sleeping brow!"

Irrigation in Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY COL. DALE BUMSTEAD

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I wish to include a speech made by Col. Dale Bumstead at the Agricultural Department auditorium on the afternoon of May 23 last month. This thought-provoking address was accompanied by a showing of a colored film picturing the great dams and reservoirs on the Salt River system in Arizona, tracing the precious water which is the life-blood of our State from the deep snows in the mountains down through a series of Alpine lakes, below which it turns the wheels in numerous hydroelectric power plants, and on down through canals and headgates out upon the fertile soil of the valley in which I live, to make of it a productive garden. Our great vineyards, citrus groves, cotton fields, and truck farms growing lettuce, cantaloups, and the like are all described and pictured so that my colleagues may know to what splendid wealth-making uses their appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation have been put. Col. Dale Bumstead is himself a dirt farmer in this wonderful valley, and he is also a businessman who has been busy helping make Arizona what it is since his military service in the first World War. One of his lectures in Washington delivered at the agricultural auditorium is as follows:

THE LIFE BLOOD OF THE DESERT

(By Col. Dale Bumstead)

In crossing the Nation by surface and by air, at different seasons, and under widely varying climatological conditions, we have been impressed with the importance of your well-directed efforts toward controlling, storing, and judiciously distributing water.

Especially when viewed from the air the losses by drought, on the one hand, and erosion, on the other, appear enormous. One is impressed by the thin coating of vegetation covering the earth, and the almost total lack of any desirable growth over immense areas.

The contrast with areas where irrigation agriculture is practiced is impressive. If biological laws continue to operate, and there are not too many wars, we must provide food for a rapidly increasing population.

Is it right to ask the Great Father for rain—and when He sends too much or too little say meekly, "It is thy will"? Or is it reasonable to assume He expects us to show just a little common sense and store water for the dry years, and to so control it as to prevent erosion when there are floods?

One is never justified in becoming reconciled to disaster until he has done all in his power to prevent it. And even then he should search his own soil and question his own judgment.

In these United States irrigation agriculture is the sturdy child of necessity, and was born in our Southwest.

The earliest settlers in Arizona found in the Salt River Valley great irrigation canals, dug with stone implements, leading from the stream beds over the same lands that are under cultivation today.

There were ruins of cities and towns that indicated a prehistoric population nearly or quite as large as the combined Indian and white population supported on the same land today.

Ditches and buildings showed excellent engineering ability.

One of the large prehistoric canals passed through the date garden you will see in the picture. In digging basins in which to plant palms imported from Africa and Arabia, the workmen discovered worn stone tools used by early Indian farmers.

East and West have met in the Valley of the Sun. The beauties whose aristocratic ancestors graced the gardens of King Solomon and the Pharaohs are happy there—as you shall see; and our women who visit them are probably as attractive as the proud daughters of Egypt and Arabia who found shade, nourishment, and perhaps romance, in those eastern gardens.

Our prehistoric farmers cultivated corn, squashes, melons, cotton; had domesticated turkeys, and hunted deer, bison, and smaller animals and birds.

Men of the different tribes fought for the possession of lands, food, and women—just as men do today.

There is reasonable evidence to indicate that drought may have driven these people northward into our mountains—and to the south into Mexico, where are Indians with similar features, customs, and language.

The same causes that reduced the marvelously beautiful cities and all but destroyed the brilliant civilization of the East, also brought desolation to the Valley of the Sun.

Drought, alkali, and insects—the "Three Horsemen of Agriculture"—laid low the humble works of our Southwest—and Babylon, ancient Phoenix, Nineveh, and Troy: the glittering palaces of a truly magnificent age.

The only certain protection for life and property in such lands is stored water. The first important storage dam in the United States was built by the United States Reclamation Service for a group of farmers organized as a cooperative under the name of The Salt River Valley Water Users Association.

This dam was named in honor of Theodore Roosevelt, that blue-blooded eastern aristocrat whose great courage and fine spirit made him the idol of the West. It was completed and dedicated by Roosevelt March 18, 1911. That was yesterday. Some of the original signers of the articles of incorporation are still very much alive and at work.

This first large reservoir proved inadequate to serve all of the lands; and others have been built, one below the other, until now there are four large reservoirs on the Salt River, one on the Verdi River, and several to take waters from other areas. For the first time all are full—and spilling over.

Not very long ago Theodore Roosevelt was in Chicago and made an important address that is worthy of repetition. Listen to his words:

"I wish to preach not the doctrine of ignoble ease but the doctrine of the strenuous life; the life of toil and effort; of labor and strife; to preach that highest form of success which comes not to man who desires mere easy peace but to the man who does not shrink from danger, from hardship, or from bitter toil, and who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph.

"A life of ignoble ease is as little worthy of a nation as of an individual. I ask only that what every self-respecting American demands of himself shall be demanded of the American Nation as a whole.

"We of this generation do not have to face a task such as that our fathers faced, but we have our tasks, and woe to us if we fail to perform them."

Unfortunately it is becoming the custom to picture the march of our sturdy forebears across the continent—and have them disappear forever in the fogs of the Pacific; to preach that opportunity ended with the settlement of the West.

We hope to convince you that there is still opportunity for individual and cooperative effort and rich rewards, and the joy of accomplishment for those at work now and for others certain to follow through the ages.

The spirit of constructive adventure is not dead but will continue at increased speed and in rapidly growing volume as long as men exist.

Try to visualize our desert as it was before the dams were built. Thirst and desolation everywhere. A few hardy human beings lived near streams and about water holes. When drought came they were driven back into the snow-clad mountains from whence comes the water that formerly crashed in great floods to the sea; now caught and stored in man-made lakes and judiciously distributed, it serves mankind.

We shall take you with us from the snows in our great pine forests down crystal-clear brooks to rivers that discharge their waters into a succession of lakes that nestle, one below the other, between beautiful mountains or in magnificent awe-inspiring canyons, a nearly continuous body of water for more than 60 miles.

Then we shall follow down natural channels to the diversion dam that divides the water and sends it through canals and ditches over all the fertile valley. Our magic carpet will carry you where you can see the results that come from the wise use of controlled water—fields and gardens, herds and flocks, great natural factories for the production of food. We want you to share with us the pride we feel in an accomplishment to which all have contributed and that is for the benefit of all.

All life depends upon vegetation. All vegetation upon sunshine, water, and fertile soil. There has always been plenty of sunshine in the Valley of the Sun, and rich land. Now, for the first time, all the great reservoirs are full and overflowing and there is ample supply of water.

The farmers in Arizona who banded themselves together to fight drought have asked me to show you, their comrades in the battle, this evidence of the fulfillment of the dreams you have shared with them, the result of joint effort.

The day is here. Drought has lost the battle of the Valley of the Sun. Peace and plenty are assured for those who live "in the palm of the hand of God." We now have sufficient water to wash mineral salts down below the root zones and away; we are improving our methods of insect control. We shall not go the way of the East.

If the world is ever conquered it will, we think, be by insects—not by man. And let us not forget those children of water—power and light. The same water that nourishes our plants, and that is essential to all life, passes first through turbines to produce great quantities of electric power.

Millions of slaves struggled for years to build the Pyramids, and it is reported that some of the virgins of Biblical times forgot to bring oil for their lamps. One electrically driven machine does better the work of a thousand slaves. Our maidens can have all the light they desire, for Arizona has become the most highly electrified agricultural section of the world.

With increased reserves of power we hope to build up a balanced economy by increasing the manufacture of those things man needs or desires.

Surely, given all these resources, we shall quickly build larger communities of free, happy peoples, with time to cultivate the arts and sciences and enjoy a richer life.

The Star of Empire moves westward—there are glorious frontiers ahead of and above us.

You have joined with us in our crusade for a better, richer life. You have been marching with us in the faith that the eternal light will continue with increasing brilliance to lead us to a better world.

Look to the stars.

A Statement of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by John S. Knight, editor of the Detroit Free Press, which was published under date of June 1, 1941:

[From the Detroit Free Press of June 1, 1941]

A STATEMENT OF POLICY

In a searching analysis of the national-defense program last Sunday, we asserted that the American people "are not looking for a dictator in this country but we have a right to demand leadership in critical times."

This statement was based upon:

1. The lack of an understandable foreign policy.
2. The lack of management at Washington.
3. The lack of national unity.
4. The lack of a sound method of financing our war emergency.

Since that editorial appeared in the Free Press, Mr. Roosevelt has spoken to the Nation.

In this memorable address, he made one thing quite clear. He told us in the most direct language that we are embarked upon an undeclared war against the Axis powers. Only a wilfully stupid or pathetically misguided person could construe his remarks to mean anything else. The Free Press is glad to know where Mr. Roosevelt now stands. His previous policy of "saving England" while trying to avoid a "shooting war" was a type of unrealism which we never were quite able to comprehend.

There is no such thing as "half a war." To those of our readers who protested when we said months ago that our program of "cautious involvement" would eventually mean naval convoys, encounters at sea, and another A. E. F., we need now but quote Mr. Roosevelt's words:

"1. We insist upon the vital importance of keeping Hitlerism away from any point in the world which could be used as a base of attack against the Americas.

"2. From the point of view of strict naval and military necessity, we shall give every possible assistance to Britain and to all who, with Britain, are resisting Hitlerism or its equivalent with force of arms.

"3. All additional measures necessary to deliver the goods (to Britain) will be taken."

Nothing could be more sweeping than that. President Roosevelt has defined our foreign policy in words of unmistakable meaning. His hand controls the ship of state. He alone is the master of our destiny.

The free press has opposed every step leading toward involvement in a war which was not of our making. We have seen far too much of Europe's intrigue, the wars that have been fought to preserve its sordid commercialism disguised by noble and high-sounding slogans; yes, too many comrades lying wounded and dying on the battlefield, not to be skeptical of the motives of the statesmen in high places who make these wars.

But now the die is cast. We are in this war quite as though our Congress has made a formal declaration of hostilities.

There is no turning back.

To that end, the Free Press pledges its complete support to President Roosevelt as our Commander in Chief.

We shall support him, not in the mawkish sense of the sloganeer who mouths meaninglessly, "stand by the President," but in the upholding of our best American ideals as reflected in complete freedom of speech and the press.

He will have our unlimited support in any measures designed to safeguard this Nation against foreign aggressors, enemies of the Republic within our own borders and all other termites who would destroy the priceless liberties and blessings handed down to us by our brave and sturdy ancestors.

But, if our Republic is to endure as such, there must always be room for freedom of expression and constructive criticism designed to focus public attention upon the dangers which confront us at home.

From time to time, the Free Press proposes to speak quite as vigorously about the shortcomings in our national-defense policies as does Lord Beaverbrook in his London Daily Express.

This is no time to use a feather duster when a club may be needed.

We propose to have much to say about the petty jealousies and incompetencies at Washington which are slowing up the wheels of production.

We propose to inquire from time to time why it is possible for men in key defense industries to demand their pound of flesh and tie up vital production when the youth of the Nation is preparing to face death at $21 a month.

We propose to keep hammering away at misfits like Madam Perkins and others who have shown a complete incapacity for the important posts they occupy.

We propose to keep talking about the necessity for sound methods of financing our war effort, methods which will avoid the twin specters of inflation and insolvency.

We propose to continue our adherence to the true principles upon which this Republic was founded and to combat with all our strength every attempt to substitute for them anything that smacks of fascism, nazism, or communism.

An alert, informed, patriotic, and intelligent press is essential to any nation which believes that democracy must not be suspended in time of war; that we cannot discard our priceless liberties in a period of national emergency and hope to recapture them once it is ended.

It is in this spirit of adherence to our finest traditions and with every realization of the enormity of the task before you, Mr. President, that we pledge you the loyal support of the Free Press.

May God be with you.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Republicans and Federal Reserve Board Favor High Interest—Democrats and the United States Treasury Favor Low Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill extending the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised was reported to the House May 19, 1941, by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. It is Report No. 592 in the House of Representatives, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. The report was made by Mr. COCHRAN, a member of the committee. Minority views against the passage of the bill were filed by the Republican members of the committee and printed in the report. In fact, the minority report was signed by every Republican member of the committee.

On page 7 of the minority report, the following statement appears:

Forcing interest rates down was another consequence of raising the world price of gold. As observed in the April 1941 Federal Reserve Bulletin: "Since 1934 the dominant and basic factor tending to reduce interest rates has been the large inflow of gold." In June 1933 the average rate of interest on the gross public debt was 3.56 percent, but by December 1940 it had declined to 2.56 percent. In view of the heavy burden placed upon the Treasury to finance the vast increase in the public debt, can it be said that the Treasury closed its eyes to this hidden consequence of devaluation? Although low rates of interest saved the Treasury millions, abnormally low returns on legitimate business investments have cost the general public billions. Still worse, this policy prolonged the depression, retarded recovery, and thereby has slowed up the people's efforts to rearm America.

When the bill was passed in the House of Representatives, only one Democrat voted against it, and all of the Republicans, excepting fewer than one-half dozen voted against it. All of the Democrats, save and except the one, voted for the passage of the bill. I am not criticising the Members who voted against the bill. That was their prerogative. This matter is being brought out to show a fundamental difference in the two major political parties on the question of interest.

It shows conclusively that the Republicans are complaining about and vote against low interest, and the Democrats are in favor of and vote for low interest.

Before this administration came into power one who purchased a $5,000 home on 20-year terms, and paid the customary rate of interest, paid $1,600 more than the home owner who now purchases a $5,000 home and pays for it over a 20-year period of time. This does not include several hundred dollars now saved through second mortgages, renewals, and other devices.

The farmers are receiving the lowest rate of interest that the farmers of this country, or the farmers of any country, have ever received in the history of the entire world.

Low interest rates have made a great contribution toward electrifying one-third of the farm homes in America during the past 6 or 7 years.

Numerous other instances could be cited which prove the value of low interest rates.

The people, including farmers, workers, and home owners, are now saving billions of dollars a year through the low interest policy of the present administration, as compared with administrations preceding this one.

The vote I refer to is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, May 27, 1941. There were 222 yeas—for low interest rates—and 138 nays—against low interest rates.

This report of the Republican Members, which was supported by the Republican Members in the House by their votes, contend that low interest prolonged the depression and retarded recovery, as well as slowed the people's efforts to rearm America. No statement could be further from the truth than this one. It has neither logic nor reason to support it.

POUR MONEY IN AT THE TOP

When the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was first organized—1932—it was intended to bail out the big banks, insurance companies, and railroads. It did not have the power to help the people generally, as it has now. It was the theory of Mr. Hoover and his advisers in the Republican Party that the country could be made prosperous by pouring money in at the top. This plan failed. It was just as sensible as the Republican plan to help the country by charging high interest rates.

There is not anything that will help the country and the people generally more in an economic way than low interest, and this administration is to be commended for giving the people the low interest rates that have been given to them during the past 8 years.

Organ Pipe Cactus Monument Should Be Opened to Mining as Have Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call further attention to my bill, H. R. 2675, to permit mining within the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument in Arizona which was objected to a while ago. Let me mention the fact that this bill in identical form has already passed the Senate by unanimous consent. It was introduced by Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, than whom there is no Member of

Congress who is better informed or more vitally concerned about the West. I say this that it may be clear to all that no man alive knows more about Arizona and cares more about Arizona than does Senator HAYDEN, and he thinks, in the light of all circumstances, this is a good bill.

I know objection has been made to the bill, especially by an organization known as the National Parks Association, for several Congressmen have asked me regarding the merits of the bill, stating that they have received protests from this association. The secretary of the association called upon me a few days ago and said he was opposed to it. Having never seen the area, he did not know the real facts concerning it and seemed to assume that Senator HAYDEN and I were callously trying to commercialize a great natural beauty spot in such a way as to destroy it. Apparently there are nature lovers protesting this bill who are entirely unfamiliar with such areas in our Southwest and how to obtain the maximum benefits without the loss of anything.

It is one thing to demand that the primitive conditions which we are trying to preserve in national parks, monuments, wilderness areas, and recreational grounds be not commercialized, profaned, or destroyed, and I am for exactly that. It is another thing, however, to demand that great natural wealth be locked up over 400 square miles and left untouched, simply that certain designated regions may be said to remain in its primeval condition, especially when it is entirely unnecessary that any such locking up be done. Well do I remember about 3 years ago when it was proposed to tunnel under a national park in Colorado in order to carry out a great hydroelectric power and irrigation development. These same nature lovers protested, declaring it would ruin the park. As a matter of fact, among those most anxious to have the bill passed were all Congressmen from Colorado and other high officials of National and State Government and men who have the highest interest of that Mountain State at heart and who know a lot more about Colorado and care more about it than those who did the protesting. How ridiculous that for their small subjective gains in keeping the park thus theoretically untouched they should defeat, or attempt to defeat, the great actual and objective gains of the engineers who could utilize our natural resources to the full in a natural manner.

Gentlemen, this Organ Pipe Cactus Monument is in Pima County, Ariz., in the extreme southern part of the State, and lies along the international border touching Mexico. It contains 400 square miles of area, and I have it on the highest scientific authority that a portion of this area is mineralized. A copper mine has already been opened up at Ajo, which is in the same geological region as the monument. The Organ Pipe Monument lies in that desert region between Nogales and Yuma, where the international boundary line takes a northwesterly direction. This is the territory which the Spaniards called El Camino del Diablo, which means The Highway of the Devil. Congressman COLE said the Spaniards had been over this ground for four centuries, which is true, in a way, but they did not do all the necessary prospecting. Some of the greatest explorers of New Spain—such as Juan B. Anza, Padre Kino, and Padre Garces—literally took their lives in their hands to cross this country several times. History records that several hundred Mexicans lost their lives along this route in 1850, when they were attempting to go from Sonora, Mexico, to our California to hunt for gold. The American prospector who put all of his belongings on the back of a burro and ventured into that dangerous region to locate hidden mineral wealth also took his life in his hands, but such has always been the way mineral deposits have been discovered throughout the Great West. Those prospectors and their burros have done no more hurt in traversing this cactus-covered region than do the coyotes, jackrabbits, and rattlesnakes which prowl, hop, and crawl through that same area.

As I understand it, the School of Mines at the University of Arizona has reason to believe that at least a fourth of this great area is mineralized, and that there is a fair chance of finding something worth while there. An eastern Democratic Congressman said to me a few minutes ago, "I do not like the looks of this, for it seems to me too much like Teapot Dome, or something. Is some big mining company hoodwinking you into unlocking a treasure chest for their benefit?" I assured him that I was not working in the interest of "any big mining company," or any corporation, to try to "steal" something from Uncle Sam and the American people, but that what I was attempting to do had been suggested by several councils of small mine operators in Arizona, which organization has probably 4,000 members in the State made up of prospectors and small claim holders.

These men with rugged individualism are trying against adverse nature and unsympathetic man-made laws to discover wealth in the earth and make it available for human use That is the type of individual that I have in mind, and for whom I am working in sponsoring this bill. If I ever get the bill passed these same hardy individualists may get no more out of their efforts, on an average, in this area than they have out of similar efforts in the whole mineralized portion of our country throughout the history of American mining. No; all we are asking is that the general mining laws apply to this area, with the exception that no ownership of land or title to the surface shall pass to any individual or corporation. If mineral should be found it must be handled under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior lays down.

It is said that this measure would set a precedent which would be dangerous. I have before me Public Law No. 750 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 22, 1936, which opens up Glacier Bay National Monument in Alaska in exactly the same way that I ask to have the Organ Pipe Cactus Monument made available to the prospector and small mining man. An objector earlier today said this idea had not been applied anywhere in the continental United States, but I hold in my hand Public Law No. 49 of the Seventy-third Congress, approved June 13, 1933, in which this same legislation was made to apply to the Death Valley National Monument in California. Therefore, we have examples of the same thing having been done in Alaska and in the State of California.

Let me again assure you, gentlemen, that I am far more interested in the preservation of the cactus growth of my State than are many of those who are protesting against this bill. I want to do two important things—preserve the unique cactus and at the same time allow opportunity to the hardy prospector and mining man to seek, find, and bring forth the hidden mineral wealth which lies beneath the surface. Properly understood, there can be no reasonable objection to the passage of this measure. I ask that the Senate bill (S. 260) be substituted for H. R. 2675 and that it be passed.

Uncle Sam's Rubber Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following interesting article on domestic rubber production. It gives an excellent review of the research work that has been done in developing the guayule rubber shrub into a practical source of supply.

Already the major rubber companies in the United States are anticipating a shortage in crude-rubber inventories for the coming year. The tremendous costs involved in the production of synthetic rubber on a large scale are proving to be a deterrent in the rapid expansion of this industry. Time is an essential factor, and our time is running short.

Guayule presents the only feasible answer to our need for a supply of rubber which can be produced within the United States. We should lose no time in investigating its potentialities to the fullest extent possible.

The article mentioned above, from the June issue of the Country Gentleman, follows:

[From the Country Gentleman for June 1941]

UNCLE SAM'S RUBBER FARMER

(By Frank J. Taylor)

Three decades ago this year, a diminutive, pipe-puffing botanist and authority on desert plant life, Dr. William B. McCallum, left the University of Arizona campus to tackle a job for a big rubber company. The rubber concern wanted to know if he could domesticate guayule, pronounced wy-yoo-lay, a wild desert shrub of the Mexico and Texas plateau region that is as rich in rubber as the tropical Hevea tree, and grow it on plantations.

Ever since 1910, Dr. McCallum has been taming and growing guayule on a string of 150 farms, stretching from Mexico across Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to the northern tip of the Sacramento Valley. With over 10,000 acres of experimental growing behind him, the wrinkled little botanist is today this country's No. 1 rubber farmer.

In the cool, dry warehouse at his breeding nursery near Salinas, Calif., Dr. McCallum has accumulated hundreds of airtight, 50-gallon drums of choice guayule seed, which is as fine as grass seed and keeps indefinitely. These shiny black drums constitute one answer to what Americans, who use over half the world's rubber in their tires, could do about it if a hostile foreign government tried to cut this country off from its present rubber sources in the East Indies and the Malay Peninsula.

Acre for acre, Dr. McCallum's domesticated guayule now yields as much rubber annually as an East Indian Hevea rubber plantation. Forty thousand farmers, he says, each with a hundred acres of semiarid land planted to guayule, could make the United States independent of foreign rubber plantations within 4 years. Dr. McCallum is convinced that the farmers could grow real guayule rubber cheaper and faster than chemists could make synthetic rubber in chemical plants.

The struggle of the patient Canadian-born botanist to domesticate an obstinate mustang of desert plant life and make it a potential southwest farm crop is an epic of plant breeding. It is a story that is hard to extract from Dr. McCallum, who, in spite of his enthusiasm for guayule, has a Scotchman's weakness for understatement. He likes to puff his old pipe and think a long time before he answers a question. The story, in brief, is this:

Up on the Mexican central plateau, where Intercontinental Rubber Co. operated 3 mills to extract rubber from wild guayule gathered by peons, Dr. McCallum found no fewer than 2,000 distinct varieties of the plant growing. Nobody had grown the gray, stunted, willowy shrub under cultivation before, and he soon discovered why. Guayule seeds sprouted prolifically under hostile natural conditions out on the desert, but in his seed flats and garden he was lucky if he induced one seed in 500 to germinate. That was problem No. 1.

No. 2 was the variety of guayule types. Some ran as high as 10 percent in rubber, some were as low as 5. Some guayule varieties thrived up where it was almost freezing, others where it was dry and hot. Some grew fast, some grew slow. Undismayed by the reluctance of the seed to germinate, the botanist set to work crossing the varieties to get what he wanted: A fast-growing plant, high in rubber yield, adapted to cooler climates farther north. Dr. McCallum can laugh at this discouraging phase of his work now.

"I attempted thousands of crosses," he told me. "So far as I know, not a single one was successful. The guayules just wouldn't hybridize."

After that, Dr. McCallum resorted to selection. Whenever he found a flourishing plant that looked like a good rubber producer, he marked it, gathered the seed, then reduced the plant to rubber and residue in a laboratory. The rubber in a guayule plant is stored in the wood. The only way to extract it is to shred the entire bush, roots included, then pulverize it in a rotating drum filled with smooth pebbles and water. When this liquid is drained off into vats, the wood and bark precipitates to the bottom, while the rubber, resembling chopped up rubber bands, is skimmed like cream from the top of the liquid.

Every time Dr. McCallum found a plant with unusually high rubber yield, he planted the seeds, grew another generation, selected again, repeated the laboratory process. By experimenting with heat and chemical treatments, he increased the germination of seeds until now 95 percent of them grow in sand under nursery conditions. After thousands of laboratory rubber extractions, coupled with careful growing tests, he settled on four choice strains of guayule which ran consistently to 20 percent rubber content, or double the yield when he began.

Though he had successfully tamed the wild guayule, Dr. McCallum's troubles as a rubber farmer were just beginning. About that time, the agrarian Mexican Government began confiscating the farms owned by foreigners. The rubber company officials discovered that though they could mill wild guayule without interference, their holdings might be confiscated if they grew the stuff on plantations. So they hustled Dr. McCallum off to the United States to establish nurseries and trial plantings. His first plantings, naturally, were in southern Arizona. The test near Tucson proved a complete failure, because the rubber yield was low, even from his carefully selected stock. Puzzled, Dr. McCallum made a new discovery. Guayule plants make their growth during the wet winter months, hibernate, and store up rubber, which they extract from the atmosphere, during the dry summer season. In Arizona, the rains come in cloudbursts during the summer. Lacking the alternate droughts, the plants stored little rubber.

Again the tireless guayule grower packed up his equipment and nursery stock and moved. This time Dr. McCallum took no chances. All the way from Texas, where varieties of guayule grow wild in the semiarid western plateau, to northern California he made trial plantings, over 100 of them. The largest were in the Salinas Valley, where he established his laboratory and nursery, and eventually planted 8,000 acres to guayule, some on lands leased by his company, the rest grown on contract by enthusiastic farmers eager to use marginal or worn-out lands. The company erected a half-million-dollar mill at Salinas to extract rubber from not only Salinas Valley plantings but those in the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Santa Maria Valleys, and in southern California.

Company engineers devised an ingenious machine for planting seedlings in fields at the rate of 14,000 a day, and other labor-saving equipment for cultivating, harvesting, and chopping the plants in the field, and blowing the shredded guayule into trucks, to be dumped at the maw of the mill, which turned out for a considerable period 10,000 pounds of rubber daily at Salinas. One machine, resembling a vacuum cleaner on wheels, sucked seeds into sacks by the millions. The hope of the industry is this efficient machinery, without which American guayule growers could not compete against 30-cents-a-day labor on East Indian and Malayan plantations.

After World War No. 1, when rubber skyrocketed to over a dollar a pound, it looked as though Dr. McCallum's domesticated guayules had brought a bonanza crop to California and Texas marginal landowners. The bubble burst in 1932, when the international rubber cartel collapsed and rubber stocks stored abroad poured into this country in a tidal flood. Dollar rubber tumbled in price to 3-cent rubber, then began the slow climb back. Unhappy Dr. McCallum watched disgusted farmers, on whose lands he had planted guayule on a 50–50 share-crop basis, plow under their guayule and replant to barley or wheat.

"Leave it in," he pleaded with them. "Every year your acre of guayule stores up 300 pounds more rubber. Let the plants grow and the rubber will be there when the prices come back."

Guayule is a peculiar crop for farmers to understand. At 4 years of age, a good stand of guayule, 8,000 plants to the acre, will have stored 1,200 pounds of raw rubber. At 8 years, the harvest is 2,400 pounds, at 10 years, 3,000 pounds. This is exactly the annual yield of a good plantation of Hevea rubber trees in the East Indies. The plants thrive up to 40 years, but for maximum yield per acre Dr. McCallum's crews harvest them between 4 and 10 years, completely stripping the fields with their harvesting machines.

A few Salinas farmers heeded his advice to leave the guayule in the ground. Later, when rubber prices climbed to around 20 cents and the company reopened the factory to process its own crops, the growers came out with a fair return. The Salinas factory opens late in the fall for an annual "campaign," just as does the near-by beet-sugar mill. Last winter's 3 months' campaign practically wiped out both the share-crop and the company plantings ready for harvest. The thousand or so acres remaining in guayule in the valley are in company-owned plantings of Dr. McCullum's improved varieties.

He thinks these will be kept for the seed crop in case the guayule acreage has to be expanded in a hurry. United States Department of Agriculture men were inspecting these fields, the nursery, the laboratory, and the mill, with this eventuality in mind, when I visited the valley recently. The United States Army had already made an independent survey of guayule possibilities.

If the country ever needs rubber in a hurry, Dr. McCallum and Charles Lee, farm manager for the company, have tested a growing program for delivering it 8 months from seed, by sowing the seed like grain in the fields. After it is sown, the seed is covered lightly with sand and sprinkled twice a day, with overhead sprinklers or water wagons which run on ramps. This is done twice a day for the first fortnight, then gradually tapered off until, at the end of the month, the little plants are able to shift for themselves. In 8 months they are 10 inches high and yield 350 pounds of rubber per acre.

This hurry-up rubber is expensive, costing 57 cents per pound, f. o. b. Salinas, where it is processed. Even at this price, it is less expensive than most of the synthetic rubbers.

A MARGINAL-LAND CROP

Dr. McCallum believes that, quite aside from national-defense considerations, a stabilized rubber price of 30 cents or more per pound will see the guayule crop a permanent agriculture in the Southwest where, he says, 10,000,000 acres of marginal land, now used only for grazing or speculative grain growing, are suited for rubber production. Four million acres in guayule, he estimates, would emancipate the country's automobile users from dependence upon foreign plantations, in which, curiously enough, his company is heavily interested.

Thirty-cent rubber would mean $90 worth of rubber per acre stored up annually in average guayule plantings, half for the farmer, the rest to the mill for supplying the nursery stock and harvesting and processing the guayule. Because of the processing problem, Dr. McCallum thinks guayule will always be a crop grown on contract, like sugar beets. In improved varieties now undergoing selection, the rubber content runs up to 25 percent.

THE GROWER'S JOB

The grower's work is mainly cultivating during the first 2 years to keep the weeds down. After that, the guayule plants fight for themselves. Irrigating guayule makes the plants grow faster, but fails to increase the rubber content. Guayule thrives in any well-drained soil, dislikes clay, does as well in wornout as in rich soils.

On the Irvine Ranch, near Los Angeles, a guayule crop pumped so much nitrogen into the soil that beans, planted after the guayule was harvested, yielded three times a normal crop.

Twelve years ago the Italian Government, hearing of Dr. McCallum's success in taming guayule, decided that the shrub was the

answer to Italy's woeful shortage of rubber sources. Since then, he has made six trips to Italy to oversee experimental plantings contracted for by the Italian Government-owned subsidiary before Italy plunged into World War No. 2. A good many of those drums of guayule seed stored at Salinas by Dr. McCallum were originally intended for Mussolini's rubber planters in Italy and north Africa. Now the canny old botanist is hanging onto them, because they may be needed for democracy's rubber farms.

Make United States Air Power Invincible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions on the floor of the House and off the floor of the House of Representatives I have urged that this country make itself invincible in the air. We know that a superior air force means victory for one country as against another. Modern warfare is greatly different from the type of warfare employed in the years past. The use of bombers, pursuit ships, scouting planes, and air transports has revolutionized warfare. Again I plead that this Congress take immediate steps to build up our air force so no combination of aggressors would dare attack us. I call to your attention the following news articles which discuss problems of air warfare:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 23, 1941]

AIR POWER BECOMES AN ARMY

However the battle finally goes in Crete, this operation marks a new development in warfare, such as the use of gunpowder, the application of armor to ships, the invention of the land tank.

Here, for the first time, the airplane ceases to be the adjunct of an invading army. Air power is the army. And as such it must sustain the whole operation, at least until such time as infantry and naval units can get through. The men rain down from the skies in parachutes, but they are more than parachutists. They are infantry, artillery, supply corps, medical corps, intelligence corps, all in one.

It is the knell of the older type of warfare and the knell of any nation that chooses to go on slumbering under the false security of the older type. The Germans may or may not succeed in this attempt, but they have demonstrated the power of an aerial army to sail over a fleet and over land forces to establish itself—not as a group of spies and saboteurs but as a fighting force—in enemy territory.

Attack now has a new prong. To the historic army and navy services is now added a new service—the air striking force. It is as distinct from both the army and the navy as these older services are distinct from each other.

This did not come in a day. It has been long in coming. It existed first in the dreams of the Billy Mitchells; of two or three young officers in France who, alas, got no further in the brass-hat circles of Paris than General Mitchell got in this country; of a group of young German officers who received a free hand to carry out their ideas.

America received a heavy jolt just a year ago this month when land mechanization swept infantry from the fields. How we awoke and dug in to accomplish something by way of catching up. Now we all get another jolt as air mechanization demonstrates its power to deal with situations that land mechanization cannot reach.

America might have foreseen this and anticipated it if those who are shaping our defenses had had some imagination of their own. Apparently they have very little. We are still thinking of the airplane as an aid to the Army and Navy; of semiautonomy, perhaps, in belated recognition of what the new warfare means. We are not thinking yet of air power as an army in itself.

We should be without another day's delay. Due to our particular geographic situation, air power as an army can be of more use to America than to any other nation. This thing that the Germans have developed is our spear, if we only claim it.

Take first our bomber situation. We are turning out bombers and assigning them to their respective services, the Army and the Navy, mostly the Army. The process is one of dispersal, with the bombers under the ultimate control of men who still think in terms of infantry and ships.

What we ought to do, without delay, is to create this new and distinct service, build up an organization to deal with technical problems just as the Navy has a free hand to deal with its own technical matters—in short, create a great air striking force of 10,000 bombers, protection fighters, air Army personnel, intelligence service, everything that is needed.

We do not mean by this that we should put all airplanes under such a command. The Army should have its own planes and the Navy its planes. We are talking about an aerial striking force to do the new job that has to be done in warfare.

America is spending the money now to do this job. It is creating the machines. But if it makes an error in organization, much effectiveness will be lost.

Are we to spend twenty or thirty billions and remain always just about a year behind? Let's wake up and get ahead.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 23, 1941]

POINTS A LESSON FOR UNITED STATES IN GLIDER INVASION OF CRETE

SAN FERNANDO, CALIF.—Hawley Bowlus, who taught the Lindberghs to glide, says the German glider invasion of Crete should be a warning for the United States to prepare for possible use of the same means of transporting troops.

Bowlus, glider pilot, designer, and manufacturer, has designed a glider large enough to carry 8 men. He estimated that a motorless craft to transport at least 25 soldiers could be built easily at a cost of not more than one-fourth that of an airplane of similar capacity without its engine.

A large bombing plane, he added, could tow at least three such gliders at 175 miles an hour.

Bowlus theorized that the attack on Crete is a dress rehearsal for a similar attempt on England. He has had recent word from Germany, he said, that factories there are turning out as many as 500 eight-place gliders a month, and that glider pilots are being trained in the open country of Rumania.

"There are two elements which make a glider invasion dangerous," he explained. "The silence of their operation and the fact that a glider train could have one or two ships assigned as carriers for guns, ammunition, and other material.

"It would be possible for a bomber to take up a train of eight gliders over France and for them to cut loose at a high altitude and cross the channel on their own, absolutely silent and virtually undetectable except by visual sighting."

Bowlus said he is informed that Germany has 100,000 qualified glider pilots, while only about 500 are registered in the United States. A glider pilot can be trained in 5 or 6 hours.

Strikes and the Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN LEGION WEEKLY

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion Weekly in the current issue has written its thoughts on a highly controversial issue of the present time and I take the liberty of including the article under my extension of remarks:

[From the American Legion magazine]

STRIKES AND THE DEFENSE EFFORT

The appointment by the President of an 11-man National Defense Mediation Board, with representatives of industry, labor, and the general public among its members is a realistic approach to a problem that has been threatening to blitzkrieg our national-defense production effort.

The American Legion, composed as it is of every element of American life, has a tremendous interest in seeing that justice is done to both employer and employee, while the sorely needed planes, guns, and matériel needed in our national-defense effort are produced as fast as is humanly possible.

We want no stoppage in this national-defense work. We want no strikes against the national defense. The right to strike should not be abrogated, but the need to strike should be eliminated. There is no need for organizational or jurisdictional strikes now. Labor should not tolerate them at this time.

The real labor leaders of our own country have stated in no uncertain terms that the Communist, the radical, the saboteur, and the destructionists have no place in the ranks of established, organized, honorable labor; and thank God such leaders are in the majority. A determined public opinion should back them in tearing from the breast of labor this poisonous adder.

There are two principles in connection with our expanding national defense that should be kept clearly in mind. First, the object of our rearmament program is not to make a few millionaires or to swell the ranks of labor unions. The object of the program is to make certain that no matter how the situation abroad develops we shall be able to protect our shores and overseas possessions, maintain the Monroe Doctrine in all its vigor, keep the integrity and identity of the United States as a great Nation and insure to ourselves and our children a degree of well-being consistent with our resources and our position as a world power.

Second, industrial management and labor leaders must keep clearly in mind that national security is the commanding considera-

tion of this historic hour, that every stoppage of defense effort menaces that security, and that therefore management and labor owe it to the people of the United States to exhaust every means toward a settlement of disputes before a plant is shut down. For more than a generation the United States Government has had machinery for conciliating differences between industry and the workers and the new defense mediation board broadens the base of that procedure. If in spite of all this, a strike closes down an essential plant, public opinion, rallied by what Woodrow Wilson used to call "pitiless publicity" of the facts of the case, will deal swiftly and drastically with the person or persons responsible.

Labor remembers how in 1917–18 the cost of living was always a jump ahead of wage increases, and working men know that in the present national-defense effort their demands must square with the facts of the situation if they are to be successful. There will be very little profiteering in our expanding national-defense effort, if the laws and regulations in effect are administered without fear or favor. As for the individual citizen of the United States, Mr. Micawber's famous reflection on the interrelation of happiness and income-outgo sounds like good sense: "Annual income, £20; annual expenditure, £19 6s.; result, happiness. Annual income, £20; annual expenditure, £20 6s.; result, misery."

Charles Bateman Timberlake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements from the New York Times and the Washington Star with reference to the late Charles B. Timberlake, formerly a Representative from the Second Congressional District of Colorado:

[From the New York Times of June 1, 1941]

TIMBERLAKE DEAD; EX-CONGRESSMAN—REPRESENTED SECOND COLORADO DISTRICT, 1915–33; URGED EQUITABLE FREIGHT RATES—SOUGHT TARIFF ON SUGAR—WANTED LEVIES ON PHILIPPINE IMPORTS TO ENCOURAGE THE BEET INDUSTRY IN STATE

STERLING, COLO., May 31.—Charles Bateman Timberlake, Representative from Colorado for 18 years, died today at the age of 86.

Mr. Timberlake was born on an Ohio farm, of Scotch-English ancestry, attended Earlham College at Richmond, Ind., and came to Colorado, where he homesteaded and taught school.

A farmer and stockman himself, Mr. Timberlake championed such interests during his years in Congress. He fought incessantly for equitable freight rates for the Rocky Mountain region. Although he was reelected at each congressional election, his age prompted him to retire from the House of Representatives in 1933.

He leaves a widow, his third wife, whom he married in 1930.

Mr. Timberlake, a Republican, represented the Second Colorado Congressional District in the House of Representatives from 1915 to 1933.

One of his main objectives, which he was never able to completely carry out, was the levying of a high tariff and restrictions on the import of sugar from the Philippine Islands. Mr. Timberlake believed that such a step would greatly encourage the sugar-beet industry of the Rocky Mountain area.

Mr. Timberlake, after becoming a member of the Republican Party, took an active interest in local politics and served as superintendent of schools of Phillips County from 1889 to 1895. From 1895 to 1897 he acted as county clerk.

In 1897 he was elected recorder of the United States Land Office at Sterling, Colo., a position in which he served until November 1914, when he was elected Representative.

Mr. Timberlake, upon his retirement from Congress, returned to his home at Sterling, where he served as vice president and director of the Logan County National Bank. He was a member of the Masons, Knights of Pythias, Elks, and Odd Fellows.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 31, 1941]

C. B. TIMBERLAKE DIES; COLORADAN, 86, HELD HOUSE SEAT 18 YEARS—LEGISLATOR, RETIRED IN 1933, CHAMPIONED EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE

STERLING, COLO., May 31.—Charles B. Timberlake, 86, who represented the Second Colorado District in Congress for 18 years, died today. A Republican, Mr. Timberlake retired from the House in 1933.

As a legislator, Mr. Timberlake concerned himself chiefly as a champion of the farmer.

A farmer and stockman himself, he believed in the equality of the farmer with the manufacturer. He once characterized the deflation in farm and livestock prices after the World War as "the greatest crime the Nation ever experienced."

While primarily concerned about his own district and State, he devoted himself to a study of agricultural conditions throughout the United States and exemplified his conscientiousness by canvassing his district to sound out his constituency on pending legislation.

SOUGHT SUGAR-IMPORT QUOTAS

With equal fervor, Mr. Timberlake studied the needs of the stock-raising and mining interests of Colorado. His was one of the first proposals to limit the imports of sugar from the Philippine Islands, put forth in the belief that only through such a restriction would the domestic sugar industry of the United States, centering in the Rocky Mountain region, be able to survive and flourish.

Born in Clinton County, Ohio, September 25, 1854, Mr. Timberlake was of Scotch-English ancestry. His parents, Alfred and Phoebe Timberlake, embraced the Quaker faith, and he also became a member of that church. From the farm he went to Earlham College at Richmond, Ind., for his higher education. Later he moved to Colorado, where he engaged in teaching. At 33 he homesteaded land in northern Colorado, subsequently moving to eastern Colorado to engage in farming and stock raising.

He served as county superintendent of schools of Phillips County, chosen county clerk, and as recorder in the United States Land Office here. He was elected to Congress in 1915. Thereafter, he was reelected at each congressional election.

Mr. Timberlake married twice. His first wife was Marguerite E. Fall, of Thorntown, Ind., whom he married in 1882 and by whom he had two children. His second wife was M. Catherine Ballard, of Washington. Representative Timberlake made his home here, where he was vice president and director of the Logan County National Bank. He was a member of the Masonic fraternity, Knights of Pythias, Elks, and Odd Fellows.

Of massive frame and strong features, Mr. Timberlake commanded attention on the infrequent occasions when he spoke in the House.

He was a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He voted for the McNary-Haugen farm relief bill and afterward, ever open to suggestion, readily admitted that some other form of relief legislation would perhaps meet the farm problem more squarely.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

LETTER FROM GABRIEL LUNDY, HEAD, AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT, SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE, BROOKINGS, S. DAK.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I offer for the RECORD, the very thoughtful observations of Prof. Gabriel Lundy, head of the Agricultural Economics Department, South Dakota State College, on the subject of unemployment.

I would call special attention to these striking sentences in Mr. Lundy's letter:

The contemplated reorganization of all the different industries would call for representatives of the investors, labor, and the consuming public or Government on the general management body which would be formulating policies. This can all be done by democratic methods. If we cannot beat Hitler at the job of providing employment for everybody, our talk of defending democracy is not going to mean much to the rank and file of unsuccessful job seekers and poverty-stricken farmers.

If we continue simply to rely on a public-building program, grants to destitute farmers and W. P. A. jobs for the idle city workers, all financed out of taxes, our Nation will remain on crutches, economically speaking.

The letter follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS,
Brookings, S. Dak., May 17, 1941.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE:

* * * * * *

Industrial unemployment is the big problem and challenge facing our democracy. This is more serious than the European war. We have never failed to defend ourselves successfully when attacked in war, but have quite consistently suffered defeat in our piecemeal, sporadic, and half-hearted attempts to solve industrial unemployment. As of December 1940, the National Industrial Conference Board estimated the unemployed at eight and one-fourth million. Furthermore, during the past decade industry has failed to absorb the surplus population from the farms, with the result that we have possibly 6,000,000 more people than desirable eking out a subsistence on farms. Hence, a

large percentage of our population is ill-fed, ill-housed, poorly nourished, unhealthy, and ignorant.

The maximum per capita food consumption is limited physiologically. Improvements in technology enable a declining percentage of our population to produce all necessary food and farm-produced fiber. With a higher birth rate on the farm than in the cities, there should be a resumption of large migration from farm to factory. But first, industry must be ready to increase employment.

The per capita consumption of industrial products is limited only by production and economic buying power. Idle workers reduce both purchasing power and salable products. The expansion in industrial employment would create both increased demand for commodities and an enlarged supply of industrial products. The demand for farm products would also be increased, and a shift of surplus farm population into industry would increase the per capita income of the remaining farmers actually needed on the farms. Thus the standard of living of all could be increased.

One handicap now is that each firm, group, or industry is looking at the problem from the restricted viewpoint of narrow, temporary self-interest. They are not charged with the responsibility of formulating and following a long-time plan for the enrichment and strengthening of the entire Nation. Possibly some of our laws actually hinder the development of this more effective and efficient use of all our material and human resources.

Government encouragement and assistance is needed for industrial expansion of the magnitude here contemplated. Probably each entire industry, such as the iron and steel industry, for example, would have to be organized on such a basis that all the separate plants and companies would cooperate as a unit in assuming responsibility for the expansion and stabilization of employment in the industry. Gradually, and in unison, all industries could be similarly expanded as long as there were idle employable workers. If workers receive fair wages the market, or the demand for commodities, will expand step by step with the increase in employment. By the use of statistics of production and demand, it will be possible to adjust the expanding output to fit the expanding and expansible demand. Agriculture is now in a sense trying to do this through the A. A. A. A fair balance with respect to population, production, and prices would have to be maintained between agriculture and industry. Furthermore, extreme concentration of wealth would have to be prevented in order to give the mass of consumers sufficient purchasing power to buy the enlarged output of goods.

The contemplated reorganization of all the different industries would call for representatives of the investors, labor, and the consuming public or government on the general management body which would be formulating policies. This can all be done by democratic methods. If we cannot beat Hitler at the job of providing employment for everybody, our talk of defending democracy is not going to mean much to the rank and file of unsuccessful job seekers and poverty-stricken farmers.

Even if the Nation is fortunate enough to escape involvement in the current foreign wars, our economic problems will be made more difficult by the fact that we have failed to solve our unemployment problem. This is a drain on our national resources and an indictment of our vaunted industrial leadership. By solving our employment problems we would greatly simplify our problem of financing the defense program, because with full employment our national income and tax-paying ability would be greatly increased.

If we continue simply to rely on a public-building program, grants to destitute farmers, and W. P. A. jobs for the idle city workers, all financed out of taxes, our Nation will remain on crutches, economically speaking.

The post-war depression and unemployment problem, whether we succeed in staying out of the war or not, obviously will be serious when defense workers are laid off and soldiers are demobilized, unless the Nation by that time has a comprehensive plan for expanding productive peacetime employment.

For these reasons the most important problem facing our Nation, it seems to me, is that of providing productive employment for all employable workers in order that we may raise our standard of living and promote genuine democracy.

Because I know you are sincerely interested in the welfare of our great, and potentially much greater, Nation, I pass these suggestions on to you.

Sincerely yours,

GABRIEL LUNDY,
Head, Agricultural Economics Department.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. FRANK T. HINES

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, May 30, 1941:

Chairman Yaden, gold-star mothers, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we meet again at Arlington—our national memorial shrine to courage, patriotism, and sacrifice.

Here lie before us the mortal remains of those men and women who have made the supreme sacrifice for their country while in the armed services. In contemplation of their great devotion, we necessarily must reflect upon our history—upon the progress we have made in the century and a half since the founding fathers, armed with their muskets, sallied forth bravely in defense of certain high ideals.

Quite recently, I stood before the beautiful monument, erected in the city of Indianapolis, as a tribute in marble in honor of Indiana World War veterans. Over the entrance door of the memorial were these words: "To vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the world."

As I stood before the memorial, I reflected upon the reasons why those men, in whose memory that marble edifice had been erected, had their names listed there. They had joined up to protect their country, I thought. "Had their service been effective?" I considered, because today we find ourselves again in a troubled world, where the cadence of the feet of marching men is heard, again going forth to vindicate the principles of peace and justice.

Those Indiana boys, I thought, fought for the freedoms which are America's—freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of conscience, and freedom of religion. They fought, in other words, for the true principles upon which this democracy of America has been erected.

We, in America, believe that all men and women should be free. They should be free to live their own lives in their own way. We only require that they, as law-abiding citizens, must have full respect for constituted authority.

We believe in majority rule, and the great majority believes in the Golden Rule.

All of the men and women whose bodies lie here in these hallowed graves in Arlington—from Revolutionary War battlefields, from the War of 1812, from the Mexican War, the Indian Wars, from the fields of valor, both North and South in the Civil War, from the Spanish American War, and in so much greater numbers from the World War—all, all fought for these democratic freedoms of America.

Are our freedoms again challenged? Time alone will tell.

America is inhabited only by free men and free women. No challenge to our freedom, if it be a challenge of force, will remain unanswered.

It is difficult for us, as citizens of this free America, to picture always to ourselves from the headlines in the newspapers or the announcements on the radio, just what is going on in other parts of the world, so distressed by warfare. We cannot always translate these announcements into terms of the deprivation of rights of individual men. We learn of bombed cities, ships sunk, and many battles in widely scattered places in Europe, in Africa, and Asia.

What we cannot see in our mind's eye are the dispossessed families, the homeless children, the orphaned children who may never know their parents' names—whole populations dislocated; people whose farmsteads may have come down to them through direct legal process for hundreds of years—lost overnight, and never to be regained, if the rule of aggressors persists.

Yet, in their years of peace, these people wished for, hoped and prayed—just as we do today—that they could live in peace, unselfishly, neighborly, and in secure possession of those things which they had won by their own labors.

It is hard for us to realize that such a situation could be brought about on the soil of America.

All right-thinking men and women hope fervently that this could not be. They also hope that it is possible for the people of other nations to have peace and contentment again, and that they may overcome those forces of greed, prejudice, and selfishness that have led men and nations away from the roads of peace.

Because Americans are honest, unselfish, neighborly, clean, and free—it does not mean that with these attributes of righteousness they can live in peace, unless all are prepared to defend it. Our fathers looked to God for their direction; there are some today who look to every other place but God. While we still print "In God we trust" on our money, many carry this idea around only in their pockets and should be reminded of this trust from day to day. Unless we are willing to practice these ideals, to unite for them, to prepare to defend them there is real danger that we will lose them.

For more than 150 years our Nation and its people have labored and prospered under the principles of the founders of our country. We remember the sacrifices made by George Washington and the principles that he believed in. We recall that our people believed in his integrity and followed his leadership. We have studied the aims and the work of Abraham Lincoln who preserved our Nation during the great struggle for national unity.

Our Nation has sent forth sons in the defense of these same principles when they were challenged abroad during the great conflict of the first World War. They have made many sacrifices so that our citizens may live

in peace and prosperity, but, notwithstanding these efforts, our people are again confronted with a test of their patriotism and of their national unity.

At no time in our history has the need for a sound American citizenship been so great as it is today. At no time before has it been more essential that our people stand squarely united confronting the common danger, which is now bringing about death and destruction in many parts of the world.

Thousands of years ago China built a wall, and her people behind it felt safe and secure. Although the wall stood, her enemies were able to enter the gates, because of disloyalty on the part of gatekeepers. France, following World War No. 1 built a strong defense, the Maginot line, but that also proved to be a vain reliance. It is hard to conceive that she fell through lack of courage of her soldiers. It seems probable that intrigue from within and mechanized might from without were what caused France to fall. She was unprepared and not united.

We are committed in our form of government to abide by the decision of a majority of our people. While we may in honest debate have differences of opinion, when the decision is reached by the majority, America united, responds and follows our national leadership. A majority has already decided that it is necessary to have an adequate defense, and America, therefore, should and must stand strongly behind our President, in a policy of national defense so well coordinated as to be impregnable. We must do more by giving expected aid to those democracies still fighting for those principles in which we believe.

So it is essential that we bring about that type of strong national unity that spells close teamwork between Government, industry, and our people.

It is natural that some should differ on methods of achieving the desired result, but we should not have differences of opinion as to the desirability of getting the result we have already decided upon.

There can be no compromise with American citizenship. We either believe in the principles upon which our Government is founded, or we do not believe in them. If we do believe in those principles, we should stand up for them and be prepared to fight for them, if need be.

What is best for our Nation should be uppermost in our thoughts. We should sacrifice those things which would hamper the desire of the majority. When community interest requires united action for the protection of the ideals of our Nation, any conflicting desires must be put aside.

In the services here at Arlington and throughout our Nation at many other similar shrines we are paying homage to those men who did this very thing in time of national danger—men who responded when the Nation called, regardless of what it meant to them individually, who gave service to the Nation and those ideals for which it stands.

The real issue at this time is simple. All of us—the whole 130,000,000 of us—are confronted squarely with a great emergency, a historic crisis. Our President and the Congress have indicated how great this emergency is by word and by action. This is no time for minorities to argue as to whether the emergency exists or is great enough. This is no time to waste precious minutes and hours in debating procedures. We have selected our leaders to make our decision. It is for us to support them and do all in our power to play our part nobly and well.

In other words, we must have teamwork for national security, for a stronger and better American citizenship, so that we may have a chance to aid in reestablishing peace throughout the world and in maintaining peace in America.

Let our trust be in God, our loyalty to our country, and our faith in our fellow men.

The Meaning of Crete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 31, 1941:

[From the New York Times of May 31, 1941]

THE MEANING OF CRETE

All the lessons of the amazing German victory in Crete will not be known until more details have been revealed and the whole story has been pieced together; but it is possible to draw one or two lessons of the first importance from what is already known. It is the most dramatic and clear-cut victory ever scored for air power. By all traditional standards the British appeared to have every advantage. Crete is an island some 60 miles from the nearest mainland; the British were in possession; they had an army there, with defended positions, artillery, tanks, and other heavy equipment; and they commanded the seas. They even had a small air force already based there. The Germans had no equivalent naval force; they did not have the tanks and other celebrated land matériel of their previous blitzkriegs. By air power alone they landed, equipped, and supplied on the island forces more powerful than those they opposed. Though the British were able to prevent sea landings on any important scale, they did so only at so heavy a cost to their fleet that they recognized long-continued defense of the island by sea to be hopeless. Crete had been made untenable.

The German victory at Crete gives no grounds for supposing that Britain itself could be invaded in the same way. It is protected by a huge army, by heavy mechanized equipment, and above all by the Royal Air Force, with the best pursuit planes in the world. The great difficulty of the British in Crete was that they did not have sufficient planes and airfields there to hold it; they were unable to get sufficient pursuit planes to the island, and, unlike the Germans, they had no mass aviation transports. But what the conquest of Crete does make clear beyond all doubt is that the British Navy is a far less important defense of England from invasion, and the R. A. F. relatively a far more important one, than traditional military opinion even up to a few weeks ago was willing to concede.

In that period we have seen not only the startling demonstration in Crete. We have seen the newest and most powerful battleship in the world, which a few days before had proved her power by sinking the largest ship in the British Navy, herself sought out and found by planes and made a helpless cripple by aerial torpedoes, so that the task of finishing her off by fleet shelling became almost perfunctory. The British Navy will be effective in protecting Britain from invasion only to the extent that it can itself be protected by a canopy of at least local air superiority. Without this local air superiority, we are now forced to recognize that the British Navy alone could not defend Britain today even if it were many times as large as it is.

But the conclusions to be drawn from all this are by no means wholly pessimistic, either for Britain or ourselves. Though it requires years to reverse an unfavorable naval balance, the reversal of an air balance is a far shorter task, particularly for a country like ourselves with the greatest mass production industry in the world. A mass long-range bomber program becomes more imperative for us than ever, both for our own "aggressive defense" and for that aid-to-Britain program which can help to make secure what is now the first line of that defense.

Federal Tax on Motor Fuel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

LETTER FROM THE LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION, INC.,
University, La., May 26, 1941.

Hon. HALE BOGGS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOGGS: As secretary of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, I have been keeping up with the situation with reference to further increases in the Federal taxes. It is the opinion of my organization that such new taxes as may be imposed for the purpose of carrying on the national-defense program should be of such a character as not to destroy our system of private enterprise upon which the well-being of this Nation so greatly depends in our present emergency.

But, on the other hand, no persons should be allowed to make excessive profits nor should taxes be levied for purely punitive purposes. Our organization, composed of farmers, does not believe that the existing Federal tax of 1½ cents per gallon should be increased. The highway users of this country are already paying their full and proportionate share of all general taxes. In addition to that, they are contributing, in round figures, about $2,000,000,000 a year in special highway taxes of various kinds, Federal, State, and local. This sum is approximately equal to 14 percent of the total revenues accruing to all the units of government in the United States. Roughly speaking, State and local taxes on highway transportation amount to $1,500,000,000, while the Federal Government is collecting about $500,000,000 a year from this source.

State taxes imposed on gasoline now average 4.4 cents per gallon (here in Louisiana the tax is 7 cents per gallon). The existing Federal levy of 1½ cents per gallon brings the total to 5.9 cents (in Louisiana, 8½ cents per gallon). Adding another cent per gallon for Federal purposes would bring the average total to 6.9 cents per gallon (in Louisiana 9½ cents). At the present retail price of gasoline this would represent a sales tax of more than 50 percent (in Louisiana 76 percent).

So far as agriculture is concerned, motor transportation under modern conditions is not a luxury but an absolute necessity. More than 1,000,000 trucks, or about one-fourth of the country's total, are owned and operated by farmers. A recent survey discloses the fact that with the abandonment of many branch lines of railroads that are no longer profitable there are about 48,000 communities throughout the United States that are entirely dependent upon highway transportation.

The farmer must have his motor-vehicle facilities, and he does not feel that his use of the highways is a proper and adequate measure by which to determine his contribution toward the cost of national defense.

Some idea of the importance of the motor vehicle to the American farmer may be gained from the records of the United States Department of Agriculture, which show that approximately 27 percent of the butter, 29 percent of the eggs, 65 percent of the poultry, 40 percent of the fruit and vegetables, 62 percent of the cattle, 61 percent of the calves, 68 percent of the hogs, 29 percent of the sheep and lambs, and 50 percent of the mules and horses are now moved from farm to market by truck.

When the revenues derived from gasoline taxes are expended in improving and maintaining the highways, there can be no legitimate criticism. However, it must be kept in mind that much of the gasoline purchased by farmers is used for plowing, harrowing, threshing, filling silos, pumping water, operating spraying machinery, sawing wood, grinding feed, and for other purposes that do not involve any use of the highways. Many States properly refund tax to farmers on gasoline used in such ways as have been enumerated. Other States do not make these refunds. So far as the Federal tax on gasoline is concerned, no refunds whatsoever are made. To increase the Federal gasoline tax would, therefore, result in increasing the farmer's cost of production.

The cost of transportation constitutes the biggest single service that agriculture has to pay. The imposition of an additional Federal tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline would make present excessive transportation costs on farm commodities just that much higher. This would be true of the more than 1,000,000 trucks operated by farmers themselves. It would likewise be true of common and contract carrier trucks that transport the products of the farm, and which haul supplies consumed on the farm.

I wish to further call your attention to the fact that Louisiana has more than $103,000,000 in outstanding highway bonds and is dependent principally upon the revenue derived from the State gasoline tax to pay off these bonds as they mature. Should the Federal tax on gasoline be increased and consumption curtailed, which is the result that is predicted by some economists, our State would suffer embarrassment of not being able to meet her road bonds as they mature.

The legislatures in half of the States feel that the intrusion of the Federal Government into a sphere of taxation developed by the States to provide funds for road improvement may be serious as to its effect on State finances, and have memorialized Congress to withdraw from the field of motor-fuel taxation.

I realize that you are extremely busy at the present time with very important matters, but feel that it is my duty to call your attention to facts that I think are very pertinent with reference to further increasing the Federal tax on motor fuel.

Hoping that the information contained herein will be of benefit to you, I remain,

Very truly yours,

MILTON C. TAINTER,
Secretary, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation.

The Speech of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WICHITA (KANS.) BEACON

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of May 28:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of May 28, 1941]

THE SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT

To those who were looking for a declaration of war the speech of the President was disappointing. But to those who were looking for a cold and logical review of past events, a lucid analysis of this country's present situation in world affairs and a forthright declaration of the United States policy in regard to the war the speech was fully satisfying.

The declaration of an unlimited national emergency was the one step forward, the final act of leadership on the part of the Chief Executive, that the President has been urged to take to insure the complete cooperation of all elements of our national life. From Tuesday night forward the eradication of Hitlerism becomes the chief objective of this Government and this Nation.

The President made clear to Germany and to the rest of the world the action this country will take to resist Nazi aggression and where that action will be taken. It will be taken anywhere on the high seas where the traditional freedom of the seas is threatened. That is a direct answer to Admiral Raeder's recent warning against convoying. No nation—Germany or any other—shall drive the United States from the seas.

The President made clear that prompt action would be taken against any threat on the Western Hemisphere and he extended the defense limits of that hemisphere to the Canary Islands, the Azores, and even to Dakar. In view of the President's analysis of our defense area, a clash with Hitler is almost certain if and when he breaks out of Europe into West Africa.

Our aid to Britain will be continued and increased. And more important, the naval forces, and if necessary the military forces, of this country will be used to insure the delivery of this aid. The President declared American warships are already patroling the Atlantic and that they will continue to do everything necessary to insure the delivery of material to the British. Convoying will not be employed because changed conditions make the convoying system obsolete but the newer and, we presume, the more efficient methods of ocean delivery will have the cooperation of the United States Navy.

In the domestic field the President made it clear, even beyond his declaration of national emergency which gives him unlimited power over production, that there must be no selfish interests interfering with the industrial defense efforts. Capital must cooperate, must not take excessive profits, but, more important, labor must abide by the mediation efforts and decisions of the governmental officials and boards set up for their protection. The President made it plain that stoppage of work will not be tolerated.

His respects were also paid to that small group, some of them sincere persons, who still harbor the illusion that Hitler is the kind of a person that self-respecing men and women can deal with. From the stand taken by President Roosevelt Tuesday night this country can no more negotiate with the Nazi dictator than can the Churchill government in England. In America, as well as in England, it must be "Quislings" who will barter with Hitler in the extreme event he is victorious in his dream of world power.

The position of this country has now been made plain, not only to citizens of the United States, but to the entire world. Without a declaration of war this country is dedicated to the task of defeating Hitler in any and every way that defeat can be accomplished. If that be war, then Hitler must make the most of it.

The President is to be congratulated on one of the greatest addresses of his administration, great in its clarity and logic, great in its appeal to the American people, great in its insistence on the rights of this Nation, no matter where they may rest.

Antiwar Petition of Committee of Volunteer Women Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

LETTERS TO THE PRESIDENT AND HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

DE PERE, WIS., *May 23, 1941.*
The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, District of Columbia.

MR. PRESIDENT: The signatures on the enclosed petition have been hastily gathered by women workers of Green Bay and De Pere, Wis., who have volunteered their services to satisfy a general demand by women in this area.

They represent the wholly voluntary expression of 99.9 percent of all the women who have been approached in the limited time available.

The response has been overwhelming and spontaneous. No opposition or discouragement has anywhere been encountered—nothing but prayers for its success.

These signatures, nearly 1,000 of them, are only a start—more will follow as rapidly as they can be gathered.

Respectfully submitted.

ELIZABETH M. WELLS,
ROSE SCHULDES,
VIRGINIA TROWBRIDGE,
Representing the Committee of Volunteer Women Workers.

DE PERE, WIS., *May 30, 1941.*
Hon. JOSHUA L. JOHNS, M. C.
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For your information and guidance, we are enclosing herewith a typed copy of a petition with its appended

signatures, the original of which was sent by registered mail to the President of the United States together with the letter you will find attached.

The petition was mailed in two installments, the first on May 23, the second today. Other signatures are being gathered as fast as the calls can be made. They will be forwarded later.

This is a purely spontaneous effort made by volunteer women workers, without any organized backing of any kind. It represents the unhesitating and undoubted sentiment and opinion of every woman called upon with but one exception out of a thousand.

The signatures came from all ages and positions in life. They represent every group.

We beg you to use this information to help you make it clear to our Government that the women of America are overwhelmingly opposed to war and to the proposals referred to in this petition.

Respectfully yours,

ELIZABETH M. WELLS,
For the Volunteer Committee of Workers.

Defense of New York-New Jersey Area Deplorably Weak—Should Be Strengthened Immediately

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I addressed to the Secretary of War, under date of May 31, 1941:

MAY 31, 1941.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently I completed a 3-day inspection trip of Army camps and forts in the Second Corps Area, and, believing that my observations should be of interest to you, I pass them on for your consideration.

At the outset, let me point out that, as a World War veteran and as a member of both the Military Affairs and Dies Committees of the House of Representatives, I appreciate the need for secrecy. On the other hand, I deem it important to acquaint the American people, as well as yourself and the committees of which I am a member, with facts which you and they should know and which will be of no aid to other nations. Further, I think it highly essential at all times not to follow a policy of fooling the people.

FORT DIX

My visit took me first to Fort Dix at a time when the Forty-fourth Division, under the command of General Powell, was on maneuvers in southern New Jersey. While at Dix, I conferred with Colonel Dowell, camp commander; Major Sexton, plans and training officer; Major Floryck, camp ordnance officer; Captain Karakas, chemical-warfare officer; likewise Maj. John Sharpe, of the One Hundred and Fourth Engineers, Forty-fourth Division. After conferring with these officers, I made a tour of the camp, visiting barracks, mess halls, recreation centers, ordnance depot, and ammunition magazines.

A most deplorable state of affairs was found in both the ordnance depot and in the magazines, there being practically no reserve supply in either. It was usually one of this and two of that. In the magazines there was a great shortage of small-arms ammunition, while there was no ammunition at all for some larger weapons, nor any fragmentation hand grenades. Likewise, in the ordnance depot there was no reserve supply of automatic rifles, machine guns, or antitank guns, and absolutely no reserve supply of field pieces. The ordnance officer estimated that in the whole camp there were probably only 80 rounds of small-arms ammunition per man, which, when you consider the amount of small-arms ammunition used in automatic and machine-gun fire, you can well imagine the very short length of time which would be consumed to fire the entire stock on hand. The post ordnance officer seemed to be more concerned with a shortage of 1,000 17-jewel watches and field glasses, both for officers' use, than about anything else.

The reserve supply of everything in the Dix magazines would be insufficient to repel even an internal disorder occurring in some neighboring industrial center. There is hardly enough small-arms ammunition on hand for ordinary guard duty.

What ammunition and powder there is is stored in four buildings of wooden construction built in World War days. These buildings are on a plot of about 1½ acres surrounded by steel wire. The only guard, day and night, at these magazines is a lone soldier armed with a pistol. This guard is required to report to the guardhouse every 30 minutes by telephone, the guard being inside of the wire fence while the telephone is located on the outside, necessitating the opening of the gate every 30 minutes and easily permitting an entrance at night. As far as I could determine, about the only things which this fence and guard could keep out would be stray dogs and cats.

The barracks at Dix were reasonably well kept and of satisfactory construction, although in some cases the flooring had already begun to wave and the roofing had begun to roughen. Some mess halls appeared to be untidy, caused mostly by the use of soft coal in the kitchen, which in a few months had darkened both floors and walls. Many of these kitchens are supposed to accommodate some 125 men and yet each kitchen contains two large ice boxes where in most cases one would easily be sufficient. I noticed that in many kitchens one ice box was not used at all.

Another observation which I made at this post concerned milk, all milk on the post being purchased from a local distributor who holds a virtual monopoly. The milk is purchased by the Army at the rate of a half-pint bottle per day per man, whether to be used or not. I was informed by an officer that the milk costs 5 cents per half pint; bottled, 20 cents per quart; and, according to officers stationed at the post, is grade B. The milk situation at Dix appears to be a racket and certainly should be investigated, particularly when at Fort Monmouth, only a few miles distant, the price paid per half pint is 3¾ cents, or 14 1/10 cents per quart, for grade A pasteurized.

Officers at Dix report that the War Department has been reducing the allotment of training ammunition to the post by one-third; that no fragmentation grenades are on the post; that 12 pontoon boats and 20 trailers belonging to the One Hundred and Fourth Engineers were standing idle during maneuvers of the Forty-fourth Division because of a lack of trucks with which to haul them.

The chemical warfare officer reported that there was no adequate gas chamber on the post and that there was no money available for building such a chamber, but I learned from a different source that considerable money has already been expended for such nonessentials as a new wing on the officers' clubhouse.

As a result of the shortage of ammunition, the troops of Dix have been unable to even have one round's firing in certain of their weapons, such as antitank guns, and in small arms firing they have had no practice in firing at a greater distance than 200 yards. I was unable to find one antiaircraft gun in the entire fort.

NEW JERSEY MANEUVERS

From Dix I went to the maneuvers of the Forty-fourth Division, where I witnessed the One Hundred and Fifty-sixth Field Artillery, the One Hundred and Thirteenth Infantry, the One Hundred and Fourth Engineers, Division Headquarters, and certain other units in action. Both men and officers appeared to be keenly interested in the work. The morale of the troops good, and both the officers and troops, even with inadequate equipment, well trained.

I would give special mention to a Captain Adyasuna, of the Medical Corps, who gave an excellent demonstration in completely setting up in the field, ready for emergency use, a first-aid station in less than 10 minutes. This unit was most efficient.

While the equipment on the maneuvers, other than Garand rifles, was deficient and antiquated, nevertheless it was well camouflaged and well handled. I think, though, to use 75-millimeter guns and 155-millimeter howitzers against approaching ships, as was the "problem" at Atlantic City, is just plain silly. Further, there was not one single antiaircraft gun to defend any position from air attacks.

While inspecting a 37-millimeter antitank gun on the road, the enlisted men at the gun reported that it had yet to be fired. In fact, while the troops had had 37-millimeter antitank guns for many weeks, they had yet to see their first ammunition.

Other observations which I made at both Dix and on the maneuvers were that recreation facilities at the fort were fair and that general sickness was below average (the average, as I understand it, is 5 percent and the post has been running about 2 percent). Venereal disease is not prevalent (out of 842 men in the One Hundred and Fourth Engineers, only 1 man is afflicted with venereal disease).

There was some criticism about the field rations served to the troops and, if one evening meal I had was any criterion, improvement is warranted. This meal consisted of two slices of crushed bologna, one boiled potato, two slices of bread, a few sliced carrots, a cup of coffee, and a dish of bread pudding. The greatest criticism I heard about the food was that there was an insufficient supply of meat and an oversupply of starches.

FORT MONMOUTH

Early in the morning of the second day I visited Fort Monmouth. I was met at the gate by an M. P. officer, who directed our party to divisional headquarters, where we were met by Lt. Robert Evans, G–2 and public-relations officer. At headquarters we conferred with General Van Duesen, commanding officer of Monmouth; Col. Roger B. Colton, in charge of Signal Corps laboratory; Capt. Leon Fields, assistant executive officer; and Lt. Col. Edgar L. Clewell, post executive officer.

We first toured the reservation, and on this tour I made the following observations:

1. No hand grenades available.
2. Not a single antiaircraft gun.
3. Only about 60 gas masks on hand.
4. Short about 100 trucks.
5. Barracks, mess halls, and various areas in excellent condition and very clean.
6. Sixty rifles on hand in the entire post for some 10,000 soldiers and trainees.

The laboratory is naturally one of the most important spots on this post and is the nerve center for the entire United States Army. Officers estimated that the equipment in the laboratory would be valued at between $30,000,000 and $50,000,000. Protection against sabotage inside the laboratory is good. There has been no evidence of sabotage or attempted sabotage to date, but among the civilian employees, 80 percent of whom are selected by civil service, there are some known Communist sympathizers. An effort has been made by the authorities at Monmouth to have these employees either discharged or transferred, but to date approval has not been granted.

The weakness at this laboratory in connection with the guards is on the exterior. Thirty civilians (civil service) guard the outside of the laboratory building and are at all times on guard, but the laboratory itself is only partially protected by fence. The guards carry pistols only. At night or day no guards are on the outside of the fence. The intelligence officer estimates that if the laboratory were destroyed it would retard the entire defense program of the United States by at least 7 months, so valuable are the instruments and other material in the laboratory.

I recommend to you that the War Department immediately appreciate the need of detailing an entire well-equipped regiment of infantry to furnish an outside guard for this laboratory at all times, that the fence be electrified and extended to surround the laboratory, that floodlights be thrown on the laboratory and the laboratory area as well. Strictest supervision is also essential in that the theater should not be open to the public. No one should be permitted to enter the reservation after dark unless on official business and unless a pass has been issued by the commanding officer. A closer check should be made on civilian employees. All employees entering and leaving the building, as well as all visitors, should be searched. The present system, for example, of not examining lunch boxes of employees is dangerous and should be stopped.

Another glaring weakness is the fact that outside vendors, such as milkmen, laundrymen, soft-drink vendors, etc., are not guarded as closely as they should be. The present system would permit delivery of time bombs in milk cans or concealed in trucks. The driver could abandon the truck near the laboratory.

Considering the vital key position which the laboratory plays in our defense program, no time should be lost in guarding it more carefully and affording better protection.

Likewise, antiaircraft guns, of which there are none now, should be mounted and ready for action all over this reservation, there being no post near to Fort Monmouth that has a mobile battery of antiaircraft guns which could be called upon for quick protection.

Fort Monmouth is the only training base in the entire country for Army carrier pigeons. About 1,900 of them are on the post. The trailer lofts permit quick transportation in event of attack at other points. The system is excellent, but weakness lies in the fact that all of the pigeon carriers for the Army are concentrated at Monmouth. A disease epidemic or sabotage might wipe out the entire flock.

The Communist Party is undoubtedly active at Monmouth. I learned of one employee working in the laboratory who has been writing letters in code to a leader of a Communist organization, telling of laboratory work and secrets. I know of three other cases of known Communists who are being watched and who have been taken away from vital areas. One Communist was detailed by outside Army authorities to the Aircraft Warning Division, where the highly secretive new machine is being assembled. He has since, however, been assigned to another post. It is impossible to understand how such a person could be placed at this most vital spot.

Fort Monmouth in the main, however, is a credit to the United States Army. The command is excellent, the discipline and I. Q. of the men of the highest. Both officers and men throughout the post are to be commended.

FORTS HANCOCK AND TILDEN

Practically no fixed armament received at these most strategic outer defenses of the New York harbor since the World War. Most guns on hand, though very old, are in good shape. Twenty-four hour alert at all batteries.

The lack of modern equipment, including antiaircraft, some classes of ammunition, and directors and height-finders for antiaircraft batteries, and searchlights, is pitiful. The amount of small-arms ammunition at both of these posts would last less than 1 minute in actual combat. Small-arms ammunition is now coming in in dribs and drabs, there being at the moment only about 100 rounds per man on hand of .30 caliber ammunition. Old Springfield rifles are still being used. Only 49 hand grenades on hand. No gas chamber—they use only gas-training masks.

One major-defense position, armed with a 155 milimeter rifle battery, has no sighting devices. There is no rifle range at Fort Tilden and men have not yet fired small arms since they have been in training. There is very little camouflage for batteries at either Tilden or Hancock. No casements or camouflage for heavy guns. One antiaircraft battery which has been in position for months has not yet received any directors or height-finders, so if this battery ever had to go into action, it would be like firing at wild ducks with blank shells from a shotgun. Incidentally, the ammunition for aircraft batteries would last about 3 minutes.

There is needed in the bay a restricted area to permit long-range target practice, but there is also dire need for subcaliber ammunition so that all gun crews could have continual firing practice. There are also needed some 100,000 sandbags for buttresses; now using flour bags which break when damp. Little barbed wire on hand.

There is a good supply of ammunition for 10-, 12-, and 16-inch guns.

Both the Communist and Nazi organizations have also made inroads at Hancock and Tilden, and it is not understandable why the Army should not thoroughly investigate new recruits before sending them to such strategic coastal-defense positions. A change in the system is needed so that men from reception centers at Forts Dix and Upton, who are known to be sympathetic to either communism or nazi-ism be not sent to such important forts as Hancock or Tilden. A more detailed report on the inroads of all these camps by un-American groups will be supplied by me to the Dies committee and to G-2 of the Army.

At Forts Hancock and Tilden, I found the enlisted personnel well trained, the command excellent, the morale of both officers and men high; and, while working with deficient equipment, they are nevertheless prepared to go into action at a moment's notice. General Gage, commanding officer of these two forts, is doing a splendid job.

CONCLUSION

These are the things that I have seen. They are not hearsay. They come from official sources, and I make the following recommendations on the basis of the information I have transmitted to you:

1. As I have said, the morale and spirit of the troops and selectees are excellent. They are working hard and faithfully to prepare themselves to defend the United States. Surely men with this spirit are entitled to the fighting chance which comes with having adequate equipment for, as we all know, in war as it is fought today, courage and physical condition can mean nothing unless they are accompanied by superior equipment. If this war has taught us anything, it is that superior equipment determines the victor.

Therefore, these vital positions defending Greater New York must at once be given the tools with which to do the job.

2. I have shown that subversive agents have been assigned to key positions in these forts. In time of emergency they could wreck the entire defense of the New York area. Therefore, the War Department should see to it that such men, if they must be taken into the service, be assigned to less critical places and that anywhere they are their activities be most carefully scrutinized.

Furthermore, Army authorities should have complete power of supervision, and dismissal, over the activities of the civilian employees on the posts.

3. Strategic nerve centers, ordnance depots, and ammunition and powder magazines at these forts, which at the present time are inadequately guarded, should be given immediately the protection that is so vital to the safeguarding of Army secrets and Army operations, and in this connection coast-defense fortifications should be more carefully camouflaged, and both physical and personnel arrangements made to guard all areas.

4. The total lack of antiaircraft defense in these posts at the present time means that the defenders would be helpless in the face of air attack. This might have the effect of making the positions useless in time of emergency and should be remedied quickly. Further, a more efficient and more pliable working arrangement should be instituted between the coastal positions and nearby supporting air forces.

5. In view of the importance of the New York industrial area, with its large defense plants, its shipping facilities, its tremendous population, its important warehouses, its railroad connections, and its airports, its bridges, power plants, and waterworks, all of which make it the most vital in the defense of the whole Nation as well as for sending aid to Britain, it is imperative that the practice of transferring for export of big guns from these fortifications be discontinued, at least until replacements are at hand.

Only if these things are done can we feel confident that the New York-New Jersey area is adequately defended.

Respectfully submitted.

Consolidated Metal Craft, Santa Fe Railway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 29, 1941.*

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the members of the Consolidated Metal Craft, Santa Fe Railway System, wish to reaffirm our loyalty to you, the Government of the United States, and our employer and assure you of our support of the Government's program to safeguard the Nation's welfare.

LEO DUNMEYER,
System General Chairman.

The Norfork Dam, To Be the Fifth Largest in the United States, Is Now Under Construction on the White River in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE NORFORK CELEBRATION (LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE) BY HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, there was held at the site of the Norfork Dam, now under construction on the North Fork of the White River in Arkansas, a huge celebration, attended by some 12,000 people. I insert in the RECORD the address which I made on that occasion:

What we shall say here today is of little importance but that which we have come to celebrate will live with the ages.

We are especially honored that the man who is recognized in Washington and throughout the country as the father of the reservoir method of flood control is with us. It was he who many years ago foresaw the failure of the levee system of control and began advocating holding the waters upstream. It was he also who many years ago advocated the development of hydroelectric power in dual-purpose dams. The man of whom I speak is our own United States district judge and former United States Senator, your friend and mine, John E. Miller.

Except for sections of the country that have been given special attention, such as the Tennessee Valley, the development of projects like this must take place under general authorization laws and general appropriations. For some reason, yet unexplained, the White River not only was never given special attention, it was never given equal treatment under the general laws.

For 2 consecutive years now I have heard the chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives ask the United States Army Engineers, "Is there a stream anywhere between the Appalachians and the Rockies, except the Tennessee, that has the power possibilities of the White?" And twice I have heard them say, "There is no stream that compares with the White."

The White River, draining as it does all or parts of 44 counties in Missouri and Arkansas, covers a territory of 28,000 square miles—only 12,000 less than the celebrated Tennessee. Twenty-one thousand of those are in the uplands; 7,000 are in the rich alluvial plains below Batesville.

In the valley live an estimated 750,000 people. The average rainfall ranges from 44 inches in the upper to 52 inches in the lower basin. The soil in both the uplands and the lowlands once was very fertile, but erosion resulting from cultivation has taken away one-third of the upland soil. So poor in fact have much of these lands become that the deposits now made upon the lowlands in flood time are a distinct detriment. The average direct flood damage in the valleys of the White, as estimated by the Army engineers, is $2,185,000 annually. This does not include the damage by our waters below the mouth of the White nor the damage by erosion.

If the present process of destruction goes on unchecked for one more century it is estimated that our upland population will decrease by at least a third, for the peril has just begun.

There is perhaps no community in the basin of the White which has not at some time given up one or more of its sons or daughters swept to their death in the raging floods of the White or its tributaries. There is not a farmer in the valley nor a businessman who is not suffering by our past policy of neglect in dealing with this stream.

The Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration are doing splendid work in soil conservation but they have hardly scratched the surface.

The Norfork Dam, with a total capacity of 1,983,000 acre-feet, will store 732,000 acre-feet of floodwaters. This is equivalent to keeping the floodwaters off of 732,000 acres of land for a depth of 1 foot.

Only disaster undreamed of can prevent the Norfork becoming a reality. It was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938 for flood control only. Built for that purpose alone it would cost approximately $15,000,000.

Five other projects on the White were authorized at the same time, including the Clear Water Reservoir on the Black River, a tributary of the White, in Missouri. That dam is well under way, but we were crippled from the beginning, for although the Congress authorized the six to cost an estimated $58,914,000 for flood control only, it at the same time placed a limitation of $25,000,000 on the total construction, hence only two could be begun. Worse still, the Congress failed to authorize power production in Norfork, or any other.

POWER

We started to work early in the fall of 1938, and I say "we" because many of us worked on it and I deserve no special credit, for everything I did it was my duty to do. We went to work, determined that we should get some dirt started moving. I came here, as you will recall, with Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief Engineer of the United States Corps of Engineers, Col. Eugene Reybold, division engineer, and Col. Stanley L. Scott, the district, and now division, engineer. That was in the fall of 1938.

We set to work to obtain the funds with which to get Norfork under way and in the spring of 1939, after a fight, we managed to get $434,350 for the next fiscal year. This was really the beginning. It is much easier to get projects authorized than to get appropriations for them. In the spring of 1940 we obtained, as an item in the general bill, $1,450,000 for this fiscal year, and this spring we have obtained $2,700,000 for the next fiscal year. Nearly two millions have been spent already.

The most desperate fight we have had has been on the question of power. In the spring of 1939 I introduced legislation designed to add power facilities. The bill was referred to the Flood Control Committee of the House. That committee votes out nothing but general bills and any bill dealing with flood control, unless it is in some sort of authority, goes to that committee. There was no general bill in 1939; hence, it died. In 1940 I introduced H. R. 9037, designed to add power. We thought we were going to have a general bill and the Flood Control Committee incorporated my bill into the general bill and voted it out. About that time the President decided there should be no new authorizations and the general bill died on the House Calendar.

Week before last we again held hearings on the question of power at Norfork and authorizations for Bull Shoals, Table Rock, Lone Rock, Mill Creek, and Greers Ferry. Present at the hearing—and every one of them testified—were the chairman and 4 other members of the State flood control commission, its chief engineer, the chairman of the State agricultural and industrial commission, the secretary and 1 member of the State game and fish commission, 1 district and 6 county officials and 25 other prominent citizens from Baxter, Marion, Boone, and Searcy Counties. Clebourne and Independence Counties were also represented.

We are fortunate to have on the Flood Control Committee a member of Arkansas' delegation in Congress, Mr. W. F. NORRELL, of Monticello.

I am confident that we will get the power authorization for Norfork and I am hopeful of getting authorizations for some of the other projects at this session.

I am determined to tell you here a little story that has not been told before. The Budget for the Nation, as you know, is made up every fall. Late last summer I learned with sickening disappointment that the President had requested the Secretary of War to submit to him a list of all reservoirs in the Nation that the War Department considered as begun, and that later he had asked for a list containing only those projects on which the Government had already been obligated and that this was the list that was being studied by the Budget for the ensuing year. This new list did not contain Norfork and seven similar developments throughout the country. I contacted every Senator and every Member of Congress whose projects were likewise left out and we started seeing the President and wiring him and writing him. I hold here in my hand a letter from President Roosevelt, written to me on the 6th day of last September, in which he says, and I quote:

"The present plans make it possible to construct the Norfork Dam to a greater height than that required for flood control alone, in order that suitable provisions may be made for the future development of hydroelectric power. It appears desirable that the necessary authority for the higher dam be secured at this time, not only because of the savings to the Federal Government which would be accomplished by such construction, but also on account of the desirability of providing for the future installation of power-generating machinery."

To convince him that Norfork had to stay in the Budget and to thus obtain an appropriation for this year, we had to convince him first that the power that it would produce would be vital to the defense, and I read you again from his letter:

"In times of national emergency such as these, the importance of an adequate supply of electric power for national-defense purposes cannot be overstressed."

And so the Norfork Dam becomes Arkansas' first huge defense industry.

After all, it was reasoned, generators at Norfork can be producing power long before some of the battleships for which we are contracting can ever float.

We must not anticipate that the present war will end in 1 2, or even 3 years, and we must never again anticipate that there will not be another war.

Then there came the question of the height of Norfork. All I can tell you about that now is that, constructed for flood control only, Norfork would have been only 191 feet high; but the contract was let to build the dam 220 feet high and that is the power dam. Its total cost, with generating facilities, will be approximately $28,000,000.

Norfork is being constructed for an initial power installation of 60,000 kilowatts and an ultimate installation of 120,000 kilowatts. It will produce annually approximately 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours. At the average price of electricity in Arkansas today, the power from Norfork would pay for the total cost of the dam in less than 30 years. If it sells at less than the present price—and it surely will—the people will still get the savings and it will in the end cost the Government nothing. When the Norfork and several other

projects are developed and tied together with a system of transmission lines, and when we have been able to firm up the peak power of these dams with the cheap oil and gas and coal from western and southern Arkansas, we will be selling power, we think, at rates even lower than those of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

We have among the highest power rates in the Nation. For instance, here at Mountain Home the first 25 kilowatt-hours cost $1.98. At Tupelo, Miss., under the T. V. A. rates—and I am quoting here from the Federal Power Commission figures—25 kilowatt-hours cost 75 cents, as compared with the $1.98 at Mountain Home.

Furthermore, the people of the T. V. A. region are using more than twice as much current, because of the low rates, as we are using and, therefore, their savings are twice as much. The irony of it is that we are using T. V. A. power right here today.

It is not a question of whether the rates in Arkansas are too high. The point is that as long as they are two and three times higher in Arkansas than in our neighboring States, new industries will not come to us and very few will grow up among us and our country will not be developed and our population will not grow and prosper.

MINERALS DEPEND UPON POWER

The minerals of Arkansas today far exceed those of Tennessee. In oil, in gas, in coal, in zinc, in aluminum, in manganese, in mercury, in lead, in glass sand, and in timber products we are far ahead. She surpasses us in the outstanding ones only in phosphates and marble, and we have unlimited deposits of each of these. Tennessee's industries are growing and increasing by leaps and bounds, faster even than T. V. A. can supply the power.

There are more than 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity possible of production from the streams of Arkansas every 12 months, not only on the White but on the tributaries of the Arkansas and the tributaries of the Red, including the Ouachita and Little Missouri. Facilities for steam plants to produce cheap power and to build the peak power of these dams into firm power, plants to be fueled with coal and oil and the cheap gas of our State, are as inevitable as are the dams themselves.

INDUSTRIALIZATION

A proper industrialization of Arkansas is as vital almost as agriculture itself.

Only 20 percent of the people of this Nation depend directly upon the soil for a living. In Arkansas 60 percent depend directly upon it.

The Nation's per capita income is $536. Arkansas'—and we are third from the bottom—is $244 (1939). The per capita income of any State is almost the exact inverse ratio of the number of people depending directly upon the farm. In other words, as our industries increase so will our per capita income. I hold in my hand a letter from the President of the Reynolds Aluminum Co., dated February 21, saying that he would like to locate a plant in Arkansas, "but power is the deterrent."

The high-power rates of Arkansas have kept us from being allocated several defense plants. If I were not in position to prove this, I wouldn't say it.

Arkansas stands out today as the No. 1 State of this Union in all the potentialities of its undeveloped resources and the forty-sixth State in per capita income.

High-power rates constitute barrier No. 1 to our proper industrial development.

On December 6 the Federal Power Commission wrote President Roosevelt that a definite shortage of power was developing in the Arkansas-Louisiana-Mississippi area. And I heard Chairman Leland Olds of the Commission testify last week that the needs of the national defense require an additional 10,000,000 kilowatts of power now.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Norfork Dam will furnish work for some two to three thousand men from 3 to 4 years. Nothing like that has ever come to this country before. The construction will be going on, no doubt, long after this war is over, and at a time when we will need this one and many others like it to help take up the slack in the economic chaos that is bound to come with peace.

RECREATION

The Ozarks have long been noted as a recreational center but the chief tourist attraction is water and the Arkansas Ozarks have no lakes. The Norfork, when completed, will provide one of America's most beautiful freshwater lakes here in a natural setting among these rugged hills, a pool more than 40 miles in length, lying in two States, a lake for fishing and boating and swimming, one in a great chain of lakes that, to use the words of President Roosevelt, will build the Ozarks into America's No. 1 playground.

NAVIGATION

And with the completion of Norfork and several of the other projects will come a regulated stream-flow that in turn will give us navigation for certain commodities peculiarly fitted to that type of transportation, navigation that will indirectly increase traffic on the railroads and highways.

CONCLUSION

Rivers, unchecked, have become paths of destruction; controlled, they are tools of democracy.

We can build all these dams either under the general authorizations and appropriations or under a special authority. If we proceed under the general bills, it will likely take half a century and our losses during that time would be increasingly terrific. We can build them under a special authority in well under a decade. The Tennessee Valley Authority is now 6 years old and the Tennessee is almost completely harnessed, but whether we build them one way or the other, these projects are on an interstate stream as are those on the St. Francis, the Arkansas, and the Red Rivers. Once they are built there must be some Federal authority to operate them scientifically, and by whatever name it is known, it will be very similar to the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority.

Once constructed they will eliminate our barrier No. 1.

With your help we are making a desperate effort to get still other projects under way.

Dam construction promises to be one of Arkansas' largest industries during the next decade.

And so you and I have the satisfaction of knowing that we stand at this hour at the gateway of a new frontier, witnessing the beginning of the construction of a long-time development that shall bring to our State a new day in agriculture, in commerce, and in industry—new hope and new inspiration—the antithesis of defeatism—democracy at work.

Employment of W. P. A. Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

LETTER FROM LESTER W. HERZOG

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter I have received from Mr. Lester W. Herzog, New York State administrator, Work Projects Administration, Albany, N. Y., explaining eligibility rules for employment of W. P. A. workers. I think it is well to emphasize that existing law provides for employment of persons who are referred as in need of relief by public-welfare agencies, and it is not necessary for an applicant to be in actual receipt of relief assistance before he can qualify.

Mr. Herzog's letter follows:

[Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration of New York State (exclusive of New York City)]

ALBANY, N. Y., *May 29, 1941.*

Congressman ALFRED F. BEITER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEITER: I understand Congressman TABER has accused this Administration of employing W. P. A. workers who have not received direct home relief, and further understand that Congressman CANNON will probably answer this on the floor.

I believe you are fully aware of the very strict regulations in effect in this Administration, and I am sure you will be interested in the fact that, because the act permits it and because we can do it within our quota, we have now broadened our eligibility rules to accept persons who are certified by the welfare departments but who have not as yet been actually granted a relief order.

I give you this information, due to the fact that questions might arise and, because it is New York State, you might become involved, and I think, if so, you certainly know how strict we have been in our assignments to W. P. A.

Very truly yours,

LESTER W. HERZOG,
Administrator.

Classic Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I beg to introduce an editorial which recently appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune relative to a Supreme Court decision in connection with the 1940 congressional primaries and which I believe will be of interest to the Members of this House.

The editorial follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune]

CLASSIC CASE

The civil liberties of voters in Federal primaries as well as in general elections are protected by the United States Supreme Court decision in a Louisiana case, in which it stated: "A primary election which involves a necessary step in the choice of candidates for election as representatives in Congress and which in the circumstances of this case controls that choice, is an election within the

meaning of the constitutional provision and is subject to congressional regulation as to the manner of holding it."

The interpretation is sound. Had it been made earlier in Louisiana history, one of the hydra heads of State dictatorship would have been lopped off. Its immediate effect is to subject to trial five defendants charged with ballot-count irregularities in the congressional primary of September 10. The facts in the case are still to be established. It was not by accident, we are informed, that the defendant, Patrick B. Classic, was named first in the indictment; the temptation to be able to refer to this case as the "classic" one, literally as well as figuratively, powerfully impressed the staff of the United States attorney.

In many elements it is classic. Political bias was not conceivable, much less subject to any credence. Alleged changes in the ballot count favored T. Hale Boggs, an unquestioned exponent of good government and election purity. He did not need the votes allegedly thrown to him. They could not have been other than embarrassing to a candidate who has heaped his share of derision on the old machine practice of "goose-egging," or nearly goose-egging, the opposition, apparently for the sake of show alone. Alleged changes in another race involved favored a woman candidate also backed by the coalition of antidictatorial forces.

In the national field the decision is so far-reaching as almost to stagger the imagination. If it is not entitled to the appellation "classic" in that connection, it will be because it was reached by a vote of four to three. The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration, and the ninth place in the Court is still unfilled. Hence no more votes actually were mustered for the principle that Federal primaries and general elections should be the same thing as far as civil rights are concerned, than were cast in the indecisive Newberry case of 1921.

Resolutions Adopted at National Defense Meetings in Atoka and McCurtain Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT NATIONAL-DEFENSE MEETINGS IN ATOKA AND McCURTAIN COUNTIES, OKLA.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from Hon. Nelson Newman, Atoka, Okla., and Hon. Bill Kuykendall, mayor, Idabel, Okla., together with copies of resolutions adopted at national-defense meetings held recently in these two towns in my district.

I am proud of the loyal support given our great President by my fellow citizens and their spirit of true Americanism as expressed in these resolutions.

The letters and resolutions follow:

GUARANTY ABSTRACT CO.,
Atoka, Okla., May 19, 1941.

Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
United States Congressman

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Appreciative of our privileges and duties, 1,000 American citizens of Atoka County, State of Oklahoma, assembled, unanimously adopted and respectfully urge your consideration of our expressed views disclosed by the enclosed resolutions.

Respectfully,

NELSON NEWMAN,
Chairman of Atoka County Defense Committee.

Resolution adopted by Atoka County citizens' mass meeting, Atoka, Okla.

To. Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
United States Congressman:

Be it known to all that we, the God-fearing, freedom-loving citizens of the United States of America living in Atoka County, Okla., do hereby assemble ourselves, by the grace of God and under the rights, privileges, and responsibilities guaranteed by our Constitution, for the purposes of considering the serious problems that affect and threaten the continuance of our democratic way of life and the perpetuity of our Nation.

Because we love peace and want to share its blessings with all mankind we declare the following principles and purposes, and recommend the same to our national leader, President Franklin D. Roosevelt; to our Congress; and to our fellow citizens throughout the Nation.

1. Curtail or eliminate nonessential production to release labor, materials, and plant facilities for maximum speed in producing all adequate defense needs;

2. That capital and labor immediately be forced to subordinate personal gains, as a million draftees have done, to concentrate on every effort toward proper national defense; and

3. That we and all other liberty-loving Americans be called upon to pledge sacrifices for defense and liberty.

Adopted on this the 7th day of May 1941, at Atoka, Atoka County, Okla.

NELSON NEWMAN,
Chairman of Atoka County Defense Committee.

CITY OF IDABEL,
Idabel, Okla., May 23, 1941.

Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WILBURN: Under separate cover I am sending you the signed resolutions and amendments as adopted by the McCurtain County national-defense mass meeting held in the stadium at Idabel, Okla., May 11, 1941.

This meeting was a very enthusiastic gathering of the leading citizens of the country and was held with the serious thought of standing behind the Government in the all-out aid to Britain or to any other democracy striving for peace and freedom.

Yours truly,

BILL KUYKENDALL,
Mayor.

Be it known to all that we, the God-fearing, freedom-loving citizens of the United States of America, living in McCurtain County, Okla., do hereby assemble ourselves, by the grace of God and under the rights, privileges, and responsibilities guaranteed by our Constitution, for the purpose of considering the serious problems that affect and threaten the continuance of our democratic way of life and the perpetuity of our Nation.

Because we love peace and want to share its blessings with all mankind, we declare the following principles and purposes, and recommend the same to our national leader, President Franklin D. Roosevelt; to our Congress; and to our fellow citizens throughout the Nation.

First. Curtail or eliminate the nonessential production to release labor, materials, and plant facilities for maximum speed in producing all adequate defense needs.

Second. That capital and labor immediately be forced to subordinate personal gains, as a million draftees have done, to concentrate on every effort toward proper national defense.

Third. That we and all other liberty-loving Americans be called upon to pledge sacrifices for defense and liberty.

Adopted on this the 11th day of May 1941.

WRIGHT CITY, OKLA., *May 7, 1941.*

We, the undersigned citizens of Wright City, Okla., adopt these resolutions with the following amendment attached, to be presented at the county-wide meeting to be held at Idabel, Sunday afternoon, May 11, at 2:30 p. m.

Amendment: That we go on record opposing strikes and that they be eliminated at all costs. And whereas we are 100 percent in favor of convoying ships to Great Britain and any other democracy fighting for freedom.

Adopted: May 7, 1941.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address given by me at Arlington Court House, Va., at the Memorial Day services conducted jointly by the John Lyon Post, No. 3150, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Arlington Post, No. 139, American Legion, and broadcast over station WWDC, Washington:

We have paused for a few moments to pay tribute today to those who have fought to make our Nation great and freedom a living creed in the world. These men had an abiding faith in the righteousness of their cause and the ultimate destiny of our country. They believed that here in America was the finest haven of freedom in the world and the home of that principle which recognizes the worth of the individual and his right to the pursuit of happiness. To defend that right they gladly gave their lives. What a mockery of that faith to send our young men to be slaughtered again in the useless carnage of a foreign war. In the last World War, Americans fought to end all war, and yet what an unholy fraud was practiced upon them. Shortly, it became all too apparent that, instead of banishing war, the seeds of another conflict had been sown and democracy was fast withering. Are we again to be plunged into the fight to save Europe from itself?

The passions and heat of battle from the Civil War have long since departed into the pages of history, but the brave deeds and self-sacrifice of these men will continue to live in the hearts of all true Americans for ages to come. Now that time has healed the old bitterness, we can all take pride in the courage and steadfastness of these men, clad in blue or gray, who fought valiantly for principles in which they so earnestly believed.

Now in this hour when the clouds of war again hover over most of the earth and threaten to engulf us, we know full well if war strikes, no one will be spared. The mother and child, the sick and the aged

behind the lines are in as mortal danger in modern warfare as the man at the battle-front.

While we pay tribute to those who fought in battle, let us not forget the others who sacrificed in the long dread hours—the mothers and wives keeping lonely vigil at home. Nor should we forget those who labored on the farm and in the factory to keep flowing a steady stream of food and supplies—a nation giving its all.

Our liberty was not purchased in the international marketplace; it was bought with the blood and toil of patriots.

Let us renew our pledge to care for the widow and the orphan whom those brave men left as a sacred charge upon the gratitude of the Nation. An even greater duty rests upon us to see that we do not wantonly and recklessly again cause mourning in the homes of America for husbands and fathers sacrificed upon the altar of war.

In this hour let us hope that an enduring peace may yet be achieved in this warring world. The men whom we honor today fought and suffered to achieve peace. Peace founded on justice is the only path to progress and prosperity. War not only destroys the lifeblood and resources of a nation but leaves a terrible aftermath of depression and misery in its wake. Before we again plunge headlong into the dark whirlpool of strife we must be sure that we are fighting in defense of America. Much as we may abhor the barbarism and complete disregard of human values in other lands we should recognize the tragedy of hurling ourselves into the abyss.

We cannot help but realize that only in free America is it possible to gather in meetings of this kind and exercise the right of free speech. Now as the war fever rises we have to be more diligent than ever to insure open and full discussion of the grave problems affecting every American. It is not too late to see that tolerance and understanding, rather than bigotry and persecution, are necessary if we are to maintain our strength and morale in these critical times.

We must beware of the subtle propaganda of those who would lead us into war to serve their own selfish ends. What shall it profit this country to save the world and lose its own heritage? I say to you here and now that we can best serve ourselves and humanity by maintaining inviolate our free institutions here at home. And to that end, realizing our sacred obligation to defend America at all costs, I pledge to you that as long as I represent the people of the State of Illinois in the halls of your Congress, I will not cast my vote to sacrifice the flower of American youth in any foreign war.

St. Lawrence Gateway of Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. WALTER C. PLOESER, OF MISSOURI

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the Nation on the subject of the St. Lawence seaway project over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Wednesday, May 28, 1941. The following are my remarks:

The St. Lawrence seaway project before the Congress would create great injury to our national welfare in more ways than one. On May 5, this year, I told the Nation by means of a coast-to-coast broadcast that the treaty—which is being called an agreement—between Canada and the United States would surrender control over Lake Michigan, thereby internationalizing an all-American lake. I said then that on this occasion I would discuss the injury to American labor and industry. It is well to again briefly explain the nature of this project.

The billion-dollar Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway is a plan to open the Great Lakes to ocean traffic and international trade by building a 27-foot channel through the Lakes and river from Lake Superior to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River in Canada.

This seaway, as projected, would be built jointly by the United States and Canada, with the bulk of the cost falling on the American taxpayers. Aside from the cost, this project, if constructed, would enable foreign nations, with their control of the world's shipping and their cheap labor, to invade our own great inland industrial and agricultural empire. It would, therefore, irreparably damage American labor, agriculture, rail transportation, motor transportation, and industry in general.

Because the proponents of this measure claim benefits, some of which are ridiculous, many of which are misstated, I have chosen to entitle this discourse with you this evening "St. Lawrence Gateway of Delusion."

In 1934, when the President urged the approval of the St. Lawrence Treaty before the Senate, he said in his message, "Broad national reasons lead me, without hesitation, to advocate the treaty." It is interesting to note he then called the subject a treaty, but since the Senate failed to ratify he now calls the same subject, rewritten recently, an agreement. I remind you that the Constitution requires a treaty—and it really is a treaty—to be approved by a two-thirds' vote of the United States Senate, while the devious method being used today is to approve the same subject by a simple majority vote of the House and Senate under the false title of agreement. Except for the fact that this circumstance cannot be overemphasized, it has no particular point in our principal phase of the subject at the moment. The President went on in his message to the Senate in 1934 to say, "There are two main considerations, navigation and power." Then we are to believe that according to the President, the two main reasons for building the St. Lawrence seaway are, "navigation and power." Both involve long-range planning, because the treaty calls for 8 years for completion.

Obviously, therefore, the proponents' present claim for defense is completely eliminated by, first, the President's own written words, and, second, by the very conditions of the treaty. Therefore we shall not at this moment worry or concern ourselves about the defense argument, except as it affects the use of necessary labor and materials which are so badly needed for true defense projects. In passing the defense argument for the present, it is only fair to mention to the American taxpayer that it would be a tremendous injustice to him to charge him an extra billion dollars for any project labeled "defense" which is not defense.

Now, if navigation and power are the real reasons for the seaway—and they are—then both reasons are economic. Both reasons affect trade, commerce, industry, and labor. The principal concern to Americans is whether or not the project will be economically beneficial. I am to deal now with the navigation phase only.

Opening the Great Lakes to world trading vessels directly affects other transportation facilities of the Nation and accordingly, and in like proportion, affects the many industries linked to these transportation facilities. When these industries are affected adversely it follows, as simply as the day follows the night, that all labor connected therewith is adversely affected. In addition, all retail and wholesale suppliers of the people employed in these industries suffer. Let us take a very simple example, a town of 5,000 people. This community, we shall say, is a main-line railroad town with a small factory manufacturing motortruck parts. Along comes an act of the Government, which creates an economic situation which causes a tremendous loss of business to both the railroad and trucking business. What happens to this town? It is very plain that with the railroad business curtailed, if not discontinued, and the trucking business in the same situation, this community suffers a terrific blow, and every person in it suffers accordingly without any compensating benefit. This injury spreads throughout the Nation like a cancer affecting every person, who, directly or indirectly, is in any capacity serving these lines of commerce.

Specifically, as a result of the St. Lawrence seaway, injury would be severely felt in the railroads affecting every person who has anything to do with the building, maintenance, or operation of a railroad. Why? Because cheap foreign-vessel shipping rates would take business from all Gulf of Mexico and eastern seaboard shipping ports and also from Pacific coast ports, and transfer that business or commerce to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River in Canada, up the St. Lawrence into the Great Lakes and into the very heart of our great inland industrial and agricultural empire. This would seriously affect our great established system of transportation as well as all the cities, large and small, which they touch, as well as the surrounding agricultural country feeding these cities.

Specifically, the St. Lawrence seaway would affect the great coal industry of America in two major ways. It would greatly diminish the need and demand for coal used by the transportation industries and would likewise open the Great Lakes to the importation of cheaply mined foreign coal, with which our coal producers could not hope to compete. This would cause the reduction of coal mining wages to the level of the virtual slave wages of foreign coal miners. Such a condition would be a virtual calamity in the coal industry, and labor would be the greater sufferer.

Specifically, the iron-ore industry of America would suffer. Importation of foreign ores from Brazil, Chile, Peru, Cuba, and other foreign countries in large quantities through the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, would have a ruinous effect upon the iron-mine operators, shippers, and smelters. It might eventually seriously impair the self-sufficiency of the steel industry of the United States and thereby, in the event of another world crisis, jeopardize our national security.

It is well to briefly review the economic significance of the Lake Superior iron-ore industry. The market for Superior iron ores is confined primarily to the Great Lakes and upper Mississippi Valley region. The industry now supplies about 86 percent of the iron ore consumed in the United States. In 1937 it shipped over 61,000,000 tons of ore to domestic consumers and over a million tons to Canadian furnaces.

The same year over 20,000 persons were employed in the Lake Superior iron-ore industry, receiving wages of about $32,000,000; the industry paid approximately $30,000,000 in State and local taxes, there was invested approximately $300,000,000 in the mines and these supported the operation of 195 blast furnaces within the United States.

The total investment in mines, railroads maintained by the iron-ore business, and the lake vessels carrying that trade, exceeds $600,000,000. The industry pays in wages and in ore-handling charges nearly $150,000,000 a year. This is exclusive of investment in 35

unloading docks on the lower lake ports where the ore is consumed or from where it is shipped by rail to inland furnaces. These unloading and rail facilities represent an investment of many additional millions of dollars, employing thousands of workers annually.

The Lake Superior iron-ore mining industry alone supports 74 cities, villages, and towns. All these communities would suffer great injury.

Specifically, the St. Lawrence project would tremendously injure the great inland-waterway system of the Mississippi, Ohio, and Missouri Rivers. It would throw into waste the many millions which the United States Government has already invested in the development of these waterways.

This project would seriously injure the entire Mississippi Valley territory, which is immense and covers practically all of the Midwestern States from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

I will not go on naming the many more industries affected. I do emphasize that when we open the Great Lakes to foreign sea traffic we permanently damage our own well-established lines of commerce, and we open our Inland Empire to cheap imports, thereby causing unknown injury to all American labor and business.

I said at the outset that my reference to the so-called defense claim of this project would be only as it affects the use of necessary labor and materials which are so badly needed for true defense projects.

Since the St. Lawrence seaway is being submitted to the Congress and the people as an urgent defense measure, it is necessary to have a greater understanding as to the quantity of labor and material involved. Because of the prodigious size of the undertaking it is obvious that many thousands of skilled and unskilled workmen, engineers, and technicians of all kinds would be required, together with hundreds of contractors, contracting organizations, and all kinds of mechanical equipment. In the International Rapids section alone some 92,000,000 tons of excavation would be required, over 7,000,000 tons of concrete would have to be used, besides huge quantities of earth fill.

If the work were evenly distributed over a period of just 7 years, at least 43,000 men would be required daily at the site and behind the lines furnishing materials and equipment. Undoubtedly, the daily requirements during the peak period of construction would exceed 60,000 men. If all of the work required for the entire project is carried on at the same time, at least 100,000 men would be required for the work every day for a 7-year period.

According to the very claims of the administration in its rush to produce urgent defense weapons and supplies, we could not divert this labor or material to any such project which does not in any way contribute to demands of the present home-defense emergency.

The more this project is analyzed, the plainer it becomes that it is a pet spending project and a form of pork barrel waste being pushed and rushed at this time in the hope that it might get through under a false banner of defense.

This St. Lawrence seaway project, which I prefer to call the St. Lawrence gateway of delusion, would ultimately spend more than a billion dollars of the American taxpayers money to promote a condition which would not benefit—but instead injure—the business of the Nation. Industry and labor, as I have already pointed out, would suffer as the result of this plan. The people are entitled to know the whole truth. Making that truth known is part of my duty as a Member of Congress.

I am hopeful that the people of this Nation will let their Representatives and Senators in the Congress know of their opposition to this untimely and poorly chosen St. Lawrence seaway project.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. TOM CONNALLY, OF TEXAS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered last night on the Radio Forum by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on the subject of national unity.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The civilized world is tonight living under the Damocles sword of armed might. Suspended by a single thread above the liberties of civilized men are massed armies equipped for modern wars. Argosies of the air with multiplied thousands of armored aircraft, with destruction and death in their touch, swarms of submarines lurking in the dark with deadly weapons in their hands, searching the sea lanes to assassinate human beings and to destroy vessels without warning and with merciless and bloody purpose. Civilized nations are challenged either to submit to a single master who directs these engines of death and destruction or to suffer being overrun, conquered, subjugated, and enslaved. These are not idle statements. These are not distempered dreams. These are not wild flights of imagination. Look at Europe since the war began in 1939.

Austria was commanded to join the Reich. Her Government refused. Hitler's legions swarmed over her and overwhelmed her. She was locked in the iron manacles of submission. Czechoslovakia was challenged. She refused. The thunderbolts of armed might subdued her before she could strike. Poland, upon her denial of demands of the dictator, was left in smoking ruins, in devastated and wrecked cities, with a soldier's foot upon her neck. Neutral, peaceful, inoffensive Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, whose only crime was to possess lands which the cupidity of Hitler desired, and liberties which he wanted to destroy, without warning were overrun, conquered, subjugated, and enslaved. Bulgaria and Rumania, first penetrated and saturated with the deadly virus of Nazi influence and under the threat of military force, succumbed to Nazi power. Yugoslavia was harried and machine gunned and bombed and beaten into abject submission. Greece, invaded by Mussolini, in a campaign in which Italian armies with vastly superior numbers were defeated and driven in flight before the gallant Greeks, was at last bombed and battered by Nazi legions until the classic land where Homer sang and Demosthenes thundered against the tyranny of Philip, and where Greek poets, dramatists, and artists and sculptors gave to all the centuries the imperishable gifts of their genius and culture, now lies broken and shattered, in ruin, with the heavy heels of Nazi conquerors upon her ancient liberties.

These events are part of the history of our times. They have not been lifted from the pages of some thrilling volume of fiction. They are not from the chapters of some military and naval writer, predicting what might transpire in some future war. They are not the creation of some poetic mind, soaring on the wings of fancy. They are facts. They are realities. They have happened under our own eyes.

If these things have happened to weaker countries, will they not happen to any other nation, except for the armed might of other nations to resist the waves of aggression and conquest? Does anyone doubt that England, if conquered, will be subjected to an even more tragic fate than that of nations already conquered?

If England should fall and her Navy should be captured, the legions and the navies and the swarming vultures of the air, under the direction of Hitler and Mussolini, would, no doubt, as soon as they should feel strong enough, attack the western world to incorporate us into the new world order and to imprison our institutions and economy in the ancient bed of Procrustes, making our pattern neither longer nor shorter than the pattern which their tyranny might prescribe.

Why will not their military desires reach out to the western world? They reached and encompassed most of Europe. In the Western Hemisphere lie rich lands and great wealth. Here is the citadel of free government which is the deadly enemy of their governmental conceptions. They have done these things in Europe. Why will they not do them in the western world?

Armed might, overpowering navies, and superior forces of aircraft, are the only things that stand between the western world and the mad ambitions of Nazi and Fascist conquest.

These things face America today. They face the whole Western Hemisphere today. They face the whole civilized world today. The United States must let the world know, and must let Hitler and Mussolini and all the Axis alliance of greed and cruelty, and military and naval power, all the Axis compact of aggression and mastery, know just where America stands and just what America purposes to do.

President Roosevelt, in a notable and epoch-marking speech, from the White House on May 27th, gave utterance to the national policy of the United States. The President, under our Constitution, is our leader in the field of foreign relations. In times of stress and peril, we must have determined leadership. It must be definite. It must be clear in its objectives. It must be firm, and it must have behind it the united support of a mighty people.

The President reaffirmed America's traditional policy of freedom of the seas—the freedom of our people to send our ships out upon the seas in accordance with the sanction of civilized nations through the centuries. To surrender the freedom of the seas the United States would be imprisoned within its own boundaries, economically and politically. Hitler and Mussolini cannot dominate the world unless they first master the seas. England now bravely stands in their way. If Great Britain should be conquered, we alone shall be face to face with menacing challenge.

The United States, since Yorktown, has stood for freedom of the seas. Under President John Adams, our Navy resisted European depredations upon our commerce. In the distant Mediterranean, our Navy suppressed the Barbary pirates. In 1912 and in the World War, America adhered to this ancient doctrine. We shall not now surrender nor retreat.

The President, as our national leader, made it clear that we shall resist the efforts of Hitler and Mussolini to extend their influence, their power, or their domination to the western world or to gain control of the seas.

When the repeal of the arms embargo was before the Senate, I prepared and secured the adoption of a preamble, expressly reserving to the United States and its nationals all of their rights and privileges under international law and set forth that the act restricting their shipping was purely a domestic regulation and that we reserved the right to repeal, change, or modify that act as the interests of the United States might dictate. By the Neutrality Act we gave up nothing of our international rights; we surrendered not a jot or tittle of them.

The American people have pledged aid to Britain, and the Congress has translated their desires into legislation. We have pledged military and naval equipment, shipping and supplies to Great Britain. We must, we shall keep that pledge. We must speed supplies across the sea. We must speed production more and more. We have pledged to all of the republics of the Western Hemisphere the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine—that no European power, that neither Hitler nor Mussolini, nor any of their allies shall acquire a single foot, nay, a single inch of territory in the western world.

In crisis the American people will rededicate themselves to Americanism. Thrilled by the sacred memories and shrines of our patriot fathers, out of whose sacrifices and blood this Nation was born and preserved, we pledge anew to protect and defend our country, our liberties, and our institutions. We shall maintain our naval and military forces in readiness to drive back any act of aggression.

President Roosevelt called for national unity. The President, as leader of the Nation, sounded a rallying cry to every element and every group and every portion of the American people. I believe that the American people will respond—will respond with enthusiasm and with a spirit of fervent Americanism—to the President's leadership and to the vitality and vigor of America's lofty purpose.

Our task is gigantic. We are standing at a momentous period in the fate of the human race. All the lights of history are beating down upon us, all the mighty upheavals of the centuries, all the stirring chapters of man's groping and struggling toward liberty and self-rule come ringing down to us through the years. The blood of our fathers commands us to hold the line. We shall, by God's help, hold the line.

We are now building a Navy great enough to dominate both the Atlantic and Pacific. For years I have advocated such a Navy. We must have a Navy strong enough to dominate all the seas. In armed strength we must rely.

We have been shocked by the report that France may give military or naval aid to Hitler and Mussolini. If France gives any military or naval aid to Germany, the United States should seize Martinique, French Guiana, and other French territories in the Western Hemisphere.

The staggering sums which we have appropriated will require not alone sacrifice in service by our people but will demand much more burdensome taxes. Our people are willing to bear these added burdens, are willing to shoulder these heavy responsibilities. They demand that there shall be no scandal or waste. We shall not tolerate swollen war profits in Government contracts. If industry extorts an undue profit because of speed and the Nation's need, it must be recaptured by taxation. Wealth and money and industry owe a duty to the Nation. They must not shirk. They must not be permitted to shirk.

Men who work in the production of munitions and arms also owe a duty to the Nation. The President said, "A Nation-wide machinery for conciliation and mediation of industrial disputes has been set up. That machinery must be used promptly and without stoppage of work." The President means that strikes in defense plants must stop. Production has been delayed by strikes and labor disputes. I hope they may stop through voluntary action, but stop they must, if necessary through governmental action. There is no right to strike against the Government of the United States in the hour of the Nation's peril.

In a national emergency, there is one paramount Union, there is one supreme Union, and that is the Union of these 48 States, the United States of America. That Union must rule or democracy must perish.

There will soon be set up a civilian defense organization in every locality in the Nation. Civilians may and should serve in suppressing un-American and foreign influences, and sabotage and other activities, inimical to the national safety.

President Roosevelt's address has received the commendation and approval of the great body of our people, and of the press. Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate for President in 1940. Gov. James M. Cox, the Democratic candidate for President in 1920. John W. Davis, the Democratic candidate for President in 1924, and Gov. Alfred E. Smith, the Democratic candidate for President in 1928, have all given ringing approval to the President's assertion of American rights and obligations and America's purposes in the present crisis. They call upon all Americans to follow the leadership of the President. We cannot achieve our lofty purposes or our noble ends without unity or without granitelike resistance to the aggressions and to the ambitions of Hitler, Mussolini, and the Axis Powers.

We must produce more supplies and more airplanes. We must work more shifts in our factories. We must rush more arms and ammunition to England. We must maintain the freedom of the seas. We shall defend America with everything that we have.

To the President's thrilling and stirring address, to his leadership, the American people respond. They respond in loyalty to American ideals and American traditions. They respond in fervid determination to preserve things American—they respond with a firm and immovable resolution that democracy shall not die; that freedom shall not perish; that Great Britain's gallant stand for democracy shall not be overwhelmed; that the western world shall be preserved and defended against every attack, every danger, and every threat from the mailed fists of as cruel and heartless a band of conquerors as ever roved the high seas when pirates reigned on the seas and bloody bandits ruled on the land.

Ideologies for Export

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY STUART CHASE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Progressive on Saturday, May 31, 1941, written by Stuart Chase, entitled "Ideologies for Export."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive of May 31, 1941]

IDEOLOGIES FOR EXPORT

(By Stuart Chase)

As I write, the military situation never looked darker for Britain. Many of my planetarian (interventionist) friends admit this, but it does not get them down. They come back briskly with the moral strength of the democracies. They say guns do not count as much as "the imponderables." The imponderables are the evidence of things not seen. We shall triumph, they say, because we bring the four freedoms to a world writhing under the lash of conquerors. We appeal to the conscience of mankind, and we cannot lose.

Dorothy Thompson looks at the ruins of the last major air attack on London: "This war is to stop the destroyers of civilization in their tracks. To defend the Abbey, the British Museum, and the Commons. The Abbey stands; the museum lives; the Commons meet. Because the human will cannot be broken."

This reads magnificently. It makes one forget about shortages in bombers, ships, and tanks. It stirs the blood. But will it stir the victims of aggression? Will they rise up and join the great crusade?

HOW ABOUT THE LITTLE MEN?

Who are the victims? They are some 300,000,000 little men—farmers, peasants, shopkeepers, industrial workers, clerks, mechanics, railwaymen, and their families utterly sick of insecurity, unemployment, political chaos, and the threat of being bombed out of their beds. On top of this great mass of common folks is a thin layer of writers, artists, professors, and other intellectuals.

There is no question about the victimization of the intellectuals or of the Jews in Germany, as well as in the occupied countries. All reports from refugees confirm the savage onslaught made upon their freedom of expression, often upon their very lives.

How much are the little men, the peasants, workers, shopkeepers suffering? They are the people who really count if our ideological battle is to be made concrete and eventually won. The plans for victory all bank heavily on revolt by the little men. What have we to promise them that is superior to Axis promises of a new order in Europe?

They must be inspired with the conviction that the American way has more to give them than the dictators have. They must believe in our definition of civilization. Unless this conviction is burning in millions of breasts, the little men will not have the courage to rise against the machine guns of their overlords. They must see clearly what Dorothy Thompson sees, and want it as she wants it.

IT HAS BEEN FOOD OR REVOLT

Here is the rub. We really have nothing to offer them but freedom. "What more do you want?" thunder the planetarians. But little men cannot eat freedom. They want much more than a bill of rights. If that is all civilization means, it is not good enough for them. This is a truth so fabulously immoral that few intellectuals are able to grasp it. Because they prize freedom of expression above all else they think that other classes in the community must do likewise.

This, however, is simply not so. The plain people of Europe have had relatively few whiffs of the Bill of Rights in the last 2,000 years. They have had wheat, pork, turnips every day, or they have risen in revolt.

We have nothing to sell but freedom.

We cannot sell the idea of full employment, for we have had 10,000,000 unemployed for 10 years, and all the world knows it.

We cannot sell security, for our farmers, sharecroppers, migratory laborers, Negroes,

industrial workers, have been desperately insecure since the last war.

We cannot sell hope for young people, for we have 4,000,000 youngsters between 16 and 24 who are not in school and who have no work. This great army has been shunted right out of the American community and left there in the dark.

We cannot sell the American high standard of living, for a third of our people have not had enough to eat. Mr. Roosevelt has been hammering the point home for 8 years, with his concern for the forgotten man.

We can hardly sell equality of opportunity. Look at the 60 families.

We can hardly sell free enterprise. Look at the 200 corporations which control the output and prices of a majority of the things which American consumers buy.

We cannot sell world-free markets, in spite of the saintly devotion of Mr. Hull to the cause. Consider the Smoot-Hawley tariff, and the grim determination of American manufacturers to protect their output against cheap foreign imports at all costs.

WORLD IN REVOLUTIONARY PHASE

In short, what we have to sell is a set of abstract principles, a string of lofty words. When it comes right down to jobs, security, access to raw materials, hope for the forgotten man, if we are honest we can only hang our heads in shame.

The world is in a revolutionary phase. Little men everywhere are tired of being pushed around and half starved when they know that an economy of abundance is here. Political freedom will not satisfy them. The reestablishment of old national boundaries in Europe will not satisfy them. The fine words of Mr. Willkie, Dorothy Thompson, Bishop Manning will hit the tiny class of foreign intellectuals right enough, but will go clear over the heads of the great mass.

AMERICA'S UNIQUE POSITION

I happen to believe that we have something here in America which makes us the greatest nation on earth, with the greatest long-term future. Part of it is material—the land itself, its situation and resources. Another part is spiritual, if you like. But this spiritual part is something which cannot be sold, cannot be exported, cannot be lend-leased. It is indigenous to the continent of North America and would die in alien soil.

I refer to the fundamental democratic behavior of most Americans, the absence of inherited class divisions, the deep conviction that one man is as good as the next. This is not so much a matter of voting as it is a matter of day-by-day behavior along Main Street. It is deep in the folkways of this continent—Canadians have a measure of it, too—and is the product of three centuries of the frontier, the melting pot, and the great open spaces.

It is unique in human history, precious beyond rubies, and totally unexportable. Probably the only way other people can get it is to go through generations of pioneering in a similar environment. To identify our democracy with that of the British Isles is sociological nonsense. In Britain everyone has his place in the social hierarchy. You feel it 5 minutes after you get off the boat.

Our economic failures are lamentable and universally known. No other country took such a headlong collapse in the depression of the thirties. But these failures, in my opinion, are transitional. They are symptoms of the break-down of one era and the beginning of a new one. We are working through them, and the New Deal was the first attempt to meet them.

HALF-BAKED BISCUITS

We shall come out on top, if we are not engulfed by an interminable war overseas which drains our lifeblood away. For the moment, however, our economic renovations are like half-baked biscuits. They offer little appeal to foreign customers. Hitler banished unemployment, while we only succeeded in stabilizing it.

So here we are. From the strict military viewpoint, the outlook for Britain is dark, with no assurance that our joining the battle will materially improve it. We are unprepared to fight a two-ocean war. As Mr. Hoover pointed out, we may indeed have to cut down our aid to Britain, if we attack the Axis, because of bombers, merchant ships, supplies needed in the Far East.

We are equally unprepared to win by virtue of the "imponderables." We have no economic or social program with which to rouse the little men of Europe and satisfy their revolutionary aspirations. Our own programs are still in the half-baked stage. It will take several more New Deals to work them out. Britain has offered no programs at all, in any stage of baking—only bombs and blockade. We cannot export our "democracy," for it is a unique product of the American frontier.

I wonder what a French peasant in his blue smock thinks of our planetarians who now throw 40,000,000 Frenchmen into the category of totalitarian devils and propose to make war upon them, along with devils rampant in Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Spain.

Does Jacques believe that civilization will be saved by our bombing his family and blockading his food supply?

Prevention of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] at Indianapolis on May 28, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Keeping this Nation at peace and free from foreign wars is the most patriotic service that Americans can render this Republic. The America First Committee, by these standards, deserves great recognition; and to every man, woman, and child here tonight who is fighting for peace, who is fighting for democracy, I say to you that the greatest glory comes not from battles won or lost but from wars prevented

Peace or war is not a partisan issue; it is an American issue.

This morning I read President Roosevelt's fireside chat. It was more than a chat; it echoed the sentiments of our war makers—of our Rockefellers, Morgans, Dorothy Thompsons, Stimsons, Knoxes, Walter Winchells—and all those who would sacrifice lives that are not theirs to give. These international bankers, jingoistic journalists, and fierce and warlike statesmen would plunge this Nation into war either because of their hate or fear of the little paperhanger from Berlin.

But I was informed over long-distance telephone that the President at his press conference today said he was not going to ask for a repeal of the Neutrality Act. And when asked how he was going to enforce freedom of the seas, he stated, "One way is to keep American ships out of places where they will be sunk." Which statement do you stand on, Mr. President—your warlike speech or your later statements to the press?

The American people hope it is the statement to the press.

In his fireside chat the President said, "The thing we have most to fear is fear itself." With that I agree. But, Mr. President, you sought to implant fear in the minds of the American people. Preaching fear has been the weapon you have used so successfully against your political adversaries. Beginning on March 4, 1933, you preached successively a fear of money changers, a fear of the economic royalists, a fear of munition makers, a fear of the lobbyists, and a fear of the Supreme Court. A year ago you began preaching physical fear—a fear that New Orleans and St. Louis and Denver were in danger of bombing raids. No man in all history, Mr. President, has exploited fear as you have exploited it.

Today, Mr. President, you have forgotten your fear and hatred of the economic royalists. You have forgotten your fear of the munition makers. You have forgotten your fears of reactionary Republicans, which you so fervently preached a few years ago. At this minute you are the leader of the Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Kuhn-Loebs, and the elder statesmen who want war but who are too old to fight. Wendell Willkie is your lieutenant. These, your new-found friends, join in praising the war program which you have raised in the ashes of social and economic reform. Aren't you, Mr. President, a little chagrined by your new-found friends?

Today, as of yesterday, by preaching fear and hate, you, President Roosevelt, are creating intolerance and bigotry. You are turning class against class, race against race, and sect against sect in a country where all races, classes, and all religions have lived together peacefully and tolerantly for generations.

I hate one-man government. I was denouncing Mussolini when Churchill was saying—1927: "If I were an Italian, I would be a Fascist." I was denouncing Hitler when Lord Halifax was shooting wild boar with Goering in Germany.

I am opposed to fascism, nazi-ism, or communism. If there are those within the hearing of my voice who prefer any foreign "ism" to Americanism, I say, go to Russia, Germany, or Italy; and stay there. I say to them there are those who have faith in American institutions, who have confidence in our ability to defend ourselves, who are not afraid to remain at peace, and who believe we can solve our domestic problems within the framework of the Constitution.

During the past month or two I have addressed public meetings from one end of this country to the other. In Cincinnati, in Denver, in Sioux Falls, in Butte, in Boston, and everywhere, east or west, it was the same; the American people are firmly resolved to avoid this war. If I know anything of public sentiment or the temper of the American people, I fear the fate of those who would take them into the hell of war today.

These American people were a cross-section of our population. They hate war today, as you, Mr. President, said you hated war in 1936. They cannot be discredited by your calling them bundists in 1941 any more than you were discredited by those who charged you with communism in 1936. These American people to whom I spoke were not pro-Nazi, pro-Fascist, or pro-Communist. They were simply pro-American.

No blood but English flows through my veins or any of my family. I greatly admire the English; they are smart people.

Today, with the identical tactics that preceded our entry into the first World War, they would take us into another World War.

Then, as now, they were fighting our war. Then, as now, we were to be enslaved. Then, as now, South America was to be invaded. Then, as now, the Germans wanted our country.

Who believes that if we were at war with a foreign power that England would give us her gold, her battleships, her planes, and tanks, and guns, as we give them to England today? And how many believe that if England offered us these gifts of vital military and naval supplies that she would say: You do not need to come after them; we will bring them across war zones to you, even if it means war for England.

I repeat, I admire the English. Wherever you meet an Englishman he is for England first. How I wish we had more Americans who thought of America first. No one has ever called the British silly, sentimental suckers.

They are realists. Listen to what a great English leader—Lord Palmerston—once said: "England has no eternal enmities and no eternal friendships. She has only eternal interests."

The American people resent the untiring efforts of the royal refugees and the British Ambassador to plunge us into war. They know that these royalists did not give their subjects the democracy they now implore us to save. They know that these royalists did not solve the economic and social problems in their lands. They know that when cannon roared and death rained from the skies these royal refugees seized their gold and departed for safer lands. They left their subjects to do the fighting and dying they would now have us do. Their pleas left the American people cold. And so now the President has been induced to lead the crusade for war.

The American people are still moved by noble emotions—but they learned 25 years ago, to their eternal sorrow, that there is no idealism in war. They learned, and President Wilson learned, that economic or political spoils, not humanitarian impulses, govern conquerors. They saw democracy sacrificed on the altar of international selfishness. They know—after fighting a war to make the world safe for democracy—that the four freedoms of our form of government cannot be imposed upon all the people in all the world. Democracy and freedom spring from within.

This Nation is prepared to "face hard, cold, fact." The American people want all the facts—and, with such a full and complete knowledge, they are prepared to decide for themselves. They do not want Mr. Churchill or Mr. Hitler, or even you, Mr. President, to make the decision. They still believe in a government of, by, and for the people. They want a government of law—not one of men—not of executive orders and decrees.

The American people demand a voice in government—a voice that is expressed by their duly elected representatives in the Congress of the United States. Significant, Mr. President, was your complete omission of any reference to Congress in this critical hour. Congress is still one of the three branches of our Government. It is your function to recommend legislation—treaties or policies—but it is the function of Congress to enact legislation—to ratify treaties or to make effective policies. In a democracy Congress or parliament is all important. In a totalitarian nation the parliamentary body is a sham, a mere form to cheer and applaud the dictator. The American people do not want to make of Congress a mere sounding board.

The President, in his most recent fireside chat, said we should be guided by hard, cold facts and not by sentiment or emotion. I agree wholeheartedly. But the President failed to give us all the facts. He failed to make clear his future course of action. Let us ask the President for some facts.

During your recent campaign for reelection, for a third term, Mr. President, did not you promise the American people that you would avoid war and maintain peace? Didn't you say at Boston, "And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars"?

Does your fireside chat last night mean, Mr. President, that you have repudiated this sacred pledge to the American people, even as Mr. Willkie renounced his promises as mere campaign oratory?

Didn't you promise the American people, Mr. President, that there would be no foreign entanglements or alliances? Have you since repudiated that by pledging England delivery of war goods? Does this mean, Mr. President, that you will wage an undeclared war in violation of the Constitution of the United States that provides that only Congress can declare war? Does your fireside chat last night mean, Mr. President, that you will attempt to fulfill the promises of Ambassador Bullitt to Poland that we would enter this war?

Why not tell the American people the facts about our defense program? Is it not bogging and breaking down? Why not tell the American people the fact that we have few planes suitable for combat fighting; that is, equipped with armor plate, adequate firing power, and self-sealing gas tanks? Why not tell the people that our Army is ill-trained, judged by modern standards of war? Why not tell the people, in short, Mr. President, that we are wholly unprepared to fight 3,000 miles from our shores?

And, Mr. President, why didn't you tell the American people that there is no possibility of a military invasion of the Americas? Aren't these cold, hard facts:

That our Navy is the mightiest in all the world—and that it is becoming stronger and stronger.

That the German fleet is inconsequential for long-range invasions and was designed for short-range fighting.

That to invade either North or South America the invading force would need a tremendously superior fleet.

That it would require at least 7 years for Germany to build a fleet that would equal ours.

That if the British Navy were to be captured tomorrow 1, 2, or more years would be required to train men to operate the vessels and then to integrate the units into a cohesive, fighting fleet.

That there isn't sufficient shipping in all the world today to transport an army of a million men and all their necessary supplies from Europe or Africa to the Americas.

These are hard, cold facts, Mr. President. They can be confirmed by almost any well informed military or naval expert.

Mr. President, is each of the following a hard, cold fact?

That many military experts believe that Britain has exhausted much of her air manpower?

That we, in combination with England, cannot land troops in Europe?

That England has lost every major battle?

That the only hope to bring American manpower and airpower to bear on the continent of Europe is to establish a front in the Near East?

That only 2,000,000 tons of American shipping are available for an expeditionary force?

That World War experience taught us that three gross tons were required per man of the expeditionary force?

With less complete control of seas—with mechanized forces, it is probable that 5 tons of shipping per man will be required. And, on this basis, the maximum American expeditionary force would be 400,000 men—a force wholly inadequate to maintain even the security of the air bases established once the expeditionary force and its shipping are committed to a near eastern effort.

How much can American tonnage be augmented by 1943, when we must supply the British with new ships continuously?

And Mr. President, isn't it true that if we were to enter the war today, we would have to fight most of Europe, the dominant Asiatic power, and likely, Russia? And that our entry into the war would mean years and years of conflict before victory?

Just as I know that this Nation can live in peace—just as I know that we in the Americas could repel and throw back any invading force—so do I know that American labor—American industry, and American genius can compete with slave or cheap labor or with totalitarian-controlled industry. To say otherwise, is utter defeatism. To say otherwise is to indicate lack of confidence and faith in American production.

China has cheap labor—even slave labor—but they are not now nor have they ever been a serious competitor. England controls the largest low-wage labor supply in all the world. British factories, with British machinery and British executives—and employing the cheap labor of India and the Malay States—have never been able to stifle American competition.

If facts prove anything, they prove that slave or low-wage labor cannot compete on anything like equal terms with free labor. Facts prove that government-owned or dominated enterprise cannot compete with free enterprise.

I call upon the President:

To reassert his faith in the Constitution of the United States.

To reassert his repeated promises not to send American boys to fight and die on foreign soil in a foreign war.

To reassert his confidence in a government of the people.

To reassert his desire to abide by the law of the land, and his unwillingness to discard the Neutrality Act by Executive order.

There is unity in America today. There is unity for national defense. There is unity to solve our domestic, social, and economic problems. There is unity for freedom and democracy in the United States. And above all else, there is an overwhelming and indivisible unity for peace and against American involvement in a foreign war waged on distant continents.

There is unity for faith and confidence in American Government, in American institutions, and in American peace.

Remember, Mr. President, distrust begets distrust even as faith begets faith and confidence begets confidence.

Commencement Exercises of Wofford College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD the very able address delivered by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] at the commencement exercises of Wofford College, at Spartanburg, S. C., on June 2, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL UNITY NOW

The President has declared a national emergency. The declaration is timely. America today is in peril. That peril is increased because many Americans do not realize its existence. And our failure to achieve unity of thought and action is making America's position more critical every day.

From the moment that Adolf Hitler launched his merciless drive to destroy democracy, it has been evident to many Americans that his objective is domination of the entire world. Too many other Americans have contended—and still are contending—that this is just another European war, merely a continuance of the centuries-old fight for the balance of power.

Today the British Empire stands alone to block Hitler's bloodstained path across Europe. If Britain falls, the United States must face a Hitler dominating all of the world except the Western Hemisphere.

In all of the countries now under his heel, Hitler has factories in operation, the workers forced to produce vast quantities of material for the Nazi war machine. This releases almost the entire manpower of Germany for military service.

We cannot assume that the same conditions will not prevail in Britain if the gallant defenders of those isles should be compelled to submit. We believe, of course, that Winston Churchill would never consent to the surrender of the British Fleet. But when Britain falls, Churchill will fall. A Laval will then come to power, as was the case in France, for there are in Britain, as in the United States, men who believe in the appeasement of Hitler. The question then will be not what the British wish to do but what they will be forced to do.

If Hitler obtains possession of the British Fleet, only an exceedingly optimistic person would dare claim that with the fleet we today possess, divided between the Atlantic and the Pacific, we could successfully defend the Western Hemisphere against the combined navies of the world and the air power of Germany.

Of course, Hitler announces that he has no intention of invading America. After the invasion of Czechoslovakia he declared, "This is the last territorial readjustment I will seek." There were people in many European countries who believed in him. Today they live in slavery. But there are people in the United States who believe Hitler's statement.

Let us recall the days preceding the war. I was in France in September 1937. The French people were in the midst of a great struggle. Employees were fighting to retain the 40-hour week and to gain further increases in wages. Employers were making no concessions. There were sit-down strikes and lock-outs. Neither faction would stop fighting long enough to take note of what Hitler was plotting at France's eastern border. Today, the French—both employers and employees—are working long hours, for no pay. And they are working for Germany, not for the land of their birth.

From Paris I went to Germany. There was no debate in progress there. Hitler had declared there could be no increase in wages and no increase in the cost of living. There could be no dissent from his decrees.

While I was in Berlin the Germans had their first black-out rehearsal against air raids. No nation threatened them; no nation was prepared to make war against them. Because their intention was to make war on others, they were preparing themselves against air attacks. In nearly every city I saw soldiers marching, invariably singing, Deutschland Über Alles. I visited various sections of the country, talking to all types of Germans. They all feared Hitler was determined upon war.

An overnight trip took me to London. The following day I witnessed a peace parade. Several thousand men, women, and children marched through the streets. They carried placards, such as We Did Not Raise Our Boys for Cannon Fodder, and Peace on Earth. Today in Washington there are men and women parading in front of the White House carrying similar banners. While the British prayed earnestly, Hitler prepared feverishly. These Britons were precisely like the God-fearing, peace-loving people in this and every other community in America. Because they would make war on no nation they could not believe that Hitler would make war upon them.

Twelve months later Hitler struck. There was nothing for Chamberlain to do at Munich except to appease Hitler because he knew that Britain was totally unprepared.

Just 1 year later Poland was invaded. The war was on.

For some years at least 15 Members of the United States Senate voted against any appropriations for the Navy. They were sincere in their view that the appropriations were unwise or unnecessary.

After France had fallen, Congress unanimously appropriated billions for the Navy and the Army. Senators changed their views only because they feared Hitler. If we are in no danger there is no defense for their votes, no excuse for the tremendous expenditures.

During this period many prominent Americans were opposing our preparedness program. They indulged in much oratory against participation in a foreign war. We should bear in mind, however, that if we are to defend the Western Hemisphere, it is just twice as far to some of the South American republics as it is to the British Isles. Should Hitler invade South America these same men would argue that we should fight only in the event the United States should be actually invaded. That policy would meet with Hitler's enthusiastic approval. Germany has always favored fighting on the soil of other nations. As a result the fatherland has known little of the horrors of war.

In this war civilians have suffered as many casualties as have those men wearing military uniforms. Women and children are targets for death-dealing bombs. They must pay a heavy price when a nation waits for Hitler's stukas to scream overhead before taking steps to defend itself

The arguments of those who oppose our assistance to Britain have had some effect. Today, when we are engaged in an attempt to have America produce in 2 years what Germany required 10 years to produce, our people have not yet achieved that unity of purpose essential to our success. Under any circumstances, the task would be difficult. In Germany the man engaged in producing munitions works approximately 2,800 hours per year. In the United States, when we eliminate Sundays, one-half the day on Saturdays, and all holidays, the average working hours per year total approximately 1,800.

Therefore, if the same number of men were engaged at work and the output was the same, it would take us much longer than 10 years to accomplish what Germany did during that period. But we have more workers and our mass-production methods are superior. If we were united and awake to our danger, with the superior skill of our workmen, we could accomplish this seemingly impossible task. But that unity and realization of danger must be had before we can succeed.

Our contribution to the battle for democratic government is measured not by the number of our soldiers but by the volume of our production. Every day lost in the production of defense orders is a battle lost. Some men are being forced to sacrifice their business, go to camps, and work long hours for less than a dollar a day. Those who remain at home, as employers or employees, must realize that they, too, must make sacrifices. A national emergency cannot be used as an excuse for increased profits or increased wages. The administration that has insured collective bargaining and given to wage earners increased wages and better working conditions can be relied upon to preserve our social gains. The duty of patriotic employers and employees is, as the President has pointed out, to submit their differences to an impartial mediation board appointed by the President and put an end to strikes and lock-outs in defense industries. We must not forget what happened in France.

The opponents of our foreign policy warn against slogans. I concur in this warning. Beware of the slogan, "Our children's children will be paying for this defense program." The purpose of that is to appeal to the selfishness of men who hate taxes much more than they hate Hitler.

View with suspicion the slogan, "What will it profit us to help democracy elsewhere if we destroy democracy at home?" It is a false argument that if we make sacrifices for liberty we will thereby lose our liberty. Accept with doubt the statement of those who protest they are in favor of national defense and aid to Britain, but opposed to granting power to a President. The purpose of that is to appeal to those who enjoy hating the President. A democracy can avoid a concentration of power in the Executive in normal times, but when an emergency arises, and government must act promptly, power to act must be lodged with some individual. In America it is lodged—not with a dictator—but with a President elected by the people. It cannot be lodged in the Congress. While Congress debated the wisdom of conferring power upon the President, Hitler could invade South America and the United States.

It is better to submit to a temporary concentration of power now than to a permanent concentration camp later.

The people of the United States conferred unusual powers upon the President in the War between the States, in the Spanish-American War, and in the first World War. At the end of those emergencies the powers were returned to the people. We remained a democracy. In the present emergency concentration of power is inescapable. When this critical period passes the people will have those powers restored to them. If they are not returned willingly, then, at the first election, the people will see that they are returned.

There are some who by the term "warmonger" try to frighten those who profess their love of liberty. They would eliminate from our histories and our memories Patrick Henry's declaration, "Give me liberty or give me death." and for it substitute the battle cry, "Even as a slave, let me live."

Not every person who uses such slogans or makes such arguments is deliberately indulging in German propaganda—but no German propagandist would fail to approve their use.

After debating since 1939 all phases of our foreign policy the Congress recently enacted the lease-lend law. That action of the Congress did not have altruism as its basis. It was enacted only because the representatives of the people believed that aid to Britain was essential in order to gain for ourselves the time necessary to build a navy and to equip and train an army capable of defending the hemisphere we are obligated to defend.

The lease-lend law was enacted in the manner provided by the Constitution. Congress then, by an overwhelming vote, appropriated $7,000,000,000 to carry the policy into

effect. The President announced to the world that the munitions purchased with the money of the American people would be delivered. Regardless of what opinion you may have held prior to that time, it is now the duty of every good American to sacrifice his personal opinion and support the policy adopted by the Congress and approved by the President.

It is difficult to understand the views of those who refuse to support the policy of the Government. It takes 7 months to build a ship and less than 7 minutes to sink it. These people would make sacrifices to build ships but do nothing to protect them. They would pay $7,000,000,000 for munitions and would not object if they are sent to the bottom of the sea.

That is not the view of America. We have pledged ourselves to furnish assistance to Britain. We must take whatever steps are necessary to insure the delivery of these munitions. America can do no less. America will do no less.

If we stand idly by while Hitler sends our munitions to the bottom of the sea, what will the people of the world think of us? If you resided in one of the republics of South America, relying upon the pledge of the United States to defend your country against attack, would you think us weak or cowardly? In either event, would you be willing for your country to rely for its safety upon the pledges of the United States?

If you were a British subject, and we failed to deliver the help we promised, Britain fell as a result of our failure, and Hitler served notice that if the fleet were removed you would be forced to suffer for it, would you be willing to suffer further and sacrifice more in order to send the fleet away to prevent Hitler from using it against the United States?

That would be asking much of a people who have suffered much. Daily and nightly their women and children are dying, as in other wars men died upon battlefields. They fight on, encouraged by the solemn promises of your Government, and the courage and the sacrifices of these noncombatants will be remembered as long as the hearts of men thrill to brave deeds.

We are told that if we seek either by plane or surface vessels to insure the delivery of these munitions our planes and ships will be attacked by Hitler, and that this development will plunge us immediately into the conflict. That may be true. No one of us can with certainty say what Hitler will do.

My own belief is that he will hesitate to attack our planes and ships. He has skillfully refrained from doing anything that would inspire cooperation by those he sought to destroy. It would be in perfect accord with his policy to permit the landing of the limited quantities of munitions now available for shipment to Britain rather than to run the risk of bringing the United States, with all its naval power, actively into the war.

America believes in peace, but not peace at any price. I must believe that in France today there are thousands of Frenchmen who would rather be in London suffering the horrors of war among free men than in Paris enjoying so-called liberty among the slaves of Hitler.

Paris became an "open city." Its buildings were saved. In the future, as in the past, Americans will go to Europe. In Paris they will visit the Louvre. They will marvel at the architecture of the magnificent churches. But I believe those who visit London will receive greater spiritual refreshment from the ruins of St. Paul's Cathedral and the damaged walls of Westminster Abbey than they will ever receive from the unscarred buildings of Paris.

In America there are those who charge that the President cannot carry into effect the provisions of the lease-lend law, because the President has declared he will do all in his power to keep us out of war. He has done and will do all in his power to keep us out of war. But I would have no respect for a President who construed such a statement as requiring him to favor peace at any price.

They refer to a statement of the President to abide by the Democratic platform which declared we would not send "our Army, Navy, or air force to fight in a foreign land, outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

There is nothing inconsistent in that statement with the attitude of the President today. I insisted upon the inclusion in that sentence of the words "except in case of attack." Otherwise, I would have opposed the inclusion of the paragraph in the platform. I assumed there would be given to the word "attack" the meaning it has acquired in modern warfare, and not the definition given by the advocates of "peace at any price." It is for the United States, and not Germany, to say where and when we are attacked. There is in this platform declaration and in the statement of the President, nothing to prevent your Government exercising the ancient right of freedom of the seas and insuring the safety of this hemisphere.

If you think differently—if you construe it as meaning that America would not, under any circumstances, fight until its shores are actually invaded, then let me say that, after all, the safety of the American people is more important than the consistency of a Government policy with a party platform. In the crisis confronting us today it is the duty of every man holding a position of responsibility to decide every question in the light of conditions existing at the time of the decision and not in the light of conditions existing at some time in the past.

I realize the mental confusion of persons who attempt to reconcile the acts of Hitler with the conduct of those people in our midst who are German or of German extraction—the law-abiding citizens—loyal to God, country and church, who have contributed so much to the making of America. We must remember, however, that these people never knew the Germany of Hitler. It has been only since he came into power that the German Government has sought to drive religion out of the hearts of its people.

Before you criticize the German people as a whole, consider what would be the effect upon this country if, because of persecution by government, many of our people had never known the teachings of Christ.

I share the longing of the man who loves peace; but, in order to be a Christian, it is not necessary to be a coward. We have seen Hitler persecute the Jews, Catholics, and Protestants—all in an effort to force men to worship Hitler instead of God. We have seen him force the German people to substitute Mein Kampf for the Holy Bible, and as a Christian people we are determined that he shall not do to the people of America what he has done to the people of Germany.

The church of Christ is persecuted in Germany; it can find no comfort in Japan and no solace in communistic Russia. It must fight for its existence in a Hitler-controlled Italy and a Hitler-controlled Europe.

Love of peace will not cause the church in America to give comfort to those who would take from us the priceless blessing of freedom of worship. In a Hitler-dominated world Christianity would perish and the great teachings of the Prince of Peace would be forever lost.

We have declared our policy. There is danger if we carry it out. There is greater danger if we do not. If democracy is to function, we must now disregard our differences and unite in giving the best thought of which we are capable to the problems confronting us.

While this storm was gathering, one man demonstrated outstanding ability to foresee the developments that were to shatter the peace of the world. President Roosevelt lifted his voice again and again. He warned us, as well as the other nations of the world, of the terrible consequences of the war that was brewing. His voice was the voice of reason, but madmen would not listen.

Surely, in this hour, when our lives and our liberties hang in the balance, Americans can forget unimportant differences and unite behind our President. We elected Franklin D. Roosevelt through our democratic process. If we believe in democracy, if we desire its preservation, we will unhesitatingly rally around him. Hitler's policy has been to divide and conquer. Let us unite and win.

I have confidence in the future of America because I have confidence in the people of America.

I am sure they will share with me the sentiment expressed by Stephen Decatur:

"Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

America Has a Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, which appeared in The Progressive on Saturday, May 31, 1941, the title of the article being "America Has a Choice."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive of May 31, 1941]

AMERICA HAS A CHOICE

(By Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago)

I am for aid to Britain. I am against naval or military intervention in this war.

For 10 long years we tried one expedient after another to recover from a war. That war, for this country, had not been a bad one. But the effects of it, in terms of inflation and deflation, of delirium and depression, of hate and fear, were still being felt after 20 years.

Before 1917 the country had serious problems. The war settled none of them and produced some new ones we had never dreamed of. From 1919 to 1929 we paid no attention to these problems, or anything else, except the price of stocks. From 1929 to 1939 we thought of nothing but these problems.

We applied a whole pharmacopoeia of desperate remedies and succeeded only in doing a few things that ought to have been done years before. We passed the Wagner Act, and the social-security legislation, and the Securities Exchange Act. We started the T. V. A. But there was little fundamental improvement. We were depressed and bewildered. We had some hope that some day we might get somewhere. We couldn't see just how.

IT WAS ONLY 2 YEARS AGO

When the war broke out in 1939, the country recognized that its difficulties were still

unsolved. Our liberals had been telling us for years that the first World Was was accountable for many of them. They urged us not to be drawn into another which could only aggravate diseases that had already proved nearly fatal. Leading businessmen warned us that there was nothing in war for business. They knew that though war business would be large, it might not be profitable; that if there were profits they would not last; and that the collapse of industry after the war would cancel them.

We wanted Hitler to be defeated. We knew all about him and didn't like any of it. We wanted the British to win. We like them. They speak the same language. They have an analogous constitutional system. We are accustomed to dealing with them.

In 1939 we felt that a British victory would be advantageous to us. We did not believe that it was our only hope. We did not believe that our safety, the integrity of our institutions, or the contribution we could make to the welfare of mankind depended on a British victory. Nobody offered the faintest suggestion that we should go to war. We knew too much about war to be deceived again.

A DIFFERENT STORY TODAY

How different is the spectacle today. Instead of working still to solve the problems resulting from the last war we have been quivering for months on the brink of another. The President has been conducting a war of nerves against the Axis and against his own people. The speeches of his representatives, from the Vice President down to Senator PEPPER, have all the marks of a concerted campaign to frighten us into war.

We have every reason to fear that we shall enter this war for democracy without resort to democratic processes. Because totalitarian powers do not declare war, but simply start shooting, this democratic Nation, we hear, in its war for democracy should do the same thing.

We have stopped trying to make democracy work. The liberals now tell us that we cannot have democracy in this country unless the British Empire is preserved Many leading businessmen hint that Hitler will starve us if he wins. Everybody tells us that Hitler will arrive in South America, or at the Panama Canal, or at New York City within a few minutes, days, months, or years after he has conquered England.

LET'S NOT COMMIT SUICIDE

This, then, is the spectacle It is the spectacle of a country with appalling problems, many of them resulting from the last war, about to plunge into another in the hope of ending its troubles that way. In the life of individuals this method of solving problems is known as suicide.

If we don't want to commit suicide, if we want to preserve our country, these problems must be solved. Let me recall a few of them. The problem of unemployment. Is the war a W. P. A. project? The problem of social justice, justice to the Negro, to the sharecropper, to the migratory workers, to the exploited members of our economic system.

The problem of clearing the slums and building 10,000,000 decent homes; the problem of the land and of gaining access to it for the people; the problem of the machine and how to direct it to the common good; the problem of starvation in the midst of plenty, politely called the problem of distribution; the problem of adequate medical care; the problem of agriculture; the problem of monopoly; the problem of capital and labor; the problem of political corruption; the problem of education.

Last December Mr. Walter Lippmann said that the prevailing system of education is destined, if it continues, to destroy western civilization, and is in fact destroying it. If Mr. Lippmann is right, and I think he is, we would gain little by defeating Hitler unless we could reform education at the same time. But we obviously cannot guarantee a British victory and reform education, or anything else, at the same time. We cannot fight a total war and at the same time solve the overwhelming problems that must be solved if we are to make democracy work in this country.

WHAT THE COST WOULD BE

We present a strange, and even an unprecedented, spectacle when we look at ourselves from the military point of view. We have not been attacked. We are not prepared. Hitler's public statements about this country, at least when compared with those of our leaders about Germany, have been characterized by moderation and reserve. Certainly no country has ever entered a great war so unprovoked and so unprepared. Military nations have gone to war without provocation. Provoked nations have gone to war without preparation.

For a nation to go to war as unprovoked and as unprepared as we are must be unique in history. We present the strange spectacle of a country dragging itself by its own bootstraps into a war which it did not begin, for which it is not responsible, for which it is not ready, and which, only a few months ago, it was determined never to enter.

I believe that we could win this war. I do not see precisely how we could win it. But I have faith that the vast resources of our land and the technological genius of our people would conquer in the end. But at how distant an end and at how great a cost.

On the basis of anything we know now, we could not expect the end in less than 5 years. The cost is the sacrifice of the institutions we would be fighting to save. The cost is the sacrifice of millions of our youth.

WE DO HAVE A CHOICE

But we are told we have no choice. Hitler will decide. Perhaps we shall be forced into bankruptcy, revolution, and totalitarianism at home. But we must make up our minds now to defeat Hitler or be defeated by him. If we are defeated by him, we shall have all this and Hitler, too.

I insist that today we have a choice—that today we can decide. Will Hitler attack us? Not if we are prepared. Will he penetrate South America? Not if we deal justly and intelligently with her; not, for example, if we adopt Secretary Knox's proposal for an immediate customs union with the Latin-American nations.

Shall we be able to survive in a totalitarian world? The loss of all the foreign trade we have had in the last decade would cost less than 1 year of war. Shall we suffer the fate of Denmark and Norway? Not unless we stop building battleships and bombers; not unless the Atlantic Ocean is rolled back to make a pathway for the enemies of God.

FIRST CHANGE OUR OWN HEARTS

Things will be bad for this country and for the world whether we go to war or not. They will be far worse if we go in than if we stay out. To stake the lives and fortunes of our people and the hopes of the world on the nightmares and bogeys that have been conjured up to scare us in is to betray humanity. We know the horrors of war. They are obvious. They are inevitable. The horrors we are told we shall undergo if we stay out of war are the product of hypothesis and hysteria.

The United States must prepare to meet the totalitarian onslaught if or when it comes. We are working hard on military preparation. Military preparation suffices for defense. It suffices even for conquest. But for the peace that must come sometime another kind of preparation is required. All we have to do is to recall our incompetence to deal in time of peace with those domestic problems that haunted us during the depression. With a multitude of gadgets we were sinking into poverty. With a decreasing death rate we had yet to discover what to do with our lives. With a love of liberty we did not know how to use our freedom or how to free the economic slaves among our population. I have faith that we can gradually muster the military strength to win the war. I see no sign that we possess the moral, intellectual, and spiritual strength to write the peace.

If we would change the face of the earth, we must first change our own hearts. If we will fight for the "four freedoms" with the same devotion that total war demands, we have a chance to get them for ourselves and for our fellowmen.

We are the only people who have. If we plunge into war we shall deprive the world of its last hope. We shall rob mankind of its last chance.

Jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office and the Tennessee Valley Authority

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

COMMUNICATION TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 2, 1941.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I regret that I have to report to the Congress the existence of a disagreement between this office and the Tennessee Valley Authority which, for reasons hereinafter stated, requires the enactment of clarifying legislation satisfactorily to settle the fundamental issue of whether it is the intent of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to exempt the fiscal officers of the Authority from accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act and other general statutes requiring an accounting for the disposition of public funds.

Immediately after taking office as Comptroller General, a number of informal discussions were held last November, at the instance of the Tennessee Valley Authority, with Director James P. Pope and another representative of the Authority, in an earnest attempt to settle some then existing differences between the Authority and this office and to establish satisfactory working procedures for the future settlement of their fiscal officers' accounts and for making the annual audit of the Authority's transactions expressly required by section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935, (49 Stat. 1080). These matters were thought to be progressing satisfactorily when, in response to my suggestion that the Authority submit a written statement of its proposed changes in the procedure, there was received

from the Authority a memorandum contending for the flat proposition that by reason of its corporate status and the provisions of section 9 (b) of the act the Tennessee Valley Authority is wholly exempt from the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act and other statutes requiring an accounting for public funds and that the duties of this office in relation to the Authority were strictly limited to the making of the annual special audit of the Authority's transactions expressly required by said section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. (The memorandum went to the length of proposing—apparently for the purpose of eliminating even that prescribed official examination and in disregard of the express requirements of section 9 (b)—that such annual audits be made by the Comptroller General and that the expenses thereof, with one exception, be borne by appropriations made for the General Accounting Office—that this office withdraw its representatives engaged in such audit and that "the Comptroller General should appoint a firm of certified accountants of national reputation to make an annual audit of the accounts of the Authority, the expenses of the audit to be borne by the Authority.")

These contentions of the Authority that it is exempt from accountability under general law were not in accord with the views of my predecessors, but the whole matter was carefully reexamined with the result that I had to advise the Authority that while admittedly there is some room for argument I could not say that I found the views of my predecessors in this office on this point without substantial support or that they went further than appeared to be justified in resolving the doubt in harmony with the basic legislative policy of holding public officers to a strict accounting for the use of public funds entrusted to them. The reasons for my conclusions in this respect were fully set forth in decision of December 21, 1940, addressed to the Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, a copy of which is enclosed herewith as a part of this report. For the reasons stated in the decision it was, and is, my view that any intent of the present law to exempt the Authority from accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act and other general statutes is not sufficiently clear to justify me in proceeding officially on that basis. The directors of the Authority remain firm in their contentions to the contrary, however, and, in effect, now refuse any rendition of accounts under general law as is shown by letter dated February 12, 1941, as follows:

"TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., February 12, 1941.

"The Honorable LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the
United States, Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR MR. WARREN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 21, 1940, which has been studied with great care.

"That letter rules that the accounts of the Authority are subject to final settlement and adjustment in the General Accounting Office under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, and that the entirely different audit procedure provided in section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act is to be considered as in addition to and not in lieu of such final settlement and adjustment.

"It seems clear that this view is identical with the one taken by a former Comptroller General, the late Mr. McCarl, and departs sharply from the basis for relationship developed tentatively in a series of discussions with your predecessor, Senator Brown. In effect, therefore, we respectfully suggest that your letter of December 21 puts the legal question of relationship between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the General Accounting Office back to where it was when the Authority was created. The only question is the intent of Congress as expressed in the statutes which govern both agencies. At that time (1933) there may have been room for difference of legal opinion as to the intent of Congress as expressed in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and its legislative history. Since that time, however, repeated attempts to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to bring it under the Budget and Accounting Act have been defeated in Congress, the last such attempt being through the medium of an amendment to the appropriation bill as recent as 2 weeks ago. In each instance, over a period of years, when the issue was brought before Congress, it has declined to extend the Budget and Accounting Act procedure to the Authority.

"I am sure you will understand, therefore, why the Board of Directors of the Authority cannot acquiesce in the position taken in your letter. We are convinced that the position stated in your letter is inconsistent both with the express provisions of our governing statute and the intent of the Congress clearly expressed in its legislative history and the actions of Congress over a period of 7 years. For us to acquiesce in a requirement of settlement and adjustment of Tennessee Valley Authority accounts by the General Accounting Office under these circumstances would, in our judgment, constitute an avoidance of our responsibility as a board for the administration and management of the project which Congress and the President have assigned to our charge.

"We feel certain you would agree that the issue is an issue of law, depending entirely upon the construction of the relevant statutes. The Board therefore would, under such circumstances, follow the advice of its general counsel. The advice that has been given to the Board both by its present general counsel and his predecessor has been that the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office over the transactions of the Authority is defined by section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and that any extension of that jurisdiction beyond the limits there set out is without authority of law. These legal opinions are supported by the independent conclusions of the joint congressional committee specifically charged by the joint resolution creating that body with the duty of determining this particular issue. We have concluded that the only way in which this controversy now stalemated on opposing opinions of law can be brought to a conclusion is by obtaining a ruling on the legal questions by the chief law officer of the Federal Government. To that end we have forwarded to the Secretary of the Treasury a letter requesting a revision of procedure, a copy of which is forwarded herewith for your information. We are advised that the Secretary plans to transmit this request to the Attorney General for his opinion upon the questions of law that are involved.

"In disagreeing with your position you will understand I am sure that the Board of Directors is simply trying to discharge its responsibility under the act in full conscience and that it is with the greatest reluctance we find ourselves at issue with you.

"Respectfully yours,
"TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
"DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
"Vice Chairman, Board of Directors."

I cannot proceed on the suggested basis, heavily relied on by the Authority, that the subsequent failure of Congress to enact proposed amendments which, among other matters, would have expressly required the Authority to render accounts pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act is determinative of the meaning and intent of existing legislation in this respect. On the other hand, I appreciate that the rejection of such amendments could be regarded as an indication of the attitude of Congress at the time. It is understood that the Authority's letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, referred to in the letter above quoted, is still under consideration in the Treasury Department. However, the conflicting arguments on the issue appear to have been fully developed; and as neither the Treasury Department nor the Attorney General has jurisdiction to decide or determine the matter so as to relieve me of official responsibility in the premises, it is not perceived how the Authority's present course of seeking such collateral administrative opinions can settle the issue.

The result is that I am faced with the alternatives of permitting the Authority indefinitely to continue to withdraw large sums from the Treasury for which no accounting is rendered, which I believe would be contrary to law and my official duty, or of holding that the fiscal officers of the Authority are delinquent in the rendition of their accounts and thereupon to withhold approval of requisitions for further advances from the Treasury as required by section 12 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 209, as amended, 31 U. S. C. 78). I am loath to follow the latter course, in view of the room for doubt as to the legislative purpose and of the expressed convictions of the Authority's directors that the rendition of accounts would constitute an avoidance of their legal responsibility. Moreover, such disapproval of requisitions would leave the Authority without funds for current activities and would jeopardize not only normal operations but national-defense activities dependent thereon. I see no other course, however, unless the issue be settled by clarifying legislation.

In these circumstances, I must suggest the immediate importance of an amendment to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to set the matter at rest. Whether the fiscal officer of the Tennessee Valley Authority should receive and disburse the funds appropriated for the activities of the Authority without rendering accounts therefor for adjustment and settlement under the general law is, of course, purely a question of legislative policy. If it be the legislative will that the Authority shall not be required to render an accounting pursuant to general law, that can be accomplished by amending section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1080), by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph substantially as follows:

"All amounts appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act shall be paid to the treasurer of the Corporation upon the request of the Board and, notwithstanding the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act or of other provisions of law, no accounting to, or rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement by, the General Accounting Office for amounts heretofore or hereafter received or disbursed by the said treasurer shall be required. Provisions in appropriation acts directing that appropriations for, and receipts of, the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund shall not be construed as requiring the rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement by the General Accountng Office."

Conversely, if it be the legislative purpose not to exempt the Authority from accountability under general law, that would be made clear by the addition to the said section 9 (b) of a paragraph substantially as follows:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to relieve the Treasurer or other accountable officers or employees of the Corporation from compliance with the provisions of existing law requiring the rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement pursuant to section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24) and accounts for all receipts and disbursements by or for the Corporation shall be rendered accordingly."

I hold the view that any governmental agency charged with the responsibility of conducting operations of the character of

those of the Tennessee Valley Authority should have some latitude of authority beyond that needed and usually granted by the Congress to the regular departments and establishments of the Government. In this connection see page 28 of my decision of December 21, 1940, herewith. However, I strongly oppose the view, sometimes expressed, that the only route to such necessary latitude of authority is through exemption entirely from regular accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act for the disposition of public moneys. When an agency of the Government conducts its business under special grants of authority, permitting greater flexibility of action, the audit and settlement of its accounts in the regular way is in nowise inconsistent with the exercise of that flexibility of action, because in the audit and settlement full consideration must be given to the same special authority under which the agency's business was conducted.

During the past few years charges have been made that the close scrutiny by representatives of the General Accounting Office over expenditures of the Tennessee Valley Authority has reflected prejudice of the former against the latter. Such charges have never seemed to me to merit serious consideration; but even if justification for them could be found in the past, none now exists.

It is perhaps not necessary for me to state in this communication that I strongly appreciate the importance of the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority and have always supported legislation to enable it to be prosecuted successfully. My record in this regard is known to Members of both Houses of the Congress, but I also strongly favor uniform and complete accountability of all Government agencies for the disposition of public moneys entrusted to their use.

While it is inconceivable to me that any agency entrusted with the expenditure of mammoth amounts of funds collected from the people of the United States should desire to evade responsible accounting and scrutiny by an independent office created for that purpose, I make no further comment at this time with respect to the situation here presented other than to urge the early enactment of legislation which will definitely settle the question as, in the wisdom of the Congress, it should be settled.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 21, 1940.

CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

SIR: Careful consideration has been given the matters involved in the letter of November 23, 1940, from the Honorable James P. Pope, director, Tennessee Valley Authority, as follows:

"I am handing you a memorandum in compliance with the understanding we had during our recent conversation.

"This has to do primarily with the legal aspects of the questions involved in the relationship between the Authority and the General Accounting Office. You will note that the position of the Authority on the legal questions is supported by the Supreme Court in the case of *Skinner & Eddy Corp.* v. *McCarl* (275 U. S. 1), and by the conclusion of the joint investigating committee, pages 109 to 133 of the report. For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of the report of the joint investigating committee.

"Our desire is to cooperate fully with the General Accounting Office, and to be of every possible service in resolving these questions in a way satisfactory to both agencies."

The memorandum accompanying the letter is as follows:

"STATEMENT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ON PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AUTHORITY AND THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"This statement does not purport to be a comprehensive study of the history of the relations between the General Accounting Office and the Authority, nor is it intended to explain all the exceptions which the General Accounting Office has taken to disbursements by the Authority. It is, rather, a general discussion of a few of the principal problems now involved in the relationship between the two agencies. Detailed statements on each of the points discussed have already been furnished the General Accounting Office, and further explanation will be supplied to any extent which may be requested.

"I. THE NATURE OF THE JURISDICTION OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE OVER THE AUTHORITY

"The Authority's prior statements on this matter make necessary only a very brief discussion at this time. The report of the joint committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority contains a full study of the question. It is enough to say here that the Authority's relations with the General Accounting Office are prescribed in detail by special legislation, section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. This section makes no reference to the settlement and adjustment procedure by which the General Accounting Office controls the expenditures and accounts of the departments and establishments of the United States. Instead, this section requires that the Comptroller General 'shall audit the transactions of the Corporation.' Thus, in view of the specific provisions of this section, there would be no basis for application of the settlement and adjustment procedure to the Authority unless relations between the Authority and the General Accounting Office were governed not only by the provisions of section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, but also by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. In the case of *Skinner & Eddy Corp.* v. *McCarl* (275 U. S. 1), the Supreme Court explicitly ruled that the Budget and Accounting Act is not applicable to Government corporations in the absence of specific legislation so providing. This decision was rendered prior to the enactment of the T. V. A. Act, and the act must therefore be construed in the light of the prior decision. In the case of the Authority, moreover, legislative proposals were made in both Houses of Congress in 1935, endorsed by the General Accounting Office itself and introduced for the announced purpose of bringing the Authority under the Budget and Accounting Act. These proposals were voted upon and defeated in both Houses, thus again demonstrating congressional intent.

"It may be added that the joint investigating committee revealed that counsel for the General Accounting Office in 1935 expressed to the then Comptroller General complete agreement that the Budget and Accounting Act was not applicable to the Authority (report, pp. 119, 120). This, however, had no effect on the position of the General Accounting Office.

"What is meant by an audit as used in section 9 (b) of the T. V. A. Act must be determined in the light of the commonly accepted meaning of the word, as well as the intention of Congress as revealed in the congressional debates at the time of the enactment of the legislation. It is clear from both that what was intended was an audit of the type common among commercial enterprises, in which trained auditors would review the accounts and fiscal procedures of the Authority with a view to developing accurate statements of its financial position, in the customary balance-sheet and income-and-expense forms. Such audits are commonly made within a few months after the end of the accounting period under review, so that they may be utilized for appraising the financial status of the corporation at any given time. Such audits have never been supplied to the Authority. Since the activities of the Authority correspond in a number of ways to those of business enterprises, audits of this type are essential, and it has become necessary for the Authority to secure such audits from qualified public accountants.

"The two principal purposes of an audit, as that term is used among businessmen, are to afford a pericdic review of the operating condition and results of the business, and to aid the managers of the enterprise in increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of its operations. General Accounting Office examinations are not directed to either of these ends. They have to do, rather, with the technical legality of individual items of expenditure on the basis of the Comptroller General's interpretations of various regulatory statutes. Under the settlement and adjustment procedure, the General Accounting Office supervises the disposition of all claims against establishments and departments within its jurisdiction, thus participating in the management of the various agencies. Neither of these functions is involved in commercial audits. No effort is made to substitute the auditors' judgment for that of management, either as to the legality or wisdom of any commitment or disbursement. The purpose of private auditors is to present accurate statements of the results which have been achieved by the business in the past and to make such suggestions for the establishment of internal accounting and fiscal controls and procedures as to insure that accurate financial statements will be forthcoming in the future. They are free, of course, to criticize and report on any past expenditure or action, or on any method of operation or internal control concerning which they feel the public should be informed. It is the position of the Authority that under section 9 (b) it is audits of this type which the General Accounting Office is required to make. This was also the conclusion of the joint investigating committee.

"II. NATURE OF THE EXCEPTIONS TAKEN BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"Perhaps because its staff does not contain many certified public accountants and it is therefore not well equipped to make business audits, the General Accounting Office has carried over to the Authority the same procedures with respect to examination of accounts as are applicable to the departments and establishments of the Government under the Budget and Accounting Act. This has given rise to a vast number of exceptions to particular expenditures and transactions. Most of these exceptions have been released after the Authority has supplied additional data or information. There still remained, however, as of October 31, 1940, exceptions to items aggregating $6,737,646. While the Authority does not agree with the propriety of the procedure under which these exceptions were noted, so long as the General Accounting Office sees fit to operate in this way, it will, of course, be the effort of the Authority to explain and justify, so far as possible, the items to which exceptions are taken, and to attempt to secure the release of the exceptions. It may therefore be helpful to state generally the types of exceptions which have been made and the reasons why the Authority believes they should be released.

"Most of the exceptions fall within three general classes:

"(a) Exceptions based upon differences of opinion between the General Accounting Office and the Authority as to the legality of disbursements.

"(b) Exceptions based upon differences in judgment on questions of fact.

"(c) Exceptions based upon claims of inadequacy of supporting papers for disbursements.

"These will be discussed in order:

"(a) It is the Authority's view that even if the General Accounting Office is to continue to apply its exception procedure to the Authority, exceptions should not be taken on the basis of differences of opinion between the General Accounting Office and counsel for the Authority. The determination of legal questions is no part of the normal auditing function, whatever part it may play in the settlement and adjustment procedure. Private auditors accept without question the opinions of counsel for the agency subject to audit. To do otherwise would mean the substitution of the auditors' judgment on legal questions for that of the counsel for the agency.

"It should be emphasized that none of the exceptions taken on legal grounds are even alleged to be based upon willful violation of the law. They involve doubtful questions of legal interpretation, where the auditors of the General Accounting Office have taken one viewpoint, and the legal department of the Authority has taken another. The statutes involved relate, for the most part, to technical and procedural matters, and no question of fraud or personal honesty has been raised.

"A few examples will show the nature of the items upon which the G. A. O. auditors and the Authority's lawyers have taken conflicting positions.

"A large number of exceptions have been taken to the purchase of land for the reason that no approval of title was secured from the Attorney General. It was contended by the General Accounting Office that such approval was required under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, which by its terms applies only to departments and establishments of the Government and not to corporations. The Authority's general counsel construed this statute as being inapplicable, and counsel for the General Accounting Office was of the same view (hearings of the investigating committee, p. 120). It is interesting in this connection to note that the revision of section 355 adopted by this Congress (Public, No. 825, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) carries the following provision:

" 'The foregoing provisions of this section shall not be construed to affect in any manner any existing provisions of law which are applicable to the acquisition of lands or interests in land by the Tennessee Valley Authority * * *.'

"The amendment was sponsored by the Department of Justice, and the quoted provision had the approval of the Department. It is, therefore, apparent that Congress, with the acquiescence of the Attorney General, has left undisturbed the Authority's interpretation of section 355 as having no application to the purchases of land by the Authority.

"Another large volume of exceptions has been taken to the Authority's purchases of cement, on the ground that such purchases were not made on the basis of competitive bids. At the time of entry into the contracts under which most of the purchases were made, there was no requirement in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act for competitive bidding, and it was the opinion of counsel for the Authority (and, as it subsequently developed, of the G. A. O.) that section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, which carries a general requirement of competitive bidding for Government departments, was not applicable. As a matter of fact, however, competitive bids were invited. When received, the bids proved to be identical. The Authority considered that the identical nature of the bids indicated collusion and that the bids were too high. After long negotiation, and after the Authority had stated that unless bids were reduced it would build its own cement producing plant, contracts were entered into with a number of the companies at prices much lower than those contained in the original bids. The General Accounting Office was therefore in the position of insisting that the Authority enter into contracts on a highly disadvantageous basis because of the requirements of a statute which counsel for the Authority, as well as counsel for the General Accounting Office, considered to be inapplicable. It may be asked with what propriety the Authority could pay higher prices for cement when advised by its own counsel that there was no requirement that it should do so.

"Among the other items to which the General Accounting Office has taken exception are the purchase of rubber boots and goggles, firearms for Authority safety officers, and noiseless typewriters, and the payment of accumulated leave to employees transferred from an annual to an hourly basis. In each case the Authority was advised by its counsel of the legal propriety of the disbursement.

"It is not intended to argue here whether the legal interpretation of the lay auditors of the General Accounting Office or of counsel for the Authority was correct in these cases. It is intended, rather, to suggest that the taking of exceptions based solely upon a difference of opinion with counsel for the agency under examination on questions of legal interpretation is wholly outside of the auditing function.

"(b) Exceptions based on the alleged erroneous computation of liquidated damages are examples of exceptions based on differences of opinion as to questions of fact. A number of exceptions have been taken to the computation of liquidated damages due the Authority because of disagreement on the part of the General Accounting Office auditors with the various officials of the Authority concerned on the facts which were the basis of the computation. Here again it is no part of the duties of auditors to substitute their own judgment for that of the business officials of the agency under examination in regard to facts or the inferences to be drawn from them in order to arrive at a mathematical calculation.

"Exceptions have also been taken where purchases have been made without advertisement because of the existence of an emergency requiring immediate delivery. Section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended in 1935, specifically permits purchases of supplies and services without advertisement when an emergency exists. The General Accounting Office's exceptions have been based upon a difference of opinion between its auditors and the Authority's Materials Department as to whether the facts in given cases constituted an emergency.

"The General Accounting Office has also excepted to disbursements made by the Authority in settlement of claims made by private litigants. It need hardly be remarked that the Authority, unlike ordinary Government departments, is subject to suit in its own name, and its general counsel, who is responsible for the conduct of litigation in which claims are sought to be enforced against the Authority, is in a better position than are the auditors of the General Accounting Office to decide what settlements from the Authority's viewpoint are financially desirable. The practice of the General Accounting Office in taking exception to settlements because it disagrees with the judgment which the Authority's general counsel has exercised in given cases has nothing to do with the auditing function which the General Accounting Office is directed by law to perform.

"(c) Various types of exceptions have been taken by the General Accounting Office based on the inadequacy of papers furnished to support particular disbursements. Examples are exceptions taken to identification of 'extras' increasing material costs of contract prices; proof of circumstances warranting the award of contracts without advertisement; failure of supplemental vouchers to make reference to all previous vouchers; failure to append certification to statements and bills; proof that payment of rentals and repairs is not in excess of the limits fixed by the Economy Act. Exceptions of this nature are not deemed to constitute a problem of serious import, inasmuch as such exceptions are readily released after additional information is furnished. Such exceptions nevertheless greatly and unnecessarily increase the amount of paper work the Authority is required to perform and are therefore responsible both for reduced efficiency and increased cost of doing business. The Authority welcomes suggestions for the improvement and simplification of its forms and procedures, but no suggestions to this end have been made by the General Accounting Office, and few, if any, of the exceptions are based on criteria other than a formalism divorced from business judgment. The requirement that statements and bills carry formal certificates that the money is justly due frequently necessitates the return of such statements and bills to contractors for revision. In not a single case has this requirement affected the amount billed. No such certificates are required by any business organization, and they have no legal, moral, or other effect whatever.

"III. UTILIZATION OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS

"The Authority has been served by the General Accounting Office with Certificates of Settlement of Account for the period from July 8, 1933, to July 1, 1934. These certificates 'find a balance due the United States' in the aggregate amount of $31,596.95, and state that immediate action should be taken by the treasurer of the Authority to recover this amount from the officers who made the disbursements to which exception was taken. The exceptions in question are all of the nature above described. Such certificates and demands are part of the settlement and adjustment procedure, and are entirely out of place in the relations between the Authority and the General Accounting Office.

"As has already been indicated, it is the position of the Authority that the periodic audits which the General Accounting Office is directed to make have no relation to the settlement and adjustment procedure applicable in the case of ordinary Government departments subject to the Budget and Accounting Act. Section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act specifically provides that the General Accounting Office's audit report shall not be published until the Authority has had an opportunity to reply to it, after which the report and the reply are to be submitted by the Comptroller General to the President and Congress. The act clearly contemplates that the Authority shall take such action with reference to criticisms appearing in the Comptroller General's report as it deems proper; Congress, after receiving both the General Accounting Office report and the Authority's reply, is then in a position to take such measures as may be necessary. In other words, the General Accounting Office's report is to be treated as the report of a private auditing firm would be treated by a private business. The Authority is free, unless Congress otherwise directs, to take only such action as it may deem advisable.

"IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

"1. The General Accounting Office should discontinue the exception procedure as applied to the Authority, recall its representatives now in Knoxville reviewing transactions of the fiscal year 1941, and withdraw the request for collection of the amounts involved in the certificates of settlement for the period ending June 30, 1934.

"2. The Comptroller General should appoint a firm of certified public accountants of national reputation to make an annual audit of the accounts of the Authority, the expense of the audit to be borne by the Authority.

"3. If the General Accounting Office insists on continuing the application of its exception procedure to the Authority, the following would aid in establishing more helpful relations between the two organizations:

"(a) The General Accounting Office should expedite its decisions on exceptions to which replies have been made or which are similar to those already released. Releases should be sent to the Authority as soon as determined. Opportunity should be given the Authority to restate its replies on any items proposed to be disallowed.

"(b) The General Accounting Office should recast its reports for the past 7 years in the interests of accuracy, the elimination of exceptions already released, and in order to insure that financial statements, if included at all, are in a form comparable with the statements published by the Authority.

"(c) Representatives of the two organizations should review the proposed final report in order to remove as many classes of exceptions as possible. No future exception should be taken to the classes thus eliminated."

The controversy, in its various aspects, as to whether the Tennessee Valley Authority was intended to be subject to the requirements of the Budget and Accounting Act and other statutes generally controlling the expenditure of, and accounting for, public funds extends back over several years. The matter has given me much concern, and I have made a careful review of the subject, including the conflicting views stated in the majority and minority reports of the Joint Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority. While admittedly the law is not entirely clear and there is some room for argument, I cannot say that I find the views of my predecessors in this office on this point without substantial support or that they went further than appears to be justified in resolving the doubt in harmony with the basic legislative policy of holding public officers to a strict accounting for the use of public money entrusted to them.

First and foremost, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act does not expressly exempt the Authority from such requirements as would be expected if that were legislatively intended. Implied exemptions from the provisions of general law are not lightly to be presumed (see *Morgan* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, 28 F. Supp. 732). In this connection it is to be noted particularly that section 3 of the act expressly exempted the Authority from the requirements of the civil-service laws. This was not left to implication but was expressly stated and it is only reasonable to assume that if other exemptions were intended they, too, would have been expressly stated and not left in the twilight of doubtful implication. The Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, approved June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 128), was enacted contemporaneously with the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. Section 4 (a) authorized the creation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and section 4 (j) not only exempted such Corporation from compliance with the civil-service laws but expressly provided that it "shall determine its necessary expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, without regard to the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds." This indicates that when the Congress intends such exemptions they are expressly stated, and the omission of any such provisions in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act—enacted at almost the same time and similar in various respects—cannot but be taken as most persuasive that the Congress did not intend in that act to confer any such exemptions. It was said in *Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Company* v. *Wheeling Bridge Company* (138 U. S. 287, 292) that "an alleged surrender or suspension of a power of government respecting any matter of public concern must be shown by clear and unequivocal language," and, in *Brown* v. *Duchesne* (19 How. 183, 195), that "neither will the court, in expounding a statute, give to it a construction which would in any degree disarm the Government of a power which has been confided to it to be used for the general good—or which would enable individuals to embarrass it, in the discharge of the high duties it owes to the community—unless plain and express words indicated that such was the intention of the legislature." The will of the legislature is to be discovered as well by what the legislature has not declared as by what they have expressed (*Houston* v. *Moore*, 5 Wheat. 1), and it is difficult to conclude that the Congress without express mention intended to leave to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority the expenditure of hundreds of millions of public money free of the restraints of general law governing spending and accountability.

The position of the Authority, nevertheless, that the Congress impliedly intended to exempt it from accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act is founded on the proposition that the Congress created it a corporation and, therefore, that there is for application the principles of *Skinner & Eddy Corporation* v. *McCarl* (275 U. S. 1), where it was held that the Comptroller General could not be compelled to settle a claim against the Emergency Fleet Corporation. In its opinion the Court said, inter alia:

"For the Fleet Corporation is an entity distinct from the United States and from any of its departments or boards; and the audit and control of its financial transactions is, under the general rules of law and the administrative practice, committed to its own corporate officers except so far as control may be exerted by the Shipping Board."

The Court said respecting the Fleet Corporation and various other "Government-owned private corporations" that:

"Indeed, an important if not the chief reason for employing these incorporated agencies was to enable them to employ commercial methods and to conduct their operations with a freedom supposed to be inconsistent wtih accountability to the Treasury under its established procedure of audit and control over the financial transactions of the United States."

But a careful reading of that case shows clearly enough that it does not go to the extent of fixing a rule that an act of Congress giving a Government agency a corporate status ipso facto establishes such agency as an entity so entirely separate and distinct from the United States as to divorce it from accountability under general statutes governing Government establishments. On the contrary, the Court quoted section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act amending section 236 of the Revised Statutes to provide that "all claims and demands whatever by the Government of the United States or against it, and all accounts whatever in which the Government of the United States is concerned, either as debtor or creditor, shall be settled and adjusted in the General Accounting Office" and, with respect thereto, said:

"The language of this grant, if standing alone, might possibly be broad enough to include authority to audit accounts and to pass upon claims arising out of contracts made by a Government-owned corporation 'representing the United States.' But there it must be construed in the light of the statutes dealing specifically with the Shipping Board and the Fleet Corporation, of the latter's origin and character and of the administrative practice prevailing with regard to it and other similar corporations."

The Court then proceeded to point out that the Emergency Fleet Corporation was organized by the United States Shipping Board pursuant to specific authority conferred on it by the original Shipping Board Act of September 7, 1916, in contemplation of war, to form one or more corporations, to be dissolved at the expiration of 5 years from the conclusion of "the present European War"; that all of its stock was subscribed and paid for by the Shipping Board on behalf of the United States and that it was thus an instrumentality of the United States. The Court then said:

"But it was organized under the general laws of the District of Columbia, as a private corporation, with power to purchase, construct, and operate merchant vessels. The act authorized the Board 'to sell with the approval of the President, any or all of the stock of the United States in such corporation, but at no time shall it be a minority stockholder therein.' Being a private corporation, the Fleet Corporation may be sued in the State or Federal courts like other private corporations; it does not enjoy the priority of the United States in bankruptcy proceedings, *Sloan Shipyards Corporation* v. *United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation* (258 U. S. 549); and its employees are not agents of the United States, subject to the provisions of section 41 of the Criminal Code. *United States* v. *Strang* (254 U. S. 491). Compare 34 Opinion Attorney General 241."

The Court then referred to various other Government-owned private corporations employed by the United States as its instrumentalities in several other fields during the World War and in the conduct of activities essentially commercial in character, pointed out that at no time had the financial transactions of the Fleet Corporation passed through the hands of the general accounting officers of the Government or been passed upon as accounts of the United States either by the Comptroller of the Treasury or the Comptroller General, but that the accounts of the Fleet Corporation, "like those of each of the other corporations named," had been audited and the control over their financial transactions had been exercised, "in accordance with commercial practice," by the board or the officer charged with the responsibilities of administration. It was with reference to such Government-owned private corporations formed or utilized for such purposes that the Court remarked that "Indeed, an important if not the chief reason for employing these incorporated agencies was to enable them to employ commercial methods and to conduct their operations with a freedom supposed to be inconsistent with accountability to the Treasury under its established procedure of audit and control over the financial transactions of the United States." It was these circumstances relating specifically to the origin and character of the Fleet Corporation as a private corporation and the administrative practice prevailing with regard to it and "other similar corporations" employed as instrumentalities of the United States that were stated by the Court in sustaining the contention of the Comptroller General in that case that he was without jurisdiction to consider claims against the Fleet Corporation, notwithstanding the broad language of section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act, supra, which the Court indicated might otherwise be applicable. Thus, the decision is limited to the Fleet Corporation and the principle of the decision to other similar Government-owned private corporations, and cannot be viewed as establishing or intending to establish any rule that the corporate status of any governmental agency ipso facto exempts it from accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act.

Now, unquestionably, there are wide and material differences in such respects between the origin, status, and purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Fleet Corporation and such differences have been recognized by the courts. While the formation by the Shipping Board of the Fleet Corporation was authorized by statute, it actually was organized under the laws of the District

of Columbia as a private corporation to engage commercially in purchasing, constructing, and operating merchant vessels, and it was held to have the attributes of other private corporations. The Court said in *Sloan Shipyards* v. *United States Fleet Corporation* (258 U. S. 549, 565), that—

"The Shipping Act contemplated a corporation in which private persons might be stockholders and which was to be formed like any business corporation under the laws of the District, with capacity to sue and be sued. The United States took all the stock but that did not affect the legal position of company."

The Tennessee Valley Authority was not so formed. It finds its origin in the language of section 1 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, 48 Stat. 58, as follows:

"That for the purpose of maintaining and operating the properties now owned by the United States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in the interest of the national defense and for agricultural and industrial development, and to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River Basins, there is hereby created a body corporate by the name of the 'Tennessee Valley Authority' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation'). The board of directors first appointed shall be deemed the incorporators, and the incorporation shall be held to have been effected from the date of the first meeting of the board."

Thus the Authority was not incorporated "like any business corporation" under general incorporation statutes, but was by express declaration of Congress "created a body corporate" for the purpose of performing functions primarily governmental in character, its organization, duties, powers, authority, and character being expressly delineated in the act, as for any other governmental establishment or agency, without reference to general incorporation statutes or without respect to attributes which might inhere under such statutes or general corporation law. Is such Government agency, by virtue of thus being "created a body corporate" for the purpose of performing specified Government functions, necessarily to be regarded as a "Government-owned private corporation" within the principles of *Skinner & Eddy Corporation* v. *McCarl*? In *Osborn* v. *Bank of the United States* (9 Wheaton 738, 823, 827, 860), the Court, by Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, said:

"The case of the Bank is, we think, a very strong case of this description. The charter of incorporation not only creates it, but gives it every faculty which it possesses. The power to acquire rights of any description, to transact business of any description, to make contracts of any description, to sue on those contracts, is given and measured by its charter, and that charter is a law of the United States. This being can acquire no right, make no contract, bring no suit, which is not authorized by a law of the United States. It is not only itself the mere creature of a law, but all its actions and all its rights are dependent on the same law. Can a being, thus constituted, have a case which does not arise literally, as well as substantially, under the law?

* * * * *

"This distinction is not denied; and, if the act of Congress was a simple act of incorporation, and contained nothing more, it might be entitled to great consideration. But the act does not stop with incorporating the Bank. It proceeds to bestow upon the being it has made, all the faculties and capacities which that being possesses. Every act of the Bank grows out of this law, and is tested by it. To use the language of the Constitution, every act of the Bank arises out of this law.

* * * * *

"* * * The bank is not considered as a private corporation, whose principal object is individual trade and individual profit; but as a public corporation, created for public and national purposes. * * * It is not an instrument which the Government found ready-made, and has supposed to be adapted to its purposes; but one which was created in the form in which it now appears, for national purposes only."

In *United States* v. *Strang* (254 U. S. 491), after referring to the organization of the Emergency Fleet Corporation by the Shipping Board under laws of the District of Columbia, the court said:

"The corporation was controlled and managed by its own officers and appointed its own servants and agents who became directly responsible to it. Notwithstanding all its stock was owned by the United States, it must be regarded as a separate entity. Its inspectors were not appointed by the President, nor by any officer designated by Congress; they were subject to removal by the corporation only, and could contract only for it. In such circumstances we think they were not agents of the United States within the true intendment of section 41 of the Criminal Code."

But in *Posey* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (93 F. (2d) 726), the court said:

"The Tennessee Valley Authority is a corporation created by act of Congress, 48 stat. 58, section 1, 16 U. S. C. A., section 831, for the purpose of managing certain properties of the United States developed in consequence of the World War, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., and of building further dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries to improve navigation and control floods, and to dispose of surplus electricity generated thereby. There is no capital stock. The operations are paid for by appropriations from the Treasury of the United States. The lands acquired belong to the United States. The great functions of the Authority are governmental in nature and might have been performed directly by the officers of Government. But a corporation consisting of three publicly appointed officials was created, and by section 4 (b) of the act, 16 U. S. C. A., section 831c (b), it was given power to sue and be sued in its corporate name. Notwithstanding the corporate entity and its subjection to suit, the Authority is plainly a governmental agency of the United States, and except as Congress may otherwise consent, is free from State regulation or control. *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316 4 L. Ed. 579); *Johnson* v. *Maryland* (254 U. S. 51, 41 S. Ct. 16, 65 L. Ed. 126). It may be emphasized that it is not a corporation created under the general laws of some State or territory whose stock the United States happens to own, as was true of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Panama Railroad Co.

* * * * *

"That section (sec. 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act) deals comprehensively with employees of the Authority. Evidently Congress regarded the employees as being substantially employed by the United States, and therefore takes off the fetters of the civil-service regulations which otherwise might apply.

* * * * *

"* * * it is a case in which a new sort of corporation is directly created by the legislature as an instrumentality of government; and in the same act the corporation is authorized to employ persons, and their injuries are considered and provided for, and then suit allowed where there is no otherwise provision.

"The true intent of the whole act is to be sought, in the light of its novel subject-matter and the intimate relation to the Government of the employments under it.

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, on December 6, 1940 (No. 8427), affirmed the lower court's dismissal of Dr. A. E. Morgan's suit for salary as a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority after his removal from office by the President, and, in the course of its opinion, stated in part as follows:

"It required little to demonstrate that the Tennessee Valley Authority exercises predominantly an executive or administrative function. * * * It is not to be alined with the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, or other administrative bodies mainly exercising clearly quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial functions—it is predominantly an administrative arm of the executive department."

Thus the concept drawn from the statute is that the Tennessee Valley Authority, though denominated a "body corporate," is in reality an arm—an integral part—of the Government, as distinguished from "an instrument which the Government found ready made" (*Osborn* v. *U. S. Bank*, supra) or has formed or has had formed to facilitate its work, as exemplified by the Fleet Corporation and other corporations referred to in the Skinner & Eddy case, a distinction between the arm and the instrument it uses, and as the arm may be viewed as a member apart in the performance of its functions although inherently an integral part of the body, so the Authority is to be viewed as administratively an integral part of the Government although functioning as a corporate entity.

For these reasons the conclusion appears required that the Tennessee Valley Authority has a governmental status materially different from that of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and other similar Government-owned private corporations, and, therefore, that neither the reasoning nor the result in the Skinner & Eddy case applies to the Tennessee Valley Authority or would justify holding that the Authority was intended to be exempt from accountability under section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act.

In the conference report on the bill which became the Tennessee Valley Authority Act (H. Rept. No. 130, 73d Cong., 1st sess.), the managers on the part of the House stated, at page 19:

"We are fully persuaded that the full success of the Tennessee Valley development project will depend more upon the ability, vision, and executive capacity of the members of the board than upon legislative provisions. We have sought to set up a legislative framework, but not to encase it in a legislative straitjacket. We intend that the corporation shall have much of the essential freedom and elasticity of a private business corporation. We have indicated the course it shall take, but have not directed the particular steps it shall make. We have given it ample power, and tried to prevent the perversion and abuse of that power. We have set bounds to prevent its liberty from becoming license."

This statement of the managers for the House that the Tennessee Valley Authority was intended to have "much of the freedom and elasticity of a private business corporation," taken in its context, shows that it was not regarded as actually being constituted a private corporation, but in its functioning was to have "much" of the freedom and elasticity of such a corporation. However, "freedom and elasticity" in operations does not connote freedom from accountability. From the first the yearly appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority have been made in extended detail as to the purposes for which such appropriations might be used, the same as for other Government departments and establishments. See the act of June 16, 1933, 48 Statutes 295, for the first such appropriation, and the act of April 18, 1940, Public, No. 459, page 30, for the last, to date. Under all such appropriations, funds have been requisitioned and advanced to fiscal officers of the Authority on accountable warrants, the same as for other Government departments and establishments. Beginning with the appropriation made by the act of August 12, 1935, 49 Statutes 596, for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, each yearly appropriation act has expressly pro-

vided that the sum appropriated, together with the unexpended balances of prior appropriations and the receipts of the Authority from all sources, with one exception, "shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund," to be available until the end of the particular fiscal year. A former Comptroller General construed this new language, incorporated in the appropriation acts, that the Authority's appropriation and receipts should "be covered into and accounted for" as one fund, as removing any doubt that the fiscal officers of the Authority were required by law to render their accounts to this office pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act for the disposition of advances and collections, the same as in other departments and establishments.

It has been said that such new language was included in the appropriation acts at the instance of the Tennessee Valley Authority and, therefore, should not be viewed as intended to affect its status with respect to accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act. But the effect of the language is to be interpreted in the usual sense of the words as they were employed and adopted and apparently intended by the Congress, and not by what may have been intended or not intended by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and, on that basis, such provisions must be given substantial weight as showing that the Congress did not consider the Authority to be exempt from accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act. It has been urged that such effect should not be given such provisions because contemporaneously with the first of such provisions and in connection with the amendment of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act in various particulars by the act of August 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1080), there was a failure to adopt two different proposed amendments, one in the Senate and one in the House, expressly requiring, among other matters, that funds of the Tennessee Valley Authority be covered into the Treasury to be withdrawn only on accountable warrants. However, a reading of the debate on the two amendments (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 7465, et seq., May 14, 1935; id. 10972, et seq., July 10, 1935) shows that the opposition was directed primarily to other provisions of the amendments, particularly those restricting the power of the Authority to make contracts and purchases without advertising pursuant to section 3709, Revised Statutes.

In the House it was said by Representative HILL, page 10973, that the language of the amendment as first proposed "gave the Comptroller General more power over the Tennessee Valley Authority than the Comptroller General had over any department or any division of the Government," and that even as modified "it means that the Tennessee Valley Authority cannot even purchase a lead pencil without first coming to Washington and getting the permission of some auditor or other accountant in the Comptroller General's office." In the Senate it was said by Senator MCKELLAR, page 7466, that when he examined the amendment he found that it had a very different purpose from the one he thought was behind it and that "I find also that the Comptroller General does have jurisdiction over the accounting of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for that reason I have changed my mind entirely with reference to the amendment." Under these circumstances the rejection of the amendments may not be viewed as detracting from the effect of the specific language later incorporated in the appropriation acts requiring the funds of the Authority to be covered into and "accounted for" as one fund, even though such procedure was involved as a part of the amendments theretofore rejected.

Moreover, it appears that the Tennessee Valley Authority has consistently been regarded as subject to the budgetary provisions of title II of the Budget and Accounting Act and has followed the regular Budget procedure thereunder in requesting, justifying, and obtaining its appropriations. Section 2 of title I, Definitions, of the Budget and Accounting Act, 42 Statutes 20, provides:

"When used in this act—

"The terms 'department and establishment' and 'department or establishment' mean any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, or other establishment of the Government, including the municipal government of the District of Columbia, but do not include the Legislative Branch of the Government or the Supreme Court of the United States."

This definition is clearly broad enough to include the Tennessee Valley Authority as an "agency, or other establishment of the Government." The definition applies to the whole act; to title III establishing the General Accounting Office as well as to title II establishing the Bureau of the Budget, and it would at least be most incongruous to regard the Tennessee Valley Authority as an agency or other establishment of the Government for the purpose of justifying and obtaining its appropriations pursuant to title II of the act but as not such an agency or estaolishment of the Government when it comes to accounting for the disposition of such appropriations pursuant to title III of the act.

As originally passed by the House of Representatives the bill, H. R. 5081, which became the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, provided in section 10 (b):

"The board shall require a careful and scrutinizing audit and accounting by the General Accounting Office or its successor in performing similar duties, during each governmental fiscal year of operation under this act, and said audit shall be open to inspection to the public at all times, and copies thereof shall be filed in the principal office of the Authority at Muscle Shoals, in the State of Alabama. At least once during each fiscal year the President of the United States shall appoint a firm of certified public accountants of his own choice and selection which shall have free and open access to all books, accounts, plants, warehouses, offices, and all other places and records belonging to or under the control of or used by the Authority in connection with the business authorized by this act. And the expenses of such audit so directed by the President shall be paid by the board and charged as part of the operating expenses of the Authority."

As amended by the Senate and finally enacted there was substituted for these provisions the ones appearing in section 9 (b) of the act, 48 Statute 63, as follows:

"The Comptroller General of the United States shall audit the transactions of the Corporation at such times as he shall determine, but not less frequently than once each governmental fiscal year, with personnel of his selection. In such connection he and his representatives shall have free and open access to all papers, books, records, files, accounts, plants, warehouses, offices, and all other things, property and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation, and shall be afforded full facilities for counting all cash and verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries. He shall make report of each such audit in quadruplicate, one copy for the President of the United States, one for the chairman of the Board, one for public inspection at the principal office of the Corporation, and the other to be retained by him for the uses of the Congress. The expenses for each such audit may be paid from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General. All such audit expenses shall be charged to operating expenses of the Corporation. The Comptroller General shall make special report to the President of the United States and to the Congress of any transaction or condition found by him to be in conflict with the powers or duties entrusted to the Corporation by law."

Thus there was substituted for the provision of the House bill for periodical special audits by outside firms of certified public accountants, in addition to "a careful and scrutinizing audit and accounting by the General Accounting Office," a provision for such periodical audits to be made by the Comptroller General with personnel of his selection. This substitution and the use of much of the same language with respect to such periodical audits strongly indicates they were intended to be of the general character which the House bill contemplated would be made by a firm of certified public accountants, except that they were to be made under the Comptroller General by personnel of his selection instead of by a firm of certified public accountants appointed by the President.

The original provision for having such special periodical audits made by outside firms of certified public accountants denotes no purpose to exempt the Tennessee Valley Authority from general accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act, but such audits were apparently intended to be in addition to the accounting required under that act, and it would follow that this accounting requirement was not changed by the elimination of the provision for audits by outside firms and the substitution therefor of the provision requiring the Comptroller General to make such character of periodical audits. That is, the provisions of section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, supra, were not intended to limit the functions of this office to the duties there prescribed, but such duties were intended to be in addition to those prescribed by general law in the Budget and Accounting Act. That the principle of expressio unius est exclusio alterius does not apply under such circumstances (see *Morgan* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, 28 F. Supp. 732).

As stated above, the various matters involved are not entirely clear. But on the whole record, and in the light of the considerations herein discussed, I am constrained to hold, in the absence of clarifying legislation, that the Tennessee Valley Authority is not exempted from accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act, and that the duties imposed on this office by section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, of making periodic audits of the transactions of the Tennessee Valley Authority are in addition to the duties of settling and adjusting the accounts of the fiscal officers of the Authority pursuant to section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act.

Applying these conclusions will entail primarily (1) the resumption of the procedure of submitting disbursing and collection accounts to this office supported by original vouchers and necessary data for examination here by the Audit Division of this office and settlement as in the case of other Government departments and establishments, subject to review under my personal supervision of any disallowances upon appropriate request therefor, instead of having vouchers examined and exceptions raised as a part of the periodic field audits under section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act; (2) the deposit in this office of Tennessee Valley Authority contracts pursuant to the provisions of section 3743, Revised Statutes, as amended, 41 United States Code 20, requiring that "All contracts to be made, by virtue of any law, and requiring the advance of money, or in any manner connected with

the settlement of public accounts, shall be deposited promptly in the General Accounting Office," and (3) making the periodic field audits pursuant to section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act on a basis as analogous as practicable to that of a financial or balance-sheet audit, and leaving generally to the settlement here of the disbursing accounts such questions as may arise as to the legality of particular expenditures.

Respecting the various points of past differences between the Tennessee Valley Authority and this office as to certain classes of expenditures, I think these should be resolved in the light of the statutory purpose of establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority as a body corporate so that it might have much of the freedom and flexibility of a private business corporation. Prior to the amendment of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act by the act of August 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1080), there was no requirement in the act that purchases and contracts be made after advertising, that apparently being left to the sound discretion of the directors under the broad corporate powers conferred on the Authority, it appearing from the legislative history of the amendment of August 31, 1935, requiring such advertising with exceptions there stipulated, that it was not regarded that the general provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes, were theretofore applicable. The same principle would be true of such matters as the purchase of "rubber boots and goggles, firearms for Authority safety officers, and noiseless typewriters," mentioned in the Authority's memorandum, supra. The records of this office show that the Acting Comptroller General held in intraoffice instructions of December 16, 1936, that the corporate powers conferred on the Authority to purchase and condemn real property carries with it the power to determine the validity of the title to be acquired and, accordingly, that section 355, Revised Statutes, requiring generally the approval of titles by the Attorney General, does not necessarily apply to acquisitions of real property under such powers. This view of the matter appears to be confirmed by the provision cited in the Authority's memorandum, supra, from the act of October 9, 1940 (Public, No. 825), revising said section 355, Revised Statutes, that "The foregoing provisions of this section shall not be construed to affect in any manner any existing provisions of law which are applicable to the acquisition of lands or interests in land by the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Respecting the certificates of settlement covering the period from July 8, 1933, to July 1, 1934, and the pending audit reports for subsequent years, you are advised that if the Authority will submit a statement indicating as to each disallowed item or exception—either directly or by reference to prior statements—the Authority's reason or reasons for disagreement, such items will be reviewed on the basis of the principles herein stated with a view to the allowance of credit and the removal of exceptions where such action appears justified, and the settlements and reports will be revised accordingly. Such action should be taken as promptly as possible so that revised audit reports may then be submitted to the Authority without further delay for the Authority's statements to be filed with the final reports pursuant to section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended.

In the absence of further legislation determining otherwise the matter of the Authority's accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act, arrangements should be made as early as practicable to render accounts to this office supported by original vouchers and data for examination and settlement here, and to deposit contracts in this office as required by section 3743, Revised Statutes, supra.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Government Space in New York City

REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, I called to your attention the conditions existing here in the Nation's Capital. As a result of the big influx of Government workers there is a scarcity of housing facilities and the available office space is not sufficient, in my opinion, to meet the requirements of the rapidly expanding Government departments. In addition to the need for added space on the part of the Government, there is also a demand on the part of private business for office space and housing facilities for the many employees who must necessarily be present here in Washington in connection with the defense program.

Today, I again wish to remind the House that local conditions are becoming worse and the need for action is most pressing. It has been suggested that several of the departments occupying valuable space here could be easily transferred to other cities where there is unlimited facilities in the housing and office fields. Such a transfer would serve a twofold purpose; first, it would allow the departments performing vital services in the defense program to expand, and secondly, the employees that would follow the transfer of the departments, would find housing accommodations more plentiful and at a more reasonable cost. In addition to all of the other reasons why it would be well to make a shift in certain departments, is the heavy load placed upon the transportation companies, electric-light company, telephone company, and the restaurants by the folks now in residence here.

The real-estate division of the Department of Commerce of New York City has had representatives here in Washington making personal calls on the various heads of departments outlining to them the type and cost of office space in New York City. There are more than 5,000,000 square feet of office space which might be occupied at once at an average rental of $1.25 per square foot, a rate which compares most favorably with the rate charged in this city.

I particularly referred to the advisability of transferring the Maritime Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission to New York, because practically all of their work originates in that city. It is interesting to note that the building at 24 Broad Street, New York City, adjoining the Stock Exchange, has been offered to the Government on the basis of a rental of $1 a year. Could you find a more appropriate or convenient location for the Securities and Exchange Commission? Certainly, you could not obtain space at a more reasonable rental.

I hope that the Members of the House will join with me in my efforts to move some of the departments out of Washington to other cities and by so doing, relieve the congestion here, thereby increasing the efficiency of the employees and the departments and at once increasing the limited housing facilities which are so badly needed at this time, here in the Capital of the world.

Resignation of Chief Justice Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the announcement in this morning's press of the resignation of the Chief Justice of the United States, Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, brings a feeling of great regret. With his retirement, which unfortunately is motivated by considerations of health and age, he closes an outstanding career of public service, extending over a third of a century.

As Chief Justice since 1930, he has come to symbolize, in the public mind, the majesty and dignity of the Supreme Court and the impartiality of its proceedings. His stately appearance and noble countenance commanded respect and confidence.

As the Washington Post so well states, his retirement "is like the passing of a landmark from the national scene."

Few men ever had so distinguished a career as Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, or left so great an imprint upon the events of the Nation. As a young member of the bar, his public service, and with it his rise to fame, began with his investigation, first, of gas rates and then of insurance companies as counsel to commissions set up by the New York Legislature. His disclosures in connection with these inquires swept him into the Governorship of New York State, in which capacity he served two terms. It was during the latter part of his second term as Governor that he was named by President Taft as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, which office he assumed on October 10, 1910. As a new member of the Court, he represented a liberal viewpoint, based on fundamental constitutional principles.

In 1916 the Republican Party chose Justice Hughes as its nominee for the office of President of the United States, and, in one of the most dramatic elections ever held in this country, he was denied the Presidency by the small margin of 3,777 votes. It will be recalled that he was at first thought to have been elected, until the late returns from California gave President Wilson that State's electoral votes and with them the election.

Following his defeat for the Presidency, Mr. Hughes resumed the practice of law. However, when Warren G. Harding was elected President, he asked the former Justice to become his Secretary of State. Mr. Hughes filled the office with great distinction for 4 years,

from 1921 to 1925, after which he returned to the practice of law.

When illness forced Chief Justice Taft to resign on February 3, 1930, President Hoover the same day nominated Mr. Hughes to that office. His nomination was confirmed by the Senate on February 14, 1930.

The Washington Daily News, in its editorial today, pays tribute to Mr. Chief Justice Hughes in the following language:

Although he is 79, and his retirement has been long predicted, still it is a shock to see him step out of a public life that he has adorned in so many high capacities. His very physical presence, his kindly dignity which invariably commands the word "Olympian," his massive frame, and splendid beard have been a sort of symbol in this country—a symbol of the benignant powers and protections that issue from the basic law.

But the Chief Justice has been much more than a symbol. There is no need to recall in this space the record of his public service; suffice it to say that, whether as legislative counsel, or Governor, or Presidential candidate, or Secretary of State, or Chief Justice, he has served his country well.

Not that he has been immune to criticism. In the early days when he was letting daylight into the corrupt practices of the insurance kings he was pilloried as a radical. Later, as a corporation lawyer, he was abused as a reactionary. And on the bench he has grown used to sharp words from both left and right.

The fact is, it seems to us, that he has been neither radical nor reactionary, but rather the inheritor of the mantle of the great compromisers who sought to smooth the history of this country's middle years. It is commonly thought that his generalship, his skill at give and take, at steering a course between the election returns and the precedents helped mightily to preserve the Supreme Court from degradation in the crisis of 1937.

The writer of the editorial concludes with the thought that "we do not envy President Roosevelt his task of choosing a Chief Justice who will not look too small in the chair of Justice Hughes." It will indeed be difficult to find a man who will measure up to his stature.

I am sure I speak the sentiment of the House when I say that while we have a selfish regret in his retirement we sympathize with his desire to lay aside the cares of his high office after so many years of faithful and distinguished service, and wish that his health may be fully restored and that he may enjoy many more years of life.

As Secretary Helen M. Boyer Saw It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

LETTER OF A CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the Congressman was ill, but the letter to the home folks had to go out, so the secretary wrote it, and here is her idea of the news of the week:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

One of the most interesting results of the President's message to the Nation and to the world, heralded as an epoch-making event, is the reactions it has produced. Those who are in sympathy with the President's foreign policy hail it as a clear-cut outline of the course we should follow. Those who disagree say it is but another effort to confuse the people; that it says nothing that the President has not said before, except that it brings us just that much nearer to the accomplishment of his purpose, that is, our active participation in the war.

Since the delivery of the President's message, I received a letter from a resident of the District, inquiring as to what the President meant and what he would do now. Well, as the saying goes, "That is a poser." We all know from past experience that what the President says does not necessarily indicate what he will do. Quoting from a Pennsylvania daily:

"What the President said, for the most part he had said before. * * * What the President meant is another matter for which his fellow citizens will wait patiently while he interprets his meaning in his acts. Meanwhile, question marks must stand in the place of interpretations."

What the President did not say was what we are to use for the destroying of the Axis Powers, just where the battle is to be fought, or what we are to do with Germany after she has been defeated. Are we to join the British in a new nobility, with a few American lords, and establish a ruling class in Germany, to be maintained by the armed forces of America, paid for by her taxpayers?

OIL

Mr. Ickes, the august Secretary of the Interior, holds, by appointment from the President, the position of Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense, and it is his duty to make recommendations with regard to that product. One news commentator has stated that, under the unlimited emergency declaration of the President, the recommendations of Mr. Ickes for the conservation of our oil supply would virtually amount to decrees. Mr. Ickes says that, because transportation facilities have been greatly curtailed by the taking over of oil tankers for defense purposes, unless some arrangement can be made to transport oil, our citizens may have "gasless Sundays," and that the price of gasoline may skyrocket.

The threatened oil shortage is causing grave concern and it has been indicated that President Roosevelt may take steps to eliminate any possibility of interruption of the national-defense program. He already has warned that "restriction of oil consumption to essential uses" is a "distinct possibility" and has urged Congress to authorize acquisition of rights-of-way to provide for construction of oil pipe lines from the South to the East.

In this connection, it is a little difficult to understand the policy of the Government in permitting oil exports to Japan. In March, last, America shipped more than 1,500,000 barrels of oil to Japan, and this was about one-third of former shipments. To quote the President of the Honolulu Oil Corporation:

"All American oil companies have told State Department officials that they are prepared to halt these shipments, but we have not received such instructions."

UNITED STATES TO TRAIN BRITISH PILOTS

Secretary of War Stimson has announced that June 7 will see the beginning of a program to train Britons as Royal Air Force airmen in the United States. The plan calls for the training of 4,000 as fighter and bomber pilots annually through the same instruction as now given for flying cadets of the Army Air Corps; annual training of 3,000 as fighter and bomber pilots according to Royal Air Force course of instruction, and the training of approximately 1,000 annually as aerial navigators.

MORE BILLIONS

During the week beginning June 2 the House is scheduled to begin consideration of the War Department appropriation bill, which calls for appropriations of approximately $9,000,000,000. And can you remember back to 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, when the average total appropriation for the operation of the entire Government was a little over $4,000,000,000?

Tennessee Valley Authority

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the greatest safeguard that this country has against usurpation on the part of the Executive is the auditing of the accounts of the different agencies of the Government by the Comptroller General. In this connection, I call attention particularly to the letter sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Comptroller General, Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, on the 2d day of June 1941, wherein he reports to the Congress the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority has defied the Comptroller General and refuses to submit its original accounts and vouchers to the Comptroller General with every audit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Corporation Normal Profits and Excess Profits Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

STATEMENT BY JAMES F. STILES, JR., VICE PRESIDENT AND TREASURER, ABBOTT LABORATORIES, NORTH CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the 1941 tax bill is one of the most important documents in American history. By its

provisions, our great Republic apportions among its citizens the enormous cost of unprecedented appropriations for national defense. We must make every effort to distribute these burdens with justice and sound judgment.

Mr. James F. Stiles, Jr., is a businessman who has been a serious student of taxation. In his recent appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee, he made recommendations which deserve our careful consideration.

The statement follows:

The problem of taxing equitably growing companies is unquestionably one of the most difficult which we have to face. The fair application of an excess-profits tax seems to me to be even more puzzling. The fact that you have recognized the unjust discrimination which the original revenue bill of 1940 worked against growth companies and corrected it in part by H. R. 3531 was most encouraging. In fact, your attitude in that matter, especially your prompt action on sections 713 and 742, inspired me with sufficient courage to request a hearing before this committee if for no other reason than to express my sincere appreciation of your action.

I have a problem which my company and hundreds of other relatively small growing organizations face in connection with the excess-profits tax if it remains as it now stands. I feel it is a privilege to present that problem to you, and at the same time also submit to you what seems to me to be a simple and fair solution.

I am convinced that while it is necessary for you to levy, and all of us to pay, all the taxes that can be raised, it is not your intention to tax normal profits of any company as excess profits, when it is possible to determine what are normal profits.

Every growing organization today must, through constant research and development work discover better means of making new and more useful consumer goods which must be sold for less money if they expect to keep on growing. Such companies form the backbone of our normal peacetime economy. Their discoveries during the past have made, and in time to come will continue to make, our country outstanding in the world in that respect.

If such growth companies by reason of their research are able to contribute to the economic welfare of our Nation, and in so doing increase not only their profit but their pay roll, then I believe you will agree with me that at least that increase in profit which bears the same relationship to their pay roll as their normal profit bore to their pay roll during the base period is and can be justly called normal profits.

I, therefore, submit to you for your consideration the following simple formula for determining normal profits of a growing company:

Determine the average ratio during the base period of pay roll (subject to social-security taxes) to net profit (net income after deduction of normal tax) and use such ratio to determine the base credit for normal profits in each subsequent year, for example:

Total pay roll (subject to social-security taxes):	
1936	$1,000,000
1937	1,500,000
1938	1,400,000
1939	2,100,000
Total	6,000,000
Net profit (after deduction of normal tax):	
1936	600,000
1937	900,000
1938	800,000
1939	1,200,000
Total	3,500,000

Net profit—58.33⅓ percent of total pay roll subject to social-security tax.

1941 pay roll: $3,000,000×58.33⅓ percent—$1,750,000, which becomes base credit for the year 1941 to be used to determine excess profits.

1941 net profit after normal tax	$2,500,000
1941 base credit allowed as normal profit	1,750,000
Subject to excess-profits tax	750,000

In presenting this formula for determining normal profits in a growing company, I desire to make very clear the following:

(1) It is not offered as a substitute for any of the present methods but as an additional provision or yardstick.

(2) It is not offered as a panacea for all difficulties nor do I presume to say it is the only method. I it is a simple, logical, and fair one.

(3) I do believe its adoption will definitely encourage those companies, whose pay roll in the lower brackets expands as they grow, to keep on growing—and thus they will pay more normal tax plus excess-profits tax if their net profit after normal tax increases faster than their pay roll.

(4) If adopted as an additional alternative, I believe it will very definitely be an incentive to cooperation in increasing employment, stimulate research and development work, and thereby strengthen our national industrial relationships.

(5) Its simplicity makes it easily understood and at the same time it can be applied to thousands of organizations which operated at a profit during the base period, each one of which might have a different relationship between pay roll (subject to social-security tax) and net profits (after normal tax), depending on many factors peculiar to their own business.

(6) I believe that growing organizations will play a vital part in the economic readjustment which must take place after the defense spending is discontinued. The knowledge they acquire by continuous research and development work, as well as the steady employment and normal profits which will arise by new discoveries, will not only help to pay the defense bill but put us in a position as a nation to meet competition in the new world relationships which will arise after this conflict is over. Certainly we need not and must not stop all present development and postpone all progress until the emergency is over.

All this formula does is to use the average earnings method with pay roll (up to $3,000 annual salary per employee) as a common denominator. It says to every one of us:

"If you are a growing corporation, if your nondefense business and your profits increase, and if at the same time your pay roll increases in the same proportion, then your growth is normal; the kind we wish to permit and encourage; and your profits will correspondingly be considered normal."

It does not interfere with the defense program but it does encourage industries to keep on growing and find new ways to replace materials now needed for defense. It rewards them for putting men to work—which will be the real problem when the defense spending stops.

The success, nay even the preservation, of our entire economic system will depend on what we can and will do after this great struggle is over.

This suggestion in a sense involves a little long-distance planning. One thing is certain: It does not take away from anyone any other benefit the present law gives him. It would focus some attention on employment in the lower-income brackets, which I am sure you will agree is a good thing for everyone.

I have suggested that "this option should not apply to any part of a corporation's profits arising directly out of defense contracts or subcontracts." In making this suggestion I had no thought of profiting by increased employment due directly to defense spending.

I believe that this formula should not be applicable to any company whose net profits after normal tax exceeded its pay roll, but your committee with the aid of your experts can decide that question better than I can.

The idea that capital alone makes profit is fundamentally wrong. Only when capital employs "human effort" or when it is loaned to an enterprise which employs "human effort" is economic value created and profits accrue to the entrepreneur. Therefore, pay roll, the basis for compensating the producer of economic wealth, related to the net value of what he creates (profits) is to my way of thinking a practical, simple yardstick for measuring normal profits.

Finally, these growing companies in the main supply the peacetime requirements of our Nation. For that reason they could and did maintain employment during the depression. The continuous production of such commodities and the development of new products should maintain a supply of needed goods which in itself will help offset dangerous inflationary price tendencies at least in the products which they produce.

Federal Mediation Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in these critical days when the fate of our democratic world hangs in the balance I hope I will be pardoned if I attempt to discuss, through the medium of two cracker-box philosophers, one important current event.

In order to center attention on the Federal Mediation Board and its brilliant chairman, Dr. Clarence A. Dykstra, I have listened in, so to speak, on an argument between "Old Bill" and his crotchety friend "Si" and am here reporting their reactions to one of the phases of the strike problem.

Old Bill hunched his shoulders and observed: "I been a-readin' in the newspapers that that there Board that the President appointed has been settling strikes."

"They sure have!" said Si.

"Well," says Old Bill, " 'taint no surprise to me. That there President of ours is one wise feller. He done picked a good Dutchman. Not no German, but a real Dutchman, that there feller Dykestraw. Oh, maybe his name ain't got no 'w' on the end of it, but that don't signify nothin'. Dykes is the salvation of the Dutchmen. If 'twer'nt for the dykes in them there Netherlands the whole country would be under water. But, jest the same, that there feller Dykestra, or Dykestraw, that makes no odds, is one fine feller. He used to be a perfessor, out California way, that's agin him I admit. But perfessor or not, he went ter Cincinnati and he sure did a whackin' job in that there city."

"But," observed Si, "what's that got to do with strikes?"

"Well, ye pesky old varmint, it's got a lot to do with strikes! This here feller Dykestra, I'm usin' your own spellin', is, what all sensible people call a realist. He ain't a union partisan. He ain't no Democrat partisan, he ain't no Republican partisan, he's an American partisan. He looks on a strike as something that interferes with national defense and with aid to the democrats, that is furriner democrats. I ain't never been too sure about them furriner democrats, but a friend of mine onct told me that them there Greeks really invented democrats. Anybody that invented democrats is got my sympathy. I always thought that Jefferson invented democrats, but the feller that I talked to argeed so well that I was fool enough to agree with him that the Greeks really invented democrats. That bein' so, I'm for them there Greeks. I don't like their cookin' but I'm still for 'em."

"Let's see. That there Board, headed by a Dutchman, did settle some strikes. No doubt about it. That there Allis-Chalmers fandango was a-goin' strong after about 70 days, wasn't it? Well, old Dyke and his pals finally got a shot at it, and bingo, it was over. I say Dyke and his pals because I happen to know Dyke. I happen to know that he is one smart feller. He's one of them perfesser fellers that keeps his feet on the ground."

"Oh!" observed Si. "He's one of them practical idealists. I read them there words in a book. I had to spell out most of the stuff and it didn't mean much to me, but that there 'practical idealist' thing kind of made sense."

"Well," observed Old Bill, "this here town, Bass Center, is not as bad off as I thought it was. If Si can get it through his thick head that there be such a animal as a practical idealist, then it is a sure bet that there must be about 100,000,000 peepul who can understand it. That's turrible encouraging. I just do hope that them there Congressmen, the fellers that represent the peepul, will also see the pint.

"Of course, what the highbrow fellers call the 'processes of democracy' are jest in our blood. We believe that democracy is not just a name but a principul. I'm still sorry we didn't invent it, but we've invented almost everythin' else, so Hoo ray! for them furriners, the Greeks, I mean."

"What do you mean, feller, by the processes of democracy?" asked Si.

"I mean jest what I say. I mean that in this here country, which ain't no furrin country, that democracy means just this. It means that we fellers, ignorant, bawdy, illiterate—thems words I read in a book—are still the fellers that say what's what. As long as we can say that we are Democrats—oh, I know the highbrow fellers say that's democracy—but I ain't no fussboddy about words. I am one of the fellers that is strong fer action. That's what the President's Board got. Action. Even if a Dutchman is chairman of that there Board, I'm still fer him. He is like that other Dutchman that stuck his hand in the hole in the dyke—he stopped the flood. That's the kind of action I go fer."

Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM COLDWATER (MICH.) DAILY REPORTER

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include excellent editorial comment by Mr. Roy Newberry, editor of the Coldwater (Mich.) Daily Reporter, in the issue of Wednesday, May 28, 1941:

[From the Coldwater (Mich.) Daily Reporter of May 28, 1941]

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Before our soldier boys march away to battle for "the freedom of the seas"—an issue which was declared paramount in President Roosevelt's fireside talk last night—why not let someone define the expression so that those of us who listened in may understand it?

Since the war first started the "seas" have been far from free. Thousands of men, women, and children have found watery graves in blockades of shipping lines and millions of tons of boats and cargo have come to rest in Davy Jones' locker. A very large percentage of the shipping loss has been British, but Germany has suffered, and is still suffering, terrific losses.

One of the first objectives of Britannia has been to "rule the waves" and she has in bygone years made very little bones about it and has heralded the fact in song and story. One of the first objectives of that same Britannia today is to "rule the waves" with a "far-flung battle line" so that Germany may be deprived of the sinews of war.

Can America expect or look for "freedom of the seas" under the conditions which prevail in Europe today? Can America with all its resources establish and maintain such freedom? To assume such a possibility is pretty farfetched and the best America can hope for is to restore to Britannia her fabled prestige of bygone days when she, by sheer force of naval supremacy, arrogantly commanded the lanes of commerce of the seven seas.

And if our boys die, they will die fighting England's battles. Is that to be the great aim of national devotion? Is that to be the objective of our patriotism and loyalty?

Life and Character of Jefferson Davis, the First and Only President of the Confederacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALL DOXEY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. WALL DOXEY, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me today, June 3, 1941, on the life and character of Jefferson Davis, at the foot of his statue in Statuary Hall, United States Capitol, commemorating his one hundred and thirty-third birthday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it has been said, "A people pays tribute to itself when it gives due recognition to true greatness."

Today we as a united Nation honor ourselves by commemorating the birthday of that great soldier, leader, patriot, and statesman—Jefferson Davis.

Here in the most beautiful Capitol of the greatest Nation on earth—here in historic Statuary Hall, the Nation's Hall of Fame, at the feet of this imperishable bronze statue presented to this Nation by the great State of Mississippi as one of her two favorite sons, we gather to pay tribute, honor, and devotion to the first and only President of the Confederacy—Jefferson Davis.

One hundred and thirty-three years ago today, Jefferson Davis was born in what is now Fairview, Todd County, formerly Christian County, Ky., on June 3, 1808.

Early in life he moved with his parents to Wilkinson County, Miss. He was well educated and was graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.

As a very young man he served with distinction in the Indian Wars and made a name for himself as a gallant soldier.

He resigned from the Army and married Miss Sarah Knox Taylor, daughter of Col. Zachary Taylor, afterward President of the United States. They went to his plantation—"Briarfield" in Warren County, Miss., about 20 miles below Vicksburg. In a few months, however, his wife died, and for some years he lived in great seclusion, but in valuable preparation for his future career, as his time was spent in wide reading, constant study, and deep thought.

His entrance into political life was in 1842 when he was elected to the Twenty-ninth Congress as a Democrat from Mississippi, and served as Congressman-at-large from Mississippi in this very hall in which we are now gathered.

He shortly resigned to take command of the First Regiment of Mississippi Riflemen in the War with Mexico in 1846. His distinguished and gallant service in the Mexican War, especially at the seige of Monterey and at the Battle of Buena Vista, is well known to all of us.

He served as United States Senator from Mississippi and was appointed Secretary of War by President Pierce and served 4 years.

Then he was again elected to the United States Senate and served in that body as a Senator from Mississippi from March 4, 1857, until January 21, 1861, when with other southern Senators he withdrew from the Senate.

He was chosen President of the Confederacy by the Provisional Congress and was elected by the Confederacy as President of the Confederacy, serving as President of the Confederacy during the duration of the War between the States.

He was captured by the Union forces, imprisoned for 2 years, indicted for treason, released on bail, and his case was finally nolle prosequi by the Federal Government.

He returned to his beautiful home, "Beauvoir," on the Gulf coast of Mississippi, where he spent the remaining years of his life. Here he prepared his great book on the Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government.

During these trying years, one of the great sustaining forces of his life was his second wife, Varina Howell Davis, of Natchez, Miss., whom he married in 1845. She shared with

him the glory and honor of achievement, together with the sorrow and humiliation of defeat, having those strong, heroic qualities of character that enabled her to bear, with matchless fortitude, the varying fortunes of her eventful life.

When he was a prisoner in Fortress Monroe, she plead for the privilege of sharing his imprisonment, and during the last year of his captivity this was granted and she was with him, cheering and encouraging him.

As his faithful companion and comforter, Mrs. Davis fully met the demands of misfortune as she had his years of success.

He died December 6, 1889, and is buried in Hollywood Cemetery, Richmond, Va., the city where he was inaugurated president of the Confederacy.

Mrs. Davis survived him for some years, and in these years did honor to his memory in her excellent biography, Memoirs of Jefferson Davis, in which she presents him as he was: "The great soldier, marked and fitted for more than fame; the citizen, fashioned in the old faithful type; the Christian, who was a lover of all high and righteous things."

Before the death of Mrs. Davis, which occurred October 16, 1906, she gave to the State of Mississippi, as a home for Confederate soldiers, beautiful Beauvoir, the last home of Jefferson Davis.

On this very day Beauvoir is being dedicated as a national shrine to be known as Jefferson Davis Shrine.

Truly this favorite son of the South was a wonderful man with a remarkable life. He lived in the bosom of his country, friends, and family.

This afternoon, as we gaze upon this beautiful statue and pay homage to his memory, we as Americans are inspired and thrilled by his eventful life and brilliant yet tragic career.

This country will never again produce a man who was idolized more by some and spurned more by others. However, through it all he was a man among men, a leader among leaders.

In peace as well as in war, he always played a commanding part and gave his all for others and the country he loved so well.

As time goes on and the history of this great country is written and rewritten, the name of Jefferson Davis will be listed among the bravest of the brave. Truly one of God's noblemen.

At this critical time when the war clouds again hover over these United States and as a united people, believing in the principles of democracy, our pleasant way of life is being threatened, we as sons and daughters, grandsons, and granddaughters of men and women who have made this country great and powerful should cry out, "Give us more men and leaders whose souls are inspired with lofty ideals and noble purposes as was the soul of Jefferson Davis."

Congress a Mere Reichstag—a Totalitarian Government Established in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following special to the New York Sun under date of May 31, 1941:

[From the New York Sun of May 31, 1941]

PRESIDENT'S POWERS GROW VAST AND CONGRESS HAS FEW LEFT—COMING GRANT OF AUTHORITY IN R. F. C. BILL WILL MAKE HIM ALMOST AS SUPREME AS TOTALITARIAN DICTATORS

(By Phelps Adams)

WASHINGTON, May 31.—Congress, already reduced to the status of a mere kibitzer on the Washington scene, was moving rapidly today to confer on President Roosevelt the broadest grant of authority he has received since the enactment of the lease-lend bill.

Today the President is perhaps almost as independent of Congress as the foreign dictators are of the parliamentary bodies of their own respective lands. By his emergency proclamation of last Tuesday he has seized the extraordinary powers conferred on all past Presidents in time of war. In addition, he wields many other powers which Congress has delegated to him during the last 8 years as the country has progressed from one emergency to another—powers specifically vested in Congress by the Constitution, but now exercised by the Executive.

In actual practice Congress today performs only three functions in connection with the crisis which confronts the Nation: It levies taxes, it appropriates money, and it passes bills giving away more of its power to the President.

ONLY ONE MAJOR FUNCTION LEFT

This third function is becoming less and less important as more and more of its power goes to the White House. The second has already been delegated to the President in large measure under the Lease-Lend Act, and under the pending R. F. C. bill, which gives the administration vast sums to spend at its own discretion without further consent by Congress.

Only the first function—the levying of taxes—remains the exclusive task of Congress, and it is to this duty that the legislative branch is expected to devote the major part of its attention during the next 2 or 3 months.

Theoretically, of course, and constitutionally, the Congress also retains the exclusive right to declare war, but the President, as Commander in Chief of both the Army and Navy, can plunge the Nation into an undeclared war anywhere in the world, and send troops, planes, and ships to fight in that war.

So Congress daily becomes a factor of smaller importance in the affairs of Government, doing less and less about more and more as time passes, and Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, isolationist, of Montana, in a radio address this week, pointed out that the President, in his dramatic fireside chat to the Nation, did not bother anywhere in the course of his 45-minute address to so much as mention the Congress of the United States.

The new powers which Congress is expected to hand over to the Executive during the coming week are embraced—almost parenthetically—in a bill to increase the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and so sweeping is their scope that critics of the measure have charged that it would enable the President and Federal Loan Administrator Jesse Jones to create a Fascist state.

The legislation itself is in the form of an amendment to existing provisions of law enacted several months ago, when the Congress expanded the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank to permit a wholesale program of loans to South American republics in promotion of the good-neighbor policy.

At that time the R. F. C. was given authority to create or organize governmental corporations to implement the national-defense program by performing various functions set forth in the law in precise terms. These corporations were empowered to produce or acquire strategic materials needed in the rearmament effort; to buy or lease land and build or expand and equip plants for the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; to lease these new plants to private operators or to operate them directly under a Government agency.

It will be noted, however, that this language limited the administration to the creation of corporations empowered only to manufacture arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

PROPOSED LIMITATIONS BEATEN

The new legislation which has been passed by both Houses of Congress in slightly different forms and is now in a conference committee of the two Houses where those differences are to be composed, would wipe out that limitation entirely by the mere addition of the words "and to take such other action as the President and the Federal Loan Administrator may deem necessary to expedite the national-defense program."

In other words, the President and Mr. Jones are authorized to create corporations empowered to do anything that the administration may desire to have done, and the only limitation imposed upon them under the language of the House version of the bill is that the R. F. C. may not have more than $100,000,000 outstanding under this particular provision of the law at any one time.

Critics of the bill were quick to point out that it would permit the President, for example, to proceed immediately with the construction of the St. Lawrence River power project despite the fact that Congress once refused to authorize it, and would enable him further to revive the Passamaquoddy tidal-power scheme and the Florida ship canal despite the action of Congress in killing both projects.

To meet this objection the R. F. C. itself recommended an amendment to the language of the bill which would have specifically outlawed the expenditure of funds on the St. Lawrence, Passamaquoddy, the Florida ship canal, or the Tombigbee River project; but under the White House lash administration forces in the Congress beat down all attempts to write these limitations into the bill.

WEAKENING THE NEUTRALITY ACT

Of interest to observers here, too, was the fact that while the President disavowed at his press conference this week any present intention of seeking revision of the Neutrality Act, this bill would further erase from that battered law a proscription against the extention of loans to belligerent nations. The bill specifically authorizes the R. F. C. to lend money to foreign governments who can provide collateral in the form of American securities, either governmental or private.

Representative JESSE H. WOLCOTT, Michigan, Republican, who led the opposition forces in the House when the measure was under consideration, pointed out today that the language of the bill was so loose that a foreign government could create an American corporation with whatever capital it desired and then use the stock of that corporation as collateral for a loan from the R. F. C.

The principal virtue of the bill, of course, lies in the fact that it disposes of large quantities of red tape, permitting the President to move quickly to meet some defense program need not now foreseen, but its fault lies in the fact that the abuse of the broad power it bequeathes would permit the President virtually to wipe out any private industry that he might wish to obliterate, whether or not that industry was in fact connected in any way with the defense program.

Shall We Submit to a Supreme Personal Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I personally feel that it can be stated with much truth that the people of the United States, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, has embarked upon the most gigantic and far reaching program ever undertaken by any people. In making this observation, I do not in the least except the program of England in creating and attempting to manage the whole British Empire. Our specific and categorical commitments to Canada and all of Latin America; our historically entrenched entanglements in the Philippine Islands and their relation to the far eastern problems; and our recent enunciations with reference to the "four freedoms," acting as an arsenal of ideas, of food, of manufactured equipment of all kinds, and of financial resources and raw materials all constitute a considerable program. Are our people mentally prepared to proceed to a successful conclusion of this ambitious program? Speaking very frankly, I do not believe they are and this, because they have not been given specific and sufficient information in the form of facts to prepare them for the great undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, we can well afford to go back and carefully review the political history of England from 1933 to 1939, both inclusive. We can well afford to carefully study the debates in the House of Commons and observe the excuses, the alibis, if you please, the specious arguments presented by the political leaders of England during all of the 7-year period. It would be well for us to compare that period and many of its developments with many of the presentations being made in our own country at this very hour and the things we are not accomplishing. In addressing my remarks to one of our very important Cabinet members just the other day, I observed that I personally felt the administration and the Cabinet were almost criminal in their pussyfooting attitude, plans, and procedure. Any fairly intelligent person who cares to inform himself must conclude that we are making such a slight degree of progress in our defense approach, in our preparation for a defensive war, in our preparation for carrying out the obligations announced by the President, that it is all no less than criminal against our people.

Mr. Virgil Jordan, president of the National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., in his address of May 21, 1941, made some very pertinent observations, which I now submit for the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF VIRGIL JORDAN, PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE BOARD, BEFORE THE GENERAL SESSION OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD IN TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 21, 1941

In the minds of millions of Americans today there moves the shapeless shadow of a nameless fear which confuses their spirit and paralyzes their efforts. They sense that they stand in the same profound peril as the people of the French Republic 2 years ago, and the people of the British Empire today. The roots of that peril reach deep into the same dark morass of indifference, delusion, deception, and moral disintegration in which the people of France wandered till they were destroyed. We know that by that defeat and those which have followed it, vast satanic forces of evil festering for centuries in the poisonous swamps of political perfidy and exploitation in Europe and Asia have been let loose to range the world, infecting the spirits of men everywhere, corrupting their integrity, crippling their creative power, crushing their bodies and shattering their civilized life. We know that by the blindness and indolence of their leaders toward this peril in their time and place, the people of Britain may soon be beaten or absorbed into submission and their Empire broken. We know that when this is done we must stand alone in a world laid waste to face in utter isolation these powers of darkness which have destroyed it, and bear the solitary burden of battle with them, or become their final victim, as all others did who failed to defend themselves in time because their leadership was too false, too feeble, or too faithless. Though few among them can even imagine its meaning, many Americans are beginning to be dimly aware that we, too, have been out-tooled, out-armed, out-witted, and outstripped, as these others were, and that by unseen and silent disintegration and dissipation of the community resources we may suddenly find ourselves, like them, silently absorbed by the enemy, and subjected to its power, though we never see the invader's uniform, his airplanes, or his fleet.

The peril and the fear which so many Americans sense today lie deeper in their hearts than any prospect of destruction and death by the battleships or bombers of any enemy abroad. They could face a foreign foe with confidence and courage, and find leadership for such a struggle, if they did not feel that even in victory they still must face for an indefinite future the same enemy among and within themselves. The grim Guggernaut of supreme personal government in Germany, Japan, Italy, and Soviet Russia seems to many of them merely a magnified image of their own—its insect society in human form a mere reflection of themselves in the mirror of modern life. Millions of Americans today already feel like refugees in their own land, much more than those who have fled to it from others. They are beginning to believe that the America they have known and loved has already disappeared, its essential spirit of expansive faith in human freedom long since surrendered, absorbed, and submerged in the spirit of the ancient world, the normal world of those Asiatic hordes and European masses of humanity who for untold centuries have been concerned solely with bare subsistence and sheer survival.

They feel that long before the war began, or their Government invoked their aid in it, the democracy they are asked to deliver to the oppressed peoples of this ancient world had died or been destroyed in every nation involved in it, and their own as well. They fear that by blind pursuit of absolute personal and group power in their political life, and their passive and complacent acceptance of its bribes for their ballots, the great American experiment in human freedom has ended. They have seen the control of their Government pass out of their hands and become a private personal and group interest, as it is everywhere else in the world, an entity separate from themselves, to which their life, their labor, and their resources are dedicated, and for whose sustenance and nourishment they must henceforth live, work, and die. By their self-centered indifference and lack of foresight they have seen the initiative in creative community effort for security and for productive cooperation of labor, management, and tool-providers in the community pass to the sterile hands of the state, to be exploited for purposes of political power. They have seen that imperative and indispensable copartner of all democracy, their productive enterprise, subtly undermined and destroyed, the consumers it serves absorbed into the single stomach of the absolute state, and its management and labor transformed into camp followers or kitchen police of the political commissariat. They have seen the willingness and the strength of great masses of their fellow-men, and of themselves, to assume the risks and make the sacrifices of life and labor wane and weaken, to be replaced by a persistent search for passive security and ease at any price, which they expect someone else to pay. They have seen one group after another among them recklessly destroy for some immediate imagined advantage to themselves those constitutional and institutional defenses of freedom and justice upon which these and all the rest of us must one day depend for our very survival, knowing that those who take the sword of the supreme state into their own hands for purposes of personal or group power shall perish by that sword.

They have been told, by those who ought to know, that in all these things they are seeing beaten out before their eyes on the anvil of experience, in blood and bitterness, by shattering bombs and subtle brains, a new world, not so brave as the old, but more orderly and less dangerous and hard, in which the gods of some omniscient management or some providential political power will give them their daily groceries and gadgets without risk, sacrifice, responsibility or cost.

They are dimly aware that in the delirious drive of their leaders in this messianic mission their minds are being deliberately kneaded like dough—and with it—and their emotions insistently needled by drugs of ignorance and deception into participation in a cosmic crusade to save for others something they have lost or wasted for themselves.

Seeing everywhere the violent and reckless struggle for personal and group advantage and gain, the devious evasion, the contemptuous flippancy, the complacent arrogance toward the community which accompany the conduct of this holy crusade for the rescue of democracy on the part of government, labor, and business management, they wonder whether this war for which their sacrifices are demanded is not indeed a mere incident in the domestic framework of American life—a mere incident of the same divine mission of permanent power to which its protagonists in Europe and Asia consider themselves called by God. If this be true, they fear that, long after the struggle to bring freedom to other nations shall have ended, whether in success or failure, the struggle to find it for themselves will only have begun again, and must go on for generations still unborn.

Sensing these things they wonder where and what is the freedom they are to defend. Where, then, and what, the dower of democracy with which they are to endow the world? If these things be blessings, why did these peoples of Europe and their leaders not fight for them to the bitter end, and if they did not, how can we deliver them who are in bondage to the same master as ourselves and

like them have sold our birthright for the same mess of pottage?

So, when we search our hearts for the source of that pervasive fear which cripples and confuses our efforts in this crisis, whether we see our danger at home or abroad, we find that those powers of darkness which dismay us rise in the end out of those deep-seated weaknesses of spirit which have developed in the past quarter century in the people of our own and other countries, and which are expressed in the personalities and purposes of their leaders today. The collapse of European civilization and our own peril are rooted in the failure, both among the community of men and its leadership, of those essential qualities of integrity, independence, self-discipline, and responsibility upon which any enduring civilization depends. To recreate and revitalize them throughout the community and its leaders is the great task, not only of the future, but of today. It is necessary not only for reconstruction, but for survival.

It is their disintegration which is reflected in the destruction, conflict, and chaos of our time. The world we have known and lived in has crumbled to ruins around us, but the rubble of the bomb-shattered cities of Britain is but a symbol of a catastrophe far more profound. This was the most abnormal world the human record has ever known, a world of unparalleled progress and unimagined plenty, of unprecedented stability and peace born of the momentous discovery that truth, integrity, and responsibility, embodied and applied in the political and economic institutions and the public and private life of the community, could make men free, prosperous, and secure. It was the most revolutionary discovery ever made by the mind of man, but in the world it built it lasted only a little more than a century, a mere moment in human history. The normal world to which we sometimes dream today of returning, the world in which men had lived for unnumbered centuries before, was a world of treachery, terror, ignorance, and enslavement. This is the world to which the leaders of our time have once more turned the spirits and the immense productive powers of men which a mere century of human freedom and faith enabled them to command.

But today the time for post mortems is past. Whatever the sources of the peril and the fear that confuse and cripple us, we cannot now escape the task to which by fate we have been committed for the future, the most colossal task that has confronted any community of men in human history—the task of saving ourselves from the destructive power of the supreme state which has subdued the world, so that by grace of God we may help to restore among us many communities of men as may have the aspiration and the strength to sustain it elsewhere that essential structure of truth, integrity, and responsibility upon which the possibility of a humane civilization and human progress depends.

What any of us here may do or say cannot much matter to ourselves, for our lives are largely spent, but it will matter to the America that comes after us and the world in which she lives. We cannot give her integrity or liberty; her people will have to attain and preserve it for themselves; but we can at least transmit to them the aspiration and the opportunity which were entrusted to us by our ancestors who won it for themselves.

Despite all that I have said about the doubts and dangers that burden them today, the impulses, purposes, and aspirations of the American people in this crisis are noble in spirit and worthy of their character and the traditions of their country, a deep expression of that love of liberty, that hatred of tyranny, that generosity and sympathy toward the unfortunate and oppressed which have always marked America. We may be proud to be part of a people who can impulsively present such a spirit to an unhappy and tortured world, and implement it even to the point of folly.

But I submit that it were a tragedy too brutal and too humiliating to be borne by the broken heart of mankind if the spirit of such a people were to be betrayed or exploited by anyone, whether for a few pieces of silver or for the scepter of political power. In this dark hour of their great adventure America surely deserves and as surely desperately needs the utmost candor, competence, courage, and integrity which she can command or which a merciful Providence can grant in the leadership of her government, business management, and labor.

We have a right to ask whether those who urge and lead us to this colossal task understand what it means, and do they mean it themselves? Are they clearly conscious of the task, the suffering, the sacrifice, to which they ask the American people to commit themselves, and are they willing to commit themselves to it? Are they ready to accept for themselves the stern and uncompromising discipline it implies? Are they aware that it will require the sacrifice of numberless lives, and the resignation of all hopes of peace, prosperity, security, comfort, and social or political gains for an indefinite period? Are they willing to tell the American people that, in utter honesty and complete candor?

This is too great a Nation to need or deserve to be brought to defend itself or to fight for a great cause by any synthetic circumstance, or political manipulation, by having its Government range the world begging for a bomb or praying for a politically appropriate provocation. The true America does not move to its battles or its ballot boxes on its belly. It has something more to fight or vote for than its public corncribs, its political swill barrels, or its silver pigsties.

I am sure that, despite the doubt, confusion, conflict, and fear which afflict them today, the American people are willing to follow with unquestioning unity and allegiance any leader or group among them whom they can feel with complete confidence are utterly committed to the same cause as that for which they are called to make their sacrifices and endure their endless burdens and sufferings, and who is as prepared as they are expected to be to put aside all private purpose or aspiration of personal power, position, privilege, or pleasure in every aspect of life or work. They will make these sacrifices freely and unflinchingly and follow to the bitter end any who commands them in the name of this supreme cause, whenever they know in their hearts that he has won the right to command them by his unqualified acceptance of them.

Desperately as they may need and nobly as the deserve such leadership today, whether they get it or not, the American people should remember that the rescue or wreckage of their country does not lie in the hands of those walking shadows, those poor players of political power, who strut and fret their brief hour on this world's stage and are heard no more. It rests in the end in the hearts and minds and muscles of the nameless millions of men and women in America who must and will carry through whatever task and pay the price of whatever waste and suffering the weakness of their leaders has committed them to. No matter how supreme its power, or how complete its competence, the State can create nothing that does not already live and grow, nor destroy anything that is not already dead in the spirit of its people. It is at best but the scavenger of time and human aspiration.

They should remember that liberty is not granted us by grace of governments, constitutions, courts, or congresses, nor can we depend upon them permanently to preserve and protect it for us. It does not prevail or persist by the power of political traditions, parties, personalities, or laws. Liberty springs solely from the spirit of those common citizens who have the will and courage to create it for themselves, the strength and integrity to accept its responsibilities and pay its price, the valor, vigilance, fortitude, and fidelity to defend it even with their life against its unseen, incessant, and insidious enemies—indifference, ignorance, indolence, and injustice. Save as it is more precious to us than prosperity, peace, comfort, or security, it will never exist or long endure among us. Every man in each generation must renew and replenish its spirit in himself, and none can demand it for himself and deny it to others without destroying it for all.

The civilization by which we live is a vast invisible web ever woven anew of countless acts of sacrifice, fortitude, faith, and foresight by unnumbered, nameless men. Thread by thread these unseen strands of individual aspiration, effort, adventure, and accomplishment are spun into those indestructible cords of endurance, industry, independence, and integrity of spirit which bind society together. This frail fabric from the ceaseless loom of generations of unremembered lives is the strongest and most precious substance in the world, for by it alone we hang suspended above the abyss of savagery.

Save for these things, the story of the great adventure upon which America has embarked must be but as a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing, and all her yesterdays will have only lighted fools the way to dusty death.

We shall win prosperity only if we have the strength to suffer poverty; leisure, only if we have the will to labor endlessly; security, only if we have the courage to risk all; and peace, only if we have the pride to die fighting for freedom, truth, and honor.

American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Academy of Music in New York on Friday, May 23, 1941, during I Am An American Week, entitled "American Heritage":

As a Member of Congress, it has been my privilege for many years to serve on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives, and the last decade or so I acted as chairman thereof.

As such, it came to my lot to pass on legislation affecting the position of the alien in the United States. It was through my committee that laws were passed which provided for the naturalization of these aliens. I therefore became more than ordinarily

conversant with the problems of the foreign-born, and all the steps taken by the alien to become an American citizen.

Many of us in the audience today are foreign-born—men and women who have come from many countries in the world to escape oppression and tyranny, and to make their homes with us under the protection of the American Constitution and the American flag. It is these men and women particularly who realize what it means to be an American. It is they particularly who will shout with glee and joy the message of "I am an American." Just as a person appreciates his good health only after he has gone through a long illness, so does a naturalized American appreciate the blessings of our liberty, where he and she came to this country to escape oppression and tyranny.

It is quite obvious that the blessings of liberty cannot be obtained without a struggle and without a desire to preserve those liberties at all costs. It is not enough to say "I am an American" and let the other man fight for the preservation of our cherished ideals. All of us, whether native or foreign born, who love and cherish this country, who believe in its institutions, and who pride themselves on being members of our community, must remember that the blessings of liberty can only be preserved if we are ready to fight for them. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and it is that eternal vigilance to which we must dedicate ourselves on this patriotic "I Am An American" Day. We must fight all subversive activities both from within and from without, and I can assure you that as long as the Lord spares me, you will find in me a protagonist and a fighter for these ideals of liberty and justice for which the American commonwealth stands.

A Department of Air Power—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, there are many who look upon our air forces as simply auxiliaries to Navy warships and Army divisions. Recent European experience has proven that the air force is no mere subsidiary to the main branches of the military services but has its own place as a definite force for offense and defense. France might well have traded her Maginot line for a real offense and defense in the air. Even England with her mighty Navy has depended on the air force to defend her coast and naval bases. Comparatively small as the R. A. F. is, it has been the main defense of the British Isles.

In America, the ability of air power to strike at long range fits it admirably for defense of our Atlantic and Pacific coasts, as the main air force can be shifted from one coast to the other in a matter of hours, rather than the many days required for the transfer of a navy through our canal bottleneck.

Why have we refrained from putting air power in its true position?

LET US TAKE A LOOK AT THE RECORD

First. Military aircraft manufacturers, in general, prefer foreign orders because they are not hamstrung by continual change orders but when the foreign governments accept a standardized product they stick to that design until completion of the contract. This is in direct contrast to our constant changing of designs and lack of standardization of material between our two services as well as the fear of the red tape and other restrictions which hinder rather than help production.

Second. We have no fixed continuous policy toward the development of the aircraft industry. We have no fixed policy toward air safety or the development of air power. There are those who would rather let our country fall than to give up their preconceived ideas as to what makes for supremacy in war.

Third. The necessity to develop airports and landing fields has been a matter of concern to all aeronautic experts. In fact, direct action by the Chief Executive was necessary to secure a decent sized airport for our Nation's Capital. Our airports have been developed without tactical regard to their defense situation and this has led to waste of vast sums of money, when the same amount judiciously expended would have given us strategically located airports, training fields, and concentration airports for our air power.

Fourth. Money alone will not build up our air power. Wide-awake executive control, good engineering judgment, and a working knowledge are also required. Congress has appropriated plenty of money in the past but the technical experience needed for a strong national defense is lacking.

Fifth. It does not require a genius to see that our present national-defense effort is lagging and that we are woefully behind other nations in our air power. We need coordination of air-power activities under one two-fisted department so that we can have, first, simplification of standard combat aircraft to make real production possible and make military needs in aircraft manufacturable and not just laboratory ideas; second, we need a single control of air power so that we can standardize and simplify our methods of manufacture to take full benefit of the well-known American production methods.

Sixth. What we must have is the greatest amount of defense per tax dollar that it is possible to get. Would not our people rather have 1,000 bombers with a speed of 350 miles an hour than one 45,000-ton battleship that has to have planes to protect it? Great Britain, possessing a great array of splendid capital ships, finds no way to engage them against the Nazi planes flying over England. Navy has its place in the war scheme, Army has its place, but do not forget for a minute that air power is the deciding, as well as the contributing, factor in any invasion threat as well as in any defense effort today.

We realize now that Col. William Mitchell was right in his contention that air power was destined to be the deciding factor in modern warfare. Accordingly, I am advocating as he did that a Department of Air Power be set up so that we can be fully prepared.

Air power is an absolute necessity for this country with the resultant calm planning and development of long-range aircraft which will keep control of the air and keep the enemy from our shores. Just the types of planes attached to an Army division or the planes attached to carriers and warships are not the ones that we most urgently need.

We have had to acquire outlying air bases because we have been shortsighted in our long-range airplane development. Had the money poured into the outlying air bases been spent on development of long-range fighting planes, we would not be worrying today about our national defense.

Air power is a most necessary and vital part of our defense mechanism, and our military leadership should be divorced from the control of air power and the control placed under a separate department.

We must have such a department, not only for our national defense and security, but also for our national air development and for the orderly and safe planning of civilian flying. We must always remember that when war clouds have cleared away, the immense war effort must be transiated to peaceful pursuits—and the Department of Air Power would have planned and prepared for that.

The emergency, with its Nation-wide stimulus to all phases of aviation, has created certain extremely urgent problems, and in order that our people may take full advantage in a long-range, well-planned program, I have introduced the following bill, H. R. 4790, to establish a Department of Air Power. Other nations have made rapid strides in this field and I believe such a department, if established, would be a more modern approach to the whole problem of America's national security. The prospect of a new era in civil-aviation development at the end of the war gives further incentive for long-range planning which can best be effectuated by the passage of H. R. 4790.

[77th Cong., 1st sess. H. R. 4790. In the House of Representatives, May 19, 1941. Mr. BEITER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. A bill to establish a Department of Air Power]

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of national defense and economy in operation of our armed forces there is hereby created an executive department in the Government to be called the Department of Air Power; with a Secretary for Air who shall be the head thereof, to be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate; and whose tenure of office shall be like the heads of other executive departments. The provisions of chapter 1 of this title shall be applicable to the said Department. The purpose of the Department of Air Power shall be to foster, promote, and develop the art and science of aeronautics, both military and civil, and to bring together and to coordinate under one Department and head all of the governmental activities, both civil and military, now existing and vested in any executive department, military or civil, or in any board or independent agency of the Government: *Provided*, That the Bureau of Aeronautics with a limitation of 6,000

planes with necessary military personnel to maintain and operate them and the Air Corps of the United States Army with a limitation of 7,500 planes and necessary military personnel to maintain and operate them will be maintained under their respective departments.

SEC. 2. Assistant Secretaries: There shall be in said Department an Assistant Secretary in charge of Military Air Power and an Assistant Secretary in charge of Civil Air Power, to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. They shall perform such duties as may be assigned them by the Secretary or required by law.

SEC. 3. Bureaus and offices in the Department: The following-named offices, bureaus, divisions, and branches of the public service and all that pertains to the same shall be under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Department of Air Power:

1. The Aeronautical Board;

2. The Civil Aeronautics Board of the Department of Commerce;

3. The Weather Bureau in the Department of Commerce;

4. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

5. The Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory and the branches thereof;

6. All agencies of the Government connected with the procurement of aircraft or aircraft supplies for the United States Government or any agency thereof;

7. All material and matériel, including airports, airdromes, factories, laboratories, etc., not required by the Army or Navy for the maintenance and operation of the planes assigned to those particular Departments.

SEC. 4. Bureaus, records, etc.: The official records and papers on file in and pertaining exclusively to the business of any bureau, office, department, or branch of the public service transferred to the Department of Air Power, together with the furniture and equipment in use in such bureau, office, department, or branch of the public service, are transferred to the Bureau of Air Power.

SEC. 5. Duties and powers invested in Department: All duties performed and all power and authority possessed and exercised by the head of any executive department in and of any bureau, office, board, branch, or division of the public service transferred to the Department of Air Power, or any business arising therefrom or pertaining thereto, or in relation to the duties performed by and authority conferred by law on such bureau, officer, office, board, branch, or division of the public service, whether appellate or revisory or otherwise, shall be vested in the Secretary of the Department of Air Power.

SEC. 6. Transfer of statistical or scientific work: The President is authorized to transfer the whole or part of any office, bureau, division, or other branch of the public service engaged in statistical or scientific work from the Department of War, Department of the Navy, or Department of Commerce to the Department of Air Power; and in each case the duties and authority performed and conferred by law upon such office, bureau, division, or other branch of the public service or the part so transferred, shall be hereby transferred with such office, bureau, division, or other branch of the public service or the part thereof which is so transferred. All power and authority conferred by law, both supervisory and appellate, upon the department from which such transfer is made, or the Secretary thereof, in relation to such office, bureau, division, or other branch of the public service, or the part so transferred, will, immediately, when such transfer is so ordered by the President, be full conferred upon and vested in the Department of Air Power, or the Secretary thereof, as the case may be.

SEC. 7. Records and papers and equipment transferred to the Department: The official records on file in and pertaining to any office, bureau, department, branch, or division of the public service transferred to the Department of Air Power, together with the furniture, equipment, etc., in use in such office, bureau, department, branch, or division of the public services are transferred to the Department of Air Power.

SEC. 8. Annual and special reports: The Secretary for Air shall annually, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to Congress giving an account of all moneys received by him and his Department, describing the work done by the Department in fostering, promoting, and developing the aeronautical science and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties of the Department. He shall also, from time to time, make such investigations and reports as may be required by the President or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent.

SEC. 9. Report on coordination of duties etc.: The Secretary for Air shall investigate and report to Congress a plan of coordination of the activities, duties, and powers of the office of the Secretary for Air Power with the activities, duties, and powers of the present bureaus, commissions, boards, and departments, so far as they relate to aeronautics and its field, in order to harmonize and unify such activities, duties, and powers with a view to further legislation to further define the duties of the Department of Air Power.

SEC. 10. Transfer of personnel: The transfer, to the Department of Air Power under this act, of officers and employees of the different bureaus, offices, departments, branches, or divisions affected by this act shall be without change in classification or compensation, but the Secretary for Air Power is authorized to make changes in title and designation and prescribe such changes in the duties of such officers and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 11. Military personnel in Air Power: (1) There are hereby created in Air Power commissioned officers of such number as the President may determine to be necssary, but not to exceed 22,000 in all grades and branches. The President is authorized to establish appropriate grades, titles, and ranks for such officers.

(2) The President is authorized—

(a) to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the commissioned offices in air force flight officers from the Army or Navy, and such other individuals as he may determine to be fitted to perform the duties thereof;

(b) to prescribe the pay and allowances for the offices created by this section until otherwise provided by the Congress, but no officer so appointed shall receive less pay and allowances than officers of equal flight rank in the Army or Navy. No officer transferred from the Army or Navy shall receive lower pay or allowances than he was receiving as an officer of the Army or Navy when so transferred;

(c) to establish appropriate grades and ratings in Air Power, to assign thereto warrant and ratings from the Army and Navy with relative pay and allowances, but no warrant or enlisted rating shall receive lower pay or allowance in Air Power than he was receiving in the Army or Navy;

(d) to consolidate, eliminate, or redistribute the functions of bureaus, commissions, boards, and departments or divisions, to create new ones and fix the powers, duties, and functions of their executive heads and to take such other action not inconsistent with this act which he may deem necessary for perfecting the organization and coordinating the activities of the Department of Air Power.

SEC. 12. Governing laws and regulations: Where practicable and not otherwise provided and not inconsistent with this act and until otherwise provided by the Congress (1) The administration of the Department of Air Power shall be governed by the laws in force with respect to the Department of War and the Department of the Navy at the time of the enactment of this act; (2) the Air Power personnel shall be governed by the laws in force (including laws relating to relative rank, promotion, retirement, enlistment, and appointment of new personnel, reserves, and articles for the government of the Army and the Navy) with respect to the Air Corps of the Army and Navy.

Discrimination Is Subversive of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WJZ Sunday, June 1, 1941, entitled "Discrimination is subversive of democracy":

It is most disconcerting to find in these days of our effort to creat a thorough national defense, that agencies of our Government, as well as private employers who have contracts for national defense, discriminate against cur citizens by reason of their race, creed, or color.

Any attempt to do so at this time is playing into the hands of the enemies of democracy. Anything that creates disunion and disruption of our national effort is a link in the chains of slavery, which these enemies are trying to forge around all free people.

Our President, in the speech delivered a few days ago, called attention to the fact that our country is at the present time surrounded by totalitarian forces. We are a minority seeking to carry on the torch of liberty, in a world where liberty seems to have been extinguished. We are trying to carry on the American way of life against a world of enemies, seeking to do everything in their power to disrupt and destroy our American way of life. We are seeking to maintain an American standard of living, in a world where the standard of living is being undermined and put on the basis of slavery, instead of free labor. It is therefore of great importance to us at this junction to insist that democratic principles and ideals be maintained within our own borders, that cooperation among the many sections of our population be promoted, and that there be no attempt made to divide our citizens by virtue of race, creed, or color.

American citizens should have equal rights to employment, equal rights to participate in our national effort to establish a thoroughgoing national defense, and equal rights to contribute their share to the well-being of the Nation, in accordance with their abilities, character, and reputation. Discrimination, because of race or creed does not belong in a democracy, and it is a most unhealthy practice for this Government to allow such a thing, right under our noses when we are

spending billions of dollars to defend democracy. What good is it to defend democracy against attacks from without, when we allow the basic principles of democracy to be violated right here in our country?

When Government departments, which should set an example for the rest of the people of the unity of our democracy, take it upon themselves to discriminate against our own citizens, there is something "rotten in the State of Denmark," and something should be done to call a halt to such procedure. Any Government official, who is entrusted with the power to select personnel, and lets his prejudices govern him in determining who should, or should not be selected, is not worthy of his trust, and should be summarily removed from office.

Many instances of discrimination by Government departments, as well as by private employers, who have contracts for national defense, have been brought to my attention. In such cases, it was clearly shown that certain people in power had adopted the policy of judging applicants for positions not by their qualifications and ability to fill the respective positions but by their racial or social backgrounds. I know of cases where thoroughly qualified men were refused employment simply because they were of a racial origin which did not appeal to the particular person who had to make the appointment.

We must not assume that, because the national background of an individual happens to be of a country which saw fit to embrace a totalitarian ideology, that just because of that, this particular individual is not going to act the part of a loyal American citizen. Quite the opposite, some of our best American patriots have come from national backgrounds which are "totalitarian," and some of them have made splendid officers in both the Army and Navy, loyal civil servants, and the like. As a matter of fact, an example of that background is the former presidential candidate of the Republican Party, Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, as to whose patriotism or loyalty there surely can be no question among Americans.

Furthermore, people who come from countries where there has been discrimination are likely to remember their origin and appreciate the blessings of liberty more than others who take their liberty for granted. So that, as a matter of fact, we cannot find any more loyal citizens in this country than among those whose national origin is such that persecution and tyranny have left their indelible imprint in their blood. And now if people who are clothed with power and authority will use that power and authority to undermine the very principles upon which our democracy has been built, how can they expect the rest of the country to believe that they are worthy of the positions of trust in which they were placed?

In normal times there is always some discrimination practiced. After all, all of us who are in a position of responsibility have our likes and dislikes. We may not like certain people because they do not wear the proper clothes, or because they do not speak the way we want them to speak. However, our personal likes or dislikes should not be the basis upon which we should select those who should be called upon to work for the Government, its agencies, or other agencies of the national defense.

There should be only one rule to determine the fitness of an applicant, and that is whether or not he can do the job which is assigned to him. It should not make any difference whether the person in question is white or black, Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant, or whatever racial origin he may be charged to. If he is an American citizen, there should be no discrimination, and very person who owes his devotion and loyalty to the United States should be given the opportunity to work for this country and promote its welfare. Everyone who is disloyal should be weeded out, even if his ancestors go back to the days of the American Revolution.

This principle was so thoroughly understood during the last war in which this country participated, that most of our fighting units in the Army were composed of boys of the most diversified racial origins. Even today we do not discriminate as a rule, whenever a person is drafted into the service of the United States, although instances have been shown of people being placed in the undesirable regiments or companies because of their racial origin or color. But, again, a true American will never be guilty of an offense of this type, and one who understands the aims and objectives of the Government of the United States will not deliberately lend himself to a procedure where he would be guilty of discriminating against our own citizens.

I have placed this discrimination on the basis of national defense, because there is an old adage "In unity there is strength and in disunity there is failure." I am sure that Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin would like to see our people divided. I am sure that Hitler chuckles with joy whenever he reads in his newspapers how Americans are guilty of discrimination against their own fellow citizens. Just as Hitler was able to destroy Europe by playing up to the various nations and respective prejudices against others within their borders, so do Hitler and his agents now take advantage of every opportunity where an American is discriminating against another American, or where one brother is arrayed against another brother. If we do not stand together, if we do not fight together as a unit for the defense of our American ideals now, then there will be no American ideals left which will be worth while defending later.

Laws and Regulations Relating to Veterans, Including Trainees Under Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the pamphlet on Veterans' Benefits, which gives information concerning monetary and other benefits available to persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States, and to the dependents of such persons, is being revised for publication, July 1, 1941.

It will be a revision of House Document No. 666, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, published July 1, 1940, and will bring all statements, laws, and regulations contained therein up to date.

Information will also be included concerning those who are serving by reason of the Selective Training and Service Act. Two hundred and forty-eight thousand five hundred and forty-two of the new trainees have applied for and have been furnished life-insurance policies through the Veterans' Administration. Seventy-nine death claims have been filed to date.

Under the Selective Training and Service Act, each man inducted is entitled to the same pay allowances, pensions, disability, and death compensation provided for other enlisted men and officers of like grade and length of service.

In making this revision, I have received the assistance and cooperation of Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and the Veterans' Administration.

The pamphlet will provide helpful information to persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States in time of war or peace and to the dependents of such persons regarding the rights to monetary and other benefits, which may be obtained by applying to the Veterans' Administration or elsewhere as indicated.

The purpose sought to be attained is to state in a general way the different benefits and the most essential requirements which must be met by a claimant with respect to each. No effort has been made to provide detailed technical information on constructions and interpretations of the veterans' acts, such as would be essential in the adjudication of claims. The pamphlet also includes information concerning veterans' preference to civil-service employment; burial in national cemeteries; headstones; benefits given by States; Veterans' Placement Service; Civilian Conservation Corps; preference under homestead laws; and laws for purchase, repair, and refinancing property.

As heretofore, the Joint Committee on Printing will be requested to present a resolution, providing that several thousand copies of this pamphlet be printed and made available to the Members of Congress for distribution. They will also be sold through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. The price of the last edition, which was released July 1, 1940, is 10 cents a copy.

Sumner Sewall, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Post of May 26, 1941:

[From the Boston Post of May 26, 1941]

SEWALL AS TIMBER FOR HIGHEST JOB—VOICE SAID TO MATCH PRESIDENT'S OVER RADIO

(By Timothy A. McInerny)

This is an era in politics in which the voice and the language of a man are as important as any other one quality in winning public attention.

The radio has done this. It has made and broken budding political careers, for the most statesmanlike-appearing man cannot be seen over the air waves, and the man with a winning voice can best him in almost any contest.

SEARCH STILL ON

Mr. Roosevelt's golden radio voice and his precise Groton accent has been the despair of the Republicans. The search has been on ever since 1932 for a Republican voice to match his.

Willkie's was far short of the ideal. Taft and Landon and Vandenberg all had their pronouncements twisted by the intricacies of the reproducing systems. They sounded bumbly, adenoidal, and commonplace.

But the search is still on as the G. O. P. looks to 1944. This time they are certain that they will have to have someone to oppose Mr. Roosevelt for his fourth term, in what will probably be the latter part of a big war.

The Republican National Committee has found plenty of good voices, but the men carrying them are not Presidential timber. But a select little gathering of Republicans have already found their man, and some day they intend to spring him on the public to see what the reaction is.

As Joe Martin or any of the Republican leaders know, the party cannot rig up a candidate now to suit conditions 4 years from now. But the party can take cognizance of the material at hand and, if it is good, it can steer the candidate into the proper position for notice when the convention meets.

IT'S MAINE'S GOVERNOR

The man who has the voice, the rhythmic emphasis which is believed equal to Roosevelt's power over the air, is Gov. Sumner Sewall of Maine.

The other day in Augusta, in the classic atmosphere of the Blaine Mansion, Mrs. Roosevelt sat across the table from Governor Sewall and his charming wife, little realizing perhaps that Republican bigwigs down in Washington have been looking him over as a Presidential dark horse for 1944.

Governor Sewall, strange as it may seem, has never considered himself an orator and has never made any attempt to be one. He has spent most of his life to date as a businessman, with commercial air lines as his chief interest, and most of his talking has been over the table at directors' meetings.

But he has a priceless political heritage, for his uncle was a candidate for Vice President of the United States and members of his family have been in public affairs since the first Sewall began kicking around Boston Common in 1636.

The Governor slid easily from the business world into the political field when times were dull a few years ago, and after an experiment with the city council in his home city of Bath, went to the State senate and thence to the Governor's chair.

AMAZED BY ADDRESS

Since his election he has made very few addresses and has generally kept away from the microphone. At his inauguration he pulled out a few stops and in an eloquent address practically stampeded the audience, who were expecting something rather matter-of-fact. It was a good place and a good setting for a dull address and the new-fledged Governor crossed up the dope and delivered an exhilarating sermon which lifted the listeners out of their chairs.

His voice has a fine timbre and there is a noticeable rhythm in his sentences. Clear, concise, and unperturbed, he has demonstrated again and again in the Maine Senate that he is a master of words, and on his feet he gives the impression that here is a man who is interested and interesting and utterly sincere.

The Grand Old Party can use that sort of stuff.

The only fly in the ointment as far as the political soothsayers are concerned is that the gentleman comes from Maine. To hear some of them talk, one would believe that Maine isn't a part of the United States.

Sewall, they say, has background—for his is one of the first families of New England and Maine. He has money, a long lineage of shipbuilding forefathers, and some pretty fair politicians, too. He has a fine family—a devoted and intelligent wife and three handsome children

NOT TALKING OF FUTURE

He has a war record which is hard to beat. He is Maine's only flying ace of the World War. He is a former member of the famed Lafayette Escadrille.

But the politicos on the Republican side say that Maine is Maine, and not the Middle West, and a Presidential candidate has to come from the central region of the United States. A Maine or Vermont man, such as Coolidge, is fine for the Vice Presidency, but the top man on the ticket must come from the Middle West.

This appears to be an axiom among the party bosses. If Sewall goes to the United States Senate 2 years from now, he will be nearer the center of political doings. But up to now he has evinced no further ambitions than to be as good a Governor as he can and let the future take care of itself.

But if, in the future, you suddenly see him unveiled as an orator at some big Republican function, you will know that the boys on the inside are trying out the golden voice from Maine, which is a good one.

Increased Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. SCHULTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

REPORT OF COST OF LIVING COMMITTEE, OIL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL NO. 210

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and report:

HAMMOND, IND., *May 13, 1941.*

Congressman WM. T. SCHULTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of a report made by our cost-of-living committee. This committee has made an extensive study of living costs especially as they apply to the oil workers' membership in the Calumet region. We believe that if you will give a few moments' study to this report you will discover some facts which may not have occurred to you in ordinary conception of the cost of living in our area, inasmuch as the Labor Bureau makes its reports based on the cost of living in Chicago and South Bend. If it is possible for you to do so, we would appreciate having you insert this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours truly,

OIL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,
M. B. ROBERTS, *Secretary, Local No. 210.*

COST-OF-LIVING BULLETIN 2

Living costs in the Calumet region, Hammond, Gary, East Chicago, have increased to the point where even with the recent wage raises the worker has a burden to bear that grows ever heavier.

From December 1937 to January 1941, the costs of the following have increased:

	Percent
Rent	10.0
Hospitalization	11.5
Fuel (coal and coke)	10.0
Food	3.7

This is an increase in the general cost of living of 8.9 percent.

This picture of the cost of living for the workers of this area which is the result of a study made by the cost-of-living committee of the Oil Workers International Union, Local 210, does not include furniture, automobiles, radios, refrigerators, clothing, drugs, or taxes (a large and continually growing item).

The other items and taxes will be the subject of later bulletins. It is enough to mention here that in the clothing field, for example, there has been little price change, but considerable quality change; that is, a sweater or a suit or a pair of shoes made by a company and sold for a particular price still sells for the same price in general but will not give the service, does not have the same quality of materials. As for taxes, excise and special levies, increased income taxes, and property taxes have been taking a regularly increasing slice from the workers' pay check.

Vastly more important than the surface of the picture given above is the meaning of it. The year selected as a basis for comparison is 1937, a year that stands out as the most abnormally high year of the entire decade from 1930 to 1940. The cost of living committee selected that year as a basis of comparison because it was the year that the last general wage increases had been gained in this area.

But 1937 was an extraordinary year. In most regions of the country, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics findings, the general cost of living had not yet reached the highs that it reached during 1937.

The extremely high price levels of 1937 were due to several factors: Government expenditures (P. W. A., W. P. A., A. A. A., etc., emergency relief, and the like) reached their peak; industrial, wholesale, and retail inventories, which had been almost nil, were greatly expanded both because of normal needs and because of the very fear of a boom and of boom prices; construction had considerably increased, partially because of the Federal housing program and partly because of the extensive repairs after depression neglect; foreign trade had picked up; and the approaching war in Europe stimulated speculation.

Immediately after December 1937, there was a drop in cost of living, which continued till it hit a level about 6 percent lower than 1937's high. With slight fluctuations, it remained there through the first quarter of 1940. Since March 1940, the cost of living has constantly risen. There seems to be no stop to the increase.

As the defense program accelerates, as the demand for food, uniforms materials, for aluminum, steel, rubber, building materials, paints, etc., grows ever greater, there is little chance that the skyward drive of living costs will be checked.

Thus when it is realized that in the Calumet area here, the cost of living has actually exceeded 1937 by a substantial amount, it becomes possible to understand better why wage earners have been finding it harder and harder to make their income balance their necessary expenditures.

Already since the wage increases of 10 cents an hour in steel, in Westinghouse, in General Electric, 8 cents per hour in the Aluminum Co. of America plants, 8 cents in the farm-equipment industry, 6 to 10 cents in Du Pont's plants, and the 5 cents in the oil industry, wholesale and retail prices have immediately jumped upward higher than before. The Cost of Living Committee has already had reports of rent increases from $4 to $15 per month.

For those who are interested in the method by which the Cost of Living Committee has obtained its information on the price situation in the Calumet area, we will summarize our work.

Questionnaires on comparative rents for December 1937 and February 1941 were distributed to members of Local 210 and were mailed out to real estate agencies in Hammond, Gary, and East Chicago; similar questionnaires on coal and coke were sent to fuel dealers; questionnaires on oil products, on hospital rates, were sent out. A questionnaire was prepared on the costs of food and meats as of December 1937 and February 1941; the questionnaires listed 31 commodities which comprise the bulk of the average wage earner's essential purchases. Our figures were computed from the returns on our questionnaires; and the number of returns has been so great that we feel our work on that phase is substantially complete. From time to time a belated questionnaire still comes to the office, but such late material of which there is just a very small quantity has not so far changed our findings in any respect, and we find each additional questionnaire returned late, merely a further confirmation of the results already attained.

We realize that rent, hospitalization, fuel, and food do not have equal weight in computing an average of the general living cost, that, for example, rent makes up in nearly every instance more than a quarter of a wage earner's expenses and that food makes up more than a third; hospitalization over-all is a relatively insignificant part of the general cost of living; fuel may run from practically no part of the cost of living to nearly 5 percent of it Clothing, furniture, radios, refrigerators, automobiles, and taxes also bulk large in the worker's budget. But the picture given above is a fairly accurate representation of what has happened to the worker's cost of living in this region.

It might be added here that the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor has compiled exhaustive statistics on cost of living and regularly publishes a bulletin on them. But the Bureau of Labor Statistics must necessarily generalize on the Nation as a whole; it does not—cannot—cover every region. It has selected a series of cities which are supposed to be representative of the whole. The Calumet area is represented in the Bureau's reports by South Bend and Chicago, two cities in which conditions are definitely different from those in Hammond, Gary, and East Chicago. The concentration of population, shortage of housing, highly industrialized nature of the region make any picture that is taken from Chicago or from South Bend decidedly inaccurate.

The cost of living committee's findings on rent, however, are not far from those of the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and the sharp upward trend in all prices which the committee has noted is clearly indicated in the Bureau of Labor Statistics' figures.

COST OF LIVING COMMITTEE, OIL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 210.

HAMMOND, IND.

Federal Claim to Submerged Lands in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARD JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include Senate Joint Resolution No. 24, adopted by the California Legislature. The resolution follows:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 24

Relative to memorializing the President, the Congress, and the Solicitor General with respect to the assertion of any pretended Federal claim to the submerged lands of the State of California

Whereas, on the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the original States, as successors to the English Crown, became the owners of the tide and submerged lands within their respective borders, and such ownership was retained by them on the adoption of the Constitution, and never has been relinquished to the Federal Government since; and

Whereas the State of California was admitted to the Union on a basis of equality with the original States, possessing and enjoying all the attributes of sovereignty residing in the original States, including the ownership of the tide and submerged lands within its borders; and

Whereas such ownership has long been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States of America and by other Federal departments and agencies, and has not been questioned until recently, with the result that the State of California and its grantees, both public and private, relying thereon, have expended vast sums of money in the development of such lands, including harbor facilities, reclamation and filling in, and the erection of costly structures; and

Whereas this legislature is informed that plans are being made to initiate litigation against the State of California, or its grantees, to assert a pretended Federal claim to such lands, whether with or without the authorization of the Congress; and

Whereas any such litigation could only result in a decision in favor of this State or its grantees, would be unjust in view of the concomitant vexation and annoyance, and would seriously impair the further development of such lands and the financing thereof until the final decision: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the State of California hereby solemnly and firmly asserts the title of the State and its grantees in such lands within this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the President, the Congress, and the Solicitor General of the United States be, and they hereby are, respectfully urged not to initiate or authorize the initiation of any litigation that would becloud such title of the State and its grantees, however temporarily; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Solicitor General, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in the Congress.

Poll Reveals Ship Convoys and War Opposed by More Than 90 Percent of People in Kokomo, Ind., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM KOKOMO (IND.) TRIBUNE

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune of May 31, 1941:

[From Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune of May 31, 1941]

POLL REVEALS SHIP CONVOYS AND WAR OPPOSED BY MORE THAN 90 PERCENT OF PEOPLE IN KOKOMO, IND., AREA

If the majority view expressed through a straw vote taken here represents the majority view of the community as a whole, public sentiment in and around Kokomo is overwhelmingly opposed both to use of United States war vessels to convoy ships carrying supplies to Great Britain and to the United States entering the war and sending our troops to foreign shores.

Only a few hundred votes were cast on the two propositions, it is true, but the preponderance of sentiment expressed against both of them doubtless will be regarded as significant by citizens generally.

On the first proposition, "Do you favor convoying by the United States of ships carrying supplies to Great Britain?" the committee that conducted the count found that 89.80 percent of the ballots were against the suggestion and only 10.20 percent in favor of it.

On the second question, "Do you favor the United States entering the war and sending our troops abroad?" adverse opinion was even more emphatic. The committee found that 95.65 percent of the ballots were against the proposal and only 4.35 percent in approval of it.

Comparison of the straw vote taken here with that taken in Indianapolis reveals that the division of sentiment here is substantially the same as was shown there. In Indianapolis 92 percent of the ballots were against convoying and only 8 percent in favor of it. On the question of entering the war, 95 percent of the ballots opposed the suggestion and only 5 percent approved it.

In Indianapolis a blank form of ballot was carried only 1 day in the News of that city. In Kowomo the blank form of ballot was carried only 1 day in the Tribune.

The count of the ballots cast here was conducted by Forrest E. Jump, judge of the Howard circuit court; James L. Duke, a past commander of the Kokomo American Legion post; and Ernest E. Ellis, Spanish-American War veteran.

Thomas Lamont Opposed to Our Entrance Into War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

LETTER FROM THOMAS W. LAMONT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am reprinting herewith a letter received from Mr. Thomas Lamont, of the House of Morgan. You will find this letter entirely self-explanatory. It is written to correct an impression left in connection with some remarks I made in the House on May 12 when I inserted an editorial from the Wall Street Journal in which that periodical strongly argued against America's active involvement in the fighting at this time.

We have all heard the House of Morgan and Thomas Lamont quoted on the floor of the House, and in speeches elsewhere, as being favorable to policies which would definitely involve the United States in the shooting and sacrifice of another overseas war. I am sure none of us has any desire to attribute to Mr. Lamont any warlike attitudes which are not his. I am happy, therefore, to insert Mr. Lamont's letter, in full, so that the Congress and the country may be advised as to the true position of Mr. Lamont as written on May 28, over his own signature. I am sorry that space limitations are such that I cannot include the speeches which Mr. Lamont enclosed with his letter but I feel certain that anybody interested could secure copies of them by writing to him at the address indicated at the top of his letter to me.

The letter follows:

NEW YORK, *May 28, 1941.*

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
The House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your speech of May 12 on the floor of the House, based upon an article in the Wall Street Journal, has been called to my attention, especially this phrase: "* * * It offers encouraging evidence that the persistent clamor for war coming from Thomas Lamont, the House of Morgan, and a few other international banking houses on the Street is not the universal pattern of thinking on Wall Street."

I do not for a moment question the sincerity of your opinion, but certainly your accusation against me is not based upon any attitude of mine, either public or private. On the contrary, everything that I have said goes to show that I am just as averse to war as anyone is. No man in his right mind can desire war for his country. And as for this thought that industrialists and bankers profit by war, my experience proves that they are the ones that have most to lose.

Now, just to show you what my record is—and I hope you will have time to glance at these excerpts that I quote—I am going to attach excerpts from a few talks that I have made in the last 18 months on this very topic, as follows:

From American Business in War and Peace, a speech before the Academy of Political Science, November 15, 1939.

From The Far Eastern Threat, a speech before the Academy of Political Science, November 13, 1940.

From The Defense of the Republic, a speech before the Merchants' Association of New York, January 28, 1941.

From China and the Dictators, a speech before the Economic Club of Detroit, April 28, 1941.

I do not ask for correction of your statement, my object being simply to call to your personal attention the fact that as to my views you are completely mistaken. I am giving you the evidence of what they actually are.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS W. LAMONT.

Flags of the Confederacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ARTICLE BY MRS. JONES HOYLE, OF DICKERSON, MD.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Daughters of the Confederacy at Beallsville, Md., sponsored a beautiful ceremony at Monocacy Cemetery Sunday, June 1, 1941. Hon. Arthur C. Elgin presided over the meeting, and Mrs. G. Robert Gray read a most interesting paper entitled "Flags of the Confederacy," written by Mrs. Jones Hoyle, of Dickerson, Md. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this interesting document entitled "Flags of the Confederacy":

With the outbreak of the War between the States, the question of a national flag for the North and one for the South arose, and a prominent citizen, S. F. B. Morse, proposed that the "national flag, the Stars and Stripes, be cut in twain, the North retaining the upper six and one-half stripes and those stars above a diagonal line extending from the head of the staff to the lower corner of the canton; while the South should be given the lower six and one-half stripes and the stars below the diagonal line on the canton, the remainder of each flag being white"; but neither the North nor the South saw fit to follow this suggestion. So, when the Union dissolved there was a universal and patriotic display of Old Glory in the Northern States, while each of the seceding States of the South made haste to display the emblems of their State sovereignty on banners; and when the Legislature of South Carolina adjourned on November 13, 1860, a few days after Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States, the flag of the Union was taken down from the State House and the Palmetto flag of the State raised in its place.

When the Ordinance of Secession was passed at the convention on December 19, 1860, South Carolina became a free and independent nation, and the Governor was authorized to organize a cabinet, to receive representatives from abroad, and to appoint similar representatives to foreign countries. At this time, according to the Boston Journal, a banner of red silk was adopted by the convention; it bore a blue cross on which 15 stars were set representing the 15 Southern States, the central star was larger than the others and represented South Carolina. On the red field was a palmetto tree and crescent; this was changed to a more elaborate design in 1861, the first flag waved over the Confederacy.

As seceding States followed each other secession flags were adopted in place of the original State emblems and this great variety of flags caused much confusion, so it became necessary to adopt a flag that could be used by the entire South. In February 1861 a convention of the six seceding States—South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, and Florida—was held at Montgomery, Ala., and while a committee had the subject of a permanent government under consideration the convention discussed the matter of a national flag for the Confederate States of America. Meanwhile the Bonnie Blue Flag made its appearance without official sanction, and instantly its popularity became assured by virtue of a spirited song with a defiant swing:

"We are a band of brothers, and native to the soil,
Fighting for the property we gained by honest toil;
And when our rights were threatened the cry rose near and far,
Hurrah for the Bonnie Blue Flag that bears a single star."

At the Montgomery convention the committee decided that—

"The flag should be simple, readily made, and, above all, capable of being made up in bunting; it should be different from the flag of any other country, place, or people; it should be significant; it should be readily distinguishable at a distance, the colors should be well contrasted and durable; and lastly, and not least important, it should be effective and handsome."

Many designs of flags were submitted and the most beautiful chosen—The Stars and Bars, presented by Col. Orren Randolph Smith, of North Carolina. * "The three bars were emblems of the Trinity, the white for love and stainless character, while the blue was for the great heaven, spangled with stars to watch over us, and the red for the vesper light that should never die out." The recommendation from the committee was that "the flag of the Confederate States of America shall consist of a red field with a white space extending horizontally through the center, and equal in width to one-third the width of the flag; the red space above and below to be the same width as the white. The union of blue extending down through the white space and stopping at the lower red space; in the center of the union a circle of white stars, corresponding in number with the States of the Confederacy." The recommendation was adopted, thus making the birth of the Stars and Bars the symbol of the Southern Confederacy at the same time Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated President of the United States at Washington.

This flag with seven stars in the union was first displayed in public on March 4, 1861, and was used until May 1863; but this flag did not meet with general approval, because of its resemblance to the Stars and Stripes, which led to confusion and mistakes on the battlefield. At the Battle of Manassas, July 21, 1861, the opposing regimental colors were so alike that each side accused the other of displaying its colors. For this reason, Gen. Joseph E. Johnston attempted to substitute State colors for those of the Confederacy, but being unable to obtain them, except for the Virginia regi-

ments, designs for a flag were called for once more.

Most of the new designs came from Louisiana and were presented by General Beauregard. The one selected had a red ground with a blue diagonal cross emblazoned with white stars, one for each State of the Confederacy, and was oblong in shape. General Johnston changed the oblong flag to a square flag, the infantry flag being 4, the artillery colors 3, and the cavalry standards 2½ feet. This famous battle flag, or Southern Cross, is the one best known and beloved by all southerners.

"Furl that banner: True 'tis gory,
Yet 'tis wreathed around with glory,
And 'twill live in song and story
Though its folds are in the dust.
For its fame on brightest pages
Penned by poets and by sages
Shall go sounding down the ages—
Furl its folds though now we must.
* * * * *
Furl that banner, softly, slowly;
Treat it gently—it is holy."

No other flag was used in the field by the Confederates after the battle flag was adopted and furnished to the troops in Virginia in October 1861. In a letter from General Beauregard, written from New Orleans January 24, 1872, he said:

"And we finally adopted, in September 1861, the well-known battle flag of the Army of the Potomac to which our soldiers became so devoted."

After describing the flag he continued:

"It had the merit of being small and light, and of being very distinct at great distances, but it was not accepted by the Confederate Government until it had been consecrated by many a hard-fought battle."

The battle flag, however, was not adapted to sea service as it could not be reversed as a signal of distress, so the Stars and Bars continued to be flown from fortresses and hoisted on vessels. Still another change of flag continued to be the subject of attention, and in May 1863 the Confederate Congress, at Richmond, established by law as a national ensign of the Confederacy, a plain white flag having for its union the southern cross or battle flag of the army. The law read:

"The flag of the Confederate States shall be as follows: The flag to be white, the length double the width of the flag, with the union (now used as the battle flag) to be a square of two-thirds the width of the flag, having the ground red; therein a broad saltire of blue bordered with white and emblazoned with white mullets, or five-pointed stars corresponding in number to the Confederate States." This flag is often called the Jackson flag. President Davis sent the first one to be unfurled over the Capitol in Richmond, but it was not destined for that purpose; the accidental and tragic death of Stonewall Jackson brought the flag and General Jackson's body to Richmond almost at the same time and it was used to enshroud the remains of the Confederate hero.

This flag did not prove satisfactory either, for while it was not used in many land fights, it was used at sea and was so much like the English white ensign, also like the flag of truce, so a broad transverse stripe of red was added to the fly of the flag.

This national ensign of the Confederacy was adopted by the Southern senate February 4, 1865, but was never used in the army as the adoption of the flag came so shortly before the surrender at Appomattox.

To all southerners, the flags of the Confederacy hold a dear and sacred memory, for they typify to each of us the courage and pathos of a lost cause, and it is interesting to note the influence of the Confederate flags, especially the Southern Cross, on some of the State flags in use today.

Benefits of the National Youth Administration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID D. TERRY
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

LETTER FROM COUNTY JUDGE VIRGIL C. KOLB, OF JOHNSON COUNTY, ARK.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, dated May 22, 1941, addressed by County Judge Virgil C. Kolb, of Johnson County, Ark., to Mr. William H. Moore, area director, N. Y. A., Russellville, Ark., on the benefits of the N. Y. A. auto-mechanic shop program at Clarksville, Ark.:

JOHNSON COUNTY,
Clarksville, Ark., May 22, 1941.

Mr. WILLIAM H. MOORE,
Area Director, National Youth Administration, Russellville, Ark.

DEAR SIR: On May 12, 1941, I received at the N. Y. A. Auto Mechanic Shop, Clarksville, Ark., one rebuilt Caterpillar, No. 60, road machine.

I have been delayed in securing the development of a picture which I had taken on the yards before removing the machine, that I wanted to send you.

There are some facts concerning the work and rebuilding of this machine that I want to relate to you. The equipment had been out of service approximately 6 months; unused, account of worn-out condition. Had it not been for an institution like the National Youth Administration, of which I am very proud, the county would have received as salvage price, high bid, $400 for the machine. A new machine would have cost the county $5,500; thereby making it possible, with the credit allowance of $400, to replace the machine with a new one at the cost of $5,100.

With the skilled-mechanic supervision and the development of youth mechanics at the N. Y. A. Auto Mechanic Shop, Clarksville, Ark., I found that this equipment could be rebuilt, and was assured that it would render lots of good service.

In this connection I wish to state that time and again I was in the shop after the machine had been completely torn down and was in the process of repairs. I took pleasure in watching the progress the N. Y. A. youth workers were making and the manifest interest shown in their work on this equipment. It is more for the credit to be given these young men who participated in the rebuilding of this machine that I want to convey to you my sincere appreciation of the opportunities that have been made possible by the N. Y. A. for such a group of boys and their adaptability and progress as auto mechanics. Also much credit should be given Kenneth F. Early for his knowledge and capable supervision.

This machine is now in use on the county road work and has been for a period of 10 days, and I do not hesitate to tell you that it is doing perfect work; that the operator of the machine on the county road work has told me on more than one occasion it is as good as new. This man is also an experienced tractor and machine man, with years of experience and reliable as well as dependable.

For your information, also, the cost of parts purchased for repairs was approximately $650 and the cheapest reconditioned machine I could have purchased, less the salvage value of this old equipment, would have been $3,500. With these figures before you, you can see now that I have a machine worth more than $3,500 and have spent, as above stated, approximately $650.

Again, I want to thank you and your organization in behalf of the citizens of Johnson County for the cooperation and consideration shown in doing such a wonderful job for the benefit of Johnson County.

Yours truly,

VIRGIL C. KOLB,
County Judge.

What the Automobile Means to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

STATEMENT BY NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement showing the part the automobile industry plays in furnishing work for our people, compiled by the National Automobile Dealers Association, as well as in national defense and our normal needs.

The statement follows:

ONE OUT OF SEVEN WORKERS SUPPORTED BY THE AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

One out of seven workers in the United States today are employed in motor transport, according to statistics in the fifth study of a series developed by the National Automobile Dealers Association to acquaint the public with the place of the motorcar in modern transportation and the necessity of maintaining continued production to supply the needs of the United States in its defense program and national economy.

In round numbers this employment force aggregates 6,500,000 people, spread throughout the manufacturing of motor vehicles, parts and tires, petroleum refining, sales and servicing, Federal and State road departments, truck and bus drivers, and raw-material suppliers.

If they all supported an average family of 4 persons, a total of 26,000,000 individuals would be provided with a living directly from the motor industry. That gives some idea of how important the operation of motor vehicles is in our economic system.

Employed directly in the manufacture of motor vehicles, bodies, and parts, in 1939, were 394,000 workers, whose pay rolls amounted to $639,756,000. Employment rose to 447,000 in 1940, with proportionately greater increase in pay rolls due to wage advances.

Employment in the sales and service end of the business in 1939 amounted to 1,306,752 persons, according to the latest Bureau of Census figures. Of this number, 440,536 had jobs in automotive retail establishments where cars, trucks, or parts are sold. Service establishments accounted for

another 176,393 jobs; filling stations, 467,000; and other automotive wholesale and retail functions, 222,821 individuals.

But all this comes far from telling the whole story. Many employees not included in the 6,500,000 total referred to are dependent upon automobiles and automobile traffic for their livelihood. For example, there are thousands of workers in parking lots, in auto camps, resorts, hotels, restaurants, refreshment stands, and automobile clubs. There are advertising men, tax collectors, insurance men, and others whose jobs have come into existence through the automobile.

Then there is the huge building industry. Economists credit the automobile revolution with creating the building boom of the twenties. That was when people found they could live miles from their work and away from mass transportation lines by having automobiles. Homes went up by thousands in the suburbs. Cities began stretching out. The recent census shows that the movement has by no means run its course. Some think it is still in its early stages.

Thus the influence of the automobile is felt in almost every walk of life. It explains the widespread interest in the operations of the industry and the concern over curtailment. Thousands of jobs are at stake throughout the land. Every State supplies materials and every State has its quota of the industry's far-flung retail organization. National-defense priorities may limit the supply of materials and manpower for automobile production, but arbitrary restriction of output would cause unnecessary reduction in employment in industries not vital to defense.

United We Win—Divided We Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BERGEN EVENING RECORD, HACKENSACK, N. J.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., May 28, 1941:

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., of May 28, 1941]

UNITED WE WIN—DIVIDED WE LOSE

President Roosevelt's formal proclamation of an unlimited national emergency is a prelude to passage of our long-prepared M-day bill, which is designed to regiment all of the Nation's resources—men, money, and machines—to wipe the menace of foreign totalitarianism from the face of the earth. That means war, whether declared or undeclared. Henceforth, therefore, there can be no more differences of opinion between loyal Americans over the merits or the demerits of this country's foreign policy. The die is cast—we have crossed a rosy Rubicon—we must now unite, fight, and die if necessary to prevent that adventure from becoming this democracy's funereal Styx.

We cannot permit any divided national sympathies here until the fight has been won. All Americans, whether of recent or remote European origin, now have only one national duty to perform; and that is, in the language of our immortal Declaration of Independence, to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the complete success of the cause to which their duly elected National Government has committed them. The current development was anticipated in these columns by a first-page anticipated in these columns by a first-page March 17. They were in full as follows:

"A UNITED AMERICA

"Foreign news reports from nations at war are censored at their source. Belligerents may suppress important facts; they may distort them; or they may release wholly untrue propaganda. All foreign news should therefore be analyzed critically by American newspaper readers, lest they and their country be enticed into ruinous foreign involvements.

"Since the outbreak of hostilities between Great Britain and Germany 18 months ago, this newspaper has published daily in this space the above warning to its readers. It was motivated solely by a desire to prevent this Nation from becoming propagandized into another ruinous foreign military involvement. It has fought the good fight, and it has lost. The congressional representatives of the people have now spoken, and for better or for worse the Nation is committed to its course. Now the adherence of American citizens to that course must be unanimous because this is our country—may she in her relations with other nations always be right; but, right or wrong, our country."

WE'RE IN IT; WE MUST WIN IT

In recent weeks the question has been not whether but when the United States would be at war. This one uncertainty at least has been settled. President Roosevelt in effect announced the fact Saturday. He was empowered to do so by Congress which in the so-called lease-lend bill delegated its constitutional powers by authorizing him to conduct undeclared war.

That legislation was opposed determinedly but ineffectually. It was identified accurately and dispassionately by this newspaper and a few—pitifully few—others, by many sober-minded individuals, and by some Senators and Representatives. Nevertheless it was passed. So be it.

We cannot yet know how grevious our common task may be. The President hinted; we remember and anticipate. He stressed the sacrifices which we all must make. What will they be? He pledged our total effort, which means anything and everything. Britain, Greece, and China are promised what they need of what we have or can produce. If they cannot come and get it, we must take it to them. Convoys seem imminent, and an expeditionary force is a possibility less remote than may have been imagined. But first and above all we must produce. If we do not subordinate ourselves to this effort, regimentation of labor and management alike is indicated. We are committed to fight for four freedoms: of speech and expression, of religion and worship, from want, and from fear. We may be compelled to suspend or abrogate all four in the process, but if it must be done it will be done.

The prospect is forbidding, but we cannot well retrace our steps. Lightly and more prophetically than we knew, we sang in the last war: "We don't know where we're going, but we're on our way." Well, here we go again. But in self-defense we must go together. We should do it soberly, candidly, with no illusions or delusions. We must overcome Germany, Italy, and Japan in this war and Great Britain after it. We may lose the war. We may win the war but lose the peace. Or we may be able to gain for ourselves, our posterity, and humanity at large more than we know we must sacrifice. But that is secondary. The prime consideration is the fact that we are in the war. Being in it, we had better win it.

JOHN BOGG, *Publisher.*
DONALD G. BOGG, *Editor.*

Rural Electrification—H. R. 4931

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a bill which I have introduced (H. R. 4931) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 so as to increase the amount of annual allotments from $40,000,000 to $100,000,000, reduce the interest rate to that paid by the Government itself, and to extend the time for amortization of these loans to 50 years.

If this measure is passed, it will enable us to electrify practically every farm home in America at rates the people can afford to pay, and at the same time the Government will be repaid every dollar advanced, with interest.

I need not tell the House that our rural electrification program has been the greatest blessing this Government has ever provided for the farmers of America. Under the present law, we are limited to an expenditure of $40,000,000 a year. I managed to get around that provision and secure an extra $100,000,000 through an amendment to the so-called relief bill in 1938, and we managed to secure $60,000,000 additional last year and $60,000,000 additional this year.

But in order to do a real job we are going to have to increase the amount, reduce the interest, and extend the time of payment.

The Government will not lose anything, for the reason that all the money expended, as I said, will be paid back with interest, and these lines, and other facilities, will stand as security. They will increase in value as time goes on and become such a fixed part of the community, as well as of the home and the business establishment, that by the time they are paid off they will be worth many times the investments.

In the meantime they will have added untold billions to our national wealth, contributed to the up-building of rural life and the comforts and conveniences of the average home, and to the prosperity

of rural business establishments, to say nothing of their value in relieving the drudgery which the farm people of America, and especially the farm women, have been compelled to endure since time began.

This program is building a new civilization for rural America—for the farmers of the Nation—and I know of nothing that we could do that would contribute more to that end than the passage of this measure at this time.

It has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I call upon the members of that committee to give it immediate consideration, and to report it to the House as soon as possible. I also call upon every Member who represents any appreciable number of farmers in this House to get behind this measure and help us to put over a program that will enable us to electrify every farm home in America at rates the people can afford to pay.

The matter referred to follows:

[77th Cong., 1st sess. H. R. 4931. In the House of Representatives, June 2, 1941. Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, by providing for loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in aggregate amount not to exceed $100,000,000 in each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year 1942; by prescribing the rate of interest and maturity of loans made under said act; and by authorizing the extension of the maturities of and the reduction of interest rates on loans heretofore made]

Be it enacted, etc., That the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon his request approved by the President, not exceeding in aggregate amount $100,000,000 for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, with interest at the same rate as shall be chargeable on loans to borrowers made in the same year pursuant to section 4, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act or from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order No. 7037: *Provided, however,* That the maturity of such obligations incurred pursuant to section 5 for the purpose of financing the wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments, and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of all such obligations or otherwise to secure loans made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

(2) Subsection (e) of section 3 is amended by striking out the words "*And provided further,* That no loans shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator after June 30, 1937.", and by changing the colon following the word "Territories" to a period.

(3) Section 4 is amended by inserting after the words "central station service" and before the colon preceding the first proviso, the following words "and the acquisition and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems in rural areas" and by striking out the words "*Provided, however,* That all such loans shall be self-liquidating within a period of not to exceed 25 years, and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued." and inserting in lieu thereof the words "*Provided, however,* That all such loans shall be self-liquidating within a period of not to exceed 50 years, and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations issued during the preceding fiscal year:".

(4) Section 5 is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Such loans shall be for such terms, subject to such conditions and so secured as reasonably to assure repayment thereof, and shall bear interest at the rate prescribed for loans under section 4."

(5) Section 12 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Administrator is authorized and empowered to extend the time of payment of interest on or principal of the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator, including obligations securing loans made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: *Provided, however,* That with respect to obligations evidencing loans made under section 4, the time of payment of principal shall not be extended more than 5 years beyond the maximum period provided in section 4 for the self-liquidation of loans, and the time of payment of interest shall not be extended more than 5 years after such payment shall have become due: *And provided further,* That with respect to obligations evidencing loans made under section 5, the time of payment of principal or interest shall not be extended more than 5 years after such payment shall have become due."

SEC. 2. Commencing with the effective date of this act, loans made prior thereto by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations issued during the fiscal year preceding the effective date of this act, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed, upon the request of the Administrator, to extend the time of payment of each such loan for a period not to exceed 50 years from the respective dates upon which such loans were made.

SEC. 3. The Administrator is authorized and empowered to reduce the rate of interest on the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator which are outstanding on the effective date of this act, including obligations securing loans made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: *Provided, however,* That the rate as reduced shall not be less than the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations issued during the fiscal year preceding the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. The amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Balancing the Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT, OF MISSOURI

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, last evening, over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., my colleague, Mr. PHILIP A. BENNETT, the Member from the Sixth District of Missouri, made a stirring and logical appeal for the people's support to keep this Nation out of war:

Fellow Americans, we are living in a tragic period. The lurid clouds of war and the smoke of battle hover over a great part of the civilized world. Airplanes, winging their way through the blue, drop death upon helpless men, women, and children, while submarines, stealing their way through the dark depths of ocean, loose deadly torpedoes to send other humans mangled to the bottom of the sea. Wanton destruction, horrible beyond human comprehension, razes city after city, village after village in Europe and the Orient while the finest works that have come from the hands of man over the centuries are destroyed. In view of these awful conditions, we find ourselves divided over the question whether we should disregard the advice of the Father of our Country, and of the great men who have followed him in the Presidential office, to avoid foreign entanglements, or yield to our natural sympathy for the oppressed and enter the war. Before we take such an important step let us balance the risks.

Two major groups are battling for the leadership of American foreign policy—the "interventionists" and the "noninterventionists." Already these labels have become fighting words with a whole string of epithets attached to them. Interventionists are the warmongers and British agents. Noninterventionists are appeasers, isolationists, and defeatists. In the middle of this verbal free-for-all are a few interventionists so un-American and un-Christian as to label those who honestly disagree with them as pro-German or Nazi fellow travelers. Recently we have witnessed an intense barrage of propaganda laid down by the accredited and responsible spokesman of the administration calling for convoys, for patrols for any and all measures necessary to aid Britain. The proponents of war have finally come out into the open and have said bluntly that we must be prepared to risk participation in a shooting war if necessary to save England. Cash and carry has now been changed to "give and deliver."

We are now talking about freedom of the seas. What does freedom of the seas mean? It means that we insist, as a nation, on sending our merchant ships, or our Navy, or both, anywhere in the waters of the seven seas we choose, regardless of what conditions of warfare may exist in any region of the world.

Now let us look at that for a minute. The city streets are free public highways. Every citizen has the right to walk down a city street if he chooses to do so. That is freedom of the streets and highways. But

what is to be said of the citizen's intelligence if two groups, one on each side of the street, are shooting at each other, or dropping bombs on each other, or undermining and blowing up each other, and that citizen still insists upon his right to walk down the street between the two battling groups without as much as a pea shooter in his pocket, without any method of enforcing his rights to the freedom of the streets?

Now there isn't any use to try to gloss over, or to ignore, or to explain away our condition today. We have been told by everybody from the President down through every responsible military and naval officer, that we are not yet equipped to defend ourselves. So then, when we begin to insist upon freedom of the seas, we are assuming the position of a citizen who insists upon exercising his right of freedom of streets regardless of how many bullets are flying across them. To do that at this time, in the condition we are in, from a military and naval standpoint, is to prepare to sacrifice millions of American boys who would not have a chance. It is a fact well known here in Washington that we have not enough military equipment on hand today to equip properly an army of 500,000 men, much less 4,000,000. The proponents of war insist on talking about equipment on hand and on order. Before we think about on-order equipment being of any practical value in this situation, we have first to think of a lot of strikes which have been permitted to go on week after week and recur in every section of the country. We have got to think of a lot of bottlenecks, not the least of which is the lack of skilled workmen to build this defense we have on order.

The best estimate Congress can get from military authorities is that we do not yet have adequate defensive, let alone adequate offensive, war weapons. Let me warn you now, my fellow citizens, that wishful thinking, and oversanguine estimates, and airplanes and tanks and guns and uniforms "on order" do not win wars. Those things win wars only when they are on the field in action, not on blueprints. What are the blunt, naked, ugly facts about this situation, as we are being urged into war? We haven't a trained army of men to begin with. It will take considerable time adequately to train our army of draftees. Young men do not leave counting houses, or college or high school or farms or ribbon counters, and the next day go up in airplanes, and step out into space with a parachute and a tommy gun. It takes training—long training—to do that sort of thing.

We haven't an army of trained men fit to send into a shooting war. We have not the equipment—battle equipment—not even training equipment, for an adequate army. We haven't the ships to carry an army across the seas with its impedimentia. Remember the military authorities say that we would have to land an army of 4,000,000 men in Europe to have an expeditionary force of any value. It takes, according to military authority, 7 tons of military impedimentia per man. Four million men would require—think of this—28,000,000 tons of ammunition and supplies. That would be on the first trip. We would then have to keep a line of supplies and communications open across 3,000 miles of stormy sea to supply that army of 4,000,000 men. Now, will some of these people who are eager to get into war tell me where in the world we would find enough ships to send 28,000,000 tons of war material across the sea? If we can't get supplies to Britain now in sufficient quantities, will some of these people who are beating the war drums please tell us how we could get sufficient additional supplies over to take care of 4,000,000 of our own boys?

Now, let's sum up a bit:

If we had an army of trained men, which we haven't; and if we had the equipment for an army of trained men, which we haven't; and if we had a fleet of ships to transport those trained men whom we haven't with their equipment, which we haven't; and if we had a place to land them in Europe, which we haven't; and if we had the ships, plus a two-ocean Navy, plus the airplanes to guard those ships and to keep open lines of communication across 3,000 miles of sea, which we haven't; then, and only then, would we be even justified in talking about going into a shooting war with anybody in Europe. If we attack the dictators, we must defeat them on foreign fields.

Now, my fellow citizens, you fathers and mothers whose sons are going to be sent across the ocean to spill their blood, give up their lives, or come back to you broken in mind and mangled in body, for a perfectly futile mission, these are the bare facts, stripped of all the dishonest pretense and all of the wishful thinking and all of the gloss and varnish of propaganda that has been poured over these ugly but realistic facts.

This question of going into a shooting war is not a problem of what we might like to do, it is not a question of whether we like or dislike the methods of the dictators. It is a question of using enough common sense to be ready to do some fighting before we get into a war with anybody. Nobody is shooting at us. Our greatest dangers are not from without but from within.

We have a lot of unsolved domestic problems that we must think of while we are being literally deafened by the din of those who are beating the war drums. In advance, not afterward, but in advance, we must count the costs of war; we must look forward and see what will be our own economic condition at the end of such a war. We must figure out how in the depression that will follow this orgy of destruction and hate we are going to manage to keep the flame burning in the torch of liberty here in America. We won't do it by going to war before we are prepared for war, and being defeated. We won't keep the torch of liberty burning in America by decimating on the battlefields the youth of this land because we go into war before we are fully prepared even to defend ourselves against an enemy, let alone assail an enemy across 3,000 miles of ocean. Again the balance of risk favors peace.

Fascism was not born with Hitler and will not die with Hitler. Fascism is something which springs from a certain type of economic and social soil. Nowhere does there exist such fine soil for fascism as a land economically exhausted and unbalanced by a costly war—and disillusioned by the inevitable tragic post-war awakening. That is the soil in which fascism flourishes. That is the soil which produced Soviet Russia, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany. That is the soil which will produce a Hitlerized America—even though Hitler be dead and buried.

In an effort to frighten the people, the proponents of war claim that if England goes down, we will be invaded. Every handicap that would be ours in an effort to invade Germany would likewise be a handicap to the dictator in an attack upon the United States. Today he has air bases near England, in Norway, Belgium, and France. Where would his air bases be while trying to invade America? In South America? South America is farther from the United States than Germany. Here again the risk is balanced in our favor.

Even if we were well prepared with arms and trained men; even if we had no national debt; even if we ran no risk of losing liberty at home, I plead with you to stop and think of the horrors of war; of human arms and legs stacked like cordwood outside field hospitals; of eyes that cannot see; of reason forever gone; of flesh and lungs burned by gas; of sorrowing mothers, wives, sweethearts, and for what? To satisfy the ambition of some to live in history and to preserve the financial investments of others. It requires neither moral nor physical courage to plan wars for others to fight.

"What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" I trust that I may not be thought irreverent when I ask you what shall it profit America if by trying to establish the four freedoms for others, we lose them at home?

The most dangerous threat to our Republic is not Hitler. It is the kind of bitter intolerance that is being shown to those of us who do not want to go to war at this time. I dare say that 90 percent of the Members of Congress were elected upon a promise to keep America out of foreign wars. But, we are told, "You should support the President." Well, the President, too, was elected upon a promise to keep us out of war. He has not yet broken that promise. I know that terrific pressure is being put upon him, but my prayer is that he may stand firm, and he will keep his promise if enough of you write or wire him to do so. Anyway, it is not his to declare war. That power under the Constitution is vested in the people through their duly elected Representatives in Congress. If I believed that England was fighting our fight, I would introduce a resolution in Congress declaring war. I deny she is fighting our fight. I deeply sympathize with the unfortunate people of England, but my first obligation is to my native land—the good old U. S. A. We should not be hypocritical in these dark days. Let us face the facts. Let us be realistic. We cannot by force change the character and habits of peoples; we cannot establish peace where teachings of the Prince of Peace have failed after 2,000 years.

This is, indeed, a critical hour. Mothers of America, where are you? They are your boys who would be sent to die on foreign shores. Speak while you may. You have the same right to be heard as the President. Make your chorus for peace so loud he cannot help but hear. Like the besiegers of Jericho of old, you can, if you will, shout down the walls behind which the warmongers hide.

In Reply to the President's Fireside Chat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. VITO MARCANTONIO, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a radio address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. hook-up on Memorial Day:

My fellow Americans, as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, I have fought the administration's imperialist program of armaments, conscription, war, and dictatorship from the very beginning. At times I have had to vote alone. I have

not opposed it partially. I have opposed it in its entirety. Therefore, I now make answer to the President's fireside speech of last Tuesday night, which proclaimed the shooting and bloodshedding and dictatorship phases of the Wall Street-Downing Street Axis scheme for war, Empire, and dictatorship.

Despite the frantic activity on the part of the press, radio, false leaders of labor, and those who occupy the seats of the mighty to scare you, the American people, into a state of war hysteria, over 90 percent are opposed to involvement in this war. You have been saying, and are saying "No" to convoys, to an expeditionary force, and to everything that makes for war. It is precisely due to your overwhelming opposition to war that the President sought by means of a fireside-speech proclamation to take the issue of war and peace away from the Congress of the United States and away from you, the American people, thereby making it appear that war was inevitable and that the issue was closed. This war is by no means inevitable and the issue is by no means closed. You, the American people, can get our Nation out of war and keep it out of war.

The President in his speech repeated that the only thing to fear was fear. Yet despite this assertion, he used fear, fear of an attack by Hitler as a justification for the usurpation of the right to determine when, where, and at whom the shooting was to begin, for a redefinition of defense so as to have it actually mean aggression, to in effect destroy the Neutrality Act, and thereby create a situation in which a war incident would be unavoidable; for an attempt to set up a dictatorship over the very life of every American. He used fear, fear of an attack by Hitler for this four-way panzer attack on the peace and liberties of the people, notwithstanding the fact that he knew of the existence of the unanimous report of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, filed on May 16, 1940, made after years of study, that this country and this hemisphere cannot be successfully invaded by any nation or combination of nations.

When to shoot, whom to shoot, and where to shoot is a power vested only in the representatives of the American people assembled in Congress, whose sworn duty is to do the will of the people. The assumption of this power by the President is not only unconstitutional but it constitutes a dictatorship second to no other existing dictatorship, including even that of Adolf Hitler. The President was never given this power either by the forefathers of this country or by the mandate of the American people in the last election. There is no difference between a Nazi system by which one man orders his people to shoot or be shot at in Poland or in Holland and a system as set up by the President in his speech whereby one man can order his people to shoot or be shot at in Dakar tomorrow and in Singapore the day after tomorrow, or somewhere in South America, Europe, or on the high seas.

Neither the demagogic use of the word "democracy," of the phrase "freedom of the seas," of the four freedoms, nor of the fear of invasion by Hitler will cause you, the American people, to accept this new order.

The President, in his speech, also redefined defense. Defense now means, according to the President, fighting on the high seas in order to carry out aid to Britain, or fighting a thousand miles away from Boston, Mass., at Dakar, or anywhere else that he may choose. This definition of defense is a distortion and you must repudiate it. Imperialist aggression at Dakar, or in Europe, or in South America is not defense of our shores, or of our way of life. It is in pursuance of a course of empire, of the Wall Street-Downing Street axis.

The entire war program has been marked by fraud and deception. Under the guise of defense, America was plunged into a program of armaments, destructive to the economic and social welfare of the entire Nation. On May 16, 1940, the President asked Congress for these armaments, and said we needed them for defense against invasion. Yet, after the elections, in another fireside speech, the President revealed the true character of the armaments, as an arsenal for one belligerent as against another belligerent. Conscription was sold to the American people as a 1-year peacetime training for the youth of our country. Now, conscription is revealed in its true light as training for a war of aggression, and the assurances of the duration of 1 year have been cast into a pale of doubt and confusion.

You, the American people, were even tricked into a phoney Presidential election, deprived of the opportunity to vote up or down the President's war program, by Wall Street imposing on the party of the opposition a candidate who joined his opponent in selling the American people this war, concealed in the wrappings of such peace and defense slogans as "Aid short of war" and repetition of pledges of again and again and again promising that your boys would never be sent to any foreign war. Aid short of war has now been completely forgotten by both the President and his opponent. Even the lend-lease bill was given to the American people in the name of defense and as a peace measure. Now we are told that in order to carry out the provisions of this act, we must do what we were promised would never be done—to shoot when, where, and at whom the President may decide.

They have sought to ease you, the American people, into this undeclared war by fraud and deception against your will, and now by redefinition of defense and by usurpation of power they seek to shed the blood of your sons on land and sea without your consent.

The President, in his speech, demanded unity and backed his demand with the proclaiming of an unlimited national emergency. You are told that the debate must be closed and everybody must unite and acquiesce to the program of war and dictatorship. And all for what? For democracy, we are told. The very fact that you, the people, are being sneaked into this war, the very fact that the President has arrogated unto himself unconstitutional power, the very fact that fraud and deception have been used throughout this whole scheme and conspiracy, the very fact that all this is being done without your consent, and that you are being deprived of your right to decide, demonstrates conclusively that this is not a war for democracy.

China was mentioned in his speech, for the President could not very well talk of democracy or of the four freedoms or of the minimum wages and maximum hours of the people of India, Africa, Egypt, nor of the wage slaves of British-owned West Indies, nor of the exploited masses of British-owned China in Hong Kong and Singapore. No; it would not have been in keeping with these four freedoms nor consistent with his condemnation of the Nazi slave labor as a menace to our trade, if he had talked about the portions of rice that are being doled out to the millions and millions of Britain's exploited toilers all over the world as wages for their labor. The President also failed to tell you that the very gasoline that Japan uses for the destruction of lives in China is furnished in great quantities by the same ladies and gentlemen who are advocating that your sons kill and be killed in a war for their vest-pocket democracy. Yes, my fellow Americans, the President failed to tell you that while we are fueling Japan with oil, we have been fooling China with words. Nor were we told that Ireland is being starved in order to force a surrender of her sovereignty and her neutrality.

And as for South America, the people of South America know that exploitation is exploitation and that imperialism is imperialism, be it by Berlin, London, or Wall Street. They know particularly when the President assumed the right to speak and to set forth and dictate the foreign policy for these South American neighbors that it was an extension of dictatorship over them. Further, they will never forget our tyranny over Puerto Rico.

No, this is not a war for democracy. It is a war for conquest. It is a war to determine whether the Wall Street-Downing Street axis or the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis shall exploit humanity. Examine the record of the people who are asking your sons to die for this so-called democracy of theirs. The same gang that caused the defeat of the Republic of Spain with the assent of the administration, that put over the Hoare-Laval deal on the people of Africa without protest from our administration, that made Munich possible with the consent of our administration, is the ally of those who beat the tom-tom war drums, and whom the President himself characterized as economic royalists and as enemies of democracy in 1936. They ask that you sacrifice for their kind of democracy, for a democracy which means war, empire, 52,000,000 empty stomachs, a higher and higher cost of living, decreased W. P. A., more taxes for you, and more profits for them, a destroyed Bill of Rights, persecuted foreign-born and political minorities, the poll tax, lynchings, discrimination on jobs because of race, color, or creed, a shackled labor, and an impoverished farmer. This is the democracy for which the President arrogated unto himself the right to determine when, where, and at whom to shoot. This is the democracy for which defense has been translated into aggression. This is the democracy for which a false national unity is dictated to you.

It is precisely because you recognize that this war is a war between two sets of the enemies of the American people, that it is a war of Hitlerism versus Hitlerism which will only mean the triumph of a Hitlerism of either brand, it is precisely because you know that it makes no difference to the enslaved people throughout the world whether the whip is in the hands of Adolf Hitler or whether the whip which lashes them into slavery is held in the hands of the masters of the Wall Street-Downing Street axis, that you reject this false national unity and refuse to surrender your peace and your liberties. Hitlerism can and must be defeated. However, Hitlerism cannot be defeated by plunging into this imperialist war to insure the victory of the Wall Street-Downing Street brand of Hitlerism. The only weapon against Hitlerism is real democracy with no ifs and buts in our Bill of Rights, with no exception to the proposition of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, with the guaranty of the rights of labor, of free unions, abolition of the poll tax and all kinds of discrimination, a decent living for the American farmer, and jobs for the unemployed. Before such a democracy, collaborating with all of the democracy and peace-loving people of the world, both brands of Hitlerism inexorably will collapse. Therefore, write to the President, your Congressmen and Senators, and insist that they take this Nation out of war and keep us out of war, because you want no part of it.

In this hour, the most crucial hour of our history, I appeal to my follow countrymen, American men and American women of all races, of all color and of all creeds, to defeat this war and dictatorship conspiracy. The conspirators are powerful and occupy the seats of the mighty, but they are few. You, the people, are millions. This is our county.

Our lives are our own. Our liberties are God-given. I appeal to you to unite, stand up as free men and free women, as brave men and brave women, and let the world know that you refuse to be rushed further into this war, that you refuse to be sneaked into this war, that you refuse to be duped by fraud and deception into this war, that you refuse to accept edicts or proclamations for war and for dictatorship in a free United States. Americans, save your peace, save your sons, save your liberties—unite and fight.

Memorializing the President and Congress To Enact a Federal Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

RESOLUTION BY CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein, and to call to the attention of the Congress and people generally, the following resolution passed by the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress to enact legislation to amend the Social Security Act, in order to make possible the payment of a Federal Retirement Pension to senior citizens, as a matter of right. I consider this resolution of great importance and know that many of my colleagues will agree with me. The resolution was introduced in the California Assembly by Assemblymen Dills and King:

House Resolution 170

Whereas under the present Federal Social Security Act no provision is made for retirement income for those who already have reached retirement age, or for those who later will attain that age, who have as farmers or business or professional men or women or in other capacities created jobs for themselves and others, nor for those who have been employed on farms or in homes, churches, public offices, or other employment excluded from title 2 of the Federal Social Security Act, except by submitting to poverty registration of themselves and all members of their families, while retirement income and widows' pensions are made available to all employed in business and industrial establishments without question as to their economic status, thereby discouraging individual initiative and private enterprise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized to enact legislation so to amend title 1 of the Social Security Act as to make a minimum of $30 per month available, as a matter of right, to every retired citizen 60 years of age or older, who is not drawing annuities in that amount under any other Federal retirement system; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States and that they be and they are hereby requested to support legislation which will effectuate the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor and the presiding officer of the senate and the assembly in each of the States now having a legislative session and to the Governors of all the other States and that the said officers be and they are hereby respectfully requested to present the same to their respective legislative bodies with a request that each of them promptly take similar action to the end that there shall be a known definite public demand upon our Federal Government from these States for prompt elimination, in the manner herein indicated, of the injustice herein complained of; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly of this State be and he is hereby instructed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker and to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to all other persons to whom this resolution is specifically directed.

The National Youth Administration, Its Operation in Michigan Under the Administration of Orin W. Kaye, State Administrator, and John L. Wagner, Wayne County Area Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, the National Youth Administration will have rounded out a 5-year span. It is an anniversary to which, in my opinion, considerable social significance should attach. It is my wish, therefore, to append at this time a brief appraisal of National Youth Administration to the all-too-thin transcript previously recorded by persons who believe in its enormous potentialities and who favor its continued expansion.

When I assert that this transcript has been too thin, no inference is intended that National Youth Administration has failed to win its share of recognition and approval in Congress. It has, as a matter of fact, won a reassuring measure of backing. What I do mean is, that of articulate praise it has won far less than its richly deserved share, and for two fairly obvious reasons. First, is that the national emergency has pretty well monopolized the public records. Second, National Youth Administration's capable administrators have lacked both the time and the facilities to effectively dramatize for public consumption a record of progress that has been truly remarkable.

I believe that actions speak louder than words, but in a sense this reticence regarding the growing importance of National Youth Administration is to be deeply regretted. I, for one, feel that too much cannot be said in its praise.

For here is an agency as nearly self-sustaining as any to stem from the Roosevelt domestic program, and one which has outsped all others in gearing itself to the urgent demands of national defense. Here, in action, is the solution of a problem that seemed unanswerable a few years back—the problem of what to do about our youth in their relation to technological unemployment.

To paint an adequate picture of N. Y. A.'s growth, to outline its scope in even a general way, would call for a canvass bigger than is at my disposal. And the mere listing of the dozens of mechanical pursuits in which young Americans are now being trained or the listing of the essential items they are fabricating under supervision of their Government, would necessarily fail to do N. Y. A. its full justice.

Any such cataloging of mere fact and figure might let those important and analysis-defying intangibles escape. I have reference to the character-molding aspects of the training, the development of self-confidence, and ambition, and self-respect now being engendered in N. Y. A. youth by the age-old but too long forgotten prescription of hard work and plenty of it.

It is intended, therefore, in this résumé to touch briefly on N. Y. A.'s achievements in my own section, that is, Detroit and Wayne County, and also to cite some instances of progress it has accomplished in the State of Michigan. Such restricted treatment is, after all, natural inasmuch as this is the section about which I am most competent to pass judgment. Furthermore, it is a pleasure I could not very well forego in view of some interesting material just sent along to me from the efficient offices of Orin W. Kaye, State Administrator, and John L. Wagner, Wayne County area director.

But before getting around to this, I would like to point out that no purely provincial viewpoint, no merely local appraisal, can portray the truly vast notion of N. Y. A. If we wish a rounded-out picture of the task it is engaged upon, we must bear in mind that there are in the United States some 20,000,000 young people between 16 and 25 years of age. A percentage of these are in school or in the Army or Navy. But a great proportion are out looking for jobs, which several million are destined not to find in either a peacetime or a wartime economy unless they are trained for the particular job they would like to get.

It was not long ago that a half million of these hopeless and confused youngsters—boys and girls alike—were roaming the highways and the railways of the country, a lost generation headed for nowhere. Children from poverty-stricken homes, the very force that made most of them "road kids," was a fierce American pride that could not abide their sharing the few crusts needed by less able members of their brood. A lot of that pride, a lot of that courageous spirit of adventure could have been harnessed had we known the N. Y. A. formula back in those days. Young and able hands could have been trained in useful pur-

suits, the pride of craftsmanship could have been awakened, and self-respect retained in thousands of these young wanderers.

In a sense the road kids of the deep depression years did not live in vain, for it was the phenomenon of this lost generation as much as any other single factor that expedited the establishment of N. Y. A. back in 1935. Today the safeguarding of the younger brothers and sisters of these road kids is the solemn and sacred function of N. Y. A. And I doubt if ever our Government made an investment from which it will eventually reap a greater profit.

During the fiscal year now coming to a close N. Y. A. has been training 600,000 young men and women for defense industries through work experience in some 5,000 workshops scattered from coast to coast. It has been helping another 500,000 to get an education by providing part-time work through which to pay their way.

One of the most easily understood indexes proclaiming the success of N. Y. A. is the amazingly high number of youth it is graduating into private employment. And it is around this point that I wish to bring forward a few facts relative to the growing stature of N. Y. A. in my own community and my own State.

Figures from N. Y. A.'s Wayne County office reveal that 39 percent of the 10,918 youth carried on the rolls for the first 10 months of this fiscal year have secured regular jobs, largely in the industrial plants of the Detroit area.

These Wayne County figures include both in-school and out-of-school programs. They include those who have been gaining their experience in the regular work centers, operated and maintained exclusively under N. Y. A. auspices, as well as those employed on cosponsored projects, such as city and county offices, hospitals, and so forth. Wayne County has more than 300 of these cosponsored projects where young people are working side by side with veterans in several specialized fields.

Today, Wayne County has 5 work centers including an outstanding operation, known as Southfield project, which is regarded as one of the largest and most complete N. Y. A. machine shops in the country. Opened last August, the sightseer who might invade Southfield today, without foreknowledge, would have no way of detecting that he had not stepped inside the nerve center of one of Detroit's great industrial plants, so competently and busily engaged are all its 1,000 young employees.

Another highly regarded Detroit project, located on premises owned by the Michigan State Fair, is now preparing to move its outstanding wood shop, drafting department, and sign-painting department into more ample quarters on Detroit's east side. Growth and progress are constantly making such changes necessary inside the N. Y. A. structure.

As elsewhere throughout the country, the work systems and environment obtaining in private employment are simulated as closely as possible in Wayne County work centers. Thus, the young workers are required to punch their time "in" and "out" on standard factory time clocks, and are "docked" if tardy, unless an extremely valid excuse is forthcoming. The pay scale in the work centers ranges from $18 to $20 a month, the latter rate in effect in Wayne County only at Southfield.

Because they penalize the young employee for coming late, one is not to conclude that a too drastic system of discipline is in effect. Quite the contrary, all the centers are staffed with counselors whose duty it is to adjust the youth to their jobs and assist, as well, in the solution of personal problems if such assistance is invited.

Wayne County's "in school" program, that is, its provision of part-time jobs for students in secondary schools and colleges, is currently assisting at a scale that fluctuates between $3 and $20 a month, students in all of the county's high schools as well as those pursuing college courses at the University of Detroit, Wayne University, and the Detroit Institute of Technology. The pay is certainly meager enough, but it is reported that in hundreds of instances these few dollars represent the difference between remaining in school or dropping out into an already glutted labor market.

Since the defense program was launched last year, increasing emphasis has been placed on projects which afford work experience and basic training in mechanical pursuits. Thus, at Southfield which, incidentally, employs boys only, work on production of socially useful goods shows that a high volume of items is manufactured directly for defense needs.

Working in close conjunction with Army and Navy stations in Michigan—Fort Custer, Fort Wayne, Selfridge Field, and Detroit's Coast Guard Station and naval armory—Southfield's boys have been producing a wide range of articles which include equipment for the military police and also such needed items as wheelbarrows, kitchen tables, street signs, and rear steps for trucks.

Besides the service branches, a number of public agencies in Detroit and Michigan are profitably availing themselves of the manufactured items and services rendered by the Southfield project, as well as by all the other work centers in the county and State. While I may appear to be stressing work at Southfield, I do so only to indicate specifically the scope and utility of these work centers as they are functioning in much the same fashion in every State in the Union.

National Youth Administration youth are not engaged at make-believe, academic tasks, undertaken for mere practice. They are practical producers of usable and needed products. For every item on their production schedules there is a definite waiting market. The fact that this market always constitutes some public agency or institution, Federal, State, or municipal, with no cost involvement whatsoever to the beneficiary, is as tangible evidence as any of the economy represented in this great program.

The defense program has also expanded the opportunities for young women in N. Y. A. As a result, machine shops exclusively for women are now beginning to dot the country. Such a one, known as the Lafayette project, is today in operation about a mile from Detroit's city hall.

Since it was transformed this spring into a girls' work center, Lafayette project has proved a happy hunting ground for the photographers from Detroit's three newspapers. Here, to the gentlemen of the press is news in the strictest sense of the word, unique, appealing, and significant. But it may be that the newspapermen, in discovering a group of photogenic young women who are not afraid to get their pretty noses greasy or their manicures spoiled, are missing the real point of the story. To the young girl mechanics, their training is a deadly serious business designed to launch them in a very short time into good-paying jobs in private industry.

Already the girls at the Lafayette project have demonstrated a surprising aptitude as operators of lathes, milling machines, shapers, drill presses, welding machines, and so forth. They are forcefully showing the important role woman is able to play in any possible program of "total defense."

So readily and naturally are these young women taking to their machine tasks, the Wayne County area office informs me, that plans are now seriously being considered to put them to work in the near future at the highly complicated and precision task of manufacturing micrometers. At this time, I am told, it requires a year to get delivery on these essential gages and their scarcity in both the Army and Navy already is said to be noticeable.

Out in Detroit there are many people who appreciate a good thing when they see it and as proof of the favor N. Y. A. is earning out there, it gives me pleasure to read into the record the following editorial, published in the May 12, 1941, issue of Automotive Daily News, generally recognized as one of the industry's most authoritative publications:

S O S FOR N. Y. A.

In the Congressional hopper in Washington there is a bill in which automobile dealers, as well as the industry as a whole, should be particularly interested because it has a particular bearing on one of their main problems. It asks for a financial support for the National Youth Administration, a governmental organization which trains youth in mechanical and production work. Translated into automobile lingo, N. Y. A. is the training school whose graduates become our shop mechanics, replacements for those boys in the back room who are taken over for defense work. At the same time they are getting a rudimentary training which will fit them also for defense work.

Now here is striking proof from an industry governed by as hard-boiled and at the same time as competent a group as are to be found anywhere in American business. And it is, furthermore, a tribute which has been won the hard way without benefit of tom-tom-beating ballyhoo because, knowing Messrs. Kaye and Wagner personally, I am aware that they are not the point-with-pride type

of executive. And I suspect this is pretty much true of the N. Y. A. executive personnel throughout the country. At least, to my knowledge, they seem to have gone about their work quietly. Certainly, they have been notably distinguished by their apparent disregard of the usual pressure techniques, the not unfamiliar displays of bluster and the usual overdrawn claims characterizing some of the brethren we know up here on Capitol Hill.

Personally, while I admire this attitude very much, I think the time has come when N. Y. A. should take its light out from behind the bushel, and on the basis of its remarkable 5-year growth, should do a little shouting for the public ear.

I believe the whole set-up should be accurately evaluated, the splendid results computed, and the public be made more fully conversant with the facts regarding a public agency about whose permanency I have not the slightest doubt. Of all the heritages bequeathed the American people by the New Deal, I can think of none more able to build and develop where the need for constructive effort is greatest.

Because my time is limited, I will not be able to mention the project at Cassidy Lake, Mich., where the construction of gliders has been in progress for several months under some of the ablest tutelage in the Middle West. But I think this phase of N. Y. A.'s imaginative program should speak for itself in this very week when the British Army has tragically been forced to evacuate the strategic island of Crete, due to the use by the Nazi army of this very type of aerial navigation for the first time in military history.

Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

LETTER FROM J. J. McENTEE, DIRECTOR OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps:

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1941.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TARVER: During the hearings recently held by your subcommittee on the C. C. C. section of the Labor-Federal Security Administration appropriation estimates, several questions were asked regarding the general character and value of the work performed by members of the C. C. C. This office was asked to furnish an estimate of (1) what the work performed by the Civilian Conservation Corps during the last fiscal year would have cost had it been performed by ordinary labor, and (2) what, in our opinion, the dollar and cents return has been, and will be, as a result of the work performed by the corps in the conservation of natural resources.

It is estimated that the value of work performed by the C. C. C. during the fiscal year 1940 amounted to $220,000,000. While no exact figure can be given in connection with question (2), the best estimate available at this time is that the future value of work accomplished by the corps over the last 8 years will greatly exceed $1,500,000,000. This figure has been reached by estimating the future value of the more than 2,500,000,000 trees planted; the 118,500 miles of truck trails and minor roads constructed through forests; the 85,000 miles of telephone lines laid; the more than 4,000 fire towers constructed; the close to 100,000 bridges and buildings built; the forest areas developed into forest and park recreational areas; the 3,900,000 acres of forests improved to effect faster and sounder growth; the range lands revegetated; the reclamation and wildlife work done; the drainage ditches rehabilitated; and the many other kinds of work completed. No attempt has been made to place an exact estimate on the future savings effected through trees saved by enrollee fire fighters who have expended more than 6,000,000,000 man-days fighting forest fires.

As one example, it is estimated by competent lumber authorities that the more than two and a half billion trees planted by enrollees since the spring of 1933 will have a future value of $240,000,000.

Before answering questions (1) and (2) in more detail, let me state that the Civilian Conservation Corps, in carrying out its dual functions of advancing conservation programs of Nation-wide proportions and training young men for future employment and future participation in American democracy, has devoted its full work energies to the prosecution of natural resources work projects of definite physical value to the Nation. The work done by the Corps has had for its purpose the protection, the development, and the expansion of our great physical resources of forests, topsoil, and water. None of the work undertaken could be described in any sense as made work or work performed merely for the purpose of keeping young men employed.

With reference to the usefulness of the work performed, I want to state that it is of the same general character and type as the work which the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and State conservation organizations have carried on for years on a limited scale in their efforts to preserve and develop our great physical resources of timber and topsoil. All work has been carried forward in accordance with long-range conservation programs planned out well in advance by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

From the very beginning of the C. C. C., all work projects, excepting those done on military reservations and the Winooski River flood-control project in Vermont where the War Department supervised the work, have been recommended to this office by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Grazing Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the General Land Office, and the Office of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and other services of the Department of Agriculture. No project has been approved until this office had been assured that the work to be performed was of definite constructive and permanent value which would benefit not only the present generation but future generations to come. Civilian Conservation Corps regulations provide also that all work performed must be done in conformance with the highest work standards of the two departments mentioned above. This has been assured by having all work supervised and inspected by technical experts selected by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

A specific example of the worth-while character of C. C. C. work projects may be found in Lake States forests where hundreds of millions of commercially useful type seedlings have been planted on cut-over and burned-over areas. These plantings, while growing into commercially valuable lumber, are gradually increasing in value as agents for halting erosion, for conserving water, and for bettering conditions for wildlife. For other examples, let me call attention to the Winooski River project in Vermont, the Lake of the Pines Dam in South Dakota, and the Skogie Lagoons flood control and recreational project in Illinois. Enrollees build roads, fire towers, extend lines of telephone communication in forests to provide better protection and administration of these areas. They carry on erosion-control projects on farms. Of this type of work, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service said, on the occasion of the Corps' eighth birthday on April 5, 1941, "It would be impossible to overestimate the contribution of the C. C. C. to the progress of soil conservation in the United States."

In 1933, when Congress approved the first C. C. C. legislation, Federal and State conservation authorities were engaged in a losing battle against the devastating forces of fire, tree-attacking insects and diseases, neglect and wasteful practices in their campaign to conserve and develop the Nation's once enormous physical resources. These departments had long-range conservation programs but national interest in conservation was lacking. Manpower needed to carry out these planned projects was unavailable.

It was not until the coming of the C. C. C. that funds and manpower were available in sufficient quantities to break the log jam that for years had, in effect, made our national conservation policy one of allowing our natural resources to decline in value yearly due to failure to prosecute a Nation-wide conservation program. The Civilian Conservation Corps, under the competent direction of trained technicians, revolutionized this conservation policy. Hundreds of thousands of young men were set to work protecting, conserving, and developing our natural resources. Over the last 8 years, these youths have made a direct physical contribution to every State and virtually every county in the country. A real start has been made to save American resources for present and future generations. Our national natural resources assets have been greatly enhanced. If this work is continued on a broad scale, the day will come when the natural-resources budget can be balanced.

Let me now take up the committee's questions in more detail. In replying to the first question, if we infer that your committee has in mind the use of ordinary labor under the supervision of the various technical agencies, then the total cost of the work performed during the fiscal year 1940, including labor, supervision, construction supplies, materials, and equipment would have been approximately $172,000,000. Of this amount, $132,000,000 represents common labor, $13,000,000 for field supervision and administrative costs, and $28,000,000 for construction supplies, materials, and equipment.

If on the other hand, we should assume that what is wanted is the cost of such work if performed by private industry on contract,

then the cost would greatly exceed the above estimate. The type of work performed by the Civilian Conservation Corps is so varied that it is extremely difficult to make a comparison of costs between C. C. C. enrollee labor and private labor. Much of this work is of a technical nature and requires more or less skilled labor. The average enrollee must be trained for the work, whether it is on soil-eroded areas, grazing lands, reclamation projects, forest preservation, or on recreational areas.

Based on 47,000,000 man-days spent during the fiscal year 1940 on work projects, a conservative estimate would be at least $220,000,000, which would include all costs. Using as a base the average wage for common labor (Bureau of Labor Statistics), the cost of such work, if performed by private industry, would amount to over $173,000,000 for labor costs alone. Add to this the cost of field supervision, which, in private industry performing work of a similar nature, varies from 5 to 15 percent. Allowing an average cost of 8 percent for field supervision, the total cost to this point amounts to $203,000,000, representing the total for all labor, common and supervisory.

To the above total must be added the cost of structures, parts, and equipment. During the fiscal year 1940 approximately $20,000,000 was spent on construction, supplies, and materials, and $8,000,000 for construction equipment, bringing the total to over $220,000,000.

The total expenditures by the C. C. C. for the fiscal year 1940 were $278,000,000. Deducting the cost computed for private industry leaves a balance of $58,000,000 which can be charged to the training, physical conditioning, medical and welfare programs of the C. C. C., or an average cost of $165 per enrollee.

Even though the cost of training as computed above is very small, consideration must be given to other important benefits which the C. C. C. offers to the enrollee and his family. During the fiscal year 1940 over 1,500,000 persons benefited from the monthly allotments enrollees made to their families—persons who were in need of relief.

Referring again to question two regarding the future return to be expected on the C. C. C. investment in conservation work, it would be impossible to furnish an exact and complete figure on the future values of the big total of corps accomplishments. No one can estimate accurately how many hundreds of thousands of acres of timberlands have been saved by the corps' protective activities in connection with forest fires and the attacks of the gypsy moth, the bark beetle, or the white pine blister rust which has endangered the Nation's entire white pine timber industry. Neither can one compute in dollars the future value to the Nation of the work the corps has done in watershed protection or in the development of a comprehensive State park system or to improve our national parks and monuments. In order to furnish an estimate, a study has been made of a number of the major items of work completed. For instance, competent authorities in the lumber and manufacturing industries were asked to compute to the best of their ability the future value on maturity of the more than 2,000,000 acres of forest lands planted to commercial-type trees. This office was advised that, assuming an average mortality rate for the trees and assuming that the C. C. C. timber stands reached maturity and that lumber values had not deteriorated, the C. C. C. trees should have a value in some 40 years of $240,000,000. Let me again repeat that it is my estimate that the total future value of C. C. C. work completed will greatly exceed $1,500,000,000.

If more detailed information is required I can furnish you with a complete list of all projects completed by the Civilian Conservation Corps since 1933.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. McENTEE, *Director.*

Memorial Day at Antietam National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many Memorial Day observances throughout the United States, the annual program at Antietam National Cemetery, Sharpsburg, Md., has long proved a mecca for thousands of American citizens who visit this historic shrine—the scene of the bloodiest battle of the Civil War.

According to records compiled by the National Park Service and released by Mr. Ralston B. Lattimore, associate historical technician, 26,000 soldiers were killed in 24 hours on the Antietam Battlefield.

It was my privilege to accept an invitation to participate in the Memorial Day program at Antietam National Cemetery, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein my address on that occasion:

Mr. Chairman, comrades, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with bated breath and whispering humbleness that I accept the kind invitation to come here today and assist in carrying out the annual program for the observance of Memorial Day inaugurated by the Grand Army of the Republic.

For many years the Antietam Memorial Association sponsored a program that was a mecca for thousands of American citizens who made their annual pilgrimage to this historic shrine. When our comrades of the Civil War reached the twilight of life, the torch was handed to us veterans of the World War to carry on in honor and respect the tribute of love and devotion to those defenders of our great Republic who now enjoy the sleep of the just.

Antietam National Cemetery is a living symbol of the spirit of sacrifice that was necessary to guarantee the existence of the ideals on which our Nation was founded. On this historic site Americans imbued with a love of country met in deadly combat and made the supreme sacrifice in order that one Nation indivisible with justice and liberty for all might prevail.

As we join in spirit the similar observances in many other communities where love and reverence is being paid to the dead of all wars, we are conscious of our great blessing that America is at peace with all nations—yet today is a sad day; sad because many of us have felt the loss of dear ones who made the supreme sacrifice for our beloved land; sad because of the possibility that we may again be plunged into a futile Old World conflict.

On the other hand, Memorial Day is also a day of inspiration, of exaltation, and of hope; for as Abraham Lincoln said in those immortal words at nearby Gettysburg, "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion."

When Lincoln spoke, that cause was to save our Nation from disunity; to preserve the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, from being torn apart and by being torn apart from final death as a nation. It was a heroic struggle to hold together this great Republic which our founding fathers at Valley Forge, Lexington, and Concord had fought so gallantly to create.

When the Civil War ended and the victory of Antietam had played a conspicuous part in restoring peace to our troubled Nation once more, our Republic was united. Again the people of America stood shoulder to shoulder—as they had in 1776—in a determined effort to build a greater and more united Nation. The custom of observing Memorial Day was the outgrowth of that stirring period known as the Civil War, and the desire of the American people for a day of tribute to their hero dead. All over the land our grandmothers and grandfathers on both sides of the Mason and Dixon line united in paying homage to their honored dead. In so doing, they removed their hats, dropped a spray of flowers on some soldier's grave, lifted their heads to the stirring notes of the Star-Spangled Banner, and, at the same time, in their hearts they resolved that this Nation shall never again be torn asunder, that we shall never again allow internal discord or partisan dissension to break the solid front of all Americans.

This action on the part of our forefathers took place here at Antietam, as well as in the most remote country churchyard in America.

Spurred on by such a determined resolve, America embarked upon a course backed by this unconquerable spirit of national unity that transformed this Republic into a mighty and respected Nation among the people of the world. Yes; a nation that in a short span of years became the leader of the world.

The Spanish-American War in 1898 temporarily halted our progress as a nation, but with a united and unconquerable spirit we soon emerged victorious and returned to our task of development as a nation.

When the war clouds gathered over Europe in 1914 America was a peaceful and united nation. As a result, in 1917, when we were told our Republic was in danger, we arose to the occasion and defended our national honor with the effectiveness to be expected of a united nation.

But our victory in 1917–18 was a hollow mockery. When the armistice ended hostilities and the battle lines were discarded, we found that the price we paid for our part in the World War was written in the blood of American youth and the tears and heartaches of American fathers and mothers. Then came the devastating aftermath of war; that rushing tide of depression, unemployment, starvation, and want. We saw the base political philosophies of the Old World seek to gain a foothold in our great Nation as many citizens were forced to the breadlines to keep body and soul together.

It was at this point that communism and other foreign fanatical ideologies sought to take root in the hearts of Americans. For the first time since the Civil War the unity of our Nation was challenged as these so-called isms sought to replace the spirit of Americanism so firmly implanted in our hearts by the brave sacrifices of such heroes as rest beneath the green sod of this historic battleground. In truth, for the past several years we as a nation have been fighting another Civil War aimed at eradicating the alien influences in our midst. We have been aided in our fight largely by patriotic organizations, of whom organized veterandom play an important part. This task of freeing ourselves from subversive elements was greatly impeded, as the same fanatical ideologies caused the war clouds of Europe to

again form over many peaceful nations of the Old World.

Unfortunately, we as a nation do not occupy at this critical period in world history the same position we enjoyed as a united nation in 1917–18. Today with the war clouds forming again and threatening our peace and security, we are in truth a house divided against itself. While our youth is again responding to their country's call, and our industries humming with activity as they strive to produce the needs of an adequate national defense, we find ourselves woefully lacking in national unity.

We lack the spirit of our heroic dead who knew no "ism" but true Americanism; who saluted no flag but the Stars and Stripes; and to whom preservation and advancement of American ideals was a birthright and a solemn duty to one's country. These honored dead whose memory we revere this day, believed in true Americanism, and were willing to fight and die for it; an Americanism that keeps strict faith with every word in the Bill of Rights and in every line of the Constitution. Yes, a kind of Americanism that gives you and me the right to express our opinions, to approve or disapprove, to commend or criticize, as we see fit.

That same Americanism that gives us the legal right to meet under the same roof as coworkers in the ranks of labor, as farmers in our local granges, as businessmen in our local chamber of commerce, as fraternal brothers in the Masonic Order, Knights of Columbus, Eagles, Odd Fellows, Elks, or Moose.

That same Americanism which leaves our newspapers free to print anything not in conflict with the laws of libel or decency, and which recognizes that a free press must be available to all and that if we deny it to those with whom we disagree today, it may be likewise denied us tomorrow. That same Americanism that in 1620 caused Pilgrim Fathers to migrate from England in search of individual liberty with the objective to establish homes in a new land where they could cling to the religious faith in which they believed.

And that same Americanism teaches us that the blessing of religious freedom must be ours forever if America is destined to survive. These are the concepts of liberty and freedom that motivated our hero dead, and you and I realize that there can be no compromise with such fundamental truths. We would be repudiating the principles of true Americanism were we to deny our neighbor the right to walk with his Lord and his God in his own way.

Our honored dead felt that no sacrifice was too great to guarantee that tolerance for the rights of others is the essence of Americanism applied to religious freedom, free speech, or other individual liberties. They took the position there must be freedom for all or freedom for none, and that those who would have America half slave and half free are traitors to the spirit of Americanism. They proved by their sacrifice that Americanism is not something you can sell for a price nor is it something you can put on or take off when you own a certain kind of uniform. To them Americanism was a way of life, a way of living. In short, it was the Nation's gospel handed down to them from the heroes of the American Revolution.

On this Memorial Day in a war-torn world we, the American people, to the number of over 130,000,000, are the custodians of the gospel of true Americanism. As trustees of this blessed heritage, Memorial Day 1941 should be a day of mediation, causing us to pause and reflect on the manner in which we are protecting the American way of life.

Who is there to deny that our mode of living is unequalled in the world today? It is not shared by the people of any other nation but belongs exclusively to the people of the United States.

Our precious heritage as free Americans sets us apart from all other people in the world. It has given us advantages so great that most minds fail to comprehend them. By virtue of this greatest of all gifts—American citizenship—the American people have more than twice as many automobiles as are owned by the other 2,000,000,000 human beings that inhabit the earth. By virtue of our many blessings, with 1 hour of labor an American workman can buy twice as much bread as an English or French workman and four times as much as can a German workman. By virtue of the American way of life, a child born into the home of an average American family will live years longer than will a child born into a similar home of any other great nation in the world.

In the short span of 150 years the American people through the American way of life own nine-twentieths or 45 percent of all the tangible wealth of the entire world despite the fact we have only 6 percent of the population of the entire world.

This gospel of true Americanism has made possible the great discovery of Bessemer and utilized it to gird this continent with tens of thousands of miles of railways. It made possible every suspension bridge, every ocean liner, and every great battleship. It has made possible the many uses of electricity, the invention of the mower, the reaper, and the steel plow and the farm tractor.

Yes, in the short span of 150 years this new Nation developed these worth-while achievements that for centuries were unknown to the Old World. These accomplishments constitute the world we know, as well as the American way of life. I repeat again, credit for these achievements belongs to that gospel of true Americanism made possible and perpetuated by those hero dead whose memory we commemorate this day.

As we solemnly rededicate ourselves to carry on the task for which they gave their last full measure of devotion we view with alarm as the war clouds again gather over this last peaceful Nation. True to our traditions, the American people are rallying to meet the challenge to the American way of life. The tramp of marching feet resounds throughout the Nation as the youth of America respond to the call of their country. Industries hum with activity as they strive to break all production records in their determined efforts to supply all the needs of an adequate national defense.

If America ever needed unity it is at this critical period in world history. It is distressing to witness labor and capital at swords points when we should be united in producing the necessary military equipment incident to our national defense. It is equally disturbing to see fellow Americans engage in name-calling contests that tend to weaken and divide us as a nation.

These seeds of discontent, sown by our own American citizens, prepare the soil for the planting of alien influences so easily accepted by a nation divided against itself.

Today America is being challenged as never before by enemies within and without. There are insidious forces at work within our own country who are seeking to undermine the basic ideals of our Republic. These political termites are tirelessly gnawing at the pillars of our form of government. And as I have said before they are encouraged by indifference on the part of many lukewarm Americans and by the active work of foreign agents.

Mark you, I hold no brief for the Communist, Nazi, Fascist, or any other un-American group. Yet regardless of how dangerous are these political philosophies they exhibit a unity of purpose that cannot fail to attract our attention. We are forced to admit reluctantly that the advocates of these new-fangled political concepts diametrically opposed to our gospel of true Americanism are fired with a fanatical zeal and enthusiasm that staggers the imagination of every one of us.

Such a nationalistic frame of mind as displayed by Nazi Germany has transformed into a mighty military machine a nation that in 1918 was conquered and subdued. We must recognize that for 7 years prior to the war now raging in Europe you and I read in the newspapers or witnessed in the news reel at our family theater the almost unbelievable systematic effort employed to arouse the national consciousness of the vanquished German people. From a prostrate nation they arose to take their place as the second greatest industrial nation in the world. Yes, we saw legions of German youth depicted in brown shirts and raising their hands in salute to an insignificant Austrian paperhanger, now held in abject contempt by the nations of the world as a ruthless invader of peace-loving nations.

Today those same youth of Nazi Germany are the spark plugs in the blitzkrieg that has reduced 14 countries in succession to a state of servitude.

Let us dwell for a moment on the activities of other nations since the close of the first World War. When we look back we now recall with vivid recollection that while Hitler pursued his program the remainder of the world, including our own America, was content to take everything for granted and be lulled into a false sense of security.

When the rude awakening came on September 5, 1939, the United States with other nations of the world found themselves wholly unprepared for this new challenge to the peace and security of the civilized world. Through the grace of God we as a Nation have been spared actual combat with the ruthless forces now overrunning the plains of Europe. And while we are engaged in a feverish effort to build an adequate national defense at the earliest possible moment, such a gigantic task provides a real testing ground and an opportunity to view the principles of true Americanism at work.

Surely we as a nation are not unmindful of the lessons taught by the sacrifice of those honored dead who placed unity of purpose and loyalty and devotion to one's country above any selfish aims or ambitions.

The need for a united Nation devoid of any partisan motives was never more apparent as we face the future with our problem of providing an adequate national defense.

What we need is more enthusiasm and zeal for Americanism. If the dictator nations can muster loyalty and enthusiasm for their lustful regimes, what is there to prevent America from casting off her lukewarm attitude and experiencing a revitalization of American principles and ideals?

The crying need of the hour is for every American, regardless of race, creed, or social position, to be inspired by the courage and fortitude of these brave patriots whose names are indelibly inscribed on our hearts and whose memory is a benediction. They met the acid test of patriotism at Valley Forge, Gettysburg, Antietam; San Juan, and in Flanders Field. They were unafraid and glorious in their victories.

We fellow-Americans may have honest differences of opinion in regard to many questions, but there can be no compromise on the fundamental principles of unity, loyalty, and love of country. The tolerance of the American people as a Nation has been seized upon by un-American groups to promote their own programs of hate and oppression.

In the name of our martyred dead, let us as Americans address ourselves to these alien parasites in our midst and in unmistakable terms serve notice that their presence here among a free people will not be countenanced. Let the Communist return to Russia and face the secret trial and consignment to an unmarked grave by the light of the moon. Let the Nazi, Fascist, and their kind return to the fatherland where the principles of

human liberty have been discarded and where no man dare call his soul his own.

We should unite in supporting a mass movement to provide the means of transportation to these base ingrates who while enjoying the blessings and privileges of America are in the same breath laboring incessantly to uproot and destroy every vestige of liberty and freedom.

Let them demonstrate their sincerity for Godless Russia and Nazi Germany by departing from our shores, and every loyal American will utter a prayer of thanksgiving.

In similar fashion, we should hold in contempt the "lukewarm" American. To him the day of reckoning has arrived and he must remove his cloak and stand revealed in his true light as a spineless ingrate and one who accepts the blessings of American citizenship with no thought of assuming its duties and obligations.

Ladies and gentlemen, we as a nation have been indicted as being patriotically lazy and accused of being our own worst enemy. Today we are divided as a nation, in thought and in action, which, as I have already pointed out, presents a fertile field for the sowing of the seeds of false political philosophies.

If we are to meet such a challenge, we must wholeheartedly adopt the slogan—America for Americans—and let such a slogan be on the lips of every school child, preached from the pulpits of the Nation, and inscribed on every heart.

We can pay no greater tribute to the martyrs of our Nation on this Memorial Day, nor can we make a greater contribution to the welfare of our country, than to resolve as we stand within the portals of this historic battleground that we will truly evaluate the manifold blessings bestowed upon us by citizenship in this great republic.

Let us carry aloft the torch of freedom and, in so doing, let us march as a united people, asking God to place us in His infinite care and continue to shower us with His choice blessings of peace and happiness.

From grateful hearts let us pour forth our prayers of thanksgiving for the American way of life and beseech God to preserve our great republic for the countless unborn millions to follow us.

In the same breath let us in prayerful attitude ask Divine Providence to restore peace and tranquillity to the nations of the world that in so doing we may again look upon civilization as being rescued from the onslaughts of those who would destroy it.

With such an objective and with faith in the future let us say from the depth of our hearts—

Thank God! I am an American.

June 14, Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM T. KERR, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FLAG DAY ASSOCIATION

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, while I was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, I was the author of the bill making Flag Day, June 14, a legal holiday in the State of Pennsylvania—Pennsylvania being the first State in the Union to honor Old Glory legally. Among our most loyal Americans interested in this legislation in the State of Pennsylvania was William T. Kerr, founder and national president of the American Flag Day Association. He is also interested in H. R. 2321 and House Resolution 95, bills I introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress to make Flag Day, June 14, a national legal holiday. I am herewith including in my remarks the address prepared by Mr. Kerr on the birthday of Old Glory.

THE BIRTHDAY OF OLD GLORY—THAT DAY, JUNE 14, SHOULD BE A NATIONAL HOLIDAY—LOYAL AMERICANS URGED TO HELP MOVEMENT TO SET THAT DAY ASIDE FOR NATION-WIDE CELEBRATION IN HONOR OF OUR FLAG

(By William T. Kerr, founder and since 1898 national president of American Flag Day Association)

Birthdays are milestones in our lives. We celebrate joyously if we truly love our parents, the annual return of their birthdays as they—never forgetting us—remember ours. As it is with individuals, so it should be, and usually is, with nations. That is why we especially remember June 14.

WHY JUNE 14 IS FLAG DAY

We call June 14 Flag Day because it is the birthday of Old Glory, the anniversary of the adoption by the Continental Congress, June 14, 1777, of the Stars and Stripes as the emblem of the United States. With that date began the history of our flag as a symbol of our nationality. It has been a legal holiday in Pennsylvania since 1937, but several States now provide for the issuance of a proclamation by Governors asking patriotic observance of Flag Week, June 8 to 14, and especially Flag Day, June 14. Each succeeding year it is becoming the greatest unofficial holiday on our calendar.

FLAG DAY HONORS LIVING AND DEAD

We have, as we should, holidays commemorating certain outstanding American events and birthdays, but when we celebrate Flag Day we not only recall June 14, 1777, when Congress "resolved that the flag of the United States be 13 stripes alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation," but we honor every known and unknown American, whether high or low, rich or poor, of every race, color, and creed, who, in our country's battles, helped keep our flag unashamed, and we also honor those whose battles for civic righteousness have won unheralded victories in peace. It is honorable for one to be willing to die, if need be, for one's country, but we need today, more than ever, Americans who will truly live for our Nation that our free institutions may not perish through treachery within or from assault without.

EVERYONE FAVORS FLAG DAY

There may be differences of opinion among some classes of our people regarding the observance of certain holidays or special days, in honor of noted statesmen, soldiers, or others, or of special events, for the human mind is critical; probably we could not get a unanimous voice on the merits of anyone or anything; but there is scarcely a doubt that every true American will unite in the view that our own emblem—the Stars and Stripes—is deserving of every tribute, because our flag represents all of us without regard to age, rank, sex, race, color, or creed, for all the institutions of our Republic. As the emblem of our Nation, "your flag and my flag" should be given every honor, be flown from every flag pole, at schools, homes, stores, in automobiles, and from every point of vantage, and be worn so that all may see we have not forgotten the birthday of our national banner. But the display of our flag means nothing unless our hearts are in and behind it, for in the World War, spies wore and displayed our emblem as a means to accomplish the destruction of American lives and American property.

TO DISPLAY OUR FLAG A SERMON TO THE EYE

If during Flag Week, June 8 to 14, and especially on June 14—Flag Day—we could have a great general display of Old Glory, no matter what the flag's size or cost, it would make such an impression in every community, the moral effect could not be estimated. It would be an unanswerable argument against every foreign "ism." It would preach a sermon to the eye, calling all to reconsecrate themselves to the great principles of our Government.

WHEREVER OLD GLORY FLOATS THERE IS A SHRINE

Flag Day emphasizes that our flag is more than a mere banner which claims power or a great history, though it has both. To every real American our flag is the symbol of all that we are and hope to be; what we are, our flag is. It is an emblem of freedom in its truest sense. No stain has ever marred it; no clouds have dimmed its stars. Its mission is and always has been to champion the cause of the oppressed. Wherever Old Glory floats there is a shrine, and it is the only flag in all the world's history which has never bowed in defeat.

TRUE AMERICANS

Flag Day calls to all who enjoy the inheritances bequeathed to us by illustrious forefathers that they love our flag, honor and respect our laws and institutions, and help preserve these inheritances unimpaired so that they may be passed on to the generations to follow. Whoever does that, not alone on Flag Day, when bands play and orators inspire, but every day, these are true Americans.

We often speak and talk of Americanization as if it applies only to those who happened to be born outside of the United States. It is not alone the alien who needs Americanization; that is not only for those born across the seas; some of us may need it ourselves, we who were born on American soil.

FORGETTING UNTIL IT IS TOO LATE

One may live so close to the beautiful that it becomes commonplace and unappreciative. Philadelphia has so many patriotic shrines that their importance is sometimes forgotten—perhaps the fact that there Old Glory was born. Some pass Independence Hall and have never stood within its walls and caught the patriotic spirit of the illustrious forefathers who made it possible for all of us to enjoy real liberty, for our Declaration of Independence as they made it was the first solemn declaration of the only legitimate foundation of civil government. It was the cornerstone of a new fabric destined, in God's providence, to cover the surface of the globe. It announced the inalienable sovereignty of the people, and from July 4, 1776, the people of this country were no longer the fragment of an empire—a nation had been born in a day; and until after the close of the recent World War our United States was the only country with a known birthday. All others began they knew not when, and grew into power they knew not how.

Possibly there are some in Pittsburgh and vicinity even living within the shadow of Forts Duquesne and Pitt, where the civilization of America was changed, who have never been within its walls or given thought to those who laid the foundation of Pittsburgh. Some of us take for granted the loving care and affection of our parents to such an extent that we fail to show proper appreciation to

them and only discover—when it is too late—when they have passed on to their reward—the great debt we owe them but never could repay.

COMMERCIALIZING THE FLAG

Why is it that many who rarely fly our flag on Flag Day, Memorial Day, Independence, or other days, require the sight of their own sons or husbands, fathers or brothers drafted perhaps in war preparation, marching away to the strains of martial music to become possible cannon fodder, before they raise Old Glory? Why do they not remember to fly their national banner over their homes in peacetime in honor of special American events as an appeal for patriotic national unity? If some thoughtless business concerns make a great display of our flag to draw attention to special sales of socks, shirts, dresses, or suits at bargain prices—commercializing our flag—why do not our citizens generally use it in display to emphasize Americanism as opposed to all isms foreign to the spirit of our American institutions?

BENJAMIN HARRISON AND HENRY WARD BEECHER

Someone charged Benjamin Harrison, President of the United States, with being "too sentimental about the flag." In reply, he said, "I will not enter any defense; God pity the American citizen who does not love it, who does not see in it the story of our great free institutions and the hope of the home as well as the Nation." One of my special memories is of having lunched and talked with this great, God-fearing, patriotic American. In 1861 Henry Ward Beecher said, "Accept our flag in all its fullness of meaning. It is not a painted rag. It is a whole national history. It is the Constitution. It is the Government. It is the Nation."

LET'S FLY OUR FLAG EVERYWHERE ON FLAG DAY

Last year I urged a great national display of our flag during Flag Week, June 8 to 14, but especially on Flag Day, as a protest against every form of intolerance, hate, and bigotry, and as an appeal for true Americanism—it was done in many communities—and the Philadelphia Evening Ledger, in a leaded editorial, said, "It seems to us that a great display of countless American flags throughout the Nation on Flag Day would, as Mr. Kerr suggests, do more to combat 'isms' than a thousand sermons." I repeat that request now and urge all teachers and directing heads of schools everywhere to emphasize it in their own practical way. No one can estimate what results may be secured through patriotic influence of teachers upon their pupils and through the pupils reaching their families.

NO DIVIDED LOYALTY

As we celebrate Flag Day we say to everyone that there must be no divided loyalty of citizenship; that nothing will be accepted but an unqualified, unreserved wholehearted allegiance to our Republic, that no citizen can or should have or hold any mental reservations of allegiance to any other earthly power, for there is a present demand for a strong crusade for true, sturdy Americanism. No nation can exist part loyal and part disloyal. We cannot afford to permit any class to cherish fealty to an alien land, to put foreign ties above American citizenship, to be supported in prosperity from our veins while they repay us with venomous poison. There are isms in our midst which would destroy our Republic if they could, whose leaders and teachers have no place here. Our national reins should be drawn tighter, and they and all others like them should be deported.

NO ROOM HERE FOR FOREIGN COLONIES

The birthday of Old Glory means that its sheltering folds are only for freedom-loving people who come here to be one with and of us, that others must not attempt to build foreign colonies or establish foreign groups on our soil and maintain their foreign customs. We are trying now to Americanize those who are in our midst, and their sincerity will be proven by the progress they make in dispensing with their foreign languages and their foreign-language newspapers, which more frequently than otherwise keep alive foreign languages, customs, and habits of the land from whence they came. Go into some self-made foreign districts and you will find growing up in our midst even native-born Americans of foreign-born parents who were born and are being reared in as distinctly a foreign atmosphere as if they were in Europe or Asia. This ought not to be and would not be if they would use the language of our Nation and the story of Old Glory.

OUR FLAG AND CONSTITUTION

As one strong feature of a flag day, Americanization programs, let me suggest here that where it is not now carried out in a practical, thorough manner it would be well if all our public, private, parochial schools, colleges, and universities added to their "must" list of studies the study of our Constitution under sincere, patriotic men and women. Thus they will reach millions in taking our Constitution to the people through the youth of our land. Teach them what the bulwark of our liberties, the Constitution, and our flag, the emblem of our Nation, really means, and we need not fear the results, for, grounded in a living faith in our Republic, these boys and girls will become the stalwart, four-square American citizens of tomorrow, the pride and defense of our great Nation. Educators, here is your opportunity.

WHAT WE ARE "OLD GLORY" IS

On Flag Day and every day let us not forget that our flag is the symbol of American ideals and principles, and represents all our people. Let us tell its history and redouble our efforts, especially among the rising generations, to teach reverence for our flag, our laws, and our institutions. We are the makers of our flag, what we are "Old Glory" is. We should fly it on Flag Day, and other days also, as evidence that we truly value our citizenship and to arouse in others a sense of gratitude and thankfulness for the blessings we have and enjoy because we live in free America. We should do this without selfish boasting as we see the rise of totalitarian states, dictatorships, and diminishing power of democracies abroad under the heel of pagan intolerance. Here, because the great mass of our people are God-fearing, we have liberty, freedom, and constitutional democracy, making us the greatest republic of all times. But what of the future? What about your children and mine, our grandchildren, the Americans of tomorrow? Let us resolve to preserve it as our forefathers willed it and enshrine the love for our flag, our Nation, and American institutions in all our hearts in consecrated, loyal, unselfish service to God and country.

MAKE FLAG DAY JUNE 14 FLAG DAY EVERY DAY

All of us in our school days were stirred with pride when we recited Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" but reviewing the history of our Nation and knowing that the only hope for the permanence of our Republic is a devotion to our institutions, and undivided loyalty and a unity of spirit, I am convinced that Patrick Henry's greatest patriotic legacy to us was in the speech when he said in the Continental Congress, "I am not a Virginian, I am an American"—and when the day comes that all of our people of whatever race, color, or creed no matter where they were born, abroad or in this country, declare sincerely and by deed and action say, "I am an American" all these "isms" which trouble us today will vanish. Make Flag Day June 14 flag day every day in the hearts and affections of all our people. Let these words be the prayer of every American:

OUR PRAYER

"God of our Fathers whose almighty hand
Leads forth in beauty all the starry band
Of shining worlds in splendor through the skies
Our grateful songs before Thy throne arise.

"Thy love divine has lead us in the past
In this free land by Thee our lot is cast;
Be Thou our ruler, guardian, guide, and stay,
Thy word our law, Thy paths our chosen way.

"From war's alarms, from deadly pestilence,
Be Thy strong arm our ever sure defense;
Thy true religion in our hearts increase,
Thy bounteous goodness nourish us in peace.

"Refresh Thy people on their toilsome way,
Lead us from night to never-ending day,
Fill all our lives with love and grace divine,
And glory, laud, and praise be ever Thine."

Teller and Taylor—December 4, 1876, to June 4, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the Territory of Colorado was admitted into the Union as a State on the 1st day of August 1876. The State elected a legislature that fall, and on November 14, 1876, that legislature elected our first two United States Senators—Henry M. Teller, for whom Teller County was named; and Jerome B. Chaffee, for whom Chaffee County was named. The legislature elected Teller for both a short and a long term, and Chaffee for the short term which ended March 3, 1879. Congress that year met on December 4, 1876. Both of those men were sworn in and officially took their seats at that time.

After the death of President Garfield on September 19, 1881, Vice President Arthur became President, and on April 17, 1882, he appointed Senator Teller as Secretary of the Interior. Senator Teller then resigned from the Senate, took that appointment, and served as Secretary of the Interior until the end of that Presidential term, March 4, 1885. He had then been reelected again to the United States Senate and resumed his seat in that body on March 4, 1885, and served until March 4, 1909, when he voluntarily retired to private life.

At the Presidential election of 1908, EDWARD T. TAYLOR was elected Congressman at large for Colorado and took his seat in the House on March 4, 1909, the day Senator Teller retired from the Senate. He served 6 years as Congressman at large and, notwithstanding the vicissitudes of politics in Colorado, he has served ever since as the Representative from the Fourth District of Colorado.

Senator Teller's total official service in Washington from our State was 32 years and 3 months. On the 4th day of June this year, Mr. TAYLOR has served in the House 32 years and 3 months. That makes a record of two equal immediately successive services totaling 64 years and 6 months, extending from the year in which our Centennial State was born to this hour.

Teller was "Colorado's grand old man." TAYLOR is "Colorado's grand old man."

United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM AND THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix an editorial from the New York World-Telegram of June 2, 1941, and one from the New York Daily News of June 3, 1941, supporting my contention that a separate air force is necessary for the United States.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Daily News of June 3, 1941]

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Air power in the last couple of weeks has been primarily responsible for two first-string victories in this war, one by sea and one by land.

The Germans have taken Crete from the British and the Greeks. They did it almost exclusively with air-borne troops, the British Navy apparently having been able to prevent any important landings of German sea-borne soldiers on Crete.

And the British have sunk the German battleship *Bismarck*, brand-new, "unsinkable" sea fighter, officially rated at 35,000 tons, but perhaps actually a 50,000-tonner. A British scouting plane spotted the *Bismarck* after she had sunk H. M. S. *Hood;* British torpedo planes wounded her, slowed her down, and poured more torpedoes into her before ships of the Royal Navy finished her off.

So it looks as if such prophets as the late Gen. Billy Mitchell and the still active Al Williams weren't so cockeyed as most of us supposed when they first sounded off with predictions that air power was going to be the controlling factor in future wars.

Air power hasn't decided this war as yet. It would be foolish for any nation to abandon battleships, infantry, and artillery and put its entire defense wad on airplanes. But air power has been and is so big a factor in this war that we think the time has come for the United States to adopt the separate-air-force principle.

TOUGH JOB, BUT IT'S NECESSARY

The term "separate air force" doesn't accurately describe what we're talking about.

Actually, our air forces are separate now, in four different ways. They are split around among the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard. Their flying men are under the thumbs of land soldiers and sea soldiers.

This, according to Mitchell, Williams, and kindred air-power prophets, is dangerous. It is charged that it cuts down both the efficiency and the morale of the air fighters.

Both Germany and Great Britain learned the need of an air force operating under its own command from the last war. Today the Royal Air Force and the Luftwaffe (literal translation "air force," according to the German consulate in New York; pronounced "Looft-woffa," loof to rhyme with hoof) are the two most powerful and efficient air forces in the world.

GIVE THE WINGS A FAIR CHANCE

So we think it is time to pull the air forces out from under the land and sea commands and unify them under a cabinet Secretary of Aviation, Secretary for Air, or some such title.

The term "United States Air Force" would seem to be the simplest and best name for the new outfit, but such details could be decided later.

The main thing is to get this service coordinated under its own air-minded chiefs, it being understood, of course, that the air arm will cooperate whenever and however necessary with the land and sea arms. The argument that such cooperation would be impossible was knocked galley west by the 100-percent cooperation of German planes, tanks, and infantry in Flanders and France, and by the 100-percent cooperation of the Royal Air Force and the Royal Navy at Dunkerque.

We should think a new set of ratings and grades, replacing the old sergeants, majors, etc., with titles suggesting air war, would be advisable. The Army-Navy retirement age of 64 would obviously not do for the air force. It would be true economy to retire these men on pension at, say, age 45.

The time to accomplish this reform is now, when we have a lot of pilots training for a rapidly expanding air force.

And the way to accomplish it is for the Government to override the humanly natural protests of the admirals and generals and put this reform into being, with the full backing of the President.

The admirals and generals were powerful enough to block this reform after the previous war. They can be expected to fight it tooth and nail now.

But if we're to have the best air force in the world instead of only the second or third best, it looks as if we've got to follow German and British practice and take the land and sea halters off our flying fighters.

[From the New York World-Telegram of June 2, 1941]

STEPCHILD

It was German air power that made Britain eat dirt at Munich. Later it was the same instrument that pulverized the defenses of Poland, rid the Skagerrak of British sea power while Norway was invaded, broke the backs of Holland, Belgium, and France, and turned British cities into stoneyards.

It was air power again that bullied and bombed the Balkans into submission. It is air power—this time air power alone and unassisted—which has cleared the British out of Crete and which threatens to clear them out of the Mediterranean and the middle east.

It is the threat of German air power to the Western Hemisphere that runs like a refrain through President Roosevelt's speeches. Time and time again he has tolled off the shortening count of bomber hours from Africa and the far Atlantic islands to South America, from South America to the Canal, from the Canal to the heart of the United States.

And it is air power on which this country is concentrating as never before its defense effort.

But here is a thing that is not easy to understand:

In spite of the proven dominance of air power in modern war, in spite of the fact that we are shoveling billions into aircraft production and the training of airmen, military aviation in the United States is still a stepchild.

It is still just a branch of the Army and a branch of the Navy.

It is still under the thumbs of nonflying admirals and generals who, no matter how scrupulously they may seek to keep abreast of strategic innovations, are hogtied by the thongs of tradition, sentiment, and inertia.

It still suffers from the luxurious duplication of Army and Navy air facilities and air missions.

Much has been written about an independent air force for this country. Much has been spoken about it, in whispers, by Army and Navy airmen. But what has been done about it? Nothing. Not a solitary thing.

It seems to us that it is time for somebody—for the President or Congress or the Secretaries of War and the Navy—to seize the initiative and take steps now, at once, toward scrapping our antiquated system and creating a fully independent department for air.

Oh, let the Navy keep its ship-borne aircraft, of course. No advocate of an independent air force has ever proposed depriving the Navy of its floating air arm. Let the Army retain airplanes for reconnaissance work, etc. But put a flying man, with a flying staff, in full command of the great striking air force that is now just a skeleton, but will presently be the first line of our defense.

Canadian Friendship

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising at this time is to give a background for a letter which I intend to insert in the RECORD. It is a remarkable letter, written by a Canadian to a citizen of the United States. The writer is an executive of the company of J. J. Gibbons, Ltd , an advertising firm. This firm has offices in Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton, and Vancouver, and is the largest advertising firm in Canada. It is the business of this company to know the sentiment of the people of Canada. Therefore the writer is particularly well qualified to make observations as to the opinion of the Canadian people. I am sure that all of us will be interested in reading this letter and that we will be happy to learn of the fine feeling of friendship and cordiality that exists on the part of the Canadian people toward our people and our President.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this letter in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

J. J. GIBBONS, LTD.,
Toronto 2, Ontario, May 28, 1941.

H. A. DUDLEY, ESQ.,
Bureau of Public Relations,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DUDLEY: I have happy recollections of the courtesy and kindness you extended to me when I called on you in Chicago at the request of Messrs. Townsend & Townsend some 3 or 4 years ago. Because of those happy memories and the fact that Canada is most seriously engaged in the present war, I was very much interested to note that you have received leave of absence from the William Wrigley, Jr., Co. to assist

Maj. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., Director of the Bureau of Public Relations for the War Department.

From what I know of you and from what I gleaned when I had the pleasure of meeting you personally, the Bureau is to be congratulated. I wish you a large measure of success in your new position.

I wonder if you know how grateful Canadians are to your President and you wonderfu' people of the United States for the encouragement and the support you are giving to our Empire at this time. We have a long, grim job on our hands, and we realize to the full how much we are dependent upon the United States if final victory is to be ours.

I think, perhaps, more Canadians listened to your great President's epoch-making address last night than have ever listened to a radio address before.

We know that there are differences of opinion in the United States regarding Mr. Roosevelt, but I think, perhaps, that that may be because of political differences; but so far as Canadians are concerned, we are unanimous in the view that he is not only one of the greatest statesmen the United States has ever produced but one of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced.

And so we say, thank God for Roosevelt and the American people, for their grand cooperation and their priceless assistance.

With most cordial regards and all good wishes, believe me to be, my dear Mr. Dudley,

Sincerely yours,

R. A. STAPELLS.

W. P. A. Achievements

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when we are urged to cut nondefense expenditures people usually mention the W. P. A. They suggest that we reduce relief costs by drastically reducing the W. P. A.

They do not seem to realize two important facts. First, W. P. A. has done, is doing, and can do in the future very important defense work. Second, there are still hundreds of thousands of people, perhaps millions, who cannot find work in private industry.

On defense projects, take a glance at W. P. A. achievements. In one State, Massachusetts, over 1,500 acres have been developed or improved for airports, and work now in progress covers 500 more. Twenty mess halls have been constructed; 15 storage buildings have been erected, and 258 repaired.

That is just in Massachusetts. In the Nation, the W. P. A. has responded to the requests of the Army and Navy and has made an excellent record in building necessary roads to military and naval establishments, in completing hundreds of new landing fields, and in erecting buildings of all kinds. Seven hundred and twenty new hangars for airplanes, for instance, have been put up.

Donald M. Nelson, the head of the Purchasing Division of the O. P. M., recently said:

Private employers, although they are eager to cooperate in the great task of national defense, often find it difficult to shift quickly from their regular tasks, to meet the requirements of the Army and Navy. It is in this situation that we have discovered the value of the W. P. A. organization. W. P. A. workers can be quickly turned to defense work.

As for those who are not working on defense projects, can they be allowed to shift for themselves? Many of them are doing highly useful work, even though it is not defense work. Remember that the average age of the W. P. A. worker in the Nation is about 43; in my own county, two-thirds of the W. P. A. workers are over 40 years of age. Private industry is taking on some men over 40, but usually only if they are highly skilled. The other manual workers are not easily absorbed.

As for the white-collar workers and the women—about 20 percent of W. P. A. personnel are women—no great new demand for their services has been made by private industry.

There are, then, hundreds of thousands of needy people doing valuable defense work; other hundreds of thousands of needy people gainfully employed who, but for W. P. A., would be idle "welfare cases" in their local communities. And there are still others who are on local relief because the W. P. A. appropriation now is not big enough to employ them all.

To cut the W. P. A. would be to throw a new and heavy financial burden on already burdened localities. Worse, it would be throwing hundreds of thousands of American families back into black despair. To economize this way in the name of defense would be the falsest kind of economy and the worst kind of defense.

Dangers Within Rather Than Dangers Without

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as a nation we have become so engrossed in watching the black war clouds which have gathered beyond the seas that we have failed to take due note of the cyclone which threatens our own fronts. As a result, I believe, of deliberate intent on the part of some of our leaders to "plan it that way," we have become a nation that looks upon and magnifies out of all proportion far-distant dangers, while we fail to perceive real and immediate dangers which threaten our political institutions, our economic and social stability, and our American way of life.

I desire at this time to try to focus the attention of America upon American problems, upon dangers within our own borders, rather than dangers far beyond our borders; to try to point out that the path we are following can lead only to national bankruptcy, a socialized state, to a dictatorship—the very thing we detest and are preparing to fight against 3,000 miles away.

Mr. Speaker, there are two developments of the past 9 years which should alarm every liberty-loving American in this broad land of ours. First, political platforms have completely lost all semblance of honesty and integrity. Political promises by leading candidates of both parties have lost all vestige of sincerity. "Weasel words," a term coined by Theodore Roosevelt, are the words of the day. The people are deceived not by silence, but by too many words—by an avalanche of language.

Mr. Speaker, words were evolved—language grew out of the need of men to communicate with each other honestly. Language came out of a necessity for men to exchange their ideas frankly. The world has witnessed in the last decade a complete change in the use and purpose of language. Words are used today not to reveal but to conceal the motives and purposes of rulers and administrators. This has been true in Europe. It has been all too sadly true in the United States of America. No one can deny that the most solemn promises made by candidates of both parties for the highest offices in the land were cast aside the moment the election was over. No wonder the people are beginning to lose their faith in the integrity of their political leaders and administrators. Second, there has been created in these United States of America a political-propaganda machine which is the most cleverly devised, the most competently managed, the most completely financed by public funds, and the most thoroughly buttressed by political power of any propaganda machine the world ever knew. That political-propaganda machine, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, represents one of the great dangers that confronts this Nation. It has been carrying on its work under the name of Office of Government Reports. By legislative action it has now been made a permanent part of our Federal set-up.

Mr. Speaker, another great danger that confronts this Nation today is the concentration of power in Washington. More power has been concentrated in the executive department of the Government in Washington since the New Deal took the reins than during the 150 years previous to that time. We have seen one power after another demanded and gained by the President through his powers of patronage, persuasion, and punishment. We have seen every new power granted to the President, along with all of the other powers which had previously been granted, used to bring still new and greater powers to the executive department of the Government from the Congress.

Lest I be accused of partisanship, let me quote to you some of the warnings issued by Thomas Jefferson. Said he:

To preserve the faith of the Nation by an exact discharge of its debts and contracts, expending the public money with the same care

and economy we would practice with our own, and impose on our citizens no unnecessary burden; to keep in all things within the pale of our constitutional powers and cherish the Federal Union as the only rock of our safety—these are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings.

When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated. It will be, as in Europe, where every man must be either pike or gudgeon, hammer or anvil, our functionaries and their wares are from the same workshop, made of the same materials and by the same hand. If the States look with apathy on this silent descent of their Government into the gulf which is to swallow all, we have only to weep over the human character formed uncontrollable, but by a rod of iron, and the blasphemers of man, as incapable of self-government, become his true historians.

* * * You have seen the practices by which the public servants have been able to cover their conduct, or, where that could not be done, delusions by which they have varnished it for the eye of their constituents. What augmentation of the field for jobbing, speculating, plundering, office building, and office hunting would be produced by an assumption of all the State powers into the hands of the General Government.

* * * Our Government is now taking so steady a course as to show by what road it will pass to destruction, to wit by consolidation first, and then corruption, its necessary consequence. The engine of consolidation will be the Federal judiciary, the two other branches the corrupting and corrupted instruments.

Think of Jefferson's words concerning the necessity of administering the public moneys as we would administer our own funds, and then look at the expenditures of the last 8 years, which have exceeded all human comprehension. Just consider for a moment our economic and financial danger. On top of a $50,000,000,000 debt, a $40,000,000,000 defense program is already under way, and another $40,000,000,000 defense program has been planned. We are told by the Secretary of Commerce, the head of the R. F. C., Jesse Jones, that we can expect a Federal debt of at least $90,000,000,000 before this war business is through. I say to you that no man can this day forecast, if we continue the squanderlust road we are now traveling, what the Federal debt may be. It may just as easily be $150,000,000,000. This can mean only inflation or repudiation. It can and will mean economic confusion, chaos and collapse, unless we awaken to the dangers which confront us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that our Executive Department is infested with Communists and other proponents of alien doctrines who, if they could, would overthrow our American way of life. Who is there here today who can regard with equanimity the sympathy existing between radical labor leaders, communistic labor leaders, labor racketeers, and the New Deal administration? Consider the solicitude of the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, for the alien Harry Bridges, agitator of the shipping strikes on the west coast. Think of the great motor industry being confronted by demands from unions headed by the Communist Walter Reuther, whose record in the files of the Congressional Committee Investigating Un-American Activities clearly shows him to be a Communist, sympathetic with the Third International and intent upon destroying the American system of free enterprise and free industry. Think of men like John Brophy serving on the Mediation Board, before which Walter Reuther's automobile workers' union was making demands upon the General Motors Corporation. Who is John Brophy? John L. Lewis, in describing this same John Brophy and two others in Senate Document No. 24, says they are—

Fakirs, repudiated leaders, traitors to the unions, opportunists, and purveyors of every falsehood, slander, and deception.

In the United Mine Workers' Journal, the leadership of Brophy and others was characterized as—

Doing its dirtiest to capture the United Mine Workers and to transform this splendid union into a Communist organization.

This is the John Brophy who sat on the Mediation Board that decided the dispute between the communistic Walter Reuther and his C. I. O. Automobile Workers' Union and the General Motors Corporation. In the name of our forefathers, can there not be found among 130,000,000 Americans enough men to fill the panels on the Mediation Board in this hour of the Nation's dire peril without calling upon these Communists to assume places of power and control in the defense movement?

Mr. Speaker, what this Nation needs today—and sadly needs—are fewer of these labor racketeers and power-lustful self-seekers, and more labor leaders of the type of the late Samuel Gompers and the late John Mitchell, and also more Victor Olanders and John P. Freys. These are the men who played such a constructive part in the last World War. Those are the labor leaders who led the patriotic rank and file of American working men and women to their workbenches to meet the Nation's need. The rank and file of workers today are not being led to their work benches but away from them. When they cannot be enticed or persuaded by these racketeers, these extortionists, these Communists and Fascists to leave their workbenches, they are terrorized into leaving them while picket lines are established and strikes threaten the success of our national-defense efforts.

There is a very strange—and to me as yet unexplained—discrepancy between the statements of the administration as to the dire necessity for our national defense and the failure of the administration to curb strikes which admittedly are endangering that national defense. It is admitted, even by labor leaders themselves, that there is no excuse for permitting jurisdictional strikes to endanger the security of this Nation, the very lives of the men, women, and children of this country, simply because some officers of some unions cannot agree as to who shall have jurisdiction over what work. These jurisdictional fights have nothing whatever to do with wages or hours or working conditions. They are simply disputes between two private organizations.

Mr. Speaker, if the perils of this Nation are one-half what the administration insists they are, if the danger that confronts us is one-half as serious as the administration insists that it is, if the urgency to complete our national defense is one-half as great as the administration says it is, then there is not time enough for 1 hour to be lost through strikes.

Labor disputes can be mediated. They can be settled by arbitration. The workingmen can lose nothing, and neither can the employers, by continuing the work while disputes are being settled by mediation and arbitration, because the decisions can be made retroactive to any agreed date. In spite of that, labor leaders have refused time and again to submit to any delay before calling the men out and before establishing picket lines in defense industries.

Unless this Nation wants to go down the same road which France went to her ruin, then it behooves us to put a stop to these strikes and to make the people realize that their security is paramount to the individual interests of any employer or any labor leaders.

Understand me, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with honest wage earners who are members of unions. My quarrel is with labor leaders who, for personal profit or power, are willing to mislead the wage earners into striking against the Government in the national defense. Any strike against any contractor engaged on national-defense work is a strike against the national defense and against the security of every man, woman, and child in this Nation. These Communists and Fascists and professional labor agitators should be weeded out and thrown out of every industry that is engaged in national defense. They have no place at this hour in our industrial scheme of things. There is a place in the national defense only for good Americans who desire first and foremost to help to build for this Nation a national defense which will make it invincible against any nation, or any group of nations, who may choose to attempt aggression against us at any time in the future.

I do not hold with those who believe there is a difference between the devotion to duty to be expected of the boy who is drafted into the Army at $21 per month and the devotion to duty to be expected of the mechanic who is deferred from the draft in order to do essential defense work at twelve to fourteen dollars per day. I find it very difficult indeed, Mr. Speaker, to reconcile two statements made by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, one found in the New York Herald Tribune of February 25, 1941, issued in a press conference. Mrs. Roosevelt, at that time, said that certain draftees in Army camps were refusing to accept the seriousness of America's position today and urged that they be made to think of their training as something they may have to use. Keeping that statement in mind, just try to reconcile it with her later statement of April 1, 1941, that strikes in defense industries should not be looked upon as indicating a lack of patriotism

on the part of labor. In that statement she advised the public not to become "overexcited" about delay in defense orders due to disputes between employers and labor, stating that "labor disputes should still be regarded as disagreements between two groups trying to get just returns for what they are doing." She said, "We should not behave as though this were a case of patriotism." This is typical of the administration's attitude toward the boys who have been impressed into the Army at $21 per month, while other men have been leading honest American labor away from its patriotic and necessary task of building the national defense. I want to say, in reply to Mrs. Roosevelt, if it is true that the soldiers in the Army should be made to think of their training as something they may have to use, then it should be equally true that these men who have been deferred from military service to work in the jobs to help build the national defense, these labor racketeers who are taking advantage of this hour to line their pockets and to clothe themselves with power at the expense of the national defense had better be made to think of the national defense as something we may have to use, too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a third aspect to our national situation that seriously disturbs me. I know it is regarded as some sort of treachery, or Benedict Arnold stuff, to mention it now, but we have not forgotten the attempt of the administration not so long ago to pack the Supreme Court and the rest of the Federal judiciary by an act of Congress. The mutations of time and human frailties have operated to enable the President to place on both the Supreme Bench and on most of the inferior benches men of his choosing, and men who apparently are disposed to interpret the Constitution in much the same manner as Mr. Roosevelt himself interprets it.

Mr. David Lawrence, the columnist, has written several articles along this line, and, among other things, he points out that "One of the principal obstacles to national unity is the widespread distrust of the new dealers who are conducting the defense program." This would include Harry Hopkins, who managed the notorious Chicago convention. It would also include the more radical new dealers, such as Leon Henderson; Sidney Hillman; Ben Cohen; "Tommy the Cork," otherwise known as Thomas Corcoran; Samuel Rosenman; and the "hot dog" boys.

Says Mr. Lawrence further:

The New Deal behavior from day to day constitutes an impetus to the membership efforts of the America First Committee, because there are tens of thousands of Americans who are more fearful of totalitarianism at home than they are of a Hitler invasion, and the New Deal is doing very little to remove these fears. In fact, the decisions of Messrs. Frankfurter, Black, Douglas, Reed, and Murphy, who control the Supreme Court, are increasing the suspicions and apprehensions of liberals who do not favor government by totalitarian-minded commissions and boards.

What can Congress do about it? For one thing, it can amend and clarify any legislation which the New Deal Court attempts to define as it pleases. Thus, instead of allowing Justice Frankfurter to say what he thinks Congress meant, or permitting him to supply words that are not in a statute, the Congress can do its own legislating—that is, if Congress is still an independent body. And if the Democratic majority refuses, the Republicans can carry the issue to the polls, which is what a minority party is supposed to do.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the trend toward war step by step for many, many months. I do not intend to take time here today to detail those steps. They have been set out in newspapers from time to time, and any one of my colleagues may, if he or she desires, have the Congressional Library Legislative Reference Service or some other research bureau of the Government furnish a list of these steps as they were taken chronologically.

Today we are hearing demands for the President to invoke the industrial mobilization plan. The industrial mobilization plan, as originally conceived and written, was not only to perform an educational function by being so publicized as to warn the people of the tremendous restrictions on their liberties which another war would entail, but that plan was also designed to place the control and direction of the national defense in the hands of the responsible, experienced, and trained officers of the Army and Navy, whose duty it is to defend the Nation. This plan has been revised from time to time, and the result is that today the industrial mobilization plan is not the same as was originally proposed.

As I see it, the various powers to be conferred upon the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the Nation—the President—under the industrial mobilization plan were to be conferred only when there came an emergency due to the imminence of war. The President has now proclaimed a full emergency. Well, Mr. Speaker, heaven knows the Nation has been full of emergencies ever since the New Deal came into power.

Now, let me read to you something that appears in the 1936 and 1939 revisions of the mobilization plan that did not appear in any of the plans as revised previous to the advent of the New Deal administration:

TITLE II. INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

This title may be cited as the "Industrial Management Act."

The President is hereby authorized, when, in his opinion, the successful prosecution of war so requires or renders advisable, to require, under such rules and regulations as he may establish, the registration of all or any class of persons engaged in the management or control of any technical, industrial, or manufacturing plant, or establishment of any kind whatsoever, whatever the form of ownership thereof, corporate or otherwise, or who have been engaged in such capacity within 6 months prior to any declaration of war.

STATUS OF REGISTRANTS

Whenever the President shall, in his discretion, deem any technical, industrial, or manufacturing plant or establishment or any group thereof comprising an industry to be essential to the maintenance of the Military Establishment, or the effective operation of the military forces, or the maintenance of the national interest, during the emergency, he may proclaim such plant, establishment, or industry so to be. Thereupon any person registered pursuant to the provisions of this title shall, if within a classification promulgated by the President in his said proclamation, be brought into service of the Government for the duration of the war and shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the War Department. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to provide such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the government of such persons so brought into the service of the Government. Such rules and regulations by the Secretary of War shall not affect nor interfere with the internal management of the industries in which such persons are engaged, but the Secretary may at any time, if he deem the public interest in successful prosecution of war so to require, remove such person from such industrial position and assign him to any service within the jurisdiction of the said War Department. Upon such removal the vacancy so created shall be filled in the normal manner by the officers or managers of the plant or establishment affected, but the person chosen as such replacement shall immediately be subject to the provisions of this title.

LIMITATION OF INCOME—PENALTIES

No person brought into the service of the Government pursuant to the provisions of this title shall at any time receive any salary, gift, compensation, or other emolument whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, for services rendered during wartime from any plant or establishment for or in which such person shall render services during time of war. Such person shall receive for services rendered during time of war only such compensation and allowances as shall be fixed and paid by the President. If any such person does receive any salary or compensation from any other source for services rendered during wartime he shall be dishonorably discharged from the service of the War Department and shall in addition thereto be guilty of a felony and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues realize what this means? It means that the President, under the powers of the mobilization plan, could remove Henry Ford, or Edsel Ford, or the president of the General Motors Corporation, or the head of any other industry, from the management of his industry, and put him to peeling potatoes in some kitchen at whatever compensation the President should prescribe. Under those proposed powers, Mr. Speaker, the President could take anybody, from the foreman of a plant to the owner of it, or the manager, big or little, industrial or agricultural, draft him into the services of the War Department without any reference to his age or his physical condition, and then put him back to work managing his own business at $30 per month. That is one of the powers which we must guard against if we want to perpetuate Constitutional Government in this fair land of ours.

Let me read something else that appeared in the 1939 revision of the mobilization plan, and this was the reason, in my opinion, the President transformed the industrial mobilization plan from a public document into a "secret" document. Section "F—Post War Readjustment," reads:

This plan contemplates that the proposed coordinating agencies will be temporary in nature, and that they will be demobilized upon the termination of the emergency.

This plan takes cognizance of the fact, however, that although winning the war is of primary importance, postwar rehabilita-

tion is a very important secondary wartime consideration. During the course of a national emergency therefore, the War Resources Administration will undoubtedly give proper weight to rehabilitation factors in formulation of its wartime policies. In fact, the War Resources Administrator, as the termination of the emergency is approached, might well study the desirability of proposing the creation of a new and entirely separate agency to deal with the rehabilitation problem. In event of the creation of such an agency during the national emergency, contact with the War Resources Administration might be provided through the Liaison Division of the latter agency.

On the other hand, it may be considered advisable, upon the termination of the emergency, to continue the War Resources Administration as a postwar readjustment agency. Decision as to the organization and composition of such an agency will depend upon personalities, the degree of rehabilitation required, and political and economic factors which would then obtain. Decision must therefore be deferred until controlling conditions are known or can fairly accurately be forecast. The important consideration for the purposes of this plan is that due consideration must be given the problem of postwar readjustment.

Mr. Speaker, consider this last provision in the light of the industrial management provision I read just before it. We cannot close our eyes to the plain implications of these paragraphs. Here are laid the foundations for an absolute military despotism in this Nation. Here are laid the foundations for the continuation of that military despotism for an indefinite period after the emergency has ended.

Who is to decide the period necessary for the readjustment to a peacetime basis? The Chief Executive. Who is to decide what is necessary for the rehabilitation of the Nation after the war is ended? The Chief Executive. Who will continue to wield these despotic powers provided for in the industrial mobilization plan after the war? The Chief Executive. Who will continue to wield those powers until such time as he shall voluntarily return them to the Congress? The Chief Executive. Who, Mr. Speaker, can point out one single major power that Mr. Roosevelt has ever gotten at the hands of this Congress, that he has ever returned to the Congress and the people?

Another phase of this whole situation gravely disturbs me. I believe it ought to be brought point blank to the attention of the American people, regardless of whether the administration should try to visit punishment upon those of its critics who dare to say these things. The point is the administration's inclination to use all of these powers against businessmen but not against labor racketeers. We cannot win wars that way. We must be unbiased and impartial in the use of the vast powers of the Government during this emergency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no man or woman can look at this situation honestly and clearly, and not realize the implication in the course of action followed by the administration ever since the election last November. We must all be disturbed by the brazen and scornful abandonment of the "short of war" slogan, which we heard so much about before the election and which we now have seen cast aside since the election.

Truly, indeed, as David Lawrence has said:

> One of the principal obstacles to the national unity is the widespread distrust of the new dealers who are conducting the defense program.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced by information that has come to me, and by my study and observation of the developments as they have come along, that our gravest danger, the gravest threat to our American Government and way of life, and the greatest menace to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights exist here at home, within our own borders. Some danger may lie across the seas for us, but our most immediate danger lies closer home. Some economic threat may exist in Europe, or the Orient, but our most serious economic threat exists within our own Nation. I want to urge every American man and woman to be alert to the dangers which menace us; to see to it that we do not slip down into the abyss which Thomas Jefferson said would engulf the States if they were not watchful against the dangers of centralized government.

I cannot get away from the warning voiced by Abraham Lincoln when he said:

> At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth—our own excepted—in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years. * * *
>
> At what point, then, is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide.

Mr. Speaker, we should take Abraham Lincoln's warnings to heart now. We should maintain that vigilance which is ever the price of liberty among free men.

Memorial Day has come and gone. We have paid a tribute of tears and flowers to our honored and beloved dead, who have offered upon the altar of their country their all, who have made the supreme sacrifice that our American way of life should be maintained and perpetuated. The cemeteries of this great, free country of ours are filled with flags and blossoms, but recently placed upon the graves of our noble dead, who died that we and those who come after us might know the sweetness of life under the liberties and privileges of this free Nation. During these days we should especially remember these sacrifices. Let us look for inspiration as well as for warning to the words which Lincoln spoke on November 19, 1863, when he said:

> Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.
>
> Now we are engaged in a great civil war; testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.
>
> But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Additional Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

LETTER FROM NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York State Federation of Labor. I consider a letter from the New York State Federation of Labor of such importance that I am placing it in the RECORD so that the entire membership of the Congress may be informed on the question discussed:

NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Albany, N. Y., May 29, 1941.

To the Chairman and Members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

HONORABLE SIRS: The New York State Federation of Labor through its executive council has given careful consideration to and has endorsed the proposal for additional taxation to be levied on the proceeds of radio broadcasting entertainment submitted to your committee by the International Allied Printing Trades Association. This proposal provides for an excise tax on the gross incomes of licensed radio broadcasters and for a transfer tax on profits realized from the sale of Government broadcasting licenses.

We are convinced that this proposal is sound and that it will effectively serve to promote the public interest as indicated by the reasons set forth in the factual data submitted for your consideration by Mr. John B. Haggerty, president of the International Allied Printing Trades Association The facts thereby disclosed show:

That radio broadcasting is the only commercially operated entertainment business in the United States upon which no amusement tax has been levied and, therefore, under a monopolistic protectorate of Government licensing, contributes nothing in the form of amusement taxes levied on every other form of competing, commercially operated entertainment business.

That this form of commercialized entertainment derives the bulk of its revenue from radio-advertising sponsors; that it yields excessive profits inconsistently high compared with invested capital and valuation of physical properties; that these excessive profits are also enjoyed by radio-advertising agencies by reason of a system of rebates which are detrimental to recognized fair trade practices.

That the excessive profits of the radio-advertising business has had a serious adverse effect upon the newspaper and magazine business of America, narrowing its field and causing many suspensions and consolidations of printed publications, thereby greatly reducing the number of employment opportunities and the earnings of printing-trades artisans and mechanics, contrasted by failure to offset these economic losses by providing a comparable number of other job opportunities or an equivalent compensating distribution of purchasing power.

Such a situation, if permitted to continue without requisite Government intervention, will, in the opinion of the New York State Federation of Labor, place the Federal Government in the position of having failed in the proper exercise of its police power to prevent unfair competition and trade practices which are detrimental to the freedom of the press and the opportunities essential to the survival of that cherished free American institution. Inadequately regulated, this present situation has resulted in the enrichment of concentrated commercial interests, whose contribution to the expense of government is disproportionately small in comparison with its profits and which, on the other hand, has militated detrimentally against the most crying need of our country—increased opportunities for economic independence in the field of free public enterprise, that basic essential to the success of our democratic economy.

We believe that situations such as this should, by appropriate Government action and regulation, be turned into an economic asset for the public benefit. Our salvation and the survival of our economy does not depend upon unchecked inordinate prosperity of a few at the expense of the many. More unemployment and continued reduction of earnings of large numbers of individuals militates against the Government by reducing its income and increasing its expenses by reason of Government's obligation to care for the unemployed. The problems and responsibilities of our Government require that there be larger numbers able to pay taxes.

Therefore, we are in favor of the proposals submitted by the International Allied Printing Trades Association to which we respectfully urge you to give your careful and serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
THOMAS J. LYONS, *President.*
E. W. EDWARDS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

National Youth Administration in Virginia

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I had prepared by the National Youth Administration a statement which gives, year by year, the amount of funds spent by the N. Y. A. in the State of Virginia, and a complete summary of its activities. We are all proud of the record the N. Y. A. has made in my State. Its out-of-school work and student-work programs have created hope and planted security in the breasts of thousands of our youth. In bringing the Government home to our boys and girls we are not only helping them but strengthening our Government. The programs are making it possible for thousands of our boys and girls to better their conditions, thus enabling them to develop into better citizens. Then, too, in bringing these boys and girls to a realization that they are really a part of this Government, that the Government is actually being administered in their behalf, you create loyalty and love of country and a reverence for our democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include the statement above referred to, as follows:

[Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration]

SUMMARY OF CURRENT OPERATIONS, NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM, STATE OF VIRGINIA

I. EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
All programs, total	20,305	8,561	11,744
Out-of-school work program, total	10,166	4,043	6,123
Student work program, total	10,139	4,518	5,621
School work program	7,407	3,104	4,303
College and graduate work program	2,732	1,414	1,318

II. FUNDS EXPENDED, 1936 THROUGH APR. 30, 1941

Fiscal year	Amount		
	Total	Student work program	Out-of-school work program
1936	$573,318	$412,205	$161,113
1937	885,868	422,327	463,541
1938	756,323	315,451	440,872
1939	1,236,805	397,390	839,415
1940	1,835,370	519,205	1,316,165
1941 (encumbrances through Apr. 30, 1941)	2,121,134	440,555	1,680,579
Total, all years	7,408,818	2,507,133	4,901,685

Out-of-school work program

III–A. EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF PROJECT, APRIL 1941

Type of project	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
Total	10,166	4,043	6,123
Resident projects	575	548	327
Workshop-production	2,592	788	1,804
Construction, total	2,667	2,504	163
Roads, streets, and bridges	728	728	
Improvement of grounds	597	492	105
Building construction, repair	1,143	1,085	58
Recreational facilities other than buildings	36	36	
Conservation, irrigation, and flood control	4	4	
Water and sanitation	159	159	
Professional-clerical, total	4,032	203	3,829
Clerical assistance	1,906	88	1,818
Public health and hospital assistance	271	38	233
Library service	89	18	71
Arts and crafts	27	1	26
Recreational assistance	56	9	47
Nursery school assistance	73	3	70
School lunch and food preparation	1,610	46	1,564

III–B. EMPLOYMENT ON WORKSHOP PRODUCTION PROJECTS BY TYPES OF PRODUCTION, APRIL 1941

Type of production	Number of youth employed			Number of units
	Total	Male	Female	
Total	3,130	1,218	1,912	196
Sheet metal	58	58		3
Welding	24	24		1
Auto maintenance and repair	134	134		8
Aviation service	45	45		1
Farm implements and equipment	37	37		9
Machine shop	50	50		10
Electrical	74	74		5
Radio	31	31		2
Woodworking	559	479	80	42
Drafting, map making, blueprinting	4	4		2
Sewing	1,817	89	1,728	84
Other production	297	193	104	29

III–C. EMPLOYMENT IN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS, APRIL 1941

Type of Military Establishment	Number of youth employed	Number of establishments
Total	126	9
Army	115	8
Marine	11	1

III–D. TERMINATION FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT, JULY 1940 THROUGH APRIL 1941

	Number of youth
1940	
July	272
August	227
September	380
October	349
November	282
December	163
1941	
January	408
February	387
March	582
April	744
Total	3,794

III–E. PLACEMENTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, DECEMBER 1940 THROUGH MARCH 1941

	Number of youth
Total	1,540
Manufacturing industries, total	225
Food and kindred products, and tobacco	37
Textile and textile products	88
Lumber, furniture, and finished lumber products	29
Paper and allied products	7

III–E. PLACEMENTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, DECEMBER 1940 THROUGH MARCH 1941—continued

	Number of youth
Manufacturing industries—Continued.	
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	4
Rayon and allied products	20
Chemical products (excluding rayon and allied products)	8
Petroleum and coal products	13
Rubber products	1
Leather and leather products	11
Iron and steel and their products (excluding machinery)	3
Agricultural machinery and equipment	1
Metal working machinery and equipment	3
Aircraft and parts	4
Automobiles and automobile equipment	15
Ship and boat building and repairing	18
Railroad and other transportation equipment	10
Other manufacturing industries	3
Nonmanufacturing industries, total	451
Agriculture, forestry (except logging), and fishing	37
Construction	132
Railroads (interstate)	5
Other transportation and services	9
Telephone, telegraph, and related services	9
Electric, gas, and other local public utilities	4
Wholesale and retail trade	51
Finance, insurance, and real estate	24
Service industries (excluding domestic service)	66
Domestic service	56
Other nonmanufacturing industries	58
Unknown industry	864

III–F. CERTIFIED YOUTH AWAITING ASSIGNMENT APRIL 1941

Total	8,004
Male	4,310
Female	3,694

III–G. VOCATIONAL BUILDINGS AND FARM SHOP CONSTRUCTION, JULY 1940 THROUGH FEB. 28, 1941

Type of work	Number of buildings		
	Total	Completed	In progress
Total	33	6	27
New	25	1	24
Additions	8	5	3

IV. STUDENT WORK PROGRAM, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth			Number of institutions	Average earnings
	Total	Male	Female		
Total	10,139	4,518	5,621	[1] 906	$7.42
School	7,407	3,104	4,303	869	5.19
College	2,685	1,381	1,304	37	13.34
Graduate	47	33	14	7	18.96

[1] This total represents the number of institutions reported on line 2 plus the unduplicated number of colleges and universities for which entries appear on lines 3 and 4.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to give a few concrete examples of just what this program is doing:

SECOND-CLASS MECHANIC

John J. Verser, an orphan from Crewe, Va., had to leave high school at the end of 1 year due to financial difficulties. He was enrolled at the N. Y. A. project at Manassas in October 1938 and worked in electricity.

Upon leaving the project he went to work in the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Corporation as a sheet metal worker's helper. Within 6 weeks he was giving rating of second-class mechanic and has progressed steadily since that time.

This young man did not have the opportunity common to most young men, as he was an orphan with five of his brothers and sisters to support. Much of his life was spent in the Presbyterian Orphanage in Lynchburg. The opportunity given him at the project was the first real chance he had ever had offered him and he proved his ability admirably.

PLUMBING

Albert Groves, from Bealton, Va., was a high-school graduate. He entered the project March 31, 1938, and remained until June 1, 1939, and was above average in both work and attitude. He was a willing worker and always trying to improve his knowledge of his trade.

Upon completing his training he secured employment with the Langslow Plumbing & Heating Co., Newport News, Va., at a weekly wage of $25. He is now employed as a machinist-plumber at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Corporation.

PAINTING

Alvinza B. Jeffers is of an excellent but poor family. His mother died when he was 5 and his father was partially, but permanently, disabled. Alvinza managed to get through high school by the odd-job route.

For 2 years after high school he worked at various jobs. His highest pay was $12 per week and the lowest $3. Jeffers enrolled at the N. Y. A. project on October 11, 1938, and took the painting course. He was an average student and completed his training on November 7, 1939. He was then employed as a painter, second class, at the Newport News shipyard. Through diligent application he is now a timekeeper in the paint shop. His salary is $35 per week, and he is now able to contribute to the support of his disabled father.

CARPENTRY

Kent Loving, of Salem, Va., entered the project in September 1938 and enrolled in the carpentry shop.

His father was dead and his mother a W. P. A. worker. Kent was forced to leave school in the eighth grade in order to make his own living.

During his time at the project he was outstanding in studies and manipulative skill, and an excellent draftsman. He was also a leader among the other boys.

At the end of his year's training he went to work for the Hampton Lumber Co., Hampton, Va., where he is now employed as millwork foreman.

SHEET-METAL WORKER

Homer R. Rose, Hansonville, Va., went to Fort Eustis in April 1940 to take a course in sheet-metal work. This boy's father is a farmer, and the total yearly income for the family was only $250 at the time his application was taken.

In February 1941 Homer left Manassas, where he had been transferred, to accept a job at the Norfolk Navy Yard as a sheet-metal worker.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to pay my respects to Mr. Aubrey Williams, N. Y. A. Administrator. Because his heart is in the work, he is putting the program over in a fine way. I am sure the people down in my State appreciate the splendid public service he is rendering. And I also want to pay my respects to the administrative officers and their assistants in the State of Virginia. Without exception, they have been carefully and wisely selected and are rendering outstanding service.

Strikes in Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, those who advocate the closed shop should be extremely proud of the success of their plan. In this article it is stated that on a $30,000,000 project for the Government in Ohio the unions are now collecting from 6,000 laboring men $19 each.

Laborers seeking work, desiring to serve their Nation by way of national defense, on this $30,000,000 arsenal, will pay more than $100,000 for the privilege of serving their country.

This Congress should be anything but proud of its participation by way of inaction in this graft racket, which is only made possible by our failure to act, by our failure to insist upon that equality of opportunity which the President said must be established throughout the world, but which he, in America, although charged with the enforcement of the law, fails to maintain.

This story from the Cleveland News of Monday, June 2, should be read by every Member of the House, who, after reading it, should take counsel with his conscience and consider once again the question of whether this Congress is performing its full duty toward the American laboring man:

[From the Cleveland News of June 2, 1941]

UNION ASKS $19, TAKES NO BACK TALK, FOR ARSENAL JOBS

(By Randall Brown)

RAVENNA, OHIO.—It's business-agents-as-usual here at the Army's $30,000,000 arsenal, in spite of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by President Roosevelt.

Lt. Col. R. S. Chavin is official commander of this mammoth shell-loading plant under construction. But a handful of A. F. of L. business agents have a lot to say about the work under progress here.

I got a job on the 30,000-acre Army reservation as the lowest of all laborers—smashing stone with a 12-pound sledge hammer.

Before I could lift my hammer once to do my bit toward speeding American defense, I had to sign an agreement to say $19 initiation and dues to the A. F. of L. International Hod Carriers', Building and Common Laborers' Union.

"GOOD TIME TO GET OUT"

"Now, if this isn't agreeable to you all," Kenneth Statler, the union's business agent, told a group of 50 newly hired laborers, "now is a damned good time to get out."

White and colored, young and old, we stood in line inside the Hunkin-Conkey Construction Co. employment offices at the main entrance of the arsenal, listening to Statler.

"And another thing," he added. "If there is any one of you that doesn't believe in American ideals, now is also a damned good time to get out—before you go to work."

At this a young man, second in line in front of me, muttered:

"What does he mean—American ideals? Paying $19 into his blankety-blank union?"

"POOR SUCKER" LOSES CHANCE

This touched off an argument and a brief scuffle which ended with the young man, a fellow with wavy black hair who said he was a member of the A. F. of L. Bartenders' Union, being escorted off the reservation by an armed guard.

"The poor sucker," somebody said. "He would have had a job if he hadn't squawked."

The argument was between the unlucky work applicant and a Hunkin-Conkey official, each protesting he was "a better union man" than the other. The scuffle occurred when the guard, summoned by the official, grabbed the applicant by the arm and

started to lead him off. The talkative applicant finally left without resistance.

After standing in line for 2 days, I happened to get my job and arsenal employee's badge No. 7383 because of the unwillingness or inability of 500 previously employed laborers to pay dues to Statler's union.

Under the closed-shop agreement between the union and company, workers hired before May 1 who were not in good standing last week were summarily fired, leaving room for new employees.

Rules for payments to the union provide for $5 out of the first pay check and subsequent payments at the rate of 75 cents a day until all initiation fees and dues are paid up.

I saw a gray-whiskered man of 55 step up to one of Statler's assistants and ask if he could stay on the job. The answer was a curt "No." The man walked away.

An Akron laborer had paid $17 of the $19 he owed the union. But he, too, was turned away.

I saw dozens of men emptying their wallets "to get square with the union," many of them paying $19, which meant they previously had paid the union nothing.

Statler and another assistant named Tom stood inside the union booth at the main gate stuffing the shower of bills into their wallets and making out receipts.

ANNUAL TAKE IS $180,000

I estimated that Statler's union, thanks to Uncle Sam's defense program, is collecting at the rate of $180,000 a year from laborers at the arsenal.

If 6,000 laborers—at times more than 7,000 are employed—paid their full dues for a year, the collection would total $186,000. This is at the rate of $31 a year—$15 initiation and $4 per quarterly year dues.

Counting truck drivers, painters, electricians, carpenters, bricklayers, and operating engineers—crafts which pay heavier dues than laborers—union dues paid by arsenal employees total in excess of $500,000 a year.

The best union story I heard while working at the arsenal was told by a bus driver who drove us from our time office to our work location—Smalley Road, where our labor gang smashed stone for a roadbed.

"Yes, sir; when Uncle Sam dishes out the dough, man, he really dishes it."

UNCLE SAM CAUGHT IN JAM

He told about a truckload of electricians coming in from work at the end of the day. Their union contract, he said, provided for a full hour of overtime pay for every fractional part of an hour over 5 minutes, even though this extra time was spent en route to the time office, after completion of the workday.

"Well, do you know what happened?" the bus driver said. "That danged load of electricians got caught in one of the traffic jams we have every now and then when shifts change.

"Their truck was held up for just over 5 minutes," he added. "Know what that traffic jam cost Uncle Sam in overtime? Just $200. There was hell to pay from the Army, but the electricians got their extra money all right."

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE, OF INDIANA

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on Memorial Day, over radio station WOWO, Fort Wayne, Ind.:

Friends of the radio audience, 23 years ago today this Nation was engaged in a great war—a war to "make the world safe for democracy"—a war to end all wars.

Today we pause to pay tribute to those brave men who died for that noble ideal, while Europe's battlefields bear testimony to the futility of that resolve.

No nation ever entered a conflict with higher ideals, with more unselfish purpose, or more noble motives than did the United States in 1917. We had no desire for world domination, no lust of ambition, no pride of power and might. Our sole desire was to give to the world the same right to live in freedom, in peace, and happiness which we held as a heritage from our forefathers.

Our heritage had been won in the snows of Valley Forge, guaranteed at the "Bloody Angle" of Gettysburg. It was our heritage—our unchangeable right—because thousands of brave men to whom we pay tribute today had died that we might live as free citizens of a liberty-loving republic.

It is fitting that America today should pay tribute to her sons and daughters who have died in defense of her freedom. But today as we honor those sacrifices, we should at the same time make an accounting of our stewardship. We should search out our own duties and ask of ourselves what we are doing to carry on those ideals for which they died.

Our tears and our flowers are tributes of love and devotion, but they are not sufficient. It is only by doing our part to live up to and carry on the ideals for which they died that America today can pay tribute to her honored dead.

The world today is again torn by wars—wars more terrible and more destructive of human life and property than anything that has ever been known to man. The powers of aggression and tyranny again are on the march. Freedom and peace are being trampled under the heel of dictatorship and power.

What, then, is America's part in this new world crisis?

Should we again send forth our sons to fight to make the world safe for democracy?

Should we again cast our ideals with Europe's ambitions?

On this Memorial Day of 1941, I say to you that America's place is in America. America's duty is not to make the world safe for democracy. America's duty is to save democracy for the world. America's task is not the destruction of nazi-ism, fascism, nor communism in other parts of the world. America's destiny is the preservation of Americanism in America.

Close as Europe's wars have touched many of our lives; hate, as we must, the aggression of the dictators—I can see no reason for another A. E. F.

If tyranny, dictatorships, and the rule of might are to perish, it will not be because America or any other nation has overthrown them at the point of a bayonet or a machine gun. It will be because the people themselves, guided and inspired by the example of freedom-loving America—living in peace and happiness—will throw off the shackles of dictation and assume for themselves the rights of self-government, of liberty, and right.

But it is not sufficient that we should only hold aloft the burning torch of liberty. We must be prepared to defend our American way of life against any conceivable enemy.

No nation can possess the wealth, the natural resources, and the glories of America without being coveted by forces of greed and ambition.

We in America therefore must be prepared to defend not only our ideals but our possessions—not only the rights but the fruits of freedom and individual liberty.

Congress—since the fall of France a year ago—has been engaged in appropriating billions of dollars for the rebuilding of our national defenses. The largest peacetime appropriations in history have been voted for the development of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Corps.

To be sure, our present armed forces are the strongest—and the best equipped and best trained—in all our peacetime history. But this is not particularly reassuring. Our peacetime Army has never been anything but a skeleton organization. Assurance that it is the best it has ever been is not sufficient. It still is not strong enough, sufficiently well equipped, nor trained for the defensive tactics this war in Europe and Africa has shown us is vital to any defense.

Congress and the country are united on the necessity of immediate adequate national defense. We are working as a unit toward the end that America must be prepared to successfully resist any conceivable attempt to invade our shores

Determined as America is, however, to see our defenses in order, we should go about this business with calmness and deliberation—with both feet planted squarely on the ground—and with a united demand that for every dollar of American money spent for defenses, we get a dollar's worth of defenses.

America is not totally unprepared. We have in our Navy 323 warships, including 15 battleships, 6 aircraft carriers, 37 cruisers, 160 destroyers, and 105 submarines. They are manned by 210,000 officers and men plus 40,000 officers and men of the Marine Corps. Another 47,000 officers and men comprise the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.

Our Army today consists of some 1,240,000 enlisted men, including draftees, and 82,000 officers. This is being steadily strengthened and will reach a peak of more than 1,400,000 men by early summer.

The present strength of the Air Corps is 6,600 officers and 121,000 enlisted men. Of these, approximately 6,000 are rated as pilots.

The Air Corps has on hand as of today 6,000 planes, consisting of about 3,500 training planes and 2,500 combat ships. Additional planes are coming off the assembly line by the hundreds, and only this week a new appropriation of over $3,000,000,000 was requested for the Army and Navy airplane program.

But let us not follow any false illusions. Adequate national defense is not going to be accomplished by the passage of some bills by Congress and the ordering of more airplanes, more guns, and more explosives.

Adequate national defense can only be achieved if we stamp out and forget those class hatreds and intolerances which have been too much in evidence during recent months.

Adequate national defense can be had only by the sacrifice of each of us—of every man and woman in every walk of life—by industry and by labor—by farmer and mechanic—by teacher and pupil.

America cannot be defended by pitting industry against labor, rich against poor, isolationist against interventionist. America can only be defended when we all realize that we are Americans—working, living, and sacrificing for the same high ideal.

Armaments cost money. One giant long-distance bomber alone costs in the neighborhood of $350,000. A great battleship costs millions. Unless America is willing to sacrifice or to go without other things to pay for it, we will have no adequate national defense.

Today our national debt is at the highest figure in history. The debt limit in the last year has been raised from $45,000,000,000 to $65,000,000,000. We can provide a great defense force in two ways. We can tax ourselves to pay for it or we can continue to raise our debt limit and pass on the cost to our children and our children's children.

But the delusion that we can continue to borrow huge sums of money with no thought of repayment is as dangerous to this country's safety as a lack of guns or warships or

planes. Financial bankruptcy is no less a danger to our democracy than an invasion.

Congress very wisely is now engaged in drawing up a new tax measure to pay for a large share of our defense program. Along with this, however, should come strict economy in regular Government expenditures. Americans will gladly share the burden of defense expenditures if they are assured that the money they pay in taxes is not wasted and squandered on nonessential, nondefense frills.

We need billions for national defense. Let some of these billions come through a reduction in the luxuries and unnecessary expenses of government itself.

And now, may I mention another phase of our defense which in my opinion is just as important as a strong force on land or sea or air? I refer to a defense against those "fifth column" and Trojan-horse tactics which already are among us, preaching and teaching the substitution of alien "isms" for the American way of life.

These alien agitators and propagandists are a more real and immediate danger to our democracy than any foreign invader.

America today has no place for any "ism" but Americanism. Let those among us who do not like our way of life—whose hearts do not thrill at the sight of the Stars and Stripes—who are not ready and willing to make any sacrifice for our ideals—I say, let's send them back to the dictators they love. We need and want none of them.

America today needs a great spiritual revival. We need to rekindle our belief in the fundamentals upon which our Government was founded. We need to again rededicate ourselves to our ideals, to reaffirm our faith in God and His teachings. We need pride in the things for which we stand.

As this Memorial Day draws to a close, America could make no better resolve than to carry on the ideals for which these loved ones gave their lives—to willingly and eagerly make any sacrifice necessary for the preservation of our noble heritage—to keep America as a bright light of freedom and happiness—shining as a beacon to all the world that in America, peace and democracy and freedom shall live forevermore.

Thank you and good night.

Candles of Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ADDRESS BY FRED TAYLOR WILSON, LL. D.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, June 2, at Lewisburg, W. Va., an address of rare beauty of diction and lofty thought was delivered to the graduating class of Greenbrier College for Young Women. The speaker was Fred Taylor Wilson, LL. D., of Washington, D. C., noted author and lecturer, and personal friend of many Members of the Congress. Dr. Wilson's subject was Candles of Culture. He spoke, in part, as follows:

Today, I ask, in the lovely lines of Lowell: "What is so rare as a day in June?"

It is delightful to be here and enjoy once more the quiet stillness of this peaceful mountain region. When I last saw your beautiful mountains they were robed in the white weeds of winter. Today, they are even more beautiful in the green and gay garments of summer. May I express the hope as you go away today, like Milton's Lycidas, to "seek fresh woods and pastures new," that you may take away with you in your bodies a bit of the mountains' strength, in your minds something of the wide view from their sun-painted summits, and in your soul of souls a purity like unto the purity of the gentle winds that blow above them.

My subject is Candles of Culture. There is an old Chinese proverb which reads: "It is better to light a candle in the darkness than to complain of the darkness." So, instead of complaining of the dark and gloomy wood in which civilization, like Dante of old, now wanders, I am going to try to light for you seven candles which I hope will drive away some of the darkness and gloom from your future lives.

The number "7" is a mystic one. It is often found in both sacred and secular literature. Genesis tells us all creation was completed in 7 days, and that after the flood God made a pledge to man in the seven colors of the rainbow. John, in his revelation to the seven churches of Asia, wrote of seeing seven golden candlesticks. Dante, in the Middle Ages, described the seven heavens and the seven major sins to a church with seven sacred sacraments. Shakespeare, in As You Like It, spoke of the seven ages of man, and Ruskin wrote of the Seven Lamps of Architecture.

I. CALMNESS

The first of our seven candles we will call the candle of calmness. What a task you will have to keep it burning in times like these. Wicked winds from every direction seek to snuff out its flickering flame. From the north come the furious winds of fear; from the south the softer winds of anxiety; from the west the whistling winds of worry; and from the east the ever-rising gale of guilt within.

Now is a great hour to learn the lessons of poise and dignity, self-mastery, and self-control. Let us keep calm and cool, whatever may happen. Though others lose their heads, and, as Kipling cautioned us, blame us with their loss, let us remain cool and calm and steadfast. To do this we must learn early the art of self-discipline and drop the desire for mere self-expression. Compare the silent river with the slimy swamp. The one follows a channeled or disciplined way, while the other realizes self-expression. Which is the more useful and admirable?

The disciplined way of life is also the way of wisdom. Milton named solitude as the place to plume our feathers and grow the wings of wisdom. Dr. Alexis Carrel, in his great book, Man, the Unknown, reminds us that only two groups in human society know the value of solitude, the very bad and the very good, the condemned criminal and the monk in the monastery. He also warns us that out of such monastic silences will come the great discoveries of the future.

Study the secret lessons of Nature. Learn to speak her varied language. Catch the message of both mountain and sea. And, as you look up into the silent evening sky, repeat with Emerson, "Teach me thy mood, oh, patient stars."

II. COURAGE

Our second candle is the candle of courage. What an hour to learn of the metal of which we are made.

The whole world seems to be in the grip of some mad monster who would take it and shake it as an angry cat would take and shake a frightened little mouse.

What is real courage? There is nothing courageous in flying at night with the speed of the wind above a sleeping city and dropping deadly bombs upon helpless people below. Such are the deeds of daredevils and not of daring men. No crosses of honor will ever be given those who perform them. Few real heroes have appeared in the present cruel war, where man has been matched, not against man, but against the machines which man has made.

It was Milton who reminded us that "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."

"Dream not that sword and helmet
Are signs of valor true;
For peace hath greater victories
Than battle ever knew."

We read much of the world's great battlefields. Marathon in Greece and the Marne in France were scenes of immortal valor. But there is a greater battlefield than these. It is found not upon the maps of the world but in the hearts of men and women where they, like Jacob of old, wrestle with the angels of their better natures. It is there that truth challenges falsehood as a dragon of danger and 1 legion of honor puts to flight 10,000 legions of dishonor; it is there the angel of purity with the sword of self-respect drives away a whole division of unclean devils. But when the fight is over, and truth and honor and purity have won the day, ladders from heaven rise before the victors, upon which angels descend to bestow the golden crown of the truly courageous.

England is a recent example of a courageous nation. Its people have shown themselves valiant and brave in the midst of great hardships. Though bombs have broken their beautiful buildings, they have not touched their unconquerable souls.

All literature pays tribute to courage. The Bible is one clear call to be strong and of a good courage. At its close, the morning star is the reward offered to him that overcometh. Shakespeare also bids us be brave. One of his noted female characters scornfully cried to her faltering husband, "Screw your courage up to the sticking point and you will not fail." It was Hotspur who declared, "Out of the nettle danger, I pluck the flower safety." On a tomb in the old Thomas Jefferson Cemetery at Monticello are these words from Browning: "One who never turned his back but marched breast forward." That is the spirit of the truly courageous. The stars in their very courses fight on the side of all brave souls. For—

"If courage feeble were
Heaven itself would stoop to her."

III. TOLERANCE

The candle of tolerance has long since ceased to shine in many places. But you must keep it burning. For tolerance is a fundamental part in any real religious faith. We daily ask in our prayer of prayers, that the Father of us all be tolerant and forgive us in proportion as we are tolerant and forgive those who trespass against us.

I am aware of the difficulty in always being tolerant and kind. But, as Wordsworth warned us, we are most remembered by the little, nameless acts of kindness and of love. For love never faileth.

We pay in physical as well as in spiritual pain when we harbor hate and unforgiveness in our hearts. So, learn now to be kind and tolerant.

Time makes changes in the lives of all of us. The Dives of one day often becomes the Lazarus of the next; the learned of one hour is sometimes the lunatic of the next hour, and the greenhorn of now may be the great man of tomorrow.

There are two groups in human society which should command our greatest tolerance. They belong to the first and seventh ages of man. When infants torment you into tears, remember that you, too, were once an infant.

And, when the very aged seem unreasonable in their demands, remember that your highest hope is to some day join their restless ranks.

Be tolerant, too, toward the people of other flags and faiths. Keep in mind that Socrates was a Greek, Cicero an Italian, Tolstoi a Russian, and Goethe a German.

May you, as Beatrice directed Dante, drink deeply of Lethe's waters and forget the ugliness of life, and then drink from Eunoe's stream, that only its beauty may be remembered. When that is done, like Beatrice, you are ready to continue your journey toward the eternal forests.

IV. TRUTH

Truth, our fourth candle, is the first casualty of war, both without and within.

To know, or not to know, that is the eternal question. Saint and scientist alike are ever asking with Pilate, "What is truth?"

I am thinking now of five great torch bearers of truth who led the world into new realms of knowledge. First, there was Copernicus, the Polish monk, who, when dying, declared that the earth was not the center of all creation as Aristotle had taught and the world had believed for centuries. Then came Galileo, who aroused the anger of the world, the church, and maybe the devil by announcing that the earth and not the sun was the great traveler. Newton's discovery of the law of gravitation which we now take for granted, also opened a new gateway into the fields of knowledge. Darwin, too, shocked mankind into a new understanding with his calm conclusion that man was a rising and not a fallen angel. And finally came Einstein, who now lives among us, with his far-flung theory of relativity, about which we talk so much and know so little.

Greater truths than these will be unfolded as man advances in wisdom and understanding. So follow truth's candle wherever it may lead you. It alone will guide you into the largest freedom of mind and heart.

V. SERVICE

Our fifth candle is a key one. It is the candle of service. I am wondering now what dream most possesses you. Some of you may be thinking primarily of personal pleasure and future social triumphs. If so, God pity you. These alone will not provide for you a permanent happiness. Life is something more than moonlight and roses. Lives devoted largely to selfish satisfactions are like orchids—expensive but emit no sweet odors; like peacocks which parade in pride and splendor but sing no songs; or like the Japanese cherry trees which delight us with their beauty of bud and blossom but furnish no food for the hungry or shade for the shelterless.

Most of you, I am sure, now dream of a happy home and family life of your own. You could have no finer dream. To provide a restful retreat for some gallant Romeo is a work worthy of the loveliest Juliet. For a happy home is a replica of heaven and to be the mother of a Washington is greater than to be Washington himself. Some of you, no doubt, have already hitched to shining stars the wagons of your ambition in art, music, and literature. And that, too, is well, for "too low they build who build beneath the stars." So, dream on my beautiful young dreamers and may God help you make your dreams come true.

Let me here impress two of my favorite thoughts upon you. First, true greatness does not depend upon place or power. An artist is an artist whether she holds in her delicate hands the unshapen clay of the commonplace, the costly gifts of gold and purple, or gently leads some little child into paths of honor and usefulness. For "all service ranks the same with God." Second, there is no real progress in life without privation and pain. Life is made up of both tears and cheers. Into every fertile life some rain must fall. Eternal sunshine everywhere means a dreary desert. When you feel keenly the chisel of fate and circumstance remember that so are fashioned all the finest things of life.

No one loses by unselfish service. As one candle lends its light to another, nor loses any of its luster, so those who serve never lose in so doing. "Give to the world the best you have and the best will come back to you." The names in history which will live until the last syllable of recorded time are the names not of mankind's greatest masters but of its greatest servants. Let me now turn prophet: You in this class who in the years to come will receive the accolade of highest acclaim will be those of you who serve most graciously and generously your day and generation. You will reveal most the redolence of roses and the loveliness of lilies.

VI. FAITH

Our sixth candle, the candle of faith, often fades, then glows again. It must glow again, or life could not go on. For faith is the alpha and omega of all human progress.

Our first faith should be in faith itself. One philosopher declared doubt to be the beginning of wisdom. If that be so, the world should now be full of countless Solomons.

Let the beams of light from faith's candle, like those from a lighthouse, revolve in four different directions. First, let such rays turn on yourselves. You will largely be the architects of your own future. The fault will not be with others. The secret rests with you. So believe in your own star.

But you must always be worthy of your own confidence.

"First to thine ownself be true
And then as the night follows the day
Thou canst not be false to any man."

These beams of light must also turn to an ever-renewed faith in humanity. That is very difficult to do, even now, but it must be done. You, of West Virginia, are familiar with tunnels. The civilized world is now passing through one of the tunnel periods of history. There is darkness everywhere. But, just as travelers through tunnels again behold the light, so will the world of today be dazzled by the brighter light of tomorrow when we have successfully passed through the darkness of the present hour.

"Now at last, tho' oft mistaken, oft despairing,
At last! At last! methinks I see the dawn,
Soon shall the awakened nations proclaim
The passing of the night forlorn.

"Soon shall the long conceived child of time
Be born of progress. Soon the morn sublime
Shall burst effulgent through the clouds of earth
And light—time's greatest page, O Right! thy glorious birth."

Keep your faith in America. Every true patriot loves his country. Remember Scott's lines:

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land."

As the Wise Men of the East followed the wondrous star, so do lovers of freedom and the democratic way of life throughout the world now follow the guiding hand of our Nation. We must not fail them.

We have made much today of the number "7." I want to commend to you seven great American documents. Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, of Boston University, called them Our American Canon. The Mayflower Compact, he called our Genesis; the Declaration of Independence, our Exodus; the Federal Constitution, our Books of the Law; Washington's Farewell Address, our Major Prophesy; the Star-Spangled Banner, our Psalm of America; Lincoln's second inaugural address, our Gospel of Americanism; and Woodrow Wilson's last written message, the Road Away From Revolution, an Epistle to the Americans. I commend them all to you.

We point with pride to our wide territory and our ever-growing population. But neither plains nor population alone make a nation great.

"Only men can make
A nation great and strong;
Men who for truth and honor's sake
Stand fast and suffer long.

"Brave men who work while others sleep,
Who dare while others fly;
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky."

Finally, keep your faith in God. The pure in heart see Him everywhere. They behold His glory in the rising of the sun and His beauty and sublimity in sunset and evening star. I dare not suggest your way of worship. Many rival roadways lead to the city of God. The terminus of all of them is the same. Some people prefer to worship in stately, ritualistic ways. Others, Quaker-like, kneel in solemn silence. The lofty message of Emerson's Oversoul and that of the most primitive preacher alike assure us that frail man does not walk alone but has a divine companion.

So keep your faith in yourselves, in humanity, in your country, and in God.

VII. CHARACTER

You now have burning before you six candles; the candles of calmness, courage, tolerance, truth, service, and faith. We will now light our seventh, and last candle. It is the candle of character. It should be more than a candle. It should be an everlasting flame.

Learn now, my dear young graduates, that spiritual values are as real as material ones; that faith is as real as the fragrance of flowers; that hope is as eternal as the everlasting hills; and that love is as luminous as the light from sun and stars.

Nature and man work together to fortify a living faith. A little while ago, I visited the nearby Natural Bridge of Virginia. I was thrilled as you no doubt have been by its massive masonry, chiseled through the ages by the hand of Nature into a thing of beauty and grandeur. But more vivid to me than my recollection of rock and river is the memory of the marvelous music wafted to my waiting ears on the evening breeze from a golden-voiced singer somewhere in that cathedral of stone. "It dissolved me into ecstacies and brought all heaven before mine eyes." I shall ever remember his last lingering lines: "Earth hath no sorrows heaven cannot heal."

You, rightly, should aspire to be as Helen-like as possible in charm and beauty. But remember character—sweet, modest, gentle, Christian character—is the choicest of all cosmetics. Its divine influence is indelible. It will remain long after mere physical beauty of form and feature has faded. Neither time nor tears can erase it. Character alone will enable you to sleep well when life's fitful fever is over. Its mark will shine brightest upon you in the light of the eternal morning.

Each one of you, I am sure, aspires to the finest possible type of young womanhood. Let me suggest that you study well the secret of the hidden strength of strong men and women. A friend tells of a recent visit to a famed California florist, and the dwarfed redwoods he saw there. Though they belonged to the family of earth's oldest and largest living things, they were forever doomed to dwarfdom, because their taproot had been cut, and they no longer fed from Nature's inexhaustible springs. In like manner, we frail human beings live "pigmy" lives in moral and spiritual stature when we might become "giants," because we keep ourselves cut off from the hidden springs of God. To keep open such divine connection is the supreme end of life. We drink from the shallow pools of doubt and uncertainty and failure when we

might quench our thirsts at everlasting fountains which alone can provide us with peace, power, and plenty.

You will remember Emerson's reminder that the gods we worship write their names upon our faces. May I, in closing, breathe the hope and prayer that henceforth each one of you will so worship the Christ of Calvary, the Candle of the Centuries, and so walk in His way of love that He will write His name upon your fair faces in living letters so lustrous that—

"All your future years will be as a tract of light,
Like an angel's footsteps passing through the night."

Compensation Tax Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 31, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 31, 1941]

COMPENSATION TAX RATES

Wisconsin, with its individual employer account system, in its unemployment compensation law, will, if it passes certain present legislation, be in an excellent position so far as the critics in Washington are concerned.

The reason that it will be in an excellent position is that, while it permits reduced tax rates to employers with specified reserves, it also demands a higher-than-normal tax from the few employers whose reserves fall below specified minimums.

The normal unemployment tax rate is 2.7 percent. The minimum tax is complete exemption for the period of high reserves. The maximum tax is 4 percent. Under this system, each employer's account is kept sound—or the employer pays 50 percent additional until his account is restored. At the same time, because reserves are ample and because they are invested in interest-bearing Federal securities, a more than adequate "general fund" is built up. The interest received on the total reserve, it may be recalled, goes into this general fund.

Only two others of the 13 States which have individual employer experience rating follow the Wisconsin practice of a higher-than-normal tax for employers with excess labor turn-over. The other 10 allow reduced rates (two of them down to no tax at all), but they do not complete the circle by assessing excess taxes in case of depleted reserves.

These 10 States, in the interest of perpetuating the individual employer reserve system, should adopt the minimum-normal-maximum tax policy. One sure point of attack by the pooled fund advocates is the one-sidedness of a plan which permits a discount but exacts no penalty.

A. V. A. Is Endorsed by Missouri House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the masses are beginning to think in terms of this Nation of ours after the war. Missouri is one of the eight States lying wholly or partially within the area of the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority.

The House of Representatives of Missouri has just passed a resolution by the Honorable A. T. Parrish, of Springfield, petitioning and memorializing Congress to pass the bill now pending in both the House and Senate to create the Arkansas Valley Authority. I take pleasure in inserting the resolution in the RECORD:

Whereas there is now pending in the National Congress of the United States a bill known as the Arkansas Valley Authority bill; and

Whereas there is a necessity for the developing of the State of Missouri in the mining industry and also for the curtailment of the damaging floodwaters that have brought about the rapid erosion of soils in the last 50 years; and

Whereas the passage of this bill is necessary at this time for the carrying out and boosting of a national-defense program: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That the National Congress be asked, petitioned, and memorialized to pass said bill at its earliest convenience.

I, Joseph A. Bauer, chief clerk of the House of Representatives of Missouri, do hereby certify that this resolution was adopted by the Sixty-first General Assembly of Missouri now in session.

J. H. BAUER, *Chief Clerk.*

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT NATIONAL PHILATELIC AUCTIONS FOR REFUGEE RELIEF

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein an address given by former Postmaster General James A. Farley at a dinner tendered to him at the Astor Hotel, New York City, on June 3, sponsored by philatelists and civil and social leaders of the United States:

I consider it a privilege to have been invited to this delightful dinner tonight and to participate in the national philatelic auctions for refugee relief.

One of the most beautiful things of our American way of life is that we have both the heart and the disposition to gather together in meetings of this kind for the purpose of helping those who are helpless, and sometimes almost hopeless, by reason of forces over which they have no control. It is, indeed, an attest for democracy and typifies those soul-consoling influences which make us so proud of our citizenship today.

It is an honor to appear before such a distinguished audience, and I need not tell you that we face a grave emergency when a large part of Europe is under the ruthless control of totalitarian states aspiring to greater conquests. The danger is real and calls for every possible effort for defense. And, may I repeat, it is commendable that we assemble here to do something for those whose defense was not quite enough to meet the adversary.

During my administration as Postmaster General I had opportunity of participating in many ceremonies sponsored by philatelic groups, and I have always found such meetings both interesting and informative. I have found stamp collectors to be patriotic American citizens, and their interest in and devotion to their hobby have always been intriguing to me. The philatelic auctions here tonight and the contributions thereto by those prominent in philately unmistakably evince also an interest in and devotion to good citizenship.

When I became Postmaster General I knew very little about a postage stamp except that it was an indispensable item in everyday business. In fact, were it not for the postage stamp I probably would not have been Postmaster General, for I am credited with having written more letters to the voters of this country than any other one man. I still believe in letter writing as I think it is one of the strongest ways, outside of personal contact, in which people may be brought together.

As many of you know, the Post Office Department has a series of what is known as ordinary stamps for everyday business. These stamps are of such size as will lend themselves easily to business usage. It also issues from time to time what are known as commemorative stamps. These stamps memorialize figures or events prominent in American history. I believe that the first real interest that I had in these stamps began with the issue of the Mother's Day stamp in 1934. Any stamp commemorating mother is of interest to all of us, of course, and I could not have directed the issuance of this stamp without thinking of my own mother whose love and care meant so much in my life. This stamp further served to impress upon me the significance of a small postal label in carrying a beautiful thought and message to everyone in the land. While I was criticized for putting what was termed a "10-cent-store vase of flowers on the portrait of Whistler's mother," this stamp was very popular and had one of the greatest sales in postal history. I had the happy privilege at the first press run of this issue to have with me at an appropriate ceremony the First Lady of the Land, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Approximately 100 commemorative stamps were issued while I was Postmaster General, and I believe that I may say, with becoming modesty, that we confined the issues only to those people and affairs that justified national recognition. I dare say that many will agree with me that the 35 stamps issued for prominent Americans was one of the greatest groups of stamps to be issued by this or any

other country. These stamps represented a cross section of leaders in the arts and sciences, and the person is erudite, indeed, who can refer to his stamp album and discuss with ease each person memorialized.

I found that the Department for many years had issued a book carrying descriptions of United States postage stamps from the first issue in 1847. This book was intended for the adult or mature stamp enthusiast, and the subject matter therein was restricted to descriptive matter and statistical facts with regard to the various issues. I was convinced that the value of this book to collectors would be greatly enhanced if the text was supplemented by actual reproductions of the stamps. This had not been possible in the past because of the restrictions of the law prohibiting the reproduction of United States postage stamps in their entirety. However, it was possible to obtain a favorable ruling with respect to the illustrating of stamps in this Government publication, as a result of which the edition of 1936 contained a full complement of stamp illustrations which has made this publication of universal interest to students and stamp collectors. It was also my happy privilege to authorize a junior edition of this book to sell at the very nominal price of 10 cents in order that every boy and girl might have a handy booklet depicting through stamps our country's history and tradition.

While the Post Office Department has always been generous in furnishing display frames of postage stamps to conventions and other meeting of philatelic groups, many people were deprived of observing and learning the interesting things surrounding stamp issues. It was my further privilege to authorize the building of an automobile truck which was completely equipped with stamp models and other exhibits picturizing the full history of stamp issues. This truck has passed through many cities, towns, and hamlets—more than 400,000 people have visited it. And I believe that the appreciation of these governmental issues betokened an interest in better citizenship.

The Department for many years has maintained a Philatelic Agency which is for the particular use and convenience of stamp collectors. The sales in 1933 were only a little more than $300,000 per year. In 1940 the sales of the Agency were nearly one and one-half million dollars. Not more than 15 people were employed in 1933, whereas today there are 42 people assigned to the Agency, and nearly 20 people do nothing else than handle orders by mail. Not only did the sales at the Philatelic Agency increase, but interest in stamp collecting has grown to such an extent that postmasters in many of the largest cities report considerable revenue from the sales of stamps through their philatelic window. In fact, the postmaster here at New York, Albert Goldman, reported more than $750,000 last year from the sales of stamps to philatelists.

It, of course, would be folly on my part to claim all the credit for this splendid growth and accomplishment in the field of philately. The No. 1 philatelist, whose encouragement and friendly counsel has meant so much, is the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I am sure that all philatelists, because of their more intimate knowledge of the world due to their interest in stamps of all nations, recognize the great problems that beset the President today. Like all the people of America, they stand shoulder to shoulder in support of whatever course he and Secretary of State Hull may deem best in this grave crisis. In the time of a national emergency there can be but one Commander in Chief.

The people of the philatelic world have done their part, too, and I want to acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the stamp columnists and stamp magazines, many of whose representatives and editors are here tonight. In furthering interest in your chosen hobby, you have done your part well.

Last, but not least, I may refer to the philatelic exhibition room, started in 1935 in the Post Office Building in Washington. At the present time the collection of stamps in this exhibit numbers approximately 50,000 original specimens. There are, in addition, some 1,500 die proofs of United States postage stamps. One hundred and eighty foreign countries are shown, with a total of approximately 10,000 foreign stamps on display. A better understanding of the scope and importance of the exhibition room will be gained from the fact that in the 6 years of its operation a collection of postage stamps has been assembled worth well over half a million dollars. It will be worth your while to visit this room when in Washington.

Through cooperation with the Treasury Department, legislation was sponsored and finally enacted on January 27, 1938, removing the restrictions heretofore in effect with regard to the illustrating of United States postage stamps for philatelic purposes. This has proved a boon to philatelic publishers and has enabled the news service of the country to promote an advertising campaign of immense possibilities to the Department in connection with the sale of new issues of postage stamps. It is now possible for the stamp columnists to illustrate their articles with black and white reproductions of postage stamps.

I have endeavored in the foregoing to render an account of my stewardship to the stamp collectors of America, to whom I am deeply indebted for many valuable suggestions with regard to new issues of postage stamps, and concerning the adoption of measures that would react to the benefit of philately in general. By reason of this departmental recognition and support, the stature and importance of philately has been raised to new heights heretofore assumed to be unattainable. Stamp collecting is the peer of all hobbies that appeals to persons of all ages and conditions in life.

I see around me so many people prominent in all walks of life, and doubtless many of you have hobbies other than that of stamp collecting, but I trust that my little talk tonight has served to present to you the attractiveness of even just a casual study of postage stamps.

I thank you.

General Fleming Discusses Questions Concerning His Legal Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

LETTERS FROM PHILIP B. FLEMING, ADMINISTRATOR, WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

JUNE 3, 1941.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you with respect to two phases of H. R. 4926, a bill "making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

The bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations on June 2, 1941, reduces by $349,110 the Budget estimates for the Wage and Hour Division. The bill also transfers from the Wage and Hour Division to the Office of the Solicitor $360,000, representing salaries of the legal personnel and their clerical assistants in the field offices of the Wage and Hour Division.

I should like first to discuss the effects of the reduction of the appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division. At page 13 of the report of the committee it is stated that "whether the additional funds sought by the Division and approved by the Budget should be allowed is purely one of policy." The report then goes on to state that as a matter of policy the committee is unable to find any justification for placing the inspection under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 on a basis of inspecting each and every plant that might be covered by the act. The committee points to examples of administration of the Food and Drug Administration and the Walsh-Healy Act, where only partial inspections are made as a justification for not requiring routine inspections of all covered establishments. The committee concludes that the sum recommended by it for the Wage and Hour Division will be sufficient to investigate all complaints of violation that might be registered with the Division, and will permit, in addition thereto, inspector service to be available for spot checking of industries throughout the United States.

I wish to take sharp issue with the committee on the question of policy of the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act referred to in the committee report. I am convinced that nothing short of an inspection of every one of the more than 300,000 establishments in which employees subject to the act are employed will give assurance of fair and uniform compliance with the act in every one of the States and Territories. In my annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, I announced in chapter IV the need for routine inspection of all covered establishments under the act. I stated that, in my opinion, the vast majority of employers are complying with the act. I also stated that many who have been in violation would be entirely willing to comply could they be assured that their business competitors also would be required to comply. Continuing, I stated that since the complying employer may experience difficulty in meeting the requirements of the act if the violations of competitors are allowed to go unchallenged, I acknowledged a moral, as well as a legal, responsibility to employers to put an end as quickly as possible to the payment of subminimum wages. The report concluded that to carry out this responsibility requires the systematic inspection of all establishments covered by the act.

During the fiscal year 1941, I instituted systematic routine inspection drives in several industries. The results of such routine inspections amply demonstrate the wisdom of following this approach. Thus, for the first 9 months of the fiscal year 1941, violations involving restitution were found in one-third of all establishments found to be covered on routine inspection. Furthermore, restitution was found owing to one-fifth of all the employees in the establishments in which routine inspection showed restitution to be due. In other words, the violations did not affect merely isolated employees, but, rather, a substantial proportion of all the employees in the establishments, none of whom filed complaints. Half of all legal actions instituted by the Division involved establishments against which no complaint had been received. For this 9-month period, violations of the overtime provisions of the

act were found in 15 percent of all establishments found to be covered on routine inspection, as compared with 24 percent for establishments investigated following the filing of complaints. The percentage of violations revealed in routine inspections increased during this 9-month period, whereas the percentage of establishments in violation in complaint cases remained at a constant level.

A few statistics will demonstrate forcibly the necessity of administering the Fair Labor Standards Act on a routine inspection basis. Out of 12,621 complaint cases reviewed in Washington during the first 9 months of the fiscal year 1941, 6,324, or roughly one-half, involved violations serious enough to warrant the payment of restitution to employees. Out of 19,635 cases reviewed in Washington during this same period as a result of routine inspection, 5,359 constituted violations serious enough to warrant the payment of restitution to employees. During this same 9-month period, out of 1,297 cases requiring litigation by the Division, 607 involved the payment of restitution to employees. Six hundred and forty-six of the 1,297 cases requiring litigation resulted from complaints received by the Division. Slightly more than one-half, or 651, of the 1,297 litigation cases grew out of routine inspections.

The experience of the various State labor departments clearly shows that routine inspections are essential in the administration of State labor laws, comparable to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The experiences of the States of New York, Rhode Island, Minnesota, California, Georgia, Nebraska, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania clearly demonstrate this conclusion. For example, the Department of Labor of Rhode Island, in its annual report for 1939, Division of Women and Children, page 43, states: "To enforce a wage order fairly, each firm subject to the order should be inspected at least once a year as a matter of routine, so that one violator will receive the same attention as another." The twenty-sixth biennial report of the Department of Labor and Industry of Minnesota for 1937-38, Division of Women and Children, page 201, states: "Enforcement of labor laws rests in part upon periodic inspection of women-employing industries."

I do not believe the administration of the Walsh-Healey Act, referred to by the committee in its report, presents a comparable problem to that of the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act. In the case of the Walsh-Healey Act, all firms subject to its provisions are known in advance, and a more intelligent sampling of the types of firms to be inspected may be made. It should also be pointed out, however, that the fact that the Administrator of the Public Contracts Division inspects only 25 percent of the firms subject to that act is not because of a conviction that such a partial inspection results in a proper administration of the law. Rather, the testimony of the Administrator of the Public Contracts Division before your committee on the appropriation bill in question indicates that a much larger percentage of the firms subject to the Walsh-Healey Act should be inspected to assure fair administration of that law.

As the action of the committee in announcing, as a matter of policy, that inspections of the Fair Labor Standards Act should not be made on a routine, systematic basis is contrary to the whole experience of departments, whether Federal or State, engaged in administering labor laws, I wish to take this opportunity to question the wisdom of the proposed policy.

I shall now discuss briefly the provision in H. R. 4926 which transfers from the Wage and Hour Division to the Office of the Solicitor the funds representing salaries of the legal personnel and their clerical assistants in the field offices of the Wage and Hour Division. The result of this transfer of funds is, of course, to transfer the administrative supervision of the field attorneys from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to the Solicitor of the Labor Department. The Solicitor of Labor and I addressed communications to Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor, on April 24 and May 31, 1941, setting forth the reasons why we believed the transfer in question should not be made. I am taking this opportunity of enclosing copies of these letters for your consideration.

Respectfully,

PHILIP B. FLEMING.

Enclosures, 2.
Certified copies:
Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM.
Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER.
Hon. BUTLER B. HARE.
Hon. ALBERT THOMAS.
Hon. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON.
Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL.
Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE.

APRIL 24, 1941.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TARVER: In view of the questions which the committee has raised with respect to the action of the Bureau of the Budget in placing estimates for all legal services in Washington in the item, "Office of the Solicitor," but leaving field attorneys within the general coverage of the item, "Wage and Hour Division," we should like to make a further statement to be inserted in the record of the hearings before your subcommittee.

We believe that the matter of allocating items of expenditure in the appropriation bill is primarily a fiscal and accounting device rather than a means of resolving relative questions of jurisdiction among statutory officers of the same department. The responsibility for preparing Budget estimates and seeing that appropriations made by Congress are expended in accordance with the law is placed upon the heads of various executive departments by reason of the Budget and Accounting Act. Moreover, authority with respect to appointment, promotion, and dismissal of personnel is also vested in the heads of executive departments by reason of Reorganization Plan II. Consequently, except to the extent that advisory functions are delegated to them by the Secretary, bureau heads in the Department of Labor have no duties in connection with the appointment of personnel or the expenditure of public funds. In other words, under existing law, internal questions of administrative management of this character are placed entirely in the hands of the Secretary of Labor.

Both the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division and the Solicitor for the Department of Labor hold offices created by statute which are filled by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Fair Labor Standards Act provides certain duties for the Administrator which are not subject to review by any officer in the executive branch of the Government. The act did not purport to amend or curtail the earlier statute creating the office of the Solicitor.

Insofar as the duties of these two officers impinge upon one another (and it is not apparent that they do), the execution of the duties connected therewith can be confined in their appropriate orbits under existing law through exercise by the Secretary of Labor of the power vested in heads of departments by Revised Statutes 161, "To prescribe regulations not inconsistent with law for the government of his department, the conduct of its officers and clerks, the distribution and performance of its business, * * *."

Prior to Reorganization Plan II, the Wage and Hour Division had a separate bureau legal staff. It was found during this period, however, that considerable overlapping legal work was being performed by the Bureau attorneys and the Solicitor and his assistants in that both groups had occasion to construe and apply the provisions of different statutory provisions which were identical in phraseology. For example, original research was performed separately on questions relating to overtime and compensation and the computation of hours worked, both under the Walsh-Healey Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. Questions of coverage in interstate commerce, arising under the child-labor provisions (the enforcement of which the Children's Bureau is responsible) and the wage provisions, were being separately considered with varying results sometimes reached. Moreover, different advice would occasionally be given by the Solicitor's office, which is the channel of communication with the Department of Justice, to the Attorney General on matters involving litigation, from that which would be given orally to private litigants by attorneys on the staffs of the bureaus.

The Secretary therefore deemed it desirable to integrate the various legal staffs by consolidating the work of all the attorneys in the Department under the supervision of the chief law officer. This was done by regulation issued on June 9, 1940. It was not necessary to seek an amendment to existing law to do this for no limitation had ever been placed by any statute on the legal duties performed in the Solicitor's office. In view of the fact that it has been the administrative practice here, however, to delegate accounting functions to each of the bureaus or divisions from whom separate appropriations were made, some inconvenience has resulted from the fact that the salaries, travel expenses, etc., of attorneys in the Solicitor's office are accounted for in four different administrative units. In order to simplify this practice during the coming fiscal year, the Bureau of the Budget, upon the recommendation of the Secretary, has based its estimate upon a single consolidated appropriation for the attorneys in Washington.

The reasons for making this change do not apply to the field attorneys, however, since all of these men perform duties solely in connection with the wage-and-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and are physically located in the regional offices of the Wage and Hour Division. In view of the fact that the administration of management functions in each regional office has been delegated to the regional director, it is felt that it would only complicate matters to have another regional official who would be concerned with such duties as providing appropriate office space, keeping records of leave of absence, travel authorizations, and other routine matters. Moreover, it was also felt that since the portion of lawyers in the different regional offices may vary according to the amount of violation cases reported by the inspectors more flexibility in the matter of transferring field attorneys from one regional office to another could be achieved if the expenditures relating to field attorneys were kept in the books of the Wage and Hour Division.

We should also like to add that under this system the relations between the Wage and Hour Division and the Solicitor's office have been entirely harmonious, and it is felt that the plan will reduce to a minimum any frictions which might occur among subordinate personnel.

Respectfully,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator, Wage and Hour Division.
GERARD D. REILLY,
Solicitor of Labor.

Newark's State of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

RADIO INTERVIEW OF MAYOR VINCENT J. MURPHY BY HAROLD JOHN ADONIS

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview of Mayor Vincent J. Murphy, of Newark, N. J., by Harold John Adonis, director, New Jersey State Governmental Bureau of Research, in one of the forum broadcasts over station WINS on May 31, 1941:

Mr. ADONIS. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Today we are privileged to present, as a guest speaker on our Know Your Government Forum, Mayor Vincent J. Murphy, of Newark, N. J., who will be interviewed on the subject Newark's State of Progress.

One of New Jersey's distinguished citizens and public officials, Mayor Murphy occupies several other positions of trust and importance. Three Governors have honored him with appointments to State-wide public posts. The first chief executive to thus honor him was former Governor Hoffman, who named him as a member of the unemployment compensation commission; the succeeding Governor, A. Harry Moore, reappointed him to the commission. This year newly elected Gov. Charles Edison appointed him as a member of the New Jersey Industrial Peace Commission.

Mayor Murphy has also distinguished himself in the field of labor, where he has attracted widespread attention for his indefatigable efforts in its behalf. The present secretary of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, Mayor Murphy is probably the only labor mayor in the Nation holding such high municipal office in a city of Newark's size, population, and industrial importance.

Mayor Murphy, I am happy, indeed, to welcome you to our forum.

Mayor MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Adonis. I am glad to be here. I know our listeners will find much of interest in today's talk relating to Newark's state of progress.

Mr. ADONIS. I am sure they shall, Mayor Murphy. Meanwhile, will you tell us something about the background of Newark? What type of a city is it and what are the key sources of its activities?

Mayor MURPHY. Well, the city of Newark, Mr. Adonis, is noted primarily as an industrial center. Its activities in this direction are many and varied. Today it occupies a very vital role in the national-defense program.

Mr. ADONIS. In what way, Mayor Murphy?

Mayor MURPHY. I mean that Newark, Mr. Adonis, is now, in company with the State of New Jersey, receiving and filling a major share of defense orders. It is my hope, as mayor of Newark, to do everything in my power to attract additional industries to settle within our community. It is common knowledge that Newark offers these industries now or soon to be engaged in national-defense production many advantages not found in other centers.

Mr. ADONIS. Could you tell us, Mayor Murphy, what some of these advantages are?

Mayor MURPHY. Briefly these are, first, our inland waterways; second, our main-stem railways; third, our highway system; fourth, our airport facilities; and fifth, our geographical, commercial, and industrial advantages.

Mr. ADONIS. What are some of the major industries located in Newark?

Mayor MURPHY. Time, of course, does not permit a detailed listing. However, any partial grouping would include machinery, electrical appliances and necessaries, thread, lumber, chemicals, jewelry, insurance—life, fire, and indemnity—and novelties.

Mr. ADONIS. Well, Mayor Murphy, that is quite a list, even though it is a partial one. And now, what can you tell us of Newark's financial status?

Mayor MURPHY. I am glad you asked that question, Mr. Adonis. As a matter of fact, we in Newark now find ourselves selling our bonds at a lower rate of interest than at any other time in our history.

Mr. ADONIS. What is the present rate?

Mayor MURPHY. It averages 3 percent. In many cases, too, our city has sold its bonds at a premium.

Mr. ADONIS. That is another "feather in the cap" for Newark, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor MURPHY. Yes, it is, and I know that our citizens and taxpayers may look forward to more accomplishments in this, our new administration.

Mr. ADONIS. What do you imply by "new administration"?

Mayor MURPHY. As you know, the city of Newark has just completed its city-commission election, and a new administration has come into existence. Of the previous body, only two commissioners—Joseph M. Byrne, Jr., and myself—have been returned to office. The new members are Commissioners Brady, Keenan, and Viliani.

Mr. ADONIS. Do you believe, then, Mr. Mayor, that your new administration is now in a more advantageous position to carry out a program of achievements?

Mayor MURPHY. Yes; I do. Under our new administration we, the entire membership, are firmly determined to work on a cooperative basis for the general welfare of the entire city and its inhabitants.

I might point out, at this time, that experience has always shown that united effort in the discharge of public duties by the duly constituted officials is vital to continued progress.

If we bear in mind that our city should be, first, a better Newark, and then, a greater Newark, I am sure we can expect the measure and degree of municipal fulfillment essential to our daily needs.

Mr. ADONIS. I agree with you, Mr. Mayor. In the meantime, I have heard it said on frequent occasions that Newark has a very unique system of budgetary control.

Mayor MURPHY. Indeed, it has. I should like to emphasize that our methods of budgetary control, bookkeeping, tax billing, and accounting are estimated by many leading authorities to be the most modern and efficient now in operation.

Mr. ADONIS. Mayor Murphy, those who attended your recent induction as Newark's new chief executive were loud in their praise for the vigorous, forceful, and commendatory manner in which you outlined the policies to be followed in your administration. Would you at this time care to add anything to your former statement?

Mayor MURPHY. I would, indeed, Mr. Adonis. The present tempo of international and domestic affairs, the rapidly changing sense of values and of beliefs, the need for constant adjustment of individual and collective opinions—all these are factors in our current daily life that force us to adapt ourselves to present needs and requirements.

In the city of Newark, for example, I feel there is a positive necessity for maintaining a progressive system of real- and personalty-tax inventory in order to more equitably levy assessments on those doing business and residing within our midst. In addition to that, to promote the desire on the part of those outside of Newark, to locate in our city.

This deals with the definite consideration that must be given to the life of property, its obsolescence, income factors, and depreciation. Meanwhile, thought must be devoted to new technological mechanization and trends in neighborhood changes, so that industrial, mercantile, and residential possibilities may be explored to their utmost extent; thereby giving some measure of assurance that the overhead costs for municipal taxes will make it possible for those in Newark to remain as contented taxpayers, and also to attract other desirable enterprises.

By establishing and conducting such a comprehensive program of procedure, we will thus be afforded the opportunity to broaden our tax base and to spread the load so that the responsibility for maintaining local government functions and obligations will not bear too heavily on any individual taxpayer or group of taxpayers.

It is my avowed intention to initiate within the immediate future a regular periodic and systematic campaign to acquaint the entire Nation with Newark's attractive and lucrative possibilities.

I hold myself in readiness at all times to assist any and all efforts designed to foster and enhance Newark's stature, both as a leading industrial center and as a progressive residential community, completely modern, efficient, and wholesome in thought and endeavor.

Mr. ADONIS. Mayor Murphy, I know our listeners are very much impressed with the expression of your sentiments with respect to Newark's outlook. I know, too, that under your administration efficiency of governmental operation will continue to thrive and prosper.

At this juncture, may I ask you a rather intimate question?

Mayor MURPHY. I wish you would, Mr. Adonis. You know that we public officials have little of the privacy enjoyed by the average citizens. However, this is as it should be, and you may depend upon me to answer to the best of my ability whatever questions you think will be of interest to our listeners, both in and out of Newark.

Mr. ADONIS. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. You have the laudable attitude that is so much a part of your meritorious record as a public official, local and State.

My question is, What is your personal view on the current domestic emergency, and what do you, as one of the Nation's leading chief municipal executives, believe can be done to effect national solidarity?

Mayor MURPHY. To my mind, the present domestic emergency is one that calls for united action on the part of every loyal American citizen. This is the time for unity of mind and achievement, and a period in our existence when differences of opinion must be submerged for the continued success of the national-defense effort.

America has undertaken a positive stand in the face of international upheaval. Our entire resources of manpower, machinery, and moral support are marshaled to the colors. We must and shall devote our total energies to the task which lies ahead. In that direction of united endeavor lies the safety and security of our Nation.

Mr. ADONIS. Thank you, Mayor Murphy.

Your presence here today was a most welcomed one, and truly indicative of your distinguished qualities of public leadership.

Progress Made by Farm Security Administration Borrowers of the Third District of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

LETTER FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a letter received by me from Hon. C. R. Baldwin, Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, evidencing the splendid record of the farmers whom I have the honor to represent in discharging their obligations and the substantial gains which they have made as a result of the aid extended to them by the Federal Government.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MAY 31, 1941.

Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Since the beginning of the present emergency, it has been generally recognized that the health, welfare, and morale of our people are vitally important to national defense. Providing for these needs among low-income farm families has been one of the essential contributions of the Farm Security Administration to the Nation's defense efforts during the past year.

We have just completed a special survey undertaken last winter to measure the progress being made by borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. It indicates the gains in terms of money, living standards, and capacity for self-support which have been made during 1940 by handicapped and low-income farm people all over the country. It occurred to me that you might be interested in seeing the figures for your district.

In the Third District of Washington there were 681 active standard rehabilitation borrowers at the end of 1940. The survey showed that the average borrower earned a net income of $878 during the year, as compared with $671 in the year before he borrowed from Farm Security. In other words, the typical family increased its annual net income by 31 percent.

This means that Farm Security borrowers in the Third District have increased their total annual incomes by $140,919. Naturally this growth in prosperity and purchasing power has been reflected on the books of merchants and other businessmen of the district.

We were pleased to find that borrowers in your district are rapidly repaying their rehabilitation loans. Already $314,102 has been repaid on loans totaling $1,284,584, although much of the money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years. Throughout the entire country, rehabilitation loans totaling $420,865,050 had been made as of December 31, 1940, and $149,626,442 of this sum had been repaid. As you know, loan funds currently are advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instead of coming from direct appropriations.

In view of the fact that none of the borrowers from Farm Security was able to get adequate credit anywhere else, and that many of them formerly were on relief, we feel that this repayment record is a tribute to the honesty and industry of these needy farm people. There is ample evidence that the great majority of them are getting back on their feet and becoming permanently self-supporting. In large measure, this progress is due to the advice and technical guidance in sound farm and home management which accompanies each Farm Security loan.

For example, we encourage our borrowers to get away from one-crop farming—particularly of surplus crops, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat—and to raise as much as possible of their own food and feed for their livestock. During 1940, the average farm security family in your district produced $279 worth of goods for home consumption, as compared with $184 before they came into the F. S. A. program. This produce for home use included 406 gallons of milk per family; 359 pounds of meat; and 357 quarts of vegetables and fruit canned for the winter. This increased production of food did not, of course, add to the supply in the commercial markets, since virtually none of it was offered for sale. It simply meant a better diet, better health, and a rising standard of living for these families.

Often it has been necessary to work out an adjustment of the family's old debts before rehabilitation could be successful. Local farm-debt-adjustment committees have been set up for this purpose. They have no legal authority to compel adjustments, but by bringing the farmer and his creditors together for a friendly discussion, they usually are able to arrange a scale-down of the obligations, reduced interest rates, or extension of the payment period. Such adjustments frequently save the farmer from foreclosure, and at the same time enable the creditors to get substantial payments on what might otherwise have been bad debts.

This service is available to all farmers, whether or not they are rehabilitation borrowers. Altogether, debt reductions totaling $79,408 have been negotiated for individual farmers in your district. This represents a scale-down of 11.6 percent. As a direct result of these adjustments, $5,049 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

In addition, reductions totaling $132,346, or 47.3 percent, have been negotiated in the debts owed by irrigation districts and similar farm groups.

In making this special survey, our field employees reported that there are 551 families in your district who are eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans but have been unable to get them because of the limited funds available.

In addition to the rehabilitation program, Farm Security is carrying out the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which provides a limited number of loans to competent tenants to enable them to buy family type farms.

During the first 3 years of this program we made 12 such loans in your district, totaling $88,851. This year we expect to make about 8 Bankhead-Jones loans in the Third District, amounting to approximately $56,000. Throughout the country delinquencies of these loans have amounted so far to only 2.6 percent, or $23,658; and this has been more than offset by the fact that other borrowers have been able to make advance payments totaling $196,765, as the result of good crops and management.

I am hopeful that this rather detailed report may be useful to you; and if you would like to have any further facts about our program, I shall, of course, be glad to supply them. Sometime during the year I hope that you may find an opportunity to visit some of the borrowers from F. S. A. in your district, and see for yourself the efforts they are making to get a new start as independent, taxpaying citizens.

Sincerely,

C. B. BALDWIN,
Administrator.

Phrase Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DELAWARE COUNTY (N. Y.) DAIRYMAN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Delaware County (N. Y.) Dairyman of May 30, 1941:

[From the Delaware County (N. Y.) Dairyman of May 30, 1941]

PHRASE MAKING

After the President's fireside chat Tuesday evening his hearers were but little forwarder as to the administration's foreign policy, and more so in their conviction that he is a phrase maker par excellence.

His affirmation of the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere and the preservation of its status quo was but a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine in other terms. Whether or not supply lanes to Britain were to be kept open by policing by the Navy, whether or not supplies were to be protected by United States convoys the President was careful not to say.

His most significant statement was the declaration of an all-out national emergency. Its significance is seen, as it recalls the wide powers delegated by Congress to the President if and when he believes such a declaration necessary. He has made it, but we are not further in our knowledge of what he proposes to do.

He also said that the administration and the public had a right to expect harmony between "capital and capital, capital and labor, and labor and labor," a fine epigrammatic phrase, but he failed to say what, with his well-nigh unlimited power and opportunity, he proposed to do to effect it. When one recalls that only a few days ago a powerful labor leader said that "one man" could stop labor strikes in short order and indicated that "one man" was the Chief Executive, his hearers naturally wonder what the President proposes to do.

Generally commenting on the entire chat, a good many of his hearers felt that they had listened for a half hour to a series of well-turned sentences, but, so far as real information or profit, they might better have turned to a neighboring station and listened to the report of a minor ball game, and it wasn't much of a game at that.

Marine Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1941, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an extension of remarks in which there was included a syndicated article relating to marine insurance. I submit for the RECORD a letter with reference to the same subject written to me by Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, May 19, 1941.

Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: In pursuance of your request referring to a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 14 at page 4043 regarding insurance of American vessels and the quotation of a writer in a Washington newspaper, I submit herewith some pertinent observations.

As illustrative of the information which can be obtained by most anyone, including belligerents, any person with the slightest knowledge of transportation can enumerate many ways by which anyone could with but very little effort ascertain when and where hundreds of vessels are to sail and data relative to their cargoes, itineraries, and ports of calls, days, and weeks in advance—all without any reference whatsoever to marine insurance.

Many daily newspapers publish advertisements of vessels, sailing dates, ports of destination, names of operators, and in many instances the dates upon which vessels are expected to be at various ports. Vessel operators publish these advertisements to solicit business, both freight and passengers. Trade journals and shipping pamphlets which are distributed to the trade by the operators disclose full information concerning itineraries and schedules, which traffic people need in preparing shipments for export. All traffic men necessarily know the usual ports of call of American vessels of all the companies in the various trade routes, and must have this information in arranging for the transportation of shipments. Railroad and truck employees handle the shipments and documents relating thereto showing the vessels, their destinations, and the names of consignees. When shipments are assembled on the piers awaiting loading the stevedores and other employees all have access to this information. Customs brokers and their employees who handle the manifests and customs documents have complete information for preparation of the vessels' sailings. Even employees of tugs and lighters that bring cargo alongside a vessel for loading could obtain information concerning the vessel and its ports of call. Steamship company employees, shipping commissioners' offices, inspectors, and the crews of the vessels are all informed of the details of the itinerary. The interior plans and details of vessels are published regularly in most technical and shipping magazines, and general particulars are currently published in the American Bureau of Shipping Register, the Department of Commerce List of Merchant Vessels, Lloyd's Register, and similar publications. At the present time the itineraries of the voyage are used as determining factors in fixing wage scales, bonuses, and crew insurance provisions. These are the facts known to those who are engaged in ocean shipping.

It is readily apparent from the foregoing that there are a great many sources of information concerning the movements of vessels other than through marine insurance, which would furnish those wishing it rather complete information.

The following three questions were suggested on the floor of the House of Representatives:

First. Whether or not foreign insurance companies located in the axis countries are in reality getting insurance business on United States ships.

Second. To what extent secret United States data is being learned through direct insurance or reinsurance coverage.

Third. Failure of the Martime Commission to intelligently administer the Government marine-insurance fund so as to be able to supply the insurance requirements of the American shipowners.

The following replies are given to the questions above, and I include a résumé of the authority granted to the Commission by Congress and our procedure with respect to insurance:

No. 1. There are no known foreign insurance companies located in the axis countries insuring or reinsuring United States-flag vessels. There are branches in the United States of the General Insurance Co., Ltd., of Trieste and Venice, Trieste, Italy; the Switzerland General Insurance Co., Ltd., Zurich, Switzerland; and the Tokyo Marine & Fire Insurance Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan, who are subscribers to the American Marine Insurance Syndicate C and authorized to do an insurance business in the United States. The Commission has no record of any other insurance companies who may be called axis companies participating in insurance on vessels in which the Commission has a legal or equitable interest. The Commission does not have complete insurance records on other American-flag vessels. However, we have no knowledge of any axis marine insurance companies participating in the latter group of American vessels. The Neiji Insurance Co., of Tokyo, and other companies suggested in the news article quoted are not known to be participating in such marine insurance business.

The syndicate constitutes almost the entire marine hull insurance market and is composed of domestic companies and the branches of foreign companies established in the United States and authorized to do business under the laws of the State in which they operate. The domestic companies control the syndicate and underwrite 75 percent of the business of the syndicate. The domestic companies reinsure in the English market probably 10 percent of their direct risks, generally with respect to the high-valued vessels. Twenty-five percent of the direct insurance is underwritten by the foreign-admitted branches who are members, and domestically incorporated companies controlled by foreign interests are members under the status of admitted companies—not domestic companies. All the members of the syndicate reinsure among themselves, within limitations as to amounts which may be accepted by the admitted companies.

All the admitted branches which are subscribers of the syndicate are subject to the jurisdiction of the superintendent of insurance of the State of New York. Likewise they are under control of the other States in which they are authorized to do business. No funds can be remitted to their home offices without the permission of the superintendent of insurance. These branches are independent underwriting units and there is little need for them to communicate information concerning policies and risks in which they participate to their home offices. Managers of the above-named admitted branches are known to be reliable officials who have been in charge of insurance activities in the United States for years, are believed to be for the most part American citizens, and are considered as dependable as those officials in charge of domestic insurance companies.

Approximately 10 percent of hull insurance on American oceangoing vessels is underwritten by domestic and English companies not members of the syndicate.

Cargo insurance is underwritten by the same companies who participate in the hull insurance, but they act individually with respect to cargo and not through the syndicate. (In writing cargo insurance the admitted companies are under the supervision of the laws of the State in which they operate.) The cargo underwriters may reinsure cargo risks among themselves or with foreign companies, but this is limited to companies in the English market. With respect to the reinsurance of cargo war risks, the American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, composed of any companies which are authorized to do business in any State, accepts all reinsurance on cargo war risks offered to it and distributes the risks among the members of the companies on a prearranged basis as to amount and at a uniform rate. The same general conditions which relate to hull marine and war-risk insurance are applicable to cargo insurance.

The Axis insurance companies' policies have not been considered satisfactory security since the commencement of this war, and consequently their policies have not been accepted by American cargo owners, for the same reasons that they are not acceptable by American shipowners.

No. 2. It is not believed that secret data goes to Axis countries through direct marine insurance or reinsurance because of the conditions set forth in the preceding paragraphs. The British insurance market has by far the greatest portion of our foreign-held insurance and reinsurance.

No. 3. The Maritime Commission considers the administration of the Government marine insurance fund and the authority to insure and reinsure marine and war risks as fully in accord with the intent of Congress and the scope of the provisions of Public, No. 677, Seventy-sixth Congress, being subtitle insurance, title II, Merchant Marine Act 1936, as amended, approved June 29, 1940; sections 9 and 10, Merchant Marine Act, 1920; and sections 503 and 712, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which are explained in detail hereafter.

Section 221 (a) subtitle, insurance, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, covering the general scope of the Commission's authority with respect to insurance and the most recently granted by Congress, and in anticipation of possible war conditions, as follows:

"For the purpose of protecting the waterborne commerce of the United States from the impediments and burdens arising from the lack of adequate facilities for the insurance of such commerce, due to extraordinary risks arising under existing war conditions, the Commission is authorized to provide marine insurance and reinsurance against loss or damage by the risks of war and rein-

surance against loss or damage by marine risks, as prescribed in this subtitle, whenever it appears to the Commission that such insurance adequate for the needs of the water-borne commerce of the United States cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from companies authorized to do an insurance business in a State of the United States."

Other paragraphs of this subtitle enumerate the class of insurance and procedure to be followed:

Section 10, Merchant Marine Act, 1920, provides that the Commission may insure against all hazards commonly covered by insurance policies "any legal or equitable interest of the United States (1) in any vessel constructed or in process of construction; and (2) in any plants or property in the possession or under authority of the Board" (now Commission).

Section 503, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provides that purchasers of vessels constructed under title V of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 shall comply with the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to any portion of the purchase price remaining unpaid on such vessels. Section 9, Merchant Marine Act, 1920, provides that upon any vessel where payments of the purchase price are deferred the purchaser shall keep the vessel insured "(a) against loss or damage by fire, and against marine risks and disasters, and war and other risks if the Board (Commission) so specifies," and "(b) by protection and indemnity insurance with such insurance companies, associations, or underwriters and under such forms of policies and to such an amount as the Board (Commission) may prescribe or approve." Section 712 requires charterers to fully insure vessels as approved by the Commission.

Under the foregoing provisions of the law the Commission requires vessel owners and charterers to properly insure vessels to protect the interest of the Government in such vessels. In approving the marine insurance submitted by mortgagors and charterers the Commission has close contact with the American marine insurance market and is familiar with the companies composing that market. It has been considered one of the primary responsibilities of the Commission to develop and maintain a strong American insurance market so that American operators may not be compelled to rely completely upon foreign underwriters of any nationality. The Commission has urged American owners and operators to place their insurance in the private commercial market in order to give the commercial market, primarily American, a wider spread of insurance coverage, thereby tending to spread risks and assist in minimizing insurance rates. The Commission insures a small portion of a number of vessels in which the Government has an interest and also assists the commercial market, and vessel owners by assuming a portion of the risk upon the high-valued vessels for which the private market cannot supply full coverage, but such portion cannot exceed the amount of the Government's interest in the vessel, and is usually much less than that amount. While the Commission does not attempt to compete with the private market, it does keep fully informed of the rates and practices of the private market and can use the underwriting authority vested in it by section 10, Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as a control over the market, if it is apparent that rates and forms of policies are not fair and reasonable. It has been the policy of the Commission to strengthen and expand the American marine insurance market.

In obtaining marine and war-risk insurance, the owner of an American-flag vessel as a general rule deals through his insurance broker and obtains rate quotations from the American and English markets. The insurance rates are based upon the loss experience of the vessel or fleet of vessels, the valuation of the vessels, and the premium return to the underwriters. Usually the majority of the insurance is placed in the market which quotes the most favorable rate, but the Commission has urged that the majority be placed in the American market. This same general procedure is also followed in obtaining protection and indemnity insurance, and a majority of this form of protection is placed in the American market, largely because the terms of the policies are more favorable in the American market.

Upon vessels in which the Government has a legal or equitable interest and for which insurance is required, the policies and the underwriters must be approved by the Commission before such protection is accepted.

Marine-insurance policies are issued for 1 year and contain a general statement of the world areas in which the vessel will be operated. If damage occurs beyond such areas, the underwriter uses such deviation as a defense against claims. At the time the insurance attaches for the policy year the insurance underwriting companies do not necessarily know the location of the vessels, nor do they receive advices during the term of the policies indicating the movements of the vessels covered.

Insurance policies insuring against the perils of war (war-risk insurance) are issued for each voyage and the cost of this insurance depends upon the itinerary of the vessels, the ports of call, and the conditions existing at the time of sailing. Both the American and English companies participating directly in the insurance must be given full information as to the risks which they are to assume including the itinerary of the vessel, so that an appropriate rate for the insurance can be fixed.

The marine war-risk underwriters frequently, but not always, shift some of their liability to other insurance companies by reinsuring a part of the risk. The insurance companies, which may be in the American or foreign markets, the latter being almost entirely British, do not as a rule receive detailed information of the vessel or its itinerary immediately, because they rely upon the primary insurer to obtain full particulars, and such information as they do generally receive is received so late that it would not be of much value to anyone interested in the movements of vessels. It could, however, be obtained promptly if desired. There does not appear to be any danger from these data being received in the British market now available.

Public, No. 677, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 29, 1940, authorizes the Commission to insure and reinsure American vessels and property against the perils of war and also to reinsure American vessels and property against marine risks, when it appears to the Commission that such insurance adequate for the needs of the water-borne commerce of the United States cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and at reasonable rates from companies authorized to do an insurance business in a State of the United States. The foregoing clearly indicates the intention of Congress that the Commission exercise this authority only when the commercial market became inadequate. So far from close contact with the industry and steamship operators and also numerous conferences there has not appeared to be the inadequacy in either the hull marine or the cargo insurance commercial market as contemplated by the Congress as a condition precedent, and the Maritime Commission has not felt disposed to engage in the general insurance and reinsurance business. The Commission has granted assistance, however, through the provisions of section 10, Merchant Marine Act, 1920, and continuously considered all developments to determine promptly whether Public, No. 677 should be made effective.

If all American insurance companies carried all of the required insurance to the exclusion of the English market and other foreign markets, it would be necessary to guard against the dissemination of information by employees in more than 60 insurance companies, all of which may be interested in any one vessel. If the Commission reinsured these companies, thus obviating the necessity for any of them communicating with foreign markets, the employees of the Commission engaged in handling the reinsurance would also have such information. All of these employees would, of course, be added to those enumerated above engaged in the normal transportation activities who have information concerning vessel movements. If Congress authorized the Commission to do so, which it has not as yet, all the insurance against marine risks and perils of war could be underwritten by the Commission; however, this would not prevent information as to vessels, their cargoes, and itineraries being known by a great many persons, because of the facts set forth above and also because of the large number of employees who would be required to handle this vast amount of insurance business. Moreover, were the Commission authorized to underwrite all such insurance, the private insurance companies would be forced out of business and the employees of such companies would be forced to seek other employment. Likewise the insurance brokers and their organizations would be forced out of business. The difficulty of reestablishing these American insurance facilities after the emergency is quite apparent and it is impossible to say whether they could ever again be reestablished with any degree of satisfaction to the merchant marine industry, which would again be forced to accept full coverage in the foreign market.

The S. S. *America* is at present insured against marine risks and the perils of war. The marine policies were arranged in July 1940 and will expire 1 year later. The amount of marine insurance required, $17,600,000 was so large that the American and English markets were called upon to insure the maximum amounts they could offer, but nevertheless it was necessary for the Commission to supplement these markets and underwrite a part of the risk. The hull marine insurance on the *America* is as follows: American Syndicate, $4,000,000; American market other than the syndicate, $380,457; London market, $2,781,049; and Maritime Commission, $3,838,494; the rate for all the foregoing insurance was 1⅞ percent. Disbursement insurance was underwritten as follows: American market other than syndicate, $112,000; American market, $171,500; Maritime Commission, $6,316,500; the rate for the foregoing disbursements insurance was thirteen-sixteenth percent.

The war-risk insurance on the S. S. *America* was arranged in the same markets as the hull insurance and in the amount of $11,820,000 for a period of 40 days at the rate of 13½ cents per hundred dollars, for three cruises to the West Indies, the last of which will be completed on or about May 22, 1941. The amounts of war-risk insurance are as follows: American Syndicate, $4,000,000; American market other than syndicate, $1,234,158; London market, $1,510,500; Maritime Commission, $5,075,342.

The outline of the membership of the American Marine Insurance Syndicate, its method of operation and participation given above shows the method by which the

insurance on the S. S. *America* was arranged for marine and war risks in the above amounts.

I have gone into considerable detail in the foregoing statement inasmuch as the subject is one which has received very careful consideration within the Commission and within other Government establishments. I believe the foregoing outlines the practical situation as it exists and I trust furnishes you with the statement you desire.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

RESOLUTIONS OF LIONS CLUBS OF MUNISING, ESCANABA, AND SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a copy of the resolution adopted by the Munising Lions Club, Munising, Mich.; the Escanaba Lions Club, Escanaba, Mich.; and the Soo Lions Club, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., asking the Michigan Senators and Representatives in Congress from Michigan, to aid in enacting legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project, as a means of bringing a new era to the country's most important agricultural and industrial regions.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas Michigan is the largest producer of export merchandise in the United States; and

Whereas the midwestern section of our Nation, which is a part of the Great Lakes region, produces more agricultural commodities and has more industrial production than any other section of the country; and

Whereas the people of Michigan possess the natural right to ship agricultural, mineral, and industrial products from their ports to the markets of America and the world in the most economical manner; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence River will enable us to make our full contribution to the needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt has called to the attention of the American people and the Members of Congress the importance of completing the St. Lawrence seaway as soon as possible, not only as a defense measure but as a means of bringing a new era to the country's most important agricultural and industrial regions: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Munising Lions Club, Munising, Mich.; Escanaba Lions Club, Escanaba, Mich.; Soo Lions Club, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., That we do formally and respectfully request the Michigan Senators and Representatives in our National Congress to aid in enacting legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Michigan in our National Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

MUNISING LIONS CLUB,
J. H. BLIZEL, *Secretary.*
ESCANABA LIONS CLUB,
H. J. YELLAND, *President.*
SOO LIONS CLUB,
W. F. G. WEBER, *Secretary.*

MAY 29, 1941.

Song of the Rolling Coulter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

POEM BY DON GRAY

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, one of the activities which seems to be universal in this country is to write poetry. I use the word "poetry" advisedly. Most of it is merely doggerel. The other day in the Janesville Daily Gazette, of Janesville, Wis., I ran across something I think will have an appeal to every Member of the House who has ever walked behind a plow. This is the Song of the Rolling Coulter. This is of a steel plow which was invented in the Middle West many years ago. These verses were written by a graduate of Milton College who lives on a farm near my home city, and I may say that he is now employed in making machine tools for defense. This is the poem:

SONG OF THE ROLLING COULTER

I cut the sod, the lush green sod,
And the mold of last year's stubble—
On through the clover roots, rod on rod,
On through the trash and the rubble.

O I am the rolling coulter,
And my rolling falters never—
With the sod in my teeth,
And the share underneath,
I plow the fields forever!

The lark pipes loud on the fence post there,
As we roll the greensward under—
The furrows gleam in the sunshine fair,
But tomorrow there'll be thunder.

So it's rolling, rolling, rolling on,
To the end of the long brown chapter—
A coulter rolling free am I,
And the moldboard follows after.

The rich loam flutters endlessly
To join its fresh-turned brothers,
And even my heart grows sad to see
The grass and flow'rs it smothers.

But I am a rolling coulter,
And I know why the grass is slain—
For the sower will sow
And the rich grain grow
And the bins be full again.

Then what care I for the fields of blood
Where the war-mad worldlings blunder—
Where they use good steel for bayonets
And guns to blast asunder?

The share and I, and the moldboard, too,
We plow in a land of peace,
Where the hearthstones glow, and the strong sons grow,
And the tribes of the just increase.

O I am the rolling coulter,
And I sing of life and laughter—
I plow all day in the fields of God,
And the moldboard follows after!

—*Don Gray.*

Genuine Security for the Old Folks of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1941

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, it is the fundamental responsibility of Congress to plan now to guide the destiny of our country and her course safely over the difficult and dangerous period of her readjustment, which will inevitably fall upon all of us following the war, or following the period of our huge national-defense spending. Democracy has been challenged by the dictators of the world as a failure, and, if democracy is to prove itself, we should and must establish a social-security program which will not only protect the old folks of our country against want and insecurity but which will also operate as a means of maintaining balance between the producer and the consumer.

Congress should enact an old-age assistance program for all American citizens over the age of 60. Among such plans is the Townsend plan, which is a permanent plan designed to restore and maintain prosperity in America. Its objective is to achieve and maintain at all times a sound and prosperous economy through increasing the circulation of money by the spending of a uniform and adequate old-age pension, levied and secured on a pay-as-you-go basis. I believe such a plan will keep old folks from the W. P. A. and relief rolls. Such an act of Congress should not require the aged to mortgage their little homes to participate in such a program; red tape should be cut; and old folks should not be required to sell their possessions to become recipients. The old folks should be entitled to this annuity as a matter of right. A democracy should guarantee this much protection to those folks who have struggled to preserve our democracies, for, after all, we are practically the only remaining democracy on the face of the globe. This is not a partisan question, and I firmly believe that the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, should grant an immediate hearing on H. R. 1036, and to all other groups who have

old-age pension legislation before the Ways and Means Committee. If this is not done, I favor the signing of a petition to discharge the Ways and Means Committee and bring any proposed old-age-pension legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives at which time the Members of Congress of the United States will have the opportunity of pressing the will of their electorate. I feel certain a bill that will meet the approval of the people of America will be enacted into law. I herewith submit two resolutions, one from the Westinghouse C. I. O. Local No. 601, with a membership of 11,000, which is one of the largest labor organization locals in America; and the other resolution being from the Wilkinsburg Townsend Club, one of the largest Townsend organizations in Allegheny County, stating that they are in favor of the enactment of a liberal old-age-pension plan.

Whereas there has been introduced for consideration by the Seventy-seventh Congress of the United States a bill to provide for national recovery by raising revenue and retiring citizens past 60 years of age from gainful employment and provide for the general welfare of all the people of the United States, and for other purposes.

Whereas the above-mentioned bill, known as the Townsend National Recovery Plan, has been designated in the House of Representatives and referred to the Ways and Means Committee as House Resolution 1036.

Whereas we believe that it is absolutely necessary that the fundamental principles embodied in the above-proposed legislation must be enacted into law, making those adjustments to our economic and social system, to the end that we may enjoy a sound and permanent prosperity, under our democratic form of government: Therefore be it

Resolved by the membership of the Westinghouse Local 601, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, do hereby appeal to you as our elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to urge the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for an immediate hearing, failing in that, to sign a petition to discharge the Ways and Means Committee and bring the proposed legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives, with the honest intent of giving it a fair and just hearing and voting to enact the fundamentals therein into the law of our land.

WESTINGHOUSE C. I. O. LOCAL 601,
East Pittsburgh, Pa.
WM. HUNTER,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Be it resolved, The Wilkinsburg Townsend Club, No. 3, of Wilkinsburg, Pa., in regular meeting assembled, this 29th day of May, 1941, do hereby appeal to you as our elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to urge the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHRON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for an immediate hearing on H. R. 1036; failing in that, to sign a petition to discharge the Ways and Means Committee and bring the proposed legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives, with the honest intent of giving it a fair and just hearing, and voting to enact the fundamentals therein into the law of our land.

JAMES PETERSON,
President.
H. L. MCDOWELL,
Secretary.

WILKINSBURG, PA.

Bridges Admits Falsifying Application for Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE LOS ANGELES EXAMINER

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Examiner of May 30, 1941:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of May 30, 1941]

BRIDGES ADMITS FALSIFYING APPLICATION FOR CITIZENSHIP—WATER-FRONT LABOR LEADER ON STAND TELLS OF TAKING COMMUNIST PARTY'S SUPPORT

SAN FRANCISCO, May 29.—Harry Bridges certainly must have yearned today to be back on Angel Island.

Over there, at his nice, soft 1939 deportation trial, it was a cinch for the loquacious and wily Bridges to talk himself out of what the Government had as evidence then. Since then the F. B. I. has been busy—and how!

So today, on the witness stand at his current deportation trial here—facing the most relentless, dynamite-packed, evidence-backed cross-examination that's been heard in any San Francisco courtroom in a long time, Harry Bridges was sunk.

He talked—he talked even more furiously than he ever had to do on Angel Island, but the more he talked the deeper he sank into a quicksand of evasions and contradictions and errors and misstatements. When, at 4 o'clock, the session ended, Bridges was up to his neck.

By that time he'd been trying to dodge the drumfire of Government Prosecutor Albert Del Guercio's questions for only 3 hours. But in those 3 hours Harry Bridges got into this mess—

ADMITS LIES IN CITIZENSHIP PLEA

1. He admitted that he had lied, under oath, in his citizenship applications. And with that subject the Government is, as yet, far from finished.

2. He admitted that he had accepted the Communist Party's support and that he had, in turn, given his own support to the Communist Party, its policies, and its individuals.

3. He admitted that he himself, during the 1934 strike, had taken seamen—more than a hundred of them—up to the headquarters of the Communist Marine Workers Industrial Union, and had there signed them up with Harry Jackson, and that he knows Harry Jackson is a Communist.

4. He admitted that time and again he had gone to the Communist headquarters at 37 Grove Street here, had bought Communist literature there. He still has some of it. He didn't deny that he'd "retained and applied" what he learned from those Red documents in his waterfront labor activities.

5. He admitted, in an hour-long losing battle of words and proof with Del Guercio, that what he had testified at Angel Island about his connection with the Waterfront Worker (a 1934 strike publication characterized by the prosecution as a Communist sheet) was untrue.

ADMITS HIRING MEN AT 50 CENTS A DAY

6. He admitted, red-faced and squirming in his chair, that while he howled to the heavens about what a splendid, fine union man he was, he went out and hired jobless seamen for a 50-cent-a-day wage to go out and peddle his Waterfront Workers.

In between, among, and around all those major admissions Bridges talked himself into such a pathetic tangle of inaccuracies, evasions, and contradictions that Presiding Judge Charles B. Sears looked at him in obvious pity, and his own lawyers looked at him in gray-faced apprehension.

Late this afternoon, when the trial day ended, Bridges was trying to get out of the trap he'd fallen into in Del Guercio's questions about his connection with that Waterfront Worker. Caught again and again in flat contradictions here, as compared to what he swore to on Angel Island, Bridges flew into a red-faced rage—the first time he has lost the aplomb and self-control he so jealously prides himself upon. At last, caught in another contradiction, he yelled:

"I don't have to check my testimony here with what I said at the last hearing on Angel Island—not unless I was lying."

"Well," grinned Del Guercio, "are you lying?"

"Ah—I don't know—I mean, that depends on who's gonna judge whether I am or not," said Bridges.

JUDGE SMACKS GAVEL AND FROWNS

On the bench, Judge Sears, the man "who's gonna judge," smacked his gavel into the palm of his hand and frowned hard at Bridges.

It was no easy work for Del Guercio to drive Bridges into the corners he caught him in. Bridges exerted all the shrewdness, the wiles, the trickery for which even his detractors give him credit. It wasn't enough. The Government had too much on him. So, battering him down with questions he couldn't evade, Del Guercio dragged from Bridges the admission that it was in cooperation with known Communist Harry Jackson that the Bridges group took over and published the Waterfront Worker; that Bridges' 1934 strike committee, at his advocacy, accepted the offer of a delegation of three top Communists of the California-Nevada district of the Communist Party, to print the strike bulletin under the auspices of the Western Worker, official organ of the Communist Party; that Roy Hudson, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party in America, came to Bridges' office in 1936, was admitted, and engaged in a huddle there with Bridges, a huddle that lasted "from 10 minutes to an hour," according to Bridges, who didn't dare set the time more definitely.

Bridges' cross-examination began less than an hour after today's session opened.

On the very first question Prosecutor Del Guercio fired at him, Bridges vented his spleen spainst the Hearst newspapers.

(At Angel Island trial, in 1939, Bridges had repeatedly screamed his hatred for the Hearst press; obtruded it again and again into his efforts to dodge the cross-examiner's queries.)

Del Guercio's first question was:

"Now, Mr. Bridges, don't you attribute your success as a gr-r-r-r-r-reat labor leader, even in a small way, to support given you by the Communist Party?"

"Nahr," snarled Bridges, "I might attribute it mahr to the attacks on me by the Hearst press."

SAYS HE RECEIVED SUPPORT OF REDS

"But you have received Communist support, haven't you?"

"That's correct; I've received support from other parties, too."

"And you have supported the Communist Party and its leaders, haven't you?"

"Yes and no," cracked Bridges.

"What do you mean?" demanded Del Guercio.

"I've supported individuals and policies of all parties," dodged Bridges.

"Well," persisted Del Guercio, "tell us just when you supported the Communist Party. Never mind the others."

"I daown't knaow," drawled Bridges. "You'd 'ave to nile it daown."

"You said you did support the Communists. Now tell us when."

"I gave a general answer to a general question."

"You mean that you refuse to answer?"

"I can't answer the question as you put it."

F. B. I.'S RECORD COVERS DETAILS

Del Guercio then switched into Bridges' life—fortified by a huge mass of documentary data, gathered by the F. B. I. in its months-long investigation into Bridges' background, last year.

If Bridges had hoped, by being vague as to his dates, to dodge being pinned down by the Government's cross-quiz, this early start of Del Guercio smashed that hope. For it was obvious, at once, that the F. B. I. has taken Bridges' life apart, day by day, week by week, month by month—almost hour by hour. It gives Bridges no chance to scuttle into a vague memory, if he hopes so.

Del Guercio started on Australia—and right away brought out a strange and significant point. Bridges, boasting one instant about how well he knew his native Australia's labor history, suddenly developed a complete blackout of memory when Del Guercio asked him what the I. W. W.'s part in that labor history was.

(Bridges has admitted he joined the I. W. W. here in America. But he has testified, earlier here, that he didn't know it was an outfit of sabotage and destruction.)

Now, suddenly, he professed utter ignorance, despite his vaunted familiarity with Australia's turbulent labor history, that the I. W. W. had burned docks, set a city afire, sabotaged property in Australia while he was a part of the labor movement there. And he said he didn't know the I. W. W. had been outlawed in Australia.

To him, said Bridges, the I. W. W. was "just a trade-union—and a little better'n some I've seen around."

And when Del Guercio asked him if Australia hadn't barred alien I. W. W.'s from the continent and had outlawed the I. W. W. in 1918, Bridges said he didn't know.

Then Del Guercio swung into the detailed record of Bridges' activities in America, beginning with his arrival here on April 12, 1920, as a member of the crew of the ship *Ysabel*.

"Did you desert your ship?"

"Under British law, I deserted; under your American law, I quit," said Bridges. Del Guercio had him admit that since he was British and the ship, too, then he deserted.

Then the prosecutor really began to show the extent of the Government's knowledge of Bridges. He had before him a detailed record of every ship Bridges had sailed on, what ports he visited, when he signed off, where he spent the intervening time, what he did, when, where—everything in such minute detail that Bridges couldn't have dodged if he'd tried to. He had sense enough not to.

BRIDGES QUIZZED ON SYNDICALISM

Every now and then Del Guercio dropped other matters in. Once he asked if Bridges was in favor of laws against syndicalism.

"No," cried Bridges, "you might mean something different than I do, though. To me, syndicalism means to favor direct action with complete disregard and opposition to political action of any form. I'm not in favor of a union being syndicalistic if it wants to."

Here Presiding Judge Sears interposed a question:

"What do you mean by 'direct action'?"

"I mean not resorting to negotiation, mediation, or arbitration," said Bridges. "You get your results by the direct action of walking off the job. That works all right up to a certain point. * * *"

"What is your position in regard to the criminal syndicalism laws?" asked the prosecutor.

"One hundred percent against them. I worked hard to get rid of some of them."

Then suddenly Del Guercio pulled out Bridges' first declaration of citizenship intent, the one he filed in New Orleans on July 13, 1921.

(Bridges has filed three. Followers of the Bridges case waited for the Government to demand his own explanation of the discrepancies that mark them. Apparently, this time, the Government is going to do that.)

Del Guercio asked if the statements on it were made under oath. Bridges said they were.

"And is all the information you gave therein true?"

"To the best of my knowledge, it is," said Bridges.

BUT BIRTH DATE WAS NOT TRUE

Then, demanded Del Guercio, was the birth date on it Bridges' true birth date?

"No," said Bridges, white-faced. He looked desperately toward his lawyers, ranged along the table before him, for help. They came shouting to his rescue. Up popped Carol Weiss King, his female lawyer from New York, to cry that all this was "immaterial," and to utter loud threats that if the Government was going to show that Bridges was a liar, then Bridges' lawyers "will bring in a large number of character witnesses to his reputation for truth and veracity."

"If you are permitted to," stearnly remarked Judge Sears.

Carol King gulped and said, "Oh, yes; Your Honor," and sat down. But if courtroom watchers were expecting the other Bridges citizenship applications, with other discrepancies, to come out then and there, they were disappointed. The Government didn't go further into that sort of thing then. But the other applications are in the Government's dossier before Prosecutor Del Guercio—along with what the F. B. I. has dug up about it. Del Guercio has plenty of time ahead of him.

The Bridges hearing will be in recess for 3 days over the Memorial Day Weekend.

The International Impact of Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at the convention of the National Retail Dry Goods Association of America in Chicago.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad for an opportunity to discuss with a certain segment of businessmen of America some of the interdependent problems affecting the Nation as a whole, and which are directly joined with current world problems which a somewhat waning civilization must face.

When we look about us and see the world beyond the Western Hemisphere ruled by dictators, necessitous and rapacious to the last degree, we rejoice that we are Americans. We are grateful to the memory of our fathers whose wisdom and foresight were responsible for such a mighty Nation. A meeting of this kind is commonplace in America, but a rarity in the world of nations. The right of peaceful assembly is one of our constitutional guaranties. You come here from every State in the Union, give expression to your thoughts, and pass resolutions after serious consideration of the social, economic, and political questions of the hour. Your opinions are free. Your deliberations are made without governmental influence or restraint. While our Government guarantees free speech and peaceful assembly, it is also the duty of those in Government to consider the studied opinions flowing from meetings of this kind, if such opinions challenge the duties and obligations that members of various branches of government owe to a free society.

If these were ordinary times, it would be unnecessary to discuss foundations upon which our Government has remained secure for over a century and a half. We live in a dangerous world. It is a different world than that America has seen since the Revolutionary period. We live by the side of dictators whose brutal and tyrannical policy now threatens democracy everywhere. We have seen free and innocent peoples crushed and enslaved in the dictators' tyrannical march. Their fate today is primarily due to their tragic failure to recognize in due time the length, the breadth, and the height of the totalitarian philosophy. The people of France quarreled over internal problems. They leisurely passed the time, while Hitler, who is the state, prepared for the crucial hour to strike.

The smaller countries placed their faith in Hitler's pledges and treaties. They too followed the laissez faire policy and shut their eyes to the danger. Even England slept through a long period of irresolution and as a result of her inertia she is in a death struggle with the common enemy of the democracies today. Her people would not follow the advice of Churchill in 1933. Churchill, seeing the early danger of Hitlerism, tried in vain to arouse the English people from a false sense of security. He was a firm advocate of the doctrine laid down by Edmund Burke in 1792, when he declared in a great speech in Parliament "That early and provident fear is the mother of safety."

In our own country there were few who saw the danger signals ahead. President Roosevelt in 1937 made a memorable speech in this city, dedicating a bridge on the outer drive of Michigan Avenue. He saw war coming in Europe. He wanted to avert it and suggested the quarantine of aggressor nations, while at the same time proclaiming that America hated war and searched for peace. For his prescience, his sagacity, and his boldness, he was thereupon condemned by the press, and from the platform as a dictator, warmonger, and interventionist.

Had England followed Churchill in 1933 and prepared—had America followed Roosevelt in 1937 and prepared as we are preparing today upon a basis comparable with what we are doing today, I am certain that World War No. 2 would have been avoided.

Yet I cannot blame the American people in their failure to look ahead. I belong to that class. Americans hate war. We despise it primarily because of the last war, and its failure to make the world safe for democracy.

We have always striven for a lasting world peace. Being in possession of peace, and being far away from the European and Asiatic dictators, we could not visualize the danger ahead, therefore we were unwilling to face the realities and take early and vigorous measures of defense.

But, Mr. Chairman, when the American people saw the Low Countries conquered, when they saw nations that had been at peace with the world 150 years ruthlessly invaded, their goods and chattels appropriated, and their people enslaved, when they saw Italy, Germany, and Japan enter into a tripartite world agreement which took particular pains to single out the United States of America, when they saw Hitler and Stalin sign up a nonagression pact, when they witnessed Hitler conquer one Balkan country after another, the great majority of our people awakened to the all-important fact that Hitler and his co-conspirators hope before they finish their ungodly and imperialistic careers to spread the totalitarian philosophy throughout the world.

So, my friends, the hour is struck. The time has long passed when we can give mere lip service to this thing we call democracy. America furiously prepares for any eventuality, and in this program of preparation she is supported by at least 95 percent of her people. The people of America have been speaking through their Representatives in Congress during the last year. It is no coincidence that every Member of the United States Senate voted for $15,000,000,000 in contract authorizations and appropriations during the la year in order that the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps might ultimately have the planes, the ships, the tanks, and other implements of war, to defend adequately the Western Hemisphere in case of hostile attack. Our foreign policy upon this question was clearly defined by President Roosevelt on May 27 last, when he said: "First, we shall actively resist wherever necessary, and with all our resources, every attempt by Hitler to extend his Nazi domination to the Western Hemisphere, or to threaten it. We shall actively resist his every attempt to gain control of the seas. We insist upon the vital importance of keeping Hitlerism away from any point in the world which could be used, and would be used, as a base of attack against the Americas."

My friends, why did the President of the United States make plain and certain to the people what our foreign policy is in this grave emergency? Why did every man in the United States Senate vote the billions of dollars for defense? Is it because we fear England and the Royal Navy? Is it because we fear France, Canada, Mexico, or some other country in this hemisphere? No; it is because President Roosevelt and every Member of the Senate fears the spread of the Hitler philosophy to the western world. It is our duty under the Constitution to provide for the common defense. That means in time of danger we assume the responsibility for seeing that our country, our homes, our churches, and all remaining free institutions of America are made secure. We prepare because we know that the dictators of Europe and Asia have no responsibility, either to their fellow man, or to Almighty God.

With one Hitler victory after another, and with an avowed determination to conquer the world, we have no hours, no days, no time to lose. And if the people of America can really be convinced of the seriousness of the Hitler threat to democratic institutions everywhere we may be able to stem the tide by giving to beleaguered, besieged, but unafraid Britain the necessary tools to finish the job, but, regardless of any and all combinations that may threaten this country in the future, we must be in a position to meet and defeat the challenge. It is well that the dictators remember that we have as a background 300 years of liberty engrained in the bone and sinew of American life, and well may the people of this Nation remember that such way of life will be continued indefinitely if the American people exhibit the high type of patriotism, courage, and sacrifice that were so strikingly demonstrated by the founding fathers when they removed forever tyranny and oppression from this land. The dictators also know that we have the greatest natural resources in all the world. They know that we have the genius, courage, talent, and skill to use those resources in our defense. They know we have the individual freedom and liberty—something that most people in the lands controlled by dictatorships can never understand. These are the individual attributes which have made these United States the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world.

Now is the hour for all of these factors to be coordinated and synchronized to the point of maximum production. We move forward toward that objective with amazing speed, notwithstanding, we have encountered many difficulties, and in the immediate future the world will feel the power of such a union of American forces. Hitler knows this better than any living man. His policy is to divide and conquer. He hopes through his stooges and hirelings in this country to destroy that harmony and cooperation which is so indispensable for an all-out early defense. We know Hitler's Quisslings and Lavals in conquered countries, and we know Hitler encourages and nourishes cabals in these United States, but with all his propaganda and intrigue, he underestimates the inherent power of free people.

In another camp we find additional traitors to the American cause—communistic leaders, working overtime in their effort to undermine and destroy the orderly processes of government, including our huge defense program.

Fortunately, the Government knows these misguided wretches who, while living under the American flag, secretly pledge their allegiance to another.

But, my friends, it is sufficient to say that at the moment the combined forces of these wicked men are not alarming or contemptible. Nevertheless, all "fifth columnists," the saboteurs, and the Trojan horses that despise and detest America, are always under the watchful and vigilant eye of Uncle Sam, and if their acts of depredation grow, the vigilant army of the F. B. I. will also grow.

My friends, it is a privilege for me as senior United States Senator from Illinois to speak boldly and with blunt language upon this international impact of evil. My hope is that I may impart one further spark of national inspiration to members of your organization, for I realize full well the social and economic power that you, individually and collectively, wield in the American scheme of life.

I hope, too, that you may find added inspiration in coming to the State that produced the immortal Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas, the Little Giant. It is fitting that we speak of these men, because those two leaders of thought and molders of public opinion lived in a day when the Nation was divided over sectional issues. It will be remembered that these two devoted patriots disagreed as to the proper course this Nation should pursue, but once the unlimited emergency was declared by Abraham Lincoln in that Civil War crisis, the strongest supporter of Lincoln and his policies was Stephen A. Douglas, the man who had opposed him on almost every important national matter. While Stanton, Seward, Chase, and others looked upon Lincoln with suspicion and contemptuous pleasantry, Douglas became Lincoln's close adviser and ardent supporter. He made speeches throughout Illinois and other States on the preservation of the Union, and it is said by Beveridge in his Life of Lincoln that the voice of Douglas alone probably produced 50,000 soldiers from Illinois, and 500,000 from all the Northern States.

It is also a source of great pleasure for me to know that the National Retail Dry Goods Association, being thoroughly conversant with this international impact of evil and all of its ramifications that flow from the ruthless policies of European dictators, has established an unswerving policy of cooperation with the Federal Government. My investigation of your organization definitely discloses from the very beginning of our trouble that you have been awake to the impending danger confronting the American people. So patriotic, so fair, and so self-sacrificing have you been that the President of the United States has gone out of his way to commend your activities. In a letter of recent date, addressed to your Mr. Mayfield, he said, among other things:

"I am delighted that the retailers of this country are keeping defense foremost in their celebration of the National Retail Demonstration. The need to keep prices in check is as strong, if not stronger, than it was a year ago. Prevention of any runaway rise in the cost of living is an important phase of total national defense. Because of the enlightened conduct of the Nation's retailers last year, I am confident they will discharge their responsibility as well this year.

"Very sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

If the President of the United States could write every other organization in the United States a similar letter of confidence, there would be no internal problem affecting this great defense program. Your organization has never been dominated by any spirit of irresolution in any crisis. The welfare of the country has been your first dedication. Selfish motives and personal aggrandizement have been definitely shelved as dangerous trade practices. You realize that today we are again challenged with that ancient European philosophy that might makes right. You men fully appreciate and understand what some few men in this Nation do not or will not understand, and that is dictators conquer and depersonalize the individuals in democratic nations, and destroy all social, economic, and political organizations of every kind and character.

Your most recent act of sound cooperation is found in your support of Leon Henderson, Administrator of Price Administration and Supply. When Henderson a few days ago put a 42-cent ceiling on combed cotton yarn that had a current price of 52 cents per pound, the speculators and jobbers who were the only profiteers in that unjustified advance, raised the cry of dictatorship, lack of authority, and what not. Even Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, charged the Government with going socialistic, and other Senators charged that the President was totally lacking and devoid of any authority to issue the Executive order he did.

Diverging for the moment, I want to go on record now by saying that if anyone in America questions the President's authority to issue an Executive order fixing prices in this emergency, as one United States Senator, I am willing to give the President the legislative and statutory power to perform such services. I say this because of a most unhappy and costly policy in the last war of doing nothing to control price structure until the damage was done.

We saw prices in various commodities skyrocketed overnight. We saw millionaires made in that war overnight. Following that we saw inflation as a result of the spiraling of prices. Following the war we saw the

Congress of the United States promote deflation in order to attempt to cure the evil of inflation, the result being the chief cause of the panic of 1920. We know that uncontrolled prices cost the Government billions of dollars in the last war. We are determined to avoid that in this emergency.

The Henderson organization set up by Executive order of the President of the United States seeks to keep history from repeating itself. They propose to keep retail prices from running away with themselves in all commodities; I approve this as a sound piece of business. No patriotic and prudent mind can object to this necessary activity, and happily, your organization is abreast of the times. You understand the necessity of price-fixing in this emergency. Your general manager recently issued a statement in connection with Mr. Henderson's price-fixing of combed cotton yarn when he said:

"Such is an exercise of governmental authority which all business should view as a clear indication of what may happen in any industry in which the various units are unwilling or unable to exercise a maximum amount of voluntary restraint."

Voluntary restraint upon the part of businessmen is one of the highest acts of patriotism. A rigid adherence to voluntary restraint and self-discipline by all organizations having something to sell will give the Henderson price-control organization the needed cooperation to insure a successful venture with a minimum amount of trouble. Today price-control has been fixed on only eight commodities, namely: Second-hand machine tools, zinc scrap, aluminum scrap, iron and steel scrap, nickel scrap, bituminous coal, all iron and steel products, and combed cotton yarn.

I am advised that the industries of this country manufacturing farm implements have conferred with Mr. Henderson's department and have voluntarily agreed not to disturb the present prices on farm implements and machinery. For such cooperation those industries have my sincere admiration.

Some outstanding experts contend that individual price-fixing is not effective to stop inflation. That may have been true during the last war, because of the tardiness of the Government to recognize the necessity of such control, but it is highly probable that the Henderson price-control committee has profited by the varied experiences of the Baruch committee during the World War, and have the situation well in hand.

Upon my own responsibility, however, I make this prediction: That if price control upon individual basic commodities is not successful through the failure of voluntary restraint and self-discipline upon the part of the seller, there will ultimately come a ceiling over all prices, above which they cannot rise and below which they are free to fall.

What America wants in this emergency is a stabilized price schedule, and I am confident the Henderson Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply is meeting that desire, because during the last year the cost of living has only increased between 3 and 4 percent, a record which I am certain all American consumers will applaud.

I have dwelt at some length upon the question of price control because of its importance to national defense. As I view it, it is the key to confidence and a definite solution to many of our post-war national problems. The President and the Congress of the United States seek to make America invulnerable. There are many ways which this can be done beyond training a vast army, beyond building a two-ocean navy, beyond the construction of an invincible air armada.

Before the maximum amount of ships and planes and guns can be given to the Army and the Navy at a fair and reasonable cost to the taxpayers of America the question of voluntary restraint and self-discipline which is firmly attached to all true patriots must find its way into every nook and cranny of our economic, social, and political life. That is what the President had in mind when he delivered his fireside chat Tuesday, May 27, when he said, among other things:

"Your Government has the right to expect of all citizens that they take loyal part in the common work of our common defense—take loyal part from this moment forward."

He further said:

"When the Nation is threatened from without, however, as it is today, the actual production and transportation of the machinery of defense must not be interrupted by disputes between capital and capital, labor and labor, or capital and labor. The future of all free enterprise—of capital and labor alike—is at stake."

Further he said:

"This is no time for capital to make, or be allowed to retain, excess profits. * * * Collective bargaining will be retained, but the American people expect that impartial recommendations of our Government services will be followed both by capital and labor. * * * This Government is determined to use all of its power to express the will of its people and to prevent interference with the production of materials essential to our Nation's security."

The President in that part of his message was dealing with strikes: Strikes at steel mills, strikes at airplane factories, strikes at fabricating plants, strikes at shipyards, and other strikes throughout the country that handicap our real defense efforts. I know of no other domestic question that has been discussed so much, and so little done to meet equitably the problems involved therein. President Roosevelt will express the will of the people by taking affirmative action upon this issue. Our freedom is at stake. No internal strife shall militate against its continuation.

Let it be understood that I do not contend that perhaps certain strikes may not have been justified, but certainly the reason behind the great majority of these strikes is not justified under any fair and impartial interpretation.

A number of small men in the management of industry have attempted to use the emergency for selfish gains, hoping that a situation might be created in this country where Congress through legislation would strike down all the social progress that has been made for the laboring man in recent years. On the other hand, a few small leaders of the laboring cause have attempted to use the emergency to further their own selfish ends. Ninety-five percent of the rank and file of management and labor are just as patriotic as any other group. They want to see our defenses move forward with speed and efficiency, but they are powerless to control these ungrateful leaders.

It is not my concern for the moment to determine who is at fault in any particular strike. The placing of the responsibility for defense strikes does not produce guns, planes, or ships, and it is guns, planes, and ships that we need today. The arsenal of democracy must produce without interruption, and neither labor nor management has the moral right to take advantage of the Nation's present emergency to gain some selfish end by causing the cessation of production, which is vital to our defense.

I plead with those in labor and management, as well as every other individual or group, who seek in this critical hour to take advantage of this situation to lay aside these childish things and give their all-out effort and wholehearted cooperation in order that we may have an uninterrupted and continued flow of the maximum production of defense materials for this Nation and those nations which we consider vital to our defense. A few more bombing planes, or a few more ships, or another round of powder delivered to England may save her from defeat.

My friends, the maximum production of defense weapons in this hour is more important to the security of the Nation than is the actual training of the 1,200,000 soldiers who are now in the Army.

I express a sincere and mighty hope that management, labor, and the Labor Relations Branch of the Government may be able to iron out these difficulties without losing time that can never return as we prepare ourselves for the potential danger ahead. We cannot, we must not, continue to lose these precious hours on defense contracts. Someone must act with all convenient speed. As a United States Senator, I am ready to vote for legislation to meet this bottleneck in our defense production.

My friends, the picture that I have painted is not a cheerful one. We are all aware that this world convulsion has dislocated the lives and activities of millions of people. What our fate may be in the world of tomorrow no man can tell, but the emergency is such that demands the best of each individual, no matter what his role in life may be. As one of the Senators from Illinois, representing seven and one-half millions of strong, sturdy, and true Americans, I pray to God that in this hour of peril that whatever I do, I may be right. I have only one purpose in mind, and that is to serve my country.

Hernando De Soto

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1541, four hundred years ago yesterday, Hernando De Soto discovered the Mississippi River in one of the most dramatic expeditions the world has ever seen.

It was the last of a series of expeditions that from the standpoint of a combination of romance, adventure, valor, privation, courage, cruelty, exploration, discovery, and dramatic deliverance are probably without a parallel in all the annals of mankind.

There are available four accounts of this expedition which were written at the time it was made, or shortly thereafter, together with a map of the area explored, which was published in Spain in 1543. This map, which was evidently drawn by some member of the expedition, and probably under De Soto's direction, when considered in the light of information and data available at that time, is a splendid outline and a surprisingly accurate picture of the territory explored—from the peninsula of Florida to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains.

Three of the published accounts were written by members of the expedition. One of them was by Biedma, the King's Factor, who accompanied the expedition and whose duty it was to act as the representative of the Crown and to collect

the government's pro rata share of the treasures discovered or taken from the Indians—or from any others that might be so unfortunate as to fall into their hands. His account was in the form of a report made to the Spanish Crown in 1544, 1 year after the expedition ended and the survivors finally found their way back to civilization. His report is entitled "Relation of the Conquest of Florida Presented by Luys Hernandez De Biedma in the year 1544 to the King of Spain in Council."

Another report of the expedition was written by Rodrego Ranjel, De Soto's secretary. Rather it was written from Ranjel's notes by Oviedo, a Spanish historian. Unfortunately, Oviedo seems to have destroyed these notes, apparently the custom of compilers of that day. This report is entitled "A Narrative of De Soto's Expedition Based on the Diary of Rodrego Ranjel, his private secretary, by Gonzolo Fernandez De Oviedo y Valdez."

It was published, or compiled, some time between the year 1546, the year Oviedo left Santo Domingo for Spain, and 1557, the year Oviedo died, but it was not published in English until 1904. Ranjel does not tell us that he was De Soto's secretary, and neither does Biedma. We get that information from De Soto's will.

A third report was written by a member of the expedition who called himself The Gentleman from Elvas, or A Fidalgo of Elvas. While he does not give his real name, it has been pointed out that he must have been Alvaro Fernandez, a highly educated Portuguese, who was a member of the expedition and who came from the town of Elvas. His story is well written, and while there are some discrepancies as to exact dates or days of the week, he invariably refers with accuracy to places indicated on the map mentioned. His report checks well with the report of Biedma, as well as with that of Ranjel, as to dates, names, and places, with slight variations in names or in the spelling of names, due, no doubt, to the fact that he wrote in Portuguese, while they both wrote in Spanish.

It has been contended that these writers had access to each other's reports, but that could hardly have occurred, for the reason that Oviedo died in 1557, the year Elvas' story was published. Neither Elvas nor Oviedo could have had access to Biedma's report, for while it was made to the King in 1544, it was not published, at least in English, until 1857.

A fourth report was written by Garcilasco de la Vega, usually referred to as Garcilasco, the Inca. He was born in Cusco, Peru, in 1537. His father was a Spanish officer under Pizarro and his mother was a Peruvian Indian, and a sister of Huana Capac, the last great Inca, or chief, of the ancient Peruvian Empire which Pizarro and his followers conquered and destroyed.

Garcilasco's story was written in Spain about 1587, more than 40 years after the expedition came to an end. It was based entirely upon second-hand information and is teeming with exaggerations. He got his information from "a friend," who was a member of the expedition and who related it to him verbally more than 20 years afterward. This "friend" was evidently Gancalo Silvestre, one of the cavaliers in the expedition, whose exploits during the expedition were narrated in considerable detail, although the records do not indicate that he occupied any position of prominence under De Soto, and the gentleman from Elvas does not even mention his name.

De Soto landed on the west coast of Florida on May 30, 1539, with 620 men, 223 horses, a number of hogs, and equipment necessary for the expedition.

He disembarked at what is now called Tampa Bay, but which Biedma calls the Bay of Honda, by which name it is also designated on the map referred to. The gentleman from Elvas tells us that—

> The place where they disembarked was due north of the island of Tortuga, which is in the mouth of the Bahama Channel.

The location of the Tortugas Islands indicated on this De Soto map and referred to by the gentleman from Elvas corresponds almost perfectly with that of the island of Dry Tortugas, situated due south of Tampa Bay, and made famous by the imprisonment of Dr. Mudd just after the Civil War. A comparison of these maps and the reports above referred to will leave no doubt of the fact that De Soto and his men landed at Tampa Bay.

They must have presented an imposing spectacle. Here were 620 daring adventurers selected from the very best of the young manhood of the Old World. Many of them had traveled far and wide. Some had engaged in continental conflicts; some had followed Cortez in Mexico, Davilla in Panama, or Pizarro in Peru. As one writer expressed it, they had shivered lances with the knights of the Old World, engaged in deadly combat with Indian braves from Mexico to Peru, and with their swords had placed the cross of Christianity upon the bloody altars of the Montezumas and in the golden temple of the Incas.

More than 200 of them were mounted on the finest horses to be found in all the world. They were led by Hernando De Soto, one of the most intrepid soldiers who ever set foot on American soil, and one whose record of achievements was sufficient to inspire the envy of every follower who was ambitious of renown.

At that time De Soto was about 39 years old. He was born in the year 1500 at a small Spanish town called Xeres. His father and mother were both members of the nobility, as were all four of his grandparents.

But, like many other aristocratic families, his people had become so impoverished that they were unable to give him a liberal education. His courteous and manly bearing attracted the attention of one Pedro Arias de Avilla, a wealthy member of the nobility, by whose assistance young De Soto was enabled to spend 6 years at one of the Spanish universities, supposed to be that of Saragossa.

Davila, as Don Pedro was called, was a man of ungovernable temper and insatiable cruelty. De Soto and Balboa, the discoverer of the Pacific Ocean, both married daughters of Davila. He demonstrated his affection for them by later having Balboa beheaded and attempting the execution of De Soto, whose brilliant and courageous defense of himself against the bloodthirsty old tyrant constitutes one of the most dramatic incidents in history.

During the time that De Soto was in college, Davila was appointed governor of Darien, which covered a large portion of Central America, and included what is now the Republic of Panama. He entered upon the duties of that office in 1514, and at the end of 5 years returned to Spain for a short visit, about the time De Soto returned from college.

They met at Davila's country castle near the city of Badajoz. De Soto was a fine-looking specimen of young manhood, tall, athletic, alert, courageous, and adept at such manly feats as riding, fencing, and other military exercises. He was regarded as the very mirror of knighthood. Just before Davila's return to Darien, De Soto surprised him, to put it very mildly, by asking for the hand of his beautiful daughter, Donna Isabella Debobadilla. She was a lovely and accomplished girl of 16. had been presented at court, where her extraordinary beauty and attractive personality caused her to be sought in marriage by several young noblemen of the highest rank.

De Soto's proposal seemed so absurd, owing to his poverty, that it did not even offend the arrogant old count. He contemptuously spurned it, even refusing to take it seriously, until he learned that Isabella was desperately in love with De Soto and had declared she would shut herself up in a convent before she would marry anyone else.

Davila went into a rage. He is said to have taken measures to have De Soto assassinated, but fearing the effect it might have on his daughter, he decided to take De Soto back to Darien with him, and offered him a captain's commission and free passage to Darien. Thinking this might afford him an opportunity to make his fortune, which he considered the only stumbling block to his marriage, De Soto accepted, little dreaming of the sinister design that prompted the proposal.

He managed to secure a secret interview with Isabella before his departure when vows of mutual constancy were made. Knowing her father's character, and suspecting his intentions, Isabella reminded De Soto that "one treacherous friend is more dangerous than a thousand avowed enemies."

On arriving in Darien, Davila assigned De Soto to such duties as would expose him to extreme dangers. He performed those duties with such courage and ability as to increase Davila's enmity toward him.

Davila's merciless cruelty to the Indians furnishes one of the bloodiest pages in history. They were considered heathens, with no rights which the Spaniards felt bound to respect. On one occasion Davila sent an order to De Soto to burn a certain Indian village and put every living creature found therein to the

sword. De Soto flatly refused. Davila induced one, Captain Perez de la Rua, his agent in the affair, to challenge De Soto to a duel, stating that he himself was too old, being at that time about 80.

Perez was a vicious character and considered the best swordsman in the territory. But he had met his match. After 2 hours of fierce combat, in which he was wounded several times, De Soto downed his antagonist. With the point of his sword against the breast of his fallen enemy, De Soto demanded that he ask for his life, which Perez refused to do. De Soto then sheathed his sword, saying that "a life that is not worth asking for is not worth taking." He then gracefully bowed to the cheering spectators and retired from the field. Captain Perez was so badly humiliated that he resigned his commission and returned to Spain.

When Davila first came to the territory as governor, he succeeded Balboa, who had been acting in that capacity. Balboa was young, chivalrous, and popular, and had already assured his immortality by his discovery of the Pacific Ocean.

While he continued to serve under Davila, endeavoring in every way to please him, his efforts seemed to intensify the latter's enmity toward him. A reconciliation is said to have been arranged at one time, and Balboa married Davila's daughter by proxy, Davila acting for her.

This, however, did not allay the growing jealousy of Davila, who finally tried Balboa on a false charge of treason and ordered him to be beheaded. He watched the execution through a crevice in the wall of a neighboring house, not daring to look into the reproachful eyes of the dying man.

All this became known to De Soto soon after he reached the territory, and he soon became aware of Davila's increasing hatred for him. He remembered what Isabella had told him and kept on his guard.

Davila tried in every way to entrap De Soto and to prevent his correspondence with Isabella.

Finally, Davila was transferred to Nicaragua, which was being governed temporarily by Lt. Francisco Hernandez, a friend of De Soto's. When he arrived at the town of Leon, where Hernandez maintained his headquarters, the latter appeared to give an account of his stewardship. Davila interrupted him, denounced him as a traitor, and ordered his execution at once. Immediately his official executioner went into action, and in an instant the head of Hernandez rolled upon the ground.

The vast audience was horrified. As soon as the fatal blow was given, De Soto drew his sword, but it was too late to interpose. He shook his sword at Davila, who ordered him to be dragged from his horse and executed in the same manner. An officer rushed for De Soto, who brought his sword down with such force that it split the man's head clear to his chin. He then dashed at Davila with such ferocity that the latter's guards gave way before him. He placed the point of his sword against Davila's body, while the excited crowd shouted, "Kill him!" "Kill the tyrant." These shouts were even echoed by Davila's own soldiers. "Miserable old man," said De Soto, "you hear the voice of justice speaking through your subjects. In refusing to obey the call, I am scarcely less guilty than yourself. But remember that in sparing your life at this moment, I discharge all the obligations I have owed you. Be thankful that the recollection of one who is absent can make me forget what I owe to my murdered friend. I will sheathe my sword; but I swear by the sacred emblem which it bears that I will never draw it again in your service." And he kept his word.

After his dramatic break with Davila, De Soto went on an exploring expedition of his own in search of a passage connecting the two oceans somewhere between the Isthmus of Darien and the southern part of Mexico. Geographers of that day believed that such a passage really existed, just as the English believed in the existence of the Northwest Passage. While returning from this expedition, another incident occurred which demonstrates the fighting qualities of De Soto, as well as the bloody and peremptory manner in which Spanish justice was sometimes meted out among those early explorers.

Among the inhabitants of Panama, during the administration of Governor Davila, was an aged Italian scientist named Micer Codro. He was trusted by the governor and respected by all. He and De Soto became great friends, and on one occasion, when Davila had sent Micer Codro to Spain on a special mission, De Soto got him to carry a secret letter to Isabella. This was finally reported to Davila in a letter from one of his servants. Concealing his indignation, the governor sent Micer Codro on another expedition, ostensibly to make some investigation on a neighboring island, but gave secret instructions to the captain of the boat on which he sailed to torture the old man to death.

While returning from his fruitless search for the strait connecting the two oceans, De Soto happened to board a vessel commanded by this same captain. One night the captain began to regale the crowd with his former explorations and deeds of cruelty, and recited his extreme brutality to Micer Codro, when De Soto sprang to his feet, drew his sword, and, as one historian expresses it, "dealt the vaunting criminal a blow which separated his head from his body."

He then addressed the astonished crowd, gave the reason for his strange conduct, and proposed to meet anyone who felt disposed to hold him accountable for what he had done. But his explanation seemed to satisfy everyone, or at least to furnish an excuse for the failure of any of his audience to accept his challenge.

De Soto then joined Pizzaro and went with him to Peru where he became a leader in the conquest of that country. His daring exploits, his excellent horsemanship, together with his courage and boldness as a military leader, distinguished him as the outstanding member of the expedition. His bold and daring leadership were great factors in the overthrow of the Inca, as the Peruvian ruler was called, and the conquest of the Nation, which enabled the Spaniards to garner a wealth of gold and silver the like of which the world had not seen.

Let it be said to De Soto's credit that he took no part in, nor was he responsible for, the cruel execution of Atahualpa, the Peruvian Inca.

This noble chieftain had been captured by the Spaniards under De Soto at the time of the storming of their capital, and he was held a prisoner by Pizzaro. He was promised his freedom if he would have his subjects bring in gold and silver sufficient to fill the room in which he was confined as high as he could reach.

This request was complied with and his simple subjects stripped their public buildings, as well as private abodes, of all the precious metals they could find and brought them in for the purpose of securing the release of their beloved chief—one of the most beneficent rulers whose name appears on the pages of recorded history.

His nation had progressed far along the road to civilization. They were happy, prosperous, contented, and at peace with the rest of the world until the Spaniards came. Their public buildings, their magnificent highways, and their works of art challenged the admiration of the civilized world.

In this day of whirling traffic it is hard for us to understand that such a civilization could have been built by a nation of men who had never seen a wheel, whose only mode of travel was a boat and whose only beast of burden was the llama.

When practically all the wealth of gold and silver the Peruvians possessed had been gathered and the chief Inca, Atahalpa, began to appeal to Pizzaro to carry out his part of the contract, that cruel tyrant sent De Soto on an expedition into the interior, evidently to get him out of the way for the time being. Then taking advantage of De Soto's absence, he had this noble Indian led from his prison, chained to a stake in the public square, and burned to death.

When De Soto returned he was so enraged at this brutality, this cruel and inhuman execution of an innocent man, this flagrant and brazen breach of faith, that he drew his sword and rushed into Pizzaro's tent, abused him for the miserable wretch that he was, and it was all his followers could do to restrain him from meting out to him the same punishment he had administered to the murderer of his friend Micer Codro.

De Soto was so disgusted with the conduct of Pizzaro that he decided to resign his position and return to Spain. Besides he had accomplished the main object of his adventures in accumulating a fortune from the spoils of the Peruvian Empire, and was burning with desire to return and claim the hand of the beautiful Isabella Debobadilla.

Therefore he resigned his position and returned to Spain, taking with him his share of the accumulated spoils of the expedition which made him rich almost beyond the dreams of avarice.

When he got back to Spain he found Isabella waiting for him. She had re-

mained faithful throughout all the long and lonesome years of his absence, dreaming of the time when he should return, a conquering hero, laden with riches and covered with renown.

Her dream had now come true. They celebrated their marriage in great style, attended by all the pomp and splendor of the Spanish Court at which Isabella had long been a favorite, and to which De Soto had now been admitted as one of the most distinguished men of his day.

He immediately became a national favorite, was attended by a retinue wherever he went, loaned money to the King and came to be looked upon as a national leader.

All this was very pleasant and exhilirating to the masterful, young cavalier, and for a time he enjoyed his position and popularity to the fullest extent. His cup of success was literally running over.

But while he had been the principal actor in all the achievements in which he had participated up to that time, they had all been accomplished in the name of someone else, and De Soto was ambitious to accomplish something in his own right.

Therefore, he applied to the Spanish Crown for permission to fit out an expedition for the invasion of Florida, as the North American Continent was then called. The crown granted his request and appointed him Governor of Cuba and Adelantado of Florida. The distinction between these two titles seems to be that as Governor of Cuba he merely exercised civil authority, and even that, as well as military operations, were subject to the dictation of the crown; while as Adalantado of Florida he apparently possessed all powers, both civil and military. He was to be monarch of all he surveyed.

The expedition was quickly organized consisting of about 600 men and 7 ships loaded with horses, hogs, food supplies, clothes, and other material and paraphernalia as were deemed necessary for such an enormous expedition.

They set sail in the month of April 1538. Dona Ysabel accompanied De Soto to the island of Cuba, where she remained to await the return of her husband from the expedition in which he expected to find a wealth of gold surpassing that obtained in Peru.

De Soto sailed from Habana, Cuba, on May 8, 1539, with a fleet of nine vessels—"five ships, two caravels, and two pinnances"—and landed in what is now called Tampa Bay on Friday, May 30, 1539, and began to make preparations to explore the interior.

On arriving in Florida he learned that there was a white man in that country who had been living with a tribe of Indians for many years. He sent a band of horsemen to try to see if they could find him. They soon came upon a band of Indians whom they immediately attacked when one of them called out in their own language, "Seville," the name of a town in Spain, which he continued to repeat.

Whereupon the horseman who had charged him with his lance recognized him as a member of his own race. He told the horseman that he was a Christian and a Spaniard of noble ancestry, and that he had been living as a captive among the Indians for something like 10 years.

But suppose we let the gentleman from Elvas tell his story just as he wrote it down 400 years ago:

HOW THE CHRISTIAN CAME TO THE LAND OF FLORIDA, WHO HE WAS, AND OF WHAT PASSED AT HIS INTERVIEW WITH THE GOVERNOR

The name of the Christian was Juan Ortiz, a native of Sevilla, and of noble parentage. He had been 12 years among the Indians, having gone into the country with Panphilo de Narvaez, and returned in the ships to the island of Cuba, where the wife of the Governor remained; whence, by her command, he went back to Florida with some 20 or 30 others in a pinnace. Coming to the port in sight of the town they saw a cane sticking upright in the ground, with a split in the top, holding a letter, which they supposed the Governor had left there, to give information of himself before marching into the interior. They asked it, to be given to them, of four or five Indians walking along the beach, who by signs bade them come to land for it, which Ortiz and another did, though contrary to the wishes of the others. No sooner had they got on shore, when many natives came out of the houses, and drawing near held them in such way that they could not escape. One who would have defended himself they slew on the spot, the other they seized by the hands and took him to Ucita, their chief. The people in the pinnace unwilling to land, kept along the coast and returned to Cuba.

By command of Ucita, Juan Ortiz was bound hand and foot to four stakes, and laid upon scaffolding, beneath which a fire was kindled that he might be burned, but a daughter of the chief entreated that he might be spared. Though one Christian, she said, might do no good, certainly he could do no harm, and it would be an honor to have one for a captive, to which the father acceded, directing the injuries to be healed. When Ortiz got well he was put to watching a temple, that the wolves in the nighttime might not carry off the dead there, which charge he took in hand having commended himself to God. One night they snatched away from him the body of a little child, son of a principal man, and going after them he threw a dart at the wolf that was escaping, which feeling itself wounded let go its hold and went off to die, and he returned without knowing what he had done in the dark. In the morning finding the body of the little boy gone he became very sober, and Ucita when he heard what had happened determined he should be killed, but having sent on the trail which Ortiz pointed out as that the wolves had made the body of the child was found and a little further on a dead wolf, at which circumstance the chief became well pleased with the Christian, and satisfied with the guard he had kept, ever after taking much notice of him.

Three years having gone by since he had fallen into the hands of this chief, there came another, named Mococo, living 2 days' journey distant from that port, and burned the town, when Ucita fled to one he had in another seaport, whereby Ortiz lost his occupation, and with it the favor of his master. The Indians are worshippers of the devil, and it is their custom to make sacrifices of the blood and bodies of their people, or of those of any other they can come by; and they affirm, too, that when he would have them make an offering, he speaks, telling them that he is athirst, and that they must sacrifice to him. The girl who had delivered Ortiz from the fire told him how her father had the mind to sacrifice him the next day and that he must flee to Mococo, who she knew would receive him with regard, as she had heard that he had asked for him and said he would like to see him; and as he knew not the way, she went half a league out of town with him at dark, to put him on the road, returning early so as not to be missed.

Ortiz traveled all night, and in the morning came to a river, the boundary of the territory of Mococo, where he discovered two men fishing. As this people were at war with those of Ucita and their language different, he did not know how he should be able to tell them who he was and why he came, or make other explanation, that they might not kill him as one of the enemy. It was not, however, until he had come up to where their arms were placed that he was discovered, when they flew toward the town; and though he called out to them to wait, that he would do them no injury, they only ran the faster for not understanding him. As they arrived, shouting, many Indians came out of the town and began surrounding, in order to shoot him with their arrows, when he, finding himself pressed, took shelter behind trees, crying aloud that he was a Christian fled from Ucita, come to visit and serve Mococo. At the moment, it pleased God that an Indian should come up, who, speaking the language, understood him and quieted the others, telling them what was said. Three or four ran to carry the news, when the Cacique, much gratified, came a quarter of a league on the way to receive him. He caused the Christian immediately to swear to him, according to the custom of his country, that he would not leave him for any other master; and, in return, he promised to show him much honor, and if at any time Christians should come to that land, he would let him go freely, and give him his permission to return to them, pledging his oath to this after the Indian usage.

Three years from that time, some people fishing out at sea, 3 leagues from land, brought news of having seen ships; when Mococo, calling Ortiz, gave him permission to depart, who, taking leave, made all haste possible to the shore, where, finding no vessels, he supposed the story to be only a device of the Cacique to discover his inclination. In this way he remained with him 9 years, having little hope of ever seeing Christians more; but no sooner had the arrival of the Governor in Florida taken place, when it was known to Mococo, who directly told Ortiz that Christians were in the town of Ucita. The captive, thinking himself jested with, as he had supposed himself to be before, said that his thoughts no longer dwelt on his people and that his only wish now was to serve him. Still the Cacique assured him that it was even as he stated, and gave him leave to go, telling him that if he did not, and the Christians should depart, he must not blame him, for he had fulfilled his promise.

Great was the joy of Ortiz at this news, though still doubtful of its truth; however, he thanked Mococo, and went his way. A dozen principal Indians were sent to accompany him; and on their way to the port, they met Baltasar de Gallegos, in the manner that has been related. Arrived at the camp, the Governor ordered that apparel be given to him, good armor, and a fine horse. When asked if he knew of any country where there was either gold or silver, he said that he had not been 10 leagues in any direction from where he lived; but that 30 leagues distant was a chief named Paracoxi, to whom Mococo, Ucita, and all they that dwelt along the coast paid tribute, and that he perhaps had knowledge of some good country, as his land was better than theirs, being more fertile, abounding in maize. Hearing this, the Governor was well pleased, and said he only desired to find subsistence, that he might be enabled to go inland with safety; for that Florida was so wide, in some part or other of it there could not fail to be a rich country. The Cacique of Mococo came to the port, and calling on the Governor, he thus spoke:

"Most high and powerful chief: Though less able, I believe, to serve you than the least of these under your control, but with the wish to do more than even the greatest of them can accomplish, I appear before you in the full confidence of receiving your favor, as much as though I deserved it, not in requital of the trifling service I rendered in setting free the Christian while he was in my power, which I did, not for the sake of my honor and of my promise, but because I hold that great men should be liberal. As much as in your bodily perfections you exceed all, and in your command over fine men are you superior to others, so in your nature are you equal to the full enjoyment of earthly things. The favor I hope for, great Lord, is that you will hold me to be your own, calling on me freely to do whatever may be your wish."

The Governor answered him, that although it were true, in freeing and sending him the Christian, he had done no more than to keep his word and preserve his honor, nevertheless he thanked him for an act so valuable, that there was no other for him that could be compared to it, and that, holding him henceforth to be a brother, he should in all, and through all, favor him. Then a shirt and some other articles of clothing were directed to be given to the chief, who, thankfully receiving them, took leave and went to his town.

The speech of the chief just quoted is typical of the addresses made by various chiefs throughout the expedition. This is probably the first time that any Indian chief ever greeted a visitor from the Old World accompanied by an interpreter who could speak both languages.

It may be that Ortiz helped to form his address to De Soto. Yet numerous speeches of this kind made by various Indian chiefs are found throughout the Elvas report of the expedition.

Strange as it may seem, when Capt. John Smith returned to England in 1609, he published a volume giving his experiences in Virginia, in which he made no mention of Pocahontas having saved his life. That same year Richard Hakluyt, the British historian, translated this report of De Soto's expedition by the gentleman from Elvas into English and published it in London in 1611.

A few years later Pocahontas came to England, and Capt. John Smith called on her, but neither of them ever made mention of her having saved Smith's life. About 16 years after Pocahontas died, Smith published another volume, a second edition of his exploits in America, in which the story of Pocahontas saving his life appeared for the first time.

All these books are now in the Library of Congress and available to any student of history who desires to investigate the subject.

The indications are that the story of Smith being rescued by Pocahontas was an afterthought and that he borrowed it from these experiences of Juan Ortiz in Florida. Yet every school child in America and probably in England has read the story of how Pocahontas saved the life of Capt. John Smith. A monument has been erected at Jamestown to that alleged event, and it has been carved on the inside of the dome of the Capitol. All of which carries out Napoleon's contention that "history is a fable agreed upon."

Ortiz joined De Soto and became his interpreter. Indians could speak the language of adjacent tribes; therefore every time they would pass through the territory of an Indian chief they would pick up an interpreter who could speak the language of his neighbors. In that way they collected a retinue of interpreters consisting of something like six or eight, or probably more, Indians from the various tribes through which they had passed. In order to understand the language of a tribe, he had to speak through the interpreter from the adjacent tribe, and he to the one from the next tribe, and so on down the line until they reached Ortiz who would then translate it into Spanish. To be sure, that was a very imperfect method of interpretation, but it was the best they could do and enabled them to understand in a vague way what was being said.

When we reach the Chickasaw territory, I will show how this arrangement helped to get De Soto into some very serious trouble.

De Soto's adventures in North America are well known to every student of history.

He left Tampa Bay, or the Bay of Honda, as it was called, and moved in a northerly direction for a short time, and then turned and followed a northeasterly course. A young Indian had informed him that there were large deposits of gold in an area far to the north where his own people lived, and he proposed to guide De Soto and his men to it. For some reason he changed his mind, confessed religion, and joined the church. He also confessed that he had been misrepresenting the facts, and that he did not know of any place where gold could be found. It is pointed out by some historians that large gold deposits really existed in northern Georgia, and it is entirely probable this Indian knew about them. But after witnessing the cruelty with which the Spanish treated the other Indians along the way, it is probable that this lad revolted at the idea of subjecting his people to the same punishment.

De Soto went up through what is now the State of South Carolina, and probably went a short distance into North Carolina. He struck the upper stretches of the Tennessee River and followed that stream down to about where Guntersville Dam is now situated, then turned south and engaged in a fight with the Indians under the Chief Tascalusa, at what is known as the Battle of Mabila, or Mauilla. This battle came very near being the undoing of the expedition. In it De Soto lost all of his firearms and ammunition and large quantities of other vital materials.

After the Battle of Mabila the expedition turned north, and crossed the Tombigbee River somewhere in the vicinity of the present sites of Columbus or Aberdeen, and spent the winter at Chicaca in a territory inhabited by the Chickasaw Indians. As a result of a misunderstanding with the Chickasaws, another battle occurred, which came very near proving fatal to De Soto and his band.

De Soto had a large number of hogs with him, and it is reported that he gave a dinner one night to which he invited some of the leaders of the tribe and served them hog meat. They liked it so well that some of them stole some of the hogs out of the enclosure where they were kept. Two of them were caught in the act and brought before De Soto, who had their hands chopped off, and then sent them back to the tribe. A few days later some Spaniards were caught stealing from the Indians, or, rather, robbing them. De Soto ordered them put to death, but before the execution could be carried out, messengers from the chief came to demand their punishment. On the urgent advice of other leaders, Juan Ortiz misinterpreted their message and told De Soto the chief said he did not want them punished. On receiving this information, he ordered them released. This so enraged the Indians that they decided to get even. One dark night, March 15, 1541, they attacked the Spaniards, fired their cabins, stampeded their horses, and burned up nearly all of their clothes and equipment, including their saddles. The Spaniards had to build forges, retemper their swords, and repair their saddles and patch up such clothes as they could make from the materials at hand.

On Tuesday the 26th of April they left Chicaca and went to a town called Alibamo, which is shown on De Soto's map as being about the site of Ackia, the capital of the Chickasaw Nation, where the French under Bienville fought the Chickasaws almost 200 years later, in 1736, and which is now the site of the Ackia National Battlefield Monument a few miles northwest of the present city of Tupelo.

From Alibamo they traveled in a northwesterly direction until they struck the Mississippi River on May 21, 1541. They crossed this stream and traveled many hundreds of miles in a westerly or southwesterly direction trying to find their way to new Spain, as Mexico was then called. Being discouraged, they returned to the Mississippi River, where De Soto sickened, and died on the 21st day of May 1542, just 1 year to a day after his discovery of the Mississippi River.

They buried him near the camp and told the Indians that he had gone to heaven. One of the chiefs informed them that it was their custom, when a great man went to the happy hunting ground, to kill two or three braves to go along with him, and in obedience to that custom he brought several of his own braves and offered them for that purpose, but the Spanish declined to sacrifice them.

These Indians happened to be friendly to De Soto and they became suspicious as to his whereabouts. They were seen to approach the place where he had been buried and to hold conversations, which, together with their gestures, indicated that they were trying to locate the body. In order to conceal the facts from them the Spaniards took up the body, wrapped it in heavy cloth, filled the cloth with sand in order to sink it, took it out at night, and buried it in the Mississippi River.

The Spanish then built boats in which they descended the Mississippi River to its mouth. They were harassed continuously by hostile tribes, and many of them were killed. When they reached

the mouth of the Mississippi River they managed to follow the coast line around to the west until they finally came in sight of some people dressed in their own fashion. They called to them, and to their surprise and delight were answered in their own language. They had reached the shores of Mexico.

When they landed they knelt, kissed the ground, and gave thanks to God for their deliverers. They were conducted to the capital of the territory and provided with food and clothing. Of the more than 600 men who started on the expedition, only about 320 survived.

The news of their arrival soon reached Isabella in Cuba, where she had been anxiously awaiting some word of her illustrious husband, from whom she had not heard for several years. When the news finally reached her the blow was greater than she could stand, and she died within 3 days.

Thus ended in double tragedy the career of Hernando De Soto, one of the most intrepid knights, one of the boldest adventurers, one of the most daring explorers, and the greatest soldier that Spain ever sent to the New World.

Broadcast by Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor for June 2. The article is a condensed excerpt from an address by Pope Pius XII on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of an encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. The address deals with the problems relating to the rights of labor, and social and economic policies necessary to the establishment of national and international justice essential to good social order and world peace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 2, 1941]

BASIC RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL STRESSED BY POPE IN RADIOCAST

VATICAN CITY, June 2.—Pope Piux XII, outlining his views on how the "fundamental values" of social and economic life should share in "that new order which the world expects and hopes" will emerge from the war, emphasized safeguarding of the rights of the individual.

In a Sunday radiocast commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of Pope Leo XIII's social encyclical, the pontiff said he wished to give "some further directive moral principles" on the three fundamental values: the use of material goods, labor, and the family.

He cautioned against too extensive state interference in the rights and duties of individuals and families and upheld man's right to freedom in his "physical, spiritual, religious, and moral movements."

On the use of material goods, he said:

"Undoubtedly the natural order deriving from God demands * * * private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gift as well as the function of the state as a control over both these institutions. * * *

"To safeguard the inviolable sphere of the rights of the human person and to facilitate the fulfillment of his duties should be the essential office of every public authority. * * * The care of such a common good does not imply a power so extensive over the members of the community that in virtue of it the public authority can * * * decide on the beginning of the ending of human life, determine at will the manner of his physical, spiritual, religious, and moral movements in opposition to the personal duties or rights of man and to this end abolish or deprive of efficacy his natural rights to material goods."

On labor:

"The duty and the right to organize the labor of the people belongs, above all, to the people immediately interested: the employers and the workers.

"Every legitimate and beneficial interference of the state in the field of labor should be such as to safeguard and respect its personal character both in the broad outlines and as far as possible in what concerns its execution; and this will happen if the norms of the state do not abolish or render impossible the exercise of other rights and duties equally personal; such as the right to give God his due worship; the right to marry; the right of husband and wife, of father and mother to lead a married domestic life; the right to reasonable liberty in the choice of a state of life and the fulfillment of a true vocation."

On the family:

"A so-called civil progress would * * * be unnatural which—either through the excessive burdens imposed or through exaggerated direct interference—were to render private property void of significance, practically taking from the family and its head the freedom to follow the scope set by God for the perfection of family life."

Pope Pius also suggested the opening of "habitable regions and vital spaces now abandoned to wild, natural vegetation and well suited to be cultivated by man" to immigrants from other lands as a means of contributing both "to the increased welfare of man and the progress of human culture."

Must We Fight Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered in the city of New York on April 14, 1941, at Carnegie Hall, under the auspices of Women United, entitled "Must We Fight Again?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madame Chairman, distinguished guests, mothers of American youth, must we fight again? Must we fight again on foreign shores? That is the question that springs from the lips of every American mother 24 hours in every day and every day in every week. The mothers of America are the ones who are silently praying for peace; they are the ones who daily cry out for the end of war because they will be the greatest sufferers, the greatest losers in the event of our physical participation in the present European conflagration. Governments may become bankrupt, nations may be absorbed and their independence lost, but the greatest sacrifice of all is that made by the mother who gives her son, in many instances her only son, her own flesh and blood, in the flush of youth to the god of war. There is tragedy, anguish, and a broken heart that neither time or circumstances will ever heal.

Should you, the mothers of American sons, in 1941 be called upon to make this sacrifice in either England, France, Greece, Africa, or elsewhere? Should you be forced to make this the greatest of all contributions other than in the Western Hemisphere where our Government and every American is pledged to defend the Monroe Doctrine? I say to you in perfect candor and in the deepest sincerity you should not. And to this end I pledge you and the people of America that I shall do everything in my power to see that they are not sent abroad again to die on alien shores. I shall do my best to see that there is never again an A. E. F. in 1941, '42, or in any other year.

How many of you remember 11 a. m. on the morning of November 11, 1918? That was probably the most important moment in history, when the greatest war, the war fought to end all wars, came officially to an end. That was the hour when the armistice became effective and men ceased to die. Over 9,000,000 had already paid the supreme price and some 28,000,000 of others were returned to their respective homes their bodies broken, their minds torn, to spend the remainder of their years, many of them, on pain-wracked beds.

That was only 23 years ago, and yet it appears that the American people as a whole have forgotten, have forgotten the blood that spilled, the grief they endured, the money their Government spent in those 18 months of our participation in the World War. The best evidence that the majority of our people have forgotten is the fact that the American Congress recently passed the so-called lease-lend bill by nearly a 2-to-1 vote.

The war had hardly ended when the American people said, "Never again." If any public speaker wanted to secure applause he had but to mention the fact in the course of his address that he was opposed to America's participating ever again in any foreign war, and if any national legislator wanted to secure the favor of the American people he had but to declare he would never vote for any measure which would take America into another foreign war. How scon we forget.

Must we again, as in 1917, fight to save democracy, fight to end wars, and fight for the preservation of civilization and Christianity? That's what we did then, and that's what the propagandists and the warmongers tell us we must do again. The situation is vastly different now from what it was then. In 1917 we honestly and sincerely thought that we were fighting a holy war, and we were willing to make any sacrifice to rid the world of the then prevailing monster, the Kaiser. We were willing to make the sacrifice to forever save

civilization from the attendant suffering of any more wars.

For a moment let's review and see whether or not the objectives we sought so valiantly and conscientiously 22 years ago were attained. Was democracy saved? Of course not. If it had been, would the whole world be literally mad and on fire tonight? Did World War No. 1 and Versailles end all wars? Of course, not. Since November 11, 1918, wars and revolutions have raged throughout the earth. In China, Manchukuo, Spain, Ethiopia, and even on our own Western Hemisphere in Bolivia and Paraguay. As a result of these wars and revolutions, it is estimated that more than 5,000,000 people have actually been killed and millions of noncombatants, children, old men, and old women, have starved, suffered, and died.

Now, just a word as to the cost of war. Before we have liquidated the debt of the last war we will have spent $100,000,000,000. With only 50,000 combat casualties and 234,000 wounded we, at this late date in 1940, had 66,000 veterans in Government hospitals and receiving domiciliary care. In fact, our available veterans' institutions are insufficient at the present time to care for the thousands of needy World War veterans.

Nevertheless, and notwithstanding that the average American citizen well understands the complete failure of our objectives in 1917–18, even tonight, at this very hour, there are those who tell us that our duty and even our own future preservation and very existence demand that we once more must cast down the gauntlet and do battle with practically the entire world with the exception of the British Empire. Their platform, their battle cry, is: Feed, finance, and fight. That's a real order, but there are those in the United States, as there were in France, who cried out for war, and who declared war, when they were aware of the fact that the French Government was constructing only 200 airplanes per month when at the same time the German production approximated 3,000 planes per month.

In this group we find the warmongers, the war profiteers, both big and little, those too old or so disabled as not to permit of their participating in actual physical combat, and those whose reason has been swept away by cunning propagandists and who have fallen prey to hysteria and fear. I charge, my friends, that they are the ones who are now urging us to proceed with convoys, and then just a little later they will be the ones who will cry the loudest and longest for a declaration of war. Remember this, when the order comes to convoy, then the order to declare war is just a matter of time.

In all this dark picture and during these days when we who firmly believe that the future safety and perpetuation of our beloved country demands that we devote our energies and every effort to its defense here in the Western Hemisphere and not across the oceans, there is one constant ray of hope that burns on and on. It is the determination of those Americans who have become disillusioned and even now while we are being carried away on all sides by the shrewdest, most complete, and effective propaganda campaign known in all history, remember the small part our country has played in the power politics of Europe since 1918. These are the people who know that the majority of our people are opposed to our entering this war and the sending of American boys to foreign shores. Mind you, however, there are strong forces and subtle influences working night and day to drag us in and unless you, the womanhood of America, band yourselves together and cry out from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to the Rio Grande in one great chant "This is not our war! We will not send our boys abroad," then as surely as the morning sun will come over the eastern horizon the blood of our youth will be spilled in all probability in Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Now, a word as to national defense. In my opinion, every man and woman in America is conscious of our need for the proceeding with all the speed possible of our defense program. This is not the time when defense should in effect be sabotaged by the differences of labor and capital. This is as much their problem as it is ours. Our future safety may depend entirely upon the completion of this gigantic program and our Government should take a firm hand to see that nothing is done to interfere. We must prepare today for defense; tomorrow may be too late.

In recent months it would seem that it has become a major crime in the United States to be an American. Those who speak and act as Americans should are instantly pounced upon and then sneered at as dupes or agents of foreign powers, hostile to this republic. They are branded as un-American. There are some who go so far as to say they are traitors. This mode of attack upon American patriots in thought and deed is nothing new. It was put into ruthless operation in the Revolutionary War against George Washington and those who under and with him were risking their lives and everything they had to the end that America would be emancipated from trans-Atlantic chains and enabled to live her own life in her own way safe from all foreign interference and all foreign influence. Some call us continentalists, some appeasers, some fifth columnists, but whatever they call us, because we are interested in America our views upon the issue of saving America for Americans, still prevail in our hearts and minds.

In conclusion I want to say that a "Gold Star" is a beautiful cherished symbol, but no Gold Star ever made can fill the void left by the empty chair at the breakfast table. Let's keep always fresh in our mind our 50,000 war dead, the 234,000 twisted and torn bodies. Let's not be forced by our entrance into this War to place another "Unknown Dead" in Arlington National Cemetery to rest eternally beside the "Unknown Dead" of World War No. 1. Let's be strong like our brave forebears who gave us this great nation, let's make ourselves so strong that we will be invulnerable from attack from without and within, let's preserve our cherished ideals, institutions and government and let's put our trust and faith in Almighty God to guide us and to show us the way to make this preservation secure.

Town Hall's Meeting of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY FRANCIS M. SHEA

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Francis M. Shea, Assistant Attorney General, at Town Hall's Meeting of the Air on May 29, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that this country has never heard a more dramatic, a more fateful pronouncement than these words of the President, "I have tonight issued a proclamation that an unlimited national emergency exists and requires the strengthening of our defense to the extreme limit of our national power and authority."

Extraordinary powers are given the President of the United States in the face of a national emergency or the imminence of war. Many of these extraordinary powers, to be sure, had already been brought into play by the proclamation of a limited national emergency. Most of the so-called emergency powers were probably to some extent available. The limits of their justifiable exercise were, however, circumscribed by the terms of the earlier proclamation. The time has now come for the full use of whatever powers may be necessary for our national defense.

But a more important aspect of the proclamation is that it ends equivocation. It casts the die. It is the solemn and deliberate declaration of our responsible leader that the Nation is in immediate peril. It puts aside for us as a Nation all ordinary things, all personal things, all partisan things. It calls for a single aim, the safety of our country. It demands the unmeasured devotion of ourselves and all we have to our common cause.

The proclamation serves also to remind us that the President of the United States is not only the civil head of our Government, he is Commander in Chief of our armed forces. He has pronounced the solemn judgment that the life of the Nation is at stake. In such times the President must be first and foremost the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. The great security which we may feel tonight is the sure feeling that the President himself has no doubts as to his first obligations.

But there is this further security which we may feel as well. It is the security of our knowledge and our long tradition that the Commander in Chief of our armed forces remains always the President of the United States. That is the great symbol of our national life. It means that though our whole national will be bent toward military ends, the man who leads us in this effort is the constitutional head of our Government, the aims which we seek are the constitutional purposes of our Government, and so we may be sure that militarism shall not become for us an end in itself.

The question put us tonight is, What is the citizen's role in an unlimited national emergency? I have spent a little time in discussing the role of the President in such an emergency. I have spent this time because his role is but the prototype of the role which each of us must play.

It is our obligation as citizens to use all our powers to the extreme limit for the defense of the Nation. It is our obligation to be soldiers first but citizen-soldiers first and last. The habits and the practices of the soldier must never outrun in us the purposes of the citizen.

Let me try to make concrete what it seems to me are our obligations in this period. Let me attempt it with two or three examples. They cannot be exhaustive, but I hope that they may be suggestive.

There is nothing more difficult than to cut loose from our habitual ways and our habitual calculations. Yet our safety today demands ways which in normal times no prudent man would venture. We must, for instance, expand our capacity for airplane production without calculation of its ultimate use. It would probably be a safe rule of thumb to ask our experts for the extreme calculation of our needs and to order them to proceed with triple the program that they calculate. The President's call for a yearly production of 50,000 planes was such a bold act of imagination. It is only such boldness that can save the Nation. Men who say, "What use can I have for this plant when the war is ended? Where will my business be then? What will happen to my large foreign interests if this course be pursued?"—such men are dangerous to our security. Only by having our eye on the single aim, the aim of preserving the Nation, only by refusing to let our eye wander toward views of ultimate

business expediency or the soundness of investment can we possibly bring down the thing we are aiming at.

Let me now turn to a second point, a second series of examples to demonstrate that only a President-Commander in Chief and only a citizen-soldier can win security for a democracy. The fall of France demonstrated for us that it was not the force of arms we needed most to fear, but the forces of division. We can have our security only if we can maintain the Union, this time not the union of the States, but the union of the spirit of all our people.

This war will be won by the forces of democracy and our security will be made fast only if labor has its heart in it, only if our youth has its heart in it. It will be won only if all our many and diverse alien populations have their heart in it. In times like these we cannot afford to forget those principles and those interests which are responsible for the devotion of all our people to this democracy.

It is of first importance for labor to understand that these times of stress will not be seized upon to diminish the rights of labor. It is the responsibility of all of us as citizens to make that clear. It is the responsibility of the Government, of the managers of business, of professional men, but above all, it is the responsibility of wise labor leaders. They can guide labor in ways that will put our common cause first. Those ways are the surest to preserve the rights of those they lead.

We can be thankful today for the National Youth Administration, for the Civilian Conservation Corps, for the fact that there have been leaders in our country who saw that democracy had to find ways of keeping open opportunity for youth, even in hardest times, if democracy was to survive. These leaders can now speak to youth for democracy. But it is the duty of all of us as citizens to speak to youth for democracy, and to keep open the opportunities of democracy for youth.

And what is our responsibility toward aliens? It is well to remember that we are a nation of aliens. If we remember this, we will know how to deal with those who represent the latest immigrations. We cannot have a united people if large alien groups are dissident, and they will be dissident if they feel any deep-rooted discriminations. Our problem is twofold. First, we must give these people democratic reasons to be proud of themselves in substitution for the Fascist reasons that have been given them by expert propagandists. And secondly, it is our duty to make it clear to all our citizens that this is a nation where race, color, creed, time of arrival or accident of birth does not circumscribe the possibilities open to each man. This must be implicit in our conduct, not merely in our talk.

There are enemy aliens. They must be dealt with. They must be dealt with surely and effectively, but it cannot be too often repeated that this is a professional job. The main job of our citizens is to refrain from making enemies of our aliens and to turn themselves to the task of making aliens devoted citizens of our democracy.

Strikes

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope to get time today later on to go in decent detail into some of the problems our country faces, as it goes forward to protect freedom and democracy against a whipsaw of Fascist forces on the one hand and Communist ones on the other. At the moment I rise to say one thing. When the National Defense Mediation Board was set up, I made a 1-minute speech and stated at that time that in my judgment the personnel of the Board was so evidently fair and contained such fine representation from labor that it was the duty of every group, capital and labor, to cooperate with this Board to the greatest possible extent. The one movement in this country in which I am probably most deeply interested is the labor movement The first step of every dictator has been the destruction of the organizations of the people, and labor has gone first. My basic desire is to really protect the labor movement. And in so doing I have got to speak out against some utterly irresponsible tactics which, if persisted in, will react against the whole movement, fine as it is. When I read in the newspaper that the president, Mr. Orton, of the International Woodworkers, refuses the proposition offered by the Mediation Board, which grants a wage increase of part of what the union asks, continuing negotiations, and retroactive payment of wages if they may be increased as a result of the negotiations, and then charges the Board with being "an all-out, labor-busting and strike-breaking device * * * to bulldoze our workers" it seems to me that we have evidence there of a kind of leadership that will never do labor in this country any good, that is not directed toward the welfare of the United States, but which in my judgment is directed from some other source in this world. I could submit evidence of some of Orton's organizational connections but his own actions speak louder than that. True labor leadership today will seek three objectives above all others: the wage standards of the men and the recognition of their organizations; the avoidance, like the plague, of any action that will put labor in a position where it will lose public support at a time when it needs it so much; and, finally, the welfare of the United States. Ninety-five percent, at least, of union members and leaders ask these things. A few like the men above referred to are just simply on the other side from the real interest of American labor.

Air Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM PERTH AMBOY EVENING NEWS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial taken from the June 2 issue of the Perth Amboy Evening News which comments on the need for a separate air department.

I agree with the opinion expressed in the editorial, and hope we shall set up a separate air force department now, and not wait until we are in the middle of a fight to discover the need for this new branch of government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Perth Amboy (N. J.) Evening News of June 2, 1941]

AIR DEPARTMENT

Any doubt as to the importance of a formidable air force has been removed as a result of the record made by airplanes in this war. Britannia for years ruled the waves but Germany today rules the skies and it is being proven that control of the air is now more valuable in carrying on a mechanized war than control of the oceans.

The long-distance bomber, capable of flying thousands of miles nonstop with several tons of bombs, has proven its value as a weapon of both attack and defense. It is essential to the United States, and as bigger and better bombers are built so will the United States be brought closer to those countries which are now separated from us by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

At the present time both the Army and the Navy have their own Air Corps. Recommendations have been heard from time to time for several years that the United States divorce its air forces from the Army and Navy and make it a separate department in order that efficiency might be increased.

There are the "die hards" in the Navy who, despite what has happened and is happening in Europe today to prove conclusively the advantages airplanes have over warships, still maintain that it is better to spend $100,000,000 for a battleship which can be sunk like the *Hood* from the air with a loss of 1,200 or more lives than it is to build 200 or more bombers capable of carrying tons of explosives and only comparatively small crews.

The British Navy has not been responsible for preventing the invasion of the British Isles. Neither have the antiaircraft guns nor the large army encamped on the islands. Again it has been the airplane, the Royal Air Force, which has filled the gap and despite the difference in numbers of planes has succeeded in battling and holding off the air invaders.

Crete was invaded via the air and other countries have found themselves fighting a losing battle because troops, guns, tanks, and other war materials were dropped from the skies. American airplane production has reached a new peak but many of the planes now turned out are being used to bolster up Britain's air strength.

The day of the airplane has arrived and a Nation's power will be directly proportionate to its air power, both in numbers, distance, performance, and striking power. There is still some use for the battle fleets but there are many places, too close to land, where they cannot operate without being the targets for air bombs dropped either by dive bombers or other high-flying types.

With our air force becoming so important it seems that it should come under the direction of a department which specializes in that particular branch of the service instead of splitting it up between the Army and Navy as is done at present.

This war and future wars will be won via the air. The nation that is to come out the eventual winner will be the one that loses no time in making the most of its chances to improve, develop, and enlarge its bombing planes, fighters, and the other types which are essential in war today.

Convoying

REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have received, under date of May 27, a letter addressed to me by Kenneth Ogle, chairman of the Indiana Committee for National Defense, which committee is affiliated with the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. With his letter he enclosed a resolution of the Marion County Central Labor Union, which includes the city of Indianapolis, Ind., in favor of convoying. According to Mr. Ogle, this resolution was adopted with only one dissenting vote, the action being taken by the delegates. He expresses to me a desire that this matter be given the same publicity as was accorded a straw ballot on the question of convoying and entering the war, which was conducted by the Indianapolis News, and which was called to the attention of the House by me.

Therefore, while I have declared myself as personally opposed to convoying, I want, in the interest of fairness and in this manner, to present to the Congress and the country the sentiments of the Marion County Central Labor Union, as expressed in the following resolution adopted by its delegates:

Whereas the Nazis prior to actual war engage in intrigue, both economic and political, of every description as previously exemplified in Europe and currently in every country in South and North America with the possible exception of Canada, but including the United States, and

Whereas if Hitler wins over Britain his economic attack will continue successfully since he will have South America and much of North America at his mercy through control of their more important markets, and

Whereas under these circumstances, most of these countries would be forced to adhere to his doctrine—in other words become Nazis, and

Whereas the United States cannot afford to be surrounded by Nazi nations in this Hemisphere, and

Whereas the only way in which this can be prevented is to bring about the complete defeat of Germany, and in this undertaking the least we can do is to deliver the goods to Britain now: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Central Labor Union urges all citizens, including especially those of industrial America in organized labor and management, join in saying to the President, we support:

(1) Full mobilization of the industrial, economic, and moral life of this country for production of war materials, and

(2) Use of American naval forces for police, convoy, or in whatever way is most effective to insure the delivery of these materials to Britain, and

It is further our belief that in these times of stress and national peril it is absolutely essential for the defense and safety of this country that public opinion unite behind the duly constituted government of this country.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY SGT. ALVIN C. YORK

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Sgt. Alvin C. York at Arlington on May 30, 1941:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of which I am very proud to be a member, have kindly invited me to address you today. They could have chosen many far better speakers. There is a famous trans-Atlantic aviator, for one, and a United States Senator whose favorite bird must be the ostrich. They would have been glad to come here, but I was invited instead.

Maybe the veterans felt I knew this Unknown Soldier a little better than either of them.

You see, but for the grace of Almighty God, in this consecrated tomb might be the mortal remains of one whose name is Alvin C. York. Both the aviator and the Senator were denied that privilege, which possibly explains why they feel differently than the veterans do about this country's most pressing problems. Liberty is not merely something the veterans inherited. Liberty is something they fought to keep.

There is a line in Scripture which says that if a man doth die, his spirit shall nevertheless live on. How true that is, you here today have seen with your very own eyes, for the spirit of this soldier lives on in the heart of every real American.

There are those in our country today who ask me and the other veterans who fought in World War No. 1: "You fought to make the world safe for democracy. What did it get you?"

Let me answer them now. It got me 23 years of living in an America where a humble citizen from the mountains of Tennessee can participate in the same ceremonies with the President of the United States. It got me 23 years of living in a country where the Goddess of Liberty is stamped on men's hearts, as well as the coins in their pockets.

People who ask us that question—"What did it get you?"—forget one thing. Yes; we fought that last war to make the world safe for democracy, and we did—for a while. The thing they forget is that liberty and freedom and democracy are so very precious that you do not fight to win them once—and then stop. Liberty and freedom and democracy are prizes awarded only to those peoples who fight to win them, and then keep fighting eternally to hold them.

By our victory in the last war, we won a lease on liberty, not a deed to it. Now, after 23 years, Adolf Hitler tells us that lease is expiring, and after the manner of all leases, we have the privilege of renewing it, or letting it go by default. I have no doubt that the American people choose to renew it, Senator WHEELER to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Senator ought to know by now that you can't protect yourself against bullets with an umbrella.

Isolationism is not a new idea. If it were, it might be worth trying, if only because every new idea deserves a chance. Those here who defend isolation as our policy must have remarkably short memories. They must have already forgotten the awful sight of small European countries dying like so many little children stricken with a new and terrible plague.

France let Germany into the Rhineland because there was a large group of isolationists in the French Government. They weren't afraid, because they were protected by the Maginot line, beyond which no invader could possibly advance. They forgot that there are more doors to every house—even every house of cards—than the front one.

Before the people of England were fortunate enough to get as their leader that great statesman and lover of the democratic process, Winston Churchill, England also had a large isolationist group who were content to let Germany devour Europe. They were content if only Germany would promise to stay on the other side of the Channel. I hope the day will never come when our Capital is renamed—Munich, D. C.

At the beginning of this year our Congress passed, after a series of debates which displayed the democratic process in fullest flower, a bill known as the lend-lease bill. It gave our President the right to sell, lend, lease, or otherwise dispose of any war materials—and here I quote—to any country whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States. It made this country what it should rightly be, an arsenal for democracy.

But Hitler is not going to be defeated by any guns, or tanks, or planes that lie gathering rust at the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean.

Congress agreed, when it passed that law, that an English victory was vital to the defense of the United States. It has become no less vital to us since those stormy hours. And yet I hear the same voices who opposed that bill now opposing the use of convoys.

We must give all-out aid to England, and we must give it now. If that means that we have to use convoys, then we should use them. The time is not now ripe, nor will it ever be, to compromise with Hitler, or the things he stands for.

If we do not protect our shipments of foods and munitions, there is some question as to whether or not England can long hold out. And if England falls, we are next on Hitler's list. Make no mistake about that.

For that selfish reason, if for no other, it is our business to see that Hitler and his assassination of those rights that together constitute the American way of life is stopped, and stopped now.

The Atlantic Ocean, our appeasers say, is wide and affords us protection from foreign invasion. That is true—so long as England rules the waves. But if she fails, and barbaric Germany should be triumphant, the only part of the Atlantic Ocean that would be safe for America would be that part which daily laps our shores, and is protected by powerful coast artillery units.

If Hitler wins in Europe, we Americans will find ourselves surrounded by hostile nations who will not, even if we so choose, let us keep to ourselves. The evil combination of Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan will then operate against us even more openly than it does now. I may be wrong, but I doubt that the American I am now looking at, or the American 3,000 miles from here, or at any point in between, is a man from whose shoulder you can continually knock chips without having him decide to fight.

If I am wrong, and he is that kind of a man, then let us stop making guns, and let us surrender to Hitler right now, while we can still do so on our own terms.

But if he is that kind of a man, then Americans have changed. The boy whose remains are in this Unknown Soldier's grave wouldn't recognize that kind of an American. England is fighting for her very life—for the right of

her people to be free. We have always fought for that right. If we have stopped, then we owe the memory of George Washington an apology, for if we have stopped, then he wasted his time at Valley Forge.

We are standing at a crossroads in history. The important capitals of the world in a few years will either be Berlin and Moscow, or Washington and London. I, for one, prefer Congress and Parliament to Hitler's Reichstag and Stalin's Kremlin. And because we were, for a time, side by side, I know this Unknown Soldier does, too.

We owe it to him to renew that lease on liberty he helped us to get.

May God help us to be equal to the task.

Proximity of United States to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

EDITORIAL BY STANTON HUDSON

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorial comment appearing in the Sedalia (Mo.) Times, of May 30, 1941, written by Mr. Stanton Hudson, who was a very distinguished and gallant soldier during the last war, on the subject of the general proximity of the United States to war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sedalia (Mo.) Times of May 30, 1941]

MY COL'M

(By Stanton Hudson)

Of course, I'm as concerned as you are about the situation as regards war, but the biggest problem facing us right here in Sedalia right at this moment is our need for a right smart shower. The Nazis may get us later, but the immediate threat is from our potato bugs. Like the Nazis, they have their allies, too. They have the cutworms helping them, just like Hitler has Mussolini. And then over on my beans there are some unidentified "fifth columnists" who are doing their bit, too.

In spite of the President's pronouncement the other night of "unlimited emergency," whatever that may mean, I still stand on my original premise that we have no business whatever in this present war. We found out, and generally agreed after the World War, that we had no business in it, either. I only hope that we find out about this war before we get in it—not afterward, as was the case 25 years ago.

Though the President termed those who want to stay out of this war "timid," this is a very inappropriate appellation. Senator BENNETT C. CLARK served with the A. E. F. 23 years ago. To now call him timid sounds rather foolish. He has spent the years since the A. E. F. examining the causes and reasons for war, and has come to the inescapable conclusion that there is no justification for our entry into the present war. I rely on his judgment, which I believe to be as sound, and probably sounder, on the subject of war as any now being voiced.

The "timid" class includes me, too, I guess, because I don't want any truck with this war, or any other. Really, I don't think I'm so awfully timid. If I was, I wouldn't have volunteered in the last war to "Make the world safe, etc.," the same day war was declared. Naw, I ain't timid, I've just had experience.

And I'm not pro-German, or pro-Hitler, nor an Anglophobe, nor nothin'. I just don't like war, having seen its utter barbarianism, waste of life and limb and property, and senseless uselessness. I don't care anything about the Germans one way or the other, and feel exactly the same way about the English—which is exactly the way they all feel about us. I care only about my own country and my fellow Americans. I care so much about them that I don't want to see any more of them killed helping any foreign power that secretly thinks of us as chumps, after it's all over.

Because of an astounding increase in size since my discharge from the Army I wouldn't be considered very choice cannon fodder now, but I am willing to again offer myself in the defense of my country any time it is threatened by a foreign power. But this time I've got to know.

The Taking of Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

EXTRACT FROM ARTICLE BY HELEN ESSARY

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to present a request for unanimous consent for inclusion of a matter in the RECORD.

One of the most startling features of the new propaganda machine in this country has been the employment of so-called polls for the purpose of influencing and speeding up the entrance of the United States into war. On yesterday in the Washington Times-Herald there appeared an article written by Mrs. Helen Essary, herself a very distinguished newspaper writer in this city, and wife of one of the most distinguished men who has sat in the press gallery of the United States Senate during my time, in which she tells of her own knowledge of the methods employed as to surveys by some of the so-called polls.

I am not authorized to speak officially, but I understand she refers to the Gallup poll, and she says the poll taker was referred to particular citizens, especially those connected with the W. P. A. and relief. I ask unanimous consent that that portion of Mrs. Essary's article appearing in yesterday's Washington Times-Herald which refers to her information as to the method of taking polls, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 4, 1941]

(By Helen Essary)

The authentic and startling glimpse I got recently into the methods of forming public opinion by polltaking gives me some concern. Not only had I never met a polltaker before, I had never met anybody who had ever been asked a question by a public-opinion polltaker. Nor had I ever met anybody who knew anybody who had ever been asked a question by a public-opinion polltaker.

Naturally, talking to a polltaker in the living flesh, whose name must be anonymous, was a big experience. I was curious.

"How do you choose the people to question?" I asked. "I assume that you pick at random in order to get a typical group."

"Oh, no," the polltaker answered. "I am given the names of 15 people whom I must go to see."

"What sort of people?"

"P. W. A. workers and people on relief."

"Well, aren't they likely to be prejudiced in favor of the administration?" I asked.

"Possibly. But I do what I'm told. I've just finished a questionnaire on convoys."

"Did most of your people know what convoys meant?"

"Very few of them did. So I had to tell them."

"Now, this is, indeed, interesting," I continued. "How did you describe a convoy?"

"I merely said that convoys are ships going in pairs. One ship going with another."

"Did you explain that one of such ships is a warship with guns to be shot when necessary? And that shooting such guns is an act of war and will put this country and its people in great danger?"

"No, indeed," was the calm answer. "I didn't go into that. I didn't think they'd understand."

Well, there are you. Of sure stuff are opinion polls made. Hardly a serious, honest reflection of what people think.

The Kingsbury Ordnance Plant—A Tribute to Army Engineer Maj. Benjamin T. Rogers, Bates & Rogers Construction Corporation, and Charles Cole & Son

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. SCHULTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives, I rise on the floor of the House this afternoon to speak about the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant, sometimes referred to as the Union Center Shell Loading Plant, and to pay tribute to a remarkable organization, the Army engineers, and to several men in particular.

The first one that I wish to talk about is Maj. Benjamin T. Rogers in charge of the construction of this huge project, a man of exceptionally outstanding abilities and unusually fine temperament. Major Rogers was sent out on this project when it was first brought into being and into a bare wilderness of some 13,000 acres of land, with farm houses dotted

throughout the 13,000 acres, and including a cemetery, railroad depots, ditches, and boggy lands. Immediately upon his arrival it was evident that his leadership and his ability to bring peace out of chaos was shown.

As we all know, the contract was let to Bates & Rogers, a firm coming from the West that had been engaged in a great amount of railroad construction and other works of that nature. This firm was soon to be joined by Charles Cole & Son, of South Bend, Ind. Mr. Cole's architectural engineering ability is known to almost everyone throughout the entire Middle West. Any number of cities will attest to his unique ideas. Many buildings, bridges, and plants stand today as a monument to this architect-engineer.

These three that I have mentioned, Maj. Benjamin T. Rogers, of the Army Engineering Corps; Bates & Rogers Construction Corporation; and Charles Cole & Son, architect-engineer, make up one of the greatest combinations that I know of. I am mighty proud to say that the Kingsbury ordnance plant stands today about 80 percent completed, ready to ship shells within the next week or so, because of the outstanding teamwork that has been displayed by them. It has been my pleasure to visit the plant several times, and I know of no Government construction that has been carried out by the Federal Government in the United States that has gone on more smoothly and with practically no labor trouble than has the Kingsbury plant because of the guiding influence of this organization. I hope that should the Government have any other projects of like nature to be built in the very near future, that because of the serious situation this Nation finds itself in, that our Government will see fit to take advantage of this remarkable trio. and because of their experience and ability to do things in a big way, they will place them in charge, and I defy any Member of Congress to show me any project that will cost from one million to one hundred million dollars that has been more successfully constructed with less waste of money than has this one.

For the benefit of some of the Members I want to say that in accordance with Public, No. 309, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 7, 1939, and Public, No. 703, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, a contract was let to Giffels, Vallet, Inc., Detroit, Mich., and Charles W. Cole & Son, South Bend, Ind., as architect-engineers for the construction of a shell-loading plant, including necessary buildings, utilities, and appurtenances, on a 13,000-acre tract of land situated between the New York Central and St. Louis Railroads and the Kankakee River on the east, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad on the south, United States Route No. 35 on the west, the Wabash Railroad on the north, and the Grand Trunk Railroad on the northwest, said tract of land being approximately 7 miles from La Porte, Ind., to the south. By virtue of the same act of Congress, a contract was let to the Bates & Rogers Construction Corporation, Chicago, Ill., on October 30, 1940, as contractors for the building of the project. On November 7, 1940, a contract was let to Todd & Brown, Inc., New York, N. Y., as design consultants and operators of the Kingsbury ordnance plant.

Four administration buildings were all occupied by December 26, 1940, and the job of constructing permanent buildings, railroads, roads, loading lines, and miscellaneous buildings was begun in earnest. As originally planned, the daily output of this plant is to be 40,000 fixed rounds of 20 mm.; 50,000 fixed rounds of 37 mm.; 40,000 fixed rounds of 75 mm., or 90 mm., or 105 mm.; 40,000 fixed rounds of 60 mm. trench mortar, with corresponding fuzes and boosters for the above. One hundred and thirty-five storage buildings had to be constructed with the following operating buildings: Five load lines, 2 fuze lines, 2 booster lines, 1 ammonia nitrate-amatol plant, administration buildings and shops, fire-department buildings and equipment, staff dwellings, mess halls, hospitals, guards' quarters, and so forth. Operating utilities as follows. Water, electricity, air, steam, and sewer lines, gatehouse and fencing, railroads—35 miles, later changed to 65 miles—roads, and walks. By May 1, 1941, 100,000 square feet of storage space will be available for occupancy, increasing proportionately thereafter until the total of 1,016,750 square feet have been constructed.

The original estimate of the cost of the project, including the purchase of land, was set at $13,340,000, which also included the contractor's fee. Notice to proceed was given November 4, 1940, and ground was broken for the temporary administration buildings on Armistice Day, November 11, 1940, prior to which time the architect-engineers had been making their preliminary surveys for about 2 weeks. Inasmuch as the project was somewhat new and different in design from any other arsenal, Vandykes were procured from the Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J., and had to be redesigned so they could be adapted to the needs of this plant. At the present writing there are 115 approved plans for buildings on this project with a possible 200 more to follow. With an increase in the number of buildings, miles of road, miles of railroad, and additional utilities, it is now estimated that the project will cost $23,000,000. The project is right up to schedule, being about 35 percent complete, with final completion date scheduled for November 1, 1941.

The construction of the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant is under the supervision of the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, represented by the constructing quartermaster, who is assisted by the architect-engineer firm of Giffels, Vallet & Cole, and the constructing contractor, Bates & Rogers Construction Corporation, all joined together to construct and equip a plant to be operated by the firm of Todd & Brown, Inc., under the supervision of the Ordnance Department, United States Army, represented by the commanding officer, Major Rogers. The constructing quartermaster's function is to insure construction of a plant in accordance with plans and specifications promulgated by the architect-engineer in conjunction with the design consultant, Todd & Brown, Inc., all the while coordinating the various operations to conformance with existing standard War Department construction specifications. The constructing quartermaster serves as coordinator of the activities of all agencies participating in construction of the plant.

The firm of Bates & Rogers Construction Corporation is well manned and well equipped for carrying out the various construction operations necessary for speedy completion of the plant. Every opportunity has been taken to mechanize the construction operation, some of the special features being two central concrete-mixing plants with a combined total of 2,000 cubic yards of concrete per day, which is delivered to the construction sites by a fleet of about 30 transit mixer trucks. A two-way radio communication system enables the constructing quartermaster, the works manager, and the various superintendents of Bates & Rogers, and various other officials to transmit and receive orders immediately. Included among the construction equipment are 38 caterpillar tractors, 16 LeTourneau carry-alls, 4 LeTourneau rooters, 7 motor patrols, 20 LeTourneau bulldozers, 1 Baker hydraulic, and 8 road rollers. Thirty large cranes are also in use. It is estimated that between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 cubic yards of dirt will have been moved upon completion of the project.

In its inception the operation as a whole was designed as nearly as possible along the lines of a large-scale military operation and every effort was made to safeguard the interests of the United States in the purchase of supplies and equipment; for example, although each of the three contractors was authorized to purchase his own supplies and equipment, all purchases were concentrated in one purchasing agency with the exception that on those items covered by Treasury Department contracts, which were required in quantity and which could be purchased at substantial savings to the Government, these purchases were made direct by the constructing quartermaster. On such items as office furniture and machines and automobile tires and equipment substantial savings have been affected.

This office has been on the alert to cooperate with similar activities in the United States and have transferred large quantities of automotive and other equipment into this organization that were on the verge of being released to vendors after substantial rentals were paid by other War Department construction activities. We, in turn, have released a quantity of concrete forms from this project, at no cost, to two other projects, and will be able to release additional equipment as the work nears completion. The constructing contractor, who is the central purchasing agency for the five organizations, joined together on the project, conducts his purchasing activities in full accordance with all Government rules and regulations governing purchases. Even on minor items he is organized to the extent that competitive bids are received and awards made to the concerns serving the best interests of the United States.

Labor relations on this project have been particularly gratifying. Due to the

peculiar geographic location of this project in relation to nearby large employment centers and also the fact that the prevailing wage rate as determined by the Department of Labor was lower than the prevailing rates for similar classifications in the larger employment centers immediately adjacent to the project, a certain amount of readjustment was to be expected and was made without any disruption of construction operations. Local labor has been employed extensively. For example, of the approximately 83 civilian employees in the constructing quartermaster's office, 56 are residents of the immediate area. The architect-engineer employs approximately 325 people; the construction contractor, approximately 3,700; and it has been determined that larger percentages of local employment prevail in these organizations. Of the 3,700 employees of the constructing contractor, a canvass reveals that over 70 percent were from La Porte County, in which the plant is located. And there, my friends, is the story of Kingsbury, a tribute to the trio.

Antiwar Sentiment Unchanged by President's Fireside Chat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Times-Herald by Mr. Griffing Bancroft, showing that mail to Members of Congress shows that the majority of people in America remain opposed to convoys and war. The article follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

(By Griffing Bancroft)

President Roosevelt's fireside chat and his declaration of a national emergency have not altered the antiwar sentiment, in mail to the Members of Congress, an International News Service poll showed today.

Following speeches April 24 by Secretary of State Hull and Secretary of Navy Knox—two addresses which touched off the intervention drive—representative groups in the House and Senate were polled as to what effect the drive was having on their mail.

MIDDLE WEST AGAINST WAR

The canvass showed the Middle West overwhelmingly noninterventionist, the South running about 50–50, and the far West and East going 2 to 1 and 4 to 1 against convoying.

Since that poll, important utterances have been made not only by President Roosevelt but by virtually every member of his Cabinet.

Today the same legislators were asked what effect these addresses and statements have had on their mail. By sections, here is a summary of replies:

In the Middle West, letter writers have become more overwhelmingly opposed to force, much more violent in demanding that their representatives do something about it, and generally opposed to the President's speech.

LITTLE CHANGE IN SOUTH

In the South there was little change, two districts showing interventionist gains, two veering the other way, and eight remaining the same. On the whole the South liked Mr. Roosevelt's address.

New England and the East stayed at about 4 to 1 against intervention, with little reaction to the speech, but in the far West interventionists showed slight gains, although sentiment was still against armed participation.

Here are typical results of the survey:

Middle West: Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS (Republican), of Indiana—Mail is almost altogether opposed to intervention and stronger and more vocal. Not a single letter favoring the President's speech. Representative STEPHEN BOLLES (Republican), of Wisconsin—No shift; still 80 to 1 against convoys and unanimous against war, although a little more anxious about it now. Representative ROBERT F. JONES (Republican), of Ohio—Writers much more disturbed and violent now, fearing free speech may be done away with. Representative RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ (Democrat), of Michigan—Before had a few favoring convoys; now all are against.

South: Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER (Democrat), of Louisiana—A month ago 15 letters a day, mostly favoring convoys; now 3 a day, about 50–50. Representative PAUL J. KILDAY (Democrat), of Texas—Less mail now; still 50–50. Representative JOHN J. SPARKMAN (Democrat), of Alabama—Still almost unanimous favoring convoys. Representative J. PERCY PRIEST (Democrat), of Tennessee—Complete returns on 2,000 questionnaires sent into his district shows 92 percent favoring convoys.

New England: Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER (Republican) of Maine—Percentage for convoys up a little, but still mostly against. Representative FOSTER STEARNS (Republican) of New Hampshire—Still about 50–50. Representative GEORGE J. BATES (Republican) of Massachusetts—Still about 4 to 1 against convoys, with noninterventionists up a little.

East: Representative WILLIAM P. COLE (Democrat) of Maryland—Was 4 to 1 against convoys, now 3 to 1. Representative D. LANE POWERS (Republican) of New Jersey—From 50–50 to 70–30 against intervention, but most favored the emergency declaration. Representative SOL BLOOM (Democrat) of New York—Little heavier against convoy now, but still about 50–50, received 150 postcards in 1 day opposing war; 12 letters favoring speech, none against.

Far West: Senator HIRAM JOHNSON (Republican) of California—Virtually no mail now on convoy while it was 25 to 1 against, about 50–50 on speech. Representative JERRY VOORHIS (Democrat) of California—No change, still mostly against but reaction to speech favorable. Representative WESLEY E. DISNEY (Democrat) of Oklahoma—Still very heavy, about 4 to 1 against convoy, virtually none on speech.

Aid for the Middle-Aged Mechanic

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in New York which is largely populated by mechanics. They are family men who have spent years at their trades. I find that when they apply for positions at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, or other governmental departments, they invariably receive a rating of 70 percent from the Civil Service Commission, which is the lowest passing mark. The reason for this low rating is to be found in the fact that in recent years they have been unable to follow their trades, either through lack of employment or because they were working outside their trades on W. P. A. projects, and are assumed to have lost their skill. I assume that other Representatives have found a similar situation in their districts. Unless something is done for these middle-aged mechanics of our country, they can have little or no hope of again getting back into industry. I believe if freshening-up courses were made available to these men in our trade and vocational schools many hundreds of mechanics would be made available for defense work. To that end, I have introduced a bill (H. R. 4958) authorizing the appropriation of $10,000,000 for that purpose, to be expended under the direction of the United States Commissioner of Education.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1941.

Hon. FIORELLO H. LAGUARDIA,
Mayor of the City of New York,
City Hall, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. MAYOR: I wish to call your attention to a situation in which, I believe, your assistance would be invaluable. Representing, as I do, a district whose residents are mostly mechanics, I find that hundreds of them have filed applications for employment with the various Government agencies, especially at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and Army Base. Although they have spent years at their trades, they invariably receive a rating of 70 percent, which is the lowest passing mark. I am advised that the reason for the low rating is because in recent years they have been out of employment or not working at their trades on W. P. A. It appears that long unemployment or employment at other than their trades automatically brings their rating down.

Might I suggest that freshening-up classes in the vocational schools and trade schools be made available to these men so that they might brush up on their trades, enabling them to secure employment at their trades and get off W. P. A. or the relief rolls? These men have not the funds with which to pay tuition in private trade schools, and unless some such opportunity such as I have suggested is afforded them I fear the New York mechanic of middle age will not again be able to get back into private industry.

If Federal funds are necessary to establish or to aid such classes, I would be pleased to bend every effort to obtain such allocation.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER A. LYNCH,
Member of Congress.

[From the Home News, Bronx, N. Y.]

TRADE SCHOOLS PAY DIVIDENDS

Even before the mobilization of industry for national defense provided new impetus, the movement for vocational education had made considerable progress in the New York City school system and numerous educators endorsed the argument that in this mechanized era, mastery of a trade is a prime requisite for the youth embarking on the task of earning his own living.

This year's graduating classes in the city's vocational high schools are reaping substantial benefits from the nature of their training, and they provide fresh evidence of the foresight of the pioneers who overcame stiff opposition in academic circles and effected a great expansion in vocational education.

Morris E. Siegel, director of the Board of Education's division of evening and continuation schools, reported recently that hundreds of seniors in the 24 vocational schools have been offered jobs, and he predicted that by graduation time, at the end of June, 70 percent of the 3,500 students in this category will have employment. Further, he is willing to prophesy that every last one of the seniors will be working before October. The 566 enrolled in aviation mechanics (a record number) are all expected to find positions immediately upon graduation.

Not in the lushest days of 1929 prosperity could the academic institutions produce figures like this—and certainly not at present. The diploma between the lines of which are written proficiency in Latin and literature just cannot compete in job-getting power with the one granted for skill at the lathe and the internal-combustion engine; at woodworking or metalcraft.

This is not to say that cultural instruction is a delusion. It is anything but that. Dr. Ernest E. Cole, New York State commissioner of education, citing statistics to show that in 1911 fewer than 1,000 pupils were enrolled in trade and vocational courses in this State as against 300,000 today, said, nevertheless, that it would be calamitous to neglect cultural advancement. With this we thoroughly agree.

But now the national interests join with personal economic considerations to demand that the schools turn out abundant contingents of workers efficient at the machines on which at this moment the preservation of civilization depends in more acute degree than on the professions and white-collar pursuits whose personnel also must be provided by the schools and colleges.

It is true that the quick successes foreseen for the current New York City vocational graduates is not equivalent to a guaranty that any boy or girl who learns a trade is sure to get work at once. In fact, the State employment service says there is an oversupply of electrical and auto mechanics, and it has advised the board of education to discontinue defense-training courses in those subjects and to concentrate on machinists, many thousands of whom are needed at once.

On the whole, however, the balance today is sharply in favor of students with manual skill as against their purely academic colleagues—from the bread-and-butter standpoint.

National Youth Administration in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Youth Administration seeks to aid young people by (1) providing part-time employment for needy secondary-school, college, and graduate students from 16 through 24 years of age, so that they may continue their education; (2) providing part-time employment for needy, out-of-school youth on projects designed not only to afford productive work but to benefit youth generally and the communities in which they live; (3) extending job training and counseling services for N. Y. A. youth and the preparation and distribution of occupational information; and (4) promoting health and recreational activities for N. Y. A. out-of-school project workers.

A summary of current operations of the N. Y. A. programs in Kansas shows the job has been well done, and I am happy to report that many, many Kansas school officials have recently written to me urging that there be no reduction in the N. Y. A. appropriation for 1942.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report on current operations of the N. Y. A. programs in Kansas:

[Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration]

SUMMARY OF CURRENT OPERATIONS, NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS, STATE OF KANSAS

I. EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
All programs, total	15,163	8,198	6,965
Out-of-school work program, total	5,642	3,698	1,944
Student work program, total	9,521	4,500	5,021
School work program	6,765	3,078	3,687
College and graduate work program	2,756	1,422	1,334

II. FUNDS EXPENDED, 1936 THROUGH APR. 30, 1941

Fiscal year	Amount		
	Total	Student work program	Out-of-school work program
1936	$806,923	$515,117	$291,806
1937	1,609,576	742,285	867,291
1938	1,118,745	443,759	674,986
1939	1,429,120	455,355	973,765
1940	1,623,553	523,949	1,099,604
1941 (encumbrances through Apr. 30, 1941)	1,761,530	441,655	1,319,875
Total, all years	8,349,447	3,122,120	5,227,327

Out-of-school work program

III–A. EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF PROJECT, APRIL 1941

Type of project	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
Total	5,642	3,698	1,944
Resident projects	1,537	612	925
Workshop-production	786	464	322
Construction, total	2,455	2,455	----
Roads, streets, and bridges	507	507	----
Improvement of grounds	131	131	----
Building construction, repair	1,190	1,190	----
Recreational facilities other than buildings	553	553	----
Conservation, irrigation, and flood control	67	67	----
Water and sanitation	7	7	----
Professional-clerical, total	864	167	697
Clerical assistance	832	167	665
Library service	11	----	11
Nursery-school assistance	14	----	14
School lunch and food preparation	7	----	7

III–B. EMPLOYMENT ON WORKSHOP PRODUCTION PROJECTS, BY TYPE OF PRODUCTION, APRIL 1941

Type of production	Number of youth employed			Number of units
	Total	Male	Female	
Total	1,911	858	1,053	89
Sheet metal	112	112	----	7
Welding	46	46	----	4
Auto maintenance and repair	119	119	----	6
Aviation service	18	18	----	1
Machine shop	92	92	----	6
Radio	40	35	5	3
Woodworking	374	374	----	13
Drafting, map making, blueprinting	37	21	16	5
Sewing	1,051	19	1,032	39
Other production	22	22	----	5

III–C. EMPLOYMENT IN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS, APRIL 1941

Army:	
Number of youth employed	214
Number of establishments	3

III–D. TERMINATIONS FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT, JULY 1940 THROUGH APRIL 1941

	Number of youth
1940	
July	347
August	327
September	322
October	401
November	303
December	277
1941	
January	149
February	421
March	531
April	620
Total	3,698

III–E. PLACEMENTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, DECEMBER 1940 THROUGH MARCH 1941

	Number of youth
Private employment, total	1,378
Manufacturing industries, total	87
Food and kindred products, and tobacco	26
Textile and textile products	15
Lumber, furniture, and finished lumber products	1
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	1
Petroleum and coal products	2
Leather and leather products	2
Stone, clay, and glass products	1
Iron and steel and their products (excluding machinery)	6
Electrical machinery and equipment	2
Agricultural machinery and equipment	4
Metal working machinry and equipment	6
Other machinery and equipment	3
Aircraft and parts	15
Other manufacturing industries	3
Nonmanufacturing industries, total	746
Agriculture, forestry (excluding logging), and fishing	167
Mining, quarrying, and petroleum production	40
Construction	101
Air transportation and service	1
Railroads (interstate)	20
Other transportation and services	37
Telephone, telegraph, and related services	8
Electric, gas, and other local public utilities	1
Wholesale and retail trade	87
Finance, insurance, and real estate	4
Service industries (excluding domestic service)	154
Domestic service	87
Other nonmanufacturing industries	29
Unknown industry	545

III–F. CERTIFIED YOUTH AWAITING ASSIGNMENT, APRIL 1941

Total	4,907
Male	3,278
Female	1,629

III–G. VOCATIONAL BUILDINGS AND FARM SHOP CONSTRUCTION, JULY 1940 THROUGH FEB. 28, 1941

Type of work	Number of buildings		
	Total	Completed	In progress
New	8	2	6

IV. STUDENT WORK PROGRAM, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth			Number of institutions	Average earnings
	Total	Male	Female		
Total	9,521	4,500	5,021	[1] 732	$6.75
School	6,765	3,078	3,687	687	4.19
College	2,736	1,404	1,332	45	13.02
Graduate	20	18	2	2	17.70

[1] This total represents the number of institutions reported on line 2 plus the unduplicated number of colleges and universities for which entries appear on lines 3 and 4.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to cite a few cases to show the actual results of the N. Y. A. program.

William Stone, 21, was one of five children whose mother was forced to place them in a charitable institution for care upon the death of their father in 1929. Taking her youngest child, a 2-year-old girl, the mother went to another State to seek employment, and the family was not reunited until 1938.

In the meantime, young Stone carried papers during the years he attended high school, being graduated from a Wichita school in 1938. He was unable to find anything but an occasional odd job, and in the latter part of that year he received N. Y. A. employment. He has been employed on N. Y. A. projects over a period covering 2 years, although he has left whenever he has been able to secure private employment.

It was during the time he was receiving N. Y. A. training that he heard of an opening with a Wichita millwork company, and, following up his lead, he was subsequently hired at $16 a week. He has been working for the company as a machine operator—saws, drill press, and similar equipment—for more than a year.

An elder brother has recently secured employment with an aircraft factory. Their earnings, coupled with the money his eldest sister receives as a stenographer at the N. Y. A. project, enables the family to remain together.

Martin, Carl, and Simon Hein are the eldest sons of a former Reno County, Kans., farmer who lost his land, a quarter-section farm, in the hard times of the depression. All have received part-time employment at the Wichita N. Y. A. woodworking project, although all three have since obtained private employment with local companies.

Martin, 27, averages between $115 and $120 a month as a driver for a Wichita cab company; Carl, 25, receives 57½ cents an hour for a 40-hour week as gang foreman in the wing-flap section of an aircraft factory; and Simon, 23, works as a filling-station attendant for between $16 and $18 a week, depending upon whether he works overtime. None went beyond the eighth grade in school.

Their father had only odd jobs to sustain the 11-member family after moving to Wichita from Reno County, although he later received a W. P. A. job at approximately $62 a month. At that time he was the only breadwinner in the family, and he now is employed as a maintenance man for Sedgwick County, with a maximum salary of about $86 a month.

The three boys, Martin said, "just loafed around" until they heard about the N. Y. A. from other guys. Martin was the first to receive part-time employment in the woodworking project here. Later Carl and Simon were employed together on the same project. Most of their salary from the N. Y. A. went to aid the remainder of the family. Indeed, all are contributing part of their present salary to the family's upkeep, since they are living at home.

Martin's experience is typical. Running away from home some time ago, he obtained employment as an apprentice in a machine shop at Tulsa, Okla. But, after a time, he became homesick and returned to Wichita. He was out of work for 2 years before being employed at the N. Y. A. project. He was required to leave the project 2 years ago because of his age. Hearing of an opening with a taxicab company here from another youth on the project, he immediately applied and was accepted.

Martin expressed a desire to "set up" his own shop for cabinetmaking here in Wichita as a result of his experience on the woodworking project. However, he said the prospect of obtaining enough money to make the initial outlay to equip the shop with a band saw, lathe, and other woodworking tools appeared almost hopeless.

He said he was not content with his present employment, but that he did not want to change jobs "and get something that won't be steady." He said employment as a carpenter in an aircraft factory did not appear permanent enough to warrant a change.

Simon, who is employed as a filling-station attendant, said his employer had given him assurance that his job would be permanent. He is blind in his left eye, the result of a childhood accident. Another accident last year in which he fractured an arm at the elbow has been giving trouble, and he has been paying for medical attention beside contributing to the family finances. Simon quit the N. Y. A. project here last month to take his present job.

When asked whether he believed his work on the N. Y. A. project had benefited him in any way, Martin said:

Well, we all want to go into woodworking, but Carl is the only one whose training is doing him any good. But it did keep me and my brothers off the street and out of jail.

Harold and Melvin Sample, aged 19 and 24, respectively, are permanently employed by Wichita firms. Harold, who had been receiving work experience with the Wichita N. Y. A. out-of-school program, is working for a local contractor as a carpenter; Melvin who began the training program, left after working through only one pay period and is employed as a bus boy in a grill here.

Harold became interested in the woodworking project through his father, a carpenter. The scarcity of work in that field during the winter months did not deter the youth, although he had seen that his father's wages had averaged between $400 and $600 a year since the depression.

Both he and his father are employed by the same contractor at the present time, and assurance has been made that enough work will be obtained to keep them steadily at their jobs for at least a year. Harold has been working for 2 months at 35 cents an hour. He said he expected to be raised to 40 cents an hour within the next 2 weeks.

He was graduated from high school in 1935. Out of work for almost a year, he received employment at the woodworking project. He left the N. Y. A. project several times during the 2 years covered by employment here to take private jobs, none of which were steady. In June 1940, he quit to take a job in an Oregon box factory. The work was seasonal, however, and after a series of odd jobs he was hired by his present employer.

The N. Y. A. has taught me a good trade—

He said—

and it really has helped me. I think it's a good thing for a fellow to learn a trade. He may get sidetracked, but it always gives him something to fall back on.

Melvin was graduated from high school in 1940, a year ago. He was unable to find anything but odd jobs, and finally, on his brother's insistence, applied for an N. Y. A. job. He quit soon after with this explanation:

I thought I was licked when I couldn't find a decent job after leaving high school, and taking an N. Y. A. job seemed like going on relief. When I got that first pay check and had a little money in my pocket, I had confidence enough to start looking for another job. Of course, $10 a week and board isn't much, but it helps the folks. And I don't intend to be making only $10 a week the rest of my life.

Nadine Sharon, 22, a former N. Y. A. youth, is now employed as a power-machine operator for a Wichita tent and awning company which has begun work on a Government contract to manufacture pup tents for Army use. Unable to finish high school, Miss Sharon, after working at odd jobs, applied for part-time employment with the N. Y. A. to supplement the income of her father, a salesman for a tea company in Wichita, whose $22-a-week salary went to the support of a family of six persons.

At the present time Miss Sharon is receiving $20 a week, plus bonus. Her brother, also a former N. Y. A. youth, is employed by a lithographing company.

I appreciated my N. Y. A. job so much—

She Said—

It kept me from feeling that I was a dead weight on the family.

Gene Stewart, a 20-year-old Fredonia, Kans., youth, entered the radio unit of the Topeka N. Y. A. resident mechanical center last October. He had been interested in radio throughout his high-school career, but no facilities for training this vocation were offered. His knowledge of radio previous to entrance at the N. Y. A. training center had been gained through reading technical journals and books on radio.

Two weeks ago the chief engineer of radio station WIBW, Topeka, the Capper Publications, sought out Allan Barstow, radio engineer at the N. Y. A. unit and requested that he recommend a youth whose record at the N. Y. A. training center indicated a high degree of capability.

Stewart was recommended for the job and at the present time is an engineer at W. I. B. W. His beginning salary, Barstow said, could be placed somewhere

between $18 and $25 a week. From all appearances, he added, the position is permanent. Stewart had received a technician's license, issued by the F. C. C., after entering the N. Y. A. radio unit.

The N. Y. A. radio unit at Topeka is the only one of its kind in the State of Kansas. It was started in October 1940. However, the unit already has a high percentage of placements, even after so short a time. In addition to the placement of Stewart with W. I. B. W., Barstow reported that another youth had received a civil-service position as an operator for the border patrol; another has received employment as an apprentice electrician with a Topeka firm; two youths are in the Army's signal division (both, it is believed, are in Federal service at Camp Robinson, Ark.); and three or four others are planning to enter the Army this summer, intending to make a career of Army radio work.

The potentialities of N. Y. A. training in radio work and other trades in fitting youth to take a place in the national-defense program need hardly be stressed.

Fifteen of the 40 youths at the radio unit at Topeka already have received their amateur operator's license, with other applications now pending approval by the F. C. C.

Union Now Idea Old Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

ARTICLE BY JOHN B. TREVOR, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN COALITION

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a discussion of Union Now, by Mr. John B. Trevor, President of the American Coalition, which appeared in a recent issue of The New Republic.

UNION NOW?

(By John B. Trevor, president, American Coalition)

In the deluge of propaganda which is now submerging the American people, patriotic citizens should give some attention to an effort by internationalists to arouse public sentiment in behalf of a merger of the United States into the British commonwealth of nations. There is, of course, nothing really new about this plan. It is a plan which goes back to the days and dreams of Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie. Union Now in its modern dress is based on a book so entitled, of which the author is Clarence K. Streit, a former League of Nations' correspondent for the New York Times.

Mr. Streit's original conception was broader than now appears to be the scope of his plan. He originally contemplated a union of fifteen democracies; that is to say, the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom (of England, Scotland, and Wales), France, Ireland, Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa. On the basis of one representative for each million of inhabitants, the union congress would have been apportioned as follows:

Australia	7
Belgium	8
Canada	11
Denmark	4
Finland	4
France	42
Ireland	3
Netherlands	8
New Zealand	2
Norway	3
Sweden	6
Switzerland	2
Union of South Africa	7
United Kingdom	45
United States	124
Total	277

With the collapse of virtually every vestige of democracy on the continent of Europe, Mr. Streit has modified his plan to include now only the English-speaking nations, and he has reconstituted his proposed parliament by giving a vote to one out of every five million inhabitants of the constituent countries of the proposed union. Under this plan the United States would have 27 representatives, the United Kingdom 11, Canada 3, Australia 3, and Eire, Union of South Africa, and New Zealand 2 each, as set forth in a leaflet issued by the Federal Union, Inc. On the face of it, there is a bait offered to the American people in an apparent control of the union congress through its 27 representatives, as against 23 elected by Britain and the various constituent members of her commonwealth of nations.

There is a good deal of fog in Mr. Streit's new plan regarding the exact status of the 380,000,000 British subjects who would not have the franchise, should the United States and Britain with her dependencies consummate a union. When this question was put to Mr. Streit in the course of a recent debate, he evaded a direct answer. It appears safe to say that these 380,000,000 out of 495,000,000 British subjects would be definitely subjects, rather than citizens of the new commonwealth. Of course, such an arrangement negatives the fundamental basis of Mr. Streit's proposed declaration of interdependence, which says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal," etc. If that statement be true, these 380,000,000 people should be given a vote to elect representatives who would determine their destinies.

In his book, Mr. Streit frankly says: "Whatever we may wish, we must recognize that India's politically inexperienced millions cannot at first be included in this union on the same population basis as the western democracies. * * * It would seem now practically necessary to distinguish in the union territory between the parts that are already fully self-governing and those that are not, and restrict the right to vote in the union elections and to hold elective union office to those born or naturalized citizens of the former" (p. 140).

If that is not a confession that the British Empire, as it is now constituted, is not a democracy and the plan of the proposed union undemocratic, it is impossible to find words to properly characterize it. In other words, the paraphrase of our immortal Declaration of Independence is mere eyewash. But one thing is certain: If the present subject races of the British Empire are given the right to vote, complete control of the union would pass to the black, brown, and yellow people held by Mr. Streit to be so politically undeveloped as not entitled to any determination of their own fate in his proposed union.

If the people of British India and other British colonial possessions were granted equality with representatives of other parts of the British Empire, the 495,000,000 people of that Empire would have 99 votes as against 27 votes of the United States. Let me put this matter in another way: Assume that the people of the white races of the British Empire and the United States stood together; they would, roughly speaking, possess 50 votes as against 76 votes. It hardly seems within the realm of possibility that the English-speaking races, for the sake of union now, would contemplate such an eventuality with complacency; but, unless they do, union now is not a democratic plan. It is a plan to perpetuate British imperialism—nothing more and nothing less.

Looking at this plan from a purely American standpoint, it hardly seems conceivable that, if the American people once understood the real significance of Union Now, they would give it any consideration whatsoever, because, aside from the objections which have been set forth above, Union Now contemplates a union citizenship—a single citizenship which would give perfect freedom of migration to the people of the union to wander whithersoever they willed within the borders of the union. What such a plan would mean to America needs no comment.

It is, perhaps, not a matter of common knowledge in this country, but it should be, that certain constituent states of the British commonwealth of nations have taken effective and vigorous steps to prevent the submergence of their territories by the Oriental races of the empire. It is, therefore, obvious that Union Now—if its consummation can even be seriously contemplated—would hold within itself the seed of civil dissension, such as that which divided our own nation in a bloody and disastrous Civil War.

In conclusion, it must be said that however fantastic Union Now may seem, there is another feature in it which cannot be disregarded. If Union Now is accomplished, it will involve the United States immediately and directly in the war. It would result in a call for American troops to defend British possessions in Asia and Africa; a demand for our fleet to police the seven seas; and, a draft upon our economic resources to pay all the bills, past, present, and future, contracted by the British Empire in the prosecution of her wars.

That is Union Now.

Subversive Elements in Labor Organizations

REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, some people may be surprised, but I am not surprised, to get the news as shown in the headlines "C. I. O. lumber union defiance of Mediation Board forces emergency power show-down." This is the most logical result that could obtain from

the way the whole situation has been handled from the beginning with these outlaws. Many governmental officials before have learned, and learned early, that you could not deal with an outlaw, but it appears that our Labor Department, headed by such left-wingers as Madam Perkins, Hillman, and others, either never learn or they intentionally do not want to learn and are playing right in with these outlaws to destroy not only the national defense of this country, but the country itself. That is a very terrible statement to have to make, but as against that we are faced by a very terrible factual situation which makes such a statement necessary by those who are willing to look the situation squarely in the face and strip it of all propaganda and mealy-mouthed excuses of justification.

This is no surprise to many of us because we have consistently pointed out what would happen if this country continued in its weak-kneed, mealymouth, childish handling of serious situations with socialistic, communistic, racketeering, outlaw labor misleaders. We have pointed that out time and again. If ever a group has set the stage for this very thing, the Perkins element and the Hillman element have furnished this perfect setting. They have consistently knocked down, throttled and destroyed the constructive labor element, and have just as consistently placed in power the destructive outlaw element of the C. I. O. on the National Labor Relations Board itself, on other boards, and all down the line. I say, definitely and positively, that this Perkins-Hillman left wing element is entirely responsible for this situation, and as they belong to the administration itself, the administration has its explanations to make for keeping in powerful position such people as these. Many Congressmen and many Senators have consistently pointed out to this administration the subversive, communistic, racketeering, outlaw element that is in the administration, and we have just as consistently told them that their chickens would come home to roost. It appears that these chickens are now here and it is up to this administration to handle this situation with a strong American hand, in a strong American way, and these outlaws should be dealt with in the only manner that any outlaw was ever dealt with.

I hope the stage has not further been set for socialism, communism, and fascism, and if it has been set, I call on the administration to see that their plans do not go through, namely, to take over business. I have repeatedly said that this was the program that these Communists would strike and put business in a position where deliveries were not made, and then have this administration take over business and thereby socialize this business. The answer to this question is not for the Government to take over the plants, particularly where industry and business have cooperated to the fullest extent with Government, and where it is found in these same plants, that these racketeering outlaw leaders have done everything possible to destroy the program, to deny defense to this country, and to take any step of any kind that they could to turn it into a socialistic, communistic republic.

This country has gone a long way to the left, much against the protest and the vote of many of us. Many things have been covered up under the name of social gains, while these same things would have been more truly named had they been called socialistic advancements. This thing has come to such a pass now that these socialistic, communistic, racketeering outlaws feel that they are bigger than the United States. Can it be possible that they feel they are so entrenched in this administration that they can defy those of us who are not socialists? Can it be possible that they are getting ready to dig in and take over the Government? There are many signs indicating this to be the case. I have never yet heard anyone in this administration caution or tell the C. I. O. what to do. Have we come to a point where this Government is afraid of these communistic outlaw leaders? If we have not, I say it is high time to show them definitely and positively where to get off.

Here we are asking our people to unify themselves, to present a solid front, to make sacrifices financially, to make sacrifices with reference to their personal liberty, of the things they want to do. I think our people would be perfectly willing to make the patriotic sacrifices that should properly be made, but I don't believe they are going to do it if they are taxed extra billions only to have these billions turned over to these socialistic, communistic outlaw leaders and their gangs. I believe the young manhood, who are working for $21 per month, are going to be dissatisfied to have their personal liberty taken away from them and to see these socialistic, communistic outlaws enriching themselves, and empowering themselves in government, at their expense. Do they think for a minute that these young men, who have patriotically given up their lives to go into the Army and the Navy and the armed forces of this country, are going to look upon these socialistic, communistic outlaws taking over our Government with any complacency? These young men have proved themselves to be Americans and they are not going to stand idly by and see these Socialists, Fascists, Nazis, and Communists take their Government away from them while they are in the Army.

Our people are willing to get together to follow a leadership that they think is solid and proper, but they are not going to be sold down the river by any administration, be it Republican or Democratic. Therefore, I again say to the administration that if they want our people to follow them and to entrench themselves behind the administration, they had better place their house in order so that our people can do it with confidence. Many of our people are now looking questionably upon many of the things that are being done leaning toward socialism, and particularly, toward the favoritism shown these socialistic, communistic outlaw labor leaders.

A Frank and Honest Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

LETTER FROM DAVID LASSER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it is so effective an answer to charges made against him and because I think it reveals an earnest and forthright attitude toward the work he is doing and has tried to do, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks the following letter from David Lasser:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 2, 1941.*

The Honorable JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VOORHIS: I want at this time to express my appreciation for your defense of my record when it was attacked in some quarters on the floor of the House. I think you are entitled to a full statement for the record on those questions which have been raised against my background and activities. You have my permission to use this letter in any way that you see fit. I am answering point by point those questions which have been raised.

1. I am not and never have been a Communist, nor have I had any connection with the Communist Party. I was the head of an organization, the Workers Alliance, which came under the control of the Communist Party. When I became personally convinced that such was the case I tried within the organization to rid it of the Communist control. When it became clear that that was impossible I followed the dictates of my conscience and resigned from the Workers Alliance in June 1940, making public the reasons for my resignation.

The American Security Union, which I helped form after my resignation from the Alliance, forbade membership from Communists, Nazis, Fascists, or others who believe in dictatorship, domestic or foreign.

2. My visit to Russia in 1937, in connection with a trip to England, France, and Spain, had no sinister or communistic purpose. I went there as people in all walks of life, including famous aviators, preachers, businessmen, official missions, and even Congressmen, have gone, to see for myself what was the actual situation. I took part in no official gatherings; my activities were chiefly looking at the various projects and developments, which one usually does as a sightseer.

I returned to this country glad that I was an American. I do not regret the education I received. I wish that all those who have any illusions regarding that dictatorship could have the same education.

3. In connection with a mass delegation of unemployed at Harrisburg, Pa., 5 years ago, the statement is made that under my personal direction violence resulted.

Let me say that I have never approved of, encouraged, nor condoned violence in any phase of my activities.

Secondly, this action was called by the Pennsylvania unemployed to meet the threat of starvation. I went there to represent the national organization. There was not violence, but bitterness, high feeling, tension,

and acrimony even within the legislature itself, for the legislature was paralyzed with inaction, and 600,000 men, women, and children in Pennsylvania were slowly starving.

There were no clashes with the police, no arrests. It is true that many days after a relief appropriation was finally passed and the delegates had returned to their homes, charges were made in some sections of the press and in the 1936 political campaign that some damage had been caused in some gallery seats. Those making the charge never made a request for an investigation to determine who caused the alleged damage.

4. I do not claim that during the years of intense unemployment all was sweetness and light. Our Nation was passing through a period so stormy and dangerous that other nations with similar situations lost their democracy and freedom. In those nations the unemployed were won over to the camps of fascism or communism.

As leader of an unemployed organization, during the period when unemployment was the crucial problem before the people, I had the task of representing the interests of the unemployed and helping maintain their faith in our democratic way of life. I tried to do something positive and constructive and with a spirit of complete loyalty to our great country and its institutions.

5. With regard to my present position: I accepted this post to make my contribution to the speeding up of the return of W. P. A. workers to private industry and to make them available for our defense-labor supply. I believe completely in this task. I am conscientiously doing my best to make it successful. Certainly, every American should be permitted to make his contribution to our national defense according to his abilities.

In my field trips and work on this job I have had full cooperation from business, labor, employment services, school officials, and national-defense officials. A harmonious working relationship has been established with all of them.

I am ready to continue that service to the best of my ability as long as I am needed. Those who oppose the continuation of an adequate W. P. A. program should be deeply concerned that this task shall be successful; for only by the return of W. P. A. workers to private industry can the W. P. A. program be justifiably reduced.

What I ask is an honest chance to do my part in this great task—of returning the W. P. A. workers to private industry so that they may play their part in our great defense effort.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID LASSER.

Less Than 1,700 Union Veterans Living on Decoration Day, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

DECORATION DAY ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM R. THOM, OF OHIO, DELIVERED AT ALLIANCE, OHIO

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am reprinting herewith the text of an address I delivered on the occasion of the annual observance of Decoration Day, May 30, last, by the patriotic organizations of Alliance, Ohio:

Through the years from early manhood that I have been a spectator of Memorial Day exercises, I have always speculated, as probably you have, about the day when the last of our Civil War veterans of the North would vanish from the human stage. While thought of death has never troubled us, I confess to having wondered also whether I should be present when this occurred. The answer to both of these questions has been a long time coming, but it is near. More than 2,000,000 of these Union soldiers have marched out of our world, and the little remnant left, averaging in age over 96 years, cannot much longer stand the assaults of time. Because the Union soldier caught the imagination of my boyhood, the world will never be the same, at least to me, when the last one in his blue coat, decorated with his Grand Army button, bids us goodbye.

Because I thought this audience might be interested, I asked the Veterans' Administration at Washington to furnish me with the current number of Civil War pensioners. On April 30th last, exactly 1,673 survivors were on the pension rolls, as against 2,381 on June 30th of last year. A year ago there were living 198 Civil War soldiers in the State of Ohio. What a pitiful handful to join with us in this Memorial Day. And because many younger folks here perhaps did not know the Union veteran intimately, I am, without seeming to depreciate the services and bravery of the soldiers of the Spanish-American and World Wars, going to speak of this vanishing breed of men.

The Union veteran usually was an outstanding and forthright individual in his home community. Who of us, as boys, did not hang on every word of his war tales, told over and over again? Many of them, not content to rest on the laurels of their Civil War battles, fought on in civil life to great fame. Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Harrison, McKinley were Northern Civil War soldiers who reached the Presidency amidst the acclaims of their comrades. Many of them sat in the Cabinets of Presidents. Scores of them were sent to the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. Today, the voice of the Union soldier, as well as of the Confederate soldier, is missing in the Congress. The last Northern soldier of the House of Representatives was Gen. Isaac R. Sherwood, a former Canton, Ohio, editor, and the last Confederate soldier in that body was Maj. Charles M. Stedman, of North Carolina. Singularly enough, as if to symbolize the reunion of the North and South, Sherwood and Stedman, in the House of Representatives at the same time, were bosom friends and highly revered by all other colleagues from whatever section of the Nation.

The average Union soldier was a man of rugged nature. He must have been to survive the disease and the hard campaigning of the Civil War. Perhaps merely because he was an ex-soldier, I always thought he stood out among his fellows as made of tougher fiber. He had strong, powerful hands. If he was tough in body, he was often tough in mind. He was a bulldog when it came to clinging to his convictions. Reared in an atmosphere where passions ran high over disunion and slavery, the soldiers I knew continued to be combative whether in the field of politics or religion. As we look back and remember the hates the Civil War left in men's souls, both North and South, we realize that civil strife is the most deadly malady that can affect society.

It is the miracle of our history that while the people of the North and of the South were alike swept by gusts of hate, the Government in Washington was guided by the kindly Lincoln, so untouched by all the rancor that swirled around him. Forbearing, patient, forgiving, Lincoln topped all these qualities with a sense of humor that blossomed even when trial and tribulation were all around him. The other night I was reading how a native German who bore the title of count visited Lincoln during the war days to offer his services as a soldier. He related rather proudly how his ancestors had been counts so many centuries. "Well," said Mr. Lincoln, interrupting him, "that need not trouble you. That will not be in your way, if you behave yourself as a soldier." The poor count was puzzled, and when the interview was over he asked his companion what the President could have meant by so strange a remark.

May I now indulge in a bit more of reminiscence. My mind goes back today to another Memorial Day, not in our United States, but in Germany of 1924. On a Sunday in August of that year I was in Berlin. As I stood with other Americans on that famous German thoroughfare, Unter den Linden, I saw young Germans in threes and fours walking through the streets, some of them wearing printed streamers fastened in their coat lapels, on which were written the words, "Nie mehr krieg." Interpreted, this meant "No more war." Inquiry revealed that they were proceeding toward the German Reichstag Building, where, on that day, kindly Fritz Ebert, President of the Republic, was speaking in honor of the Germans who had fallen in the World War.

To me this assertion of opposition to war so proudly displayed by these young Germans was an omen that militarism was waning. In those days most of us held high hopes that the world had tired forever of war. But alas at the same moment, there was languishing in prison in Bavaria, Adolph Hitler, an exsoldier and die-hard of the World War, who had just found defeat in a bold attempt to overthrow the German Republic. In that fortress prison he wrote "Mein Kampf" in which was set down all the devilish designs that today are afflicting the world you and I live in.

Thoughtful men of that day looked upon him as a harmless agitator, whose ambitions outran his capabilities.

Writing in 1927, a volume of history on "The Rise of the German Republic," Harold Griffith Daniels said:

"Hitler, a resident of Vienna, had been apprenticed to a house painter, and from being a Socialist he was driven by his own violent anti-Semitism into the ranks of the other extreme. He first came to Munich when the war broke out, and he served in the German army, subsequently acquiring German nationality. Modelling himself on Mussolini in all but political intelligence, he cast himself for the part of a German Gambetta, for which he was totally unequipped. Though combining sincerity with a gift for glib oratory and more than a touch of megalomania, he was a complete stranger to the realities of politics and seemed lost in a world of fantasy as he delivered his harangues, a mixture of anti-Semitic behavior, pose and vanity. In his ecstatic visions he saw a dictatorship with himself as President of the Reich, destined not only to restore order in Berlin, but to operate beyond the German frontiers and liberate Germany from the consequences of the last war."

Today millions of lives, including our own, are touched by the career of wild adventure of this house painter who so completely shattered the estimate of himself just quoted. Modern invention, intended to liberate man, has been used by him to bring danger over three continents and to threaten us as a Nation. While Hitler upbraided the world for the harshness of the Versailles Treaty, he found it possible to organize,

through the sweat and labor of his people, the most powerful military machine the world has ever known. Other nations innocently busied themselves with political machinery to preserve peace. Hitler strove to build military planes, cannon, and whatnot to destroy peace wherever it might be found in the prospering independent nations, large and small, that were his neighbors.

I wish, as your Representative in Washington, I could tell you when and how his career will be cut short. I doubt if the world will ever rest in peace until he no longer directs the fortunes of Germany. For the moment he is land bound. Until he attains free entrance into the Atlantic Ocean, both north and south, we can feel measurably safe from attack. For a moment when the battleship *Hood* sank in the waters, it looked as if he were winning his way to the sea.

Those of us who are in Washington, where the international situation haunts us from morning until night, realize only too deeply how our constituents abhor war and pray that it may not come with its devastating destruction to our people. If you saw your President as he looks today, you would know that his nights as well as his days must be filled with pain and agony. He knows from the tearful appeals of mothers and fathers that pass through his office in letter and telegram what your deepest and most fervent hope is.

I believe most sincerely that his first aim is to preserve the security of the hemisphere in which you and I live. Perhaps he realizes a bit more than do we, the power and the range of the new military assaults of the air. I have been thinking much as you have about his message of a few nights ago. Definitely, in that speech he emphasized as never before, the primary purpose he has to protect the Americas—North and South. We, as a people, I believe, can be unified in the knowledge that whatever we do shall be done to keep inviolate the Monroe Doctrine, the cornerstone of our foreign policy since the early days of the Republic.

I feel that the President, despite his bold words that have been messaged across the waters, has not thrown all caution and deliberation to the winds. He still deems himself your servant, anxious to hear your attitudes. In the spoken word, he must not seem weak and indecisive, for the Hitler crowd must realize that so far, and no farther may they approach this hemisphere. His speech, I know, was a disappointment to many who have formed themselves into a war party that has been pressuring him for an immediate war declaration. He knows too much of our military strength to go that far. Perhaps he was disappointing to those who wish to be assured of no belligerency under any circumstances. If I understood his attitude, he seeks to keep his freedom of action unbound so far as possible with definite and constraining pledges, so that he may pause, shift, or take a new tack that tomorrow or the next day seems best for the liberty and well-being of our people. Perhaps when he charts this middle course, he satisfies most of us.

This day's observance, when we revive those choice memories dates back to May 30, 1868, when the first Decoration Day was held by order of Gen. John A. Logan, Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic. Year by year the Civil War soldiers themselves, with the aid of their daughters and grandchildren have strewn the flowers over the graves of their dead. They gave up this duty of love reluctantly when they began to totter to their patriotic successors, the Spanish War Veterans and the soldiers of the World War. Together these organizations with daughters and sons of Civil War veterans, have carried on the tradition, and soon they will be in complete command, without a Civil War veteran round whom they may rally.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I wrote to President Roosevelt, calling his attention to a letter written by former President Woodrow Wilson. That letter solved the strike situation at a time when the administration of World War days was faced with the same strike problems which confront the present administration.

I think it is important for every Member to read that letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1941.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I think you will agree that one reads with profit the messages and papers of your old chief, former President Woodrow Wilson. So many present situations parallel those with which Mr. Wilson had to deal, both at home and abroad.

I believe that the great majority of labor in this country are embarrassed by the unforgivable conduct of some of the members of the machinist local in San Francisco, which broke its contract and put on an outlaw strike tying up the production of ships, an item we need most now.

May I call your attention to a letter written by President Wilson in dealing with a like problem in 1918? It was a letter that ended a machinists' strike. You, of course, recall and no doubt have considered the methods employed by the Chief Executive in those stirring days. Nevertheless, I am sure that you will understand that I refer the same to you, prompted only by a desire to be helpful.

The letter was addressed to a local lodge of the International Association of Machinists at Bridgeport, Conn. It reads as follows:

"WASHINGTON, *September 13, 1918.*

"GENTLEMEN: I am in receipt of your resolutions of September 6 announcing that you have begun a strike against your employers in Bridgeport, Conn. You are members of the Bridgeport branches of the International Union of Machinists. As such, and with the approval of the national officers of your union, you signed an agreement to submit the questions as to the terms of your employment to the National War Labor Board, and to abide the award, which in accordance with the rules of procedure approved by me might be made.

"The members of the Board were not able to reach a unanimous conclusion on all the issues presented, and as provided in its constitution the questions upon which they did not agree were carried before an arbitrator, the unanimous choice of the members of the Board.

"The arbitrator thus chosen has made an award which more than 90 percent of the workers affected accept. You who constitute less than 10 percent refuse to abide the award, although you are the best paid of the whole body of workers affected, and are, therefore, at least entitled to press a further increase of wages because of the high cost of living. But, whatever the merits of the issue, it is closed by the award. Your strike against it is a breach of faith calculated to reflect on the sincerity of national organized labor in proclaiming its acceptance of the principles and machinery of the National War Labor Board.

"If such disregard of the solemn adjudication of a tribunal to which both parties submitted their claims be temporized with, agreements become mere scraps of paper. If errors creep into awards, the proper remedy is submission to the award with an application for rehearing to the tribunal. But to strike against the award is disloyalty and dishonor.

"The Smith & Wesson Co., of Springfield, Mass., engaged in Government work, has refused to accept the mediation of the National War Labor Board and has flaunted its rules of decision approved by Presidential proclamation. With my consent the War Department has taken over the plant and business of the company to secure continuity in production and to prevent industrial disturbance.

"It is of the highest importance to secure compliance with reasonable rules and procedure for the settlement of industrial disputes. Having exercised a drastic remedy with recalcitrant employers, it is my duty to use means equally well adapted to the end with lawless and faithless employees.

"Therefore, I desire that you return to work and abide by the award. If you refuse, each of you will be barred from employment in any war industry in the community in which the strike occurs for a period of 1 year. During that time the United States Employment Service will decline to obtain employment for you in any war industry elsewhere in the United States, as well as under the War and Navy Departments, the Shipping Board, the Railroad Administration, and all other Government agencies, and the draft boards will be instructed to reject any claim of exemption based on your alleged usefulness on war production.

"Sincerely yours,

"WOODROW WILSON."

Does not the reading of this letter suggest the thought that these men in San Francisco who recently have elected to go beyond the pale of unionism and record themselves as willing to jeopardize their country's welfare in an effort to serve their own selfish desires are deserving of the same treatment accorded like offenders by the just and wise Wilson?

I have the honor to be, dear Mr. President,
Your obedient servant,
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD, JR.

Since writing the above the defense program of this country has been confronted with a defiance on the part of some members of labor organizations who utterly disregard even the orders of Mr. Philip Murray, president of the very union to which they belong.

The following is an editorial of The Evening Star, published in its issue of June 5. It is a splendid summation of the present situation, and brings it succinctly up to date. The one bright spot in the whole picture is that the majority of the rank and file of labor in this country are not in favor of, nor do they condone the course of conduct of those who are engaging in these outlaw strikes. The sooner the Congress realizes this the better.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 5, 1941]

CHALLENGE FROM LABOR

The President and the Members of Congress, endeavoring to carry out the national-

defense program, today find themselves confronted with a defiant and truculent challenge from important sections of organized labor, and if this challenge is not dealt with promptly and in decisive fashion it is perfectly obvious that the security of the Nation will be put in gravest jeopardy.

During the past 24 hours those elements in the labor movement which obviously have no intention of cooperating in the defense effort have shed all pretenses.

In Washington, O. M. Orton, leader of striking C. I. O. West-coast lumbermen, has rejected recommendations for settlement of the dispute which were submitted by the National Defense Mediation Board. These recommendations were endorsed by two C. I. O. officials on the Board panel considering the case, and their acceptance was urged by Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O. In spurning the settlement plan despite these considerations, Mr. Orton in a manner reminiscent of the attitude of John L. Lewis at the outset of the coal strike, charges the Board with being an "all-out, labor-busting, and strike-breaking device" seeking to "bulldoze and mislead workers with false and hysterical propaganda."

At Ingleside, Calif., 9,000 C. I. O. workers at the North American Aviation plant, which has $196,000,000 in war-plane orders from this Government and Britain, have gone on strike in direct violation of an agreement, ratified only last Saturday by the union membership, not to strike while their controversy was pending before the Mediation Board. The walk-out was ordered before any action could be taken, and on the flimsy pretext that the board was "stalling the workers."

And from San Francisco, it is reported that striking A. F. of L. machinists, who have tied up work in 11 shipyards, including construction of vessels urgently needed by the Navy, have flatly rejected a request from the Senate committee investigating defense strikes that they return to work.

Viewed in the most favorable light, the attitude of those responsible for these strikes establishes beyond dispute that they are selfish, irresponsible, and wholly indifferent to the welfare of the Nation as a whole. They have taken a position which does not permit of further temporizing. Weakness on the part of the Government at this time could serve only to encourage other irresponsible labor groups to take advantage of the national emergency for selfish purposes, and it is plainly the duty of the President and his supporters in Congress, however great may be their chagrin at reaping such a bitter harvest from their efforts on behalf of labor, to take the lead in meeting this challenge squarely and without equivocation.

Now is the time for the President to act upon his recent declaration that "this Government is determined to use all of its power to prevent interference with the production of materials essential to our Nation's security."

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

ADDRESS OF MAYOR CHARLES C. LITTLEFIELD, OF HAWORTH, N. J.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech by the Honorable Charles C. Littlefield, former commander of the American Legion Post of Haworth, N. J., and mayor of my home town of Haworth, given on Memorial Day.

Mr. Commander, honored guests, and friends of Haworth, I wish to thank Haworth Post, No. 13, American Legion, who sponsors this service, and all the participating organizations for giving to Haworth citizens this opportunity of again observing Memorial Day. I welcome again this year our citizens who, by attending, are also participating in remembrance of those we honor today.

As should be well known to all of us, this day originated as Decoration Day—a day on which graves of the Civil War dead, both Blue and Gray, were decorated in their memory. Since its origin, it has become known as Memorial Day—a day on which we pay tribute to them, in both simple and elaborate services, as well as by decorating graves of our soldier dead of all wars.

During these last few years, I have felt that more of us should take some time on this day to do more than speak words honoring our soldier dead of all wars. This year, in particular, those of us who can, might more specifically refresh our memories of the War of 1917 and 1918 and those men who were sacrificed in that war. We should remember those youths of 23 years ago who gave their lives for a very great cause. We might also remember the events leading up to their sacrifice in that cause.

We shall be specific and review the fact that the bronze honor roll on the large rock memorial at the Station Park lists the names of 53 men who went from Haworth in 1917. Fifty-three men, from a community, the population of which was about 600 at that time, gave up their peaceful pursuits and were willing to give their lives for a cause—a cause in which they believed. Two of those men never returned. The only outward evidence in Haworth of their existence at any time is given us by these 2 living trees which have been dedicated to their memory by veterans of that war who now live in Haworth. One of the two young men who never returned was Harold A. Rowley, who died in camp on October 18, 1918, less than a month before the war ended. The other was Sheldon C. Houston, son of Mrs. Imogene Houston Bryant, our only Gold Star Mother in Haworth. Sheldon died in battle on November 4, 1918, only 7 days before the armistice.

Each year our American Legion post, by a simple act of placing an American flag in each of the markers under these memorial trees, has called your attention to the sacrifice made by these two men. Each year Haworth citizens have thus honored these two Haworth citizens who sacrificed their lives for a cause. We are meeting here again to so honor our soldier dead.

It would be well this year not only to honor them by this simple ceremony but to ask ourselves for what cause they died and whether they died in vain. There was a cause for which they died; was there not?

As one of those who participated in that war and who saw other men die for that cause, let me recall to you one phrase defining that war, which is very vivid to me. It was "the war to end all wars." Other spellbinding phrases were used, such as "make the world safe for democracy," and "we have no fight with the German people." Similar phrases are being used today with variations, but "the war to end all wars" is not yet being repeated by those who are talking war but who will not have to do the fighting.

"A war to end all wars." A phrase that we who fought believed in so much that we said, "It shall not happen again." Do you remember all that? I do.

I also remember those who were alongside of me at the front in 1918 and who did not return. I find it difficult to picture them to you and make such a picture alive and real. So I recall to you these two Haworth young men who did not return, and I ask you: Have we kept faith with them to whom we do honor today? Are we keeping faith when we are permitting a repetition of what happened 25 years ago? History will show, if you lay that period and its results alongside of the present, that we are traveling the same paths as then. We are listening to the same false reasons as then, and you can be sure the end will be the same as then. Only, this time, there will be more than 2 out of 53 from Haworth who fail to return.

As an example of the similarity, let me quote from the headlines of this morning's newspaper:

"Eden Defines Britain's War Aims."

"Foreign Secretary Calls for a World Based on Roosevelt's Four Freedoms."

"Says German Wars Must Stop Forever."

"Bid Empire, Allies, United States Plan to Help Europe Rebuild Free Economy."

Does that sound similar to President Wilson's 14 points? Does that look like the "war to end all wars." Does that correspond with a "United States of Europe."

Are we going to repeat this every 25 years? Is the youth of our Nation to be wasted periodically on European soil as that continent's youth has been? Are we, this Memorial Day, giving only lip service in honoring those two soldiers who died only a few years ago?

If so, why cannot we make an about face? Why cannot we face cold, hard facts? We cannot undo the mistakes of that war and the kind of peace we permitted, but we can profit by those mistakes. We can begin now to keep faith with our honored dead.

Let us put forth every effort to awaken ourselves and develop our strength by showing the entire world that this true freedom our youth fought for in 1918 is safe here in the Republic of the United States of America and that it will be maintained here. Let us not confuse our truly representative form of government with so-called democracies in Europe and let us keep it from being submerged in a world of serfdom, whether that serfdom is ruled by empires or dictatorships.

We do not wish to force our form of government on other peoples—we tried it 25 years ago, and they were not successful in its use. But let us by example, show that our form of government works for us at all times and under all conditions. We have maintained our Republic in peace and war against all outside pressure, whether political or economic. We can continue to be so strong that there will be no successful attack on us, either by military force, economic pressure, or diplomatic propaganda, that can dislodge our position in the world.

We can do this if you and I believe in our God, our country, and ourselves. If we so believe, and act accordingly, we shall remember the sacrifices made by our youth in 1918, take heed, and "never let it happen again." If we do that, these two young men from Haworth will not have died in vain and we shall keep faith with those whose sleep should be "sweet and deep in Flanders fields."

A Warning Unheeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 4, 1941:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 4, 1941]

A WARNING UNHEEDED

In this day and age, when air power is kicking navies out of seas and armies out of islands, it is a little painful to recall that when Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, was promoted some months ago to be "Acting Additional Deputy Chief of Staff" of the Army, this unprecedented recognition of the air arm was hailed as a great forward step in air-mindedness.

It doesn't take a military expert to figure out from the headlines that aviation has outgrown the status of second fiddle. Everywhere else, that is, except in the United States. Here the Army, and the Navy, continue to insist that aviation's proper place is in the back seat, with infantrymen and mariners at the steering wheel.

It is common knowledge that many airmen, both in the Army and Navy, are in favor of an independent status for aviation. But it is seldom that these flying experts will talk for the book; they know the head men are opposed, and their traditions of discipline are powerful enough to keep them silent.

That doesn't go for all of them, however.

General Arnold himself and his former executive officer in the Air Corps, Col. Ira C. Eaker, had this to say in a recent book:

"Many feel that eventually the defensive air component of the Nation will be given a status coordinate and commensurate with that of the Army and Navy. When that time will come, if it does come, is not yet clear. It came in some of the other nations of the world when the pressure of war was upon them. We shall be fortunate if our time for that reorganization comes in the relative calm of peace, or, at worst, in the preparatory and not in the fighting stage."

Coming from an "Acting Additional Deputy Chief of Staff," that is stronger language than it may seem.

But what has been done about his warning?

Nothing.

The "fighting stage" has not yet come. But we are certainly in the preparatory stage.

What are we waiting for?

Townsend Movement Gains Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF DU BOIS, PA.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, interest in the Townsend plan in my congressional district is growing by leaps and bounds. Former critics are now found ready to admit that the need of an adequate old-age pension was never more apparent, and they are eager that the problem be given detailed study and favorable action at an early date.

As an indication of the widespread support for the Townsend bill, I submit herewith a copy of the resolution adopted by the City Council of Du Bois, Pa., urging passage of H. R. 1036. The resolution is as follows:

We, the undersigned members of the Du-Bois City Council, County of Clearfield, State of Pennsylvania, believe something must be done to provide adequate pensions for our deserving senior citizens, and at our regular meeting have adopted this resolution:

"Whereas the members here assembled believe that a national uniform system of old-age pensions should be adopted throughout the United States of America; and

"Whereas the proposals embraced in the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) will greatly relieve, if not entirely abolish, unemployment, and will provide to the people the American standard of living; and

"Whereas the various States of the Union are finding it difficult to raise a sufficient revenue to finance the payment of adequate pensions to the aged; and

"Whereas that a universal tax be levied and moneys so raised shall be divided pro-rata and paid to all citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 60 years and over: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to consider the basic principles of the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) now in committee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That one copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the following: the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; the Honorable JAMES J. DAVIS, Senator; the Honorable JOSEPH P. GUFFEY, Senator; the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Congressman."

D. E. SHOEMAKER,
K. S. SHOWERS,
WM. SHAW
J. W. BAILEY,
Members Du Bois City Council.

Attested:
W. L. HOOVER,
Secretary to the Mayor.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

ARTICLE BY CHESTER ROWELL

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on inflation, by Chester Rowell, appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle on May 31, 1941:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of May 31, 1941]

SUM OF GROUP DEMANDS ADDS UP TO INFLATION

(By Chester Rowell)

Unless it is faced boldly, and soon enough, the automatic spiral of inflation may get beyond control before many of us, and especially our Representatives in Congress, even realize that it is started. For, considering only the immediate situation, each step of it—a rise in wages to meet the increased cost of living, and an increase in prices to get the money to pay those wages—seems the natural and obvious thing to do. If each of them could be done only once and then stopped it would be the right thing. But if it is done the next time, and the next, and the time after that, the result is soon explosion destroying the structure it was intended to maintain.

We see it beginning already, on both the price and the wage side. Labor demands the maintenance or improvement of the "standard of living," and imagines it can be done by raising wage scales. It can—once. One of the moving causes of the wave of strikes and threatened strikes is just this. In some cases, like the proposed 30-percent increase in railway train operating scales, it goes far beyond any increase in living costs that has yet occurred or is presently in sight. Fortunately, the Railway Labor Act provides a means by which whatever is proper will be done, with no likelihood of a strike that would paralyze the transportation system of the country just when it is most needed. In some other less mature industries fighting seems to be the only way either side knows to settle disputes.

On prices the same thing is happening, especially in industries with many votes. President Roosevelt had to make a bargain with Congress to keep it from piling up both loans and direct payments to farmers until the sum of the two would have gone away beyond the parity mark which has been the professed goal of the whole farm-subsidy movement. He finally signed the 85-percent loan bill, in consideration of an agreement to amend the direct-payment law down to the sum called for in his original Budget. Whether the leaders who made this deal can deliver the necessary votes in Congress remains to be seen. If they cannot, food prices at the farm (which ought to go up reasonably) will start skyrocketing instead. Then retail prices will soar still higher. Then wages still higher, to meet them. And then the prices of the goods which the farmer must buy from the city will follow. And parity will become a will-o'-the-wisp, always just beyond where it can be reached.

The direct regulation of prices fares no better. Steel costs more to make and there is a competitive demand for more of it than can be made. In a free market that would put the price up much too high. Politics, on the other hand, may force it too low, until private capital for the necessary increase in plants cannot be obtained, since it could earn no return, and the Government will have to go into the business and charge the losses to the rest of us. Politics, however, works the other way in the attempt to hold down the price of spun cotton. The city worker, to be sure, wants his shirts and underwear cheap, but if they are dearer he thinks he can meet that by striking for higher wages. But the cotton farmer is afraid that if the price of finished cotton is held down, his raw cotton will be cheapened, too. And his Representatives are putting up a roar in Congress.

Taken just one at a time, in a free market, not only is each of these steps separately right, but the piling up of them all into a ruinous inflation is automatic. Since each of the items is right, but the sum is wrong, something beside summation must be done about them.

And neither of the easy answers would answer anything. It is quite true, for instance, that if the profits of industry increase, labor should get its share of them. But if labor got them all it would not meet the automatic increase in the cost of living. And, besides, there would soon be no industry to pay the wages.

Also, competition is not the answer. For competition works both ways. If industry pours out money in wages for making things, half of which are to be destroyed in war, there will be free money available to buy much more than the other half. Naturally, the scarce consumable goods will go to the highest bidders, and the standard of living for those who most need it raised, will go down still further.

Since this is the automatic result of the free operation of free economic forces in a free market, applied to the present abnormal and unfree unbalance of production and consumption, it follows that we must open our minds to the idea of doing something artificial about it, in this artificial emergency.

Everybody, in fact, wants just that done—to the other fellow. Whether it is food, manufactured goods, or labor, whoever has it for sale wants the price to go up, either naturally or artificially. But whoever has to buy it wants the price held down, even if it has to be done by arbitrary action of the Government.

Since none of us want the half of it done which applies to us, perhaps the result of our all getting what we want will be that none of it is done—and none of us, therefore, will have what we want.

Ponder, in time, over this paradox. For, unless you think it through by logic, now, you may find yourself paying for it later in hardship. You will know all about it, then, by experience. Learning it beforehand, by thinking, is cheaper.

W. P. A. Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. HAINES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the relief bill for the next fiscal year will come before the House for action. In connection with W. P. A. there is one matter that I desire to call to the attention of the House, and that is the necessity for persons to be certified by the bureaus of public assistance in each State before they can be given employment on W. P. A. It seems to me that insofar as World War veterans or Spanish-American War veterans are concerned an exception should be made, particularly to that group which is now granted a disability award by the Veterans' Administration.

Many of these men receive but twelve to thirty and forty dollars a month and have families to support. Because of their disability they are unable to obtain work in private industry, and because of their ages they are discriminated against. In my own State, Mr. Speaker, W. P. A. permits men to earn from twelve to fourteen dollars a week. It must be perfectly obvious to any right-thinking individual that men cannot rear their families or even give them the bare necessities of life on such a small income. The Veterans of Foreign Wars are vitally interested in their buddies and feel that an exception should be made in respect to men having honorable discharges from the Army and drawing a small disability payment. I have advocated this for a long time, feeling that we can never repay the debt we owe these men, and so I want to suggest to the House that provision be inserted in the new bill making this group eligible for certification on W. P. A. without being required to have a relief status.

In connection with this matter I received a letter several days ago from the State Director of W. P. A. for Pennsylvania in which he suggests such a provision. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I want to insert as a part of these remarks the letter in question, and I sincerely hope that the Members of this body will give this matter their very careful and sympathetic consideration and support.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION
FOR PENNSYLVANIA,
HARRISBURG, PA., *June 2, 1941.*

Hon. HARRY L. HAINES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAINES: May I suggest that in the new W. P. A. Act provision be made that veterans who are unemployed be entitled to assignment on W. P. A. work without having first been relief cases.

At the present time, one man out of every seven working on the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania is a veteran, and it seems to me that these men who have fought for their country should be entitled to a job on W. P. A. without first having to beg for relief. In addition, let me point out that disabled veterans, men who have lost an arm or a leg, or have been so maimed as to be granted a disability award, in a very large number of cases because of the disability award granted by the Federal Government are rejected for relief by the Department of Public Assistance, and that, of course, bars them from employment by the W. P. A.

The disability award granted these men is small, amounting to just about the same grant that the Department of Public Assistance would give them for relief, and yet, because it comes from the Federal Government and not from the Department of Public Assistance, these men are denied the opportunity of a Federal job.

I believe that if proper provision is made to care for our unemployed veterans, it will have a very decided effect in raising the morale of the young men who are now being inducted into the Army and Navy. If the veterans of the last war are not taken care of, the possible veterans of the next war may think our country an ungrateful master.

Sincerely and cordially yours,
PHILIP MATHEWS,
State Administrator.

Let There Be No Strikes on Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

LETTER FROM WILLIAM J. BOWEN, PRESIDENT EMERITUS, BRICKLAYERS, MASONS, AND PLASTERERS INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter sent by William Bowen, president emeritus of the Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union of America, to all subordinate unions, and also a report of a meeting of delegates of the building and construction trades of America on strikes and national defense.

President Bowen, one of the outstanding labor leaders of all time, in this letter has conveyed the expressions and the policy of all true labor leaders in this country during this emergency. Those who know him and the officers of this great international union, know by past experience that they will see that this request will be carried out.

The letter follows:

BRICKLAYERS, MASONS AND
PLASTERERS' INTERNATIONAL
UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1941.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: We draw your attention to the May issue of the Bricklayer, Mason and Plasterer which conveys our first attitude in respect to the incidents leading up to what has now become a conflagration of the entire world. May I here say, that in the outset my views were of a character that indicated that the war on the other side of the ocean was no concern of ours unless the American continent and particularly Canada was invaded. The situation has changed insofar as our idea of what is involved is concerned and with the events that have occurred and are recurring it is necessary for a change of views.

With what I have seen in the last two wars, in which the United States of America was involved, I am constrained to say that it would be abominable upon our part if we did not make our boys ready to do what now seems the inevitable. So let us lend to our boys' efforts every effort at our command to see to it that the sons of America shall not go into the conflict without every advantage that is possible for them to have. Let us get them ready. Let us pray to God that that readiness shall be of a character that will convince the entire world that our boys shall be so equipped as to meet attack from whatever source.

I request you as one of my associates in the movement to which we subscribed our young lives and in our mature years to carry out the traditions and policies of our International Union to bend every effort along the lines which the foregoing indicates.

Let there be no strikes on defense contracts.

With kindest personal wishes and as ever,
Sincerely and fraternally yours,
WM. J. BOWEN,
President Emeritus.

CONFERENCE HELD IN BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT OFFICES, MAY 26, 1941

The following building and construction trades organizations were represented:

Asbestos workers, C. A. Sickles; bricklayers, H. C. Bates, R. J. Gray; electrical workers, A. Wagoner; engineers, Wm. L. Maloney, F. A. Fitzgerald; iron workers, Leslie Myers; laborers, Joseph V. Moreschi, John Garvey; marble polishers, William McCarthy; painters, William Gallagher; plasterers, James M. Myles; plumbers, George Masterton; sheet-metal workers, Robert Byron; teamsters, Fred Tobin; also present, Mr. Joseph Keenan, Labor Relations Division of the Defense Commission.

Mr. Keenan advised those present that considerable difficulty was being encountered whereby some building and construction trades organizations were demanding increased wages rates on defense projects after contracts had been awarded and work actually started and advised that some action be taken that would adjust this situation as it was bringing about adverse criticism by administrative officials and the general public and that this criticism was being directed

at the building and construction trades organizations.

Mr. Sidney Hillman, of the United States Defense Commission and Office of Production Management, also addressed those present on the same subject.

All organizations represented were polled on the following question:

"Shall the organizations represented at this meeting go on record to complete all defense jobs on which contracts had been awarded prior to an increase in wages becoming effective at the old rate of wages? Further, we will use every effort to adjust any disputes that may arise on any building and construction defense project without any stoppage of work."

The motion was unanimously carried after an individual vote of each representative was taken:

Asbestos workers, yes; bricklayers, yes; electrical workers, yes; engineers, yes; iron workers, yes; laborers, yes; marble polishers, yes; painters, yes; plasterers, yes; plumbers, yes; sheet-metal workers, yes; teamsters, yes.

Should the United States Have a Department of National Defense?—Should It Have a Separate Department of Air Defense?—What Is the Best Preparedness Pattern for Us To Follow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, every day brings this country new lessons in national defense as developments are studied in the rapidly shifting scenes of the wars raging in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Most striking of these lessons thus far is the emphatic demonstration of the steadily increasing importance of air power in modern war, especially from the standpoint of increasing the defensive strength of a country against attacks from either sea or land.

It is also becoming increasingly obvious that the air arm of national defense in modern warfare is fully as important, if not in fact more important, than either the Army or Navy, and that a smoothly working coordination among all three defense establishments and a unity of action is imperative to secure the best results in either offensive or defensive military tactics. Many Americans are therefore asking themselves and their Congressmen whether this country has fully developed the coordination of command and action which is essential if the great air strength which the United States is fast developing is to render the greatest protective service. To date, no thoroughgoing and complete study has been made by unbiased, authoritative officials into this all-important matter.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 228

I have therefore, today, introduced in the House, House Resolution No. 228 providing that the Speaker should appoint a select committee of nine Members to make a careful and complete inquiry into the optimum method of utilizing the air power of this country. This committee would give full consideration to the advisability of creating a separate air force under a Secretary of Air Defense, to the possibility of consolidating all of our defense establishments under one head in a Department of National Defense with heads of the Divisions of War, Navy, and Air, having positions of coordinate rank in order to unify and strengthen our national defense, and to the wisdom of retaining our present set-up with air power serving as separate adjuncts to the protective power of both the Army and the Navy.

House Resolution No. 228 would answer the questions being raised all over America as to the best method of utilizing our airplane resources in national defense. The matter of protecting the Western Hemisphere is too important a matter to be entrusted simply to traditional procedure, to the judgment of civilian heads of our Army and Navy Departments who show a natural reluctance to suggest substantial changes in our existing establishments, or to the amateur conclusions of editorial writers and newspaper commentators. It is a matter of vital concern to our Nation and to this hemisphere and, in my opinion, merits the careful consideration which can come only from a congressional inquiry into the relative merits of all proposals for reaping the full benefits from the vast capacity of this country to produce military aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I herewith attach the complete language of my resolution asking for an investigation of the best methods for unifying and modernizing the defense establishments of the United States, in view of the growing importance of air power in all types of modern warfare:

[H. Res. 228. Mr. MUNDT submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules]

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be comprised of nine Members of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, eight of whom shall be chosen from among the Members of the House Military and Naval Affairs Committees, and the chairman of which shall also be appointed by the Speaker but who shall not be a member of either the House Military or Naval Affairs Committee. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the select committee to hold hearings and conduct an investigation to determine the advisability, if any, of giving the air forces of this country a coordinate standing with the Military and Naval Establishments either by the creation of a Secretary of Air Defense having equal rank with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy or by the consolidation of all defense establishments of the Government under a Department of National Defense with heads of the Divisions of War, Navy, and Air having positions of coordinate rank in order to unify and strengthen the defense establishments of the United States.

SEC. 3. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member thereof designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 4. The committee shall make a report of its findings to Congress at as early a date as is commensurate with a careful and complete study of the problems involved.

AMERICA CAN MAKE ITSELF IMPREGNABLE

Mr. Speaker, it is not my contention that the war plane of today has antiquated the battleship nor replaced artillery. However, it is apparent to all who study the developments in today's wars that the war plane has added a great new defensive weapon just as it has provided a new method of spreading horror and destruction by the bombing of cities and harbors. No longer does a nation need to meet battleship with battleship to protect its interests on the seven seas. The disabling of the battleship *Bismarck* demonstrated that aerial torpedoes launched from war planes can cripple and sink the mightiest ships that float and that a country like the United States can protect itself from hostile ships by developing and maintaining a great fleet of seagoing planes, equipped and prepared to carry aerial torpedoes, and ship-shattering bombs far out to sea to harass and destroy would-be invaders of our hemisphere. This should give new courage to those who fear an invasion of America. This country can turn out airplanes and train pilots almost without limit; it can darken the skies with defending planes which can destroy and turn back invading sea forces long before they can get close enough to our shores to land their troops and equipment or to pour out destruction from their giant guns. And because of the mobility of air power, we can project this protective air armada out to sea to protect both South and North America with equal certainty.

We need only the bases in South America, an abundance of the proper type planes, and pilots trained in the use of aerial torpedoes and giant bombs. All of this need not replace our battleships or be developed in lieu of a two-ocean navy, but when used as a supplement to such a defense establishment it can make America invincible against attack from any combination of powers in all the world. All we need do is to use our native intelligence, our vast resources, our American ingenuity, and the industrial units of this country to build and equip an air fleet and train its operators in order to utilize the lessons of this war in making America a citadel of strength and a fortress of freedom which can forever protect itself against the avarice or malice of any combination of enemies which dares to leave its homeland to try an attack across the watery wastes of sea and into the death-dealing air armada which we can send out hundreds of miles from home to meet them if and when they come.

NEEDED: MORE BASES AND MORE PLANES

Mr. Speaker, I have long been among those advocating that a greater use be

made of the potential air power of the United States in building an impregnable defense establishment for the Western Hemisphere. Nearly a year ago I proposed that we arrange with South America to give us the right to construct air and sea bases on that continent. I favor building all the island air bases we can get to protect the approaches to the Western Hemisphere from both the east and the west. A fully equipped air armada on an air base which we control in Brazil will better protect the interests of the United States than an army of soldiers in Dakar. Fully equipped sea and air bases in this hemisphere will do much more to safeguard the destiny of America and to promote the development of freedom everywhere than will the landing of a partially equipped army of soldiers on any battlefield in all the world outside of the Western Hemisphere.

In line with my resolution to discover the best method of utilizing and unifying the air forces of America, I am including with these remarks some typical excerpts from newspaper articles and editorials of the past few days indicating what a widespread interest is being manifest in developing the optimum method of using our air power while we are at peace and have time to make any changes which might be necessary. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the findings of such a committee of inquiry as my resolution proposes would do much to develop national unity and to stimulate confidence in the defense program to which all America is now so wisely and unselfishly devoting its attention.

TYPICAL NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[From the Washington Daily News]

A WARNING UNHEEDED

In this day and age when air power is kicking navies out of seas and armies out of islands, it is a little painful to recall that when Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, was promoted some months ago to be Acting Additional Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, this unprecedented recognition of the air arm was hailed as a great forward step in air-mindedness.

It doesn't take a military expert to figure out from the headlines that aviation has outgrown the status of second fiddle—everywhere else, that is, except in the United States. Here the Army and the Navy continue to insist that aviation's proper place is in the back seat, with infantrymen and mariners at the steering wheel.

It is common knowledge that many airmen, both in the Army and Navy, are in favor of an independent status for aviation. But it is seldom that these flying experts will talk for the book. They know the head men are opposed, and their traditions of discipline are powerful enough to keep them silent.

That doesn't go for all of them, however.

General Arnold himself and his former executive officer in the Air Corps, Col. Ira C. Eaker, had this to say in a recent book:

"Many feel that eventually the defensive air component of the Nation will be given a status coordinate and commensurate with that of the Army and Navy. When that time will come, if it does come, is not yet clear. It came in some of the other nations of the world when the pressure of war was upon them. We shall be fortunate if our time for that reorganization comes in the relative calm of peace, or, at worst, in the preparatory and not in the fighting stage."

Coming from an Acting Additional Deputy Chief of Staff, that is stronger language than it may seem.

But what has been done about his warning? Nothing.

The fighting stage has not yet come. But we are certainly in the preparatory stage.

What are we waiting for?

SINGLE AIR FORCE

(By Al Williams)

Each time public opinion forces recognition of its growing demand for a competently organized American air force, out comes old exhibit No. 1, the headquarters air force. And now that the European war has demonstrated to the American citizen that air power will be the determining factor in this struggle out comes that exhibit.

The ordinary people of England were asking in 1938, "Are we going to be bombed? What of our air force? How does it compare with Germany's?" Never did I hear one question about the size and efficiency of the British Army or Navy. The people were looking to the air, from which instinct and intelligence told them their menace was coming.

The plain British men and women were more realistic and practical than their leaders. But whenever British citizens became too loud in their demands for an unquestionably superior air force the Army and Navy leaders mobilized another million men or launched another battleship.

Now ordinary Americans are becoming restless about the known and suspected inadequacy of our fighting power in the air. They haven't forgotten Gen. Billy Mitchell. They know far more than is suspected about the stubborn, selfish resistance of the current leaders in both services to anything like a self-determining air force, legally authorized to work out the destiny of real American air power, without interference and under leaders who have won their leadership from the cockpit.

And what are we getting? Promises.

Next July—next fall—something or other is going to happen. Thousands of planes will be rolling off the production lines. Always in the future.

And what are we getting from Washington? Statements such as, "American combat planes are not only equal to but better than any European aircraft." This untruth has been passed along to the people time and time again by politicians and political appointees.

The American public is getting just what the British public got when it was demanding air power—real air power that could have fought this war over Germany and not over England.

And what are we getting in the headquarters air force? Well, the headquarters air force is the combat planes and air crews of the old Air Corps—with the rest of the old Air Corps devoted to training, procurement, maintenance, repair, and what not required to keep the headquarters air force provided with combat planes and fighting air crews. This smoke screen is exceedingly thin.

That leaves us with a headquarters air force and an Air Corps—both under the old Army. Two air services in the Army, divided against each other, thus permitting the old Army game of service politics to squelch any progressive air crusader who sees this European air war in its true light.

The one thing to do is to consolidate honestly all our air services—Army and Navy—into a genuine air force, freed from control by men who know nothing about air power and who even now fail to understand its predominance.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing are typical of newspaper comments appearing in many papers throughout the country these days. I shall not encumber the RECORD by inserting more of them at this time, but I have personally checked over 50 such comments within the past week. These comments stimulate our thinking and challenge our curiosity, but they neither condemn nor correct the existing situation. What is needed is a congressional inquiry, such as suggested in my resolution, No. 228, to get all the facts and search out the truth, so that the United States can be certain it is following the best path to get the full benefits of the mighty force which air power has become in effective defense planning in the world of today.

Unified Air Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the major business before the country and the Congress today is, as we all know, the problem of national defense. Since the fall of Crete and the disabling of the *Bismarck* by aerial torpedoes there has been a growing concern in this country about the problem of our own aerial defenses. This week I checked over 50 editorials and newspaper comments, which expressed alarm as to whether we have sufficiently unified and strengthened our own aerial defenses.

Because I believe Congress is entitled to the full facts and the most-expert advice in forming its opinions, I have today introduced a resolution asking the Speaker to appoint a committee of nine, selected from the membership of the House Committees on Naval and Military Affairs, for the purpose of conducting an inquiry to see whether we need a Secretary of Air Defense, whether we should consolidate all our defense establishments in a Department of National Defense, with coordinate officers handling Navy, War, and air, or whether the present arrangement is the best solution. I believe this is too important a matter to be left to editorial commentators or to civilian heads of the War and Navy Departments. It involves the basic structure of the defense of America, and we are entitled to the full facts in this matter. I hope my resolution is adopted. It is known as House Resolution 228 and has been referred to the Rules Committee.

A congressional inquiry, such as my resolution provides, will simply be a search for the truth, and the facts will speak for themselves to suggest what changes

are needed or to assure the country that the existing arrangement is the best possible method of fully utilizing the rapidly growing importance of aviation in the field of national defense. It does not contribute to our national unity or our peace of mind to have many of the best newspaper writers in the country expressing the conviction that a vital change is needed in the handling of the air arm of our national defense. The inquiry which I propose should settle this matter for all time to come on the basis of information provided by the best-informed authorities in the United States speaking with the freedom and protection provided them by such congressional inquiry.

Endorsement of President's National-Defense Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Mr. Ralph S. Ruth, of Mecca, Calif.:

MECCA, CALIF., *May 31, 1941.*

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: After listening to the Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER, Mr. Lindbergh, and a few more who keep insisting that we all write to our Congressmen, I feel called to do as they say and write you.

I get around over my district pretty regularly and hear the expression of the people, and I find there is a very, very small percentage of the people here who will agree with the above-mentioned gentlemen regardless of their political affiliations. I have heard all your speeches, and besides I know you quite well personally, and I want you to know that the big majority of the people in my district place full confidence in your good judgment. I know none of us want war, but at the same time, after you have done as we are told we should, "turn the other cheek," there comes a time when you are entitled to give the other fellow a good kick in the pants.

Seriously, though, Harry, the big majority of the people here are back of the President in the stand he has taken 100 percent, and after listening to the fine speech he made I am very sorry that I am not a younger man, but I am a pretty tough old hombre and am now looking for a place where I could fit in.

I don't know how many letters you have been getting of the sort WHEELER and Lindbergh want sent, but they got under my skin to the extent that I had to write you how I feel about this matter. With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. RUTH.

Hon. Andrew Jackson Houston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

SPEECH OF GOV. W. LEE O'DANIEL APPOINTING HIM A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 4, 1941, the Texas congressional delegation at its regular weekly luncheon had as its guest the Honorable ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, who was sworn in as the junior Senator from the State of Texas last Monday, June 2.

Gen. Sam Houston is credited with gaining Texas' independence from Mexico at the Battle of San Jacinto, April 21, 1836. Gen. Sam Houston, the father of the junior Senator from Texas, was a close and intimate friend of President Andrew Jackson. By reason of this friendship, when the junior Senator was born, his mother named him for President Andrew Jackson. Gen. Sam Houston took the oath of office as a United States Senator from Texas 95 years ago.

The biography of Senator ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, in the latest edition of the Congressional Directory, is as follows:

ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, Democrat, of La Porte; son of Gen. Sam Houston, first President of the Republic of Texas, and one of the first Senators to serve after Texas was admitted as a State into the Union; born in Independence, Tex., June 21, 1854; educated at Baylor College, Bastrop Military Academy, Texas Military Institute, at Austin, and Old Salado College; was graduated from West Point Military Academy; studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1876; clerk of the United States district court at Dallas, 1879–89; appointed United States marshal by President Theodore Roosevelt and served from 1902 to 1910; Prohibition Party candidate for Governor of Texas in 1910 and 1912; one of the organizers of the Travis Rifles at Austin during the reconstruction period in 1874; also formed a troop of cavalry for Roosevelt's Rough Riders; appointed to the United States Senate on April 21, 1941, to fill the vacancy in the term ending January 3, 1943, caused by the death of Hon. Morris Sheppard; has the distinction of being the oldest person to become a Member of the Senate of the United States.

Our late beloved Senator Morris Sheppard died April 9, 1941. On April 21, 1941, the Honorable W. Lee O'Daniel, Governor of Texas, appointed Gen. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON to be United States Senator from Texas, to serve until Senator Sheppard's successor is elected by the people of Texas June 28, 1941, at a special election called for that purpose. Governor O'Daniel's speech, which was delivered on the San Jacinto battleground April 21, 1941, when he appointed General HOUSTON United States Senator, was as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Sons and Daughters of the Texas Revolution, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the lessons of the past loom large in our thinking as we face the problems of the new day. The contribution of the centuries to our present life and mode of living is a notable one indeed. Too often, when we flash on the screen of our mind the picture of a hundred years ago and then change it quickly to the picture of today, we are tempted to marvel at our present advanced state in contrast to the primitive simplicity of those days gone by, and to commend ourselves too highly for bringing about this change. For in studying the intervening pages of history, we see that our growth has not been of a mushroom variety. We see that our progress has been step by step, and that the superstructure which now towers so high has been built—stone upon stone, timber upon timber—through the ages, and that into the building of that structure of our present society has gone not only the genius of what we might want to term our own supertalent, but also the intelligence, the strength, the courage of mind, body, and soul of men who are no more.

Contemplation on the contribution of the past gives needed restraint to our own vanity, a heightened appreciation of the intellectual qualities and the attributes of character of those who have gone before, and encouragement and inspiration in the thought that—

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

The rock upon which we stand is the rock of ages. The faith which we have was the faith of our fathers before us. The commandments which we obey were those engraven on stone on the summit of Sinai and spoken from the lips of the Nazarene in His Sermon on the Mount.

God grant that we may cling to these eternal verities which come as our sacred heritage of the past; that—faced with the fury of storms which now beset us—we may chart our course by the compass that has been tried and found true by those who captained our ship on yet another voyage.

"Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget."

On April 21, 1836—5 years more than a century ago—on this very spot, yes, at this very hour—the destiny of the land called Texas hung precariously in the balance. How that destiny was achieved; how valorous men—out-numbered, without rations, and adequate arms—defeated a dictator and his invading hordes—is a story which you know full well. "The sixteenth most decisive victory in the history of the world" it has been called, a victory starting a chain of events which brought to these United States a third of its present area; a victory which laid the groundwork for the change in sovereignty of nearly a million square miles; and, more important than all this, a victory which decided that our people should be free—free to work, free to worship, free to build here a new promised land that would contribute to the happiness and well-being of mankind.

I could speak appropriately today of the leader of our forces at the Battle of San Jacinto. I could mention the methods by which he and his brave men won victory on San Jacinto's field. We could recount the events of his earlier life which contributed to the military genius for which he was renowned—of his campaign with Andrew Jackson in the war of 1812 and the brilliance of

his achievement then for the service of his country. Or we could examine the heritage which was his; the staunch record of his father, a soldier in the Revolutionary War; of earlier ancestors in Scotland who fought with John Knox for "God and Country."

What a record was his as a statesman, a leader in the civil life of every community in which he dwelled. I know of no other character in our State or National life who served as Governor of two different States, as a Representative in the Congress from two different States, as one of the first two United States Senators from his newly annexed State, as the President of an independent republic, or who whittled a pine stick on the floor of the United States Senate. (In these mad days—in the rush and tumble and turmoil of our present life—how remarkably pleasant it would be, or clarifying to our befuddled minds, if we could all sit down "for a spell" and do some good old-fashioned whittling like Sam Houston did in the days of old.)

The incidents in the career of Gen. Sam Houston are pleasant thoughts upon which to dwell, interesting circumstances to recall. But I pass on from these considerations, remembering the simple but prophetic comment of Andrew Jackson: "The world will take care of Houston's fame."

I am thinking today not so much of the details of San Jacinto's victory, nor of the achievements of Sam Houston as orator, statesman, and leader. I am searching rather for the reason for his phenomenal success, the cause of his courage, the guiding principles which led him to such great fame.

In an obscure document, penned by his hand on October 8, 1835, I think I have discovered that creed. You will remember that he was then commander of the Department at Nacogdoches. His first act in that capacity was to issue a general order to the forces at his command While it was in the form of a military order, it seems to me that that message, and particularly its conclusion, was an address to the people of Texas, an expression of the sentiments of heart of one of their number, a promise of freedom to come, a consecration to duty, a call for high courage from all men of good will.

It was so striking and significant in its content, so sincere in its tone, that I know it must have brought a warm, a fervent, and a zealous response from those whom he had been chosen to lead.

Concluding that order, General Houston said:

"The morning of glory is dawning upon us. The work of liberty has begun. Our actions are to become a part of the history of mankind. Patriotic millions will sympathize in our struggles, while nations will admire our achievements. We must be united—subordinate to the laws and authorities which we avow, and freedom will not withhold the seal of her approbation. Rally around the standard of the Constitution, entrench your rights with noble resolution, and defend them with heroic manliness. Let your valor proclaim to the world that liberty is your birthright. We cannot be conquered by all the arts of anarchy and despotism combined. In heaven and valorous hearts we repose our confidence. Our only ambition is the attainment of national liberty—the freedom of religious opinion and just laws. To acquire these blessings, we solemnly pledge our person, our property, and our lives. Union and courage can achieve everything, while reason combined with intelligence can regulate all things necessary to human happiness."

Reading those inspired words, we find, I think, the background, the basis, the fundamental reason for Houston's achievement. And we find there further, it seems to me, a message so prophetic, a creed so lasting, a statement so significant to our present day that it might well have been written on April 21, 1941, instead of more than a hundred years ago. Listen to his solemn admonition; hear his heroic words; consider the soundness of his expressed sentiments—and you will thrill, as I have thrilled, to the challenge of this clarion call of a century ago.

"The morning of glory is dawning upon us." Surely it was dawning then, and surely is our sun still rising in the eastern sky of hope. Our State is rich in resources. Our land of Texas—170,000,000 acres in extent—can count among its cherished advantages all those things which man requires—food for his sustenance; shelter for his comfort; bountiful raw materials to be shaped into other things by his handiwork and skill, or to be molded and fashioned by mighty machines; resources of energy at his every command. Here are playgrounds for his pleasure; scenes of beauty for his inspiration; an empire for his conquest.

Our factories are humming; our soil produces new wealth; our people are working and happy. "The morning of glory" is surely here.

"Our actions are to become a part of the history of mankind." Sam Houston spoke well. The history of Texas—as a Republic, as a State—is known throughout the world. The name of Texas—said to mean "friendship"—is associated also with thoughts of fortune, of force and vigor, and of great faith. Our actions—the actions of Texans of a hundred years—have become indeed a part of the history of mankind and have opened avenues for new opportunity, further progress, and high achievement.

"We must be united—subordinate to the laws and authorities which we avow, and freedom will not withhold the seal of her approbation." That is Sam Houston speaking, my friends: Sam Houston speaking to his soldiers, to those about him; Sam Houston speaking to generations yet unborn.

How did he say we would succeed? "We must be united—subordinate to the laws and authorities which we avow." Sam Houston did not mean united in partisan groups; Sam Houston did not mean united in separate organizations, and cliques; Sam Houston did not mean united in classes which engage in strife. He called upon his countrymen to be united—just plain united! And that meant all together—all for one and one for all—dedicated to a common cause which deserved well their devotion, their strength, their every effort.

How true his words ring today, how timely his message!

I decline, my friends, to accept the viewpoint that there is an irreconcilable conflict between any arbitrary groups of our people. I refuse to recognize any chasm between Americans that cannot be spanned by those basic virtues of honesty, integrity, and fair play—virtues which are characteristic, I think, of the vast majority of the 130,000,000 who constitute the citizenry of the United States of America. I believe that, whatever the diversity of our views, we do have a common ground on which we can stand in peace and contentment; we do have the ties of a heroic past which should bind us closely together; we do have the promise of a rich and useful future which should inspire us to go forward in fellowship and good will.

"We cannot be conquered by all the arts of anarchy or despotism." Who is that speaking? Is it the voice of our great President and leader in today's crisis—telling us to be of stout heart and good cheer? Is it the pledge of 1941? No, my friends; again it is rugged old Sam Houston—breathing defiance to dictators of yet another age and telling them, as we tell the despots of a modern day, that "liberty is our birthright" and that we propose again today to "entrench our rights with noble resolution and defend them with heroic manliness."

Thank God for truth which withstands the onslaughts of time! Thank God for the sentiments of heart of free men which do not change though faced with the dark forebodings of an uncertain future!

I am told that in an old newspaper in the New York Library there is a poem by an unknown correspondent, written in December 1841, and referring to the San Jacinto Battlefield. It was as prophetic as the words of Houston. Its writer said:

"In future time, then, may the pilgrim's eye
See here an obelisk, pointed to the sky,
Commemorative of each patriot's name,
Who nobly battled for his country's fame;
And on its pedestal and tapering spire,
Read epitaphs that free men will admire,
Inscribed in lasting characters of gold,
To celebrate the gallant and the bold."

Dreamed in 1841—completely realized today. The obelisk does stand, pointed to the sky, commemorating each patriot's name and recording his contribution to an empire's fame.

May there be engraven just as deeply upon the tablets of our hearts the heroic words of Gen. Sam Houston when he called upon us—all of us—Texans of 1836, Texans of 1941—to pledge to this sacred cause "our person, our property, our very lives," and let us share with him the noble thought that "in heaven and in valorous hearts we repose our confidence."

It is particularly important, I think, that we should recall at this very time these words of admonition from one of our great leaders of the past, a leader who faced the challenge of dictatorship, a leader who was chosen by his comrades to direct their efforts in throwing off the yoke of tyranny and in guaranteeing for themselves and for their sons, and for their sons after them, the sacred and inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those sturdy pioneers of another day accepted the challenge. They placed themselves in the path of the despot's desire. By their actions, as well as by their words, they pledged full allegiance to Houston's sentiment that the sacrifice of person, property, and life itself on the altar of freedom was not too great a price to pay for the privilege of organizing and maintaining a Government which would exalt the rights of man and preserve for mankind those essentials to a free and untrammeled existence.

How similar are the situations of 1836 and 1941! True, the proportions are immeasurably different, the battle front now more far-flung. But the issues are almost parallel; the opposing forces have striking resemblance to those of a century ago. The challenge to our safety, well-being, our very existence is just as serious today as it was in the perilous years which our fathers knew.

Our general well-being, the vast resources of our land, the prosperity which we have known in the past and the prospect which we have envisioned for the future have, I am afraid, given us a sense of complacency which is inconsistent with our present situation. I do not wish to spread alarm. I hope that we shall not know fear in our hearts. But I am convinced that the democracy which was bequeathed us through the noble effort and sacrificial service of those who have gone before, the democracy which we cherish and under the beneficences of which we thrive and prosper—I do believe that that democracy is in the direst danger. And I do know that unless we shall become sufficiently aware of the peril which besets us and bestir ourselves as did the patriots of old, the most serious consequences may be in store.

But what shall we do? What shall we do to preserve the contributions of the past? What shall we do to maintain our government in the traditional American Way? How shall we combat the threat of totalitarian tyranny—a tyranny that has already in less than 12 months reduced to ruins 11 nations which embraced our democratic ideals, a tyranny which has virtually enslaved 250,000,000 people whose only offense was that they were in the way of a mad march of power-crazed men. How shall we continue to be free?

Our soldier and sailor boys and our marines did not hesitate long over that question. With marked unanimity and with patriotic spirit reminiscent of Valley Forge, San Jacinto, and the Alamo, they answered the call, and, with no murmur of protest, gave up their trades, their professions, their careers, and shouldered arms for the military and naval protection of their land.

The example which they are setting should be an inspiration to those of us who have not yet had our full share in the all-out plan of American preparedness. Our production lines must turn out more and more materials for these lads of ours. There must be machines for them to travel over highway and field, planes to soar through the skies, ships to sail the high sea. Whether we be executives or managers or labor, our duty is clear; the test of our patriotism is at hand.

In Texas we do not intend for the wheels of any machine nor the line of any assembling operation to stop for one moment while men quarrel or engage in petty partisan bickering. I proposed to the Texas Legislature the enactment of a law prohibiting the use of force or violence, or the threat thereof, in any labor disputes, and the legislature passed that bill within 8 legislative days after it was submitted. Texas can say to the world, with full assurance, that defense production in this State will not be delayed by any such practices as those described. The State of Texas has many resources and facilities which are being put at the disposal of the Nation, and those resources will be made available without interruption or delay. Sam Houston and his men destroyed the bridges behind them. Theirs was an all-out effort. There were no drones. The Houston philosophy and practice of 1836 is the Texas philosophy of 1941.

Our Government must be made strong, effective, honest, and sound. If a bungling bureaucracy gets in the way it must be replaced in favor of an efficient administration of our plans. If there are weaknesses in the structure of our Government—National, State, or local—we must hasten to strengthen those sections of our ramparts.

We must give full attention to home defense, to care of those in need, to the provision of employment for those who know no skills, for the training of our labor reserves to serve in positions more profitable to them and beneficial to the country's defense.

We must sweep from the framework of our official structure and from the recesses of our minds and hearts any evidences of selfishness, envy, and greed. We must stand shoulder to shoulder for the common cause and give to that cause all of the strength, the courage, and the talent with which a gracious God has endowed us.

My friends, shafts and monuments have been erected to our pioneer patriots—and fittingly so. And there would be pride and gratitude in their hearts, I am sure, if they were here to see these physical evidences of our esteem. Sam Houston, being human, must have been proud of the battles which he won, the high offices which he attained. But also, being human, there must have been a particular tenderness and love in his heart for his family and his close friends, a solicitude for their well-being, a pride in their achievement. I have read the last will and testament of Sam Houston, and I have noted the attention which he gave to instructions regarding the education and training of his children. How concerned he was for their future; how anxious that they should be strong, and noble, and good! How glad he would have been to know that they grew into manhood and womanhood possessed of high intellect, of gracious bearing, of profound faith!

There is one son of Gen. Sam Houston who is living today. On June 21 he will reach the age of 87 and, despite the strain of the busy, purposeful, and successful life which he has lived, he is still a close student of the trend of the times. His latest book, Texas Independence, declared by experts to be one of the most authentic works on Texas history yet to be issued, appeared but 3 short years ago.

I want to pay tribute to him today. I have just been to see him in his quaint house overlooking Galveston Bay. I have inspected the shelves of his study, lined with books representing the best literature of the ages. I have seen mementos of his successful career as a military man, and I recalled with pride that it was my honor 2 years ago to give him an honorary commission as major general of the Texas National Guard as a token of esteem for his distinguished service for that organization. I have heard him speak with great fervor on moral issues which demand the attention of our society; I have known of his work as a civic leader in every community in which he has lived. His literary skill, his ability as a lawyer, and his charming talent as a painter are well known.

Elected the first president of the San Jacinto Chapter, Sons of the Republic of Texas, in Houston, he has been identified through the years with the study of our history and with efforts to perpetuate the record of our noble past. Even as his father brought fame to him, through a life characterized by courage, high intelligence, and consecration to a great cause, so has ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, in turn, honored his father by being diligent in the service of society, devoted to his native State, and dedicated to the highest principles of public and personal virtue. He has carried the banner of Houston high and has added luster to an already ennobled name.

As Governor of the State of Texas, I have wished to recognize the useful life of ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON and to pay another tribute to the immortal memory of his father.

I have today, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the land, appointed ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON to the high position of United States Senator from the State of Texas to serve until the vacancy caused by the untimely death of the late Senator Morris Sheppard shall have been filled by election, as provided by law.

Many names of distinguished and honorable men and women have been recommended to me for appointment to this high office, but not once has the name of Gen. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON been suggested to me. He receives this high honor, not because of endorsements of many friends—although I doubtless would have received many such endorsements if the people of Texas had known that I was considering him for the place—but because I have searched the pages of history to find the one who, I think, is most entitled to this tribute.

To whom could six and a half million Texans owe a greater debt of gratitude than to the only living son of Gen. Sam Houston? What act could bring such joy to the heart of Gen. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON than to walk into the Senate of the United States and to occupy, as Senator from Texas, the same seat which his illustrious father occupied on March 30, 1846, as one of the first two United States Senators from Texas? What could be more inspiring and encouraging to the other 95 United States Senators, at this crucial time in world history, than to sit in session with the son of that great general who in days of crisis a hundred years ago played such an important role in the history of this State and Nation? And last, but not least, what a contribution Gen. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON in his own right can make to our cause of freedom and democracy. He receives this honorable appointment not alone as a tribute to the memory of his distinguished father, but also because he is eminently qualified for the place. His own high intellectual attainments, his long and useful experience, his patriotic service to his State, distinguish him as a great son of Texas and make it particularly appropriate that he should receive, to climax his career, the highest honor in our power to bestow.

In the name of the people of Texas, and moved by the impulse of our grateful hearts, I salute once again the name of Houston.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I said before, I visited Gen. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON today, and just as I broke the news to him of his appointment the sun suddenly shot through the dark rain clouds in such fashion that it appeared dazzling. I said:

"General, do you know what caused that sun to burst so suddenly through those dark and heavy rain clouds?"

He said, "No, Governor; what caused it?"

I said, "General, it appears to me as if our great and good, loving God has just spread the clouds apart so the spirit of your illustrious father could smile down upon his son on this particular scene and see the big smile on your face."

Mr. President

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, attention has been directed in the public press to a statement purporting to come from the White House, claiming that 95 percent of the letters received there approved the President's proclamation of an undeclared war. I am not going to say that it is a misstatement, deliberate or otherwise, because I have not the means of disproving it. I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that such a representation of public sentiment is completely and entirely inconsistent with the mail received by my office, and also not in keeping with that received by other Representatives of the people with whom I have discussed the subject.

Every week, every day, I receive appeals from citizens who are appealing to their public servants to keep our country out of war. And I want to reproduce here, Mr. Chairman, one petition I received from a group of citizens I think representative of the kind of America we like to think about. These citizens live in the small town typical of our Nation,

where they are not swayed by the hysteria of arguments and propaganda disseminated for selfish objectives.

The petition was sent to me, addressed to the President. In addition to sending it there, I am asking to have it reproduced in this public document, where I know it will reach the attention of those who keep account of what this legislative branch of their Government is saying and doing. The petition follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

MR. PRESIDENT: In the last election we, the undersigned, trusted your promise that you would not send our boys to fight in battlefields of foreign countries, and for this solemn promise we voted for you. Please, Mr. President, do not disappoint us—keep your promise.

Henry Rasche, Marjorie Rasche, Augusta Rasche, Emil Rasche, Sr., Emil Rasche, Jr., Frank J. Kotivicki, Eric Kretschmar, Wm. Trapp, Henry Bade, Bertha Rasche, Arthur McLennon, Mrs. Arthur McLennon, Leonard McLennon, Mrs. Victor Matuszisiki, M. M. Prell, Ed Prell, A. W. Grossman, Ida Grossman, Wm. Schaldig.

Gasless Sundays

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of our Nation are greatly disturbed over the proposed plan of Secretary Ickes to establish gasless Sundays in our country, in an apparent effort to conserve the supply, while at the same time we are selling both oil and gasoline, in large quantities, to Japan. The oil and gasoline which we sell to Japan will no doubt be delivered by her to the Axis Powers, or used by Japan as an ally of the Axis Powers, in an effort to defeat the democracies of the world. This is a policy which is so inconsistent that it should not be countenanced by the people of this country. Our Nation has given aid to China, and to the democracies, by way of supplies and money. When we sell oil and gasoline to the enemy of those democracies we are placing the weapon in their hands with which to defeat the same democracies which we have been attempting to aid. This policy should be stopped, and the President and his agencies should be prevented from further pursuing this unholy policy.

Mr. Speaker, we do not know whether this is merely another gesture to create a greater war hysteria in this country, or whether the Secretary of the Interior is in good faith in his announced policy of establishing the gasless Sundays in this country. But, in either event, the policy is so unsound in the face of the existing facts that such an order would be meaningless; and it would be almost wholly impossible of enforcement. The people know the facts respecting the sale of gasoline and oil to Japan, and they know that the oil and gasoline which Japan obtains from us will be used against every democracy in the world, including the United States, in the event of our involvement in a shooting war.

An article, with a Washington date line of June 3, 1941, is very illuminating on this subject, which I herewith include, which reads:

GASLESS SUNDAYS SUGGESTED BY OIL-INDUSTRY LEADERS

WASHINGTON, June 3.—Gasless Sundays and other restrictions throughout the United States, and possible conservation measures affecting the whole of the Western Hemisphere, were suggested by the oil industry today as means of meeting expected shortages in petroleum.

The industry's report said the east would begin to feel a petroleum deficiency by July 1 and this would be intensified progressively into autumn and the next year.

The oil men, here for talks with Government officials, recommended creation of an industry committee, and its spokesmen pledged cooperation "to any extent" in meeting needs of supply.

The mention of restriction on Sunday use of automobiles backed a suggestion made by Ickes last week.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that our high Government officials have full knowledge of the sale of oil to Japan.. The negotiations by the great oil companies with Japan for the sale of such commodities has the sanction and approval of our Government.

Herewith I incorporate an article, appearing in the press of our country, under date line of June 3, 1941, which will be of interest to the people of our Nation, which reads as follows:

JAPAN TO GET OIL SUPPLIES

FLEMINGTON, N. J., June 3.—The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey outlined to stockholders today details of an agreement to sell additional supplies of oil to Japan "negotiated with the full knowledge of the American, British, and Netherlands East Indies Governments."

It appears from the articles, above set forth, that the present administration is adopting a policy of aiding both sides in this European war—the Axis Powers and the democracies—which would have the tendency of prolonging their war, and in the event of our involvement in it—which I hope will never happen—the very supplies we are now sending to Japan would be used against us. And the very sad aspect of this entire matter is that in order to aid the Axis Powers, by selling gasoline and oil to Japan, our own people in this country are to be penalized by having imposed upon them "gasless Sundays" and a very strict limitation in the use of oil and gasoline for every purpose, including that of domestic use for heating homes in our country.

This policy is entirely inconsistent. It should never be inaugurated in the face of the existing facts. Our own people should have recognition, and not the arch enemies of the democracies.

The W. P. A. Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of the people now employed by the W. P. A. are more than 40 years of age and over half of them are over 45.

What does this mean? It means that by and large these are folk who cannot expect to find jobs elsewhere, however much the defense program may expand.

18-MONTH SUSPENSION IS WRONG

It means also that to suspend these workers at the end of each 18-month period constitutes an utterly unnecessary hardship and accomplishes no good purpose.

The W. P. A. workers today are not people who want relief nor people who could get work elsewhere if they tried. They are a group of older men and women who must either depend on local relief or else work for the benefit of their Nation on this public-works program. I have never yet met a W. P. A. worker who would not give anything to secure a private job if he could find one.

PROPOSAL TO CUT 500,000 JOBS IS WRONG

It seems to me to be utterly wrong to cut the W. P. A. as has been proposed by the Budget and as is proposed in the committee's bill. It will mean laying off some 500,000 people in the next month or so and it will mean just about 2 people can have such work next year for every 3 who have had it this year. And this will be done in the face of the fact that over a million heads of families now need W. P. A. work and cannot have it.

I know a good many people who were formerly unemployed have gone back to work due to the tremendous defense program.

WHAT OUR RULE SHOULD BE

I also know that America's rule and principle, if she really wants to be strong, must be this: No man's labor, no man's time, no man's talents must be wasted. We cannot afford any unemployment at all under the present circumstances.

The way to cut W. P. A., and the only fair and right way, is to let it cut itself—in other words, when the time comes that fewer people are certified and in need of work than there are jobs available on the program, then we should cut it down. Not until then. Not until all our people are employed and at work.

But the conservative National Industrial Conference Board estimates that the very least unemployment we can expect in the next fiscal year is 5,000,000. And at this moment there are as many people eligible and waiting for a chance to go to work as there are people employed.

And listen to this passage from an editorial in the United States News:

In the period just ahead * * *.

Many factories, without defense orders, will close for lack of steel or aluminum or rubber or copper or zinc or other defense materials.

Many workers with jobs in these factories will be out of jobs.

Many merchants selling goods that are made of materials useful for defense will find it more and more difficult to restock as shelves are emptied.

Many consumers, with dollars to spend, will find it harder to obtain the goods they want; will be limited in what they can buy.

It's just that the defense honeymoon is coming to an end.

This factor certainly must be considered.

WORK DONE AND VALUE OF PROGRAM

About 500,000 W. P. A. workers are employed right now on direct national-defense projects. One Army officer has stated to a committee of Congress that if we are going to cut down on the W. P. A. we will have to increase the Army appropriation if we are to get the work done.

If airports are important for national defense then we should remember that most of them have been and are being built by W. P. A. Without W. P. A. workers we should have only a fraction of the airports we do have or they would have cost a great deal more money to build.

Nor is this by any means the only type of direct national-defense work done by W. P. A. At one Army camp 4,000 acres of ground has been cleared for maneuvers, 42 miles of supply roads have been built, a complete sewer system has been installed, a water system has been put in, and all of it by W. P. A. This record has been repeated all over the Nation.

The question is, Is it better to have these men employed in this manner or to have them on relief rolls?

TRAINING PROGRAM

But there are other features to the W. P. A. program which may in the long run be even more important. Very few people seem to know it, but all over the nation W. P. A. is training people to take jobs in various types of defense factories where there is a need for more labor of certain types. This clearly is not only rehabilitation for the individual but of paramount importance to the Nation.

And then there are the jobs for those groups of people—older men, mothers who, without much previous work experience, must support their families—who cannot possibly get jobs elsewhere. Here is where the sewing projects for women come in, and though there will be a strong urge to cut them down and increase other parts of the program, I hope earnestly that this will not be done, because I know what this work has meant to thousands of American women who had no other place to turn except to local relief.

No group has been hit so hard by unemployment and no group will be helped less by the defense program than white-collar and professional people. Broadly speaking, the type of work they have been doing on the W. P. A. has been what is called "community service." It has included serving school lunches to about 2,000,000 children a day, the distribution of surplus commodities, adult education, and housekeeping aid to poor mothers, especially at the time when their babies are coming.

Many a community finds itself in dire need of more recreational facilities and more trained recreation workers due to the influx of new families. W. P. A. can and has supplied such workers.

Nearly 70,000 people are now employed by W. P. A. preparing and serving school lunches to undernourished children.

Teachers working for W. P. A. wages have made possible many adult education classes that would otherwise have been impossible. In all these cases it is obvious how harmful it is if a person doing work of this kind must be removed from his playground work or from his teaching because he has been employed at it for 18 months.

The 18-month rule should be abolished in this bill. Whatever useful purpose it may have served in the past it can now only punish people who need this work because, indeed, they can get no other work or else destroy the effectiveness of one of the community-service programs I have just described.

Finally, at a time like this, one of the things most necessary is that we do not let the culture of our country suffer while we build its defenses. In many respects, I believe the art and music projects of W. P. A. have been one of the finest things any government ever undertook. They have developed and preserved the talents and the art of the common folk of this great Nation. They have said to all the world that here was one nation that valued these things and believed that not only those who were able to afford expensive training but also the common people had within them talents that were worth more to their fellow citizens than money could measure. I think the arts projects should be kept going for these reasons.

The W. P. A. is not perfect. It never has been. But it still has a place in our Nation today, for if there ever was a time when it was important for all groups, especially those who are most helpless, to be fairly treated, to be encouraged, to feel that they are doing useful and necessary tasks, that time is now.

W. P. A. has two great purposes: First, to make a most important direct contribution to national defense by its direct national-defense projects; second, to put to work at useful and important jobs in the communities of the Nation those groups of our people who otherwise will have no jobs at all.

This is not the time to be adding to the number of the unemployed. Rather it is a time to say there shall be no unemployment at all.

I am in favor of an amendment to the W. P. A. bill which will provide at least enough money to employ as many people as have been employed in this fiscal year. If we can ever do that, it will mean that such gains as do take place in employment will be real gains and not imaginary ones.

Cecil Rhodes, Not Streit, Was Author of Union Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

ARTICLE FROM SCRIBNER'S COMMENTATOR

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative article by Mr. Albert Hall in the June issue of Scribner's Commentator, proving beyond a doubt that Cecil Rhodes, not Clarence Streit, was the father of Union Now. I am placing this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I believe every true American should have the facts contained.

The article follows:

[From Scribner's Commentator of June 1941]

CECIL RHODES, FATHER OF UNION NOW

(By Albert Hall)

"Union Now With Britain" is the startling title of a new book by Clarence K. Streit, who proposes that a federal union between the United States and England and the British Dominions be set up at once. Mr. Streit has a large and growing organization—Federal Union, Inc.—and many influential supporters. Echoes are heard across the Atlantic. Last August Leslie Hore-Belisha talked in the British House of Commons about the possibility of an eventual common citizenship of Britain and the United States.

As Cecil Rhodes, multimillionaire British imperialist, wrote 50 years ago, "We could hold the federal parliament 5 years at Washington and 5 years at London."

Hopes for a reunion of the United States with the mother country have lived here and in England since the days of Benedict Arnold, but the roots of the present agitation stem back to the plans and actions of Cecil Rhodes, who made federal union of the English-speaking peoples his life purpose. One of the means he adopted to bring the United States into closer association with the Empire was the establishment at Oxford University of the Rhodes scholarships for selected students from the British Empire and the United States. One of those students has been Clarence K. Streit.

It would be well for Americans to know some facts about Cecil Rhodes, who set on foot such vast enterprises for our benefit.

In 1877, at Kimberley, South Africa, in the "grand old days of the diamond fields," Rhodes, then only 24 years old, but already a man of effective action as well as a dreamer, drew up for the guidance of his life a draft of his ideas. As definite objectives, he proposed to himself: "The furtherance of the British Empire, for the bringing of the whole uncivilized world under British rule, for the recovery of the United States, for the making the Anglo-Saxon race but one empire." What

a dream. But yet it is probable. It is possible.

When Rhodes was making these amazing plans, he and a partner already held big concessions in the diamond fields. Rhodes' financial genius caused people to speak of his golden touch. But wealth, to him, was primarily a means for actualizing what he called his thoughts—political thoughts, racial thoughts, imperial thoughts.

William T. Stead, for many years Rhodes' close friend, tells that in that very year Rhodes drew up the first of his famous wills, bequeathing his property to the British Secretary of State for the Colonies and one Mr. Shippard, "giving them full authority to use the same for the purpose of extending British rule * * * the consolidation of the Empire, the restoration of the Anglo-Saxon unity destroyed by the schism of the eighteenth century."

Rhodes threw himself into the commercial and political life of South Africa, but kept his Anglo-Saxon ideas to himself and a small circle of friends. In the diamond industry, he was at the forefront of the development of London-dominated combinations and monopolies. In 1888 he merged forces with Barney Barnato, the diamond king, his erstwhile rival, to form the De Beers Consolidated Mines. This was the end of the grand old days of the independent diamond producers.

In the meantime wars and politics were raging throughout South Africa. The whites fought the native blacks and more or less gently persuaded them of the dignity of labor. Among the whites, too, there was strife—between the English and the Dutch. Cape Colony, where Rhodes flourished, had been taken by the English from their ally, Holland, in 1814 in order to "prevent its seizure by the common enemy, France." The English had come as allies and stayed as rulers.

Not all the African Dutch were reconciled to this new order and many of them trekked out of Cape Colony, fighting wars with the natives and with the English, finally winning recognition for the Transvaal and the Orange Free State as independent Boer republics. In Cape Colony itself the dominant English were opposed by a Dutch party known as the Afrikander Bond.

North of the Transvaal and approachable from the cape via Bechuanaland lay a vast territory nominally ruled by the Matabele chief Lo Bengula and known as Mashonaland and Matabeleland. This territory, rich in minerals and very suitable for white habitation, was naturally coveted by the English of the cape and by the Boers of the Transvaal.

Such was the state of affairs when Cecil Rhodes entered politics by taking his seat in the Cape Assembly in 1881. He had just been graduated from Oriel College, Oxford, having attended irregularly since 1873, alternating South African ventures with cloistered studies in his native England.

Rhodes was not above trickery and deceit if the purpose were grandiose enough. Thus he flattered the cape Dutchmen in every possible way. He cultivated the friendship of Mr. Hofmeyr, leader of the Afrikander Bond. He built a palatial residence, furnishing it in the Dutch style, and entertained the back-veldt farmers en masse on every possible occasion. The Boers regarded him with affection and called him the Englishman with the Afrikander heart. He became Prime Minister of Cape Colony in 1890.

Shortly before this, he had begun preparations for taking Lo Bengula's territory. His agents got a mining concession from Lo Bengula. Quickly forming a chartered company by grace of London, Rhodes sent his friend, Dr. Jameson, with company soldiers into Mashonaland to keep out the trekking Transvaalers.

Rhodes was now approaching the summit of his career. As chairman of De Beers Consolidated (with a vast income), as managing director of the chartered company, and as prime minister of Cape Colony, all at the same time, he was virtually dictator of British South Africa. His agents were ubiquitous.

Now, at last, he was able to begin the extension of British rule in Africa. Rhodes' agents fomented a war with Lo Bengula, seized his territory and renamed it Rhodesia.

All this while Rhodes aided in public enterprises, building railroads, schools, telegraph lines, courthouses, and so on. As time went on, he was particularly anxious to populate Rhodesia, and news of marriages or births often caused him to remark, "Good, it will help populate the country" or "So-and-so is a good citizen."

But his mind was not completely occupied with South Africa. He made one will after another, leaving his property now to this friend and now to that, with secret instructions to use the money in building up the British Empire and winning back the United States. He also desired to found a secret society of millionaires to accomplish his purpose. He wrote to William T. Stead in 1891, recalling some discussions:

"Please remember the key of my idea discussed with you is a society, copied from the Jesuits as to organization, the practical solution a differential rate (tariff war), and a copy of the United States Constitution, for that is home rule or federation, and an organization to work this out, working in the House of Commons, for decentralization."

As a step toward union, he advocated a tariff war against the United States. His letter says, "The world, with America in the forefront, is devising tariffs to boycott your manufactures, and that is the supreme question, for I believe that England, with fair play, should manufacture for the world * * * a commercial war * * * that is my program. You might finish the war by union with America."

In the same letter Rhodes reveals his vanity: "They are calling the country Rhodesia. * * * I find I am human and should like to be living after my death; still, perhaps, if that name is coupled with the object of England everywhere, and united, the name may convey the discovery of an idea which ultimately led to the cessation of all wars and to one language throughout the world."

His big objective was America. The letter goes on: "What an awful thought it is that if we had not lost America, or if even now we could arrange with the present Members of the United States Assembly and our House of Commons * * * we could hold the federal parliament 5 years at Washington and 5 years at London. The only thing feasible to carry this idea out is a secret one (society). * * * Fancy the charm to young America, just coming on and dissatisfied * * * to share in a scheme to take the government of the whole world."

Cecil Rhodes, whether dealing with the African Cape Dutchmen and affecting an "Afrikander heart," or planning his secret society for bringing the world under British rule, or setting up his scholarships, always felt himself to be a man destined to do good to humankind, in the English manner.

William T. Stead quotes Rhodes's religious conclusions as follows:

"If there be a God, I think that what He would like me to do is to paint as much of the map of Africa British red as possible, and to do what I can to promote the unity and extend the influence of the English-speaking race."

While laying plans for the government of the world, Rhodes was scheming secretly to seize the territory of the independent Boer republics. He plotted revolution in the Transvaal and posted Dr. Jameson on the frontier with a force of Chartered Co. soldiers. Jameson was to march on Johannesburg while the revolutionists rose and seized the Pretoria arsenal, after which the country would be brought under the British flag.

Rhodes and the revolutionary committee got tangled in arguments, for many of the revolutionists wished to remain independent and retain the Transvaal flag. Jameson became impatient, started his famous raid into the Transvaal and was outmaneuvered and captured by the Boer General Cronje (January 1, 1896). There was no uprising. The affair was a fiasco.

Instantly the whole world knew that Cecil John Rhodes, Prime Minister of Cape Colony, chairman of De Beers Consolidated, and managing director of the British South Africa Co. had connived at and financed attempted revolution within a neighboring independent state and had backed an absolutely unprovoked, illegal attack on the same.

Thus was British imperialism exposed to the world so starkly naked that the London government had to disown Rhodes. He was forced to resign as head of the chartered company and as Prime Minister of Cape Colony.

His position was disgraceful, and he was extremely embarrassed. His Dutch friends were heartbroken. He was no longer "the Englishman with the Afrikander heart."

Dr. Jameson went to jail for 15 months, but some years later became Sir Leander Starr Jameson. Bart Rhodes himself expected to be jailed, but was spared that final humiliation.

In extenuation of his conduct, Rhodes discussed the argument over the Transvaal flag, trotting out the idea of federal union. Rhodes said: "My whole idea was federal union, and I thought it was quite possible the Republic would remain a republic, so far as local matters were concerned, but that the federal union, dealing with railways, tariff systems, and defense, and those questions that are called federal, would be in an assembly that must be under the British flag."

In London, Vindex, one of his apologists, put the matter thus: "The question of the flag he did not look on as immediate, and he did not expect the republics to surrender their flags at once."

The aftermath of the Jameson raid was the South African War (1899–1902), ending in the extinguishment of the Boer republics and their annexation to the British Empire.

In 1899 Rhodes drafted his final will, the famous will setting up the Rhodes scholarships. His ideas had ripened. The great plan of winning the United States was to be based on educational ties. The residue of his vast fortune, after specific bequests and setting up the scholarships, he left to a chosen committee for undisclosed purposes.

Here, in the public words of his noted will, are some of his reasons for setting up the scholarships at Oxford for students from the Empire and the United States:

"I consider that the education of young colonists at one of the universities in the United Kingdom is of great advantage * * * for instilling into their minds the advantage to the Colonies as well as to the United Kingdom of the retention of the unity of the Empire. * * * I also desire to encourage and foster an appreciation of the advantages which I implicitly believe will result from the union of the English-speaking peoples throughout the world and to encourage in the students from the United States * * * an attachment to the country from which they have sprung."

Rhodes has been dead 39 years, but his ideas are still with us. We cannot yet tell if any Rhodesian secret society has been operating, but the Rhodes scholarships seem already to be producing results.

It is intriguing to note the following Rhodes scholars officially connected with Federal Union, Inc., the organization back of "Union Now": Clarence K. Streit, Frank Aydelotte, Stringfellow Barr, O. C. Carmichael, George H. Curtis, Clyde Eagleton,

S. E. Eliot, Edwin P. Hubble, W. P. Maddox, Felix Morley, L. A. Post.

On the outskirts of the Union-Now movement, we find Oxford-educated Anglophiles, like Henry R. Luce, editor of Life, who, in a recent editorial, speaks of "that inspiring proposal called Union Now" and derides as "an ignorant and foolish conception" any idea that collaboration with Britain means playing Britain's game.

Is it possible that the "vision of Clarence Streit" came to him by apostolic succession from Cecil Rhodes, whose estate paid the bill for Streit's sojourn within the storied walls of dreamy Oxford?

Truly it seems that Rhodes' "thoughts" are far reaching. Rhodes, as well as Streit, thought the United States Constitution would be a good basis for federal union; Rhodes, too, hoped that in time this federal union would encompass the whole earth, for the good of mankind, of course, but also for the fame of Cecil Rhodes.

"Rhodesia," he had mused, "still • • • the name may convey the discovery of an idea."

Why rob the man of credit due? What could be more fitting for the new sovereignty emerging from the "vision of Clarence Streit" than the name "Rhodesia"?

Our Republic is not expected to surrender its flag at once.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Charles Evans Hughes "leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

Lou Gehrig made the world more wholesome—Kaiser Wilhelm left it more Hitler hateful.

The end of all foreign wars—an eye for an eye—a *Bismarck* for a *Hood*—a wicked waste.

A new plan is to extend our war zone 180° to the east and 180° to the west and then patrol it.

We are kicking ourselves for worrying about the national credit when the legal limit was $45,000,000,000.

If Hiram and Hughes had talked to each other one certain time, two Democratic war Presidents would have talked less.

As dictators go, we have a natural—he declared an unlimited emergency by himself, with Congress in session.

England admits that she lost Crete because of opposition air superiority—the thing Lindy warned Mr. Baldwin against.

Blessings on thee, little man, barefoot boy with cheeks of tan; you are the one and only bet to absorb the national debt.

Guess it will be a long war—the Boss asks for the St. Lawrence waterway for defense and says it will take 4 years to finish it.

Under the broad, general powers of the Economy Act the soldiers' throats were cut and under the powers of "lend-lease" their heads may be cut off.

While Congress is being shut out in the cold rain by Franklin, the action of the Chief Justice reminds us that the Supreme Court was bodily attacked once by this same coordinate third branch.

Construction of Interstate Petroleum Pipe Lines Related to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, this measure—H. R. 4816—is presented as a national-defense measure. This country today is faced with the possibility of a very severe shortage of petroleum products along the Atlantic seaboard. This shortage is not due to any shortage of production, but is due to difficulties in transportation.

Approximately 95 percent of the petroleum products consumed by the States along the Atlantic coast is delivered there by tankers, either in the form of crude or refined products. About 82 percent of the total moved to the Atlantic seaboard moves from the Gulf coast. This 82 percent moving from the Gulf coast to the Atlantic seaboard amounts to about 1,250,000 barrels per day. To keep this movement going, a fleet of 260 domestic oil tankers are required.

Continuing pressing necessity of diverting oil tankers from our coastwise domestic trade to the use of our fleet and to help Great Britain under the lend-lease bill is causing a shortage of tankers. It is certain that more and more tankers will be used for national-defense purposes. In addition, we cannot overlook the possibility that, in the event of hostilities and naval warfare in the Atlantic, this method of supply will be open to enemy attack.

For this reason the United States Government is very much interested in the immediate construction of pipe lines that would enable petroleum to be transported from the sources of production and refining to the Atlantic seacoast. Evidence before the committee shows, as I have stated, that about 95 percent of all petroleum and its products now move by tanker. Only a very small percentage of the volume necessary is ever moved by rail. It is evident that the construction of such pipe lines would not be in competition with the railway transportation agencies, for the reason that they do not have the facilities for handling the great volume of petroleum products made necessary by the demands of national defense.

It is contemplated that these pipe lines will be constructed by private capital, and will be operated in accordance with requirements laid down by the President of the United States. The bill contemplates that upon expiration of the national emergency that any pipe line so constructed should become a common carrier, subject to the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and all other requirements of law.

I wish to emphasize the fact that this situation along the Atlantic seaboard is a shortage of transportation facilities, and not a shortage of petroleum. It is a problem of transportation, not lack of production. Figures presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce show the overwhelming advantageous position that this country has in regard to petroleum products. For instance, it was stated that the entire military activities of Germany and Italy, plus the industrial and other activities of those countries and of the occupied areas of western Europe, are being carried on with an amount of petroleum plus synthetic products, which is only about 5 percent of our present domestic production. The United States has 63 percent of the world production of crude petroleum. Germany, Italy, Poland, Albania, northern France, and Hungary altogether have about 1 percent of the total world production. Of course in addition to this 1 percent, Germany now has access to synthetic gasoline manufactured regardless of cost, and to a certain amount of Russian oil as well as the Rumanian oil fields. Incidentally, it might be of interest to the Members of the House to know that the production of refined oil produced in my home city of Baton Rouge alone exceeds the entire production from the Rumanian oil fields.

When we study these figures and realize their importance, we must recognize the importance of solving speedily this problem of transportation. We have an overwhelming preponderance in petroleum products. We must make that strength immediately available where it will count the most for our national defense.

This bill is in line with the principle advocated by the President of the United States, and the measure itself has the enthusiastic endorsement of the Secretary of War, of the Secretary of the Navy, of the Secretary of the Interior and of the Office of Production Management. This measure is as important in our program of national defense as any measure that will be presented to this body.

The Rules Committee—Its Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN O'CONNOR, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an

address delivered by Hon. John O'Connor, former chairman of the Rules Committee, at Columbia University, April 18, 1941:

An innovation in the method of teaching matters pertaining to public affairs is being tried out at Columbia University, New York City.

In the department of public law and government, under Dr. Kenneth W. Hechler, the class of about 60 seniors is just now studying legislative procedure.

By arrangement with the telephone company, an amplifier is connected with the telephone on the professor's desk. A telephone connection is then made between the professor and some person who is considered an authority on the subject.

On April 18 the discussion pertained to the operation of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives.

Former chairman of the Rules Committee, John O'Connor, of New York, talked to the class via telephone from Washington.

The following was the basis of Mr O'Connor's talk:

"The Rules Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States is one of the forty-odd standing or regular committees of that body, but differs from all the other committees in that it is not a legislative committee; that is, it does not originate legislation nor are any legislative matters referred to it for consideration and report.

"It is often referred to as the 'all-powerful Rules Committee' and has a long, historical background, often as a scapegoat, since its birth in 1789. It is considered by many as the most important committee of the House. Up to 1880 it was a select committee, with the Speaker becoming a member of it in 1858. For a long period up to 1910 the Speaker dominated the committee and named its membership, until the famous fight against the 'Czarism' of Speaker 'Uncle Joe' Cannon in 1910, when control of the committee was taken out of the hands of the Speaker and its members elected, as those of other standing committees, by the membership of the House. An individual becomes a member of the comittee in the same manner as applies to the other committees, but usually only members of considerable experience are appointed. As to the selection of the chairman, the seniority rule prevails, and no Executive has been able to set aside the practice, even though the Executive has effectively brought pressure to bear upon the election of the Speaker and majority leader of the House.

"Incidentally, the Rules Committee of the Senate is of minor importance and rarely functions.

"The Rules Committee is the smallest standing committee of the House, consisting in recent years of 14 members—10 Democrats and 4 Republicans from 12 States of the Union. The majority party of the House has always seen to it that the party in power controlled this most important committee by at least 2 to 1, a far greater proportion of control than exists in any other committee.

"Different from the rules committee in the assembly at Albany, which is under control of the speaker and only functions during the latter part of the session, the Rules Committee of the House functions through the entire congressional session.

"Under the rules of the House, there are referred to this committee all matters pertaining to rules and the order of business of the House (rule XI, par. 35). All resolutions for the creation of investigating committees, such as the Dies committee, are also referred to it.

"While it is the only committee that can sit during sessions of the House without special leave (rule XI, par. 46), and is one of the few committees that can report at any time (rule XI, par. 45), in recent years certain restrictions have been drawn around it, which we shall discuss later.

"Let us now take a typical example of how the Rules Committee operates.

"The recently passed lease-lend bill is an outstanding example. After lengthy hearings and consideration, that bill was reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It then went on one of the calendars of the House, but it might not be reached for consideration in regular course for a year or two, except by unanimous consent of the House or by a two-thirds vote on one of the two Mondays in each month when a few bills are called up under suspension of the rules at the discretion of the Speaker.

"Because the lease-lend bill was considered important and its passage urgent, the Foreign Affairs Committee applied to the Rules Committee for a rule making the bill in order as special business of the House. The chairman of the Rules Committee then called a meeting of his committee. Unlike other committees, the Rules Committee has no set day for hearings, and there are some Members who feel that the least often that committee meets, the better it performs its functions.

"A hearing was held in the meeting room of the Rules Committee, which is adjacent to the House Chamber, for reasons of convenience and speedy action.

"At that hearing before the Rules Committee only members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and possibly other Members of Congress, were heard—for and against the bill. Unlike other committees, the Rules Committee does not hear representatives of the public, and it is only on rare occasions that it deviates from its rule of hearing only Members of Congress, by listening to the head of some department of the Government. The reason for this is that the committee reporting the bill has held hearings, lasting for months sometimes, and has heard the public and those interested in the measure, and it is not the function of the Rules Committee to pass upon the merits of the measure, but rather only to determine whether the bill is of such importance and its passage of such urgency, that it should be presented to the House for consideration and passage. Rarely does the Rules Committee report out a bill unless there is sufficient demand in the House to assure its passage.

"This method of procedure of the Rules Committee of not hearing outsiders has not been pleasing at times to leaders of groups and blocs, like William Green, John L. Lewis, Dr. Townsend, and veteran leaders who wanted to put on a second show before the Rules Committee. The public is admitted, however, to these hearings. But it should always be remembered that the Rules Committee never acts until the other committee which has the bill under consideration reports it to the House, usually after thorough hearings.

"After listening to the proponents and opponents of the lease-lend bill, the Rules Committee went into executive session and voted to report a rule for the consideration of the bill. Under a gentleman's agreement it is rarely disclosed how the individual members of the Rules Committee voted in any instance.

"The rule voted by the Rules Committee is in the form of a resolution providing, in effect, that when the resolution shall be passed by the House it shall be in order to take up for consideration the lease-lend bill. The resolution fixes the time for general debate—several days in the case of the lease-lend bill—and provides for the control of the time, almost invariably providing that the chairman of the committee which reported the bill and the ranking minority member of that committee shall parcel out the time equally.

"Despite any popular opinion to the contrary, it should always be borne in mind that no action of the Rules Committee is in any wise effective until it is approved by a majority vote of the House. Any popular opinion to the contrary notwithstanding, the Rules Committee cannot by itself pass a bill, and the recitation that this has been done, such as in the case of some Blue Ridge Parkway bill is without any foundation whatsoever.

"Likewise the cry of gag rule is usually the last recourse of the die-hard opposition. The true purpose of practically all rules is to serve the will of the majority of the House by expedition of the measure. It is only claimed to be a gag by an infinitesimal minority of unpersuadable opponents.

"The chairman of the Rules Committee or some member of that committee then presents the rule to the House. The rule is usually drawn in the Rules Committee, although sometimes it is introduced in advance by the chairman of the reporting committee and follows a brief and usual form.

"On the next day, or at some later time, the rule is called up in the House. There is 1 hour debate on the rule. When the rule is passed the lease-lend bill, for instance, is taken up for consideration under the terms of the rule.

"The 1-hour debate on the rule is equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the rule or the bill.

"Contrary to popular conception, the rule can be amended if the majority of the House votes against the motion for the previous question, which is submitted at the close of debate on the rule.

"Sometimes—but rarely—the Rules Committee meets in executive session and holds a hearing secretly in reference to some matter of national importance. For instance, some years ago there was consternation in the defense departments over the fact that following the first World War there had accumulated not far from the Capitol a mountain of high explosives, left over from that war, which, if touched off deliberately, accidentally, or by spontaneous combustion, would blow to smithereens everything on the Atlantic seaboard from Key West to Bar Harbor.

"The purpose of the secret meeting was to obtain a special appropriation of $5,000,000 to move this sleeping volcano to the wild lands of Nevada still owned, by the millions of acres, by the Government, and partly unexplored.

"The Rules Committee acted promptly, and one night hundreds of freight cars started the journey across the continent with its dangerous burden—and the public never knew the "close shave" it had.

"On other occasions the Rules Committee has met, secretly, to make preliminary investigations into charges of misfeasance, malfeasance, and graft in Government departments, such as the inability of some high-ranking generals and admirals to account for the expensive oriental rugs on the floors of their homes and other 'gifts,' or, more recently, the charges of favoritism, waste, and worse in the present huge expenditures for national defense.

"The Rules Committee has also considered what action to take in respect to Members of the House charged publicly with misconduct.

"These secret excursions are rare, however, and properly so, because the chief function of the Rules Committee is to serve as an arm of the majority organization of the House—to expedite the important business of the House. It is not subject to the present majority party's 'steering committee,' an informal group of little activity; nor is it subject to any other person or committee.

"Contrary to the opinion, or wish, existing in some places, the Rules Committee is not the 'arm' of the executive branch of the Government. Rather is it a bulwark against Executive interference with the legislative branch. The Rules Committee would be the

first group dissolved by a Hitler, even before he prorogued the entire parliament.

"Even here, far from the confessedly totalitarian states, some complaint has been made in high places, such as, 'What's the use of a Rules Committee if it won't do what we want?' There are still some people old-fashioned enough to think that the Rules Committee is one, if not the last, bulwark between a dictating Executive and a 'rubber stamp' legislature.

"The Rules Committee can never finally obstruct legislation, but it can provide time for 'cooling off' until the impetuous provocateurs get their feet back on the ground or the public takes matters into its own hands and plants them there.

"The Rules Committee is no spot for a timid or a demagogic Representative. Such should never seek the assignment or continue on the committee. Nor is it the place for Representatives whose chief concern is for some group or bloc or interest. They should continue to gravitate to such committees as Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Agriculture, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, Labor, Irrigation and Reclamation, and World War Veterans' Legislation.

"Principally since the Democrats have been in control in the House, several restrictions have been placed on the power of the Rules Committee. Some of such restrictions are that it cannot report any rule or order, setting aside the regular business of Calendar Wednesday, or abrogating the privilege to any Member to offer one motion to recommit the matter before the House to the committee which reported it. Nor can a resolution reported from the Rules Committee be taken up in the House on the same day it is reported, without a two-thirds vote of the House (rule XI, par. 45).

"Calendar Wednesday is set aside each week for the purpose of calling the standing committees of the House in order, and giving them an opportunity to call up for consideration public bills which they have previously reported. Because of the number of committees and the hundreds of bills reported during each session, this method of reaching legislation is not expeditious and the necessity calls into play action by the Rules Committee to pick out the more important and emergency legislation for consideration out of its regular order. Even all the important public legislation reported would not be reached in years if dependence was had solely on the Calendar Wednesday call alone. At times, some committees have not been reached on the call in 2 years.

"The right to move to recommit a measure to the reporting committee is considered one of the highest privileges of the House and cannot be tampered with, even by the all-powerful Rules Committee.

"Up to 1924, some chairmen of the Rules Committee succeeded in defeating the action of their own committee by 'pocketing,' that is, failing to report the action of the committee. They carried the 'rules' around in their pocket and never filed them in the House. This situation was taken care of by an amendment to the rules, adopted in 1924, providing, in effect, that every report of the Rules Committee must be filed within 3 days, and further if it is not called up by the member of the Rules Committee presenting the report, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up. (Rule XI, par. 45.)

"It should also be mentioned, in passing, that the Rules Committee often reports a rule doing away with some dilatory or technical advantage which might be taken against a matter before the House. Such a rule often waives points of order or makes a conference report immediately in order for consideration, to avoid delay by the objection of just one Member.

"In the rules of the House, there is a provision which, as it pertains to the Rules Committee, is most anomalous. I refer to the discharge rule, rule XXVII, paragraph 4, which has attracted public attention because of its being called into use on such measures as the bonus bill, the Frazier-Lemke bill, the antilynching bill, the wage-and-hour bill, and so forth.

"This discharge rule was adopted in 1931 to meet the situation where a committee, to which legislation had been referred, neglected or refused to report the matter either favorably or adversely. The rule provides that when such recalcitrant inaction continues for 30 days, any Member may file a petition to discharge the particular committee and bring the matter before the House, after the petition to discharge has been signed by a majority of the 435 Members of the House.

"Although, to repeat, no bill proposing legislation is ever referred to the Rules Committee, this rule includes in its term the Rules Committee as one of the committees that can be discharged. Because of this extraordinary provision, the device used in most of the instances referred to above was to introduce a rule for the consideration of the legislation. This rule would be referred to the Rules Committee, and if, after 7 days, that committee failed to report out the rule to consider the legislation, a petition to discharge would be lodged against the Rules Committee for failure to bring to the floor legislation which was never before it, and in one instance, at least—the antilynching bill—legislation that had never been acted on by the Judiciary Committee in charge of the bill.

"Such a backhanded method of procedure has, on several occasions, brought the Rules Committee into popular disfavor, at least in the opinion of the particular groups favoring the legislation in question. In the opinion of many Members who have devoted study to the rules of procedure of the House, the Rules Committee should never have been included in the discharge rule, as it was originally presented by Representative Crisp, of Georgia, one of the recognized authorities on parliamentary procedure, who later admitted he had overreached, in providing for the discharge of the Rules Committee in reference to legislation which had never been before it and concerning which it had no legislative jurisdiction.

"It sometimes happens that a legislative committee 'passes the buck' to the Rules Committee by reporting a measure pursuant to some 'deal' in the reporting committee, with the hope that the Rules Committee will pigeonhole the measure. One instance of this was the reporting by the Agriculture Committee of the Frazier-Lemke farm mortgage-inflation bill.

"Perhaps some day this anomaly in the rules will be done away with, but in the meantime the Rules Committee must keep its collective chins up and withstand the barbs and shafts of unfounded or misled public opinion, reconciled to the heroic stand it must continue to take, despite any consequences to the individual members. While it maintains that attitude, it will continue to be one of the few remaining bulwarks of a democracy."

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC LAW
AND GOVERNMENT,
New York, N. Y., April 21, 1941.

Hon. JOHN O'CONNOR,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: It was grand of you to talk with my class over the telephone on Friday, and I want you to know how much we appreciated your clear, lucid description of the work of the Committee on Rules.

Your memorandum reached me this morning, and it is the most comprehensive discussion of the Rules Committee that I have ever seen. Why don't you have it published? It seems to me that it would be a valuable contribution.

I found the citation on the Blue Ridge Parkway matter to which I referred; it was H. R. 12455, considered in July 1936, and discussion of the special rule starts on page 10611 of the RECORD of that year. However, you will note that although the rule prohibited any debate, the bill had previously been debated.

Thank you again for a most enlightening experience.

Very truly yours,
DR. KENNETH W. HECHLER.

Radical Communism the Policy of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from today's Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of June 6, 1941]

DRASTIC MEASURE

(By Mark Sullivan)

CONGRESS PONDERS AN EXTREME BILL

There is a bill in Congress. It provides that the Government can seize anything you have—your factory, your farm, your checkbook, your automobile, your safety razor—literally anything. In the language of the bill, "property of any kind or character, real or personal, tangible or intangible." Just seize it and take it—no court proceeding, no argument. In the language of the bill, "requisition and take over." The Government will pay you whatever it says the thing is worth. If you are not satisfied with the price the Government fixes, then the Government will pay you 75 percent of the price, and sometime later you can bring suit to determine how much you shall get.

As a war measure it is extreme; but there is, in a way, precedent for it. That is, there would be precedent—if we were actually at war. In a state of actual war, actual fighting, it has not been unusual for the head of an army to seize the goods of citizens, their horses, their cattle. In such case it has been the practice to give the citizen a receipt for what is taken, and then let him recover the price later in some kind of proceeding.

In the present situation a material factor is that we are not actually at war. This measure does, when we are not at war, what might be justified if we were at war. The difference between at war and not actually at war is a formal declaration of war by Congress.

What is the purpose of this bill? It is not enough to accept the purpose as set forth in general terms in the bill itself. What we need to know is: What specific purpose was in the minds of the persons who thought up the bill? What was it they wanted to do that they could not do unless this bill is enacted?

Since commotion arose over the bill, various purposes have been put forth. Apparently some private owner of an airplane, used for pleasure or convenience, was not willing to sell his plane to the Government. Also it has been said the purpose was to seize tool-making machinery. One feels the purpose may have been broader than these examples.

For the best answer about the purpose of the bill, the best authority is President Roosevelt. He, when questioned at a press conference, said the purpose was to get delivery of defense orders. As an example, he alluded to the Allis-Chalmers plant, at which defense orders were delayed for many weeks by a strike. Apparently the purpose of this bill is to give the Government power to seize such a plant as Allis-Chalmers when there is a strike.

This looks strange. When there is a strike, don't do anything about the strikers—the administration has been conspicuously reluctant to do anything against strikers. Just seize the plant and operate it as a Government plant. That way, the penalty is put on the owners of the plant; they are required to give up their plant. The strikers don't give up anything. (Except that later on the strikers, and all workers, will find they have lost something precious—this way of getting around strikes would turn out to be a long step toward the totalitarian form of society and government.)

Against this bill, Congress resists. One feature that disturbs Congress is that when property is taken there is no provision for later returning it to the owner. The property is taken absolutely, and, in the words of the bill, "temporarily or permanently." Congress wonders why. If the Government takes Allis-Chalmers, or any other plant, why not return it after the emergency is over?

Congress wonders if a purpose of this bill, or an effect whether consciously intended or not, is to take over industries and keep them—in short, to bring about a permanent system of Government ownership and operation of industry. As it happens, this bill was not drafted by new dealers. It was drafted and endorsed by conservative men who came into the War Department temporarily to help in the war. They may either have been infected by the atmosphere of the New Deal, or affected by the traditional point of view of the Army about what is expedient in time of actual war.

What really disturbs Congress is recollection of what the New Deal has attempted in the past, long before war came into the picture. Step after step taken by the New Deal has been in the direction of economic and governmental revolution. As much as 4 years ago, Miss Dorothy Thompson wrote about Mr. Roosevelt's court bill and other measures: "These bills * * * add up to a consistent picture. And the picture is of a tremendously centralized government, with a power and authority vested in the President, not far from equal to the power and authority vested in Mussolini and Stalin."

And as it was expressed by Mr. Walter Lippmann, June 26, 1937: "I feel, let us hope mistakenly, that he, President Roosevelt, really does have a plan and that he is determined to execute it. * * * It is a plan, as I see it, to gather together an irresistible power over the economic life of this country, and to consolidate that power in the hands of his own following * * * irresistible power personally directed. * * * These fears, I regret to say, are shared by men who have occupied high places in this very administration and in the confidence of Mr. Roosevelt himself."

Recollection of this past record of the New Deal is now a tragic impediment at a time when some centralization of power is desirable for the purpose of war.

Policy of the Government Toward Nutrition Outside the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. A. A. BERLE, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, given at the National Nutrition Conference for Defense, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, May 27, 1941:

Let me first congratulate you for assembling, in a particularly trying time, to consider methods of improving the health of the country. Never was work more useful; and never more necessary.

Your task is to consider the problems of nutrition in this country and how they must be met. That is really a problem of how effectively to distribute the huge stocks of supplies which are readily available. To me you assign a less happy subject of the policy of the Government toward nutrition outside the United States. There, due to the efforts of war, blockades, and counterblockades, the problem is vastly less happy.

It has been, and is, the consistent policy of the United States to make food resources available, so far as possible, to those countries which need them. In normal times we rely on commerce to take the surplus stocks of food which we have to the points where they are needed. But where normal commerce does not accomplish this result, this Government has historically supplemented the supply by sending food, at its own expense, or at the expense of American organizations.

In the years following the World War, as you know, this Government through various organizations financed and sent food to Russia, Poland, Germany, Austria, Belgium, France; and sent less amounts to other countries. This process started immediately after the armistice of 1918; and it continued for several years. Only when the normal processes of reopened trade made it possible for the populations of these countries to obtain adequate food through normal channels did we cease to send relief. We did it without drawing political distinctions; and we did it on the straightforward theory that a land of plenty had a duty to humanity.

During the present war the Government has followed, so far as possible, the same policy. Naturally it has had to be modified by changed conditions, and by the exigencies of military situations which we did not create.

The chief agency which acts in conjunction with the Government in its relief policy is, as you all know, the American Red Cross.

To the extent possible, we have endeavored to send food and supplies into those countries not under actual military occupation, which were in need. We took the view that two assurances are required: First, arrangements which make sure that the supplies actually reach the people who need them and preferably by distribution through the American Red Cross or agencies designated by it; and second, that the effect of such supplies will not increase hunger and want elsewhere; for, of course, nothing is accomplished by shipping food and relief into an area if the only effect is to stimulate military seizures of other food and supplies within that area.

Relief of this sort has taken various forms, depending on circumstances. In some cases—Finland, for instance—loans have been made permitting purchases of food here and its shipment abroad. Shiploads of relief have been sent to unoccupied France. Other shiploads of food have been sent to Spain. Certain movements of food have been facilitated to certain of the unoccupied French colonies. Supplies were actually on the way to Greece when she was invaded.

In many cases, unhappily, the possibility of sending relief has been severely limited. The difficulties of transport and distribution have frequently been extreme. Where we have to choose, the first concern has been the sending of supplies for children, especially milk and vitamins.

Only recently, arrangements were made to send two shiploads of food to Ireland.

We have not felt that the policy of relief could be determined wholly by arguments over the question who is responsible for the distress. We realize perfectly that the forces of invasion and aggression are the direct cause of the want and hunger and starvation of great populations. It would be very easy to say that we ought simply to leave the problem to the people who are responsible for creating it. But that is not a complete answer. The populations of these countries still have to live; and in their children may very well lie the hope for a free and civilized Europe.

Instead, therefore, of asking "Who is responsible for this?", we have asked "Will the relief actually do any good? Or will it merely feed one group in one place and increase misery elsewhere by encouraging or assisting invaders or aggressors to requisition, or seize, or buy with worthless currency, or otherwise take away for themselves, food which ought to go to the populations of these countries?" If the latter happens, plainly the relief given does not assist in the slightest.

The technique of modern economic warfare has developed endless ways for draining a country dry of its essential food supplies. They can be seized to feed armies of occupation; or they can be bought with currency which the occupied country is forced to print and turn over to its invaders; or its export can be required to fulfill some barter trade agreement which has been forced on the country. In such cases, shipments of relief to the population do not assist that population unless it were possible to establish virtually an economic control system in neutral hands within the country. This is extremely difficult in time of war within military lines.

There is a widespread misconception that the food difficulties in Europe are chiefly due to the blockade. Such information as we have indicates that the chief difficulty is due to the disturbance of crops and harvests and transport and local distribution, and to the requisitioning and economic policies pursued on the Continent itself. The German Government has stated authoritatively that it does not consider that an invader has any responsibility for feeding the population of the country which it has invaded; and that it will, as a matter of course, assure that Germany will receive the benefits of whatever supplies do exist in Europe to the extent that she needs them. In the light of this, the difficulty of carrying on any effective policy of feeding in territory occupied within military lines must be sufficiently obvious.

Let me pass, for a moment, from the very grim picture in Europe to one other subject which I hope may offer a happier aspect. It is commonly said that there are great food surpluses in the Americas; and this is true.

But most of these surpluses would promptly disappear if all of the Americas were fed according to the standards which the National Nutrition Conference for Defense is here to discuss. The farmers of Canada, of the United States, and of many of the South American republics would not be worried over overseas markets if every family on the American Continent had the food which it ought to have to improve the health of the Americans of the future. The Department of Agriculture has been giving careful thought to this problem, and has been working out plans for consideration, which I hope, within the not too distant future, may offer some fascinating possibilities.

Although the United States is the best-fed country in the world, there are millions of people who do not, and some who cannot, obtain the food that they really need. This is even more true in many of the other American republics. The problem is partly one of finance, but if it were only that I am confident we could solve it in a relatively short time. Still more, it is a problem of education. Let me say that whenever the problem of education is solved. I am confident that the economic relations between the Americas are close enough so that a solution will be found to the problem of payment. In the Americas, at least, we have passed that point. Whenever the resources are there, and the need is there, we can work out ways of getting the supply to the need.

In its international aspect, the problem of proper feeding combines three great elements. The first is the scientific element—the careful analysis by groups such as yourselves of what is really needed, and the expert education of the public to insist that the need be fulfilled.

The second is economic, the working out of ways and means by which the supplies, which we know do exist, can be put in the localities where they ought to be used.

The third is sentimental, or if you like, moral, the feeling which everyone ought to have that the providence of God put these supplies in the world to be used for the strengthening of life; and that it is the job of everyone to see that they are so used.

Stimson's War Whoop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 17, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaelic American, New York City, which appeared in the issue of May 17, 1941, under the title "Stimson's War Whoop":

[From the Gaelic American, New York, May 17, 1941]

STIMSON'S WAR WHOOP

The dogs of war are in full cry. Stimson, Knox, Hull, Emory S. Land of the Maritime Commission, Admiral Harold Stark, Senator Guffey, Senator Pepper, and Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, are all calling for war to save, not America, but England. This concerted blitzkrieg to jockey the United States into war came nearly on the same date and was calculated to stampede America into the imperialist war of Europe. In concert with the administration's official family Lord Halifax, Anthony Eden, Premier Churchill, and other English leaders made known the danger and difficulties of England and hoped to aid their Washington friends to stampede the United States into a foreign war to save England from defeat and destruction. It cannot be said that the blitzkrieg had the desired effect.

The key speech on behalf of the administration was that of Secretary Stimson. His address was not in the interest of America. It was an unqualified appeal to jockey the United States into the present imperialist war. Not America, but England, was the first concern of Stimson. In his eagerness to create war hysteria he referred to Dakar, Africa, which is over 1,800 miles from the nearest point in the Western Hemisphere, as a jumping-off point for Nazi forces. Is not 1,800 miles a very long jump? Is not the individual who refers to it as a mere jumping-off a very simple, naive, or questionable character?

Mr. Stimson also said that the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, instead of being a barrier to the invasion of America, would in the case of the capture of the English Fleet become easy channels for attack on the United States. When the English Channel, which can be crossed by good swimmers, can hold up the invading Army of Germany, is not the broad Atlantic a much more formidable barrier? Stimson must have a very poor opinion of the intelligence of his radio audience, and it cannot be said that he has greater respect for his own reputation as a man of common sense, judgment, and veracity.

Like all the alien propagandists, their dupes and agents, Secretary Stimson asserts that America has been protected for a hundred years by England's control of the Atlantic. He does not say from what power or powers that America has been protected. Americans who are not members of the present administration family are convinced that in the past 100 years England was our only potential invader. Was it not American strength, courage, and fighting qualities that have staved off any contemplated invasion? He further states that in 1922 Britain voluntarily consented to parity between the American and English Fleets. Who made the sacrifice for the parity? Balfour was England's representative at the Washington Conference. The other delegates were like schoolboys in the hands of that astute diplomat. He was surprised when the then Secretary of State Hughes proposed parity. After the World War the United States, in ships built and building, had the largest Navy in the world, not excluding the British Navy. No wonder that Balfour was taken by surprise when Hughes stated that the United States not only would cease building warships but also promised to sink ships in course of building or projected. The outcome was that America destroyed over 800,000 tons of shipping so as to make parity with England possible.

Though Mr. Stimson talked of such generalities as democracy, language, tradition, and other vague things, he did not enlarge on the Washington Conference or bring out the fact that Balfour trimmed Hughes. For his services he was soon afterward created Lord Balfour. He well deserved the honor conferred on him by his country. He had also much to do with dragging America into the World War.

Stimson more than once talked as if our safety depended on an English victory over her enemies. He said:

"Time is the essential factor and time cannot be had if sea power is lost. Today the wide-flung forces of the British Navy are threatened in the North Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and in Malaysia. Those thinly spread forces today alone are securing to us that precious time."

Does any red-blooded American believe that his liberty is dependent on the existence of the English Navy? Has the United States been for a hundred years or more a dependency of England? When and from what enemy has England safeguarded the United States? Is England really our protector and will we lose our liberty if she is defeated? Fortunately nearly every American, outside of the administration family circle, is of the opinion—in fact he firmly believes—that his country is strong and resourceful enough to overcome any power or combination of powers from the west or the east. He also believes that any American who credits the contrary is either a fool or a knave.

The dogs of war are in full cry. Patriotism, which has been too long sleeping, must assert itself, and there is no time to wait. A powerful effort is being made to jockey us into a foreign war where no American interest is at stake and which is not worth the life of one young American.

Write to your Senators and Representatives to vote against all measures that are calculated to stampede us into war. Let the Stimsons, the Knoxes, the Hulls, the Guffeys, and the Peppers understand that they are slavish British colonials rather than virile American citizens.

A Boost for the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY CHARLES MICHELSON

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, for some time the Director of Publicity for the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Charles Michelson, has contributed a column, Dispelling the Fog, in the newspapers in my district. It is always a pleasure to read Mr. Michelson's articles, as he has done a constructive work in molding opinions for worth-while legislation. His latest release on the St. Lawrence seaway is particularly fine and very timely.

Those of another political faith will find nothing objectionable in any of his releases. His efforts, like the seaway which he so ably discusses, far transcends mere partisan politics. I recommend this editorial to all of the Members of Congress, and in passing I want publicly to commend Mr. Michelson for a task well done.

The article follows:

DISPELLING THE FOG

(By Charles Michelson, Director of Publicity, Democratic National Committee)

There is no use repining over past neglect or error, but the fact remains that had we gone ahead with the lakes-to-ocean seaway, this country would now be in vastly better shape to meet the emergency that confronts it.

When President Roosevelt asked the Senate to ratify a treaty with Canada providing for the joint construction and equipment of a

deep-water St. Lawrence canal, he probably had in mind particularly the upbuilding of the western section of our country by affording a direct outlet to the sea.

As Governor of New York, he had studied that problem. He had been given the figures to show that the difference in freight rates that would result if the wheat from the Northwest could go to the world market direct, with no transshipment, would save the western farmers millions of dollars a year. In fact, it was adduced that the saving of transportation costs alone would pay what we would spend in establishing the canal in 3 years. Added to the benefit to the western farmers was the lowering of power costs to the consumers of electric power, the up-building of industries on the Great Lakes, and the increase in population of various thinly peopled States.

Administrations previous to the advent of Roosevelt to the White House had advocated the canal; party platforms, Republican as well as Democratic, had endorsed the project. Nevertheless, the Senate refused to ratify the treaty. The project had a majority, but fell short of the two-thirds vote requisite for treaty making.

Perhaps more important than any of the advantages discussed at the time, is one that comes from the present world crisis. So it is as a defense measure that the matter is now before Congress, not as a treaty but as a law, requiring the concurrence of both Houses, authorizing the project. The specific purpose is to enable the building of oceangoing ships in the lake shipyards.

"OF ALL SAD WORDS," ETC.

It is estimated that the canal could be put in operation in 3 years. Had we been in shape in 1936 to construct vessels so direfully needed, today we could have a big fleet afloat to help meet the deficit resulting from the wholesale destruction of ocean carriers by the German raiders, submarines, and bombing planes, which are taking more than half a million tons of shipping a year.

It is estimated that by this time the Navy would have been richer by approximately 100 craft—cruisers, tankers, and smaller vessels—if a few Senators had voted the other way 7 years ago.

That the vote stood 46 to 42 was due to a variety of counterarguments and a lot of influence emanating from the railroad and power lobbies. Some of the arguments had a plausible appeal. For example, it was easy to understand that the big seaport communities did not wish to lose the business of transferring the great cargoes of Western products from freight trains to ships. Likewise, the points on the Mississippi, clear down to New Orleans, feared that the diversion of the traffic via the Great Lakes would take away some of their business—barges and the like.

It was in vain that the supporters of the St. Lawrence treaty insisted that the growth of the West—the new industries that would be established and the increase in population out there—would more than make up for the trade losses to the seaports that were suggested.

It was the same sort of thing that held up the Panama Canal for decades. The railroads said that the competing traffic through the Canal would destroy them, whereas it turned out that they did more business because of the Canal, on account of the general increase in commerce and industry, than they did before.

Naturally the St. Lawrence project is meeting the same opposition that greeted the various huge power enterprises fathered by the Government—Tennessee Valley, Boulder Dam, and the rest of them. This was all brought out in the sessions precedent to the treaty vote long ago. There were, in addition, some weird suggestions, as, for example, that the St. Lawrence waterway constituted a danger to America because British warships could penetrate to the heart of America and bombard Chicago.

THE WORLD IS BEGGING FOR SHIPS

The big advantage, as far as national defense is concerned, lies in the facilities for ship construction. If this country is ever beleaguered, the shipyards a thousand miles inland obviously would be in less danger of bombing than the establishments on the seashore. Moreover, it would take much of the pressure off the shipyards that are now crowded beyond capacity; and the demand for ships now is an acute element in the national emergency. Every friend we have among the nations is clamoring for transportation to make up for the vessels alienated from commerce by the demands of the war abroad. Our present shipbuilding establishments must be monopolized practically by the vast naval expansion, with its goal of a two-ocean Navy. We had to have that because the British Fleet on which we relied—consciously or unconsciously—to take care of the Atlantic in the event of a Pacific Ocean involvement, can't be on that job now. There is the possibility even that it may never get back on the job, for nobody can be sure of what may occur in a great war.

For our own protection—perhaps for our own salvation—we must not only be the arsenal of democracy but we must insure that the things we are sending out to the powers fighting against the Hitler scheme of world domination reach their destination. A dozen Senators made us muff the ball 7 years ago, because we, like the rest of the world, did not foresee the advent of Hitlerism. Now the St. Lawrence canal is up again and probably we are going to listen to weeks of debate before Congress has an opportunity to correct that old mistake.

The same lobbies are at work as compassed the defeat of the treaty; the same arguments will be brought out about the interests of certain cities or certain regions, and the same efforts will be made to influence Senators and Representatives to heed the pleas of their home interests, rather than the national need. The answer to all of this is, of course, that if national defense is not developed to the highest point the home places might suffer a great deal more than the possible loss of some trade.

Presumably, the advisability of getting out the ships, even though we are years behind in this particular field, will give us the canal ultimately, but every day squandered in restating all the arguments, pro and con, means an additional day without something we must have. True, nobody can prophesy for certain what the state of affairs will be 3 years hence, but whatever lies ahead we are going to want those ships, and, moreover, the peace advantages of saving transportation costs, developing the West and giving the East electricity at less than the private monopoly prices, will remain. So this defense measure, at least, will give priceless value when peace comes to the world.

The Cause of General Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, there has been introduced into the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin a resolution memorializing Congress to clear the name of Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell. I am including this resolution in full in my remarks:

Whereas the late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell enlisted in 1898 at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War as a private in the First Wisconsin Infantry and saw active service in Cuba and the Philippine Islands; then served on the Mexican border in 1912; and was repeatedly decorated during the World War by Congress and by several of our Allies for repeated gallantry and giving exceptional example to his fellow soldiers; and

Whereas he rose from the ranks during 28 years of spectacular achievement, having been the first American officer to fly over the trenches during the World War, the first American to scout troop movements by plane, commanded the largest concentration of airplanes in the then history of aviation; and

Whereas he continued to pioneer aviation progress by proving the feasibility of transcontinental flight, as a result of which our air-mail system was instituted; and

Whereas from 1920 to 1924 he served as Assistant to the Chief of the Army Air Service, in charge of operations and technical development, in which position he contributed invaluably to the development of military and civil aeronautics; and

Whereas he strove to impress his superior officers with the shortcomings and deficiencies in the Army and Navy flying units, only to be rebuffed and demoted; and thereafter the crash of the dirigible *Shenandoah* and failure of Navy's flight by plane to Hawaii prompted him to charge incompetency on the part of his superiors and criminal neglect of national defense; and

Whereas, although a separate inquiry substantiated the truth of his accusations, he was tried by a court martial for violating the ninety-sixth article of war, found guilty of a breach of discipline, and suspended from the service for 5 years without pay, but still subject to call; and

Whereas the practical effect of this decision was that the pride and dignity of military officials must be protected at all costs, even at the risk of jeopardizing the effectiveness of national defense; and

Whereas General Mitchell's fearless adherence to principle resulted in his sacrificing his personal ambitions in an effort to arouse the Nation to a knowledge of its military helplessness; and

Whereas developments arising from the present European conflict demonstrate incontrovertibly that General Mitchell was possessed of prescience which placed him many years ahead of his colleagues; and

Whereas the stigma upon his memory should be officially eradicated: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take such official action as may be necessary to clear the name of this soldier and patriot to the end that he who stood his ground, though persecuted, may be completely and forever cleared; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced by the Honorable Edward F. Hilker, of Racine, Wis., the largest city in my district. Mr. Hilker and Gen. William Mitchell were the closest of friends. They were mustered into the Army together as volunteers in the Spanish-American War in 1898, at Camp Harvey, Milwaukee, Wis. Privates Mitchell and Hilker were

tentmates at the Spanish-American War camp at Jacksonville, Fla. There may be a few who knew Brig. Gen. William Mitchell better than Mr. Hilker, but I doubt it. True to the spirit of real soldiers, Assemblyman Hilker has come to the defense of his war buddy by sponsoring the resolution asking that the Congress of the United States take such action as might be necessary to clear the name of Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell, who was a true soldier and patriot.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 4, 1941:

[From the Times-Picayune of June 4, 1941]

"HOBBY DAY" IN THE HOUSE

The long-buried St. Lawrence seaway scheme was formally resurrected Monday by a bill authorizing the President to negotiate with Canada to put it over. Long the favorite hobby of Mr. Roosevelt, it was beaten by the Senate in 1934 for reasons an American majority considered sound. Then, it was generally agreed that such a deal between this country and Canada must be effected by formal treaty subject to Senate ratification. Now, it is contended that the deal can be put over by simple congressional authorization. Treaty ratification requires a two-thirds majority in the Senate. Congressional authorization requires ordinary majorities. Denied senatorial ratification of its treaty form, the measure's promoter now seeks the easiest way of a simple congressional majority—though that was not considered a valid method 7 years ago.

Originally touted as a power enterprise in quarters where power is popular—and as a navigation project in circles where navigation is a political conjure word—the scheme now is dressed up and decorated as a national-defense undertaking, though it will take 5 or 6 years to complete. Under the pending dicker with Canada, there is, according to a recent report, "no obligation to complete the undertaking before December 1, 1948." The cost according to most estimates would range about or above a half billion dollars. Great numbers of laborers and vast amounts of material would have to be diverted from genuine and much more urgent defense projects if this thing were adopted as a wholly unnecessary addition to the enormous financial and physical burdens imposed upon the American people in this crisis.

Canada's people show no enthusiasm for the scheme even though the United States would pay most of the bill. For all Canada's manpower and material resources are needed in the vital war tasks; the Canadian Government yielded to President Roosevelt's insistence and acquiesced in the current dicker over the objections of many Canadian folks. The American people are showing even less enthusiasm than their Canadian neighbors do. Of the congressmen "lined up" for its support, we venture to say that few really believe the St. Lawrence seaway hobby should be put over at this time, while fewer still consider it a defense project.

In brief, the reintroduction of the St. Lawrence seaway business at this singularly inopportune time—and camouflaged as a "national defense" undertaking—impresses us as fresh evidence of the President's determination to have his own way in everything. We trust that majorities in both houses will have the courage to express the judgment and will of the American people by rejecting the costly hobby project again regardless of administration pressure.

Another High-Powered Propagandist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 24, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Gaelic American, New York City, published May 24, 1941, and entitled "Another High-Powered Propagandist":

[From the Gaelic American, New York, May 24, 1941]

ANOTHER HIGH-POWERED PROPAGANDIST

Prime Minister Menzies, of Australia, is another high-powered propagandist who is trying to convince the American people that England's war is our war and that we should be as much interested in it as the populations of the British Empire. No longer do men like Menzies try to cloak the purpose of their insidious mission and they are coming out barefacedly for American men, money, ships, airplanes, tanks, and food. There is no limit to their needs. Prime Minister Menzies, speaking on May 13 at a dinner of the Foreign Relations Committee, at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel, New York, said, in part:

"It is most unlikely that there could be any quick victory without you. That does not mean that we are asking you to send armies to fight in a war in which for many months no great army has been engaged. But it does mean that we need your help, your single-minded effort in the production of materials of war, and in the delivery of those materials to those places in which they can be most effectively used.

"But it may be that there are still many of you who believe that some decent fraction of your effort will suffice. I beg of you to understand that it will not. Whether you are neutral or belligerent—and that is for you and nobody else to decide—our cause, which is your cause, cannot be made victorious by half measures."

No Trojan horse or "fifth columnist" is half so dangerous to the peace and welfare of this country than Premier Menzies, Lord Halifax, and the scores of English propagandists who are feted and flattered by the forces of high finance. Perhaps the most outlandish claim that these foreign visitors are making is that their country is fighting for the safety of the United States. Is not the United States amply competent to safeguard its own independence from any old country enemy or combination of enemies? At present there is no enemy on the horizon and there is no likelihood of any enemy at least in the near future. It would be a poor dependence for this country to rely on England, who is not able to protect herself in her beleaguered island. Besides, in spite of the assertions of the foreign propagandists, and their native agents and aides, England is entirely concerned with her own safety and she has entered into a conflict which may be long and the result doubtful. The American who will gulp down England's statements that she is fighting our battles cannot be commended for intelligence or common sense. At least 90 percent of the American people are aware that they are able to meet any enemy or invader from the west or the east.

In this intensive appeal for American aid on the pretense that it is for our own safety the advice of George Washington in his Farewell Address against foreign entanglements should not be ignored or forgotten. We have no concern in the never-ending wars and jealousies of the Old World and the present imperialist war is not worth the life of one young American. Our frontiers are not on the English Channel, the Rhine, or Dakar. We have well-defined frontiers which are protected by the great natural barriers of the broad Atlantic and the broader Pacific. We have a large population, immense resources, and there is no reason why we should not have an army, navy, and air force strong enough to deter any would-be conqueror from even contemplating an invasion of the United States or any of the South American republics. The American who fears invasion or who believes the fantastic claim that we are now or have been in the past protected by the English Navy is not worthy of his great heritage.

Our blood and treasure must not be wasted or dissipated in an attempt to safeguard the doomed British Empire. We have a great country, almost a continent in itself, and we could thrive and prosper even if we were cut off from the rest of the world.

Let us mind our own business, develop our own great natural resources, and let the warring nations fight their own battles and settle their never-ending disputes. Never forget that our involvement in the World War was a gigantic blunder which piled up our national debt to astronomical figures. Also do not forget the ingratitude of the nations that we saved from defeat and disaster. One such blunder is enough in one generation.

Are We Going To Allow Foreign-Born Un-American Racketeers To Defy Our Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, since the first of this year, strikes have cost 2,253,216 man-days of production on Army contracts according to the War Department. More men were on strike yesterday, June 5, 1941, in plants trying to fill

Army orders than at any other time this year.

Time lost on naval-defense orders would have been sufficient to build 8 to 10 submarines, or 6 to 8 destroyers, or 2 cruisers, according to the Navy Department.

The situation caused by these strikes has grown steadily worse in the 10 days since President Roosevelt proclaimed an unlimited national emergency, told labor and capital that the emergency machinery set up for conciliation and mediation of industrial disputes "must be used promptly—and without stoppage of work."

And it will continue to grow still worse unless there is a firm, decisive action to make it plain that the Government is running the national-defense program and that strikes will not be permitted to wreck it.

The President's appeal has now been flouted directly by union officials in two outstanding cases. My people approved the President's message; therefore, we feel that these strikes should be stopped at once.

The North American Aviation plant at Inglewood, Calif., source of one-fifth of the country's military-plane production, was closed yesterday by the United Automobile Workers—C. I. O.—in violation of an agreement, ratified by the union membership, not to strike until the National Defense Mediation Board had been given opportunity to settle the controversy. I ask you, Are we going to continue to permit such open defiance?

The Mediation Board's recommendations for ending the Pacific Northwest lumber strike were flatly rejected by O. M. Orton, president of the International Woodworkers of America, who charged that this presidentially appointed Board was "an all-out labor-busting and strike-breaking device."

Two national officials of the C. I. O. served on the Board panel that was unanimous in making these recommendations, and Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., insisted that Orton accept them. That is evidence enough, is it not, of fairness? But Orton proclaimed his intention of following "the course adopted by John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers."

Lewis has publicly warned Mr. Roosevelt not to "expect too much cooperation" from labor in the defense program unless "labor"—meaning Lewis—is given more power in the Government.

As a Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of Oklahoma, I ask you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, who is running this Government—the President and Congress or John L. Lewis?

Recently an outstanding public official, while addressing a representative body in Oklahoma, said that not a Member of this House had raised his voice against John L. Lewis. I want to inform the good citizens that here is one, and I want to state further that several others, including most of the Oklahoma delegation, have raised their voices on the floor several times. I am not afraid of the C. I. O. or John L. Lewis. I was hired to represent my district, and I am going to represent the good people of my district. My people rightfully expect me to do my best to stop these strikes, which hold up our defense projects, and I shall do so.

Well, there it is. Clearly there are elements within organized labor which are determined that there shall be stoppages of work, regardless of the damage done to the defense program. Clearly Mr. Roosevelt cannot expect voluntary cooperation from these elements.

This Government—

Said the President 10 days ago—

is determined to use all of its power to express the will of its people and to prevent interference with production of materials essential to our Nation's security.

The time has come for Government to use its power or confess that the national defense is at the mercy of stubborn and defiant union bosses.

I repeat again, as I have so definitely stated in the past, that I am for 100-percent American unions, but that I am against those foreign-born, un-American racketeers who foster discontent among our laborers, holding up vital defense projects when minutes now mean days later. I am against communism, Hitlerism, or those in sympathy with such movements.

H. R. 4886 Would Escheat Dormant Funds in Banks to United States Treasury—Rightful Owners Provided Way To Ascertain Their Legal Rights to Dormant Accounts and Procedure Set Up for Them To Obtain Possession of Their Property—$100,000,000 Involved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 27th day of May 1941 I introduced a bill providing for the disposition of unclaimed deposits in national banks. It is H. R. 4886 and has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency for consideration.

This bill was carefully drawn by the Treasury Department, and I believe that I am safe in saying that it will have the support of the Treasury. Some States now have State laws requiring publication of the names of those who have deposits that have remained dormant over a certain period of years and also the publication of the amounts of these deposits. These laws, however, affect a comparatively small number of States.

Although the bill, H. R. 4886, applies only to national banks, it is my purpose, when hearings are held before the Committee on Banking and Currency, to ascertain if it is possible to include other banks, whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It is my personal opinion that these banks can be legally included, and it is my purpose to ask that they be included.

The American Banker, a daily banking publication, June 5, 1941, carried the following article relative to this bill:

WASHINGTON, June 4.—A bill, having important Treasury support, has been introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas, to provide for the disposition of unclaimed deposits in national banks.

While no official figures are available as to the amount of such deposits in national banks, Representative PATMAN estimates that approximately $100,000,000, at least, would be recovered by the Treasury under the terms of the bill.

The Patman bill has been through the Legal Division of the Treasury Department and, it is indicated, is an improvement over all previous bills which have been offered during recent years.

WOULD BEGIN IN 1942

In brief, the measure provides that on January 30 of each year, beginning with 1942, each national bank shall attempt to reach all depositors of dormant accounts, calling attention to the provisions of the law.

During March of each year, newspapers will carry at least once a week for 3 weeks a notice calling attention to the provisions of this act, in a form which is to be prescribed.

Between June 30 and July 30 of each year every national bank shall deposit with the Treasury "an amount equal to the amount of each unclaimed deposit which appeared on the books of the bank on January 1 of such year, together with an amount equal to the amount of accrued interest on such deposit to such June 30."

National banks are required to file with the Secretary the number of new unclaimed deposits which the bank has on each January 1 and those for which valid claims were filed between January 1 and June 30, with names of individuals filing these claims.

The banks are absolved from paying interest on June 30 of the year in which funds have been transferred to the Treasury. Further, the amount placed with the Treasury as unclaimed funds "shall not be included in arriving at the assessment base of such bank for insurance purposes." Also, such funds are not to be included in the aggregate amount of demand and time deposits for determining reserve balances.

TREASURY WOULD ISSUE LIST

With the funds placed with the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury would be required to prepare a list of unclaimed deposits, showing the name and location of the bank and amount and last known address of the depositor. Such lists will be published and will be available for inspection and may be cumulative from year to year under Treasury regulations.

It is provided that banks and individuals may make application, or through proper courts, to satisfy claims, but the Secretary is not obligated to pay costs, expenses, or fees to establish such claims.

It is specifically provided that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall have the privilege of recovering "an amount sufficient to reimburse" it for the total amount paid by the F. D. I. C. on account of old unclaimed deposits in any national banks.

Other rules and regulations may be issued by the Treasury to carry out the necessary purposes of the law, and annual reports are required by the Secretary.

"DEPOSIT" DEFINED

An interesting feature of this bill is the definition of what constitutes a "deposit." It

states that the term "deposit" means "the unpaid balance of money or its equivalent received by a bank in the usual course of business and for which it has given or is obligated to give credit to a commercial, checking, savings, time, or thrift account, or which is evidenced by its certificate of deposit, together with such other obligations of a bank as the board of directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall find and shall prescribe by its regulations to be deposit liabilities by general usage."

Is It Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the privilege of inserting in today's RECORD an editorial from the Los Angeles Times, under date of May 31, 1941, on the subject Is It Necessary?

This pertains to gasless Sundays, and so forth, advocated by Mr. Ickes.

This kind of a program does not sit very well with my people in California, and I believe with those in Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and other oil-producing States. For the last 10 years, owners of producing wells have not been able to operate these wells to their capacity because they have been operating under the curtailment program based upon the theory that there was too much production. They feel that they were wrongly advised then or are wrongly advised now, and that, further, Mr. Ickes is only using this situation politically to obtain that position which he has so long coveted, as czar over oil production.

The editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times of May 31, 1941]

IS IT NECESSARY?

Gasless Sundays, daylight saving, darkened places of night entertainment are all right with the patriotic citizens of this country if actual need for such recourse should appear. Thinking people, however, will want more than the word of Secretary Ickes that the need exists. They will at least want to know that this particular Cabinet member is speaking with Presidential authority and not merely for the enjoyment of hearing himself talk, as he has done so often in the past.

Gas rationing would seem to be something that might be postponed until the present shipments of this fuel to Japan and Russia have been stopped; there is certainly no justification for defense curtailment of domestic supplies while oil products are going to doubtful nations and indirectly helping the very powers suspected of aggressive designs against our hemisphere. With regard to the Ickes argument that tanker transportation facilities may be lacking to take oil to the Atlantic seaboard, it need only be pointed out that the railroads have shown no sign of bogging down.

Daylight saving is old stuff in the East, has ere this been resorted to in that part of the country as an economic measure. It has yet to be demonstrated that it would serve any useful purpose in our part of the Nation. We tried it in another critical period and found it wanting in effectiveness for desired results. Our western days will serve for whatever accomplishment without any clock tinkering.

We also have an abundance of water for generating electricity and the hydroelectric plants for making use of it; we can supply industry and homes and have plenty of "juice" left for the night baseball Mr. Ickes objects to. We would be as willing as anybody to sit in the dark if it should come to a pass where defense consumption was even remotely threatened, but we would prefer light in the meantime.

There is such a thing as carrying the grandstand plays too far. Common sense shows that the real approach to defense efficiency at this time is the prompt elimination of the strikes that are hampering production. It's the manpower, rather than the electric power, that is facing serious shortage right now in most defense-industry centers.

Catholic Laymen in the Present Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by me on Catholic Laymen in the Present Crisis delivered May 25, 1941, before Newman Club of Pennsylvania College of Optometry, at Oaklawn Review Club, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Just a month ago today I returned from my home in Rhode Island to the Capitol, and, because it was necessary that I get back in a hurry, I went by plane. The ride was very bumpy, and, as it was my first experience, I inquired of the copilot the reason for such a performance. He explained that it was caused by air currents forced up from the earth, some hot and some cold.

As I gazed over the countryside of Jersey and Pennsylvania, I could not help but think how much similar to that situation was the state of mind of most men throughout the country.

Today, perhaps more than at any time in the history of our Nation, our minds are confused by the constant parade of hot exclamations and cold threats of doom. On one hand we are reminded of the glorious history of our Nation, a history having its full share of heartaches, blood, and tears, and, on the other hand, we are threatened with dire consequences if we hesitate to put that history and all the accomplishments of 165 years in pawn in order to change existing conditions on a foreign continent which has been steeped in the blood of warring armies since the dawn of time.

That we face a very serious crisis there can be no question; that we are facing that crisis with the proper frame of mind and viewing it in the proper perspective can be seriously questioned.

A sick man, if he desires recovery, will follow the advice of his physician and take the medicine prescribed for the cure of his ailment. We, as a group of Catholic laymen, should bend our every effort to encourage the willing reception of the advice prescribed by the greatest of all physicians to the social order—our Holy Mother Church. For the establishment of fair play among all men, for the founding and maintenance of peace throughout the world, the saintly Leo XIII, in his justly famous encyclical, Rerum Novarum, laid down the formula, 50 years ago this month, when he said, "Since religion alone can destroy the evil at its root, all men must be persuaded that the primary thing needful is to return to real Christianity, in the absence of which all the plans and devices of the wisest will be of little avail."

There are those men in the world who attach very little importance to the teaching of that great work and by their slander of the doctrine it propounded, display ignorance of its true import. It is toward the enlightenment of such men that our efforts must be directed if we are to prove ourselves worthy of our Catholic heritage and if we are to contribute any share, though but a small one, to the eradication of that confusion of mind which now hampers our great Nation in the work of fulfilling its mightiest effort.

We have today, in this Nation of which we are so proud, a malignant growth which threatens to destroy every sinew and fiber of our country's greatness; a menace, which by holding out the false promise of a Utopia, dupes men's minds and hopes, in the confusion and destruction of manhood which it leaves in its wake, to bring about a so-called social order, which would be the direct antithesis of everything which America represents to you and to me.

Shunning the light of day; skulking behind false promises of equality, fraternity, and a redistribution of wealth, this growth robs men of liberty, steals from human nature the cloak of dignity and binds men's souls with chains of bondage.

The home, family, and Christian morals are things to be scorned while hysterical rantings of civil liberties are depended on to lull the people of the Nation into a false sense of security; prompting them to rest on their questionable laurels and do nothing to prevent the growth of this corrupt monster, communism.

This symbol of treachery and deceit, together with nazi-ism and fascism, if allowed to exist and grow in America, will some day bring us all to our knees without the need of any invasion by a foreign power. Communism, nazi-ism, and fascism are all evils born of the same spew. They have but one reason for being and one purpose of continuing. Their goal is atheism and their motivating force is a hatred of God.

We should put first things first—and our primary concern should be the destruction of this evil influence which is beyond doubt far more menacing than any enemy America faces from beyond the seas. It would profit us nothing if we were to embark upon a war of conquest and bring to their knees every nation on God's green footstool, if we were so blind as to pass by the vultures at home who only stand by, hoping to seize upon the opportune moment, when a war-weary world sinks into the slumbers of a false feeling of peace, and gobble up the last semblance of freedom and liberty and reduce this Nation, the real bulwark of democracy, to a land of slaves.

The real battle we must wage, until there is no shadow of doubt concerning our victory, is the one against subversive influences who are determined to undermine our homes and set brother against brother; the battleground is the streets of our cities and the doorways of our homes. Our shibboleth is

Christ, and the sustaining force which will guide us to ultimate victory is the soul of a free Christian man.

Charity, it is true, is a noble virtue. Our expressions of sympathy are not subject to criticism, and we cannot be blamed for doing and sacrificing in order to help suffering people wherever they may be found. But when charity or sympathy loses its sight and common sense ceases to prevail, then we must pause; for the cause must indeed be great to justify the sacrifice of our home, our men, and our freedom.

In this hour of great concern to the future of our Nation, I say to you men, it is our duty to inquire, "Whither are we led?" We have not only a right, but a duty, to determine, before we take any further steps to plunge this Republic into the maelstrom of European war, what manner of peace is offered us in return for sending the cream of our youth to fight and die in lands beyond the seas. If we are not to know what those terms are to be, then to ask us to go is to ask America to underwrite every future European conflict, and, if that is the plan, then we should be aware of it in advance. Our only alternative is to establish in Europe, after hostilities have ceased, a peace of our own making, and maintain an army there to enforce it.

I ask you to go to those who would have us send our men across the ocean, if they satisfy you that we need never again go to Europe, that we need not join any European confederacy of nations, that we need not forever maintain a great army of men and machines, ever ready to police the continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa, then, I say, they have a just cause.

We have no craving for empire; we have only a determination to preserve intact this great Republic, earth's noblest monument to God's handiwork. In that determination we have justice and wisdom on our side. To depart from that plan of justice and wisdom to go chasing bogeymen all over the world is to invite the destruction of the institutions which we pride as freemen—freedom of speech and the right to worship our God according to the dictates of our conscience. Our civil liberties, our progress, our democracy, in short, America as we know it, will live or die, according to how we act here in America, and not as we or others may act on any foreign soil.

Tyrants and militarists have walked the stage of Europe since the beginning of time. Tamerlaine, Alexander, Frederick the Great, and their spawn have come and gone, and the teachings of the Catholic Church still stand in their original brilliance as the lodestar for men's actions. The numbers who rally to membership in the church grow greater day by day, and we see no sign on the horizon which indicates that her term of life is waning. To quote the great Macaulay, "She saw the commencement of all governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshiped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a great solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of the London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

You men have educated minds; your task is the greater therefor. You men by your association here as a Newman Club, by your reception of the Blessed Sacrament, not in some furtive fashion but in a body, as a boast of your pride in your priceless heritage, are demonstrating your sincere endeavor to be worthy of the teachings of your great patron, and your purpose to travel life's causeway with a humble and contrite heart, secure in the knowledge that the doctrine set forth by our Holy Mother Church is right, fortified by the grace of God as a reward for a clean life; and determined to teach other men, by the example which you shall set, the value of charity—the mistress and queen of all virtues.

As Catholics we can be of real help to the people of the country who have been presented with an opportunity to show their capacity for self-government. We can help prove that the people of this Nation who have led the way on the road of progress will be the jealous guardians of freedom. They will not be misled by appeals to their cupidity or frightened by threats of injury. They will jealously guard and keep trimmed the lamp of enlightenment and progress. They will relentlessly work to stamp out these accursed "isms" which sap our strength; and when this wave of hysteria will have passed the foundations of this Republic will remain undisturbed.

This Nation, pray God, will still shelter a people indissolubly welded to liberty and honor, determined to forbid any distinction of burden or privilege, maintaining morality, turning its face in prayer for the aid of its creator, and pledging, in all humility, its fealty to Almighty God.

The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart,
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

What Would a Hitler Victory Mean to Americans, and What Should We Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

EDITORIAL BY DR. CLARENCE POE, EDITOR OF THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD a very able editorial appearing in the June issue of the Progressive Farmer, one of the outstanding farm journals of America, by its editor, Dr. Clarence Poe:

[From the Progressive Farmer of June 1941]

The first young man from Longview Farm called to service by our Federal Government has now gone off to camp. How many more will go before the emergency ends, or how far-reaching will be the demands upon them, no one can now forecast. And on hundreds of thousands of other farms from the Potomac to the Rio Grande a similar situation exists.

It had not been my intention, however, to make this the subject of my June talk to Progressive Farmer families. I had another topic in mind and had begun work on it when a letter came to me, a letter from an 18-year-old boy in Runnels County, Tex., so poignant in its appeal for action to keep America from going to war that no one could fail to be touched by it, and least of all a father of two sons both within the ages officially specified for military service. And how I would to God the issues were simple enough for me just to answer as flatfootedly as I did when I wrote that title for Otis Clark's war diary, "War Is Hell; Let's Stay Out of It."

WAR SHOULD HAVE BEEN PREVENTED

No one has dreaded this war more than I or prayed more earnestly that America might justifiably keep out. Repeatedly, year after year, I have sounded the warning given in the title I wrote for this page 4 years ago, "The World Drifts Toward Disaster; Patriotism Not Enough:"

"The sublimest sentence that came out of the World War was probably the declaration of Edith Cavell, the English nurse, just before she was shot as a spy: 'Patriotism is not enough.' She saw the whole world become a slaughterhouse simply because citizens of every nation had been taught to think only of that nation's own selfish interests. * * * America's selfish isolation, our unwillingness to help other nations establish a World Court and a League of Nations for adjusting international disputes, may engulf us in another world conflict. * * * We can never have enduring peace and security in our own country—and perhaps in the view of the Almighty God we simply never ought to have—until we are willing to cooperate with other nations to help insure peace and security the world over."

And not only have I criticized America for 20 years for failing to take steps to preserve international peace, but I have criticized England and France also—so much so that when war came I felt they deserved mighty little sympathy from America. This war was unnecessary. It should have been prevented. Nevertheless it is here, and our only practical question is "What should America do about it?"

IS WORLD DOMINATION POSSIBLE?

It would be a great comfort to me now if candor and courage would permit me to look at both sides and say they are so much alike it doesn't matter which wins, or that no matter which wins, the peace and safety of the United States will not be endangered, or that if Hitler and his allies win, it will at least be a short-lived triumph.

Unfortunately I cannot now believe any of these things. Since the present war began, some of the most amazing and stupendous events in human history have occurred, and no man in his senses can fail to have learned from them.

I thought at first that Hitlerism might be kept fairly well within Germany itself and that soon the German people might reform it or abandon it; at any rate, that they had a right to make their own experiments with it and that we might safely let them do so. That is no longer the situation. Not only have I seen Hitler bluff, bully or butcher practically all Europe into submission, but make a league with Japan—Japan, bitterly anti-American, and with the most powerful army and navy in Asia—and there seems every reason to believe that Hitler, Japan, and Mussolini hope first to conquer and divide the British Empire, and then to dominate the world. Talk of such domination when this war began I confess sounded fantastic. Now it is no longer fantastic. Such domination was not possible before the machine age. But the machine age has made it possible. And without powerful and immediate American aid to Britain, such domination becomes not only a possibility but perhaps a probability.

WOULD HITLER MENACE AMERICAN PEACE?

I also thought at first that, even with Hitler victorious, the United States might be spared from his defiance, in view of the separating oceans and our economic and military strength. I can no longer comfort myself with this belief. No conqueror ever lets up while riding any tide of victory. When Alexander's triumph brought him to the end of

the known world, he merely "wept that there were no more worlds to conquer." Hitler would not need to attack New York or Boston or New Orleans. For a hundred years, the very cornerstone of America's foreign policy has been the Monroe Doctrine, prohibiting foreign conquest of South America. A victorious tiger tribe, Germany, Italy, Japan, gorging on the spoils of the British Empire, might next challenge us in the Philippines, Hawaii, or Alaska, and would inevitably defy the Monroe Doctrine in South America.

Much against my will and desire, the facing of all these facts has convinced me that we cannot keep peace with a victorious Hitlerism; that we must either help conquer it or submit to it. And because I hate war with all my soul, I prefer to help conquer Hitlerism rather than submit. For with Hitler's glorification of war and of Germany's warriors as the only "master race" fit to subdue and rule all other peoples, his victory might entrench the war system on this earth for a thousand years. Only in the triumph of England, Canada, Australia, America—democracies in which the people themselves blunderingly but progressively struggle toward the good and whose Governments must now at last see the inescapable necessity for some supreme court of nations with power to enforce its decrees—only in their triumph do I see any hope for peace or justice on the earth. For all the democracies, including America, I believe, have at last learned that they must cooperate to this end.

THE MACHINE AGE BRINGS NEW PERILS

Adolf Hitler has done this one thing no one else has ever been able to do—he has fully brought the machine age to warfare. While other warriors have had armies of men, Hitler has not only armies of men but also armies of machines—tanks, airplanes, bombers, submarines, flame-throwers, etc. No other warrior has ever had machines in such colossal numbers, of such gigantic power, of such lightning-like speed. And let's remember this: His armies of machines have not only enabled him (1) to conquer unready nations more speedily than ever before, but also (2) to disarm every people he conquers and keep them in subjection perhaps for generations or centuries to come. "How?" do you ask. And again the answer must be, the machine age. In the days when war was made by clubs and swords and muskets, it was often possible for conquered peoples to hide or smuggle enough weapons to successfully revolt—but such weapons are as powerless as popguns against the monster tanks, bombers, and airplanes of today. With seeming accuracy Hitler is quoted as saying:

"For me there is only the physical and psychological extermination of the enemy. * * * Today science puts at our disposal the means to destroy a people physically and psychologically. * * * and we have the technical equipment to scatter whole peoples throughout the world and thereby distintegrate them."

TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE

Many and many a God-given liberty we have heretofore enjoyed in America without even taking thought as to their preciousness—the liberty to think, to speak, to print, to vote, and to worship with no one to molest us or make us afraid. We must now not only prize these liberties, but be ready if necessary to fight for their preservation.

When this world struggle ends, it will find either Germany or America incomparably the most powerful nation on this planet. If that supreme nation is a Hitler-dominated Germany, then a war machine more powerful than humanity has ever known will hold the rest of the world in subjection, with the destruction of free speech, a free press, free courts, free churches, and free elections—the destruction of all these freedoms in every conquered nation (as Hitler has already destroyed these things for the German people themselves) * * * a condition so hellish as to make life intolerable for anyone who prizes liberty or the dignity of the individual human soul.

Perhaps the most stupendous question our generation in America will ever confront is the question as to whether we shall now do "too little and too late" (as so many once-free nations have done) whatever is necessary to save our Nation and our world from a new dark age which might keep the human spirit in bondage to force and terrorism for a thousand years.

I had a letter the other day from a woman who has only one son (in fact, only one child) and he may soon be called into service, and I had expected she would be grief-stricken if not actually bitter over the prospect. But instead she said:

"At first I went through a stage of frantic inner protest, but I have now come to see that every man must accept the conditions of his generation, and I should not, and do not, ask any more for my son than the common lot."

I have heard the calm and determined spirit of America speaking in similar tones on Longview Farm. And I believe this is fast becoming the mood of our Nation as a whole. The one supreme duty of every generation is to make the condition of life better or nobler for succeeding generations. Accepting this heroic test, the one way to have peace in our own hearts in an hour like this is to ask God where our duty lies, and then unflinchingly "follow the gleam."

Power and Aluminum Shortages in Relation to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the morning paper carries a headline—

O. P. M. disavows Kellogg's stand on power.

The article refers to a statement, recently made by the chief power adviser of the O. P. M., that no shortage was to be expected in electric power. Mr. Kellogg's carefully prepared and subtly calculated statement was certainly not intended to strengthen the national-defense program but very definitely framed to help the private-utility companies.

The Washington Post, on May 26, carried a headline—

Seventeen States act in defense-power crisis.

That article explains the actual power shortage in the Southeast, owing to an unprecedented drought. On June 4 a Washington paper carried a front-page news article about the happenings in the Senate Defense Investigating Committee in relation to the statement of Mr. Stacy May, Statistical Chief of O. P. M., who pointed out the delays and shortcomings in the defense program. One of the Senators heatedly demanded to know whether those responsible for these delays and shortcomings were still official advisers of the Government. Mr. Speaker, I can testify from my personal experience that those officials whose judgment has resulted in these grievous and serious delays are still official advisers of O. P. M. I refer to Mr. Gano Dunn, Mr. C. W. Kellogg, and Mr. Grenville Holden. I am not familiar with the steel situation and the dangerous shortage on which Mr. Dunn made a widely publicized revised report showing that the needs had been definitely underestimated. However, I do know definitely about the power and aluminum situation, and I desire to place in the RECORD a brief reference to my experience, which has convinced me that the advisory program in relation to these two matters is not in the best hands.

Those who accept technical responsibilities in this tragic hour should be competent and trustworthy. I have not found this to be true in connection with power and aluminum in several governmental offices.

POWER SHORTAGE APPARENT IN 1938

Bonneville project on the Columbia River has been in the process of construction for over 7 years. Early in 1938 a competent and trustworthy engineer, who is in official capacity in the Government, called my attention to the serious power shortage which would be felt in case of need of national defense. I immediately urged this upon Department officials and received no encouragement in regard to the necessary expansion, and found no interest whatsoever in connection with a possible power shortage under a defense program. I helped to secure the cooperation of my informed colleagues from the Pacific Northwest in obtaining funds for immediate installation of additional generators in the unfinished Bonneville project. I found the Army engineers informed and cooperative. They are building the project. Otherwise my importunities resembled only the proverbial voice crying in the wilderness.

POWER NECESSITIES FOR DEFENSE OUTLINED IN 1939

On March 3, 1939, I brought the matter to the attention of this House in a speech entitled "Pacific Northwest Power Resources in Relation to the National Defense Program." I discussed the power shortage during the World War; the necessity for the wide distribution of the defense supply of power, rather than concentration in a single area or in limited areas; emphasized the necessity for speeding construction at Bonneville; definitely stated that the present private power capacity is "obsolete," and that the new plant installations of private utilities had been negligible. I further explained the futility of depending upon steam capacity which would consume the nation's coal needed for other defense purposes. It was made clear that the deficiency of capacity was due to speculative and destructive methods of private utility holding companies. I quote briefly from the introduction to that speech:

The development of modern production methods has sharply inclined toward electrochemical processes. These processes are so dependent on abundant power that it can safely be said that power has become the indispensable base of wartime supply. This

statement does not apply to any one group of necessary materials, but covers the entire field of such production.

In the speech of March 3, 1939, I pointed out that a minimum reserve pool of 250,000 kilowatts should be provided in the Northwest to take care of defense requirements, based on the experiences of the last World War.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing and terrifying to me that the country is accepting at this time the advice and leadership of technical men who could not see or would not admit what was so clearly pointed out by me at that time.

ALUMINUM SHORTAGE AND ALCOA

On March 3, 1941, I again besought the Congress and public men to take some action on this matter, specifically in relation to the aluminum supply. I quote from my speech of that date:

The history of the Alcoa during this emergency and its acts in the name of defense will some day be written in full. Speaking briefly, I can truthfully say that it has sought to extend throughout the country its existing power monopolies. Quietly and efficiently it has gone about this project, working through its allies in the defense set-up. First, there was utter denial of any aluminum shortage. Only 6 months ago this was made to me personally when I sought to extend the use of Bonneville power for the defense program.

Because the whole country now senses the critical situation in regard to aluminum and magnesium, I desire to make a matter of record my experience in fruitlessly endeavoring to secure the cooperation of the present O. P. M. advisers in warding off this dangerous shortage, which so disastrously affects our important air program.

EFFORTS TO INCREASE LIGHT METAL PRODUCTION

On July 13, 1940, upon the advice of a competent and reliable engineer, a northwest group decided that the probable aluminum shortage must be called to the attention of O. P. M. Senators BONE and HOLMAN and Representatives LEAVY and myself called upon Chairman Stettinius to make the suggestion that the Columbia River power be immediately put to work on the production of light metals in the interest of defense. Mr. Stettinius stated that he thought that the needs were adequately cared for, so far as these metals were concerned. He promised to send his technical advisers for further conference. Accordingly, a meeting was called in Senator HOLMAN'S office on July 15, 1940. Attending this meeting were Senators MCNARY and HOLMAN, Representatives LEAVY and myself, a representative from Senator BONE'S office, and the Washington representative of the Bonneville project. Those appearing for O. P. M. as advisers of Mr. Stettinius were Mr. Gano Dunn, Mr. W. L. Batt, Mr. Grenville Holden, and Dr. C. K. Leith. It was understood by the group that Mr. C. W. Kellogg, of the Edison Electric Institute, was the official adviser on power who had so seriously misjudged the situation. The congressional delegation pressed for the immediate utilization of the Columbia River power for the production of light metals.

The O. P. M. representatives countered with the statement that there were sufficient supplies of these metals and that there was no justification of further utilization of Bonneville power in their production.

Mr. Speaker, I so resented the neglectful and careless attitude of O. P. M. advisers that I constantly brought it to the attention of the public and this House. In that connection I again quote briefly from my speech of March 3, 1941:

The managing director of the Edison Institute is, during the emergency, conveniently located in Washington, directing defense expenditures running into the billions and dictating policies favorable to monopoly. He might well be called and questioned as to the extent to which power policies formulated by Congress are being circumvented under the guise of national defense.

POWER AND LIGHT METALS—THE AXIS OUTSTRIPS US

Anyone who can use power statistics could figure out the relative light-metal productive capacity of the Axis Powers, as there is direct relationship between the available capacity of such water-power plants and aluminum or light-metal tonnage. To produce a ton of light metals, either aluminum or magnesium, it takes approximately 2 kilowatts of power working continuously for 1 year. Therefore, dividing the available capacity by 2 gives the equivalent tonnage.

At the time the delegation called on Mr. Stettinius in July 1940, the hydro capacity of the United States applied to aluminum production was on the order of 425,000 kilowatts. Japan and Germany each had approximately the same capacity. With the acquisition of the output of France, Switzerland, Norway, and Italy, the light-metal capacity of the Axis Powers became three times as great as that of the United States. Mr. Speaker, why has it been impossible, up to this time, to secure the attention of the departments and the O. P. M. to this vitally important fact?

Until the Vultee strike in December 1940, the Defense Commission, in press releases, contended that we had adequate supplies of aluminum. In the meantime, Alcoa had contracted for an additional 100,000 kilowatts of Bonneville capacity.

As late as the middle of January 1941, Admiral Towers, of the Naval Air Corps, testified before the House Naval Affairs Committee that the supply of aluminum was adequate. The only ones who have been correct in this very critical situation, in all the Government circles, are those who comprise the Oregon and Washington congressional delegations and their engineer advisor. In spite of the clearly apparent situation, the departments did not take the lead in pressing for additional generators at Bonneville. In March and April 1940 this delegation fully realized the situation and was responsible for congressional authorization of units 7 to 10, inclusive, at Bonneville and the acceleration of units 5 and 6.

It is indeed fortunate for the country that Congress followed the leadership of the Pacific Northwest and provided aluminum producing capacity equal to 65 percent of the total 1940 production. It now appears that the Defense Commission, as late as February 1941, was estimating on a basis of about 890,000 kilowatts, while the Axis Powers, in their own and conquered territory, had nearly doubled that amount. I also called attention to this situation when testifying before the House Interior Appropriations Committee in March 1941.

ALCOA DEFIES THE GOVERNMENT

The June 7, 1941, issue of The Nation contains an article by its correspondent, Mr. Jonathan Daniels, which cites the applications of the Aluminum Co. of America to the Federal Power Commission for various rights to develop hydro power in streams in the Southeast. Apparently this power was not developed because the Power Commission demanded that Alcoa should accept the provisions of Federal law. The F. P. C. definitely commented upon Alcoa's complete unwillingness to accept these provisions. I quote from that article:

But it is not very pleasant in the dark to contemplate the fact that the sacrifice is not made to serve Uncle Sam alone but to help Uncle Sam save the Aluminum Co. from the effects of its own declaration—before defense and in the midst of it—that it would produce no more power if, in producing it, it had to abide by Federal law.

Incidentally, this same issue of The Nation comments upon the errors of Mr. Gano Dunn, O. P. M. engineer, in estimating the steel production needs. It also relates the efforts to increase and pool power production in the Southeast in order to cope with the results of the drought. In the Pacific Northwest there is no drought, and there is continuous and ample water supply. Power is furnished by the greatest power stream on the North American Continent. It has an unfailing supply of water for power, and projects are operating and expanding at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. Consent of Congress is all that is needed to add Umatilla Dam on the Columbia, completing the Coulee program by providing navigation, and augmenting the Government's hydro capacity with a stable and strategically located additional supply of power.

I demand to be informed why it is necessary to use coal and to make the people sacrifice necessities of life in order to locate great defense industries in sections in which there is a definite power shortage.

I would like to be told why it was necessary to spend a million dollars of Government money to build a Bonneville transmission line in order to locate a pressingly needed aluminum plant with an eye to salvaging a real-estate investment rather than for the purpose of rescuing our air program which is definitely in jeopardy.

I also suggest that the O. P. M. secure more competent advisers on power and light metals. Our air-defense program is seriously menaced by the proven incompetence of its staff. I am convinced that a joint congressional committee should be appointed to keep in close touch with defense activities and to inform the Congress. I believe the Congress still has a function to perform in this Government.

Is America Flying Blind?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY MAJ. ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article taken from the current issue of Coronet, entitled "Is America Flying Blind?" The author, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, is one of the most brilliant and authoritative in aviation. I agree with the opinion expressed in the article, and hope we shall set up a separate air force. Air power must be concentrated under one responsible head for an economical development of the proper hitting force we need.

The article follows:

IS AMERICA FLYING BLIND?

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

THERE IS NEITHER SENSE NOR SAFETY IN SUBORDINATING OUR AIR FORCE TO THE MORE OLD-FASHIONED METHODS OF WARFARE

The widespread popular delusion that the world was caught unawares by the terrific effectiveness of Nazi Germany's air force provides a conforming alibi for humiliating defeats. Only it happens to be wholly untrue. The fact is, Hitler has not thrown into action a single aircraft model or unfolded a single principle of aviation warfare which had not been thoroughly familiar to aeronautical experts of all other nations long before the outbreak of the war.

I had myself inspected Nazi aviation but a few months before Poland was attacked. The Germans showed me their Stuka dive bombers, their swiftest pursuits, and their horizontal bombers. The Nazis imposed no restrictions on us in conveying our observations to the outside world. They had no need to do so—all German types had been on display repeatedly at international aeronautical shows and had been fully described in the aviation press of all countries. Moreover, the progress of the Nazi Luftwaffe had been continuously reported to other governments by their military observers in Germany.

Why, then, were other nations so dismally unprepared to meet the German onslaught from the air? Certainly not because they lacked aviation brains equal to the challenge. The great strides made by the British aeronautical industry under stress of war, and the impressive progress being registered at long last by some American aircraft builders, prove that there was no dearth of designing talent.

The answer to the mystery must be sought in the mentality of nations. By this time it is clear that they were, each in its own fashion, afflicted by a species of psychological paralysis.

France had been hypnotized by a fatalistic reliance on its Maginot line and its faith in "the world's finest army." Even in that long interval after German aviation had demonstrated its power in the devastation of Poland, France continued to ignore the obvious.

England, similarly, had been leaning back complacently on faith in its glorious and impregnable navy. Hypnotized by tradition, she found it literally impossible even to imagine a crucial battle in which the navy would be little more than a helpless onlooker—the kind of all-air battle, that is to say, which has actually been under way now for almost 8 months.

And it is likewise in psychological factors that we discover the real explanation for the dismal backwardness of military aviation in America. The fact alone that our commercial aeronautics is the world's best indicates that the military lag cannot be blamed on lack of aviation talent. The simple truth is that America has been lulled into a complacent sense of safety by its two oceans. That has been—and unfortunately remains today—the American equivalent of the "Maginot mentality" in France. Unless overcome quickly, it holds the threat of the same kind of disaster.

There can be no reason in logic why, if we built warplanes at all, they should have been below the standards of performance technically possible at the time of their design and construction. The absence of immediate danger of war or foreign invasion might justify the maintenance of a skeleton air power rather than a full-sized one. But it decidedly did not justify the inferiority in the quality of aircraft. Even if we had only one airplane, it should have been at least the equal of any extant.

But while the public may have been startled by recent disclosures about the shortcomings of American aircraft under conditions of actual warfare, aviation people were not. They had known all along, for instance, that American pursuits had neither the armor nor the armament to match the British Hurricanes and Spitfires or the German Messerschmidts and Heinkels. They had known, to cite an even more striking example, that our so-called flying fortresses lacked the very essential of a fortress, which is adequate defensive ability.

The American people have a real cause for complaint. They had for years been lulled into thinking that our military aviation was not only on a par with others, but even better. In the face of reports by American observers about the obvious superiority of European air forces, a national magazine of millionfold circulation, for instance, continued to boast, parrotlike, that "Our own war birds are best."

It is about time we stopped bragging about our aeronautical superiority. Every champion who underestimates his challenger loses his crown. The more sensible course is to overestimate our potential opponents and to be ready to meet strength with greater strength. If we persist in continuing to live in a fool's paradise of self-congratulation, there is nothing ahead of us but humiliation at the hands of our enemies.

Hard-pressed Great Britain welcomed anything she could get. Desperate men trying to reach shore in a leaky boat are grateful for broomsticks and handkerchiefs, though they need oars and sails. The British are carrying on gamely without complaint and without quarreling over spilt milk. Until the night fighter, now in an experimental stage, becomes fully effective, the American flying fortresses may prove useful in nighttime bombing, when the shroud of darkness makes up for inadequate defensive equipment. Our pursuits have given a good account of themselves apparently in the Mediterranean area, as long as they were pitted against inferior Italian aviation. But the fact remains, all the same, that these planes were far below the standards of performance established by other nations.

Our failure, in short, was not technical but psychological. It can be traced to a basic refusal in high quarters to acknowledge the crucial role of aviation in modern warfare. That, in turn, has kept American military aviation tied into an organizational set-up that prevents its natural development. It is as though a fine-mettled race horse were yoked together with a pair of oxen and expected to compete against horses without such encumbrance.

The fact is that aviation designers have, for years, made specific and detailed proposals to our military authorities for increasing the fire power, the armor, and other elements in our fighting planes since demonstrated as indispensable. Such proposals were pigeonholed almost automatically, because they failed to touch the imagination of men conditioned to thinking only in terms of surface fighting. My own files, for instance, hold a series of such proposals, which were not only arbitrarily rejected but ridiculed by a high military authority.

Our military aircraft have also been seriously handicapped by what we might call our luxury complex. Because air defense seemed, to the naval and infantry people in control of it, an indulgence rather than a critical necessity, we have built into our fighting planes many comforts and super-safety provisions at the expense of combat efficiency. For instance, after an unfortunate freak accident, where a pilot was killed when his airplane turned over in landing, all our tactical airplanes were built with huge towers, like reinforced greenhouses, directly behind the pilot's head—at a cost of additional weight and reduction in speed. Our gallant military pilots, whose safety was directly concerned by this change, objected to these encumbrances. After all, under fighting conditions, the pilot's ultimate safety depends on the performance of his machine rather than the luxury of its construction and excessive margins of safety. Their judgment has been completely vindicated by the fact that a mere 25-mile speed edge of the British pursuits over the German Messerschmidts held off the numerical superiority of the Nazi air power.

The whole subject would not be worth discussing if it were merely a matter of history. But it isn't. The same brakes which have retarded the development of our air power are still in place. Airplanes are still treated as extensions of existing weapons rather than new weapons requiring new forms of organization, administration, and tactics.

Psychologically the American people, and even more so, our highest military leaders, are still leaning back on our own "Maginot Lines," the two oceans and their respective fleets. In the designing of tomorrow's aviation we are still only "catching up"—a fatal procedure when the need is to outdistance, outplan, and outthink the potential adversary. Despite the clear lessons of the tragic experience in Europe, we are still obsessed by problems of mass production, while the more crucial questions of range, greater fire power, defensive armor, and maneuverability are treated lightly if at all.

The most serious fault of all though, is that the fundamental defense scheme for our Nation is predicated on the assumption that the science of war remains the same as it was in the Argonne-Meuse battle of 1918. We have as yet failed to grasp the role of air power in the near future. The same assumption cost France its life and has endangered the British Isles. The shorter distances involved naturally made them vulnerable to air power sooner—but that is the only difference between their position and ours. And even that protection of distance is being narrowed with every passing month. National security plans which do not recognize this fact are doomed to disaster.

If our country is obliged to go to war—actively—the offensive will be possible only through the air. Our fleets will be unable to attack enemy shore lines or to land troops while the skies are under enemy control. If we come to actual grips with a foe, it will be first of all in the air. That phase must be

determined before our naval and land strength can be brought into effective play.

One high-ranking Air Corps general, in a speech on February 28, stated that the United States "should have no fear of being outstripped in the race for air power," and added that the Nation's resources "insure our ultimate command of the air." Unfortunately, natural resources by themselves can insure nothing. Despite their abundance, our country has been devoid of genuine air power to date, because of the lack of proper leadership. Our military aircraft will not take their place way out front in the race for world superiority until aviation thinking and planning has been unshackled to enable us properly to exploit our natural resources.

That, I submit, will not happen until air power is independent and administered by aviation experts of proven experience, knowledge, and vision.

The Greater New York Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL, IN CONNECTION WITH THE GREATER NEW YORK FUND APPEAL

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio speech given by former Postmaster General James A. Farley over radio station WEAF on Wednesday, June 4, 1941, as the last appeal in connection with the Greater New York Fund:

Last week I went to the Kips Bay Boys' Club. It was rainy, so the boys were all inside instead of being on the play roof in the air and sunshine. A ball game was on, and I couldn't resist a few swings at the ball. I hit it twice, but missed when a photographer tried for a home-run picture.

But I know those kids were having fun and building their bodies. There was a gym, a swimming pool, reading room, and instruction rooms. It was all fine, but the glow in my heart was a little chilled when I was told the work was being slowed up by lack of money.

Then I went to Madonna House, a lower East Side settlement that has been operating 30 years on the same spot. Four or five flights of stairs to see the different rooms. Small children's sleeping bunks that fold back against the walls make room for other activities.

Yes; I saw for myself how children and their parents are trained, helped, educated, taught to play. I saw health and morale being built right before my eyes. I saw Chinese boys learning English and other Chinese boys learning Chinese, that they might better help their parents be good citizens.

Madonna House swarms with children by day, with parents by night.

But the Sisters told me there wasn't money enough to do all that they know should be done to help their people.

Coming from these visits, I went to my office firmly believing half our city doesn't know anything about the other half.

But I do believe the half which does not know must learn and must help do something about that other half.

In these hours and days of uncertainty we are asked for all-out effort to prepare this Nation. Everything gives way to national defense.

That's as it should be. And that's why I come with this personal plea. I speak tonight as Jim Farley, a private citizen you know pretty well, and also Jim Farley, chairman of the 1941 campaign of the Greater New York Fund.

I urge full preparedness, but I ask that you start with the boys and girls, the men and women of our city, their health and welfare, their morale, that great intangible which makes or breaks nations.

Pleading with you tonight, I represent 2,000,000 New Yorkers, some of whom you may know, most of whom you never see. Sometimes they need emergency care, sometimes help over long periods; they need advice; they need services which only highly skilled people can offer.

Yet, unless we men and women who are in business, we men and women who have jobs give a little more thought, a little more time, and more money to the problem, those 2,000,000 are not going to get the care they should have; their health and welfare is going to be neglected; morale building will go to smash.

Then you and I and the whole city will suffer.

That must not happen. That's why I urge tonight that you help us because the 400 health and welfare services associated in the Greater New York Fund are helping those 2,000,000 people, are dealing with every phase of human relations and human need. And it takes a lot of money.

I feel there is need for a more personalized campaign to bring the fund more money.

It is up to you people who hear my voice to give the task the same personal interest you would in caring for an ill or needy neighbor. For that's what the fund is doing—it is being the friendly neighbor to New York's 2,000,000 who need something more in life than they have, or can get for themselves.

We have thousands of volunteers in this battle for the health and welfare of New York. I am doing what I can to help, but after all, I am only one little fellow in a great big city.

We need more help, your help. The Greater New York fund makes no individual or personal appeal for money, but I can make a personal appeal for help.

You, and you, and you, out there on the air waves—in your homes, your cars, your clubs, or wherever this broadcast reaches you. You can help, and you must help, because it is your duty as a New Yorker, in business or in employment in this city. You must help those not so well off; not so fortunate; maybe down a little on their luck; maybe a family about to break up for want of just the right advice, or just the right word.

Here is what you can do: If you are in a business firm, you can see to it that the firm makes a contribution to the fund. If you are an employee, you can make sure that you and your fellow employees give to the fund.

If you are in business and have given, how about giving a little more? If you are an employee who already has given, how about adding to your gift? It is not too late. Our fund address is 52 Wall Street.

And if you are a housewife, or a school boy or girl, or an older person not working, you can help by urging friends and relatives who are employed to see that firms and employee groups contribute.

Right now we are proving to ourselves that firms and employees will give more if appealed to. We are mailing victory pledge cards urging nondonors to give and donors to give more. Our first victory pledge cards came back within 24 hours.

The fund must have $5,000,000 this year. That's the least sum of money with which the fund can do its share in maintaining our health and welfare activities. Less than that amount means some part of the necessary work such as I saw last week cannot go on.

Files at the fund office are full of reports that would wring your heart. They tell of things accomplished that make you feel a little joy at being a part of the effort; on the other hand, there are reports of works discontinued, work partly stopped, definite tasks that ought to be done but cannot be attempted—all because of lack of money.

This should make you uneasy, as it does me, for I have seen the heroic work a few dollars can do in the hands of our agencies.

Instead of being expanded, services that are urgently needed are being reduced. In one poverty-stricken section of Brooklyn, an important district office has been closed. Day nurseries have had to suspend. Employment service for young women has been stopped.

Lack of money is halting a thorough program aimed at health, character building, and morale.

And yet this country needs all three of these elements in the largest possible doses.

One great settlement house cut out practically all health work for children and adults. This took away from many boys and girls and men and women their only chance for physical exercise and health supervision. There may be dire consequences.

Another settlement cut out entirely its program for children between 5 and 8 years old.

And when lack of a few paltry dollars prevents necessary work to help children of these ages, it's time we all sat up and took notice.

Hot weather is here now. Most of us are figuring on vacations. How about the boy or girl or the father or mother who cannot have those few hours of sun and air and good food that put pounds and pounds and pounds on skinny kids and build health right into bones and flesh?

We certainly cannot sit by placidly and say, "It's none of our business" when one summer camp for kids is closed and when 187,000 who ought to go are kept home for lack of a few dollars.

Frankly, the whole picture has me worried. I want to get that $5,000,000 the fund needs this year.

I have had lots of help getting the money that's in. I want to thank every volunteer and the regular fund staff. But there's one man who ought to be thanked specifically. He has done a great job, and on top of it has pledged to me that when we reach four and a half million he will start fighting all over again for the last half million to our goal.

That man is Floyd Carlisle, busy and hard-headed chairman of the board of Consolidated Edison. He thinks enough of suffering kids that need camp, and fathers and mothers who get aid from our agencies, to help in a big-time way. And he is no word waster when he demands his business friends produce their share of money needed for the health, character, and morale buildings our agencies do.

Do not forget, we help 2,000,000 persons without regard to race or creed. That's 2 out of every 7 New Yorkers.

People of this democracy always help sufferers, the world over. But perhaps some have been a little blind to needs at home, due to overeagerness to help abroad.

That's why I say the Greater New York Fund appeal is not "just one more drive." It is 400 appeals in 1; appeals by 400 stabilized services.

So perhaps your firm will give more. Perhaps you as an employee will put up $2 instead of $1, or a day's pay if you gave less.

We all should be a little ashamed if we do not do our full part to raise this money so the

health, welfare, and morale of New York City can be depended on in our national emergency.

That's why I make this appeal. This is a great human cause. It must be carried through.

I'll be watching the returns from you. Thanks and good night.

The Price of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and profound address delivered by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] at the commencement exercises at Wake Forest College on June 2 last, entitled "The Price of Peace." The address is indeed an outstanding one; in fact, I might well say it is a great address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One has of late the impression of many voices, of too many voices, loud and diverse. The confusion at Babel was a confusion of tongues. The modern confusion is a confusion of counsel, of ideologies, of points of view, of rival interests, of power politics, and at bottom the confusion of a generation that has rejected the beacons and authorities of the past without having found new ones to guide it. A materialistic age is reaping the inevitable harvest of materialism—tears and blood and darkness. At Babel there was a tower to build. But we have a world, a new age, to construct—and our confusion for the present is worse than that of Babel, of itself and in its consequences. The completion of the Babylonian tower was of no importance; but the reconstruction of civilization is the most important task in all history.

THE MODERN CONFUSION

So many are speaking at once that none can be heard. There is incessant listening in, but all one gets is a sense of noise, of clamor. Labor speaks and capital speaks, politicians, statesmen, and philosophers are heard. National leaders—Roosevelt, Churchill, Hitler, Stalin, and Matsuoka and many a lesser voice; editors, columnists, and professors and authors and nuts. We do have freedom of speech, of the press, and of opinion—full tide of freedom—the radio and the press present hourly the events of all the world, and opinions more varied than those events. There is impression but it does not linger—before one takes root another comes in. There is no meditation. Long ago a poet declared "the world is too much with us." Little did that poet dream how much more it was destined to be with us in this day—if this we now hear is indeed the world that the poet had in mind.

There are indeed words that penetrate and rise above the general clamor: One hears the words "new order, totalitarian, democracy, dictator, liberty, security, revolution, aggression, defense, new age, transition," and again and again the word "war," and sometimes the word "peace." But while the words rise above the general volume of noise, the speakers with their differing opinions and data and aims leave us almost as much confused as though we had heard nothing but clamor in the night without knowing whence it had come.

Better for you now, I think, on the threshold of your careers and in the midst of so great confusion, is the suggestion that one may hear more and find surer direction, if he shall succeed in finding for himself a place of silence and hear and hearken to no voice save that which comes from the eternal realms of help.

For there is a voice that speaks to every generation, to every age, and to every man if he will; a voice that one may hear best alone and in silence, and that one may understand only in meditation. It is the voice that Moses and Elijah heard, that John the Baptist heard, that Jesus heard, that Paul heard—the voice in the desert and the wilderness, of fasting and prayer. And one may dare to add that Buddha, Confucius, Mahomet heard also—and even Joan of Arc under the trees of Domremy, and John Bunyan in his prison cell, and John Woolman on the highway alone. It is the voice of which the poet spoke when he said:

"Well roars the storm to him who hears
A greater voice across the storm."

It is the still small voice that never fails the ear that will hear, that always serves him who hearkens.

I bid you hear this Voice above them all, if you can—hear and hearken. For perhaps it may bring you peace whate'er betide, and vision in our present great darkness, and through you a way for millions now lost in vast confusion. I repeat, you may hear it, if you will, and you may hearken, if you will.

With such thoughts I come to my theme, The Price of Peace, trusting that you may hear above my words the higher call.

Peace is not to be had for the asking, and, I may add, the poet was uttering less truth than poetry when she said that only Heaven is given away. Over the doorpost of a room in this college town when I was a student here I read two legends from antiquity—"Nihil sine labore" (Nothing without labor); and over another, "Ex nihilo nihil fit" (From nothing, nothing)—and a swift half century has proved to me their truth. Neither Heaven nor peace, nor any other good thing, is given away.

Peace must be bought with a price—and it is always worth all it may cost in gold, or in toil and tears and blood, and patient endurance of want and pain, as occasion may demand, and not as anyone or any nation may choose. There is no escape from circumstances. They compel us, whether we choose or not. And there is, believe me, no substitute for intelligence or toil or character.

For my purpose here, it will serve to say that the subject of peace presents itself to me at first in two aspects—personal peace and national peace. Of the former, I shall speak but briefly; of the latter at more length.

PERSONAL PEACE

One may have peace notwithstanding all earthly events if only he be capable of sufficient faith. And it was of this peace that the Prince of Peace spoke: "Peace I give unto you; My peace I leave with you—not as the world gives give I unto you"; given only to those who had paid the price, who had rejected, denied themselves, taken up the cross, and were following Him. It is the peace even of Gethsemane and, saving a brief moment, of Golgotha. It is the peace of all those who are possessed by the faith which assures them in all circumstances that "all things work together for good to them that love God, to the called according to His purpose." The peace, I may say, of a certain good woman to whom I was talking about the current perplexities of our time, who quietly said to me, "I cannot understand all that is going on; it is all far beyond me; I do not know what will happen; but I know that all is well whether it seems so or not. God rules our world for His children in power and righteousness and love." It is the peace of Stephen under the blows of his persecutors, of Paul in prison, and in the arena with the beasts, of Savonarola at the stake, and of Obadiah Holmes here in our land under the lashes that drew his blood, but which he testified he never felt.

This peace of faith is probably the most precious gift of God, of faith that disregards and sees beyond all earthly consequences. For faith is not just believing that all is going to be well or that all will be well in a heaven to be; faith is believing, when all is not going well, and when one knows that nothing is going well here, nevertheless that all is well. It is not the consolation of heaven to come or of rewards to be received. It is its own reward and a present realization that all, even the worst things, are even now working together for good to them that love God. Faith is not the means of escape from the world but the means of present victory over it. One who is fully armed with faith may say even now, I have overcome the world; victory is achieved. Of such is that glorious company which in the presence of cell and cross, of ax and torch, serenely endured, saying to themselves, "We are more than conquerors."

Get this peace of faith, young men, if you can, and pay its price—the rejection of self for the greater personality.

And with this injunction and without attempting, what is so far beyond me, to tell you how to get this peace, let me now move on to the other division of my theme, national peace and its price, a subject in which doubtless you are more interested—unfortunately.

NATIONAL PEACE

The reason for the existence of organized society, that is, a state or commonwealth, republic or empire, city or town, is peace. The word for state, the word for city, and the word for citizen has its root in the word for peace. To be exact, the word civis, the original of citizen, predicates security, and security implies peace.

Our Federal Constitution sets out in its preamble the purposes of any government, amongst them, "to insure domestic tranquillity," "to provide the common defense." Peace—then security, safety, tranquillity—is the source of the state and also the justification of its existence—peace within and without.

This is no new thing. Tribes gathered about patriarchs and chiefs for security tens of thousands of years ago, and individuals have ever yielded up individual freedom and responsibility in order to obtain peace. They paid tribute, they submitted to government, and they fought in battle, for their own security. Such was the basis of the feudal system. The state is a defensive organization, its function is security, and its grand objective is peace. Its symbol is the policeman, the soldier, the warship. This is especially true of democracies.

The first installment of the price of peace is, therefore, the surrender of a portion of one's individual freedom, as he makes common cause for the domestic tranquillity, for the collective and individual security, for the common defense or the general welfare. There must be central authority and there must be loyalty—or obedience—else there is no security, no state, no peace. A government must govern. There can be no divided authority.

There has always been debate as to how much of one's freedom must thus be yielded up, but it has always been conceded that the surrender of a certain portion is necessary.

This is the meaning of liberty as contrasted with freedom. It is the explanation of ordered liberty.

This ordered liberty is the conception of liberty founded upon inalienable rights which even the state may not take away in the direst emergency. But of late this conception has been boldly challenged and upon a broad scale. After a century and a half of liberty, mighty nations are denying its value. They declare that the State is supreme, the individual nothing—and that there are no rights of man which may not be taken away by the State whenever it chooses. This is the supreme doctrine of the Soviet Union, of the Nazis, and the Fascists, and it is likewise the secret of their immediate successes. They think so well of it, it is so good for them they propose to give it to the whole of mankind—even by force, which is logical enough and entirely consistent with the fundamental theory.

Those nations do have a certain domestic tranquillity. And they hear only one voice each respectively. It is doubtful that the individual has security They do not have peace, and are not likely to have peace so long as there are in the earth men who love liberty or men who would have souls of their own. In fact I suspect that those nations preserve their domestic tranquillity only by making war abroad.

LIBERTY AND PEACE

There is no security, from our standpoint, where there is no liberty. The great Pax Romana was peaceful enough, but it was the peace of suppression. Slavery may be peaceful, but it is not peace, nor is it security. The price of that sort of peace has often been paid and is familiar—it is stated fully in one word "slavery"—the initial stage of which is suppression by force.

It is here that we come to the present world crisis. It is a conflict between nations that would establish their peace, foreign and domestic, by force and suppression, and nations that demand not only peace but also ordered liberty, individual and collective. You may make your choice and pay the price as it may be demanded.

It is our American task to secure peace with liberty and its blessings to ourselves and our posterity. If we defend with the sword in one hand, we carry in the other our bill of inalienable rights. This is one of our difficulties, but it is a difficulty worth the carrying. For with the Bill of Rights we may rebuild a civilization, howsoever devastated; but with the sword alone nothing whatever may be rebuilt. If and when called upon to sacrifice this Bill of Rights, we will decline. There is neither victory nor security in the loss of the inalienable rights of man. That is one price we will not pay. The United States must not go totalitarian.

The Constitution, declared our Supreme Court passing upon this very question, cannot be suspended for one moment or on account of any emergency howsoever dire. Whenever we defend under the flag, we defend under the Constitution for freedom of conscience, of opinion, of speech, of the press; for freedom to educate our children in schools under our control; for the right to hold our representatives in power accountable to ourselves in frequent and free elections; for due process of law and the rights of life, liberty, and property assessed in free and independent courts; for the right to pursue happiness; for the right of local self-government in matters local; for the preservation of the reign of laws approved by ourselves in a representative government of law and administered by officers under the law no less than we are. And this is no less the meaning of the flag than it is of our Constitution, our native land, the firesides of our fathers, and the altars of our God.

So, in assessing the price of peace, we reckon upon something more than mere security or quiet—we reckon upon ordered liberty, in full recognition of the dignity of man and the vast domain in which he is above the state. If we defend, we defend only for a peace in which these trophies of civilization are the greater stake; not as aggressors, not to impose them on others; not to gain territory or power; not to preserve or gain commerce; not in revenge nor in ambition; not for wealth or living room or glory; but to make sure and to preserve to ourselves and our posterity these, the blessings of liberty. The people of the United States do not make war, but defend they will to the uttermost against all, whether from within or without, who would invade their land or their inalienable rights. For they recognize in any threat to the security of those inalienable rights the jeopardy of their peace.

These trophies of civilization, I must not fail to say, are no small portion of the great spiritual and moral heritage of the human race. They spring from our religion and without them religion is of little value. For religion must be free. It rests also upon our security.

THE VALUE OF PEACE

Since peace is the primary objective of the state and the grand reason for its existence, it ought to be most highly prized by the state and its citizens; and so highly prizing it, they must maintain it so far as is possible. It is in peace that the people are happier, safer, more prosperous; it is in peace that political and social progress is made, the arts and sciences flourish and culture extends. Our periods of progress in this our land have been the long periods of peace.

One may safely say that the great period of peace from the Civil War until now, broken altogether by less than 3 years of war, has been the great golden age of the most prosperous of peoples, in which from every material standpoint, whether of invention and industry or benevolence, whether of education—the wealth of the mind—or in the accumulation of riches, the wealth material, the building of roads, the development of transportation, the extension of the use of electrical energy, the erection of churches and schools, the development of agriculture and commerce, the improvement of rural life, and the organization of cities, the erection of hospitals, universities, and colleges—in this 75 years we have made a progress in this our land that surpasses that of many centuries theretofore. It could not have been without peace. Nor could it have been, had our Republic not enjoyed a natural security which now no longer avails us. This progress has, I regret to say, been accompanied by a moral deterioration of grave magnitude, our people, overtempted and thoughtless, yielding up the spiritual and the moral to ambition and worldly success. In gaining prosperity we have lost righteousness. Materialism has overcome us to a greater extent, I fear, than we realize.

It now appears that our period of incomparable national progress approaches its end, and we know that to maintain our security, or to extend the period of our peace, we, one and all, must pay a great price, and not in money only, nor yet just in deprivation, but certainly in full and costly preparation for war and even possibly in all the sacrifices and horrors of war—of modern war, of mechanized war, of war on land and sea, in the heavens above and the water beneath the earth, of war in which populations and noncombatants, women and children, the sick and the old, are victims no less—indeed even more—than the skilled men who bear or are borne by modern arms; such a kind of war as the human race never hitherto has known. And it is a grave question whether we are morally or spiritually equipped for our ordeal.

It is not to be denied that engagement in such a war may in truth be the price of our security, our peace at length. It may be that we must destroy much of civilization in order to save a remnant upon which to rebuild, and that many of us may be required to live out the remainder of our days in sorrow and distress in order that the generations coming on may have security. It may be that we may escape the ultimate test or at least postpone it. At the moment, none may surely say.

In this view the price of security is peace itself. And it ought to be resolved that such a price shall not be paid unless it is realized to be necessary. Some of you may recall the victory of Caesar over Vercingetorix about 2,000 years ago; and of the offer of the conquered leader of the Gauls to die at once before his soldiers or to be delivered up to Caesar, because as he himself said he had made war not of necessity, but for the sake of the common liberty, by which he meant no such liberty as ours, but only the independence of his tribe. We may after 2,000 years of increasingly costly experience well agree with the leader of ancient Gaul that war may be justified only by necessity—that is, that it is essential to national security—and that those who make war for ambition or aggression or material gain deserve the fate which he invoked upon himself—delivered over to Caesar, imprisoned 6 years at Rome, and at last paraded before his conqueror's chariot through the streets of Rome in chains and publicly beheaded.

As peace is the object of the existence of the state, so war is a state's great enemy and to avoid it is a state's chief concern. For nothing may be said in behalf of war, no more than that a state is justified in making war only by sheer necessity. Men do rise to great heights of heroism in war, and the virtue of the soldier is always to be praised, howsoever deeply one condemns war. War is not only destructive of civil life and of all the arts of peace, of life and work and home and society, of school and church, of that pursuit of happiness which is one of the inalienable rights of man, of that welfare individual and social, which it is the duty of a state to conserve; but with the horsemen of war ride three other horsemen, the horseman of famine, the horseman of pestilence, and the horseman of death. They are now on their way over the whole world. War must be the last resort of a civilized state or of reasoning beings.

THE CHOICE

The choice is not by any means, however, between war and peace, but between war and the consequences of not defending a nation's security in due time to the uttermost, or of not being prepared adequately to defend—between war and that security without which there is no peace. War is all of horror that it is declared to be by those who most abhor it—and it is more. But between war and subjugation, a people must choose the former; between war and slavery the haters of war must choose war. Invaders must be repelled; enemies must be headed off in due season. For, worse than war is defeat in war, or subjugation without war. Above war and above peace, every citizen must place his nation's security.

Across the decades comes the challenge: "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

The people of the United States at this time solemnly ponder whether to defend their country with aid to other countries short of actual belligerency or to commit themselves to the fortunes of war east and west; whether they can hope for a satisfactory issue upon present policies or not; whether they should take the chance between our present course of preparation at home and aid abroad, and await the outcome, in the possibility of fighting alone, or proceed

to join in now with other nations, especally Great Britain, whose armies and fleets are indispensable and are yet available; whether we are capable of the ordeal now or will be more so later. It is a question of wisdom rather than a mere choice, and a question demanding the utmost deliberation consistent with timely action, in which every factor and every potentiality must be weighed—and weighed by men who know the factors and their weights. The ultimate decision must be made by the people themselves, not by a mere majority, but practically by common consent—for a divided nation is beaten to begin with. Upon that decision at this moment the Government awaits, and prepares as it awaits.

THE CONDITION UNDERLYING PEACE

To preserve its security a nation must first of all be prepared. It must pay the price of adequate preparation; it must be strong not only physically, but also and in equal measure, morally and spiritually; for where liberty exists moral and spiritual armament are quite as essential as all the weapons of modern warfare. We cannot rely upon an imposed solidarity or unity; it must come from the spirit of the people—from their moral and religious qualities.

We currently have the picture of great haste in physical preparation, of huge undertakings, of incalculable expenditures imposing indescribable burdens and entailing difficulties and dangers of the greatest magnitude. Our land becomes an arsenal; and our sons soldiers in training to acquire the most ancient of skills, that of war, adjusted to the age of power and machinery.

We agree that it is necessary, for there is universal fear for our security. Our only question is, Can we in time array and equip a force equal to that or superior to that which threatens to be matched against us? Many do not like it, but few indeed are inclined to assume the risk of doing without it. This, we say, is also the price of peace, and such a price as a little while ago few suspected we would be required to pay.

But there is a not less essential preparation in our Republic of liberty. Our sons are ready for training; our industries are proceeding after a manner not altogether hopeless by any means, notwithstanding grave difficulties, touching the alleged right to strike against the security of the people, upon which I cannot now dwell. Our country requires more than trained soldiers and ships, more than planes and bombs, more than guns and explosives, more than production; there must be unity and its foundation must be secured. We now recall Rudyard Kipling's lines:

"For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard,
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding, calls not Thee to guard,
For frantic boast and foolish word—
Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord!"

The totalitarian may dispense with the moral dynamic, but the lands of liberty cannot, for they find their unity, their solidarity, their morale, their ultimate impetus not in orders handed down but in motives moving in unison from within.

MORAL PREPARATION

It is to this moral preparation or armament, if you please, that I direct your attention, because I deeply fear that we are most gravely wanting now in this respect. Our test has come after a long period of relative ease and softness, in which we have worshipped before the altar of the god success and bowed down to that mammon which Jesus most abhorred. We have yielded to self-indulgence. There has been prolonged moral lapse and luxurious living on one hand and neglect of the poor and weak on the other, of great selfishness and unblushing greed. While our country has been calling for sacrificial citizenship, so far only the young men of the armed service have made sacrifices. But the sacrifices must be made, and by one and all. It was an ancient captain who declared that he had found it easier to discover men willing to die in battle than people willing to undergo privation patiently for a little while; and modern captains are now confirming his experiences in our land. Well may the people of the United States look now to their moral fiber.

This is no hour for politics. We must suspend our ambitions and our rivalries; we must sink ourselves in the common necessity. And this also is a part of the price of peace.

There ought to be a return to and a recovery of ancient righteousness in the United States—that ancient righteousness of which the prophets spoke, which at once combines the spiritual and the moral, which is sacrificial as it is spiritual. There is no other morality sufficient for such a test as we must now undergo. This Republic might possibly fight through the ordeal of a new World War in the present state of mind of its people, but it could not hope in such a mind to sustain itself in the long aftermath of domestic readjustment. And to that also must we look even now.

THE NEED OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

It is of primary importance that we know at the outset what that righteousness was and is and ever must be. It was not and never can be mere conformity to rules and regulations, howsoever good. Jesus Himself declared to His contemporaries: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees (the best religious classes and most faithful observers of the law and the regulations) ye can in no wise enter the Kingdom" of mankind's redemption. And He demanded a righteousness within, a righteousness that fulfilled the law rather than kept it, a righteousness that was not merely just but that honored and protected the aged, that cared for the poor, and delivered the weak from oppression, even more than it conformed to any regularity whatsoever; a righteousness which rejected the material even to the degree of selling all one has, giving it to the poor, and sharing the common lot. And in this He but followed Moses and the prophets.

It is this sort of righteousness that exalteth a nation and serves as the breastplate of its soldiers and the girdle of its citizens. It is in this sort of righteousness only that a free republic can be strong and overmatch the organized, mechanized, skilled, and well-directed armies of the devotees of force and of the material—the apostles of the doctrine that might makes right. It is for us to show within ourselves that nothing less than the righteousness of God in the hearts of a people makes right; that, as our Chief Justice recently declared, the American way of life is the pathway of the just.

The Greeks had their ideal of the man in the word "kalos," a perfection of body and of mind, of behaviour and devotion to the state; the Romans had its counterpart in the word "virtus," a combination of courage, skill, just conduct, and patriotism. Our Christian civilization preserves the better meaning of both kalos and virtus and adds to them the spiritual and moral qualities of mercy, of kindness, of sacrifice, and faith, all combined in one word, "righteousness," the dynamic of which is a due relation to the most high God Himself. It is the standard of justice that imposes duty and restraint upon men who recognize their accountability to a just God, whom they worship and depend upon, rather than the standard that merely squares with the law.

Nor is this righteousness beyond us, nor are we wanting in examples of it—not only in Washington and Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson and Abraham Lincoln, but in every community even now there are men and women who illustrate it daily.

If we are to preserve our security and enjoy peace, or if war comes and we shall endure successfully the ordeal of war and its aftermath, we must prepare ourselves in this righteousness even more earnestly than in arms and fortresses, guns and munitions; and it must be a part not only of the skill itself of the fighting man, but of the character of the whole population. The hour is come for the preaching of righteousness in America. It is an hour for the return of Isaiah or Elijah.

This righteousness, let me say in passing, is the key no less to our domestic tranquility than to our defense against the invader from without. It is the antidote to low politics or selfish grasping for advantage no less than to the strife between capital and labor or class and class. It is the one sure preventive of revolution, the one guaranty of unity and the unfailing means of order.

This righteousness before God is also the price of peace.

And so I have laid before you my thoughts in this hour, addressed to our current crisis but founded in a far broader view. Let me now conclude on the abiding note of our faith—the light that never fails.

Fifty or sixty centuries ago Abraham went out from Ur of the Chaldees, not knowing whither he went, geographically a wanderer but morally and spiritually oriented and, therefore, knowing what he and all men needed and must have; for it is written of him that he looked for a city, a civilization, a security on earth, whose builder and maker is God, and whose foundation is righteous men and women. He was the explorer who sought the heavenly city, the divine order on earth, with only the inner voice for a compass. He was the father and founder of a great nation, out of which came the Book of the Ages, and the undying dream of the city for which he looked.

Again and again prophets appeared who called the wayward race of man back from the path of darkness and insecurity to the way of light and the City of Peace, rebuking them of sin and recalling them to the righteousness of God. At length came Jesus and made plain the way—the same, ancient pathway to which Abraham and Moses, Isaiah, Hosea, and Jeremiah had pointed. He proclaimed the Kingdom of God and His righteousness on earth—in the hearts of human beings. At last, His efforts apparently vain, He looked from a hill down upon the earthly city that He most loved and cried out His lament over that city and over all that have been and are, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that stoneth the prophets, how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen doth cover her brood, and ye would not." Hard by on another hill soon thereafter Jerusalem put Him to death upon the instrument of the slave's torture.

But the quest of Abraham, the ideal of the prophets and the purpose of Jesus did not die. John, the beloved, exiled on Patmos, left the vision of a new Jerusalem in words of immortal beauty as the heritage of mankind to the last generation in the closing chapters of the Apocalypse—a new city enthroning this Jesus whom the old city had slain.

THE ULTIMATE CITY

Men continue to seek the city of Abraham, of Jesus, and of John, and 20 centuries bear us witness at this hour that they cannot be content nor may they be secure until it shall have come to be even as Jesus taught and as John saw it coming. It does not yet appear; we seem farther from it today than yesterday; farther away in the twentieth than in the nineteenth century. But not so. The leaven that the woman hid will yet leaven the lump. The light that Jesus kindled and that Golgotha could not put out, that shines more brightly from the Cross intended to extinguish it than from any other source, will yet light all the world. Other kingdoms may die; other

orders may come and pass, but the Kingdom of God will come and it will come as young men like you go forth as Abraham went, looking, not knowing whither you go or what your lot may be, but looking for the city whose builder and maker is God, the abiding security of which is the righteousness of its citizens.

This is no time for pessimism but for that optimism that ever looks for the ultimate City of Peace. I recall the lines from William Tell:

"The old is crumbling down—the times are changing,
And from the ruins blooms a fairer life."

This is the order of the ages: The ruins always blossom. Be of good cheer: It is your task to see that they shall blossom!

Drawing his inspiration from Milton, the poet Blake, 150 years ago, addressed to the young men of his time a call to action—beginning,

"Rouse up, O young men of the new age!"

And with it he gave to them a marching song of the crusader's life-long battle:

"Bring me my bow of burning gold!
Bring me my arrows of desire!
Bring me my spear! O, clouds unfold!
Bring me my chariot of fire!

"I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land."

For Blake and England and the young men of another century, for the United States and her young men at this hour, at all hours to come until we see the New Jerusalem coming down out of heaven to this, our earth.

Hail and farewell. God be with you. God bless you.

The Problem of Financing Highways in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement, which I recently filed with the Ways and Means Committee for its study during consideration on the proposed tax bill:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this statement is made in my capacity as a member of another of the House's deliberative groups, the Committee on Roads.

All of us who have been privileged to serve the people of this great democracy in the present Congress naturally are concerned greatly for the future of the international situation. Under the circumstances, it is only human nature that thoughts of national defense and the devising of effective means for financing the defense program should be uppermost in our minds. But in our keen desire to provide sufficient sums for that purpose as speedily as possible it is conceivable that we may be inclined to overlook fundamental considerations to which serious attention should be devoted, and which certainly would be accorded such attention, except for the pressing nature of the current emergency.

The problem in this category to which I should like to direct your attention is the one involved in financing our extensive network of highways. The function of the Committee on Roads, as you gentlemen know, is determination of the Federal Government's proper role in financing a national system of highways.

PEACETIME HIGHWAYS AVAILABLE FOR WARTIME USE

Such facilities, of course, are indispensable to the country's growth and its continued prosperity and welfare in times of peace. As we learned at the time of the last war, and are coming to recognize even more clearly at the present time, activities to foster the national defense simply cannot function effectively in the absence of adequate facilities in the form of highways.

Too often, it seems to me, there is a tendency to overlook completely this direct relationship between the peacetime functions of highways and the way in which such functions automatically provide a system which is readily available for defense uses whenever the emergency develops.

Since the fee for registration of motor vehicles first was devised in New York State in 1901 the motorists have paid a total of some $18,000,000,000 in such special levies. This figure, of course, includes the State gasoline taxes, which were inaugurated in Oregon in 1919, and the Federal gasoline tax and automotive levies which have been collected by the Federal Government itself since 1932. Even prior to the present emergency the motorist taxpayers, through their routine peacetime payments of special levies, had created an incomparable investment in highway facilities which now will prove of the greatest practical value in facilitating progress of the national-defense program. It seems to me that we as a nation certainly owe a debt of gratitude to our motorist taxpayers for this contribution.

INVESTMENT MUST NOT BE IMPAIRED

The fact that we have had such a huge sum of money invested in highways naturally is of considerable significance. When one of us purchases a home or some other so-called permanent investment of that general character, we always exercise reasonable precautions to guarantee that the maintenance will be adequate so as to prevent serious impairment of the investment. So it is with our investment in highways. Now that we have invested eighteen billions in such facilities, we are obligated to make sufficient provision for maintenance of that investment so that the highway system may be handed down to our children in an unimpaired condition. The current investment in highways and its continued maintenance in an unimpaired condition are the twin problems which I discuss with you now.

HUGE DEBT OUTSTANDING

No discussion of the current investment in highways would be complete without some reference to the huge outstanding bonded indebtedness. Some of the States which happen to possess extensive economic and financial resources have been able to accomplish most of the financing of their highways through adherence to the commendable principle of "pay as you go." But many of the States which are less favorably situated in these respects have found it necessary either to spread the cost of the highways out over the years through the issuance of bonds or to forego the improvements altogether.

Although Chairman DOUGHTON'S home State of North Carolina enjoys the distinction of having issued $180,000 in State bonds for highway purposes in 1850, the money derived from those bonds was used for purchase of stock in a turnpike company which charged the traveling public tolls for the use of its plank roads. This procedure reminds one of somewhat similar schemes for financing highways which are being advocated in certain circles at the present time. To Majority Leader MCCORMACK'S home State of Massachusetts, however, goes the palm for having issued the first direct obligations for State highways—$300,000 in 1894. I am told that his State also enjoys the distinction of having issued the first "municipal bond," as that term is used customarily today, some two and a half centuries earlier.

For 10 years Massachusetts continued to enjoy the distinction of being the only State which had issued bonds for highways. But in 1905 another State joined the ranks; by 1910 the number had increased to 7; by 1920 to 21 States; and by 1930 to 33 States. Today no less than 41 States are making payments on bonds. These obligations either have been issued by the States themselves or they were issued originally by lesser governmental jurisdictions, but since have been taken over by the State because the money derived from their sale was spent in improvement of roads which now are a part of the primary State system.

The total sum in highway bonds outstanding increased from $300,000, the amount of the original Massachusetts issue in 1894, to $886,000 when the second State joined the ranks in 1905; by 1910 the figure had increased to $6,535,000; by 1920 to $38,900,000; and the all-time high of $2,001,000,000, significantly enough, was reached in 1932, when the country was in the deepest throes of the depression. Since that time a reduction has been effected, so that the most recent figures which are available—those for the calendar year 1939—indicate some $1,853,340,000 of highway debt outstanding at that time.

BINDING NATURE OF THESE OBLIGATIONS

We appreciate fully the sacred and inviolate character of "the obligation of contract" undertaken by a sovereign government with its creditor when such bonds are issued. It is fortunate that in this country repudiation and default upon one's obligations still are frowned upon. The possibility of any State's being unable to meet its just obligations, therefore, must be guarded against scrupulously.

CAUSE FOR SERIOUS CONCERN

This is one point which is of grave concern to the members of the Committee on Roads at the moment. From the testimony of some of the witnesses who have appeared at these hearings, we conclude that raising of revenue is only one of the objectives which is being borne in mind. Apparently there is in certain quarters in this country a well-defined attempt under way to restrict appreciably the everyday use of automobiles on the grounds that these vehicles are luxuries or at any rate nonessentials. While the so-called holiday in manufacture of automobiles can be understood quite readily, I am inclined to wonder whether there are equally valid grounds for restriction of operation of those needed automobiles already in operation. It is conceivable, of course, that the ultimate decision might be in the affirmative. But, in the event that it is, it seems only fair that we certainly should be fully aware of the consequences.

REDUCED INCOME TO STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

In the event that any such curtailment of civilian use of automobiles and the accompanying restricted consumption of gasoline should be made effective, the income of State highway departments would be reduced accordingly.

Funding of the outstanding debt cited above now require approximately one quarter of the total revenues available to State highway departments—after deduction of costs of collection and administration, distribution of specified sums to counties and other lesser governmental jurisdictions, and

authorized diversions to nonhighway purposes. In individual States, however, the ratio is much greater.

Arkansas might be cited as the extreme illustration. That State long has been a source of concern to Federal highway officials. After several years of acute financial distress, in 1934 the State succeeded in effecting a temporary refunding with its bondholders. So much money was pledged for this purpose, however, that relatively nothing was left for use in reconstruction of some of the pavements which were wearing out rapidly even then. After much deliberation the Federal authorities decided finally that the only equitable arrangement would be to permit Arkansas to qualify for its regular allotments of Federal aid without matching. This arrangement has been followed continuously ever since.

While Arkansas is the extreme illustration, as has been explained, it is not so much different than other States represented by some of the gentlemen who are present here. In Tennessee, for example, 56 percent of the money available to the State highway department is required for payments on outstanding debt. The percentage is almost nearly as high in Mississippi. Next in line comes my own State of West Virginia, with 48 percent. In Missouri 43 percent of the State highway income is spent for this purpose. Illinois and Texas are tied at 28 percent, and New Jersey ranks next, with 22 percent. Finally, in Michigan, the ratio is 19 percent.

REQUIREMENTS INCREASED BY MAINTENANCE CHARGES

In addition to these rigid requirements for retirement of outstanding debt, there also are, of course, the requirements for adequate maintenance of the existing sizable investment in highways, which has been cited above. Inclusion of this item brings the required minimum up to 89 percent of the available revenue in the case of West Virginia. Arkansas ranks close behind, with 88 percent. Mississippi is third with 78 percent of the revenue being required for debt service and maintenance. Tennessee is next with 73 percent. Then come in order Missouri, with 66 percent; Texas, with 52 percent; Michigan, with 48 percent; Illinois, with 44 percent; and New Jersey, with 40 percent. In such States an overwhelming proportion of the current revenue is required for service of outstanding debts and satisfactory upkeep of the existing highway system. It is obvious, therefore, that the financial security of the entire program might be jeopardized in the event that there should be any appreciable curtailment of operation of the automobile.

NECESSITY FOR MATCHING FEDERAL AID

But the requirements which have been outlined above represent only a portion of the story. Aside from their own obligations, these States also are confronted with the necessity of using most of the remaining funds for the matching of Federal funds which have been made available to them with that proviso.

Since 1916, as you know, the Federal Government has appropriated each year a sum of money for expenditure upon the so-called system of Federal-aid highways, which constitutes 7 percent of the total State mileage. This money has been available to States, however, only on the condition that it is matched on a 50–50 basis. An exception to this rule has been made, however, in the case of Arkansas, as explained previously. North Dakota and West Virginia also were permitted to obtain a portion of their Federal aid through a somewhat similar arrangement under the 1936 act. Aside from these minor exceptions in comparatively recent years, however, it might be said in general that the States have been required to match on a 50–50 basis.

Under the Federal Highway Act of 1940, which became effective on September 5, 1940, similar sums of regular Federal aid were appropriated for expenditure during the Federal fiscal years ending in June 1942 and June 1943. These sums, which likewise must be matched on a 50–50 basis, will amount to $114,563,000 annually during each of those 2 fiscal years. The necessity of matching these sums obviously imposes a further burden upon the States cited above, which already find it necessary to spend most of their current income for retirement of debt and maintenance. Particular States which have experienced serious difficulty in matching their regular Federal aid in recent years, in addition to Arkansas, of course, are Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and West Virginia.

Ever since it first became apparent that our everyday life would be affected directly by the current conflict across the seas, Federal authorities have been engaged in a survey to determine what improvements may be necessary in the Federal-aid highway program so as to facilitate the progress of defense activities. Certain bottlenecks have been discovered, but there is cause for rejoicing in the fact that nearly all of them are in the nature of minor details, such as widening of shoulders and strengthening and widening of certain bridges, which can be remedied economically and without serious disruption of the defense effort.

To provide funds for this work, $287,000,000 was appropriated recently in addition to the regular Federal aid cited above. Some $175,000,000 of this sum need not be matched by the States. The remaining $112,000,000, however, must be matched. In fact, a new departure has been inaugurated in the matching of by far the greater part of this sum—$100,000,000 of the total—matching on a 60–40 basis, i. e., the Federal Government being responsible for 60 percent of the total cost of the projects.

Even on this more favorable basis of matching, however, additional State funds will be required, for which in most cases no provision has been made in State highway budgets because of the impossibility of foreseeing even a short time ago the pressing nature of the current emergency. All of the States as a group will find it most difficult to reallocate their budgeted expenditures for highways so as to release sufficient funds for the matching of these additional Federal funds. But the States which I have cited, which even in the past have experienced difficulty in matching their regular Federal aid, the provision of such additional funds will constitute a problem worthy of the talents of the financial magicians.

It is requested respectfully, therefore, that the Ways and Means Committee devote its attention to these facts in the course of its deliberations as to the practicability of tapping certain sources from which, it might be believed, additional revenue could be derived for financing the defense program. It is suggested that the committee bear in mind, furthermore, that the contemplated highway improvments to facilitate the defense effort which are desired most keenly by the Federal authorities, are dependent wholly upon participation by the States. No great exercise of the imagination is required to lead one to the inevitable conclusion that the States will be in a much better position to undertake such participation if they can be sure of the continued yield of those sources of automotive taxation which even now are duplicated directly by the Federal Government.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, sight must not be lost of the fact that peacetime contributions in the form of special levies upon the motorists have created for us a system of highways unparalleled in the history of the world. The mere existence of this system is facilitating greatly the current defense effort. The $18,000,000,000 investment, which this system represents, must not be impaired through action which might affect the revenue yield of the State automotive levies depended upon to finance its maintenance.

Much of this investment has been financed through issue bonds, and there is currently more than a billion and a quarter of these obligations still outstanding. Payments of interest and principal on this indebtedness now requires one quarter of all the income available to State highway departments, but in individual States the ratio exceeds 50 percent and in one case amounts to 67 percent. Requirements for maintenance of existing highways also must be added. As a result, in at least three of the States represented on the membership of your honorable committee three-quarters or more of the current revenue available for State highways is pledged for such purposes, and in five more the proportion approximates 50 percent.

With so much of the current revenue already encumbered for unavoidable expenditures, certain of the States have been experiencing difficulty in recent years in matching their regular Federal aid. In the near future, however, they must undertake matching of special additional funds recommended recently for elimination of bottlenecks in the Federal-aid system.

The States, therefore, are dependent directly upon the continued yield of State sources of automotive taxation to provide adequate funds for retirement of the outstanding bonded debt for highways, adequate maintenance of the State system, and matching of Federal-aid funds. It seems obvious, therefore, that no action should be taken by the Federal Government toward heavier taxation of the same sources which might cause serious repercussions upon the whole system of financing State highways.

Some States which now have sizable debts outstanding conceivably might face the disrepudiation of their obligations. Other States might be confronted with the necessity of tasteful alternatives of default or outright curtailing rigidly necessary outlays for upkeep and maintenance, thereby impairing the continued usefulness of the State highway system and the many millions of dollars previously invested in that system. Finally, still other States might find it wholly impossible to match their regular Federal aid and undertake needed improvements in the highway system which are most desired by Federal authorities because of their possible effect in facilitating progress of the defense effort.

APPENDIX A

State highway bonds

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Issued during year	Redeemed during year	Interest payments	Outstanding at end of year
1894	300			300
1895	400		11	700
1896	600		25	1,300
1897	800		45	2,000
1898	400		70	2,300
1899	500		81	2,700
1900	500		93	3,100
1901	500		105	3,450
1902	500		115	3,825
1903	2,250		128	4,225
1904			143	4,525
1905	50		155	4,825
1906	600	10	172	5,701
1907	52,518	20	205	7,073
1908	5,000	32	362	18,036
1909	1,830	49	702	20,008
1910	1,000	75	853	26,468
1911	21,431	86	1,128	38,747
1912	9,270	103	1,732	53,319
1913	52,109	223	2,115	82,544
1914	6,600	271	3,349	93,264
1915	2,200	486	4,070	111,959
1916	2,700	523	4,762	123,578
1917	26,100	1,033	5,438	139,915
1918	3,700	1,740	5,741	147,102
1919	184,719	1,664	6,437	176,645
1920	62,635	3,297	7,535	212,148
1921	177,129	2,494	10,009	272,205
1922	31,275	2,528	15,950	410,703
1923	80,420	6,011	18,874	472,868

State highway bonds—Continued

Year	Issued during year	Redeemed during year	Interest payments	Outstanding at end of year
1924	8,436	9,770	22,501	549,685
1925	205,000	12,605	28,644	700,576
1926	11,600	14,873	32,158	765,678
1927	445,175	25,199	34,263	857,315
1928	121,484	27,703	36,950	1,606,000
1929	161,229	42,384	45,835	1,725,000
1930	222,288	69,505	50,668	1,877,000
1931	130,614	57,278	61,862	1,951,000
1932	104,650	54,380	69,292	2,001,000
1933	29,478	60,027	68,806	1,970,000
1934	40,969	58,578	67,303	1,953,000
1935	55,883	55,756	67,918	1,953,000
1936	106,235	79,171	66,462	1,980,000
1937	65,009	75,664	65,824	1,969,000
1938	57,505	84,711	65,322	1,909,417
1939	78,022	134,099	68,659	1,853,340

APPENDIX B

Percentage of revenue available to State highway department required for debt service

	Available revenue	Debt service requirements	Percentage
Arkansas	$12,756,000	$8,505,000	67
Illinois	32,329,000	9,510,000	28
Michigan	23,915,000	4,627,000	19
Mississippi	6,220,000	3,241,000	52
Missouri	22,376,000	9,728,000	43
New Jersey	20,619,000	4,499,000	22
Tennessee	13,988,000	7,873,000	56
Texas	39,052,000	11,117,000	28
West Virginia	16,265,000	7,815,000	48
Average for all 48 States and the District of Columbia	694,522,000	164,090,000	24

All figures from Federal Public Roads Administration, Disposition of Receipts from State Imposts on Highway Users—1939, table DF, 1939, issued September 1939.

APPENDIX C

Percentage of revenue available to State highway department required for maintenance of State highway system

	Available revenue	Expenditures for maintenance	Percentage
Arkansas	$12,756,000	$2,738,000	21
Illinois	34,329,000	5,601,000	16
Michigan	23,915,000	6,988,000	29
Mississippi	6,220,000	1,612,000	26
Missouri	22,376,000	5,046,000	23
New Jersey	20,619,000	3,780,000	18
Tennessee	13,988,000	2,401,000	17
Texas	39,052,000	9,202,000	24
West Virginia	16,265,000	6,700,000	41
All 48 States and the District of Columbia	694,522,000	206,014,000	30

All figures from Federal Public Roads Administration, same table cited in appendix B and also State highway expenditures—1939, table SF-2, 1939, issued September 1939.

APPENDIX D

Percentage of revenue available to State highway department required for debt service and maintenance of State highway system

	Debt service	Maintenance	Total
Arkansas	67	21	88
Illinois	28	16	44
Michigan	19	29	48
Mississippi	52	26	78
Missouri	43	23	66
New Jersey	22	18	40
Tennessee	56	17	73
Texas	28	24	52
West Virginia	48	41	89
All 48 States and the District of Columbia	24	30	54

National Polls on the Convoy Issue Are a Weak Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, if the President and his advisers, in their efforts to appraise public opinion on the convoy issue and other intervention measures, place much reliance on the national polls they will be leaning on a very weak reed.

It seems to me to be a singular fact that whenever an intervention measure is being debated at white heat a national poll is taken and it invariably finds a strong public sentiment backing up the intervention proposal, when persons who are acquainted with the situation know that no such sentiment exists.

This peculiar phenomenon was again brought home to me the other day when one of the national polls announced the results of a survey of public opinion in my native State of Indiana on the convoy issue, the exact question being: "Should the United States Navy be used to guard ships carrying war materials to Britain?"

The announced result of this Indiana poll was—yes, 42 percent; no, 51 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Now, everybody in Indiana knows that a statement that 42 percent of our people are in favor of using our Navy vessels to convoy war materials to Britain is perfectly absurd. I represent the capital district of the State, a metropolitan area where it may reasonably be presumed that the sentiment in favor of convoys is stronger than in the rural districts. Nevertheless, a poll taken by the Indianapolis News—a real, honest-to-goodness poll in which over 14,000 ballots were cast—shows 92 percent of our people against convoys, and 95 percent against entering the war. On this basis, I doubt whether, considering the State as a whole, more than 3 or 4 percent of the people of Indiana favor convoys. Yet this national poll finds, right off the bat, that 42 percent are in favor of it.

As a matter of fact a national poll which purports to show that our Indiana people are in favor of convoys or any other legislative or administrative measure that leads toward our involvement in war is incorrect and undependable. Indiana and every other State in the Midwest is overwhelmingly opposed to convoys and is wedded to the doctrine that our best policy is to think of America first and keep out of foreign entanglements.

I do not like to criticize anyone, and I am not challenging the good faith and intentions of the managers of our national polls, but since those polls are the basis on which much of the war propaganda is built up, and are constantly being quoted by interventionists to try to show that public opinion is what it is not, I think it is only right to warn the officials of our Government that they cannot depend upon these polls. Whether their unreliability is due to faulty mechanism or what not, I do not know.

I was a Washington correspondent for 28 years, and it is my cherished privilege to have an enormous circle of acquaintances extending into all of the States and cities of the country, and I close with this statement of facts:

First. I was never polled by a national poll.

Second. No friend or acquaintance of mine was ever polled.

Third. I never heard of anyone who was ever polled.

Fourth. I never heard of anyone who had ever heard of anyone who was ever polled.

And yet you would think from the way these national polls are quoted that they are the supreme court of public opinion, whose findings are the last word.

Notwithstanding what any national poll may purport to show, the plain fact is that an overwhelming majority of the people of this country are opposed to mixing in any foreign wars. They are dead set in their opposition to the use of convoys and to all other measures, of whatsoever character, which they think would drag us in. They are for America first, last, and all the time, and they stand foursquare and steadfast for the perpetuation of our constitutional Government, which they are ready at all times to defend with their fortunes and their lives. They may not be very articulate as yet, but as time goes on they will let the war promoters know in no uncertain way that they are not going to see our freedom and our very existence as the world's greatest democracy jeopardized by plunging our country into the quarrels of foreign nations that have been fighting over boundary lines for a thousand years and that will still be fighting a thousand years after we are all dead and gone.

Agricultural Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., OF WISCONSIN

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address which I delivered before the Committee on Interstate Migration at the National Conference of Social Work held at Atlantic City, N. J., on June 2, 1941, may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL MIGRATION—PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

It is a privilege for me to participate in this conference. It is all too seldom that we have an occasion for seeking out ways of mutual helpfulness in this present world, largely given over to conflict. Yet it is particularly appropriate that we seize the present moment for calm and considerate deliberation concerning the kind of world we hope to see emerge from the present convulsion. National policy on many vital questions is at the crossroads. Observations and experiences of the last decade have brought a realization of the necessity for vital adjustments of national policy in new directions. Current economic, political, and military crises accentuate this demand for an ever-increasingly realistic social policy.

Perhaps nothing typifies better this insistent demand for adjustment than the migration of destitute human beings in search of better opportunities for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. For destitute migrants symbolize flight from something obnoxious to the human spirit, be it intolerance, religious persecution, political tyranny, poverty, an underprivileged economic status, or a mere lack of opportunity. So it has been with all the great migrations in history. At their roots are the cancer spots that demand treatment and eradication. In flight the destitute migrant is a deserving object of sympathy and assistance. Homeless, without the ties and privileges of community life, their flight is an indication that here are human spirits with sufficient energy and courage to brave an unknown world full of danger rather than to lapse into the lethargy of stolid misery. That is why the refugee instantly receives our sympathetic cooperation. That is why the destitute migrant of our own land should be the object of equal concern. Ahead of these migrating peoples there are delicate and difficult problems of adjustment. Some will naturally find their pot of gold at the end of the rainbow because of exceptional gifts, extraordinary persistence, or the happy turn of the wheel of fortune. But many are in grim danger of finding only a new environment for a disadvantaged existence. They may be destined to wander aimlessly for an indefinite period; they may find, at best, a limited opportunity to share their misery with others in a crowded labor market; they may find that to their previous unhappy situation they may have added only a strange environment and a hopelessness that comes from having tried valiantly and failed.

To me the most significant aspect of this spectacle of destitute migrants is the great need for a wise and vigorous social policy. The cornerstone of such a policy must be a national recognition that destitute migrants are an important and valuable asset. They cannot, in good conscience, be the object of discrimination. They are entitled to all the privileges that government, be it national or local, decides to allow to its disadvantaged groups; that the length of time a man and his family have lived in a community has nothing to do with the sharpness of hunger, the thinness of raiment, the need for healthy and comfortable lodging, and access to public health and educational advantages. The problems of these migrant peoples arise because they are normal human beings; they do not constitute in any sense a lower order of humanity that can be rightly condemned to a lower set of values and standards. They are simply Americans on the move. In this twentieth century world of movement in which we live, surely any conceptions of public policy that recognize vital distinctions between the need of Americans on the move and Americans at home are not tenable. Yet such outworn conceptions, encysted in much of our law and administrative policy, are the root of much of the unnecessary hardship that destitute migrants must bear. Hence to me this gathering has a very significant function. It is, in brief, to vitalize the concept of national citizenship.

I have been requested to introduce to this meeting the topic of agricultural migration. It is not my function at this stage of the meeting to discuss the platform on interstate migration which this group will consider here. It is not my role to advocate the adoption of any given policy, but rather to analyze the various problems that are implicit in the broad topic of agricultural migration.

In the decade just past, three concrete patterns of agricultural migration have emerged as a permanent part rather than a temporary phase of the American scene. First, there is the periodic movement of the so-called migratory farm worker who, often accompanied by his family, seeks employment as a hired laborer in agricultural industry. This migration is characterized by irregular, temporary, intermittent, and seasonal employment from a mobile labor pool of otherwise unemployed workers. This labor pool is composed of fellow migrants and local residents in the communities through which they travel. Second, there is the migration of large numbers of agricultural families who move from their post as farm operators, either owner, tenant, or sharecropper. Sometimes these displaced farm families crowd the shifting, moving agricultural labor market; sometimes they compete for the ever-decreasing opportunities to become independent farmers on financial terms and adequate land to provide a decent standard of living, sometimes they move into semiurban or urban communities seeking relief; mostly, they wander until some member of the family finds a job. Third, there is the constant migration of rural youth coming of age on the land but seeking a place in industrial society with an urban environment. Sometimes they are successful and stick; sometimes they hang on only temporarily; many of them are forced to secure relief or go back home to subsistence farming and a disguised rural unemployment.

These three movements of migratory farm workers, displaced farm families, and surplus rural youth often accompanied by the most shocking misery and deprivation, have become recognized in the last decade as symptomatic of a whole complex of problems which are related to destitute rural migration. What is the meaning of these migrating peoples for us here today? Upon close analysis and investigation, it has become evident that these various types of migration are not simply a function of a temporary disaster such as a dust storm or a severe drought; rather, they are responsive to underlying causes which, with monotonous regularity, impel members of rural communities to become needy migrants, either temporary or permanent. Far-reaching developments in the techniques and organization of American agriculture toward mechanized farming and industrialized or commercialized operation, excessive farm debt, the depletion of soil resources, an expanding rural population coupled with a marked reduction in the working force required for farm production, and a drastic reduction in opportunities for employment in urban centers, have been accounted as the principal causes of destitution in agricultural migration. Hence, we must conclude as a major premise for social action that agricultural migration with its by-product problems, is a definite, permanent, and complex reality for which definite and permanent and integrated social policy must be devised. Temporary palliatives and halfway relief measures will not suffice. We must meet the problem head-on.

Moreover, we must be careful to avoid taking a futile or constricted approach in building this social policy. We must not confuse agricultural migration with the destitution and disadvantaged economic, social, and political status that oftentimes stimulates, accompanies, or climaxes it. Migration is only a normal means for the adjustment of population to better economic opportunity; it must not be choked off; State and local barriers to this migration are not consonant with our national traditions of freedom. The real evils for many who are forced to move are unserved human needs, the lack of adequate protection in the harsh competition of a crowded and disorganized labor market, and the difficulty of any individual solution to the problem of personal security.

Agricultural migration is only the passing parade that reflects these disadvantaging factors in a rather dramatic and observable fashion. We must attack the substance, not the shadow, of destitution and underprivilege. That is the second principle which should ground the formulation of a wise and effective social policy on this subject.

Perhaps, some will wonder about the scope and magnitude of this complex of problems. Is it something peculiar and local to a given area or region, or a few isolated unfortunates? It was my privilege, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, to become intimately acquainted with these problems during the course of the committee's last field investigation which largely concerned the violation of labor's rights in California's mighty agricultural industry. What the committee saw and heard there in late 1939 and early 1940 persuaded us that back of the fictional story of agricultural migration, then popularized in book and motion picture, was a vast national problem that touched and concerned not a relatively small geographical region or population group, but the whole Nation. In May and June 1940, this was confirmed by the testimony of expert witnesses called by the committee to describe generally the various facets of a national farm-labor problem. Contemporaneously, the House of Representatives established the Select Committee to Investigate Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens. Since that time, the invaluable results of the researches and inquiry of that committee of which our presiding officer today is a member, have made many parts of the Nation conscious of the fact that no single State or area had a monopoly of the destitution that is related to agricultural migration. Both before and since these inquiries of these legislative committees, farseeing students in various public agencies and universities in all parts of the country have paved the way for a fairly complete understanding of the scope of this problem which we were able to bring to our thinking in the year 1941.

Let me briefly indicate the magnitude of this problem of formulating a social policy responsive to an analysis of needy agricultural migrants. There are the people whom we call farmers but who play a relatively minor role in supplying our needs for foods and fibers. Most of them would not be on the land if there was other work for them to do. In 1929, nearly one-half of our 6,000,000-odd farm operators produced less than $1,000 worth of crops and livestock, and nearly one-third produced less than $600 worth. These farms producing less than $600 worth of products sold less than 4 percent of the crops going to market. For the most part these small farms were not very efficient. A substantial amount of this income had to be used for fertilizer, machinery, stock, and the other essentials for farming.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture has estimated that more than 600,000 farms today are located in areas where the soil is not suitable for cultivation. Hundreds of thousands of

other farms are too small. This sort of agriculture is the spawning ground for destitute migrants. To condemn these people to a continued low level of existence by encouraging them to stay where they are, and discouraging them from moving, is to betray the great agricultural traditions of our Nation. Our agricultural civilization envisages a healthy, happy, independent life on a standard of living capable of producing a vigorous and independent citizenry. It has never envisaged as ideal a subsistence agriculture, maintained as a national poorhouse, peopled by millions of disadvantaged families.

Another great reservoir of destitution related to agricultural migration is the plight of the uncounted, unorganized, and inarticulate millions who depend upon seasonal and intermittent employment on the Nation's farms. They have been truly the forgotten men of our economic democracy. Not counted as farmers, they have been largely ignored in the formulation and administration of agricultural policy with minor exceptions in comparatively recent years. Not esteemed as laborers, they are left outside the protection of labor legislation, State and Federal. As a result of this rather complete relegation to the rock pile of relief, to the meager extent it is available, farm laborers are at the very bottom of our economic and social ladder. They epitomize underprivilege.

In recent years, their numbers have so far exceeded the numbers needed to produce the country's crops that desperate competition for the jobs which have been available has caused farm wage rates in the latter part of the 1930's to lag far behind as farm prices began to recover from depression lows. It has been reliably estimated that in 1940 there was a reserve of 5,000,000 unused or ineffectively used workers pressing upon the agricultural labor market. Unemployment and underemployment is common. Full employment is available only to a relatively small proportion. There is, in some quarters, a detestable exploitation of these workers who, generally, have been unable to offer effective resistance. Their very numbers, their racial and social heterogeneity, and their exclusion from protective social legislation have made them easy prey to vicious recruitment and employment practices. By various devices, including opposition to the operation of relief projects, attacks on relief and security wage rates, the circulation of false information concerning job opportunities, open recruiting activities, and often with the assistance of public-employment services, employers have striven successfully wherever necessary to maintain surplus reserves of farm labor, when and where needed to maintain sharp competition for available jobs.

Haphazard and disordered migration is the result of a completely disorganized labor market. Inadequate housing, insufficient public health and educational opportunities, and a lack of opportunity to participate fully in the benefits of community life are common. It has been estimated that there are upward of a million of these regular migratories, who, in addition to their disadvantaged place as farm laborers, suffer the handicaps of a disordered migratory existence for all or substantial periods of the year.

Also, there are the large numbers of additional rural residents who may encounter destitution, but have not yet suffered. About twice as many farm boys currently reach the age of 21 as have an opportunity through death and retirement of present farm operators. In round numbers that means approximately 200,000 annually must find jobs in urban industry, or crowd the agricultural labor market, or settle down to a subsistence level of existence, or crowd some other person out of his tenancy or sharecropper position. The same is true of the 350,000 to 500,000 agricultural workers who will be displaced as a result of technological changes during the next decade.

The appalling magnitude of this many-sided problem should not deter us from meeting it. In all its ramifications and complications, we may boil it down to several fundamental issues which, in my judgment, the researches of the past few years have tendered our democracy in fairly sharp and precise terms. The first question we must answer is this: What is the Nation going to do to provide a useful place in our society for surplus rural people who feel forced to move in order to live? Recognizing this problem of adjustment as necessarily involving a considerable movement of peoples from one area to another, one occupation to another, and, necessarily, one community or State to another, we have our second issue: What is the Nation going to do by way of organizing and conducting a determined and intelligent fight on the destitution that is bound to occur during this process of movement and adjustment, particularly that destitution which is too large for purely local groups to handle without national aid, leadership, and coordination? It is not necessary to dwell at length here on the sad fact that the year 1940 had not brought a solution or even the adoption of a plan or policy that promised a satisfactory answer to these two fundamental issues.

Yet the decade from 1930 to 1940 witnessed earnest and significant attempts to analyze the scope and character of the task; it witnessed the first few feeble, but nonetheless encouraging, efforts to build a democratic machinery for solution of the dilemma; it witnessed the stimulating recognition of the facts by an increasingly large and intelligent citizenry. The early work with transients, the first measure of farm relief, the development of the great program of the Farm Security Administration, and the splendid efforts of many private groups, local and State agencies, can be viewed as positive accomplishments. Yet these works, no matter how worthy or zealously furthered, are pale and insignificant beside the magnitude and scope of the problem that our research and investigations have clearly etched for the American people to see and understand.

But now, in the year 1941, this great giant, and sometimes sleeping America of ours is throwing off its lethargy and mobilizing its mighty resources in a huge effort to make our national defense secure. We here today will commit a grievous error in judgment if we fail to consider fully agricultural migration and its byproduct problems in the context of this mighty national-defense program and the eventual transition which must come when the crisis is past. For our program of national defense is activating forces that are beginning to answer in some fashion on a temporary emergency basis the broad issues I have described. If we can bring an understanding of the problems of agricultural migration to those who are in charge of formulating and administering our national-defense program, we will do a great service to both national defense and the victims of underlying economic problems that are a part of agricultural migration. Indeed, the way in which our defense program is shaped may have much to do with the ultimate destiny of uncounted millions of our rural population who face destitution.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of this phase of the current situation. Perhaps a few illustrations will clarify the full meaning of this emphasis. Stories of farm labor shortage in certain areas, stories of rural idleness in other areas, stories of the lack of trained skilled workers for our expanding defense program make us conscious that the absence of adequate techniques of utilizing our wasting manpower is a peril both to our defense effort and to the welfare of our rural population. Our Nation-wide system of public employment exchanges must be geared for an effective national effort that will decasualize the agricultural farm labor market and maintain a well-ordered system for fitting the available manpower into this great national effort. Now there is both a unique demand and opportunity to develop vigorously for vocational training and guidance for farm-reared people into nonfarm occupations. Such a program will assist in the mobilizing and training of our manpower for defense activities; it will facilitate the movement of surplus rural population into nonfarm occupations, thereby reducing the number of farm people to be supported by the farm income of any given size; it would greatly increase the flexibility and mobility of farm-reared youth and displaced farm families, and to that extent facilitate readjustments to a normal economy when we have accomplished our defense aims.

To protect and render effective this organization of manpower and to avoid needless suffering and hardship by those rural people who are moving now in search of a place to serve, we must regulate those private recruiting agencies to conform to the public interest. Unnecessary and disruptive labor recruiting, training for unnecessary surpluses at given points, and the stimulation of useless and harmful migration must be avoided.

It is reported that 40 percent of the young men examined have been found unfit to serve in their country's Army. Again, those who would defend their country in the years to come, and those who would relieve destitution of rural people, find a common aim and objective; namely, the provision of adequate health and educational facilities for our needy people in both rural and urban areas.

Many of the problems of caring for needy rural migrants encountered in the 1930's have now become part and parcel of our national effort to relieve destitution in so-called defense migration. The provisions of adequate housing facilities and additional educational and health facilities, the assistance to local communities in meeting large influxes of population have now become a vital part of our defense program. As such they are an answer to the same problems of agricultural migration, because many of those whose needs as migrants will now be met are the rural people whose plight was too often ignored in the 1930's.

Stories that some of our vital industries have productive capacities far below that necessary to produce the materials essential for defense and the normal pursuits of life reveal the unhappy fact that the vain and fruitless migration of our rural population during the thirties in search of a place in our industrial life was a tragedy not only for them but for the Nation. Now, there is a great opportunity, indeed, a necessity, for organizing our economy so that this hitherto wasting human resource can be usefully employed. Perhaps we are at the beginning of a permanent rehabilitation of these needy rural folk. Certainly no opportunity must be overlooked in the location and development of new industrial capacity that looks to a better life for them in the post-defense years. Stories of trailer life, based upon defense work, lived by those who view their employment as a temporary condition, make us conscious of the fact that many millions of our fellow Americans have come to look with skepticism upon the permanence of their place away from worn-out land or the subsistence farms. We must not allow them to plan for a future that is another dose of the bad medicine of the 1930's.

All of these points touching the defense program and the relief of the destitute rural peoples have a common thread. They indicate that the failure of a democratic society to solve the problems that are related to agricultural migration is a threat to the very survival of that society when confronted either by brute totalitarian economy or military force or subversive totalitarian philosophy. Hence, we must bend our every effort

to develop plans and policies for our current defense program that are sufficiently broad, flexible, and integrated with other plans and policies that they will make a substantial contribution to agriculture and national welfare in the post defense period. The lessons taught in the 1930's, confirmed in 1940 and 1941 must be put into effective practice now and in the future. We cannot wait until tomorrow; we must begin today. The struggle for democracy in which we are now engaged will continue in a post war world. It will demand the same level of national attention to problems related to agricultural migration as we are freely and willingly giving to problems of military defense. I venture to assert that the lessons we are learning today in putting America to work show conclusively that those who said before, "It cannot be done," were guilty of a grievous error and a lack of confidence in the vitality of the democratic process.

In conclusion, let me express my appreciation for this opportunity to participate in the discussion by this group of a social policy to cope with the problems that are related to destitute migration. In summary, let us assume that this policy must look to a definite, permanent, and integrated solution; it must broadly attack the underlying causes of destitution and not cramp the healthy process of adjustment through migration; it must be broad and bold in scope; it must be initiated in high gear now as a part of and a worthy aid and accompaniment to our national-defense program; it must be carried through into the post-war period.

Moratorium in Industrial Strife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY ALBERT W. HAWKES

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Albert W. Hawkes, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, delivered June 7, 1941, at Washington, D. C., over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co:

Tonight, as president of the Chambtr of Commerce of the United States I want to talk to the American people regarding the absolute necessity of a moratorium on all industrial strife in every business and industry which directly or indirectly affects our national defense preparation.

First things must come first. No subject before you could be more important than national defense against aggression. On it depends the question of success versus failure in defense of individual liberty—the sustaining of representative democracy versus dictatorship.

This great defense will not be created by good intentions—lip service—or through seeking for and insisting upon the immediate and complete solution of all ideals in the social and economic fields, during this time of national defense preparation. The questions of amount of profit—individual reward or advancement—under these desperate conditions, must take second place in our race for preparedness.

On May 1, 1941, at its annual meeting in Washington, D. C., the National Chamber of Commerce passed its moratorium resolution. This, in effect, urged capital and labor to declare a cessation in strikes, shut-downs, and lock-outs, during the entire time required for national defense preparation. This resolution declared that unless this moratorium in industrial strife can be brought about by voluntary agreement between the parties—compulsion by law is almost certain to result.

When a boy, I took a horse to water and once when he refused to drink, I forced his nose under water He not only refused to drink, but blew the water all over me. "You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink." I believe this is the same with compulsion of individuals by law in a democracy.

In my opinion this Government should not attempt to control anything in the affairs of its citizens by indirect law that it is unwilling to control by direct law.

I call your attention to the fact that one compulsion leads to another compulsion—and the symptoms of dictatorship rapidly spread from group to group, and from one field of business and industry to another field. Such compulsion and embryonic dictatorship is seldom removed when the emergency is passed. This is particularly so if our social and economic system is disorganized or suffering from "high blood pressure." It is for this reason that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and I, as its president, plead so strongly for local activities in arousing cooperation between capital and labor, public officials, and the public itself, to establish this moratorium.

We urge full support of the American people right now for this moratorium in industrial strife.

Our purpose must be to eliminate antagonistic feelings and, through an aroused and expressed public opinion, call for the best there is in all of our people on the basis of fair regard by all for the rights of each. An aroused public opinion is the thermostatic regulator and control in a representative democracy.

After talking with hundreds of men in the ranks of labor throughout the country, I am convinced there is no fairer group of American citizens. I have every faith and confidence that when they recognize the need for this moratorium they will do their full share to accomplish it.

I am equally certain that practically all in the ranks of capital and management are determined to do—and will do—their full duty in this emergency. They are both vitally interested in establishing the safety of our people and themselves.

What we need is an awakening to a recognition that this is a reality on the stage of life—not a fiction or drama on the amusement stage or screen. When both capital and labor discover that this is a real tragedy in the life of the human family and that each and every one of us must act his own part on the stage of life, I am convinced they will satisfactorily answer the emergency call of our people.

Plans for this moratorium in industrial strife have already been inaugurated in a great many communities, large and small, throughout the United States. Many of these plans—all of which rest upon local direction by the proper people and organizations in each community—are working most effectively and have an almost perfect score in the accomplishment of the results we are seeking. Their success has depended upon two things: (1) The fact that the local organizations and people know their own community and institutions best and are qualified to handle the situation, and (2) a recognition of the fact that labor is as patriotic as capital and management.

The moratorium committee in these successful communities has been composed of the best local labor leaders, the best local industrial management, the best public-spirited, patriotic citizens, and the proper and interested local government officials. Such a committee, representing all phases of the local life and determined that this Government shall prepare for national defense, easily wins the wholehearted approval of public opinion.

The members of these moratorium committees recognize that full production requires this moratorium, and that the moratorium, to be effective, must be the result of the voluntary act of the parties involved.

Local chambers of commerce and organizations which do not normally touch labor problems can, nevertheless, as a patriotic duty, assist in establishing this representative committee in the various communities for service in this period when the Nation is confronted with the greatest danger in its history.

This plan is not an idealistic one. It is a most practical and effective plan for the accomplishment of our national-defense program, with the least delay.

This national defense is imperative, in order to protect the lives, liberties, and the American way of life for all of our people. Nothing now will satisfy the American people—except the most efficient and effective production of all things and parts of things required for full defense, without the slightest deliberate and unpatriotic interruption.

Some say a few strikes or lock-outs are to be expected in a democracy. I say—and I believe that 90 percent of the American people will agree with me—that one strike or lock-out, or the loss of 1 hour, from here on to final preparation—is 1 hour too much of interruption.

The foundation of a continuing representative democracy is a satisfied people. Let us remember that a representative democracy will survive only through voluntary cooperation in all things necessary for, and vital to, the welfare and protection of a given nation of people—with fair regard for all, and disregard for none.

It seems to me our representative democracy is challenged, right now, to prove that a free people can voluntarily cooperate and produce—on time—everything from instruments of defense to and including an army, a navy, and an air force—competent to defend itself successfully against any attack by an enslaved people driven to production and directed in aggression by a dictator.

With voluntary cooperation and the successful establishment of this moratorium in industrial strife—our democracy will successfully prepare and victoriously defend itself against any who may attack it. That successful defense will cause free men throughout the world to take new heart. They will then know that human individual freedom can survive. The lamp of liberty will continue to burn, because free men have, in a grave crisis, found a way to bury unsolved personal differences—have found a way to create a moratorium in industrial strife and thereby provide the protection needed for the safety of the people in the greatest hour of need and peril since our Nation was founded.

Voluntary cooperation cannot be legislated. It must result from the faith of the parties in one another and their determination to work together in a common cause. Let all in the ranks of capital and labor remember every hour of every day that public opinion is the only master in a representative democracy. He who fails to recognize the power of public opinion and to court its favor, will miss its support in his hour of need

If labor and capital would avoid the pressure that comes from an unfavorable public opinion, which leads to unsatisfactory and dangerous compulsory laws—they must now

recognize the call for production by this strong majority public opinion.

I am just as much concerned about our situation within our country as outside of it. I would be more concerned about the conditions internally were they not still within the control of free men. I have faith in the American people—when they are aroused from indifference and brought to a realization of the danger that now confronts them. Indifference and lack of enlightenment are the two greatest enemies of a representative democracy. Lincoln said:

"As a Nation of free men, we must live through all time—or die by suicide."

I have always believed no one in his right mind commits suicide. I also believe the American people are still in their right minds. Therefore, I believe we are not going to commit "national suicide"—but rather, we, as a Nation of free people, are going to find a way to work together for our own protection and salvation.

If collective bargaining, in good faith between the parties, fails—then voluntary mediation should promptly follow.

Mediation by a board of our fair-minded fellow Americans, properly appointed with due consideration for the rights of each and all, will cure all apparent injustices. In the few cases where this human agency fails to effect a full and satisfactory settlement for all—then public opinion says this temporary failure must not stop vital defense production.

Our future depends upon our defense production—against war production of possible aggressors. We must not take the chance of defeat through delaying production while any of us holds out for his own way against the final judgment of a fair mediation group. If we allow such delay to occur, then indeed have we lost faith in our democratic processes.

France tried a violation of these democratic principles. Her people argued and wrangled and dissipated time. The nation lost its fight and went down in tragic defeat—a defeat worse than death to free men.

In 1776 our courageous forefathers established here the individual freedom of man and much of the world followed our example. In the 1940's, if we preserve this heritage for ourselves and those to follow, such an accomplishment will redound to the benefit of mankind throughout the world. The hour is late—but not too late.

Self-restraint is the first requirement for the successful government of ourselves or our Nation. Let us demonstrate we have self-restraint and know how to use it. Let us think things out, instead of fighting them out.

Perhaps today there are too many people preying on one another, and not enough people praying for one another.

Let us tonight voluntarily declare three moratoriums:

1. A moratorium in name-calling and all that creates and sustains class hatred and bitterness.

2. A moratorium on anything that partakes of sophistry in politics or business. Simple, direct, and honest statements of fact will lead the people into unity; and

3. Let us establish this most important moratorium in industrial strife in all national-defense plants and business throughout the Nation.

I appeal to every man and woman in the ranks of labor, management, and capital—to prove now that free men, without being compelled by law, can do the right thing in this great emergency. We are all still free to do the right and necessary thing. Let us do it, and thus preserve our individual freedoms.

This is not an ordinary situation. It is freemen's last call to defend themselves successfully. Will we all respond? I can hear your answer. It is, yes.

The National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able address delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] over Station KGIR at Butte, Mont., on June 4 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have made this hurried trip to Montana because it offered me an opportunity to come before my constituents at a time of great national emergency.

First, let me express my sincere thanks to Mr. Craney and station KGIR for this opportunity to place on record in plain and simple language my views with regard to the important national problems confronting our country.

I regret that in these dangerous times there should appear to be the slightest variation in judgment on national problems of the country between myself and my colleagues on the Montana delegation to Congress. I have a very high regard for the Members of our delegation in Washington, and I do not wish to have it understood that anything I say here is intended to reflect in any degree on their views or opinions. We are all acting with sincere convictions to represent the best interests and welfare of our country.

We each have the manifest right to stand firmly by our convictions and publicly express our views and opinions with the fullest freedom and candor. This is democracy. It is important, under our system of government, that every citizen should be entitled to freely and fearlessly express his or her opinions on public issues. These debates are essential in order to arrive at safe and sound conclusions.

The whole Nation is striving to arrive at the truth; and, my friends, I feel very confident that eventually the people of the United States will stand united in a common policy to meet the dangerous threats which have been leveled at our safety and security. I feel certain, also, that the differences of judgment which may at present appear to exist among the members of the Montana delegation will soon be resolved in the best interests of our country. As these national questions become clarified and better understood, we will all be found standing stanchly back of the President, our lawfully elected leader and Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

As evidence of a gradual development of national unity and solidarity now in progress, I point to the action of the Detroit Free Press, a former uncomprising opponent of the President's foreign policies. The Detroit Free Press now pledges its complete support to the President in national policy as defined in his recent radio address declaring a national emergency. In a dramatic and patriotic appeal for unity, that outstanding American newspaper in its editorial column says:

"The Free Press pledges its complete support to President Roosevelt as our Commander in Chief. He will have our unlimited support in any measures designed to safeguard the Nation against foreign aggressors, enemies of the Republic within our borders, and all other termites who would destroy the priceless liberties and blessings handed down to us by our brave and sturdy ancestors."

Continuing its pledge, it says:

"The President has spoken. In his memorable address he has defined his foreign policy in unmistakable words. Mr. President, in this spirit of adherence to our finest tradition, we pledge to you our loyal support. May God be with you."

Of course, we are all devoted to our country and moved by a single motive—to protect and defend the United States, and strive, as far as we are humanly able, to deliver it from the perils which threaten it.

Unfortunately, some confusion seems to have arisen because of the storm of conflicting views which have been recklessly expressed. Nevertheless, we witness a striking unity when we come to analyze the situation carefully—we find ourselves in full accord on all the fundamental issues.

First. We are united in support of the national-defense program. We favor its rapid advancement as essential to the safety and security of our country in the face of the present world crisis.

Second. In accordance with national legislation, we are for the fullest possible aid to Britain and the other democracies ruthlessly attacked by Hitler.

Third. We stand absolutely together for the defense of the Western Hemisphere and the defense of our rights under the traditional American policy of freedom of seas.

Fourth. We are absolutely opposed to the entire Nazi political philosophy and its fanatical challenge to democracy and Christianity.

Fifth. We all fervently hope and pray that Hitler and his ruthless war machine may soon meet with ignominious defeat at the hands of Britain and the other European nations upon whom he has inflicted the most barbaric and inhuman warfare in all history.

Sixth. We all agree and are fully conscious of the fact that if Hitler wins and becomes master of the Atlantic, it will mean, under the tripartite agreement, Japanese domination on the Pacific. It will mean that our future national safety and security will be jeopardized, our way of life will be seriously altered, and our future existence as a democratic nation will be threatened.

Seventh. We are all opposed to war. We are all opposed to sending any expeditionary forces to Europe to fight and die on foreign battlefields. We all agree, also, that we will fight with all our might to defend the United States and repel any attack against its sovereignty.

Each one of my colleagues subscribes to the foregoing points. We stand shoulder to shoulder on these principles. It is only in regard to our faith and our confidence in the President of the United States and his alleged motives and designs that we appear to be in disagreement. On my part, I have a high faith and confidence in the integrity and the patriotism of President Roosevelt. I believe that he made a desperate effort to avert this world war, and I believe that all his policies have been designed with a view of preserving the peace of this country and avoiding the danger of involvement. In the President's recent fireside chat, he said:

"I have said on many occasions that the United States is mustering its men and its resources only for the purpose of defense—only to repel attack. I repeat that statement

now. But we must be realistic when we use the word 'attack.' We have to relate it to the lightning speed of modern warfare. Some people seem to think that we are not attacked until bombs actually drop on New York or San Francisco; but they are simply shutting their eyes to the lesson we must learn from the fate of every nation that the Nazis have conquered."

I subscribe to that statement of the President's. If the Axis Powers take any step which, in the judgment of our naval and military experts, constitutes an attack on this hemisphere, that attack must certainly be repulsed. Every American must subscribe to that doctrine. No nation could long exist if it failed to assert the right of self-defense. This is a matter of scientific naval and military judgment and strategy. We must be alert and not sleep with an enemy at our gates.

I have complete confidence that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, acting with his military and naval advisers, will abide by his promises to the people of this country. I have confidence that he will act only in the necessary defense of the Nation.

The great difficulty which is presented to the country in this crisis is due to the fact that there are some who profess to have no confidence in the President or in the officers and officials of the Army and the Navy. Such a stand, in my judgment, is an outright condemnation of our whole democratic system. That is the position of Colonel Lindbergh, who calls for the repudiation of the President and the establishment of a new leadership. Apparently, he wishes to shackle the President; he wishes to limit and circumscribe the judgment of the Army and the Navy in carrying out their functions in the national defense, upon the pretense that they cannot be trusted. This is simply a repudiation of our Constitution.

Colonel Lindbergh, in his speech at Philadelphia on May 29, was cheered to the echo by his sympathetic and unthinking followers when he asserted: "It is now time for us to turn to new policies and new leaders." What does that mean? It means the repudiation of President Roosevelt as the properly constituted leader of the Nation. That is freedom of speech with a vengeance. Lindbergh is preaching confusion and chaos. The only way I know of to take the leadership away from President Roosevelt and the National Government is by revolution.

All over the Nation efforts have been on foot, backed and encouraged by enemies of our country, intended to discredit the President and confuse and befuddle the minds of the people. They repudiate the Lend-Lease Act, although it is the law of the Nation. Some contend that we should discontinue our efforts to aid Britain and, like Lindbergh, even contend that we should prepare now to get along with Adolf Hitler because he is already the victor.

It seems obvious to me that the greatest danger that confronts our country is not so much the danger of being invaded by a foreign foe but the danger of being destroyed from within—the danger of encouraging sabotage and treason; the danger of undermining our National Government. Already sabotage is suspected in several sections of the country and, in all probability, widespread sabotage incidents will be increased as a result of this wild orgy of demagogery and wholesale condemnation and abuse of the President and his policies.

I am not one of those who agree with Lindbergh that Hitler has won the war. Notwithstanding his success in the battle of Crete, and the possibility that he may even win the struggle in the Near East and become the master of the Mediterranean, I am confident that he will be ultimately defeated. I believe it is possible that, if we stand firm in support of the President and his national policies, this country may find it unnecessary to become involved in actual warfare. The military experts who have been studying the war have formed the definite conclusion that this war will end when Britain arrives at the point where it can challenge Hitler's supremacy in the air. The strain at the present moment is severe and the threat of invasion of England continues. Nevertheless, there is definite information that the British air forces are daily expanding and, as our national-defense program proceeds, we will very soon be sending them enormous supplies of airplanes and defense materials. Under our national-defense program we are now turning out 1,500 planes per month, and this will be steadily increased until we reach a rate of 40,000 a year. As this production expands and is added to the British production, it is only a matter of time when the British air forces will be able to deliver blow for blow to the Nazi powers. When that moment comes, the handwriting will be on the wall and Hitler's forces will crumble, rendering American armed intervention wholly unnecessary.

Every recognized authority on air power now concedes that this war will be won in the air. While the rest of the world slept, Hitler had prepared, with all possible speed, his powerful fleets of air bombers. He took the world by surprise. His might in the air could not be resisted. His powerful air forces have accounted for all his spectacular victories. It was the threat of Nazi air power that compelled Britain to falter at Munich. It was Nazi air power that pulverized Poland's defenses at the commencement of the war. It carried the ruthless Nazi armies to speedy victory in Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. It quickly bombed the Balkans into submission and drove the British out of Crete. To offset this tremendous air force of Hitler's is the task of Britain and the nations of the world threatened by his program of world aggression.

Hitler has now spread his forces all over the European Continent. His difficulties are beginning. He has already fallen away behind his schedule. According to his original program of aggression, England should have fallen last year. Then his next schedule fixed this past spring for the fall of England. It has now come to be recognized that he can never invade Britain. He can never capture the British Fleet, and the British blockade is daily becoming more effective. It is the definite conclusion of the ablest experts that Germany can never gain possession of the British Isles, subdue the British Fleet, or break the British blockade. Therefore, Hitler can never gain free access to the seas, and must eventually fail. Thus, as the British power in the air expands, it is only a matter of time when Hitler will be utterly defeated.

The greatest need in this country to escape the threat of world domination by Hitler is the unity of the American people. Hitler has been led to believe that this country is disunited and he is banking on the failure of America to extend timely and substantial aid to the British. This accounts for the enormous program of propaganda that has been spread over the country, designed to stir up disloyalty and disunity among the American people. The Nazi government has maintained a propaganda organization in New York City which has covered the country with tons of publications designed to confuse and disunite the American people. The most unfortunate thing about the present situation is that we have in this country people who are innocently deceived and misled, and who are unconsciously serving as "fifth columnists" for Hitler in his plans to destroy democracy and set up his pagan system of totalitarianism in the world.

The greatest disappointment that the American people have ever experienced is to find Charles Lindbergh, hero of the first solo flight across the Atlantic, contributing to this disunity in the Nation at a time when complete solidarity is so essential to our national and hemispheric defense plans. I do not detract from the courage and daring shown by Lindbergh in his flight across the Atlantic. His success, however, was due mainly to American engineering skill that developed the plane and the engine that carried him safely over the ocean. I think, therefore, it is absurd to assume that because of that spectacular feat he has become a military expert and first statesman of the country. He merely assumes authority to tell us that we must discontinue all effort to support Britain and permit Hitler to become master of the world.

This country will never follow such craven advice. America will never take a stand alongside of Hitler in a world governed by the cowardly and fiendish philosophy of nazi-ism. The American people will never surrender to such a system. Hitler's treachery to the small democracies of Europe which have been invaded and enslaved, his ruthless and wanton murder of thousands of cowering and defenseless men, women, and children in the dead of night, his destruction of the cathedrals and historic structures of the Continent, and his demoralization of religion and culture have all but blotted out European civilization. This should be a warning to us in this country as to what will be in store for us if Hitler should succeed in becoming the master of Europe and the dominant power on the Atlantic.

We are a peaceful people in this country; we are all opposed to war. No sane person wants war. Our national policies are all designed to keep us out of war. But, let me say to you, the surest way to keep war away from America is to support the lawfully constituted Government of the United States, and not the pusillanimous leadership of Lindbergh, who regards with complacency the threatened fall of democracy and a Hitler dictatorship of the world.

When this subject was before the Congress of the United States I expressed myself on the floor of the Senate and made two radio addresses over Nation-wide broadcasting systems in support of the views I have expressed. I had not intended to speak again. It seemed to me that the country was being confused by the multiplicity of discordant voices on the air and the scores of propaganda organizations conducting forced mass meetings—contributing, not light, not understanding, but confusion.

I have been trying to devote my time in Washington to constructive work relating to our own State problems as affected by this great emergency. I have been kept very busy with that work. I would not come here today to make this address, except that I feel that I owe it to the people of Montana to let them know that I stand now where I have stood consistently throughout this period of national crisis. I am supporting the National Government of the United States. I am upholding the arm of the President, and backing up the entire national-defense program; seeking to have Montana play a noble and patriotic part in the Nation's defense. I feel that if I took any other course I would be recreant to my oath of office, false to my State, and false to my country.

Platform on Interstate Migration of National Conference of Social Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

PLATFORM PREPARED AT MEETINGS HELD IN ATLANTIC CITY JUNE 2-3, 1941

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the platform on interstate migration prepared by the special committee on interstate migration of the National Conference of Social Work for the consideration of its members in connection with the problem of migration.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREAMBLE

Migration is necessary in America. It offers new opportunities in normal times. It makes possible the full use of our resources in times of crisis. National defense demands migration, and America is on the move. This is no new phenomenon. America has always been on the move. Now the process is more rapid and more people are involved.

Migrants are people. This fact must be recognized if we would solve the problems associated with migration. Since migrants are people, their problems must be treated on the basis of individuality, regardless of length of residence.

Though they present problems, migrants contribute to the well-being of the communities to which they come and to the Nation as a whole. Most migrants are unrecognized. Though they are newcomers, they are clothed, housed, fed, and employed sufficiently to require no public assistance or special attention. Yet along with their benefits to the community these migrants bring difficult problems affecting all phases of community life. Those who fail to make a go of it and require assistance represent a small percentage, yet large numerically, of the total migrant group. A still smaller number actually ask for aid. But the failure to provide such help, the restrictions of settlement and residence requirements and the antagonism of communities to needy newcomers, aggravate the situation and magnify its related problems out of all proportion to their actual size.

To obtain the maximum benefits from the mobility of our population, to establish methods of dealing with the problems of migration whether in normal or abnormal times, and to eliminate discriminations which impair our national security, intensified efforts must now be directed toward the development of programs designed to overcome the problems that grow out of the movement of people.

In furtherance of these efforts, the time has come to present, through the medium of this committee, a recommended platform on interstate migration. It is not designed as a guaranteed cure-all. It recognizes certain existing situations and offers recommendations for dealing with them. It is presented as a basis for discussion at the National Conference of Social Work.

SITUATION

The revival of industry in large centers, the establishment of new defense industries, and the building of large military camps in small communities are stimulating a movement which is necessary, but which also magnifies community problems. Unguided movement of potential workers results in accentuating distress and waste of manpower.

Defense activity may reduce resident relief rolls. At the same time, it increases the relief needs among nonresidents, for there are more migrants searching for employment. Many are placed and need no further help; others secure employment but are soon laid off; others are unsuccessful in obtaining work; still others are unemployable. They need help but are ineligible. Some communities are unable to finance relief even to needy residents. Federal aid through the Social Security Act and Federal employment on projects of the W. P. A. are relieving distress, but many resident persons requiring help are unable to secure aid through these programs. Migrants do not receive Federal aid through the Social Security Act because of State residence requirements In general, migrants cannot obtain local relief because of settlement and residence laws. Migrants are not aided by W. P. A., although W P. A. regulations permit such assistance, because of local unwillingness to certify nonresidents, quota limitations, and the recruiting of workers from relief rolls, for which migrants cannot qualify.

People in distress are denied help, not on a basis of unproven need, but on an artificial criterion of length of residence. The unfilled need creates continuing problems which only aggravate the situation.

Settlement and residence laws vary widely throughout the country, so that migrants soon become "Stateless." Residence requirements have become more and more stringent during the past few years. The prospect of securing uniformity or abolition of settlement and residence requirements is not bright. Their undesirable effects might, however, be circumvented and thereby lead to their ultimate elimination.

Health hazards exist for both the community and the migrant because of the lack of medical care. Varying educational standards within the Nation are a threat to the development of citizens capable of taking responsibility in community life.

Arbitrary restrictions on the free movement of people within the United States are undesirable, but people are now leaving home and joining the migrant stream when assistance or advice at the source might prevent wasteful and unnecessary migration.

Government and private agencies, local, State, and National, are concerned with the problems of interstate migration. Sporadic attempts are made to deal with emergency situations. Studies and surveys are conducted without sufficient appreciation of related efforts by other organizations. States and localities have no official place to turn for guidance in dealing with their migration problems. Duplication of effort, waste, and confusion result.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee on Interstate Migration of the 1941 Conference of Social Work regards as fundamental the principle that migrants shall be accepted and cared for, if necessary, where they are and on the same basis as residents. In other words, there shall be no arbitrary distinction between people in distress based upon length of residence or settlement status. Toward this end, the committee has, therefore, prepared the following platform and presents it as a basis for discussion at the committee's sessions at the 1941 National Conference of Social Work.

1. Federal grants-in-aid for general relief shall be made available to the States to aid those not eligible under present categories of the Social Security Act, and for whom work on public-work projects is not suitable or available.

2. Federal grants-in-aid for general relief shall be contingent upon the acceptance of a State plan which will guarantee assistance to all who require it, regardless of any settlement or residence requirement.

3. Federal aid to States involving assistance or service to individuals, including health and medical care services and education and vocational guidance programs, shall be conditioned upon the willingness of the States to extend such benefits to all requiring them, regardless of residence or settlement restrictions.

4. The insurance provisions of the Social Security Act shall be extended to include occupations not now covered and provision shall be made for simplified and equitable payment of unemployment-insurance benefits to persons crossing State lines.

5. Increasing use shall be made by workers and employers of expanded employment services on a regional and national basis to guide workers to job opportunities, both in industry and in agriculture, to prevent as far as possible wasteful and aimless movement in search of employment, and to reduce distress resulting from the concentration of surplus workers at points of potential employment.

6. Loans to maintain competent farmers on their land and to reestablish them on a self-sustaining basis shall be continued and extended to prevent the economic and social losses resulting from their enforced entrance into migratory life.

7. Provision shall be made within the Federal Government for centralized and continuing collection of current information relating to interstate migration, establishing a basis for the placement of such responsibility in Federal administrative agencies as will make possible adequate protection of migrants and the communities to which they come. Provision shall be made for the correlation of Federal administrative agencies concerned with interstate migration so as to establish a central body to which States and localities may refer problems relating to interstate migration.

Special Committee on Interstate Migration, National Conference of Social Work, 1941: Philip E. Ryan, chairman; Myron Falk, vice chairman; Courtenay Dinwiddie; F. D. Hopkins; Louis Hosch; Glenn Jackson; Edith E. Lowry; Bertha McCall; Homer Morgenthaler; Philip Schafer; T. J. Woofter, Jr.

Condition of National Guard Men and Trainees in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ALEXANDRIA (LA.) DAILY TOWN TALK

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there appeared a few days ago in the Alexandria (La.) Daily Town Talk, a newspaper published in Louisiana, an editorial with reference to the splendid condition of the National Guard men and trainees

now quartered in central Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Alexandria (La.) Daily Town Talk]

A SOURCE OF PRIDE FOR UNCLE SAM

Uncle Sam may well be proud of his National Guard men and the trainees in his new Army, if those who are making their homes at present in the camps of the Alexandria area may be considered as representative of the Army as a whole.

During the few months that they have been in training in central Louisiana the boys from the North have shown that they are attaining an increasingly high physical standard, that their morale is the kind which any general would be proud to have in his army, and that their personal behavior, as a whole, is above reproach.

Good leadership, too, is reflected in the appearance of these young men. It takes more than just a healthy and well-behaved boy to make a good soldier; he must have the leadership of men of sterling character and tested ability.

Indicative of the splendid progress which the guardsmen and trainees are making was the fine display of troop coordination and healthfulness which was presented in the Thirty-second Division's "all out" review at Camp Livingston last week. Alexandrians who witnessed this spectacle of 18,000 suntanned officers and enlisted men parading briskly through a downpour of rain can join wholeheartedly in the commendation of the official reviewer, Maj. Gen. Edmund L. Daley, commanding general of the V Army Corps, who, in a letter to the Thirty-second's leader, Maj. Gen. Irving A. Fish, said:

"I desire to commend you, and, through you, the officers and men of your division for the splendid appearance made by the division during the review on the morning of May 29.

"Despite the heavy rain, the marching and appearance of your command was excellent. The morale of the troops who had concentrated in the area opposite the reviewing stand was still high as they returned to their camps."

It is regrettable that all of the parents of these husky youngsters are not able to visit them in the camps and see them in action. The boys' own admissions in letters back home that they are looking better, feeling better, and weighing more do not tell the full story. Only by seeing them could the troops' relatives and friends have the benefit of a complete record of their remarkable achievements.

Seizure of Plants in Case of Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection with the bill coming up tomorrow proposing a seizure of plants by the Government in order to deal with strikes, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from this morning's New York Times, entitled "The Wrong Solution."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 9, 1941]

THE WRONG SOLUTION

If the administration carries out its threat to seize the Inglewood plant of the North American Aviation Co. today the action cannot in itself end the strike there. When the Government has seized the plant, its next move must be to get the strikers back to work. Its first decision must be the rates of pay and working conditions that it will offer. These will either be those previously maintained by the company, those demanded by the strikers, or something in between fixed by the Government, presumably on the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board. This will be, in effect, compulsory arbitration imposed on the strikers. But if compulsory arbitration is to be adopted, it could be adopted just as well without seizing the plants at all. In any case, the question of compulsory arbitration deserves to be discussed and decided on its own merits and not adopted as an unforeseen consequence of some other policy

It is said that under the Army plan of taking over the plant the first action will be to open the picket lines to any men who wish to return to their jobs. Why has not this been done already? What excuse is there for permitting mass picketing to prevent those who wish to return to work from doing so? Here again is an action that could be taken without plant seizure and is quite irrelevant to it. It is said that if the back-to-work movement is insufficient the Army will recruit additional workers through the Civil Service Commission. Why could not the company just as well recruit additional workers from the private labor market? The Government has no magic formula for bringing new men or skills into existence.

There have been few cases in which the strikers are more clearly to blame than this one. The company has been and remains willing and ready to submit the dispute to the Government's Mediation Board. It has promised to make any wage increase retroactive to May 1. It is the strikers who refused peaceful mediation and who declared that they would stay out until the company "settles with us on our terms." They are striking in violation of their own agreement. The local C. I. O. union leaders responsible for the strike have been condemned by their own national leaders. Richard T. Frankensteen, national director of the aviation division of C. I. O., speaking on behalf of himself and of Philip Murray, chairman of the C. I. O., and R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, has denounced the walkout as a "wildcat strike" in which "the infamous agitation and underhand maneuvering of the Communist Party" are clear.

Yet if the Government seizes the North American plant it will not be cracking down on the strikers but on the company struck against. It will be, in effect, rewarding those who caused the strike and punishing those who tried to prevent it. For if, in order to get the men back, the Government should grant generous wage increases and other concessions, it may be precisely such Government seizure that the strikers are hoping to force. If this strike is inspired by the Communists, such an outcome would be in line with their domestic program. The precedent might prove a grave one that would lead to a whole wave of strikes, in the belief that they would force Government seizure and thus lead to better terms for the strikers than they could hope to extract from private industry. Such a result could only demoralize the defense effort and lead to ultimate disillusion.

The strike crisis that the administration confronts is in large part the fruit of the lack of clarity and courage until now in its own labor policy. The President declared in his radio speech of May 27 that labor and capital must defer to Government mediation processes "without stoppage of work." Why, then, has not the President long since requested of Congress that, paralleling the existing Railway Labor Act, precisely this requirement be enacted into law? It is failure to take needed and moderate measures of this sort in the past that has led to the proposal of drastic remedies that would create far more problems than they would solve.

Picketing the President's Home

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is entitled to have his home life respected the same as the humblest citizen in this land. The President is a worried man. In this grave national emergency the problems confronting him are tremendous. As a Representative of the people I denounce as outrageous and uncalled for the indignity inflicted upon this hard-working man by the mass picketing in front of the White House.

This blatant group of misguided, misinformed, misdirected, and moronic individuals are infringing upon the personal liberties of the first citizen of this Nation. For more than a month the White House has been picketed by a group of mentally unbalanced, publicity-seeking morons. It is time that someone spoke up regarding this contemptible thing that is being perpetrated, and I take this occasion to express my views and to state exactly what should be done to suppress this.

I believe that all civil liberties must be preserved. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom to worship, the right of petition and the right peaceably to assemble are American rights which no one will deny. They are the beacon lights of individual hope and the best guaranty for the perpetuity of our free institutions. This mass picketing of the White House is a public nuisance and a disgrace which should not be tolerated. Furthermore, this hard-working man occupying the most exalted position in the world in a time of grave national emergency should not have to see day after day in front of his yard a motley group of morons parading back and forth carrying signs "School budgets are being slashed"; "Student Union supports peace mobilization"; "Mr. Roosevelt, on November 2 you said, 'We want work and bread' "; "You mothers, keep your sons—No convoys"; "Jim Crow is not democracy"; and other signs similar in character.

I make this statement upon my own responsibility and without suggestion from anyone: "A man's home is his castle." After all, if any publicity-seeking group calling themselves "Peace Mobilization" or any other name desire to hold picketing exercises to show their disapproval of war, here are the Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings. Even morons should know that only Congress may declare war.

When individuals picketed the Japanese Embassy in Washington, they were rushed to jail. It is conceded that if a similar group of misguided, equally dimwitted placard-bearing pickets resorted to this same procedure in front of the German, British, or Italian Embassies, or the home of any foreign envoy in Washington, our police would intervene and end such disgraceful conduct.

There are at least eight policemen detailed constantly at considerable public expense to protect these pickets from being assaulted by American citizens. The policemen would no doubt like very much to load these blatant, dim-witted, publicity-seeking pickets, placards and all, into a patrol wagon and cart them to jail.

Ours is a government of law and order. I am thinking not only of a worried man who is head of this great Nation and who is entitled to have his home and front yard respected—I am thinking of the men and women who come here to the Capital of their country, perhaps the only trip they will ever make here, bringing their children with them—they want a good look at the White House where their President lives, and what do the children see first and last as they look toward the White House, they see this ugly little group of morons with their insulting and lying placards, and with the reference to the President of the United States as "Mr. Roosevelt."

If I were a Commissioner of the District of Columbia or the chief of police I would direct patrol wagons to cart off to jail every morning all of this group of mass picketers day after day. I would throw them into a room for investigation, holding each for investigation to determine whether they were Communists, whether they were citizens, what they were doing in Washington, were they in fact suspicious persons, and after the interrogation I would turn on the steam heat, and then if the investigation showed no grounds for further detention I would turn off the steam heat and let them out in the cool of a Washington summer afternoon, and then repeat the process each morning until there were no more pickets in front of this home.

Abe Tikotsky, an electrical worker, who appreciates the blessings of being an American citizen, has the right idea. He is picketing the picketers. His sign reads:

We Americans Protest Communists Picketing the White House.

Enough is enough. I call upon the District of Columbia authorities to abate this public nuisance and end this offense against public decency and the home life of a citizen who happens to be President of the United States.

Taking Over of North American Aviation Plant

REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, you have already had the news report, and therefore know what is going on in the air industries. I have taken this floor many times and pointed out the socialistic, communistic, outlaw labor leaders who would communize industry, betray the rank and file of decent, patriotic American labor, and destroy the defense program.

Many took my statements lightly, but these things have now come to pass, and, unfortunately, in my own district. I have had these people in my district, known them, had to fight them, and therefore was familiar with them. You were not. Had you been familiar with them, perhaps you would not have taken these statements so lightly.

Today we find these socialistic, communistic outlaws defying their own union, the O. P. M., the local authorities, the President of the United States, and the United States Government itself. Their plan was and is to destroy the defense program of the United States, bring about Government ownership, and eventually socialism or communism.

We must now meet this head on and face the facts. The Government of the United States is about to or has already taken over the North American Aviation plant and operate it. If the Government does this, do you think this is going to stop here? I say it will not. This will result in the Government having to take over every airplane plant, the steel, automobile, coal, lumber, and many other industries. What is this? I say this is equivalent to Government ownership and Government operation, which, in turn, is a form of socialism or communism. I, for one, and many Democrats and many Republicans, do not like this, because none of us is a Socialist or a Communist.

We are at a crossroad and this is a precedent. One of these roads leads to socialism or communism. The other will preserve the American form of government as we have known it. I say we should take the American road.

We can no longer be Democrats or Republicans, but must be Americans in choosing this road. The socialistic, communistic road is the one that has been on the program of these outlaw leaders, to make this country a socialistic or communistic Republic. They hope to accomplish this by disruption of production and forcing the Government to take over, and this is their program. Let not the Government be fooled and fall in with this program.

This whole matter could be solved by the President of the United States directing a strong statement to these communistic outlaws, saying that this treasonable conduct and destruction of the defense program will no longer be tolerated; that we are going to have a defense program in spite of them; that under the Constitution of the United States we will not force those to labor who do not want to, but by that same Constitution we will say to these outlaws that they shall not interfere with those who do want to work and these plants shall remain open to those patriotic men in labor who are willing to carry out the defense program; that in order to do this, if necessary, the armed forces of this country will be used to keep every plant in this country open and in production.

If the Government takes over and operates these industries, it will do this:

First. Penalize those patriotic institutions which have cooperated and are now cooperating.

Second. It will put a premium on the efforts of these communistic outlaws to destroy production. Government ownership and operation in France is the best evidence of this.

Third. It will be playing into the hands and carrying out the actual program of the Communists to establish this precedent of Government ownership, with the final result of socialism and communism.

Fourth. The President should say that if they persist in their treasonable attitude of destruction he will ask for laws to put these people in their proper place and protect this country against them.

I think the above suggestion will efficiently handle the situation and preserve the American form of government. It can be done and it should be done.

I have before this House bill 4223, which would make strikes in defense industries treason. If this bill is too strong for passage, I will be glad to modify and revise it in such a way as to penalize only the communistic outlaw labor leader and protect loyal, patriotic American labor, who are willing to do their duty, but who have been put in the position they are in today by this type of destructive leadership because they were unable to protect themselves in their positions.

I think it is also time to take a firm stand and indicate that this country is through and will no longer tolerate such people as Bridges, Freitag, Orgon, Reuther, and other saboteurs and traitors.

I hope also, that the President will investigate the whole administration, take out every Communist, and clean his house of such people as Hillman and Perkins.

There is no question of a doubt but that the Hillman and Perkins element have largely contributed to and brought about this condition. Therefore, the blame is justly and properly placed upon Hillman and Perkins. They have failed. Therefore they must go.

Atlantic Patrol

REMARKS
OF
HON. KNUTE HILL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week Alsop and Kintner in their syndicated column frankly state that the President and his close advisers hope that the Atlantic patrol will produce an incident which can be used as an excuse for taking this country into war. Note also their column in today's Post. These two commentators have been commonly credited with being unofficial spokesmen for the White House. Therefore, there must be some real basis for their statement. However, I sincerely hope that it is not true; but if it is true, this is nothing less than a tragic situation.

Either the President himself should openly repudiate these statements or, failing to do so, thereby indirectly accepting them as his own, the people, the only sovereigns in this Republic of ours, should call him to strict account and demand that he, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, withdraw the Atlantic patrol from all foreign areas conducive to such incidents as mentioned above. He should be bound by his many solemn, oft-repeated promises to the American people during the preelection days. As a servant of these people, as we all elected officials are, he is bound by the highest obligation to obey the wishes of a very substantial majority of these people as expressed in communications both to him and to the Members of both Houses of the Congress. Moreover, the President of the United States, as the head of the executive department of this Government, is definitely bound legally and morally to refrain from usurping the clear and constitutional prerogative of a coordinate branch of this Government—the Congress—to declare or bring on war. That is our duty and ours alone, and we should resent and repudiate any attempt on the part of anyone to encroach on our constitutional authority. The crisis is so serious and the proposed action so momentous that I, for my part, must speak out frankly. I am only one Member of the Congress, but I have taken a solemn oath of office. My official position is not as important as that of the President of the United States, but my duties are as clear and definite as are his, and I have served the people as long as he has. I hereby warn the President that if he persists in a course of provocation in foreign waters that will eventually lead us into taking part in war on foreign soil, I shall personally do my utmost to have such action challenged by the Congress and hold him and his advisers wholly responsible for the dire consequences of such unwarranted an act. The Congress of the United States is in session. If action such as currently attributed to the Chief Executive is necessary, let Congress act in the only constitutional way. With all due respect to the executive department, I, for one, shall insist on performing my duty as a Member of the legislative department. Let us, as men, do our full part in this crisis. May I repeat what I have said on this floor before: Billions for the defense of this Western Hemisphere, but not one cent for aggressive warfare on foreign soil or in foreign waters.

President Roosevelt Should Start a Peace Offensive—Instead of Going to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1941

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sincerity that I ask President Roosevelt to start a peace offensive instead of going to war. We know that war can bring untold suffering, misery, and want, and no sane man would want to bring war to America. President Roosevelt can lay the groundwork for peace by consulting with the belligerent nations to see what terms of peace might be acceptable. The post-war reconstruction program recently suggested by the Secretary of State Cordell Hull might be of assistance in setting up a peace program.

We know that peace must come to the warring nations at some time. When the smoke of battle has cleared away, America, if it remains out of the war, will be in an excellent position to carry on peace negotiations which might result in a peace program leading the world to freedom from military danger and political intrigue for many years to come. Rational economic reconstruction must follow in the wake of this war or we will again find the clash of arms in another war.

When Secretary Hull suggested that raw-material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination, he promoted a theory which must of necessity have a salutary effect upon relations between nations. Economic dislocations leading to inaccessibility of raw materials and foodstuffs should be eliminated if at all possible. America can best serve the world by taking a leading part in the reconstruction period following the present war.

The Defense Property Seizure Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ENDICOTT (N. Y.) DAILY BULLETIN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Endicott (N. Y.) Daily Bulletin:

[From the Endicott (N. Y.) Daily Bulletin]

THE DEFENSE PROPERTY SEIZURE BILL

A bill to give President Roosevelt power to seize for just compensation any private property, real or personal, which may be deemed in the interest of defense during the emergency has been sent to Congress with the approval of the President, the War and Navy Departments, and the Office of Production Management.

All loyal Americans will concede that our Government should have the power to seize property that is essential to national defense if the owners refuse to do their share toward producing articles needed for our Army, Navy, and air force.

Loyal Americans will not concede, however, that the President of the United States, be he Mr. Roosevelt or someone else, should have the power to seize such property, pay for it what he considers fair, with the owner's only redress being suit against the Government, which is a long-drawn-out, costly affair.

More specifically, we quote essential sections of the proposed measure:

"SECTION 1. The President is authorized, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, (a) to requisition and take over, either temporarily or permanently, property of any kind or character, whether real or personal, tangible or intangible * * * which itself or through its exercise or control can be used or is adaptable in any way for national defense * * * and (b) to use and, on such terms as he shall deem satisfactory, to sell or otherwise dispose of, either temporarily or permanently any property, right, or interest requisitioned or taken over pursuant to the provision of this act.

"SEC. 2. Whenever the President shall requisition and take over any property pursuant to the provisions of this act, the person or persons having right, title, or interest therein shall be paid as compensation thereof such sum as the President shall determine to be fair and just.

"If any such person * * * is unwilling to accept as full and complete compensation for such property the sum so determined by the President, such person or persons shall be paid 75 percent of the sum * * * and shall be entitled to sue the United States for such additional sum as when added to the sum already received shall be determined as fair and just compensation."

This bill, if passed, would give the President tremendous power, and, in fact, complete power over the economic life of individuals and business concerns in our country.

The measure also permits the President to take over property of any kind "* * * real or personal, tangible or intangible * * *" which could easily be interpreted to mean that he could seize stocks, bonds, savings accounts, and practically anything and everything that directly or indirectly might affect national defense, in the President's opinion.

We know that a united Nation is essential to defeat of Hitler, but in uniting ourselves to defeat the dictators we should not permit the President to have powers that create a dictatorship.

Effect of this measure, if passed, would be to make Mr. Roosevelt the economic czar of our country. We are absolutely opposed to this, as much as we are anxious for a united country.

We do not believe that the President should have asked for such wide powers, if he truly is interested in a united Nation, for be it Democrats or Republicans, we surely do not care to have the President, whomever he may be, the economic czar of our country.

If Congress authorized creation of a nonpartisan commission to authorize seizure of such property, subject to court review, then this action would met with public approval.

We have followed Mr. Roosevelt without criticism in his stand against the dictators ever since his reelection, but, in the interest of retaining our democratic form of government, war or no war, we cannot support delegation of "life-and-death economic powers" to the Chief Executive. That is not the democratic way.

This smacks of dictatorship. We hope that Mr. Roosevelt will call for revision of this bill and have it rewritten the American way, not à la Hitler, Stalin, or Mussolini, as it stands today.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE PONCHATOULA (LA.) ROTARY CLUB

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Ponchatoula (La.) Rotary Club relative to the current friction between capital and labor in vital defense industries.

This resolution well expresses the temper of our people in the present emergency and their determination to take whatever steps are necessary to preserve our country. It is evident that this scramble over profits that is now agitating capital and labor alike in vital defense industries, if not curbed, may well lead to the ruin of our beloved country.

The resolution in question is as follows:

PONCHATOULA ROTARY CLUB,
Ponchatoula, La., May 29, 1941.

At a meeting of the Ponchatoula Rotary Club, the taking formal cognizance of the international problems as affecting these United States, and, deploring and denouncing the improvident stands taken by labor and capital in vital defense production,

It was moved, seconded, and affirmatively voted by each member present that it is the sense of this club that drastic measures be forthwith taken by Congress, independently of any administrative complex, to effectively curb the bent of labor and capital alike against strikes during the national emergency declared by the President,

And to that end our Congressman, Hon. J. Y. SANDERS, Jr., and our Senators, Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON and Hon. ALLEN ELLENDER, be memorialized to give careful consideration to the introduction of a measure in Congress providing that any laborer engaged in any defense work who strikes for any reason shall, ipso facto become an inductee into the armed force at current pay, and, any individual, corporation, partnership or association of persons wilfully provoking and permitting any strike shall suffer fine, imprisonment, or both as fixed by the measure and within the discretion of the court.

PONCHATOULA ROTARY CLUB,
W. D. FRELLUE, *President.*
H H COLMER *Secretary.*

Sentiment Grows Stronger for Separate Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to many of us that sentiment is growing stronger in this country for a separate air force. It was my privilege a few days ago to attend the annual convention of the National Aeronautic Association, and at those sessions I found much enthusiasm on the subject, and also a determination to gather our forces and work for action.

In this connection I include two news dispatches:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

FLYERS ORGANIZE CAMPAIGN FOR SEPARATE AIR FORCE

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., June 9.—The Billy Mitchell Air Defense Committee, a group including many of the Nation's prominent figures in aviation, began work today to have a separate air force established in the United States.

James R. Graham, of Chicago, aviation underwriters official, said the National Aeronautic Association and the Aviation Writers' Association already had pledged cooperation.

Donations of $100 apiece were made yesterday by the Birmingham Aero Club and Arlene Davis, Cleveland flyer, as the group banded together at the close of the National Air Carnival.

Earlier a resolution, proposed by I. S. Randall, vice president of Transcontinental and Western Air, Inc., was adopted calling on President Roosevelt and Congress to have the air force made a separate unit.

Mr. Graham said the committee would set up groups for each Army corps area and appoint a key man for each State.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald]

SEPARATE AIR ARM DEMANDED BY EXECUTIVES—COLONEL TURNER SAYS JOB IS TO SELL IDEA TO AMERICAN PUBLIC

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., June 7.—A group of the Nation's leading aircraft manufacturers, airline executives, and aviation writers today demand a separate air arm for the United States armed forces and pledged themselves to lead a Nation-wide drive for its creation.

The group, here for the eleventh annual national air carnival, adopted a resolution favoring the separate air branch and appointed a committee "to convince America that a separate air force is a vital necessity."

APPEAL TO ROOSEVELT

The committee, consisting of Frank Tichenor, editor of Aero Digest; I. S. Randall, associate boach chairman of Transcontinental & Western Airways; and James Graham, Chicago aviation underwriter, was instructed to draft a resolution for presentation to President Roosevelt.

Col. Roscoe Turner, noted speed flier, warned that "an embossed and beautifully worded resolution will not do the job."

"Resolutions sent to Washington end up in the waste basket," he said. "The job, before us is to quickly sell the American people on the idea and get them to write, wire, and telephone their Congressmen to take action."

CREDIT TO GENERAL MITCHELL

Steadham Acker, manager of the municipal airport here and carnival director, pointed out that many men in aviation "who realize the need for a separare air force" may not be able to support the drive openly "because they are at the mercy of people in Washington who have fought the idea for years."

It was suggested that when organization work is completed the group be given the name of the Billy Mitchell Defense Commission, in honor of the late Army general who was discredited because of his efforts to establish a separate force.

MEMBERS JOIN IN EFFORT

I feel certain that a hearing on this important subject will be forthcoming in the near future. I say this after having talked again today with the gentleman from New York, Chairman O'LEARY, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I have before that group two bills, H. R. 3795 and H. R. 4532, which would bring about a unified air force or a separate department of air defense. Other Members of the House also have bills pending, while others have expressed the hope that the matter be gone into thoroughly. Scores of my colleagues have told me they favored a separate air force, and several of them, including the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS and Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], have taken the floor to say so.

I quote at this point in my remarks from the following editorials:

[From the Cleveland Press]

FOR A SEPARATE AIR FORCE

It has long been known that many important officers of the flying services, particularly of the Army Air Corps, favor divorcing air power from the Army and Navy and giving it an independent, unified status wherein the practitioners of air could work out their destiny without hindrance from groundling tradionalists.

But while Maj. Al Williams and Maj. Alexander De Seversky and other top-ranking airmen not actively connected with the services

have crusaded for this objective, active Army and Navy air officers have had little or nothing to say in public. They have known that men at the top were opposed to it.

That reluctance to talk has finally begun to break down. A new book, Winged Warfare (Harper), has just been produced by Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps and Acting Deputy Chief of Staff for Air, and Col. Ira C. Eaker, commander of the twentieth fighter group of the General Headquarters air force.

In their concluding chapter, Major General Arnold and Colonel Eaker have this to say:

"Many feel that eventually the defensive air component of the Nation will be given a status coordinate and commensurate with that of the Army and Navy.

"When that time will come, if it does come, is not yet clear. It came in some of the other nations of the world when the pressure of war was upon them. We shall be fortunate if our time for that reorganization comes in the relative calm of peace or, at worst, in the preparatory and not in the fighting stage."

While they emphasize that there should be no plunging pell-mell into separation of the air from the older services, but rather a gradual evolution, nevertheless they make it plain, despite their cautious language, that they consider a separate air force the eventual goal.

It seems to us that the country is indebted to these two veteran officers for having the courage to speak up in the face of widespread hostility in high places.

In the light of their testimony, Congress can hardly do less than to arrange hearings, such as Representative RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, is now seeking, at which the arguments for and against can be fully canvassed.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Agitation for a unified air force is increasing, and, as is to be expected, various admirals and generals are building up a backfire of propaganda against the proposal.

SPEAKING OF COOPERATION

One of the counterarguments now being circulated is this: That in the battle of Crete the Royal Air Force failed to cooperate with the Royal Navy sufficiently to beat off the German air-borne invasion. This is claimed to indicate that if we put our air forces under a unified command we'll find our sky fighters snooting and snubbing our sea fighters or land fighters or both in some wartime emergency some day.

The facts are otherwise about the battle of Crete as thus far reported. What happened was that the British air fighters were bombed or gunned out of the island's few usable airports and had to withdraw to Egyptian bases. These were too far away for fighter planes; only bombers of considerable range could continue the air defense of Crete. The battleship and the cruiser are at a bad disadvantage in narrow waters without airplane help, so the German planes eventually were able to drive the British East Mediterranean Fleet away.

That isn't refusal of cooperation; that is simply inability to cooperate. The R. A. F. did the best it could as long as it could base on Crete; and until it was driven off the Germans had very tough going. And, speaking of cooperation, was any lack of cooperation observed between the German Luftwaffe and the German invading soldiers?

Speaking of air power and sea power, the following speculations have just been suggested to us by a friend who studies these things:

TWO VICTORIES FOR AIR POWER

It was air power, almost entirely, that won the Battle of Crete. It was also air power that enabled the British Navy to give the new German battleship *Bismarck* its death blow.

Well, for two generations or more we have tacitly depended on the British Navy as our Atlantic bulwark. Of late years this understanding has grown into a virtual agreement, whereby the British Navy has policed the Atlantic for our benefit and Britain's, while our Navy has policed the Pacific for Britain's benefit and ours.

Don't these recent victories of air power by land and sea indicate that the British Navy henceforth will be less valuable to us as an Atlantic outer line than it has been up to now?

Isn't this the lesson of these air power victories: That from now on, the best defenses for a continental nation such as the United States, with long coast lines on two oceans, will be long-range bombing planes based on airfields and harbors of both coasts, plus a lot of aircraft carriers to ferry fighter planes out to sea, plus a powerful navy to back up the air-defense forces?

Putting it more briefly: Isn't air power fated to become our first line of defense, instead of sea power?

It seems too early to embrace that theory, quit building the two-ocean Navy, and the 1,500,000-man Army, and go all-out for bombers, fighter planes, and carriers.

UNIFY THE AIR FORCE

But we think it is time to bring our air-war policy abreast of those of Great Britain and Germany in the matter of unifying the air force under its own command. There should be a Secretary for Air in the Cabinet, and the Air Corps Chief should have equal standing with the Army's Chief of Staff and the Navy's Chief of Naval Operations.

The land, sea, and air forces should be trained for cooperation, just as in Britain and Germany. The notion that they couldn't cooperate has been blasted by the fact that they do cooperate 100 percent in both of those countries, which have now had actual war experience for 21 months

It will take an act of Congress to blow the air force out from under the thumbs of the admirals and the generals These gentlemen, like 99.9 percent of the rest of us, love power, and can be depended on to keep a death grip on every ounce of their power as long as they can.

But that the thing has got to be done, we're convinced. Our four separate air forces—Army, Navy, Marine, Coast Guard—now are hobbled and hampered, split up, and tied down, because they are subordinate to men trained to fight by land or sea, not by air. Until we set the air force free, we cannot hope to build the world's most powerful air force, which is the thing we need for the adequate defense of this country

---

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

RESOLUTION OF RAILROAD COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the Railroad Cooperative League of Michigan in opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway:

Whereas the agreement between the United States and Canada for construction of the much-discussed and thoroughly discredited St. Lawrence seaway has finally been signed and presented to Congress; and

Whereas Congressman MANSFIELD, of Texas, has now presented to Congress the necessary legislation for authorization of this outmoded, useless, and uneconomical project; and

Whereas the billion dollars plus that will be required for completion of the scheme is badly needed for legitimate national-defense activities, and skilled labor cannot be spared at this time for unnecessary work; and

Whereas nothing has been said of the huge expenditures necessary to deepen harbors and reconstruct port facilities at all our Great Lakes ports to accommodate the larger ships of foreign registry which will enter the Great Lakes through the deepened channel; and

Whereas the taxpayers of this Nation are beginning to question the spending of huge sums for unnecessary undertakings, even when cloaked with the mantle of national defense; and

Whereas we believe the time has arrived when Congress should assert itself on behalf of the people to end this mad orgy of spending our public moneys; and

Whereas there are absolutely no benefits to be gained, on the other hand much is to be lost by such wasteful expenditures at a time when our Nation is on the verge of financial collapse; and

Whereas from a standpoint of either transportation or power the project is not needed at the present time, never will be at a future time, and by no stretch of the imagination can it be considered as a defense measure in the present national emergency; and

Whereas hundreds of organizations, many of them national in scope such as the National Manufacturers Association, National Association of Commerce, Association of American Railroads, the 21 Standard Railroad Labor Organizations, and the American Federation of Labor can see the folly of this costly undertaking which will result in untold damage to millions of American citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we again urge our Michigan Members of Congress to take an active and aggressive part in opposing this pet scheme; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Michigan Members of Congress, members of the Michigan Legislature, presidents and secretaries of our 92 local units in the State, and all newspapers in Michigan.

W. P. A. Employment in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman of the House, we are going to be asked to consider a bill appropriating about $875,000,000 for the

continuation of the Work Projects Administration during the next fiscal year. With that sum of money the Work Projects Administration could provide an average employment of 1,000,000 persons compared to the 1,700,000 employed during this fiscal year. That will represent a curtailment of approximately 40 percent of W. P. A. employment from the fiscal year 1941 through fiscal year 1942.

A question which you may well ask is whether there is a sufficient industrial recovery and expansion in prospect in this country to absorb a very large number of the unemployed and thereby permit the Federal Government to reduce its work-relief expenditures even further.

I think the answer may be found in some of the areas which are experiencing a substantial expansion in industrial activities directly resulting from the defense program. This is occurring in southern California. I sincerely believe that in southern California we are witnessing the optimum type of empoyment conditions which we may expect as the defense program gets going at full speed.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

In southern California there is a shortage of labor. Workers are pouring in from other States to fill these jobs. These workers are by and large young persons, or, in a few cases, individuals with specialized skills. Many other workers are pouring into the State and are not obtaining employment. But the fact remains that there are many jobs available in southern California.

W. P. A. EMPLOYMENT DECLINES—WAITING LIST INCREASES

The Work Projects Administration has evidently recognized that there is a favorable job situation in southern California and has cut its employment authorization each month since the beginning of the year. I would be very much pleased to see this continue except at the same time the number of persons certified for need awaiting assignment, and by that I mean they are eligible for and seeking W. P. A. employment. has been steadily increasing. In January 1941 there were 10,900 persons awaiting assignment, or a number equal to 29.9 percent of those actually working for W. P. A. By the end of April this number had increased to 15,000, or 49.5 percent of the number of persons actually in work. These significant figures are as follows:

Month	Work Projects Administration average monthly employment (assignment load)	Certified persons awaiting assignment	Awaiting assignment load as a percentage of actual assignment load
1941			
January	36,500	10,900	29.9
February	36,000	10,400	28.9
March	33,000	12,400	37.6
April	30,300	15,000	49.5

In this period, the total number of persons eligible for W. P. A. employment and actually employed declined from a total in January of 47,400 to a total in April of 45,300 or a drop of only 2,100.

COMPARISON OF W. P. A. ROLLS AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE FILES

Unemployment has not disappeared in southern California. The active files of the local offices of the State employment services in the eight counties of southern California showed 240,000 persons looking for work in April 1940. As might be expected, there was a reduction since that period of time. In April 1941, 199,000 were registered as seeking work. This means there has been a drop of 17 percent in the number of persons looking for jobs through the local offices of the State employment service in southern California.

What has W. P. A. done in that same period? In April 1940 it employed 39,800 persons. In the same month 1 year later it gave work to 30,300. This shows a decline of close to 24 percent. Thus the Work Projects Administration has reduced its employment far more than the public employment offices have reduced their active files of job seekers.

OBSTACLES TO REEMPLOYMENT IN INDUSTRY OF W. P. A. WORKERS

It must be quite apparent that in southern California, where there are these ideal opportunities for employment in the defense industries, the W. P. A. load is not going down as fast as might be expected. The reasons for this are quite clear.

First. Age: Industries are giving preference in employment to younger persons. The average age of the W. P. A. worker in southern California is almost 46, compared to an average W. P. A. age of 42.75 for the country. I am told that this age level will increase steadily as younger workers are drawn from the rolls of W. P. A.

Second. Physical handicaps: Another significant explanation for the continuation of the W. P. A. load in southern California is the fact that industries are highly selective in the physical standards required of persons accepted for employment. The W. P. A. in southern California has a large load of competent workers who can perform the tasks assigned to them and who have built public works and rendered various public services which in my opinion are among the finest in the country. Yet close to 30 percent of the W. P. A. workers in that State have minor physical handicaps which exclude them from private industrial employment even under defense conditions. Yet these are people who are daily making an efficient contribution to the W. P. A. projects—both civil and defense—which are being undertaken in that section of California.

Third. Lack of education, specialized skills or training: Another reason for the existence of such a large number of persons on the work program in southern California is their lack of education, specialized skills, or training to meet the current requirements of the defense industries. The aircraft industries have depleted the W. P. A. rolls of all workers considered suitable by that industry at the present time.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROJECT

The W. P. A. has conducted an excellent training program in cooperation with the vocational schools and the industries. In fact, as of the end of March 1,530 or 75 percent of the 2,031 trainees who have completed their training for defense jobs have already found employment. Many of the others are expected to be placed in the near future.

But not all of the relief workers in southern California can be trained and placed with industrial standards as they are today. Age, physical condition, lack of education, and even lack of aptitude in some cases prevents the Work Projects Administration from training all these workers for industrial employment.

NATION-WIDE SITUATION

Since there is this need for W. P. A. employment in southern California where there are many jobs available, where some of the job seekers from other States can find employment, where there is frankly a great defense industrial boom, then in other areas of the country which are not so fortunately situated there is at least as great if not a greater need for carrying a substantial W. P. A. program during the next fiscal year. The March estimates for unemployment vary between 6,100,000 reported by the National Industrial Conference Board, 7,500,000 reported by the American Federation of Labor, and 9,071,000 computed by the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

During the coming fiscal year there will be the usual increase in the labor supply of some 600,000 persons. There will also be a special increase in the labor supply because of the attraction of the defense industries for young persons and housewives, retired persons, and so forth, who would ordinarily not be in the labor market. There will also be some increased unemployment because of the curtailment of production in some of the consumer-goods industries. It is reasonable to expect that with unemployment ranging from 6,100,000 to 9,500,000 at present there is likely to be, even under the most favorable circumstances, between five and five-tenths and seven and five-tenths million unemployed during the next fiscal year.

If the Work Projects Administration employs only a million of these, it will be giving work to only 1 person in 5 or 1 person in 7 who are unemployed. This is hardly too large a work program. Since 1936, when W. P. A. employed 33½ percent of the 7,600,000 unemployed persons, there have been employed on the work program a decreasing proportion of the total unemployed in this country. In the calendar year 1940 the 1,900,000 W. P. A. workers represented only 23.7 percent of the unemployed.

With a million employed during the next fiscal year, the W. P. A. may be providing work for only 20 percent of the unemployed. There comes a time when these appropriations may be reduced too much. In my opinion, the appropriation this year should not fall below the $875,000,000 requested by the President, as many people will never be reemployed in private industry, especially that type of women who have been working on the sewing projects. This type of project should be the last to be closed, as it is the only employment these women can get. Thank you.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

LETTER SIGNED BY CONSTITUENTS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this letter expressing the views of my constituents is worthy of your consideration:

GOULD, OKLA., *May 24, 1941.*

Hon. Victor Wickersham, Member of the Congress from the Seventh Oklahoma District, and all other national lawmakers, Washington, D. C.

SIRS: The undersigned are deeply concerned about the outlook for our democracy. May we suggest with all the earnestness we have that whatever measures that are necessary be taken to accomplish the following:

1. Stop these strikes in defense industry. If it takes a declaration of a national emergency or war or what not, lets get it done. As it is, the country is at the mercy of the C. I. O. which is in turn controlled by un-American and communistic influences. If these elements cannot be handled then we are defeated already.

2. Get help to England by whatever means necessary. We had better get going while there is someone to help us against Hitler. We have played at this matter too long now. Convoy ships and be glad to do it. Forget politics and use the information that has been available to you for months and months. Let's not sleep in fancied security any longer.

3. It has been pointed out to us by the dictators that our democratic form of government is slow and ineffective. Let's get some concentration camps and some teeth in effective laws and some all-out effort. If your house was on fire would you stop at the end of a 6-hour day? Then why let the country be run and ruined on that basis? You, our Representatives, are all we can depend on. Are you going to let us down?

Respectfully,

Harold Clark, M. H. Carrell, C. T. Putnam, E. Q. Anderson, H. T. Summers, O. F. Culpepper, J. M. Nelson, J. W. Curnutt, A. E. Stegall, Mrs. F. E. Johnson, A. F. Dickerson, Willie Sanders, Mrs. G. D. Robinson, J. M. Fox, A. R. Teague, L. R. Morris, Felton Farquhar, Mrs. Carl Putnam, W. T. Welch, O. O. Whitmire, J. A. Looney, Mrs. L. S. Stokesberry, J. Smalling, E. L. Harris, Carl Putnam, C. A. Scott, Ray West, Mrs. O. F. Culpepper, John Noble, Pat Ferguson, A. J. Miller, C. H. Hill, John R. Hill, S. H. King, C. V. Phipps, Floyd Cox, W. V. Gatlin, Walter Crowder, E. M. Erwin, H. W. Payne, G. A. Corning, A. L. Herrington, Rosa Earls, J. L. Ballard, J. R. Moran, Bess Bassel, Mrs. Joe Hendley, E. E. Woodman, Fay Noble, Willard Johnson, Lester Rodgers, Mrs. Roy Barlow, J. A. Harrison, Floyd Johnson, Jr., W. C. Williams, Jr., D. S. Smith, S. W. Carmack, J. D. Jones, Homer Culbert, Mrs. J. M. Nelson, W. E. Sanders, Leon Walden, O. C. Stephens, Mrs. W. V. Gatlin, J. H. Yates, Mrs. Felix Cope, Tom McCubbin, G. D. Robinson, Joe Allison, Russell Reeves, H. S. Beanland, Mrs. Russell Reeves.

The original of this letter was signed and delivered by a group of the signers personally to Congressman WICKERSHAM on May 24, 1941. These signers are from the village of Gould, Okla., population 372, and this sentiment is shared by at least 90 percent of the whole population.

Plight of the Small Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY IN THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herein an article from the Washington Post by Ernest K. Lindley dealing with the difficulty had by small manufacturers in getting defense-contract work. The case history detailed therein describes to a "t" the experiences of the small manufacturers in my district. I believe the same story applies the country over except in the overindustrialized East.

Mr. Speaker, after trying vainly for several months to obtain just a nibble of defense work for the idle men, the idle machines and the idle housing in my district, I have almost arrived at this conclusion:

That the only way we can insure an equitable distribution of defense plants and defense orders is by congressional action. Otherwise the old rule that "them that has gits" will continue to leave the have-nots out in the cold.

From my district you can draw a line 400 miles north to the Canadian border and 1,500 miles west and in this area there is not to my knowledge a single defense plant or a single defense activity. Throughout this great territory, comprising several States, the almost daily appeals from Washington to "work, produce, speed up" have come to have an ironic ring.

The article follows:

A CASE HISTORY—PLIGHT OF THE SMALL MANUFACTURERS

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

Here is a brief case history which illustrates two of the most serious criticisms of the direction of our defense-production program. It is the experience of the head of a mis-western manufacturer of brass, aluminum, and zinc castings and stampings.

The firm has 460 employees, including an engineering staff and 16 tool and die makers, and about 200 machine tools. Its normal business is making such things as parts for refrigerators The firm is in excellent financial condition. Until recently it was working around the clock—some departments on three shifts and others on two 10-hour shifts.

Some months ago its president sized up the dimensions of the defense program and decided they would put a dent in his regular business. He saw that there probably would not be enough brass, zinc, and aluminum to meet all civilian needs. He suspected also that considerable amounts of steel would have to be diverted from civilian to military channels. Some of his business friends belittled his fears, but as the days passed and it became harder to get the metals he needed, he set out to try to get some defense business.

Knowing a little about the Government and the defense agencies which are completely unknown to many small manufacturers—he lost no time in learning what steps he should take.

He was told to offer his services as a subcontractor to the large concerns which had the big defense orders. He was informed that the policy of O. P. M. was to bring these smaller facilities into use by encouraging the big concerns to subcontract parts.

So he wrote to a selected list of prime contractors, 500 in all, stating exactly what his plant was set up to do. He did not get even one serious nibble, much less a subcontract.

He filed with the Defense Contract Service office in Detroit a complete survey of his plant. All he got there was a suggestion that he write to the other regional offices, making sure that he told them he had already been in touch with the Detroit office, since, otherwise, his letters would be forwarded to Detroit.

Finally, the Detroit office invited him to submit bids on 2 fuses for the British. Neither was of a type that previously had been manufactured in this country. Of the 200 machines in his plant, 8—all automatic screw machines—could be used in making the fuses. He submitted a bid, but with it the statement that he could not produce the fuses unless he also got business to keep the rest of his plant going.

Meanwhile, the real pinch has come in supplies of metals. He can get almost no brass, zinc, and aluminum. His refrigerator-making clients have realized they are going to have to find substitutes, including substitutes for a large amount of steel, or else suspend production.

Last week our exhibit X had to lay off his night shift. His 16 highly skilled tool and die makers are idle.

He has machines and men of exactly the type and training desperately needed for defense production. But they are not being used. And unless they are put to work quickly he will have to suspend business entirely and let his organization go to pieces.

Early this week he arrived in Washington to make the rounds of the defense agencies—the Army, the Navy, and O. P. M. He received sympathetic hearings, but up to the time this was written no action.

Billions of dollars' worth of defense orders have been poured forth, largely into big corporations. Huge new plants are being built from the bottom up at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. The machine-tool industry is staggering under a record-breaking load of orders.

Here is a plant ready to go. It has the machines, the trained men, the engineers, and management. It doesn't need a dollar from the Government, either for expansion or working capital. It can make any number of items important to defense without adding even so much as one machine to its equipment, and with a few new machines here and there its scope could be greatly expanded.

It is organized and manned for two- and three-shift operation, while many other producers are still working only one shift.

It wants defense business and has been searching for it. In fact, if it doesn't get it, it may go out of business forever.

If our defense production were efficiently planned, this plant would have been sought out, surveyed, and asked to undertake defense work months ago. But for 2 months it has been knocking at the door, asking for a chance to produce for defense needs.

It is caught on one side by the failure of O. P. M. and the Army and Navy to mobilize

quickly and effectively such smaller manufacturers. On the other it is caught by the shortages of metals for civilian use—shortages which are far more acute than most of the businessmen brought in to direct the defense production program had the wit to foresee. The reassuring statements that there would be enough aluminum, enough magnesium, and enough steel have all been pricked by events. There is not enough of any of them, and not enough zinc and brass.

Our exhibit X is confident that there are hundreds, perhaps several thousands, of small manufacturers who are getting caught in this double squeeze. Many are less well-equipped than he is to move immediately into defense production. But, for lack of metal for civilian use, they will have to suspend operation and disband their organizations. Whether they would ever come to life again is doubtful.

Factory Seizure and Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE (R. I.) JOURNAL

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Providence Journal of Sunday, June 8, 1941:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of June 8, 1941]

FACTORY SEIZURE AND PRODUCTION

The three strikes on the west coast, involving two-thirds of the 52,800 defense workers now idle, are outlaws—that is to say, they have been repudiated by labor itself. They are the products of a minority of irresponsible leaders and recalcitrant workers. In view of the honest, sincere, and reasonable efforts of authorities to settle the disputes, they cannot have the support of the rank and file of workers who see clearly that our national life and security is tied up with the success of the defense program.

Both William Green, president of the A. F. of L., and John Frey, head of the metal-trades division, have repudiated the strike of the 1,700 machinists in the San Francisco shipbuilding industries, called in violation of the master agreement and tieing up millions in naval- and merchant-marine construction.

Philip Murray, head of the C. I. O., has described the strike of the Pacific Coast woodworkers as one against the National Defense Mediation Board, which means against the Government. Though the leader of this strike has called the National Defense Mediation Board "an all-out labor-busting and strike-breaking device," incendiary language of the most vicious sort, Mr. Murray has approved the settlement offered by the Board. Under the circumstances, there is every reason to suspect that the leader has other motives in the strike than the terms under discussion.

In the strike at the North American aircraft factory, producing badly needed planes for the United States and Great Britain, the effort of the National Defense Mediation Board to secure a postponement was called by the leader "stalling the workers." The Board had secured the promise of the leaders not to strike while a basis of settlement was being worked out, but they issued the order nevertheless.

This strike, as well as the other two on the west coast, has been severely condemned by spokesmen for the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O who are members of the Labor Policy Advisory Committee associated with Sidney Hillman's labor section of the O. P. M.

The unions and their leaders responsible for these three strikes have not a leg to stand upon in justification for the continuation of the disputes. They have been repudiated by national leaders of labor. They have defied the efforts of the National Defense Mediation Board. They have flaunted public opinion. And, worst of all, they have put to shame the thousands of conscientious employees in defense industries who are working up to the point of fatigue to get out production.

Now the President has intervened in the North American strike with the threat of seizure, or nationalization, of the plant unless the workers return.

In view of the fact that the North American strike, like the other two, had lost face and had been catalogued as the work of an irresponsible minority, the President's threat to intervene by seizure deserves examination for its possible effect upon the all-important issue of production for national defense and aid to Britain.

Let us examine what happened in France when, for other reasons, the Blum government in the summer of 1936 ordered the nationalization of war industries and started to take over the aircraft industry. The decision, together with the reform program of the Blum government, had an upsetting effect upon French economy and finances; production declined while Germany was working night and day to rearm. The extension of state control over industry was one of the causes of France's debacle.

Remember, the nationalization was ordered and started in the summer of 1936, with particular emphasis upon the aircraft industry. In March of 1938 accounts described the French aircraft and armaments industries as "virtually paralyzed." France, like the United States, had a paper program of aircraft construction calling for 5,000 modern planes to cost 16,000,000,000 francs. Yet the average monthly output actually was only 38 planes in 1937 and at the end of 1938 was only 62.

The picture of tragic France, badly underequipped with modern tanks, motorized columns, the vital airplanes, and the other instruments of modern warfare, when she was met by the prepared German divisions, bears recalling to make the United States democracy wake up to the menace of lagging production.

France tried nationalization of war industries during crucial months—and the Republic is a comment on the failure.

It has been said that seizure of factories in this country would come only as a last resort. There is grave danger that seizure—or nationalization—will, as in France, have a serious effect upon production. The Army can take over a factory, but the Army cannot make bombers and pursuit planes. There is the question of management—whether in seized factories the Government will put in its own employees or agents or retain the men presently in charge. Again, when the Government interferes, it takes upon itself the responsibility of fixing wages and working condition. If it is found that the Government meets the terms of the strikers without much ado, there will be the natural inclination of workers in other factories to create a situation which will cause the Government to intervene in the expectation that an administration so favorable to labor will meet the terms they ask. Then again, seizure of factories may be a penalty for management absolutely blameless in an industrial dispute.

But the most important consideration is the capacity of government, through bureaucracy, to get out production as efficiently and as speedily as private management.

It is advisable, therefore, for public opinion to forget the drama of the threat to seize a factory and concentrate its attention upon what Government control will do to production, keeping in mind the lesson of France.

Production of Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. JOHNSON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

LETTER BY HON. GEORGE W. JOHNSON, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to Hon. William S. Knudsen, Director General, Office of Production Management:

JUNE 9, 1941.

Hon. WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN,
Director General, Office of Production Management,
Social Security Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KNUDSEN: Let me preface this communication with a preliminary statement. It is that I realize our country faces a grave and perilous crisis, and as a loyal and patriotic citizen, and as a Congressman, I stand ready to approve and help put forward every means and measure which will strengthen our national defense to the maximum possible point in the shortest possible time.

One matter that gives me much concern on this score is the proposal from T. V. A. to initiate the building of a series of ten new hydro-electric power dams on the rivers under its jurisdiction. There is no pretense that these additional dams are requisite to flood control or navigation. Their express and only justification is to augment T. V. A.'s pool of electric power.

T. V. A. Director, David E. Lilienthal, made a public address at Knoxville, Tenn., in which he pointed to the need for providing more electric power than was comprehended within T. V. A.'s present power program. He stated that the construction of ten dams and their related features, would cost an estimated quarter of a billion dollars. He, then, hastened to add, "That will seem a modest price to pay for the sense of security it will bring and an end to a feeling that this great country in its hour of great danger may be without the dire necessities for the defense of its independence."

I am sure all of us would agree that a quarter of a billion dollars would be a modest price to pay for security. Appropriations by Congress for national defense, in the hope of obtaining security, will be 100 times the cost of 10 more dams proposed by T. V. A.

Unfortunately, Mr. Lilienthal's blueprints for 10 more dams afford no present security whatsoever, for it would take years for their consummation. Furthermore, even if it were

possible by magic to bring them into being immediately, it is still a question whether these dams are a solution of the problem.

I am reliably informed that while the plants producing aluminum will be ready by about June 1942, the power will not be available. It had been assumed that all the power needed could be available from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. It is now established that less than 180,000 kilowatts will be free in these regions. While there are also immediately available about 60,000 kilowatts at Boulder, putting all together there would be only about 350,000 kilowatts free by the end of 1942. At which time a million kilowatts will be urgently needed.

The question is not the need for more electric power for the production of aluminum and other vital and critical defense requirements. We all concede that more power is needed. The question is not whether the Federal Government shall go further into the business of the generating and distributing of electric power. This, I may concede, though with misgivings.

The real question presented by the Lilienthal proposal is whether the construction of more water-power dams for more electric power in the present emergency is the best and the quickest way to get that power. I do not believe that it is.

What is the alternative? Steam plants to generate electricity with coal. It seems to me that here is a major question of policy which you and your agency might very properly study and give to Congress and the country the benefit of your conclusions.

Those who follow our efforts at "all out" defense are cognizant of the serious shortage of power that confronts our airplane program. President Roosevelt recently called for a tremendous step-up in the production of four-engined bombers to a rate of 500 a month. I have been informed that this means that our output of aluminum must be accelerated approximately 50 percent over the previous goal of 200,000,000 (b) pounds annually, and an increase of 300,000,000 pounds of magnesium yearly.

This, of course, means that we must develop adequate supplies of power quickly to meet this load. I have been told by some power experts that this will require not less than 1,000,000 kilowatts additional electric energy. According to these sources, probably not more than one-third of this total will be available by the end of 1942, without rationing civilian consumption, invoking priorities, or other drastic steps.

I have also been told that it will take only 12 months, perhaps less, to build the essential aluminum and magnesium plants, yet the T. V. A. proposal would require 2 years—too late to get the plants in production during this crucial period. For this reason, it seems to me, that we should consider immediately the possibility of adding steam plants, which can be placed in operation in approximately one-half the time of dams projected to increase hydroelectric power.

It is not my purpose to disparage the hydroelectric plants which the Government has already built or has in contemplation. Nothing is served now by debating whether the electric power generated in these plants could have been developed more economically in steam plants, or more desirably located. However, it seems to me that in the present circumstances, when the time element is so vital, when speed is so essential, when the demands upon the financial resources of the Government, upon the manpower of our Nation, and upon our material resources are so overwhelming that the right way to meet the requirements for additional electric power is to build coal-burning steam plants, and that the wrong way is to embark upon new water-power dams which will take twice as long to build and cost twice as much money and, when finished, are especially vulnerable to sabotage and to air attack, and are undependable with respect to rainfall and water supply.

It is pertinent to observe that T. V. A. came to Congress last year for permission to build a large steam plant at Watts Bar, in Tennessee, with the argument that it was a quick, economical way of augmenting T. V. A.'s facilities. The Watts Bar plant is scheduled to be constructed within the space of 18 months, and is ahead of schedule. Provision is already being made for doubling its installed capacity. It is my understanding that the Philadelphia Electric Co. is proceeding with the installation of two steam turbogenerators, whose combined power will exceed the entire output of the large hydroelectric power plant of this company at the Conowingo Dam.

I am also reliably informed that the greatly increased efficiency now prevailing in the generation of electricity in coal-burning steam plants puts an entirely different complexion on the comparative cost aspect, as between steam and hydro power. In the most modern steam plants it requires less than a pound of coal to generate 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. Here let me call attention to a recent report to the Senate by the Federal Power Commission, which concluded that, whereas it would cost in the vicinity of $90,000,000 to carry to completion the Passamaquoddy hydroelectric power project initiated some years ago, and now abandoned, that a steam plant could be built at that point for less than $15,000,000, to develop an equal amount of electric power, and that in actual operations, taking into account fuel costs, the cost of steam power at the switchboard would be less per kilowatt than the cost of water power.

May I call your attention to the expert opinion of Mr. Gano Dunn, the consultant in the O. P. M., on the question of power supply—an opinion which was presented at a hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee last summer in connection with T. V. A.'s request for funds to construct a steam plant. Mr. Dunn's statement reviewed the progressive diminution in the amount of coal required to generate electric power and said, "And today, in 1940, a new plant can produce a kilowatt-hour for 0.9 pound of coal. In that scaling down from 8 pounds of coal per kilowatt-hour to 0.9 pound of coal per kilowatt-hour, steam power passed water power, and is now much the cheaper power when costs are calculated on the same basis for each form of power."

In addition to the considerations of time and money, there are other factors in favor of turning to steam plants for additional electric power in the present emergency, instead of starting in to construct new dams to provide more water power. Steam plants may be scattered, in line with the policy of avoiding concentration of war industry. Steam plants eliminate the uncertainties of rainfall and water flow.

We know that hydroelectric power plants displace coal, not for a day or year but in perpetuity, and that every ton of coal lost means the loss in aggregate somewhere along the line of 1 day's labor and wage for one man. It is a wholly unnecessary sacrifice.

I trust, Mr. Knudsen, that you will pardon the length of this letter, but, obviously, the questions here raised go far beyond the immediate proposal of T. V. A. and the contemplated development of hydroelectric power at Grand Coulee, at Bonneville, and Boulder Dams. I shall anticipate your response and the expression of your views upon this pressing subject.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

Attitude of Texas People on Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Texas recently adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 68. Since it is stated that the resolution expresses the views of the people of Texas, I desire to insert the entire resolution in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 68

Whereas the history of Texas bears witness that the people of this State oppose to the last drop of blood, and the last breath in their bodies, tyranny and aggression; and that they love liberty even more than life itself; and Texas and Texans have never hesitated to enter the fray when this two-headed monster, tyranny and aggression, has threatened their homes and their ideals.

The bloody fields of San Jacinto, Goliad, and the Alamo give mute testimony to these facts; Shilo and the Wilderness in the Civil War, and the impetuous charge at San Juan Hill were altars upon which they made their sacrifices; and Chateau Thierry and the Meuse-Argonne confirm the willingess of Texans to make the ultimate sacrifice to preserve freedom, liberty, justice, and peace in all the world; and

Whereas two divergent philosophies of government are now embraced in a deadly struggle that has drawn into its flaming vortex most of the countries of Europe; and the totalitarian states have sworn to extirpate democracies and democratic people from the face of the earth, and are now at war with our ideals and our way of life that we cherish as a heritage; and Great Britain is the last remaining barricade sheltering our Nation from the forces of tyranny and aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Texas, speaking for the people of Texas inform the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States:

That the people of Texas, in these days of peril to ourselves and all democracies throughout the world, are unified behind the foreign policies of President Roosevelt, and desire that a firm policy toward the aggressor nation be maintained without thought of appeasement, and that Great Britain be given all possible aid until victory is won, so that the epitaph of Christian civilization may not be "too little and too late," and that steps be taken to impress upon both capital and labor the full realization of their responsibilities for national defense, so that strikes and lockouts may not occur and imperil the safety of this Nation and our civilization over a few pieces of silver; and

That Texans are and will remain true to their historic heritage, and are willing to make whatever sacrifice is necessary that our Nation and our posterity may live in peace, freedom, and liberty; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United

States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States, so that the President and the Congress and all the world may know that Texans still honor the principles of their fathers.

Civilian Defense Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give warning to those in charge of civilian defense organizations of Washington and the other places in the country to be most careful and cautious about the type of persons who volunteer for that service.

There are thousands upon thousands of Communists, Nazis, Fascists in our midst right here in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere in the country, whose purpose is the destruction of our Republic, and I am sure that every Member of Congress and a great majority of the American people are very anxious that steps be taken to effectively bar such radicals from obtaining membership in the home-defense forces where they could do untold damage to our national security by the same cunning tricks they have employed in many nations which have been the victims of such cancerous growth from within and have thus fallen prey to their enemies.

Mr. Speaker, unless we make sure that everybody in our civilian defense organizations is a 100-percent true American, then we might better not even attempt such an organization.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week thousands of citizens in Washington, D. C., will volunteer for the civilian defense of our Capital City, and I hope those in charge will exercise due care and caution that not one Communist, Nazi, or Fascist be enrolled. I would suggest that the searchlight of the F. B. I. and the Dies committee be turned on this list of volunteers, that should the names of any black sheep be found on that list, they might be relegated to the ash heap pronto.

Some may resent such investigation, but I would say that any sensible, true American should welcome the same, and furthermore they should insist upon such scrutiny by these two very efficient organizations.

While I am one of the great majority of Americans who does not feel an invasion of this country by any foreign nation or combination of nations can be made against a strong national defense here, yet I am aware that he who sows safety reaps happiness. Consequently, I am going to cooperate to the fullest extent with the civilian-defense program by acting in a cool, deliberate manner, and urge every loyal American to do likewise without fanning the flames of war fear and hysteria in any sense.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY RAILROAD YARDMASTERS OF NORTH AMERICA, INC.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc.:

Whereas it is a recognized fact that our American labor unions came into being as a means of protection to the workers against the unscrupulous and selfish individuals of industry who refused to better the workers' conditions, and, the workers being disorganized, had no means of effective bargaining; and

Whereas the majority of labor organizations founded for the purpose of collective bargaining have proved beyond a doubt that their aims, objectives, and achievements, through the years, have definitely established them as a permanent foundation, a guaranty to the workers' rights; and

Whereas through the activities of the labor organizations certain legislation has been passed intending to protect the natural prerogatives of the workers and their organizations; legislation guaranteeing the workers the right to collective bargaining by means of their own choosing; and

Whereas the intent of this legislation was to create a condition of harmony between the workers and their employers by setting up legal machinery as a means of further promoting the rights of labor through freedom of discrimination and exploitation for its followers; and

Whereas, though the intention of this labor legislation may have been to protect the rights of labor, it has been inadequate in many respects in that it has failed to free labor of unscrupulous and selfish individuals who are imposing on the workers in spite of present labor laws. It is a matter of common knowledge that labor is being exploited by individuals who are unscrupulous and selfish, and many of these individuals are to be found not only among the employers but right within the unions; and

Whereas these individuals, though unworthy, are able to operate under the present laws without restraint because the present labor laws have not set up a differential as to what type of person shall exercise the rights of labor guaranteed in the present statute; and

Whereas it is obvious that aliens, ex-convicts, absconders, and persons who have never worked at the occupation represented by their union are in official capacity, which places them in a position of controlling the destiny of legitimate workers and their unions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., in convention, urgently request the Senators and Congressmen of these United States to pass further labor legislation that will correct the present-day abuses by establishing a definite guarantee of the workers' rights to collective bargaining by means of their own choosing; and be it further

Resolved, That this legislation incorporate the following safeguards:

(1) Aliens to be ineligible to hold office in any labor union.

(2) Any person not actively engaged in the occupation represented by the respective union for at least 3 years prior to holding elective office to be ineligible.

(3) All officers of labor organizations handling the funds thereof to be adequately bonded.

(4) A financial statement to be rendered to every member at least once per annum.

(5) Jurisdictional disputes to be arbitrated without stoppage of work, and a 60-day "cool off" arbitrational period before a strike be considered legal; and be it further

Resolved, That we, who have for many years been operating in accordance with the five-point program of this resolution, sincerely believe that legislation making it mandatory to all labor organizations to operate likewise would play a major role in reducing labor troubles to a minimum, and thereby promote harmony between the workers, their employers, and the general public.

Loss Due to Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the work of Madam Perkins, Harry Bridges, Sidney Hillman, and other lesser apostles of the New Deal is producing results. By reason of the strikes in defense industries since the first of this year to April 30, we are short the equivalent to approximately 1,168 bombers, or 1,193 light tanks, or 9 destroyers.

From January 1 to April 30, 1941, there were 70 defense strikes according to the records of the O. P. M., the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the United States Conciliation Service. These 70 strikes involved 203,915 men and a loss of 2,237,774 man-days. On a basis of an 8-hour day this amounts to a loss of 17,902,192 man-hours.

The Army Air Corps according to Major Timberlake estimates that 16,000 man-hours are required to produce a B–24D bomber.

The Ordnance Department of the Army according to Major Warner estimates that 15,000 man-hours are required to produce a light tank.

The Navy Department's Public Relations Division estimates that 1,800,000 man-hours are required to build a destroyer.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to this situation is not confiscation of all property in

America and a complete socialization of our country. This House should, without further delay, enact whatever legislation is necessary. The handling of our labor problems in defense industries should be taken away from the reformers and left-wingers and turned over to patriotic Americans, who consider the defense of our Republic the paramount objective.

President Roosevelt Plotting for an "Incident" in the Atlantic To Plunge United States Into Active War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of today:

[From the Washington Post of June 9, 1941]

ATTACK ON SUB BY UNITED STATES SHIP REPORTED—DESTROYER SAID TO HAVE DROPPED DEPTH BOMBS; SECOND ENCOUNTER REVEALED

(By Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner)

Nothing better illustrates the strangely equivocal position in which present war policy places this country than the undisclosed episodes of the Atlantic patrol. In one case, rather more than a month ago, an encounter between German and American warcraft at sea very nearly terminated in an attack by the Germans. In another, slightly more recent, an attack on what was believed to be a German submarine was actually made by an American destroyer.

No details of the first episode are available, but the basic facts of the second are known. The destroyer, the name of which cannot be ascertained, was picking up survivors from a British vessel sunk not far from the coast of Greenland. While the operation was in progress the destroyer's detecting device announced the approach of a submarine. The submarine could only have been German. It was virtually certain to use its torpedoes, as semidarkness concealed the nationality of the American ship. And the commander of the destroyer accordingly dropped three depth charges.

SHOOTING ALREADY

Thus, although the President is waiting for the Germans to shoot first, the truth is that there has been shooting already. The truth may be denied—indeed, it is likely to be. The outcome of the episode is a mystery, since the light was too poor for the commander of the destroyer to make certain that the submarine really was nearby, or to guess whether the depth charges had taken effect. But official denials cannot alter either the episode's basic facts, or its broad meaning.

The episode's meaning is pretty obvious. The Atlantic patrol in itself is not effective. Even now it has not been extended to cover the most dangerous waters, yet four British ships have recently been sunk in the part of the ocean it supposedly guards. The President, all his most important advisers, and the War and Navy Departments hope, however, that the patrol will produce an incident to serve as the pretext for really effective action by this country. The interest of the Germans is to avoid such an incident. It is perfectly possible that the submarine was in fact sunk, and that the Germans have suppressed all public complaint in order to keep public opinion here in its present lulled condition. Nevertheless, as the episode described above pretty clearly demonstrates, the chances are strong that an incident will eventually occur.

TIME IS SHORT

The trouble with that is the word "eventually." The time is now desperately short. In his desire for a pretext for the action the President wants to take and knows he must take, he is wasting days and weeks that may forever alter the balance of the war.

The Navy, as has been stated before in this space, is fully ready to act. Possibly measures may soon be taken to solve the minor aspects of the Atlantic problem. It is far from improbable that the preventive occupation of the Azores and the Cape Verdes, or the garrisoning of Iceland, will be ordered in the near future. But among the men who should know the President's intentions, if anyone does, the prevailing opinion still is that all-out shipping protection will not be instituted for some time, unless an incident occurs, even though other aggressive steps are taken.

There is considerable confusion about the nature of an all-out system of shipping protection, chiefly arising from the President's repeated assertion that convoys are outmoded. The President is perfectly correct in his assertion, if he is understood as he unquestionably means to be—that convoying alone is no longer good enough. But what most uninformed persons have gathered from the President's words is far from being the truth. While combined air and naval action and constant sweeping of the sea lanes are also highly important, it is still essential to accompany merchant ships crossing the Atlantic with protective escort vessels.

This is so because 50 percent of the damage at sea is still done by the submarine. Constant, aggressive sweeping of the sealanes virtually removes the threat from commerce raiders, and greatly diminishes the threat from the long-range bombers, which together do the other 50 percent of the damage. But the submarine is hardly susceptible to a mere sweeping operation. If we had enough aircraft and warships to keep within range of most of the submarines at sea most of the time, a sweeping operation would be effective. Then the submarines would have to remain submerged most of the time, and their batteries would run down. Unfortunately, there are several million square miles of ocean to be cleared. Submarines sight enemy warships and aircraft as soon as they are sighted themselves, and submerge at once. Thus submarines are only slightly hampered by a sweeping operation.

In short, the only answer to the submarine menace, in the opinion of the best naval minds, is the presence of warcraft which can attack the submarines when they attack merchant ships. If the President will face the changes wrought by onrushing events and face the unwisdom of delaying action in hopes of a pretext for action, the ablest men in our Navy are convinced the battle of the Atlantic can be won both quickly and gloriously. On the other hand, the men around the President who really know the war picture are equally strong in the belief that the war may be lost if action is much further delayed.

National Daylight Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT BY THE MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following memorandum submitted to the Office of Production Management by the Merchants' Association of New York setting forth pertinent reasons why national daylight saving should be adopted in the current emergency for certain periods of the year:

National daylight saving was in effect throughout the Nation by act of Congress from March 31, 1918, until the last Sunday in October 1919, during two 7-month periods. Since the repeal of the national daylight-saving law it has been extended by State and community action to embrace a large section of the New England and Middle Atlantic States, has extended through localities as far west as Chicago, and has touched some cities in the Rocky Mountain area.

In this memorandum the benefits derived from the practice are treated on a purely factual basis.

SAVING OF FUEL AND POWER

An accurate estimate of the reduction in kilowatt-hours consumed as a result of national daylight saving would not be possible. However, we are informed from authoritative sources having close connection with the electric-power industry that the average savings would probably amount to around 2 percent. It is estimated, roughly, that in those communities which are now on daylight saving there will be a reduced consumption throughout the daylight-saving period of approximately 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours and that if the practice should be extended to the entire United States for the same period the savings in power would be doubled, giving a total reduction of around 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

From the standpoint of savings to customers, the reduction in the electrical industry's revenues that would result from national daylight saving is roughly estimated at $50,000,000 a year, based on the probable reduction in consumption from a total annual output of 150,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The electrical industry is naturally opposed to any further extension of daylight saving. This industry contends that average spare generating capacity exceeds 30 percent. Obviously, the saving in current is more important in industrial communities where there may be a shortage of power than elsewhere. In view, however, of the current drought, which has reduced power potentialities of some plants and of the necessity for conserving every bit of energy for the gigantic task ahead, it would seem that an additional possible saving of 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours would be well worth considering.

Some additional data on the subject are available. Senator William H. Calder in an article published on October 28, 1918, stated

that according to estimates of the United States Fuel Administrator one and a quarter million tons of coal had been saved that year by pushing the clocks ahead. Senator Calder further stated that definite reports from St. Louis showed a saving of 17.5 tons for each thousand of population on a 7 months' basis. The saving in France for a 3½ months' period was fixed at 250,000 tons, which would make a saving of 12.5 tons for each thousand of population in a 7 months' period, according to the Fuel Administration.

Another factor in conservation is the opportunities afforded to cultivate home gardens to increase food supplies.

INCREASE OF PRODUCTION

Increase in production is a complement of daylight saving which cannot be expressed in statistical terms. Factors which enter into the increase in production include such items as decrease in accidents, efficiency of employees, morale, and health. These will be treated under separate headings.

DECREASE IN ACCIDENTS

Accurate studies have proved that a majority of the industrial accidents occur during the closing hours of the day, when artificial light is required. Fatigue is a contributing factor. Daylight saving decreases the need for working under artificial light. It permits a larger part of the work to be performed in the relatively cool morning hours. It thus has the effect of increasing efficiency and reducing fatigue. In instances where overtime work is required, it increases the proportion of the work that may be done during daylight hours. In the case of double shifts it may permit the second shift to do a part of its work under daylight conditions.

Related to this subject are data compiled in 1939 concerning automobile accidents. These showed that in that year 2,570 fatal accidents occurred between 6 and 7 p. m., 2,860 between 7 and 8 p. m., these constituting 16.9 percent of all the fatal accidents. The hour between 5 and 6 p. m. showed 2,150 fatal accidents, constituting 6.7 percent of the total. Thus a large percentage of the automobile deaths were shown to be in the early evening, whereas the heaviest automobile traffic is ordinarily in the daytime. It is asserted that the motor-vehicle death rate based on mileage is at least three times as high by night as by day. These figures are in conformity with the statement made above that industrial accidents occur more frequently during the closing hours of the day. The lesser eye strain experienced by the workman under natural light is obvious.

MORALE

All experience shows that the contented workman is the productive workman. Workmen are contented as they are enabled to live and work under satisfactory conditions. There is ample evidence that the workman does like daylight saving. It is a well-known fact that the largest part of the opposition to daylight saving comes from the rural districts. Definite proof of the attitude of the working man toward daylight saving is found in a poll taken by the Merchants' Association of New York in 1921 among the employees of several hundred commercial and industrial establishments. Approximately 300,000 ballots were cast. Ninety-five percent of them voted in favor of a daylight-saving law. In working against the repeal of the New York State daylight-saving law in 1920, James P. Holland, then president of the New York State Federation of Labor, stated that the wage earners had benefited physically, mentally, and morally from the operation of the law.

HEALTH

There is ample evidence that the practice of daylight saving promotes the health of both the workman and the community. Among the organizations that have endorsed the practice when it was under consideration at an earlier date were the American Medical Association, the National Tuberculosis Association, and many doctors. The late Senator Royal S. Copeland, then health commissioner of New York City, had this to say:

"I have never been able to understand how the opponents of daylight saving could deny the good the scheme has accomplished for the public health. It is my conviction that this hour of daylight has taken into the fresh air and sunlight thousands, and indeed millions, of people who otherwise would not have the opportunity. Unquestionably this benefit has resulted in great good to the public. If there were no other reasons than the argument in favor of improved health, that would be sufficient, in my opinion, for the daylight saving."

WHAT OTHER NATIONS DO

Perhaps the best proof of the universal opinion that daylight saving is a necessary addition to the national economy in times of stress is found in the experience of other countries both in the first World War and in the present conflict. Great Britain has had her clocks advanced for 1 hour for more than a year and for the present summer has advanced them for 2 hours. Unoccupied France has advanced her clocks for 2 hours. Germany and the German-occupied countries use daylight saving. Italy has advanced her clocks. Mexico has advanced her clocks 1 hour as a fuel and power conservation measure. Other countries which make use of daylight saving include Cuba, Egypt, Greece (prior to occupation), Iceland, New Zealand, Portugal, and parts of China. In all of these countries daylight saving is freely recognized as a means of conservation and of promoting efficiency. The Canadian Government by order in council required all of those communities which observed daylight saving in the summer of 1940 to extend it as a war measure indefinitely.

The United States cannot afford to be on a less efficient basis than the rest of the world.

VIEW OF INDUSTRY

Some further evidence of what production interests think of daylight saving is found in a number of communications received by the Merchants' Association and by Members of Congress when the repeal of the national daylight saving law of 1918–19 was first proposed. Of the many communications available the following may be of interest to the O. P. M.:

Published June 9, 1919

Statement by National Association of Manufacturers:

"We are interested keenly in this matter and have it under observation. We are of the opinion the repeal of this law would be a serious mistake."

Statement by American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers:

"The American Association is unalterably opposed to the repeal of the daylight saving law. Just before the expiration of the last Congress we communicated with all our members urging them to communicate with their Congressmen—against the repeal. It now appears that we shall have to renew our endeavors."

Telegram to Congressman from a representative of General Electric Co.:

"I am writing to you as a resident of the seventeenth district to say that I am strongly in favor of daylight saving; it has been a conserver of time and effort. A large proportion of the several hundred employees of this office live in the outskirts of the city or suburbs and spend from three-quarters of an hour to 2 hours each morning and evening in traveling between their homes and the office. Daylight saving has enabled them to spend more of the daylight hours with their families either in doing useful work or outdoor recreation. It results in economy in the use of electricity for lighting, which, although not directly to the benefit of our industry, is to the benefit of the community in its conservation of energy.

"I hope you are in favor of daylight saving and will work against the adoption of the rider for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which is now before you as part of the agricultural appropriation bill."

Telegram to New York Senators from a representative of American Locomotive Sales Corporation:

"My attention has been directed to the pernicious rider attached to the agricultural appropriation bill calling for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. I trust that you will use every effort to prevent the repeal of a law that has demonstrated such decided merit from the point of view of economy in coal consumption as well as affording longer leisure daylight hours to our large working population."

Telegram from Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.:

"The handling and maintenance of American steamers and the consequent steady flow of supplies to allied countries would, in our opinion, lose a great portion of its efficiency if the present daylight-saving law should be repealed."

Published June 16, 1919

Statement by International Association of Garment Manufacturers:

"We are very anxious to do all that we can to be of assistance in defeating the repeal of the daylight-saving law. In accordance with the decision of our board of directors, we are requesting all of our members to write or wire their Congressmen concerning this proposition, and as soon as you are thoroughly in touch with the situation at Washington, we would suggest further that you may use our name and favorable statement in any way you think best."

Conditions prevailing today are so similar to those prevailing when the national law was enacted that the same arguments that prevailed then are pertinent.

Letter from the Solvay Process Co. in reference to daylight saving law in New York State:

"THE SOLVAY PROCESS CO.,
"*Syracuse, N. Y., February 8, 1941.*

"MR. WILLIAM FELLOWES MORGAN,
President, the Merchants' Association of New York.

"DEAR SIR: I have your telegram and letter of February 7, regarding the daylight saving law.

"We are very much interested in retention of daylight saving for 5 months. We believe that it is the most beneficial thing for our men and for our officials and we want to do anything we can to retain it.

"We are writing today to our representatives as urgently as possible. We are also asking a number of our people to write to our representatives, and we are making an effort to have the manufacturers' association here take up the matter actively and get the other business interests of the city interested in an effort to get behind the movement. If there is anything else we can do, please let us know.

"Yours very truly,
"THE SOLVAY PROCESS CO.,
"M. H. KNOPP, *Vice President.*"

CONFUSION

The current confusion due to a diversity of practices in time observance is a source of annoyance and a hindrance to maximum efficiency. The growing confusion and danger resulting from the difference in Federal, State, and municipal time standards have led the Interstate Commerce Commission to recommend to Congress the amendment of the Standard Time Act. A study of the Merchants' Association's survey of daylight-saving communities observing summer time for the

season of 1941 will emphasize this. New Hampshire and Massachusetts require the observance of daylight-saving time by State law. It is practically universally observed in Connecticut and New Jersey, in all except the rural commodities of New York and Maine, in most of Rhode Island, in large sections of Vermont, and by a large majority of the population of Pennsylvania. The northern part of Indiana has daylight saving, while the southern part is on central time. Similar differences exist in the State of Illinois. Georgia has shifted a part of the State from central time to eastern standard time in order to get the benefits of daylight saving. Several cities in Kentucky observe daylight saving. A peculiar situation exists in Michigan. The local standard prescribed by State law for the entire State is eastern standard time, but the Federal standard for the northern part of Michigan is central time. Some municipalities use the Federal standard (central time), others use the State standard (eastern time), while a third group observe daylight saving by shifting from the Federal standard to the State standard during the summer.

All of the above creates a hodgepodge of times, which could be corrected by suitable legislation in connection with a national daylight-saving law.

CONCLUSION

It is necessary to conclude from a study of all the facts that a national daylight-saving law covering the period from the last Sunday in March until the last Sunday in October would be of distinct benefit to the United States. Were we not in a national emergency, it would probably be difficult to enact such a law, but since we are in such an emergency calling for the exercise of maximum efficiency and every productive effort, it seems plain that the country should to that extent take the same course as other nations and avail itself of this means of conserving resources and increasing efficiency.

Respectfully submitted.

THE MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION
OF NEW YORK,
By FRANK L. HOPKINS.

Increase of Federal Gas Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Colorado expresses in language easily understood what our people of Colorado think of increasing the Federal gasoline tax:

[From Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., May 30, 1941]

GAS-TAX RAISE UNJUSTIFIED, CARR ASSERTS

There is no justification for a proposed increase of 1 cent in the Federal gasoline tax for the purpose of conserving petroleum supplies, Governor Carr said.

"There is plenty of petroleum, ample refining capacity to supply the demand," he said. "Only about 75 percent of our capacity is being utilized to meet present all-time peak demands.

"As far as Colorado is concerned, the tax would be injurious in that it would reduce consumption of gasoline and cut into highway-department revenues," he said.

"We now pay 4 cents State tax and 1½ cents Federal tax on each gallon of gasoline," he said. "In 1940, alone, operators of some 352,000 motor vehicles paid Federal and State gasoline and oil taxes aggregating twelve and one-half million dollars.

"In motor-vehicle registration fees, specific ownership taxes, motor-carrier or road taxes, inspection fees, titles, licenses, and sales taxes, Colorado motorists contributed another $7,300,000, or $56 for each vehicle."

Farmer Boys Go to War—Convicts Remain at Home, Where They Can Sabotage National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that we are not fooling all of the people by just making motions is evident from a letter which came in under air mail from Beverly Hills, Calif. The gentleman who wrote it seems familiar with the subject matter. He writes:

MAY 22, 1941.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your printed statement in the RECORD regarding Willie Bioff prompts me to enclose a clipping that you may know the outcome of his trial which was set for June 24.

What dire straits our national-defense program must be in when Willie Bioff, swindler, convicted flesh peddler, keeper of bawdy houses, gangster, labor racketeer, alleged bribe taker, and income-tax evader is the only suitable and available man to keep the wheels rolling.

My, my, Mr. Congressman, is that the sort of government we are spending billions of dollars to protect and perpetuate?

Who are these Government officials who agreed it was "very essential"?

Fred E. Pelton, "film producers' coordinator" who gave Bioff this schedule of "highly important" films relating to national defense is employed by the motion-picture-studio leaders involved in Bioff's income-tax case.

Pelton formerly worked for Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer studio (controlled by Joe Schenck's brother Nick) at a time truckloads of material intended for picture production checked into the studio through one gate, was tallied and checked for payment, and then mysteriously disappeared through another gate. (Metro charges their stockholders 40 percent overhead on all pictures.)

Pelton wasn't the only studio official helping to maintain the 40-percent overhead, so he was transferred to the Metro studio in England. He scurried back to America at the first sound of war rumbling and a place was created for him as "film producers' labor coordinator."

The Congress of the United States struggle manfully to enact laws and place statutes on the books for general public welfare; but what happens to a Republic when the laws are flaunted and ridiculed, in the face of the public, by exponents of arrogance, greed, and bribery?

What has happened to the investigating powers of Congress? Motions are presented to investigate the motion-picture industry (Boren), also many other abuses in both Houses of Congress, but they all die in committee.

Who, may I ask, are the committee fooling, the public?

No, my friend, not these days.

They only fool themselves and give the individual Congressman or Senator the merry run-a-round, much to the public's disgust.

It is nearing the time some of the buried motions are revived and brought to life before democracy and all this Republic stands for is layed out solemnly beside them in the committee burial grounds of pressure politics.

Are we to be a government of laws conscientiously enforced or are we to become a government of bribery, political conspiracy, dedicated to privileged men? That question must be answered correctly if the government of our forefathers is to endure.

One of the clippings which he enclosed from the Los Angeles Examiner of May 20, 1941, is captioned "Bioff wins delay in United States Tax Hearing" and continues:

TRIAL OF FILM LABOR LEADER POSTPONED ON GROUNDS HE IS ESSENTIAL TO DEFENSE PROGRAM

Willie Bioff, Hollywood film labor leader, will not go to trial in Federal court on June 24 as scheduled on an indictment charging he evaded payment of approximately $85,000 in income tax for 1936 and 1937.

This was assured yesterday when Bioff's attorney, George M. Breslin, appeared before Senior Federal Judge Paul J. McCormick and requested a continuance on the grounds that film workers represented by Bioff were essential to national defense during the coming few months.

George E. Browne, president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, stated—

that Fred E. Pelton, film producers' labor coordinator, had given Bioff a schedule of highly important films relating to national defense, including private pictures of engine production, Army maneuvers, and various technical data to be exhibited at private showings to military officials.

Browne said, according to Breslin, that Bioff, former Hollywood I. A. T. S. E. chief, was the "only suitable and available man" to keep the wheels rolling and prevent strikes in other jurisdictions where Hollywood technicians were sent to produce military-training films. He declared Government officials had agreed it was "very essential" that there be no interruption, either through labor or technical reasons, in production of the military films.

Judge McCormick continued the Bioff tax-evasion trial to the September calendar, at which time it will be given a new trial date.

"ONLY MAN AVAILABLE"

In various items submitted to support Bioff's contention that his services were "indispensable to the Government," Browne urged that Bioff was the "only labor official available" who could give the necessary orders to assure "immediate shooting" at widely separated Army posts and industrial centers in connection with the Government films.

I have no way of knowing personally how much of the newspaper item is an accurate statement, but experience inclines one to the belief that newspapers do not print articles which, if untrue, would be libelous.

What the folks back home are beginning to think of Congressmen is indicated by the letter printed above. If we would retain the respect of our home folks, is it not about time that we produce results here in Washington?

Threat to Unity Deplored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

LETTER FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter which appeared in the New York Times on June 7, 1941:

[From the New York Times of June 7, 1941]

THREAT TO UNITY DEPLORED—FOMENTING GROUP DISCORD IN AMERICA REGARDED AS AID TO THE ENEMY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It would be a mistake to permit the dramatic and tragic death of Representative Edelstein to overshadow the seriousness of the situation to which he referred in his last speech.

Representative RANKIN's references to "a little group of our international Jewish bankers," which brought Mr. Edelstein to his feet in protest, was unfortunately not an isolated congressional expression of a misguided and bigoted way of thinking. There have been others before him, and they have said equally dangerous things.

There was, for example, Senator WHEELER, who managed to pick out a predominantly Jewish list of "international bankers" for attack in a speech February 28. There was Representative LAMBERTSON, who singled out a group of Jews as the implied nucleus of what he called the war crowd. There was Senator RUFUS C. HOLMAN, who on March 4 paid tribute to Adolf Hitler because "he broke the control of these internationalists over the common people of Germany"; and it was clear that Mr. HOLMAN meant Jews when he said "internationalists." And, finally, there was Mr. RANKIN himself, with his gibe at "our international Jewish bankers."

Representative Edelstein's reply was truthful, but he did not say all there was to be said. For he simply pointed out the facts—that there are few "Jewish international bankers," that they are not at all so important as men of finance who happen to be Christian, and that the meeting to which Mr. RANKIN objected was "entirely controlled by persons other than Jewish bankers."

But to refute these insinuations and accusations is not enough. It is far more important to remember how dangerous such loose, irresponsible talk is, especially in this period of unlimited national emergency. For such talk is not merely an insult to the dignity of the Congress of the United States; not merely an insult to the intelligence of the American people. Worse than that, this strategy is one which plays directly into the hands of Adolf Hitler and his Nazi propaganda machine.

Certainly there is nothing that the National Socialists of Germany desire more than a confusion of issues in our democracy by this irrelevant exploitation of prejudices against American citizens of the Jewish faith. However innocent the strategy may have been, it is also sinister and perhaps catastrophic because it is a threat to the unity of the American people.

In their drive for world conquest the Nazis have time and again employed the ancient technique, "Divide and conquer." They have time and again tried to set one group against another in order to create discord, disunity, and utter weakness. They set the French against the British; they set labor against industry, and they set Christian against Jew.

The people of America will be impotent if they are not united. And they cannot be united if there is distrust, suspicion, tension among the groups who make up our American population. The fomenting of group hatred, therefore, is a mightier weapon against our free way of life than would be a hundred Nazi air raids over New York City.

It is too bad that Representative Edelstein had to die to bring this explosive situation to the attention of the American people. Let us at least make sure that he has not died in vain.

C. D. JACKSON,
President, Council for Democracy.
NEW YORK, *June 5, 1941.*

The Food-Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution recently adopted by the Illinois House of Representatives:

House Resolution 21

Whereas the Federal Government has in operation a plan known as the food-stamp plan for the benefit of the workers on W. P. A. and those with low income, and also those receiving old-age assistance as well as the recipients of direct welfare; and

Whereas this food-stamp plan has proven to be a great boon in increasing the purchasing power of these people, as well as increasing their food supply in some instances as much as 50 percent on every dollar spent; and

Whereas this increase in food has and will do much to reduce the many illnesses that undernourished people are subject to, especially among the children of the lower wage group; and

Whereas there are many workers who have only part-time employment, such as coal miners, and others who receive during periods of unemployment, benefits under the Unemployment Compensation Act; and

Whereas in many instances they only receive the minimum pay under this act which at present is only $7 per week, some receive the maximum of $16 per week, yet in many instances, their benefits are lower than the maximum W. P. A. rate of $52 per month: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Illinois go on record recommending to the Congress of the United States, that the Federal food-stamp plan be amended to include all recipients of unemployment insurance and all others in the low-wage brackets whose salary or incomes are lower or equal to the wages received by W. P. A. workers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of the House of Representatives and to the Senators of the State of Illinois, the President of the United States, and to Director, Unemployment Relief Commission, Washington, D. C., by the secretary of state.

Adopted by the House, June 4, 1941.

ELMER J. SCHNACKENBURG,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
R. R. RANDOLPH,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Necessity for Suppression of Strikes on National-Defense Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the serious effects of strikes on our national-defense projects become more alarming from day to day. At this very moment, when the House is considering a $10,000,000,000 appropriation bill, outlaw strikers in some of our west-coast factories engaged in manufacturing defense materials are openly defying the authority and power of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will no longer tolerate this situation, and I sincerely hope that before this day ends the House of Representatives will have taken appropriate action to thwart the purposes and designs of certain subversive groups that have gotten into control of some of our labor organizations. The heart of American labor is sound and loyal and can be depended upon in the great emergency we are now facing.

Mr. Speaker, the splendid people of the district which I have the honor to represent want nothing left undone to insure the preservation of our Nation and our American way of life. This deep feeling and strong sentiment of my people prompted the junior chamber of commerce of the city of Caruthersville, Mo., to adopt the following expressive resolutions which I insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

Whereas the United States of America is now faced with the most acute crisis in the Nation's history in which the liberties, security, and happiness of our citizens are gravely imperiled; and

Whereas we have been emphatically shown by the fall of one free nation after another that only industrial capacity, linked with manpower, can halt the onward march of aggression; and

Whereas our ability to defend ourselves is being grievously handicapped by numerous and protracted strikes in defense industries, and by reason thereof fear and uncertainty are rising in the minds of our citizens; and

Whereas the age bracket of the Junior Chamber of Commerce organizations coincides with the age bracket of the Selective Service Training Act; and

Whereas many of our members from all over the Nation have been, and will be, inducted into the military service of our land, with great financial loss to themselves but with unquestioned patriotism and willingness on their part; and

Whereas the spirit of our people and of our Nation demands equal treatment of all of our citizens engaged in a great effort in order that there may be laid upon every American the same obligation for the support and maintenance of our democratic way of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Caruthersville Junior Chamber of Commerce in regular meeting assembled, That to make our Nation safe and strong in the crucial days to come, our Government should swiftly adopt a policy of equal justice and consistency for American manpower and American industry; that Congress and the President should act to stop, at once, strikes in defense industries and adjust immediately the differences between capital and labor, to the end that in event of an attack upon our democracy the citizen soldier of the United States will have the tools with which to do the job; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each of the following: The President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Senators from the State of Missouri, and the Representative from the Tenth Congressional District of the State of Missouri; and that a copy hereof be given to the press for publication.

Passed this 2d day of June 1941.

Attest:

L. B. FISHER,
President.
JERE KINGSBURY,
Secretary.

The Property Seizure Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. WALTER C. PLOESER, OF MISSOURI

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by my colleague from Missouri, Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER, over station KMOX, St. Louis, Mo., June 7, 1941:

CONFISCATION

Station KMOX is rendering an exceptional public service to its listeners by bringing government closer to the people, through the medium of the present series of weekly broadcasts entitled "A Visit From Your Congressman." As your Member of Congress from the Twelfth Missouri District, I am indeed grateful for the opportunity of participating in this program.

There are many pertinent subjects which I would have enjoyed discussing this evening, but, during the present week, two identical bills have been introduced in Congress which have brought to a crisis the tremendous issue of today. These bills might easily transcend in importance everything which has gone before. Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and Representative ANDREW MAY, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, introduced identical bills granting authority to the President of the United States, and those of his personal choosing, to seize and confiscate property of any kind or character.

So distasteful was this measure to my congressional colleague, ANDREW MAY, that he introduced the bill with the notation "by request." Later, speaking for the press, Congressman MAY said, and I am quoting from the press report: "If I don't like 'em, I say 'By request.' If I like 'em, I put 'em straight." Referring directly to the contents of this bill, MAY was quoted as saying: "It's just dictatorship—raw and unashamed."

From my own observation, I do not mind telling you that when the contents of the May bill became known, the temperature in the House cloakroom rose rapidly, and I must confess mine kept pace with the others. Members of both parties were incensed. This bill is unquestionably the most drastic dictatorial measure ever submitted to any Congress since the founding of the Republic.

Pending a title, the bill is being referred to by many as the property-seizure bill. I prefer, however, to call it the confiscation bill, for it gives the President complete authority to confiscate any or all property, should he so desire. Frankly, as the bill is now written it would complete the most absolute dictatorship in the world today.

I persist in the belief that in the proper functioning of our representative form of government, a republic, the people are entitled to be completely informed.

Once you have read this proposed legislation, there will be little doubt left in your minds as to its intention. Do not mistake the language. I now read briefly from the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That during any period of national emergency proclaimed by the President, the President is authorized when he deems it in the interest of national defense, (a) to requisition and take over, either temporarily or permanently, property of any kind or character, whether real or personal, tangible or intangible, or any part thereof, or any right or interest therein or with respect thereto, whether by virtue of contract, patent, license, or otherwise."

There are continuing provisions in the bill which are too long for me to read now, but none of them lessen or restrict the powers granted in this first section that I have just read. Think of what these words mean: "That during any period of national emergency proclaimed by the President, the President is authorized, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, to requisition and take over, either temporarily or permanently, property of any kind or character, whether real or personal, or otherwise.

In simpler language, the President would have the power, under this bill, H. R. 4949, to take any or all of your property, your business, your money, your home, your bank account, your clothing, your automobile, your savings, your everything, by which, and with which you live. Imagine this—in a democracy. Such an attempt causes us to wonder: Are we defending democracy or are we using the excuse of defense to destroy it?

I am not of the belief that any man living would attempt to confiscate your property and my property on a wholesale, take-all basis, at least not from Americans. The point I am making is that the President, under this bill if enacted into law, could do this. It follows naturally that with such power the President could say to me as a Member of Congress, "You do my bidding regardless of the interest of your people or I will take everything you own." He could do the same thing to you. This isn't conscription in any sense; it is confiscation, "unashamed." Now, I do not believe this bill will pass the Congress in its present form. I am hopeful that it will not pass at all.

The administration has already begun to partially back away. This bill, it seems, originated in the Office of Secretary of War, Stimson. The White House claims to have never read the measure before its introduction. This seems odd—because all of us in Washington know that the Secretary of War or any other Cabinet member never proceeds in any major move without the complete approval of the President. Even the public speeches of the Cabinet members are carefully edited before their release. I am indeed sorry that I must confess that, had a bad reaction been avoided, there would have been no disclaimer from the White House as to authorship.

Let me remind you that the President of the United States now has powers greater than any other President ever had. For almost 8½ years we have been under continuing emergencies of one form or another. The President asked for powers to cope with the emergencies and they were granted. Then, too, the war-time emergency legislation written during the last World War is for the most part—still the law of the land. Under these laws, now on the statute books, the President can if he so desires, take over and operate any plant that fails to cooperate in the production of defense materials. He can correct or alleviate any un-American situation which hampers our defense. President Wilson had these powers—President Roosevelt has them now. Then why this new request for complete confiscatory power?

Surely you and I as Americans must awaken to the trend to completely destroy our form of government and the liberty that we enjoy.

Oh, what crimes are committed in the name of democracy.

You have as much right to be heard as any living American, and I implore you to make yourselves heard on this subject. Tell your Member of Congress and your Senators that this bill, H. R. 4949, or ~~4-9-4-9~~, and the identical Senate bill go too far—much too far—that they must be defeated.

Erection of Monument to Richard S. Scarrem at Eddyville, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, when the Revolutionary War was fought, the region west of the Mississippi was still largely an uncharted and an unexplored wilderness as far as white habitation was concerned, and in the State of Iowa there are probably buried not to exceed four or five veterans of the Revolutionary War.

In the community cemetery at Eddyville, Iowa, one of these heroes is resting in peace—Richard S. Scarrem—who served in the Saratoga campaign that resulted in the surrender of General Burgoyne and his army, probably the turning point of the war. On Memorial Day this year the American Legion, D. A. R., Lions Club, other civic organizations and public-spirited men, including Superintendent of Schools L. C. Taylor and others, cooperated in erecting a monument to Richard S. Scarrem, and with an appropriate program dedicated it to the memory of Richard Scarrem, erected a flagpole, and gave a ceremony in honor of heroes of all wars.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news story by C. E. Baldwin in the Eddyville (Iowa) Tribune of June 5, 1941, and two telegrams, one from the Governor of the State and one from myself, concerning this important event.

The matter follows:

One of the outstanding Decoration Day services observed in Eddyville was held Friday when district and State officials of the American Legion, D. A. R., Lions, and other organizations gathered to dedicate the memorial to Richard J. Scarrem, Mahaska County's only Revolutionary War veteran and the new soldiers' and sailors' plot in Highland Cemetery.

The plot is located in the Eddyville Cemetery, one of the oldest in the new purchase and has the distinction of being in a grounds that has buried therein soldiers of every war that the United States has ever fought.

In addition to Scarrem of the Revolution it includes: Col. James Vance, War of 1812; William Jenkins, of the Seminole War (1837); E. W. Myrick and three other veterans of the Mexican War and veterans of the Civil War, Spanish-American War, and World War.

Rain that threatened during the day finally interrupted the ceremonies of the afternoon and the program was shortened as the more than 2,000 persons spent much of the time between speeches seeking shelters under trees and in cars.

A parade from the school grounds with American Legion posts from surrounding towns, Boy and Girl Scouts, and Veterans of Foreign Wars was greeted by the crowd that jammed all available space in the vicinity of the memorial plot.

The flag-raising ceremony, with Hayden Evans, scout bugler, was followed by a prayer by Dr. Charles M. Edmondson, of Oskaloosa. In the absence of Fred Brewer, district governor of the Lions, Clifford Thoma, governor-elect, dedicated the flagpole given by the Eddyville Lions Club.

Rev. A. S. Kilbourn, former pastor of the Eddyville Congregational Church, was in the midst of a speech dedicating the memorial plot when the rain came and drove the crowd to shelter, and speeches from that point were given from the shelter of a sound truck bearing loud-speaker equipment. Frank Miles gave a short talk, and Mrs. A. E. Augustine, of the Oskaloosa Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, unveiled the marker.

The program closed by a salute from the American Legion firing squad and Taps sounded by the Boy Scout bugler. Telegraphic communications were read from Governor Wilson and Congressman KARL LECOMPTE.

Too much credit cannot be given to the local men who gave their time in preparing the plot and arranging an excellent program in the dedication of it. No attempt will be made to list the men responsible for the ceremonies, but the community appreciates and thanks them for their efforts.

RECEIVE TELEGRAMS FROM WILSON AND LE COMPTE

Unable to be present, Congressman KARL LECOMPTE and Governor Wilson sent the following messages, which were read at the dedication:

"I sincerely regret my inability to be with you for the services of dedication for the memorial to Richard Scarrem, Revolutionary War hero, at his lasting resting place. More than a year ago I included in an address a statement that men who fought with Washington at Valley Forge built cabins in Iowa, and was immediately countered by skeptics who did not believe this to be true. It is true, nevertheless. While Iowa was settled at a later period, the men who won the first victory for freedom participated. The fact that they were few in number makes it the more appropriate that we do honor today to the memory of their accomplishments.

"We recognize this as a day in which to do honor to one noble veteran and, by so doing, to fulfill the larger purpose of memorial remembrance of all the soldiers of the Republic, that we may not only decorate their graves with the flowers of love, but refresh ourselves with recalling what they did and what it means for us and all who shall come after.

"So it is that we salute the flag of the stars and the stripes with a feeling of reverence a little deeper than ever before. Its meaning seems to be to us greater than ever in the history of the world. Certain it is that it has a meaning for peoples in remote corners of the world that fixes their attention upon that flag as never before.

"For as there is deeply embedded in every human being that which for want of a better name we refer to as his or her soul, so also there is a soul of the Nation and a living principle running through all the people of every community that is fit to survive. Today is a good time to think about all this; to think hard, to think courageously, to think with wisdom.

"All honor to the memory of Richard Scarrem. All honor to the sacred principles for which he and his comrades made this Nation safe. All honor to the American Legion, the Lions Club, and other patriotic organizations and citizens who have made this dedication possible. May this memorial serve to symbolize all that is best in our American way of life.

"GEORGE A. WILSON,
"Governor."

MESSAGE FROM LE COMPTE

"On this great occasion when the patriotic citizens of Eddyville are assembled to pay tribute to the heroic dead of all wars and to dedicate a fitting memorial to one of the immortals of the Revolutionary War, Richard Scarrem, I beg to add one simple thought. Let us resolve anew that we will not give up the fight for liberty, that we will emulate his example of unselfish devotion to his country and the ideal good which makes life grandly worth living. I congratulate and commend the community upon the accomplishment of this fine project, the dedication of a monument and erection of a flag pole.

"K. M. LECOMPTE,
"Congressman, Fifth District."

Questions Unanswered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALL DOXEY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MEMPHIS (TENN.) COMMERCIAL APPEAL

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a short editorial that appeared in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., on June 7, 1941, pertaining to the present strike situation, and entitled "Questions Unanswered."

It strikes me that this editorial expresses one of the most common-sense viewpoints on the present strike situation that I have read anywhere. It expresses my view in a nutshell.

The editorial follows:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of June 7, 1941]

QUESTIONS UNANSWERED

How many ordinary citizens—plain, sensible folk—President Roosevelt and his advisers talk to in the course of a day or a week is more than we know. On that account we are not sure whether the President and company are aware of the questions men and women are asking, so far without getting any answers that satisfy them. Whatever the case, though, it behooves them to get their ears to the ground, for the feeling is basic and the problem is profound.

What we have in mind is illustrated by the fact that a man, a resident of a small mid-south town and the salt-of-the-earth sort, dropped in at this office the other day. We'll back his public spirit and his patriotism against anybody's. He wanted to know why the same Government that had drafted his boy away from a good job to fight for his country, if necessary, couldn't draft the man who was supposed to be building weapons for his boy to use and was out on strike for the difference between $1.12 and $1.15 an hour.

In the same connection we think of a telephone call from a woman who wanted to know if any action had been taken to stop strikes in defense industries; and if not, why not. She declared herself willing to give up her boy for a year, even if it meant scrimping and the loss of certain small pleasures his pay ordinarily gave her, but she still wanted to know why the Government couldn't draft the strikers.

Then there was the Army private that we got to chatting with, and all we know about him is that he evidently came from somewhere in the Midwest. The twang of his tongue told that much. He wanted to know if you can whip a tank with a pickax; and if you can't, he said, he was out of luck because a pick was all he had. He also wanted to know why the Government could take him away from home and his job and his fun if it couldn't put the same screws on men whose job it was to build stuff for him to train with.

The best we could do was to tell these folks, not to mention lots of others, that we didn't have the answers, but that we hoped Washington did have and would give them out before long. What we do know is that such voices are the voices of the American people, and that when they want to know such things somebody had better tell them without stammering.

Wage and Hour Division Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a letter which was received this morning from a constituent of mine who is in the station-

ery business. He complains about the "imperical ruling" by the Wage and Hour Division:

THE W. H. KISTLER STATIONERY CO.,
Denver, Colo., June 7, 1941.

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I read with some interest this morning a release from our National Association which gave the speech you made in front of the House plus some amended remarks.

It seems that some interpretative bulletins have been issued giving an imperial ruling that the furniture departments and mimeograph departments come under the purview of the act because they sell merchandise supposedly which is used by firms in interstate commerce, therefore, this merchandise is of interstate commerce, and we recently had to pay a lot of back wages to the clerical force in these two departments.

We can, for instance, sell mimeograph paper at the moment in our stationery department and the retail salesmen on the floor would not come under the act, but if the same paper were sold on the balcony by a clerk in the mimeograph department that sale would come under the act. We can sell a cheap card index cabinet at the moment on the floor of the stationery department or we can sell folders or cards there and the salesmen would not come under the act, but if the same merchandise were sold in the furniture department it would come under the act.

It is the contention of the Wage and Hour Division that a retail sale should be determined by the question of the amount of the sale and of the discount allowed rather than the thought as to whether the sale was made to the ultimate consumer of the merchandise. If, for instance, any individual came into our store and purchased a binder at list, the sale would not be in interstate commerce, but if the same individual came in and purchased a quantity of binders and was given a quantity discount, that particular sale might come under the Act.

It is inconceivable to me that the amount of merchandise made in any sale or the discount at which that merchandise is sold has any bearing on the case. The only question involved so far as I can see is whether the merchandise was sold for resale which would obviously make it a wholesale transaction and therefore would come under the present law, or whether the sale was made to the ultimate consumer for the use in facilitating the transaction of his business. These things naturally pertain primarily to the stationery business.

Take, however, the case of the dry goods stores. Normally, I cannot conceive how any normal dry goods store is anything but a retail establishment. They do sell merchandise, however, in their Contract Department and they are sold to hotels, clubs, and other organizations. This merchandise is sold in quantity and at a discount. It moves, however, to the ultimate consumer. If the present definition of the Wage and Hour Division of a retailer is applied to this case, that contract department of this dry goods store would come under the Act, and with their present ruling any department of the dry goods store which handled any details for the contract department would also come under the Act. This would mean at least all of the office force which bought or billed this merchandise would be subject to its provisions as would all of its delivery departments and shipping departments.

I believe, as I have urged in previous letters to Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS and to our two Senators that a very much clearer definition should be given as to what constitutes a retailer, and secondly, as to what portion of business executed by a firm would bring that firm under the act. Let me again repeat, I believe the general conception is that a retail organization is one which in the main sells merchandise to the ultimate consumer.

I do not want to further bother you about this whole situation, but I wanted to bring our own situation more clearly to your mind.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,
THE W. H. KISTLER STATIONERY CO.,
ERLE O. KISTLER.

Industrial Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. WILL W. ALEXANDER

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of industrial migration prepared by Dr. Will W. Alexander, of the Office of Production Management, and read in his absence before the National Conference of Social Work, held at Atlantic City, N. J., on June 2, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The unlimited national emergency challenges the machines and the manpower of our Nation as they have never been challenged before. While the world presents a chaotic picture, from the American standpoint certain fundamentals are completely clear: (1) Democracy and its free institutions are menaced by the forces that seek to destroy all freedom and substitute state slavery; (2) the menace is the menace of battle on land and sea and in the air; (3) battle today is a matter of machines—the most complicated and destructive machines ever known to man; (4) machines are manufactured in workshops, by plant capacity, labor capacity, managerial capacity, working all together.

Thus, the war of democracy becomes ultimately a war of the workshops—democracy's free workshops against the slave workshops of the totalitarian system—and because the democracies were peaceably minded their workshops started late. Free industry now must overtake the mobilized production of regimented Germany, plus the additional production of the countries Germany has overrun. This is a terrific task, and the whole future of democracy on earth is at stake.

As matters stand, approximately $42,000,000,000—with more to come, for the measure of what we must do is Hitler's and not ours—must be converted into ships, planes, tanks, food, clothing, and the thousands of other items needed for democracy's defense on the battlefield. Of this sum about $37,000,000,000 have already been appropriated or authorized by the Congress.

We have made good beginnings toward the fulfillment of this objective. But they are only beginnings. There is no basis for complacency when we examine our efforts in the light of what we and other democracies must do in order to survive. It is true that in April nonagricultural employment reached a new all-time high of 37,617,000. It is true that for the sixth consecutive month employment has exceeded the levels of corresponding months for all years on record. It is true that more than 2,000,000 persons were absorbed into defense industries between May and December of 1940 and that 4,000,000 are at work in those industries today. But it is also true that defense industry should require 3,000,000 more workers by January 1942 than were employed at the start of this year, and that an abnormally high percentage must, because of the nature of the work, be skilled workers. For example, the machine-tool industry, in which skill is very high, must employ 25,000 more workers by the end of the year. They may be hard to find. The aircraft industry must have 200,000 more men in its plants of final assembly than it had on January 1, and the shipbuilding industry must have 325,000 more than its present 300,000 workers on the pay roll by September 1942, both including a high proportion of skilled. Any shortages that develop in material, capacity, manpower, or skill must tend to frustrate the necessary industrial expansion.

It is in the light of this necessity to expand, and to avoid all factors of waste, that we must look at the problem of industrial migration. This, of course, is not a new problem. We are, characteristically, a migratory nation, and it is a familiar fact that a whole assortment of economic and social problems hinges about the migration of workers—problems ranging from those of health, education, and family life to those of losses in productive efficiency by industries and by communities. But in this emergency all such problems have an amplified significance. The Labor Division of the Office of Production Management from the outset has taken cognizance of these problems, involved in migration, which accentuated our unpreparedness during the World War; when (to quote the familiar study of Clark, Hamilton, and Moulton) there was "little or no guidance from the top, since the industries and labor resources of the country had never been effectively cataloged and classified." There was also a "tremendous concentration of contracts. * * * The war-industry districts * * * reached out to the rest of the Nation for materials, money and men. They required that scores of thousands of workers be transferred to them, from districts where war work was not being done." Along several concurrent lines of attack within a unified policy of action, the Labor Division is coping with this general problem now.

Uncontrolled, helter-skelter migration of labor has presented itself, during this first year of the defense program, certainly not on any such scale as existed during the World War, but still to an undesirable extent. For example, by the middle of last November 10,000 more persons than could secure employment had poured into Camp Blanding, in Florida. They came from every State in the Nation. Many of them came with families; they had little or no knowledge as to the number of jobs open or the precise skills needed. There was no housing for them; no sanitary facilities; it is fortunate that prompt action minimized the effects of this planless migration. Similar situations were reported incipiently in Fort Bragg in North Carolina, Fort Meade in Maryland, Camp Beauregard in Louisiana, Fort Allen in Vermont, and in other places. While these areas were construction sites, which require a highly mobile labor supply, nevertheless somewhat the same condition has been in evidence in other parts of the country and in other than construction projects.

Ohio reports that many of the 7,000 migrants who flocked in from Kentucky and Tennessee in January remain unemployed. In California only a fraction of the thousands of agricultural workers who have moved toward areas of defense production have found work. The north-central and midwestern industrial areas report a consider-

able influx of workers of all kinds. Massachusetts has drawn many migrants, and Connecticut reports that migratory laborers are streaming into the State to a large and alarming extent, and that a great majority of these workers do not have much to offer in the way of skill. In many communities reporting labor influx resident labor is not yet fully employed.

In some cases workers are migrating from areas where they could actually have been more easily and more effectively employed than in the areas into which they are streaming. Their hopes for employment often have no substantial basis in fact. The communities which they left may be adversely affected. We often forget that the problem of out-migration may be just as important as in-migration. Our surveys have indicated a surprising number of small "ghost towns" and overlooked communities with idle plants and machinery which can and should be put to work, and will be if their labor supply is not dissipated.

On the other side of the picture, there is a definite need for the importation of certain types of labor to speed defense production. But the types must be carefully selected and are usually highly skilled. A specific indication of the extent of this necessary migration is contained in a survey of 68 labor-market areas with a total population of close to 17,000,000 people. The survey, compiled by the Bureau of Employment Security, reveals that these particular areas must absorb more than a million persons of the approximate 4,000,000 new workers needed this year. Of this million, more than 350,000 will have to be of special skills. For the San Diego, San Francisco, and Vallejo areas of California alone there must be either local development or in-migration of 31,000 skilled workers. Detroit will need 66,000 to 88,000 skilled workers more than it has now. Philadelphia needs 70,000 such workers. Northern New Jersey needs 30,000; the Dallas-Fort Worth area requires 17,200; Wichita must find 7,000. And so on for other specific industrial districts.

This, of course, adds to the already enormous problem of allocating our manpower efficiently. While we cannot establish any strict ratio between industrial expansion and necessary migration, it is apparent that considerably more than 350,000 workers will have to be resettled. Moreover, thousands of new service workers will be needed to supply the immediate wants of these in-migrants. And when we remember that many of these workers will have families, and that there are approximately 4 persons in the average American family, we begin to appreciate the tremendous scope of the undertaking and the danger of chaos which it represents.

Unplanned, chaotic, haphazard migration of labor, as well as the immobilization of labor in particular areas, can disturb the national-defense program as much as any other factor. Thousands of man-hours can be lost, machines may remain idle, costs can jump to fantastic levels, health and social problems can develop, unless there is complete and wholehearted cooperation of both industry and labor with the agencies of government that are working to systematize this gigantic jigsaw puzzle.

From the very beginning the Labor Division, first in the National Defense Advisory Commission and now in the Office of Production Management, has concentrated on this problem. Its Labor Training and Supply Section is coordinating the work of seven governmental agencies, as well as the Army and Navy, in locating, training, and placing workers in defense industries. These agencies include the Bureau of Employment Security, the United States Office of Education, the United States Civil Service Commission, the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, the Work Projects Administration, the National Youth Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Nearly 6,000,000 unemployed workers have been registered with the Bureau of Employment Security by occupation, by kinds and degrees of skill, and by communities. Some illuminating cases of economic waste turned up in the course of this notable achievement of registration. A spot welder was discovered making $49.40 a month as a member of a W. P. A. weed-eradication crew. An expert on cannon rifling, trained in the Skoda works in Czechoslovakia, was found herding sheep. One defense manufacturer appealed to a State employment agency for a good man at slide-rule and blueprint work. In half an hour the agency called back. "We've found him," they reported. "He's right in your own stockroom making $20 a week." We have developed an effective mechanism for securing an inventory of our labor resources and we now have the basic inventory. But still more workers must register and more employers must utilize the free public employment service, so that greater coordination can produce a more systematic matching of worker-skill to worker-location.

In addition, monthly reports are being made on labor-market conditions. The network of 1,500 public employment offices today can transfer workers from one area to another quickly and efficiently, and with knowledge of conditions in both areas. It might be added parenthetically that the labor organizations, both A. F. of L. and C. I. O., have helped very greatly by cataloging and transferring their own memership when they have received requests for skilled workers.

These labor-market surveys are proving invaluable in another respect, namely, in the location of plant sites. While it was necessary in launching the defense program to let 85 percent of the contracts in 12 States with 48.3 percent of the population, a special plant site committee has been established within the Office of Production Management to avoid any such undue concentration of defense work as occurred during the first World War and to ascertain that the contracting plant and its labor requirement are within economical touch. New plants and the major expansion of previously existing plants are now being located with a direct view to the avoidance of all possible migration or importation of workers. The use of resident labor is the key.

The training of existing resident labor reserves to fit the needs of defense industries offers an obvious means of reducing migration. Such training, as you know, is being applied on a very large scale. Refresher courses have been instituted to polish up rusty skills; apprentice courses have received new impetus; defense vocational schools and such agencies as the Work Projects Administration and National Youth Administration are training workers day and night with funds appropriated by Congress and supplied through the agencies indicated. I am happy to report that these vocational classes are this month graduating their millionth trainee, whereas during the entire World War period only 60,000 persons received vocational training for defense. Here is the basic training. However, the higher advancements in skill can best be gained on the job, and to that end a special training-within-industry section has been set up in the labor division. It is under the direction of Channing R. Dooley, formerly personnel director of Socony-Vacuum Corporation. He has secured the cooperation of 430 representatives of management and labor in 22 industrial centers throughout the country who are now engaged in installing these training systems in the defense industries as rapidly as the cooperation of industrial management will permit.

General ability must be trained into specific skill; nondefense skill must be modified to defense purposes; highly skilled operations must be put on a mass-production basis by isolating techniques. At the same time, "upgrading" of all workers into higher skills or into leadership capacities must go on constantly if the expanding plant organizations are to remain efficient. And training of resident labor skill in the localities where that skill is required is the fundamental answer to the problem of migration. As a further answer to that problem, the Office of Production Management is urging the greater development of subcontracting. It has asked time and time again that prime contractors do not hog defense awards, but break up the large contracts into bits and pieces and farm out all possible work. We want every bit of capacity—no matter how small, no matter where—to be utilized. We want every community, its people and its workers, brought into the work of defense. Fortunately, we can point out some outstanding successes in subcontracting, such as Sperry Gyroscope, York Safe & Lock Co., Kearney & Treder, William Sellers, Allison Motor, and many other companies. But these are not enough. We want subcontracting and more subcontracting and then subcontracting again. We want the skill requirements of the subcontracting plants coordinated with the employment program and the training program. In this way only, can the Nation utilize every item of mechanical and labor capacity that can be turned to defense purposes, and at the same time, cut down the need for migration, as local idle labor and local idle plants are brought together, adapted to defense production, and given work to do.

It all sums up to this: We are trying to substitute occupational mobility for geographic mobility. We are trying to bring the job to the worker rather than having the worker roam in search of the job. And while the cooperation we have received has on the whole been encouraging, there should exist no place in defense industry where that cooperation is not forthcoming. Employers must recognize that not only will these programs mean so-much and so-much in dollars and cents of plant economy, but that system is imperative to the work of national defense. As with the supplies of materials, so with the labor supply—it must be systematically and economically routed to the point of need, and no defense contractor should indulge in practices that disrupt the major program. The maximum utilization and training of adjacent idle labor is the key.

In March, the average rate of absorption of new workers into defense employment reached 5.62 per 100 workers on the pay rolls. While this was the highest rate for any corresponding period in several years, voluntary separations or quits also were reported at the rate of 1.70 per 100 employees, which was a greater percentage of separations than in any month on record. Here is one statistical reflection of a condition of labor turn-over that must be coped with; and we may ask: To what can we attribute this high rate of so-called voluntary separations? A great deal of it can be said to be induced separations—to put it bluntly, labor pirating by scouts and advertisements promising higher pay and ideal working conditions. It is strange that some who complain most bitterly about strike stoppages, which have amounted so far to but a fraction of 1 percent of the man-days actually worked, will competitively bid for another plant's workers, and create delays and disruptions in defense production, through failure to utilize local resident labor, train it to the full, and so aid both the Nation and themselves. It is strange that some who have the opportunity to stabilize their labor supplies do not learn the familiar truth that migration flows from areas of less economic opportunity to areas that have higher wages, lower hours, better conditions, and offer the worker better opportunity for employment and advancement on his job.

And here we encounter a problem long existent in this Nation of ours—a Nation whose population has been assembled from all the races, creeds, and peoples of the earth.

This is the problem of prejudice—of intangible lines of cleavage operating to prevent the full usage of our manpower in the cause of defense. We have found in area after area that it is not the nature of the labor supply which is restricting the man-hours of production but the nature of the labor demand, and here is a restriction that grows ever more acute as the many divisions of defense industry concurrently expand.

Age requirements have gone by the board to considerable extent. Increases have been registered in the employment of women. But racial and national lines of discrimination have remained damaging bottlenecks in the utilization of America's labor strength. Here is a situation in which, for the sake of the Nation, we must examine our own souls.

Negroes with necessary skills or capacities for skills are still denied employment by most companies. Specifications as to national origin are tending to reach alarming proportions, especially in the industrial areas where aliens are most numerous, and where skilled-labor shortages are most likely to develop. Extreme variations in the individual and regional specifications indicate the purely arbitrary nature of these restrictions. Some employers want both grandparents to be American-born; others will take aliens, but not first-generation Americans of particular national origins; others refuse to take any naturalized citizens at all; and there are many other variations in this picture. These employers have stretched to unnecessary and detrimental lengths the only actual legal restriction on alien employment, which is in regard to defense work of a highly confidential nature. It should be remembered that the category of alien is not only, by itself, an insufficient criterion of disloyalty but that, in many cases, the exact opposite is true. We cannot afford to cast aside democratic-minded men and women of racial and national minorities who want to do their utmost for the defense of liberty; nor can we allow ourselves to be led into the totalitarian practice of intolerance toward any group or groups in our midst.

The Negro and minority sections of the Labor Division, headed, respectively, by Dr. Robert C. Weaver and by Dr. Alexander, recognize that the few advances thus far made in coping with this deeply rooted problem are insufficient. In support of our efforts, Mr. Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General, Office of Production Management, recently issued a letter to all holders of defense contracts, pointing out what such discrimination means in the face of threatened labor stringencies:

"To All Holders of Defense Contracts:

"Pursuant to the decision of the Office of Production Management, I wish to advise you as follows:

"Current reports on labor-market developments indicate skilled labor stringency in a number of fields vital to defense production. This threatens to become more general within the next 3 months. Artificial factors, however, are tending to aggravate this increasingly serious situation. In some of these occupations, we are informed there are good workers available who are not being hired solely because of their racial identity.

"The Office of Production Management expects defense contractors to utilize all available local labor resources before resorting to the recruiting of additional labor from outside their local areas. Our programs of training and labor clearance are being established in accordance with such a policy.

"In many sections of the Nation there are today available labor reserves of Negro workers. Plans for their training and employment in capacities commensurate with their individual skills and aptitudes should be undertaken at once.

"In many localities qualified and available Negro workers are either being restricted to unskilled jobs or barred from defense employment entirely. Because of this situation, Negro workers of skills and aptitudes are in many instances not being included in many of the training programs for defense.

"Such practices are extremely wasteful of our human resources and prevent a total effort for national defense. They result in unnecessary migration of labor, in high rates of labor turn-over, and they increase our present and future housing needs and social problems.

"All holders of defense contracts are urged to examine their employment and training policies at once to determine whether or not these policies make ample provision for the full utilization of available and competent Negro workers. Every available source of labor capable of producing defense materials must be tapped in the present emergency.

"Yours very truly,

"SIDNEY HILLMAN,
"Associate Director General."

Is it not fundamental to the national emergency, then, to insist that all local labor be utilized before recourse is made to importing workers? Is it not fundamental that the gates of local opportunity should be wide open to all, thus counteracting the temptation upon individual workers to migrate? This is preeminently a time when we must consider every phase of our national life in terms of the threats presented by the international scene and the effort our workshops must make. Individual prejudices and preferences must be reexamined; management and labor must do some joint industrial housekeeping; utilization of our industrial and labor and other civilian capacities must keep pace with the military branches in being based on national needs rather than particular desires or emotions.

Time runs out. There is an enormous job to be finished. This task was not of our choosing. But having the supreme advantage of being able to shoulder that task with the spirit and the fortitude of freemen, we must and will finish it in triumph and success. In no other way can we hope for a world in which human beings can control their own destinies—a world of sanity, of stability, of peace and freedom, and the participation of all who have contributions to make under that creative tolerance which is the program of democracy.

W. P. A. Is That Something Which Is Worth Doing Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the committee, in reporting out the present relief bill, has followed the President's suggestion in reducing the total amount for W. P. A., but it has gone beyond the President's suggestion in the proposed reduction as found in the bill now before the House. I ought not and do not complain of some reduction, for in our defense program we must cut down somewhere. However, I regret to see a cut at this place. I know, of course, employment in defense industry has called many into jobs and reduced the unemployment problem throughout the country as a whole, but that does not mean that every community in the country has had its unemployment reduced to the same degree.

It must be held in mind that it is in the populous cities in the East where factories are found, and it is along the coast where navy yards are located that our great defense program has taken so many off relief. There are certain States like Arizona, for instance, where there are no navy yards, no factories, and comparatively little defense spending. The real need of W. P. A. is only slightly less in the State of Arizona now than it was prior to the defense program. Surely these facts ought to be taken into account, not only with regard to money appropriated, but also with regard to the need.

Under the direction of the State administrator, W. J. Jamieson, the W. P. A. has done a most commendable piece of work in the State of Arizona. Mr. Jamieson is an able engineer, and a great portion of W. P. A. work has been of a permanent and useful character and engineering construction by design. This has required a staff of experienced men and women who are proficient to begin with, and have grown more proficient as they have carried on their work. I doubt whether 5 percent of total outlay is enough to go for the cost of administration for, where the program is of an engineering nature, it seems that administration should properly cost more than 5 percent. If in such engineering work 5 percent is spent on administration, it pays for the brains and ability and service which determine whether the other 95 percent is well or poorly expended.

I notice by the bill as reported out by the committee that less than 5 percent has been assigned for administration. I do hope some way may be found to increase the allowable percentage for administration, and thus the State administrator may keep the personnel which he has gathered up for this very necessary work and not lose his best members of the force to private employment other than agencies of government. "A thing worth doing is worth doing well"; and I have little patience with an attempt at economizing, either at the expense of those who are being assisted or in reduced salaries for those who are planning and engineering the work.

Commencement Address at Albion College, Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR A. VANDENBERG, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an address delivered by me on the occasion of the commencement exercises at Albion College, at Albion, Mich., on yesterday, June 9.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to come to Albion College on this commencement day, despite our mutual difficulty in determining precisely what it is we are "commencing" when we face this angry, anxious, distraught world in June 1941.

I wish I could bring you the traditional graduation address and the comfortable assurances of joy and prosperity and opportunity and peace under the benediction of the blessed American way of life which has set our country apart as the veritable "promised land" for a century and a half of liberty and progress under law. But that would deny the agony of a world in pain and the hazard of American involvement in the consequences of a war—if not in the war itself—which threaten the very fundamentals of civilization.

Instead, I must bring you the hard challenge of grim reality in a world which is cursed with ruthless conquest on the march, and in an America which literally rocks beneath these alien repercussions and which will not know normalcy again within our numbered days.

But while we might all wish for the happier auspices and the relative blessings of yesterday—and the security of dependable tomorrows—there is substantial compensation in the tougher challenge. It offers magnificent adventure in behalf of God and country—not merely in terms of guns and tanks and wings and marching feet but equally in terms of courage and conscience and imperishable American ideals. It invites the sacrifice of service in behalf of great objectives which reflect the total of all human aspirations. It demands brave loyalties to the American tradition. It calls to men and women who will stand upon the battle lines of their convictions—whether in war or in the equal crisis of peace—nor will surrender, no matter what the burden, what the cost, or what the odds.

Commencement, in such circumstances, is no dull approach to the drab routine of cushioned ease. It is no passport to comfortable assurance. It is reveille, sharp and strident, upon the bugles of high destiny itself.

The college graduates of 1941 are the direct heirs of the pioneers who gave us our American inheritance, because no matter what may be the event of this martial conflict new pioneers must fit a new America into new human relationships at home and abroad. This is a solemn prospect. But I beg of you not to contemplate it as a hopeless one. It asks for earnest hearts, but equally for brave and buoyant ones. It is a wonderful thing to be a pioneer. I doubt if there could ever be a greater sense of high achievement than that which thrills the pioneer when he attains his goal. America is assigned so great a role in the unfolding drama of this new era—a new era that can make America the nerve center of this whole earth—a new era that can create a greater America than ever before, if we but make the right decisions as we go along—that we should not greet this day with downcast vision and discouraged eyes but with high spirit and firm purpose to do our full part, each one of us, in making this destiny come true.

We have faced these critical epochs before in the story of the Republic—and the glory of our inheritance is the steadfast faith and valor of those sturdy souls who never flinched in the presence of a kindred challenge. If we feel overwhelmed today by the magnitude of our perplexity, let's remember Valley Forge—when bleeding feet and doubtful hearts incorrigibly clung to the dream of an invincibly free society. Let's remember Gettysburg—and the price men paid, within living memories, to save our precious institutions from disintegration. Let's remember the valiant American Expeditionary Force of 24 short years ago—the last, I hope, that may ever leave our shores. Let's remember, too, that peace hath her victories no less than war; and that the sword is far less the genius and the impulse of our progress than have been the civilian triumphs of a people who have lived the Christian code; who have glorified the home; who have sustained religion and science and the arts; and who have encouraged individual initiative to develop here in the United States the greatest benefits, the largest freedoms, and the highest living standards possessed anywhere upon this earth.

These achievements scorn any faint-heartedness today. We shall, we must, win through. England's heroic example of grim tenacity and valor, in the presence of infinitely greater threats than ever need approach our Nation, is an inspiration. I have every confidence that the generations of tomorrow—and tomorrow starts today for you—will no less meet the vital test.

Someone has said that "America is God's last chance to make a world." Underlying all else, and dominating all else, that is our responsibility in this tragic hour when external civilization is threatened with collapse, and when our own America is too often urged to take sinister pot-luck in this Tower of Babel. Whatever may be your individual interpretation of our proper course and the policies we should pursue, that above all else is the assignment of your diploma here in Albion on June 9, 1941. "America is God's last chance to make a world."

In the supreme issue of peace or war which harasses every thinking heart, it would be inappropriate for me to use your forum to plead for the specific formula which I believe would best serve our own United States in these hours of critical decision—because conscientious citizens among us too deeply differ as to our appropriate road. But I hope I am right in believing that I may say a few fundamental things without offense to this occasion. They are all predicated, believe me, on the proposition that after our course is officially set, we must close ranks and unite behind one invincible American purpose. They are all predicated on the proposition that Nazi aggression shall not come to this Western World. They are all predicated, equally, on the proposition that until the die is irrevocably cast, the people in this democracy of ours shall continue freely to assert their views, and shall participate in the fateful debates which determine whether another Unknown Soldier shall personify their blood and tears.

The first thing I would say is this: While there is no such thing as complete physical isolation for America in this foreshortened world, there is still such a things as a vast insulating ocean, and it is 150 times as wide as the unpassable English Channel. There is still such a thing as an effective will to stay out of other people's wars, pursuant to Presidential pledges only 7 months ago. There is still such a thing as an American foreign policy, which is primarily devoted to defending America by defending America behind not only the ramparts of nature but also behind an impregnable national defense which requires no proxy to vindicate our freedom.

The next thing I would say is this: It is perfectly obvious that a victory for magnificent, intrepid Britain is to our everlasting advantage. Under the policies which we have embraced it is our major obligation to develop maximum material aid for England with swiftest efficiency—and I would withhold no effort of this nature. But our basic policy and objective surely must stem from the proposition that America is going to survive no matter what happens in Europe, Asia, or Africa.

The next thing I would say is this: It would be the tragedy of the ages if we were flung needlessly into a shooting war which might too easily involve us simultaneously on four continents and two oceans, when, in cold fact, we are not adequately prepared for war on one. It would be the tragedy of the ages if we should dissipate the essential nucleus of our own national defense to such a degree that, in a possible hour of ultimate challenge, we could not swiftly defend ourselves and this Western World against any assault by any invader who might blunderingly mistake our spirit of detachment for a spirit of pacifism or a spirit of surrender. It would be the tragedy of the ages if anything we do should contribute to insufferable aggression; yet it would be equally the tragedy of the ages if we should be less eager to lead the world to a just peace—not an appeaser's peace, but a just peace—at the first legitimate opportunity to end this process of mutual destruction which Moscow, like a vulture, waits to use to its advantage—than we are to arm the earth for war.

And the next thing I would say is this: We must not lose our own democracy at home while striving to save democracy somewhere else. It is a thrilling apostrophe when the great President of the United States asserts his noble purpose to establish his famous "four freedoms" * * * "everywhere in the world in our time and generation." I would not desert this dream within limits of reason and reality. But neither would I desert reason and reality. Nor would I ignore the warnings of Joseph P. Kennedy, the President's great friend and our former Ambassador to Britain, who lived in the heart and center of this world tragedy until last November. Said Kennedy 2 weeks ago at Oglethorpe University:

"Democracy cannot be imposed by force or otherwise. * * * In our attempt at this colossal crusade we should end in failure and disgrace abroad, in disillusionment and bankruptcy at home. * * * We cannot divert the tides of the mighty revolution now sweeping Asia and Europe. They were not of our making and they will not be subject to our control, no matter how courageously we strive to subject them. * * * We should not be deluded by any claim that self-interest should make us guardians of the peace of the rest of the world."

In my judgment, fellow Americans, there stands the naked truth. The everlasting verity of things was set down by Paul to Timothy in Holy Writ:

"If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

We have a selfish interest in the welfare of the world. We have spiritual responsibilities which are as wide as the brotherhood of man. But these things always must be assessed in the light of our own situation. Always and forever our first charge and our first obligation is not only to save democracy but also to make it work right here in our own United States.

And the next thing I would say is this. Our leadership owes the American people complete candor regarding our aims and intentions and commitments. There has been too much mystery and too much equivocation. This is still the people's Government, and our democracy can arrive at intelligent opinions only if it is authentically informed. The people must not be misled. Neither must those brave people abroad whom we promise to aid, be misled. Nothing could exceed in cruelty and bitter disillusionment the encouragement of these brave people to depend upon a degree and an extent of American martial support which we cannot deliver or which exceeds our intended commitments. That would be treachery which would win for us only the eternal enmity of the whole earth. So, above all else, let us be careful not "to keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope."

These are the tenets of my faith—and I am encouraged to believe that I speak in some representative degree for Michigan in view of the fact that the State legislature, Democrats and Republicans alike, unanimously memorialized the President recently to pursue the twofold purpose of substantial aid to Britain and strong domestic defense, adding that our involvement as a belligerent would be disastrous to democratic institutions.

These are the basic objectives, in this hour of critical decision, which I commend to your thoughtfulness. You may disagree. That is still your privilege. If you do, I shall respect your attitudes; and I shall complain of you only if, on the one hand, you lack the courage of your convictions, regardless of consequences, or if, on the other hand, you try to deny me my right to my convictions regardless of whether you approve or not. There comes a point at which we cannot tolerate the dynamite of dissension; namely, the dissension of those ugly traitors and saboteurs who advocate and practice the overthrow of our own Government by force. I would deport them, or I would intern them without a moment's hesitation. By no legitimate philosophy of free speech is Columbia required to nurse vipers in her bosom. But when honest citizens—all equally faithful to their country—assert differing opinions regarding the selection of a proper policy for us to pursue in the defense and the salvation of America, I condemn as reckless, sinister tyranny the growing habit of any person or any group which attempts to smear the motives, the purposes, and the patriotism of those who speak otherwise; and this applies equally to those who, in such circumstance, attack the President, and it applies to the President himself when he hurls epithets at the shining targets of his opposition.

Let me repeat: "America is God's last chance to make a world." Heaven only knows what lies ahead. All we can be sure of is that, win, lose, or draw, this world of ours is going to be a tough nut to crack for all the years that any of us shall survive in life. Our war decisions are desperately serious business. Our ultimate peace decisions will be still more desperate and still more serious. They are times to try men's souls. You who step this morning from the cloister to the arena are indeed keeping a rendezvous with destiny. Let's search together—you of young America, we of the passing generation—let's search together for the road of regeneration rather than destruction; let's make our blessed country so strong that no enemy, however mad, will ever dare assail us; let's make her so strong—spiritually as well as physically—that our independent influence can always weigh heavily in the scales of justice and humanity whenever and wherever we may choose to speak; then let's keep her influence independent; let's not yield one fraction of an inch in our entrenched hostility to the crucifying curse which Hitler personifies in his bloody challenge to the souls of men; let's do our maximum, short of war itself, to aid those intrepid foreign forces which contend against this curse; but let's always think things through, remembering that we are at present unprepared for war ourselves; remembering that aid to England can seriously suffer if we get in war ourselves because our own Nation will then demand a concentration on our own defense; remembering that our supreme commitment is to protect this Western Hemisphere; remembering that we tried once before to "make the world safe for democracy" and failed; remembering that the United States must finally exercise the authority that brings peace out of this chaos which threatens to reduce even a victor to the conquest of a shambles; remembering that "America is God's last chance to make a world."

Commencement for some of you may shortly take you into the uniform of your country—though I pray that we may avoid the active plague of war or of any policies that would needlessly drag us in, and that there may never be a second A. E. F. on foreign shores. If you are called to the colors, you will justify the magnificent tradition of the fighting sons of Uncle Sam. When once our course is set, we must close ranks and unite against all enemies, foreign and domestic; and to the last man or woman among us, bearing the diplomas of American patriotism, we must dedicate ourselves to the achievement of our national aims. "My country, may she always be right; but right or wrong, my country."

But whether you are destined for a uniform or not, "Commencement" for all of you brings you face to face with your share of responsibility for American decisions which will touch every hearthstone of your homeland for a century to come. Your privilege here of higher education has intensified your obligation in proportion as it has put your brains in mesh, cultivated your ability to think, and fertilized the courage of your hearts. So play your part—in or out of uniform—in making America secure, in keeping America free, in serving America's new destiny, and in building here the ever broadening blessings of the brotherhood of man.

Now, let me tell you that in such a soul-searching hour, I come to Albion to gather, quite as much as to give, inspiration. For if I were searching for a campus upon which I should hope to find the essential elements of faithful and indispensible Americanism at its best—the roots of essential understandings and essential loyalties—I should seek a middle-western town where people still have time to live and think and pray; where common sense is still insulated against the frenzies of mass hysteria; and I would seek a Christian college where spiritual values still survive. I would come to Albion.

I quote from your Albion catalog:

"Albion College accepts the teaching of true scholarship as her most serious task; yet she consistently teaches the higher life that is above text books and laboratory processes. This manifests itself in usefulness to society"—usefulness to society—"as well as to the individual."

This is a precise paraphrase of what the tremendous American scientist, Steinmetz, once wrote to Roger Babson:

"When the genius of the world turns from science to spirituality and examines the realities of God in the laboratories of life, the world will make more progress in one generation than in the last four."

It is what Ruskin said of Venice: "The decline of her political prosperity was exactly coincident with that of her domestic and individual religion."

Now I quote from your admirable President, Dr. John L. Seaton:

"Unless out of such studies interpreted in the light of the present, the student comes to understand the vast movements of life with their prophetic import, and to feel that he belongs to the ages and holds priceless values in trust for posterity, our labor is in vain. Only as the individual reaches maturity in knowledge and wisdom ideals and sense of responsibility, can we have a mature and stable civilization."

I take the liberty of summarizing this Albion theme as meaning that education is not an end in itself; it is only a means to an end; that the true purpose of higher education is not so much to teach men and women how to make a living, but how to make a useful life. And in the presence of these Albion objectives, I present my compliments to her graduates for 1941; and I tell them that their country was never in greater need of them, in this meaning of their diplomas, than in this perilous hour when every value we hold dear is hanging in the balance. But I repeat: it is no hour for the appeaser or for the defeatist or for pessimism—no matter how forbidding the horizons. It is an hour for faith and courage and the spirit of indomitable youth, determined that a greater America than ever shall come from this crucible of fate. That is the challenge, multiplied a thousand-fold today; that is the challenge to you who, as President Seaton said, "hold priceless values in trust for posterity."

What are some of these essential loyalties to which I have referred?

The first is loyalty to God. Systems of faith are different; but God is one. Voltaire said: "If there had been no God, it would have been necessary to invent one." Separateness of church and State is vital to the American system; but separateness of God and state is the open doorway to eternal ruin. That is why communism and nazism, defiling the altars of men's faith, finally are doomed. That is why not a single, great, state paper in the history of the United States—from George Washington, uttering his first inaugural and frankly tendering "our homage to the Great Author of every public and private good," down to the present hour—has ever neglected a pledge of allegiance to the only Super-Sovereign to whom America bends a knee.

This is no ethereal, intangible thing. Witness President John Adams calling the whole country to its knees in a day of prayer that should forefend against impending crisis in Franco-American affairs—and it did. Witness the Senate of the United States, in the dark, forbidding days of 1863, days rendered terrible by the Union's crushing defeat at Fredericksburg, unanimously petitioning the President to proclaim an hour in which a God-loving people should seek "Him for succor, according to His appointed way, through Jesus Christ." And witness the responsive Lincoln, eagerly declaring that history validates the scriptures when they announce that "those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord." And call it what you please—coincidence or cause and effect—the tide of battle turned. Witness President Woodrow Wilson, calling America to Armageddon. "God helping her," said he, "she can do no other." Witness President Coolidge reminding us that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge."

The first essential loyalty is to the thrones of grace. I know of no greater American insurance than the abstract but suggestive fact that out of a billion copies of the Bible, since the printing art began, one-third have been circulated in our own United States in 150 years.

The second essential loyalty is to the living spirit of the Constitution—the hope of mankind this morning all around this darkened world. When rough, uncouth, unlettered Andrew Jackson was made a doctor of laws by Harvard, it was a source of great merriment to many superficial minds to contemplate him in his uncomfortable scholastic robes. As he stood upon the college rostrum some would-be wit, unconscious of his own pathetic limitations, called out truculently from the audience, "Why don't you give 'em a little Latin, Doctor?" Quick as a flash, Old Hickory replied: "I'll give you some Latin if you want it. E pluribus unum, sine qua non!"

Jackson was right. The tides of time, the storms of change have overtaken many another form of government and swept them upon the shoals of history. But the Constitution of the United States—this immortal charter of representative democracy—sails on. It is our supreme heritage. It is sine qua non. It is the warrant of civil liberty for a free people. It is the lighthouse of the world. Those who would undermine it by adroit indirection—and we have seen such efforts in our time—are no better than those who openly would rip it into shreds. It guarantees a government of laws and not of men. Its checks and balances are the greatest creation of the human mind to save a free people from the concentrated tyranny which plagues other lands and which, I warn you,

can flow too easily from our own contemporary habits of government by Executive decree at Washington. In the name of the great dead, the living, and the unborn it asks for our fidelities. It is the difference between America and every other land on earth.

"It was not made with the mountains;
It is not one with the deep;
Men, not gods, devised it;
And men, not gods, must keep."

The cardinal difference between our democracy and the totalitarian idealogy which now reaches for universal power is the difference between the alien theory that the citizen is the subject of the State and our theory that the State exists to serve the citizen. In this simple definition lies the crux of today's world-wide strife. Our loyalty to our own ideal is terribly vital. We may call our cause the defense of constitutional government. We may call it the defense of capitalism. We may call it the defense of private enterprise. In essence, it is a defense of the personal liberty, the personal freedoms, the personal initiative, the personal aspirations of each individual citizen beneath the Stars and Stripes. That is the genius of the American system. The "goose step"—or any paraphrase of it—was never intended for the sons of our fathers, yesterday, today, or tomorrow.

It is not a static thing—this American system. It must fit itself to the new necessities of new times. It is social-minded; but it is not socialistic. It must disclose an ever-broadening concept of these human rights and human privileges to which it is dedicated under God. Blindly entrenched conservatism at the right can harm it just as much as blindly brainless radicalism at the left. Its true course is the great middle highway of rational progress—with no detours into special privileges at the right, and no concessions to the leftist mobs. Its greatest dangers are not in Europe. They are right here at home in our own United States. More completely than any other people in this world, we can be the captains of our own fate.

And that is my final plea to you.

The American system, in my humble judgment, is not threatened by conquest or invasion, although no prophet dare be sure. I express the opinion that no combination of enemies could ever cross our borders, if we give even elementary attention to our own defense, and if we stop "fifth columnists" before they ever start. I consider any threat of military invasion to be propaganda fodder which is sheer hysteria, if we give even elementary attention to our own defense.

No; these priceless freedoms, which are the hallmark of our inheritance, are threatened chiefly from within. Of course, they would be definitely blitzkrieged by our own entry into active shooting war, because war swiftly assigns every citizen to his anonymous cog in a vast, impersonal machine. We already find ourselves headed in this direction. That hazard must be accepted if national emergency requires. But I am speaking of the avoidable peacetime threats that are with us always. I am thinking of lax loyalties to the fundamental things of which I have spoken. I am thinking of public and private corruption, and the defilement of the public trust. I am thinking of the lethargy which leaves politics and public affairs to the other fellow and then complains of the results of this complacent default. I am thinking of trends which foster spawning, sprawling bureaucracy in government; trends which reach for regimentation over life and livelihood; trends which climax in government by executive decree, or something worse. I am thinking of sprouting intolerance, which casts a wicked cloud on free religion and free speech. I am thinking of class hatreds and class consciousness organized into class selfishness, regardless of the common weal. I am thinking of broken promises in political campaigns and broken hopes in subsequent administrations—a disillusionment which shatters faith in democratic process. I am thinking of our proneness to rely upon expedients instead of principles. I am thinking of our impulsive hospitality to innovations which are condemned by history and experience. I am thinking of economic bankruptcy, which fatuously pretends that the public credit is not subject to the laws of simple mathematics, and I am thinking of the spiritual bankruptcy which pretends that material achievement is enough. I am thinking of higher education which fails to produce in its graduates an intellectual conviction that the American way of life is worth every effort and every sacrifice which its preservation may entail, and which fails the Albion objective that "usefulness to society is the final goal." And, of course, I am thinking of those active agents of ugly subversion whom we allow to hide behind the very institutions they would destroy by force.

Verily, eternal vigilance has become, more than ever, the price of our liberty, our security, and our peace.

Edwin Markham has summed my theme for me in the thrilling stanzas with which he has described the fall of the Bell Tower of Venice. It is my last word to the graduates of Albion today:

"Yet all the while, in secret, without sound,
The fat worms gnawed the timbers underground.
The twisted worm whose epoch is an hour
Caverned its way into the mighty tower.
And suddenly it swayed, it shook, it broke
And fell in darkening thunder at one stroke.
The tall shaft, with an angel on its crown,
Fell ruining—a thousand years went down.

"And so I fear, my country, not the hand
That shall hurl might and whirlwind on the land.
I fear not Titan traitors that shall rise
To stride like broken shadows on our skies;
I fear the vermin that shall undermine
Senate and school and citadel and shrine;
The worm of fraud, the fatted worm of ease
And all the crawling progeny of these.
I fear the vermin that shall honeycomb the towers
And walls of state in unsuspecting hours."

Graduates of 1941, I welcome you to great adventures in behalf of an ever greater brotherhood of man in an ever greater United States under the benediction of Divine grace. I give you the challenge of Isaiah: "Look ye to the rock whence ye are hewn." And then, with you, I salute the Stars and Stripes.

Retirement of Chief Justice Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "The Tragedy of Hughes' Retirement."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 4, 1941]

THE TRAGEDY OF HUGHES' RETIREMENT—PERMITS FURTHER WRECKING OF PRINCIPLE OF BIPARTISANSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

The saddest news of the hour is the passing from the Supreme Court of a truly great Chief Justice—Charles Evans Hughes.

It is not merely, however, the retirement itself which may well be an occasion for national regret, but the realization that under the three terms of President Roosevelt the highest Court has become a political institution made up of politicians chosen from the inner circle of official intrigue and partisanship.

There are two vacancies on the high Court today. Can any man trained in the law now sitting on either the Federal or State bench look to the Supreme Court as a possible goal of attainment on merit? Not at all. For only through the channels of politics and personal service to the political chieftain of a national party apparently can promotion be won. The merit-system principle has been dealt a body blow by the five appointments already made and there is talk now of adding two more politicians from the official circle to fill the existing vacancies.

The effect of this policy has already been evident. Political decisions based on the casuistic reasoning of those who have a definite stake apparently in making the present administration's policies effective already have been rendered. Chief among these was the amazing distortion of the laws and the bold addition of words never written by Congress in a labor-relations case recently decided wherein an employer was forced to hire an applicant he had once rejected, being now ordered to compensate in back pay the same employee from the time of the rejection to the date of forced employment.

PUTS PREMIUM ON POLITICS

There are some eminent men on the circuit courts of appeals and some able men on the State supreme courts. But they haven't a chance for promotion in their profession to the Court they all revere. After this a lawyer will be well advised to get into politics early and play the political game with its customary hypocrisies and compromising expediencies if he wishes to land a place on the Supreme Court. The advice given will be to go to Washington, get an appointment in some department or agency, compromise with principle, play the game of the administration, and look for ultimate reward on the bench.

Politics has been the ruling factor not only with Supreme Court appointments but with Federal judges generally. Time was when Presidents had respect for the principle of a bipartisan judiciary. Mr. Roosevelt in 8 years has appointed more than 60 percent of all the Federal judges of the country. Yet 95 percent of those appointed come from his own political party—a great many of them having been actively engaged in politics.

There may be a difference of opinion as to whether past Presidents gave enough recognition to the economic class represented by what might be called the radical as against the conservative viewpoint. But it will be recalled that President Hoover, a Republican and supposedly a conservative, appointed the liberal Justice Cardozo. It will be recalled, too, that President Coolidge, admittedly a conservative, appointed the liberal Justice Harlan Fiske Stone. It will be recalled that President Wilson, a liberal, appointed the conservative Justice McReynolds.

TOTALITARIAN IN CONCEPT

The American concept of fair play and tolerance of the minority viewpoint hitherto has been invoked in court appointments. On the Federal Bench the party in power rarely has exceeded 60 percent, the opposition being given an average of 30 to 40 percent of the

judicial appointments. It has meant a balancing of the Court, so as to give the minority some representation. But the present administration has not done so. It has been totalitarian in its concept. Only the members of one group—the political group of officials and advisers of the present administration—have been appointed or are apparently nowadays considered eligible for appointment.

A man like Justice Harold Stephens, of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, for instance, who was recommended by Attorney General Cummings at one time for the Supreme Court and who has made a great record on the bench to which he was appointed by President Roosevelt a few years ago, ought to be placed on the highest court.

In Texas is another Court of Appeals liberal, Justice Hutcheson, and on the highest courts of Massachusetts and New York are men of proved ability and judicial temperament. Do they have a chance? Not if the gossip which for weeks has permeated the Capital is to be believed, for the next two appointments also are to come from the ranks of the politicians.

That's why the passing of Chief Justice Hughes is indication of a bigger tragedy than simply the loss of a great jurist. It means the beginning of the end of the dignified, impartial, objective, nonpolitical, and independent judiciary and emphasis instead on a court which for the first time in history has been packed with politicians who have been subservient to the will of the Chief Executive.

J. Adam Bede's St. Lawrence Waterway Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

ARTICLE BY J. ADAM BEDE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an article by J. Adam Bede on the St. Lawrence seaway project, now pending in Congress. Mr. Bede served in the House of Representatives from 1903 to 1909, and was a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House. He has long been an ardent advocate of the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway. Mr. Bede is well known throughout the United States, and I am sure that his many friends will read with interest the following article:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

(By J. Adam Bede)

When Ben Franklin, as one of our peace commissioners to Paris in 1783, asked that the St. Lawrence River be made free for the use of American citizens, his request was insolently rejected by the ambassador of George III. That was 158 years ago, and today some of our own representatives seem eager to do the bidding of that half crazy and pig-headed king.

As a Member of Congress at the turn of the century when Teddy Roosevelt was President, Uncle Joe Cannon was Speaker, John Sharp Williams was minority leader, Champ Clark was the most beloved Member, God was in His heaven and all was right with the world, I voted for the Panama Canal, for the 9-foot channel in the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to Cairo, for all harbor improvements, and the deepening of the Mississippi. The popular slogan at that time was "Dig it deep through Dixie."

The railroads along the Ohio fought the improvement of the river, declaring it would ruin them. The answer was that river boats would distribute raw materials and build up industries to feed the rail carriers with higher-class freight. This I think has come true, and the railroads have handled a vastly greater tonnage since the river was canalized than before. Both water and rail transportation are essential to develop the resources of a country, and therefore become mutually helpful. The Ohio River roads do not complain now, but their opposition long delayed a needed development.

RAILROADS OPPOSED THE PANAMA CANAL

All railroad influence opposed the Panama Canal. Well might the transcontinental and midwestern lines take alarm for the canal changed the geography of the hemisphere. Had there been a natural channel at the isthmus, the development of our western areas would have been along somewhat different lines. But the shock has been very largely absorbed, and our growth in population has helped to make adjustments.

We of the Midwest knew the Panama Canal would mean a jolt. In public addresses at the time the great railroad man and empire builder, James J. Hill, foretold precisely what has happened. But there was a tacit understanding that if Congress would authorize the ocean link at Panama, the St. Lawrence project would soon follow to compensate the West for its patriotic sacrifice. So we voted for the ditch to double the efficiency of our Navy, and economically have been taking it on the chin ever since. The wild race of the battleship *Oregon* from our far northern Pacific waters around South America to reach Cuba in the spring of 1898 was duly dramatized, and not much consideration was given to the commercial value of the Canal. Its commerce has been a national surprise.

EFFECT OF CANAL ON MIDWEST

The World War was on when the Canal was opened, and its effect was not felt till that conflict was over. But a survey made in 1927 disclosed that 8 Midwestern States had lost 18,000 manufacturing plants, and in the reapportionment of Congress they lost 17 Members.

The West wants to trade with the seaboard, and the seaboard rejects the offer. Under normal world conditions at least 90 percent of our commerce on the seaway would be coastwise—to all ports from Boston to Houston—a mere extension of our internal commerce, and largely of products that couldn't pay for the rail haul. No foreign ship can engage in this trade, and therefore every bottom built for it by private capital would lift that much burden off the Federal Treasury for the merchant marine. In a period of years this would save the Treasury more than the cost of completing the project.

SEAWAY APPROVED BY PRESIDENTS, PREMIERS, AND RAILWAY CHIEFS

The seaway as now proposed has been repeatedly approved by our own board of United States Army engineers with its constantly changing personnel, by the Canadian board of engineers, by the joint international board of engineers, by special boards of engineers, and has never been disapproved by any board. It has been commended by four Presidents of the United States, by four premiers of Canada, and by most of the outstanding railroad men of the continent in the last generation, including James J. Hill of the Great Northern; Howard Elliott of the Northern Pacific; H. E. Byram of the Chicago, St. Paul & Milwaukee; C. H. Markham of the Illinois Central; William G. Bierd of the Chicago & Alton; Fred W. Sargent of the Chicago & Northwestern; Ralph Budd of the Great Northern; Charles Donnelly of the Northern Pacific; Edward Pennington of the Sault Ste. Marie; S. M. Felton of the Chicago Great Western; Hale Holden of the Burlington; Sir Henry Thornton of the Canadian National, and others of equal standing. During the long depression, most of the roads have been refinanced by eastern bankers who know all about the Rhine, but have never seen the Mississippi, and it is their money that talks. The real railroad man stands mute today.

WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIONS?

What are the objections that can outweigh these favorable opinions?

It is a habit for opponents to say that the lakes are frozen half the year, though the records show that over a long period of years the average navigation season has been 7 months and 25 days, or substantially two-thirds of the year. And in that limited season more tonnage passes through the "Soo" Canal between Lake Superior and Lake Huron than passes through the Suez and Panama Canals combined in the whole 12 months. Somewhere between 70,000,000 and 80,000,000 tons of iron ore alone will pass through the "Soo" this season. Nowhere else in all the world is such a volume of ore available, and if Hitler could wreck the "Soo" he would win the war. This ore is our greatest single asset in the defense program.

It is said that the seaway would cause a congestion of the railroads in the winter season when they are least able to handle traffic. This is not true, as most of the products that seek water transportation, such as iron ore, coal, lumber, grain, flour and meats are stored to wait for the open season.

It is usual for railroad lobbyists to say that the seaway will cost a billion dollars, which is substantially four times the estimate of the board of engineers. However, this statement is comparatively accurate, considering the source. The cost to us is $266,000,000 less $90,000,000 to be paid for the power by New York.

Some say very loosely that it will take 8 or 10 years to finish the job. In 1927 Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, headed a Commission which reviewed the St. Lawrence project and made a very favorable report on its economic aspects. At that time Mr. Hoover, who is himself an eminent engineer, was quoted as saying that under war pressure the whole project could be completed in 18 months, which is less than half the time required to build a warship, and no one complains that we are building ships.

WHEAT MUST BE TRANSPORTED TO EASTERN MARKET

We no longer export vast surpluses of western wheat because of our increased population and greater domestic consumption. Some superficial orators seize upon this fact to shout that we no longer need the seaway, though it might have been very helpful long ago. The other equally obvious fact escapes them: that we still raise the wheat and must transport it to our own people instead of foreigners for consumption. Buffalo is the most strategic point in our country for flour milling, as she is readily supplied with every grade of wheat from Canada as well as the United States and can make any blend of flour desired. She is in a class by herself, and yet she opposes the seaway. Would she not be still better situated and more prosperous if she could load a ship at her door to sail the seven seas, but more particularly to serve our own seaboard cities and the ports of Central and South America with her flour? Why should she shun ocean commerce? However, many people, not knowing their own or the public interest, opposed DeWitt Clinton's Erie Canal, which though only a ribbon of water 4 feet deep and 40 feet wide gave New York City its commercial premiership through contact with the West. And without the West there would be no such New York City as we know today.

THE SEAWAY A 50–50 PROPOSITION

It is also charged that our Government is to bear most of the seaway burden. Only ignorance can beget such falsehood. Every informed person knows that it is a 50–50 proposition. However, it so happens that Canada has done much more than we have in anticipation of a completed seaway, and therefore has less left to do. Among the work for which she is given credit is the Welland Canal opened in 1931 at a cost of $128,000,000. Each of the 7 mighty locks that overcome the fall of 326 feet between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario is 30 feet deep, 80 feet wide, and 820 feet long. This canal is the noblest monument ever reared to 10,000,000 peace-loving people. Such is the simple story. Why juggle the facts for a partisan purpose?

In an open forum following a public address the question was asked, "If we build a canal in Canada and then get into war with England, won't the Canadians blow up our canal"? Yes, they might; but if they did they would also blow up their own canal, for it would be a joint investment, and if we couldn't get in they couldn't get out. So it would be as broad as it was long. But there is a better and more conclusive answer to the question: When the greatest republic on earth goes to war with the most powerful empire in the world, when the Union Jack and the Star Spangled Banner meet on the field of battle, the world will go to hell, civilization will go to dust, and it won't matter who blows up the canal for it will never be needed any more.

It may be a good thing for Canada, but not for the United States of America, is a murmur often heard. But how can 12,000,000 people get more out of the seaway than 130,000,000? The amazing thing is that the Canadians insist on a 50–50 deal and will listen to nothing else.

ELECTRIC UTILITIES OPPOSE SEAWAY

The electric-power interests oppose our project because it will ultimately develop some 5,000,000 horsepower of electric energy. If you know of anything worth while that they are not against, please name it. In 1932 the American people consumed 62,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, and today they are consuming substantially 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a week, or at the rate of 150,000,000,000 a year. We are now short of energy for defense work, and but for the development of T. V. A., Boulder Dam, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee, we should have an electric famine. And every one of these projects was called a white elephant by the selfish interests now fighting the seaway.

RAILROADS OPPOSED HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL

Railroad interests opposed the 30-foot channel for the Hudson River to put Albany on the ocean. Now the Lake Shore road is carrying California canned fruit from Albany to Cleveland, and distributing vast quantities of Pacific coast lumber that comes to Albany via Panama. The average banker who now controls transportation can't tell a railroad asset from a liability. In the last census of "damphools" he was in class A plus. Under a proper system of birth control he would never be born.

SANITATION INCREASED COST OF PANAMA CANAL

The fact that the Panama Canal cost more than the original engineer estimates, is used as proof that the seaway cost will greatly exceed the official figures. This is distorted reasoning. The Panama project was our first venture in the tropics. The estimates were for engineering work, but much of the cost was for sanitation. We had to catch the mosquito, pour oil in his eye, and sing rock-a-bye baby before we could do the digging. Then the diggers ran into quicksand which oozed up from the bottom, and the high banks slipped into the Canal every night. It was an unpredictable situation that cannot be duplicated in a northern latitude. But we freed the world of yellow fever, which great achievement was worth the price. Health and happiness follow the flag. We had the scandal of embalmed beef in Cuba, but the electric refrigerator is drafted for Army service now. On many harbor projects surplus funds have been covered back into the Treasury.

BACK TO MUD ROADS AND OX CART

If cheaper transportation between the seaboard and the heart of the continent, which the seaway would provide, could harm the producer or the consumer, which some of our opponents contend, then logically we should pull up our railways, abandon our highways, go back to the mud roads and ox cart, live again the narrow neighborhood life of the pioneer. Do you want to do so?

THE CHAMPLAIN CUT-OFF

Immediately the seaway is authorized there will be a move to build a cut-off from Montreal to New York via Lake Champlain and the Hudson River. This would give Canada a coveted outlet to the south, and permit the West to reach our national metropolis by a much shorter route without entering the ocean. Any lake boat could then make the trip. There has long been a proposal, opposed only by the railroads, to cut a 27-foot canal 31 miles long, across New Jersey from New York Harbor to the Delaware River. This would let our lake shipping into Philadelphia, from which city there is already a 27-foot channel to Baltimore. Thus a vast internal commerce would be developed between our continental hinterland and our three great seaboard cities. Such is the ambitious outlook for the future development of our neglected interior. There is nothing local, selfish, or sectional in such a program. It means merely a greater America with new horizons for those whose eyes have long been seared and sealed with willful blindness.

WOULD HELP DEFENSE PROGRAM

The advocates of the seaway have never urged it as a defense measure, but if electric energy is needed, no greater volume can be secured in so short a time or at so low a cost as in the harnessing of the St. Lawrence rapids. That is a matter for the engineers. Page the Chief for an answer, and follow his lead. And if the seaboard shipyards are overcrowded, ours are idle. Why not build ships in them and open the seaway so they can reach the sea?

WHAT INTERESTS OPPOSE THE SEAWAY

It seems proper to inquire who or what interests are fighting the seaway project. In the forefront are found the railroads and the electric-power promoters and manipulators. Many years ago I rode on a first-class train from Chicago to Kansas City for 50 cents when two roads were trying to cut each other's throats. Those were the days of rugged individualism when piracy was permissible. Rebates and passes were destroying and corrupting influences. All delegates to policital conventions were provided with free transportation through the constituted party bosses. One businessman could be wrecked and his rival rewarded with prosperity through corporate favoritism. The Government had not yet asserted its rightful authority in behalf of the people. Most of these evils have been corrected, but during the prolonged depression of the past decade most of the roads have been thrown back into the clutches of a pirate crew who care no more for human rights than a tomcat cares for a marriage license, and are out to crush all water competition. In the old days the management made sure that every State had the best legislature that money could buy, and their successors are playing a bigger and bolder game in which they must miserably fail.

The electric utilities are drawing close to judgment day and therefore shun the spotlight, but are financing the propaganda campaign now as they did effectively against the treaty 7 years ago. Next to air and water, electricity is the cheapest resource nature has given us, but its manipulators hold it beyond generous use by the common people. As an illustration, the city of Duluth, with 101,000 population, has taxable real estate assessed at $40,000,000, while its power and light company is capitalized at $71,000,000. The company does considerable business beyond the city limits, but the amount is hidden from the public.

An electric plant and distribution system for a city of 100,000 population can be constructed and installed for $10,000,000. Therefore, if the Duluth Co., which runs under remote control from New York, does as much business outside the city as in it, which is a generous guess, $20,000,000 would be a fair capitalization. We are, therefore, lugging about $50,000,000 of watered stock to get our homes lighted. Electric energy can be generated with steam on our water front for less than 3 mills a kilowatt-hour. The basic retail rate is 6 cents, and the average residence rate for rich and poor is probably 4½ cents, or 45 mills, a pretty big spread between cost and price. It is this and many other like injustices that account for the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota. If the old parties can't take care of this situation, the people will some day take care of them. It isn't brain power that is lacking. Both parties have plenty of that. The real trouble is that, while we can hire brains for a hundred dollars a month, we can't buy or borrow guts at any price anywhere. We drove the pirates off the sea more than a century ago. It is now time to drive them off the land. With their booty filched from the people, they are the most corrupting influence in American politics today.

STEEL TRUST OPPOSES SEAWAY

When the United States Steel Corporation was organized in 1901 for a billion and a half, the promoters put the half billion in their own pockets. It was the usual custom then for promoters to take one-third, and this transaction is notable only for its magnitude. However, it doesn't read so well in retrospect. This company has benefited greatly from Government improvement of the channels between Lake Superior and Lake Erie but fights the seaway. It says foreign ores will come in and ruin the iron business.

We have already shipped more than a billion tons of high-grade ore from the Minnesota mines and have about another billion left. At the present rate of shipment this ore will be exhausted in 20 years. Then we shall have left several billion tons of low-grade ore which must be beneficiated to be made merchantable. It would be a blessing if the high-grade ores of other lands could be imported to mingle with our low-grade ores to raise their iron content and extend the life of our mines indefinitely. Of course, a tariff could shut them out, but some mills on the seaboard wouldn't like that as they are already importers. This great corporation whose profits this year exceeded $100,000,000 is opposed to the seaway. It owns or controls the mines, it owns the railroads from the mines to Lake Superior, it owns the ore carriers on the lakes, and it owns the rails and mills in the lower lake areas. It is a very good corporation of its class and under the Bill of Rights should be heard but not felt.

Some opponents try to see a trick in offering a resolution to Congress instead of a treaty to the Senate as was done in 1934. The treaty received a majority vote of 46 to 42, but not the constitutional two-thirds. That was Mr. Hoover's treaty submitted by Mr. Roosevelt. However, there is another way to accomplish the same purpose and throw responsibility on the whole Congress instead of a single house. Besides, the bill will carry an appropriation which couldn't go into a

treaty. Those who oppose this method are opposed to majority rule, which is the essence of free government. Of course, if the resolution route in such case is not legal then the Government, far from playing a trick, has committed a blunder which should be exposed. But no one in authority raises that point.

MANY FANCIFUL OBJECTIONS

Many fanciful objections are raised to the seaway. I have often been asked if sharks would not come in and ruin our swimming beaches in Lake Superior. Some say that tramp ships with cheap labor will come in and ruin our ports, forgetful that they have been ruining Boston, New York, and Philadelphia for 200 years. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently contained a speech by a western Member showing that Canadian rail rates are lower than ours, and that therefore the seaway would ruin our farmers. Such argument is grotesque, and would seem to incriminate the speaker for not regulating and reducing our rates. The ore roads that are making from 100 to 500 percent profit, as shown in their own sworn statements to the Interstate Commerce Commission, are afraid the seaway would take the bread out of their stockholders' mouths. Their situation is pitiful. They are in a class with the farmer who wept over a big crop as it was so hard on the soil.

MUST HAVE TOLERATION

However, I have patience with all differences of thought. In 1926 the school board in an Ohio town refused the use of the schoolhouse for a railway promotion meeting on the ground that if God wanted people to travel more than 15 miles an hour there would be something in the Bible about it. And I well remember personally the opposition to standardizing our narrow-gage railroads as it would throw men out of work by eliminating transfers. It took a hundred years to overcome the opposition to free schools. When Washington died a Pennsylvania paper thanked God that at last we were rid of the tyrant.

In the campaign of 1864 leading Republicans organized a movement against President Lincoln and put an independent candidate in the field to defeat him. Such are the vagaries we must cheerfully encounter. In my time the Rivers and Harbors Committee had 17 members, 15 lawyers and 2 gentlemen. When national flood control was urged the lawyers all agreed that it would be unconstitutional. Some very good lawyers do not say so now. Several years ago I suggested to Huey Long, a very interesting personality, that if only one Senator voted for the St. Lawrence seaway, he should be the man. He evidenced some surprise, but accepted my solution in jolly fashion when I assured him that we sent the mud down the Mississippi River to make Louisiana so he could come to the Senate, and that all he represented was erosion.

ON THE KNEES OF THE GODS

The St. Lawrence seaway is a national project. It is a necessity for a more perfect union between the interior and the seaboard. It will develop a vast commerce now nonexistent because it cannot pay the price for the rail haul. It will build industries and increase coal consumption. It will aid railroads, both East and West, in assembling and distributing its cargoes, and greatly increase employment. Its commerce will be almost exclusively coastwise, bringing the products of the Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf States, and of Mexico and Central America to the heart of our continent while bearing our products to them. It will add to the trade of every Atlantic seaboard city. Every ship built for this trade will lift a burden off the Treasury by enlarging our merchant marine. The seaway was promised us when western Members voted for the Panama Canal. The West has cheerfully borne its share of the burden for the channels in all our rivers and the harbors on all our shores. Our people believe in America, and what helps any State or area of our country appeals to them. We knew that Panama would jolt us for a generation, till great adjustments could be made. We have gone through the fire and passed under the rod. We now await with implicit confidence a long-delayed act of justice from the responsible representatives of a great and free people.

Relationship Between the General Accounting Office and the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1941

LETTER TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE DIRECTORS OF THE T. V. A.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority:

JUNE 6, 1941.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The letter recently addressed to you by the Comptroller General suggesting the need for legislation clarifying the relationship between his office and the Authority has been called to our attention. The difference of opinion between the Comptroller General and the Authority as to the nature of that relationship is not the result of recent developments. On the contrary, it has existed from the Authority's inception and has since been specifically considered by Congress on a number of occasions.

The Authority's views on the matter may be summarized as follows:

(1) The question in dispute is whether, under existing law, the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General extends only to auditing the Authority's accounts in accordance with section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as the Authority contends, or whether it is empowered to "settle and adjust" such accounts in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as the Comptroller General contends.

(2) Congress has already spoken on the issue by repeatedly refusing to extend the Budget and Accounting Act to the Authority; indeed, the present section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act was enacted in 1935 in place of an alternative provision suggested by the then Comptroller General for the very purpose of rendering the Budget and Accounting Act applicable.

(3) In any event, the difference of opinion between the Comptroller General and the Authority involves a purely legal question of statutory interpretation which the Attorney General should determine and which he is now considering. The Attorney General's decision will settle the construction to be accorded the existing law, and Congress will, of course, be in a position thereafter to decide whether as a matter of policy the law as so construed should be amended.

(4) It should be emphasized that the dispute between the Comptroller General and the Authority has nothing to do with any question of whether the Authority's transactions should be subject to outside audit, or whether it is under obligation to account fully for funds appropriated to it. The Authority has welcomed and will continue to welcome audits of its transactions made by the General Accounting Office in accordance with section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. On its own initiative, it has also obtained for the past 3 years independent audits by the nationally known firm of certified public accountants, Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, as the result of which it has been able to include certified financial statements in its annual reports to Congress. While thus fully recognizing its public obligation to subject itself to periodic audits and to account fully for funds entrusted to it, the Authority believes that the application to it of the rigid and cumbersome procedures of the "settlement and adjustment" system—which bear little or no relation to auditing as that term is understood by accountants and businessmen—would mark an immediate end of its corporate flexibility and unduly hamper its activities.

In view of the importance to the Authority of the basic issue which has been raised, it has been thought desirable to discuss in somewhat greater detail each of the points summarized above. Such discussion follows:

(1) Nature of the question in dispute: The issue is a simple one. Ever since its organization the Authority has been of the opinion that the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, by which it was created, defines and delimits the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office over its transactions. Section 9 (b) of that statute provides that the Comptroller General "shall audit the transactions of the corporation at such times as he shall determine, but not less frequently than once each governmental fiscal year, with personnel of his selection." It is provided that the Comptroller General and his representatives "shall have free and open access to all papers, books, records, files, accounts, plants, warehouses, offices, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the corporation." He is to make a report of each such audit in quadruplicate—one copy for the President of the United States, one for the Chairman of the Board, one for public inspection at the principal office of the corporation, and the other for the uses of the Congress. The statute further directs the Comptroller General to "make special report to the President of the United States and to the Congress of any transaction or condition found by him to be in conflict with the powers or duties entrusted to the corporation by law." The Authority has not only never resisted the conduct of this audit provided for in its own statute but has repeatedly sought to have it made more effective.

On the other hand, the representatives of the General Accounting Office have contended that the Authority is subject, in addition to this detailed audit procedure, to all of the procedures set up in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, including monthly rendition of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office in Washington, the approval or disapproval of requisitions of funds by the Comptroller General, and the final settlement of the accounts of disbursing officers.

Clearly these conflicting points of view raise a purely legal issue of statutory interpretation.

(2) Prior consideration of the issue by Congress: The precise issue which the Comptroller General now raises was presented to Congress in 1935 by one of his predecessors during the consideration of certain proposed amendments to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. At that time the then Comptroller General proposed that Congress adopt an amendment designed for the specific purpose

of subjecting the Authority to the procedures prescribed in the Budget and Accounting Act. After full consideration in committee and debate on the floor of both Houses this proposal was rejected.

The same question was presented to the Joint Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1938. After full public hearings during which representatives of the Authority and the General Accounting Office appeared before the committee, the final report sustained the Authority's position on every point (Report of Joint Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, pp. 109–133).

It was our hope that this carefully considered conclusion of a joint committee of Congress specifically charged with the duty of determining this issue would be accepted as conclusive.

(3) Since the question in dispute is one of statutory interpretation, it should be finally determined by the Attorney General. When the present Comptroller General assumed office we reviewed the history of this controversy with him in an effort to convince him of the soundness of our legal position, which had been sustained by the Congress in 1935, and again by the joint investigating committee in its report issued in 1939. It was after the conclusion of these conferences that we received the Comptroller General's letter of December 21, 1940, reiterating the original view of his office on the question of law involved. Upon receipt of that letter we were of the opinion that the only proper way in which to settle a difference of opinion between two agencies of the Federal Government upon a question of the proper construction of a Federal statute was to submit the issue to the Attorney General of the United States for his opinion. Accordingly, on January 31, 1941, we wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury, suggesting a change in procedure, knowing that before determining the question the Secretary would in turn submit the entire issue to the Attorney General. A copy of that letter is enclosed herewith. On February 12, 1941, we wrote to the Comptroller General, stating that since all that was involved was an issue of law depending upon the construction of the relevant Federal statutes the Board had concluded that the only way in which the question could be resolved would be by obtaining a ruling from the chief law officer of the Federal Government. A copy of that letter is also enclosed herewith. Our request to the Secretary was submitted to the general counsel of the Treasury, who has ruled that the Authority's position is correct. The opinion of its general counsel has in turn been submitted by the Treasury to the Attorney General for his opinion.

In his letter to you the Comptroller General states that the Attorney General does not have jurisdiction to determine this matter so as to relieve him of official responsibility. It is impossible for us to understand this position. It means, in substance, that the Comptroller General refuses to be bound by the opinion of the Attorney General upon a question of statutory construction and insists upon reserving to himself final judgment on his own jurisdiction. Were it not for this attitude there would be no reason for requesting legislation at this time. Legislation is neither needed nor appropriate in order to determine the proper construction of existing law. This same question was considered by the Joint Congressional Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, which stated:

"The committee doubts whether any useful purpose will be served by legislation clarifying the relations between the Authority and the General Accounting Office. The Authority should be placed on the same basis as other Government corporations in the affairs of which the General Accounting Office is not permitted to intervene. Congress has already recognized this need in the case of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Inland Waterways Corporation, and the Panama Railroad. The accounts of these corporations are audited by private auditing firms, selected by their respective boards of directors. If, however, it is determined that relations between the General Accounting Office and the Authority shall continue, the General Accounting Office's activities should consist in the making of periodic commercial audits. Such audits should be made in the field and not in Washington. Disputes concerning interpretations of statutes and other legal questions should be referred promptly to the Attorney General for final determination." (Committee report, pp. 132–133.)

(4) The procedures of the Budget and Accounting Act are not suited and have not generally been applied to governmental corporate enterprises such as the Authority: While the present Comptroller General and certain of his predecessors have clung in theory to the position that the procedures of the Budget and Accounting Act are applicable to the Authority, they have not—possibly because of obviously reasonable doubts as to the validity of that position—actually sought in practice fully to apply them. It thus becomes apparent that what the Comptroller General now proposes is that the Congress abandon the procedures under which the Authority has successfully operated for 8 years and substitute therefor a new law subjecting, in practice as well as in General Accounting Office theory, all of the transactions of the Authority to the final administrative control of the General Accounting Office. Viewed in this light, the proposal raises the broad question as to the effectiveness of publicly owned corporations as instrumentalities of government.

One unfamiliar with the facts would infer from the Comptroller's General's letter that the Authority stands alone in its attempt to maintain its corporate independence. The exact opposite is the truth. The General Accounting Office has not been permitted to extend the "settlement and adjustment" procedure to such corporate enterprises as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Inland Waterways Corporation, the Panama Railroad Co., the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corporation, and the War Finance Corporation.

The very nature of the Government corporation is inconsistent with the type of control inherent in the procedures of the Budget and Accounting Act. This has been recognized by all commentators on the subject. The Supreme Court itself, in holding that the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation and other Government corporations created during the first World War should not be subjected to this type of jurisdiction, stated:

"Indeed, an important if not the chief reason for employing these incorporated agencies was to enable them to employ commercial methods and to conduct their operations with a freedom supposed to be inconsistent with accountability to the Treasury under its established procedure of audit and control over the financial transactions of the United States" (*Skinner & Eddy Corp.* v. *McCarl*, 275 U. S. 1, 8 (1927)).

In his letter the Comptroller General concedes that—

"Any governmental agency charged with the responsibility of conducting operations of the character of those of the Tennessee Valley Authority should have some latitude of authority beyond that needed and usually granted by the Congress to the regular departments and establishments of the Government."

He then expresses the opinion that there is no inconsistency between this view and his insistence upon accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act. With this conclusion we most emphatically disagree. In order to determine the extent of the inconsistency it is necessary to compare the relationship between the Authority and the General Accounting Office under existing law, and the relationship that would be brought about by the change proposed by the Comptroller General.

As previously pointed out, under existing law the Comptroller General is given the broadest possible auditing powers. He has the right to examine every record, every voucher, and every item of income and expenditure; he is under a duty to make his annual audit report available to the President and the Congress; he is under the additional duty of reporting especially to the Congress any improprieties or violations of law that he may discover. If the ultimate objective is to assure proper accounting and to protect against dishonesty and extravagance, it is difficult to see why those powers are not sufficient.

In fact, the Comptroller General does not suggest that the proposed change in the law is required because of any deficiencies in the Authority's accounting or internal audit procedures. The Authority's system of accounts is in accord with standard practices in accounting, and its power accounts conform to the uniform system prescribed by the Federal Power Commission, with such adaptations to meet the particular problems of the Authority as are approved by the Commission. In addition, the Authority has always maintained an elaborate system of internal audit controls, and its accounts have been subjected to audits by two outside organizations, the General Accounting Office and Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, a nationally recognized firm of certified public accountants.

In the 8 years of its existence the Authority has handled more than $300,000,000 of Federal funds without the faintest suspicion of fraud or misappropriation. The inevitable effect of superimposing the procedures of the Budget and Accounting Act upon existing auditing procedures would be not to protect the Government against improper expenditures but to subject the administrative discretion of the Authority's board to a final veto power exercised by the Comptroller General.

There is widespread misunderstanding concerning the actual operation of the so-called settlement and adjustment procedure of the Budget and Accounting Act. Under this process the disbursing officers of the departments and establishments subject to the act are required to submit monthly or quarterly lists of receipts and disbursements to the General Accounting Office, accompanied by vouchers and other documentary support. The General Accounting Office then determines whether, in its opinion, expenditures made were legally authorized. At this step in the process it is clear that the Comptroller General reserves to himself the final authority to pass upon the interpretation of all statutes with no possibility of appeal. In this way he is permitted to substitute his judgment, or that of his counsel, for the judgment of the agency charged with the responsibility for administering the statute in question.

The detailed internal control exercised by the Comptroller General over administration is enforced in two ways. By means of his statutory power to disallow a payment already made, and to charge the payment against the account of the disbursing officer he is in a position to force the disbursing officer to follow his interpretations blindly without consideration of their soundness. In case of any attempt at resistance to the Comptroller General's view as to law or as to policy, he possesses the ultimate veto power through the threat of disapproving a requisition for funds. In our prior dealings the General Accounting Office has not limited this asserted veto over administration, at least in theory,

to questions of statutory interpretation. Its investigators have repeatedly noted exceptions to transactions solely because, in their judgment, the expenditures involved were not wise or necessary or desirable. In this way, if the Budget and Accounting Act were to be fully applied in practice and the exceptions followed by disallowances, the investigators of the General Accounting Office would be placed in the position of overruling the discretionary decisions of the board of directors of the Authority, even though they were in no way responsible for successful performance of the duties which the Authority is expressly directed by statute to carry out. In our opinion, such a situation would constitute the antithesis of responsible administration.

It should be emphasized that what has been said is in no way a reflection upon the present incumbent of the office of Comptroller General. The objections to the extension of General Accounting Office control are based upon principles of administration and have no relation to the person occupying the office at any particular time.

In considering the validity of the contention that the proposed extension of jurisdiction would in no way jeopardize the efficiency of the Authority's operations, it is significant that all of the avowed opponents of this program have welcomed the proposal with enthusiasm. They understand that they have been presented with a final opportunity to cripple this enterprise by depriving it of those attributes of initiative, flexibility, and independence that have contributed so much to its success.

In the closing paragraph of his letter the Comptroller General states that it is inconceivable—

"That any agency entrusted with the expenditure of mammoth amounts of funds collected from the people of the United States should desire to evade responsible accounting and scrutiny by an independent office created for that purpose."

This statement is based upon the misconception that there can be no true public accounting except that particular type of detailed administrative supervision exercised by the General Accounting Office. The Authority has never sought to evade accountability to the public. All of its transactions are carried on in the light of continued publicity. In its annual reports to the Congress it accounts for every penny that it has expended and for every move that it has made, and its financial statements are certified to each year by a recognized firm of certified public accountants. Again in its annual appearances before the Appropriation Committees of the two Houses it gives a detailed accounting. This is accounting to Congress and to the public in the truest sense.

In conclusion, it must again be emphasized that the legal issue in dispute between the Comptroller General and the Authority has nothing to do with any question as to whether the Authority's transactions shall be regularly subject to audit, nor whether it shall account fully to Congress and the public. The Authority has always welcomed the fullest auditing investigations—as distinguished from application of the "settlement and adjustment" procedures—both by the General Accounting Office and by other accounting agencies, and on the basis of these investigations it has sought to include in its reports to Congress the fullest possible accounting and statistical information concerning its activities. Its books are open to the inspection and review of any interested person. This policy it will continue to pursue.

Respectfully,

HARCOURT A. MORGAN,
Chairman of the Board.
DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Vice Chairman.
JAMES P. POPE,
Director.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MANCHESTER (N. H.) UNION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union of June 9, 1941, entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of June 9, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

In a special message to Congress, President Roosevelt has renewed his appeal for the approval of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development project as a war emergency measure. This time the seaway is presented in the form of an agreement between Canada and the United States, requiring only a majority approval of both the House and the Senate, instead of as a treaty requiring a two-thirds approval of the Senate only.

The President's argument is that power, and still more power, will be needed to meet the production race for national defense. The enemies of democracy, he maintains, are developing hydroelectric resources on every waterway from Norway to the Dardanelles, and this continent must not allow itself to be outmatched.

In answer to the criticism that the seaway development will take at least 4 years, he replies that there is no assurance that the present emergency will be over before that time. The deep-water seaway, in addition to power development, he declares, will prevent transportation bottlenecks, and increase the Nation's capacity for building ships.

These are all important considerations and should be given the most careful study by Congress and the American people. National defense is the primary interest of the Nation today, and everything that is necessary should be done to promote it. Moreover, it is necessary to look ahead and make provision for every eventuality by shaping a long-range policy so far as that is possible.

But there are also certain questions in relation to this problem that should be weighed carefully. One of these is whether it is wise at a time when the full energies of the Nation should be directed to the immediate increase of production to meet a crisis that is already upon us, to divert money, labor, and skill to the development of a project that admittedly cannot be of use until 4 years hence. Power available 4 years from now will be useless if we fail to meet the emergency before that time, and every effort should be turned now to the immediate task of creating the implements of defense. For that task we have adequate power resources with the prompt supplementation that can be made through the utilization of steam.

The navigation aspect of the project also raises important questions. One of these is the probable effect of the seaway on existing port facilities along the north Atlantic coast, with which it must necessarily come into competition, and on the transportation system of the Nation generally.

It may be that for a time increased traffic due to the national-defense program would prevent the seaway doing these facilities serious injury, but here again the time factor is involved. The seaway cannot become available for at least 4 years, and the traffic problem must reach its peak long before that time. Moreover, the St. Lawrence seaway, when completed, would be usable for only 7 months in the year. Other transportation agencies would have to stand by waiting to take over for the 5 months every year when the St. Lawrence is ice-bound.

These questions are responsible for the almost unanimous opposition throughout New England to the seaway development.

The Maintenance of Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

ADDRESS BY M. H. HEDGES, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, there is more real inspiration and good American doctrine in the following speech by Mr. Marion Hedges, of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, than in almost any speech I have read for a long, long time. I ask it be printed in the RECORD.

The address follows:

I need not remind this group of engineers, economists, and administrators that morale belongs with the imponderables. I need not remind you either that imponderables are as important, or even more important, than the material sinews of defense. Imponderables may in part submit to analysis and still we may not be able to do the things that we see are needed to be done.

Morale is not a thing that is created. It exists. Strictly speaking, a nation cannot maintain morale; it can only utilize that morale which exists. I take the liberty, therefore, of rephrasing my topic as utilization of morale. Morale, therefore, belongs to the subconscious forces of a nation's life, or, if we do not like the phrase "subconscious forces," let us say that morale belongs to the forces of public opinion that move at the base of a people's on-going existence. These subconscious forces are what Americans mean when they say, "at the grass roots."

To most of us Adolf Hitler is a necromancer—a sorcerer. With unscrupulous coldheartedness and with no eye to the truth and with no regard to consistency, Adolf Hitler has said the things which he, in some uncanny way, knew would produce loyalty and discipline in his troops. He certainly capitalized the Versailles Treaty dishonestly, but he knew that a defeated nation could not rise to a renewed war effort without being promised the opportunity to become superior. He has pictured to the younger Germans the idea of a lordly race in complete control not only of Europe but of the entire earth. He capitalized defeated Germany's sense of inferiority. He built upon this chasm—thus far successfully. If we are to be equally as

successful in 1941, we must understand the subconscious forces that are working through our collective lives.

Because I do not mention natural resources and technology as applied to the production of war material and to actual war effort, I am not ignorant or negligent of these important things. My subject is morale—more specifically the utilization of morale. And the question is, Do we know enough about this disparate, various, complex, and loosely knit organization of society which we call democratic America to know how to utilize the forces which lie within to produce united effort?

First, let us see what the hazards of democracy are in the time of national emergency. Please do not underestimate the ability of the enemy to take advantage of the faults of democracy. Our Nation organized for trade and friendly intercourse between peoples is wide open to cultural invasion by the very nature of the organization of which we are a part. Harsh is the statement, but it is true no less that the virtues of democracy are liabilities in time of warfare. Good-natured tolerance and complacency, the view that every individual and every individual organization has the right to carve a niche for itself in this loose organization; the view that the right to fight it out between economic groups is a natural right creates opportunities for an invader. I need only point to France as an outstanding example of a democracy in fact and in reality incapable of defending itself because of the internal conflicts developed under the theory of natural rights.

Fifty percent of the victories of Adolf Hitler have been won within the countries subjugated, by the capitalization of internal dissension. Antagonisms between sections of a great sprawling nation, class "strugglism" the dubious philosophy as to whether society owes every man a living, laid the foundations for the "fifth column," and upon these foundations the enemy has builded in every country subjugated. These are unpleasant truths because they raise the all-important question as to whether a democracy can preserve its innermost character and enter into conflict with an autocracy characterized by its mechanical controls.

We should intently be aware that for the last 75 years in the United States two great traditions have been in competition: (1) The industrial—rapidly driving toward mechanized production and mechanical control; (2) the popular, based on life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The grind between these two great urges has produced most of the conflicts so characteristic of this era. I believe that a good case can be made for the contention that Germany has built upon the rationalism that first made its appearance in America as early as 1870. It is this deep-seated conflict, that is, between mechanized control and the will to happiness of the individual that has frequently shown itself in politics, that produces such phrases as soulless corporations, economic royalists, Wall Street, and the good life, social security, and democracy. Surely those citizens who have been concerned with creating a great industrial machine have conferred blessings upon this Nation. And surely those rebels who declare that the basic commodity of a nation, sound at heart, is its citizens, have conferred blessings also upon this Nation. But it is this hitherto irreconcilable conflict which is the chief barrier to the proper utilization of morale and which strikes at the very foundations of the Nation's existence.

I ask for agreement on this point: Adolf Hitler has carried to the extreme the logic of mechanized control. Marked evidence of this fact is revealed in feeding of boy soldiers with drugs which produce an exalted sense of courage and deaden the primitive forces of fear. Here is something new in warfare, the scientific, if momentary, production of morale on the battlefield by means of dope pills. And so the question of morale renews itself into this question, Can robots, mechanized soldiery, prevail over the natural courage and will of free men?

Let us suppose, therefore, that this conference should resolve itself into a meeting of a general staff to determine the things this Nation should do and must do to meet the robot army that stands mobilized on our horizon. Let us, as members of this general staff, adopt the principle that a condition confronts us; not a theory. I take the liberty of arising in this meeting and saying: "Gentlemen, we must plug the psychological holes in our defense. We must rid ourselves of three great illusions. We must smash three great fallacies and we must accept three simple primitive principles."

The first great illusion that we must forego is that we live in a big world physically. This illusion is increased for us in America by the fact that we live on a continent and we travel frequently and know the great spaces that lie between New York and San Francisco. Surely 99 percent of Americans still think that London, England, is 7 days from New York when in reality it is only 18 hours. We are unaware of that. New York is many times nearer to London than Charlottesville was to Washington in the time of Thomas Jefferson. It is this illusion of living in a great world rather than a small world that is at the base of the doctrine of isolation.

The second great illusion which must be foregone is the sense of inevitability. Inevitability has been part and parcel of the mechanistic philosophy that has developed along with our drive for mechanistic control. Hitler has played upon it with shrewd and remunerative results. With his intuitive genius for fingering out the holes in democratic armor, he understands how responsive Americans are to the idea that the next step is inevitable. He, as well as the Communists, has played upon the idea that history is a progress unfolding at the dictation of material forces and that it is useless to try to oppose the coming of the mechanistic state. Hitler has done this while he himself is paramount evidence that the human will is still the determining factor in human affairs. Hitler and the dictators have smashed forever the mechanistic theory of history, and it is that theory that is going on the scrap heap and not the theory of choice, so close to the life of Americans. There could be no greater antithesis as between human types than the antitheses between Adolf Hitler, the leader of the robots, and Daniel Boone, Kit Carson, the heroes of the Alamo, the pioneer leaders which belong so intimately to Americans.

The third great illusion is the illusion of our technological superiority. We Americans believe fervently that we are the greatest industrial nation in the world. The trouble with that idea is that it is compensatory. It has probably arisen out of our sense of incompletion, of unfulfillment, because we have not lived up to the fullest attainment of our subconscious powers. War gives the acid test to machinery as well as to men. The airplane engine that fails on the last heartbreaking 1,000 feet of the 6-mile altitude simply cannot be saved by sales talk, propaganda, or illusion. If we have been, up to now, a nation of drummers, salesmen, shopkeepers and not a nation of technicians, pioneers, the last 1,000 feet of the 6-mile climb will tell.

And so we must clear away our illusions and we must give up certain fallacies. First, we must give up the fallacy that the Nation owes the individual everything and the individual owes the Nation very little. The Santa Claus concept is not productive of morale. Sometime or other the individual citizen must stand up on his own two legs and say, "By all that is holy this thing must stop and now." And he must be willing to stop it.

Second, we must give up the conception that democracy is a kind of system based upon the mob. As a matter of fact it takes more individual intelligence, more individual discipline, more individual loyalty to operate a democracy than it takes to operate an autocracy or any other of the ephemeral forms of organized society.

Third, we must smash the fallacy that material things bring happiness. In the last 75 years we have been engaged in erecting the greatest industrial system on earth. We have been animated by the notion that a bathtub, an automobile, and an airplane, if possessed by the individual citizen, will produce the good life. Most of the internal conflicts in America during the last three generations have been fought over the possession of things. And it will seem strange to many of you that I, a representative of organized labor, will say that this is a spurious fallacy judged by a national emergency that involves the preservation of our common life. Organized labor has offset its drive for material things by individual sacrifice to the union, and though unionists do not talk much about moral values, a good unionist is he who gives up more for his organization than he gets, and this is a formula by which you must test a good citizen. He must give up more for his country than he receives in the hour of his country's need.

Now, then, if we utilize the morale I am convinced lies deep in the vitals of America, we must turn to three simple primitive principles. In a crisis the individual owes everything to the group. We have got to reverse the prevalent theory that organized society owes the individual much. I have heard from the radio and read in the papers the repeated statement that some Americans are willing to defend democracy if certain great reforms are put into operation. For us who are sitting here as a general staff, this is the greatest barrier in the utilization of morale. If America is worth defending, it is worth defending as it is and now. It is my earnest belief that the standard of life, when we include the imponderables of liberty, is higher in America than in any other country in the world. America is worth defending now as it is.

Second. The difference between democracy and the totalitarian countries is not so much what as how. Democracy is a way of doing things, not a mere collection of principles. The how in this crisis turns upon two stipulations: (1) all advantages and all hardships must be shared alike by every section of the population. There shall be no privileged classes in this hour of emergency. If we are to have equal sharing, then we must have some tribunal to determine what equal sharing is. That tribunal should consist of joint committees between government, employers, and labor. And it should be remarked that advisory committes are not joint committees. Joint committees imply equality of authority. (2) Voluntary doing of what should be done is not a loss of democracy. Here the question is whether Americans are intelligent and loyal enough to do the necessary things to meet the national emergency without the compelling power of force. If, then, we can rid ourselves of three great illusions, destroy three great fallacies, and adopt three great principles, we utilize the powerful forces at work among our population which will preserve our Nation in its pristine unit.

Utilization of morale, however, depends on the tapping of these great forces and this reaching down to these forces depends upon certain symbols, the symbols of words and the symbols of men—leaders. Words are powerful forces and I hope none of us organized here this morning as a general staff will seek to create slogans for the winning of

defense. Slogans must arrive out of the agony of the people and out of their subconscious life. "There shall always be an England," takes hold of the depths of English psychology and utilizes that instinctive allegiance to the compact little island which has been the English heritage for more than a thousand years. "This time all are in the front line," adorning every railroad station, post office, camp, street corner in Canada and England and its widefiung holdings, arrived out of England's ordeal and fulfills the principle of equal sharing and democratic effort. These are good slogans because they were lived before they were uttered.

Leaders are important. The leader must embody somehow the qualities of the nation. Winston Churchill and Ernest Bevin, in origin far apart, are as like in physical contour, habits of thought, and determined will as two peas in a pod. Fortunate it is for a nation to have two such leaders expressing so profoundly the nation's temperament. Bevin calls Churchill "Mate." Together they symbolize the whole nation. They are the synthetic Englishman. John Bull still broods in Downing Street.

And so it comes down to this. The war machinery of the enemy has been geared to take advantage of the customary faults of democracy. It would seem wise, therefore, for us in our effort to prepare for invasion to correct these faults. It seems reasonable to declare, therefore, that the labor unionist who believes that the objective of his union is to follow the policy of the class struggle and fight the boss is helping Adolf Hitler. The employer who believes that this is the time to liquidate trade unions is helping Adolf Hitler. The bureaucrat who sees in this an opportunity to widen the powers of government when such widening powers only produce conflict is helping Adolf Hitler.

What do men fight for? I do not believe any man will die to defend his country because it has a 5-year plan. A man will die to defend his country because he recalls the way the American flag looked flying above the little red schoolhouse; he will die to defend his country because he loves the way the tugboats look in New York Harbor; he will die to defend his country because he likes Main Street in Oshkosh or Kokomo; he will die to defend his country because he recalls the smells of a Thanksgiving dinner in his mother's kitchen; he will die to defend his country because he recalls with peculiar poignancy the way his high-school graduating class sang Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord, or America, the Beautiful; he will die to defend his country because he likes a memory of a rail splitter or a man praying at Valley Forge; he will die to defend his country because of a mother or a child, but he will not die to defend his country for mere abstractions.

The basic of morale is feeling—collective feeling—and as America emerges from a long period of self-criticism and reform, it is likely to forget these deep emotional associations which produce unity, and the problem of utilization of morale is to begin to recover these national memories.

It is my impression that we as a people have not yet begun to call upon the subconscious forces which are our greatest strength. We have carried on our defense effort as we have carried on our peace effort, by a series of explosions and by conflict. We have not been any too successful. I am not discouraged. I am confident that fully 90 percent of our great population are essentially aware of the issue now before us and are willing to make the needed sacrifices to preserve our culture. I have said that morale exists—it is not created—it is only utilized. I believe that the needed morale is here. It has been slowly and painfully created on the prairies, in the workshop, on the farm, in the mining camp, in the wilderness, on the high seas during the last two centuries.

I have been told by physicians that a person suffering with typhoid fever can secure very little aid from medical science, that his recovery depends upon his physical heritage and his moral courage. Every cell of a typhoid patient must be re-created before the patient can get well. That will to live must be dominant in the ailing man before he can live through the agonized weeks of burning fever and reach health and safety.

A nation in time of war is not unlike this typhoid patient. Whether it weathers the ordeal depends on its heritage, on the centuries of life that preceded the life of the individual generation. I have confidence in America's past; I have confidence that the right words will be said and the right leaders will arise to direct this tremendous latent power when the need arises.

Minnesota W. P. A. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

LETTER FROM S. L. STOLTE, STATE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
St. Paul, Minn., May 19, 1941.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Certain facts about the Minnesota W. P. A. program.

DEAR MR. PITTENGER: As you requested when I had the pleasure of visiting with you in your office last week, I am forwarding herewith certain facts about the W. P. A. program in general and particularly as such relate to Minnesota and your congressional district.

In my letter to you of February 4, 1941, I gave you pertinent information as to employment expenditures and accomplishments in your congressional district and the State. My purpose at this time is to give you certain current facts about the W. P. A. program in this State as it is operative at this time.

In Minnesota we have not experienced the impact of national-defense employment indicated in some of the other States. This is undoubtedly true because we do not have the concentration of heavy defense industries or large military or Navy training centers. Should additional defense plants be located or expanded in Minnesota, or should Camp Ripley be taken over as a military training center, the future need for employment relief would, of course, change in proportion. However, we too often forget that more than 70 percent of the persons now employed on W. P. A. are in the so-called unskilled classification and if adaptable will require training before any large proportion of these persons become suitable for defense industry employment. The Selective Service Act and Navy recruiting are using a considerable segment of the younger persons, and it is true that persons with skills of value to defense industries are being employed and sought after daily. Many persons, however, are not mobile and able to move to defense employment opportunities due to personal responsibilities, health, finances, and other similar reasons, and unless such employment is moved closer to their homes, they are still stranded for employment opportunities.

We also know that the average age of a W. P. A. worker is slightly over 43 years, and we find, as of April 1941, that approximately 46 percent are over 45 years old and approximately 58 percent are 40 years of age and over. In comparison with March 1939, similar figures were approximately 38 percent over 45 years of age and 50 percent over 40. A study of the current composition of the labor force in the United States shows currently that 22 percent are under 25 years, whereas in W. P. A. it is only 8 percent, and there are approximately 30 percent more persons in proportion on W. P. A. 55 years of age and over than there are on the regular labor force.

From the standpoint of enlisting all the human resources of the Nation for maximum use either from the standpoint of morale or actual production for national defense, it does seem to me that if employable persons are going to require direct relief that it is better that these persons be engaged in work on projects of importance to the welfare and needs of the community or engaged on projects actually certified as important to national defense such as airports, roads, armories, and similar work.

As of May 14, 1941, there were employed on the Minnesota W. P. A. 39,410 persons. Our May quota is 39,700. In May 1940 there were employed in the State 39,565 persons. In May 1940, however, there were 17,248 persons in the awaiting assignment file as compared with 1,162 persons today. These last figures when added to the number of persons at work makes a net decrease of 28 percent in the total load certified as in need of employment. As of April 30, in your Congressional District No. 8, there were 5,876 persons employed.

As you know, persons are continuously moving to and from the program in their movement to private employment opportunities. Our experience in the past year has been that 2,000 to 3,000 persons have been so affected each month by such movement. In April 1941 there were, however, 6,181 persons terminated from the program primarily due to private employment opportunities. The figure, however, was increased at this time due to some 2,000 forced separations in compliance with the 18 months' provision of the E. R. A. Act.

The consideration of the next fiscal year's appropriation for W. P. A. will undoubtedly resolve itself in a major degree to the amount of such appropriation. You will find enclosed a tabulation of the employment experienced during this year and what it will have to be in the next fiscal year in the event the average monthly employment is based on 1,300,000 persons or 1,000,000 persons for the continental United States. The difference between the 1,300,000 and the 1,265,000 figure listed is the amount estimated in other Federal Agency employment financed out of the E. R. A. Act. You will note that the average in the State would have to be reduced from an average of 40,389 for this fiscal year to an estimated average of 27,300 in the event $975,000,000 in the President's Budget message to the Congress in January prevails. The 1,300,000 average national quota would require $1,150,000,000.

The only additional information that seems pertinent at this time is that which was revealed in a study of how the W. P. A. Federal dollar was spent in Minnesota in 1940. We found that of every dollar 82 cents went to pay the earnings to W. P. A. project wage employees, 7 cents to pay the earnings to supervisors exempt from the schedule of monthly earnings, 8 cents for project materials, supplies, and equipment, and 3 cents

for administration. For every dollar provided by W. P. A. for the public-work program in 1940, Minnesota sponsors added 41 cents in the form of cash expenditures or credits allowed for material or sponsor-owned equipment and services made available to assist in project operations.

I trust that you will find these facts of value, and will, of course, be only too pleased to furnish you with any additional information not available to you at this time regarding the general subject of W. P. A. Further, do not hesitate to call on our Washington W. P. A. office for any information which you may need immediately and where inquiry to this office would take too long.

I have just learned today that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended an $875,000,000 appropriation for the W. P. A. bill, which would mean that an average monthly employment of slightly under 900,000 persons would be financed for the continental United States. This in turn would provide for 26,000 persons in the State of Minnesota, and would mean that your employment as of April 30, 1941, in your congressional district would have to be reduced something over 2,000 persons. You may verify this condition with Mr. Robert L. MacDougall, of the Washington W. P. A. office in the Walker Johnson Building.

Let me at this time express my sincere appreciation of your courtesies during my visit with you at Washington, and I trust that these facts as here presented will be of some assistance to you in your deliberations.

Yours truly,

S. L. STOLTE, *Administrator.*

Minnesota

Month	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,000,000 for continental United States	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,265,000 for continental United States	Average monthly employment during fiscal year 1941
1941			
July	30,800	34,800	35,367
August	26,800	32,100	35,581
September	26,800	32,100	35,466
October	26,800	32,100	36,520
November	26,800	34,800	38,260
December	26,800	36,000	43,588
1942			
January	30,800	37,200	47,837
February	30,800	37,200	49,002
March	29,000	36,000	45,383
April	26,000	34,800	[1] 42,200
May	23,700	34,300	[1] 39,700
June	22,700	34,300	[2] 35,770
Estimated average for fiscal year			27,300
Estimated average for fiscal year			34,600
Average for fiscal year 1941			40,389
Estimated need as of May 1, 1941			50,500

[1] Based on employment authorization.
[2] Based on tentative employment authorization.

Farewell to Character?

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincerity and concern that I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial by David Lawrence in the United States News of June 13, 1941. It is a tribute to a public servant and a farewell to a great Chief Justice, that is, Charles Evans Hughes. The editorial so ably expresses the interest and concern of the judiciary, the lawyers, the laymen, of every citizen—and the respect, veneration, and importance of our Supreme Court and its tremendous function in our Government; also, the imperative necessity of a continuation of that respect and confidence in the courts.

I am sure that President Roosevelt appreciates the grave responsibility that is his to fill the vacancies on our Supreme Court with men of honesty, character, legal training, and ability regardless of their political philosophy; men who will be responsive to their oath of office and their consience, and actuated solely by a zeal that the ends of justice may be served.

The editorial follows:

[From the United States News of June 13, 1941]

FAREWELL TO CHARACTER?

(By David Lawrence)

We say farewell to Charles Evans Hughes, public servant.

We say farewell to the greatest Chief Justice of our times.

We say farewell to a Secretary of State who, in the last post-war period, steered the foreign policy of the United States through troublous waters.

We say farewell to the man who, without lifting a finger or giving an encouraging nod of the head, was drafted as the nominee of his party for the Presidency of the United States.

We say farewell to the popular Governor of the State of New York who fought race-track gambling and exploitation of the people by selfish business groups.

We say farewell to a great lawyer and a great scholar.

But we say more as we welcome into well-earned retirement a man of character who stood up through thick and thin, through the pressures of politics and the passions of partisans, and never swayed.

It seems fitting that we should pay this tribute now. It is not just the customary applause for a job well done or for an individual who has performed a valuable service. It is rather a needed emphasis on a force that has gone—for the moment—an influence that can be dimmed and even frustrated in public life but which, we hope, will never perish from the chambers of justice. It is the force of character—a force that is not acquired simply by elevation to high office or to the pinnacles of financial or business success, but a force that emanates from the man himself, widening his ever-growing orbit of influence upon the citizens of his time.

JUSTICE—AN ALLEGIANCE TO TRUTH

Mr. Hughes might have been President of the United States. He would have made a great President. But he has not achieved less because he was never our Chief Executive. For he became in time the Chief Justice of the United States. What a world of meaning our forefathers conveyed when they created that title. They thought of justice as no counterpart of the vengeance of the crusader or the partisan. They thought of justice as no legislative panderer to votes. They thought of justice as no vehicle for exhibitionism or the self-conscious vanities that go with flourishes of the pen in legal opinions. They thought of judicial opinions, whether in assent or dissent, as the expression of a man's heart seeking in conscience to interpret the soul of justice itself.

For justice is not a strained effort to balance right against wrong, equity against equity, or precedent against precedent. It is a quality that emerges from selfless people whose honesty is not a rationalized piece of self-persuasion. It is a quality that can be stoically indifferent to the wounds of a temporary unpopularity. It is a quality that comes only with a sense of responsibility and with a sense of allegiance to truth.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS OF TRADITION BACK OF SUPREME COURT

Justice needs emphasis now when character, like tradition, meets the cynicism of the superintellectual who is inclined to mistake the throb of his own ego for the throb of a good society.

Justice has sat for more than 150 years in a tribunal revered by the American people as almost sanctified in its fairness in arbiting the disputes of human life. The traditions of the Supreme Court of the United States have been carried on through decades—traditions of independence in relation to other branches of the Government, traditions in defense of human rights, in defense of savings honestly acquired, in defense of labor's rights to organize, in defense of the rights of the human being to the fruits of his toil, in defense of liberties challenged by tyrants local or national, in defense of the rich and poor alike.

Today the man who, as Chief Justice in the turbulent 4 years since February 5, 1937, saw a President of the United States launch a public attack on the Supreme Court because its decisions did not happen to conform to his political philosophy as a party leader in another branch of the Government, passes from the scene. What memories of that bitter strife Mr. Hughes carries into retirement we cannot know. For he did not allow himself to be swept into the maelstrom of debate. If the institution itself could not be persuasively defended by the people themselves against unwarranted attack, his logic was that it ill became a member of that tribunal to play the role of defender.

True the Congress refused to pass the President's bill attempting to coerce the sitting judges into retirement by enlarging the number of new appointees. True the Congress, though composed of a two-thirds majority in both Houses of the members of the President's own political party, responded to an aroused public opinion by repudiating the President's proposal. But the struggle has not ended. Fate has given Mr. Roosevelt power to fill seven vacancies—more than a majority of the Court.

Have we today, instead of the "nine old men," a set of five "yes men"? And is this number now to be increased to seven "yes men"?

This is a question made pertinent because of the nature of the decisions rendered by what one of its conspicuous members recently in a formal opinion chose to term "a reconstructed Court." The opinions handed down in the session of the Court just ended are amazing in their deviation from accepted principles of constitutional law. Words not written in the statute have been supplied by the justices. What Congress meant to say or did not mean to say—though not revealed in the statute—are glibly interpolated through judicial legislation. Principles that have stood the test of time in their thoughtful balance of relationships between the Government and the citizen are demolished overnight. The lower courts are bewildered. The bar is stunned. The basic guide to human intercourse—that principles once settled are immutable but that details and applications of principles in specific cases alone may change—is now brushed aside.

MR. ROOSEVELT QUOTED ON "COURT PACKING"

Has the Supreme Court been "packed"? Let the words uttered by President Roosevelt in support of his bill for enlargement of the Court be cited now to clarify what has happened since. He said in a Nation-wide radio broadcast on March 9, 1937:

"What do they mean by the words 'packing the Court'? Let me answer this question with a bluntness that will end all honest misunderstanding of my purposes. If by that phrase 'packing the Court' it is charged that I wish to place on the Bench spineless puppets who would disregard the law and would decide specific cases as I wished them to be decided, I make this answer—that no President fit for his office would appoint, and no Senate of honorable men fit for their office would confirm that kind of appointees to the Supreme Court.

"But if by that phrase the charge is made that I would appoint and the Senate would confirm Justices worthy to sit beside present members of the Court who understand those modern conditions—that I will appoint Justices who will not undertake to override the judgment of the Congress on legislative policy—that I will appoint Justices who will act as Justices and not as legislators—if the appointment of such Justices can be called 'packing the Court,' then I say that I and with me the vast majority of the American people favor doing just that thing—now."

A GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT MOVES INTO THE RANKS

The record of the five "yes men" speaks for itself. With not a single exception, the five appointments were made not from the bench or from a list of the ablest members of the bar but from the small political group of new dealers who have been intimate advisers or personal appointees of the President in administrative offices. Other Presidents occasionally have elevated an Attorney General to the bench, but no President has selected almost an entire Supreme Court from a political clique steeped in the advocacy of a partisan cause.

The members of the bar who have been reading the decisions of the five "yes men" stand aghast. For they see a Court packed with men who are engaging in the very practices Mr. Roosevelt so vehemently condemned—the writing of legislation. They see a Court upholding almost every arbitrary order of the executive or administrative agencies no matter how capricious or ill-conceived. They see the Court voting almost always as a unit on New Deal issues, and they see a great Chief Justice in dissent after dissent, finally moving on in silence into the ranks and leaving it again to us to defend the institution he strove so nobly to preserve.

Farewell, Mr. Chief Justice. Farewell to a great public servant. But we shall not say farewell to character. For you have left behind a living ghost on that bench. And that ghost—the attributes of honesty, unselfishness, purity, and character—will remain always to haunt the zealots who in the name of virtue dare to ignore justice.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

LETTER FROM JAMES M. DAVIDGE, PRESIDENT OF BINGHAMTON JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Mr. James M. Davidge, president of the Binghamton Junior Chamber of Commerce:

BINGHAMTON JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Binghamton, N. Y., June 6, 1941.

Hon. EDWIN A. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: The Binghamton Junior Chamber of Commerce wishes hereby to express its considered and unqualified opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project, funds for which today the President asked congressional approval. Our position is taken in consideration of the following facts which, we believe, are incontrovertible:

1. The project could not be completed in time to be of service in the present emergency. Most experts agree that 1947 is the earliest date at which completion may be expected. On the contrary, it would divert manpower and material from our defense effort.

2. Steam plants for electric generation can be constructed in much less time and at a fraction of the cost.

3. There is 177,000 horsepower or idle generating capacity at Niagara Falls which can be used for expansion of our defense industries.

4. As a seaway the project cannot be defended as an advantage to American interests.

5. The expense would have to be borne almost entirely by American taxpayers.

6. It would seriously affect railway labor and coal miners in this country.

We respectfully urge that you use every means in your power to defeat the issue when presented before your body. We feel you should have no hesitancy in expressing your disapproval of a scheme which will add several billions to the staggering load which taxpayers are being asked to carry.

However, we do approve modification of the treaty of 1909, looking to a revision of water diversion rights, so that idle generating capacity at Niagara Falls may be put to work as needed. We urge you to exert your efforts to that end.

By order of the board of governors:

JAMES M. DAVIDGE,
President.

Progress Made by Farm Security Administration Borrowers of the Third District of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

LETTER FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by me from Hon. C. B. Baldwin, Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, telling of the splendid record of the farmers of my district in discharging their obligations and the substantial gains which they have made as a result of the aid extended to them by the F. S. A.

The letter referred to follows:

JUNE 2, 1941.

Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CARTWRIGHT: Since the beginning of the present emergency it has been generally recognized that the health, welfare, and morale of our people are vitally important to national defense. Providing for these needs among low-income farm families has been one of the essential contributions of the Farm Security Administration to the Nation's defense efforts during the past year.

We have just completed a special survey undertaken last winter to measure the progress being made by borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. It indicates the gains in terms of money, living standards, and capacity for self-support which have been made during 1940 by handicapped and low-income farm people all over the country. It occurred to me that you might be interested in seeing the figures for your district.

In the Third District of Oklahoma there were 3,161 active standard rehabilitation borrowers at the end of 1940. The survey showed that the average borrower earned a net income of $603 during the year, as compared with $398 in the year before he borrowed from Farm Security. In other words, the typical family increased its annual net income by 52 percent.

Also significant are the gains which these people made in net worth, since that is one of the best measures of permanent improvement in living standards. Borrowers in your district increased their average net worth—over and above all debts, including their obligations to the Government—from $440 before they came into the Farm Security program to $644 at the close of the 1940 crop year. This is a gain of 46 percent.

These figures mean that Farm Security borrowers in the Third District have added a total of $644,528 to the wealth of their communities, and have increased their total annual incomes by $649,080. Naturally this growth in prosperity and purchasing power has been reflected on the books of merchants and other businessmen of the district.

We were pleased to find that borrowers in your district are rapidly repaying their rehabilitation loans. Already $1,007,824 has been repaid on loans totaling $2,910,309, although much of the money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years. Throughout the entire country, rehabilitation loans totaling $420,865,050 had been made as of December 31, 1940, and $149,026,442 of this sum had been repaid. As you know, loan funds currently are advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instead of coming from direct appropriations.

In view of the fact that none of the borrowers from Farm Security was able to get adequate credit anywhere else, and that many of them formerly were on relief, we feel that this repayment record is a tribute to the honesty and industry of these needy farm people. There is ample evidence that the great majority of them are getting back on their feet and becoming permanently self-supporting. In large measure, this progress is due to the advice and technical guidance in sound farm and home management which accompanies each Farm Security loan.

For example, we encourage our borrowers to get away from one-crop farming—particularly of surplus crops, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat—and to raise as much as possible of their own food and feed for their livestock. During 1940, the average Farm Security family in your district produced $342 worth of goods for home consumption, as compared with $170 before they came into the F. S. A. program. This produce for home use included 420 gallons of milk per family, 416 pounds of meat, and 383 quarts of vegetables and fruit canned for the winter. This increased production of food did not, of course, add to the supply in the commercial

markets, since virtually none of it was offered for sale. It simply meant a better diet, better health, and a rising standard of living for these families.

Often it has been necessary to work out an adjustment of the family's old debts, before rehabilitation could be successful. Local farm-debt adjustment committees have been set up for this purpose. They have no legal authority to compel adjustments, but by bringing the farmer and his creditors together for a friendly discussion, they usually are able to arrange a scale-down of the obligations, reduced interest rates, or extension of the payment period. Such adjustments frequently save the farmer from foreclosure, and at the same time enable the creditors to get substantial payments on what might otherwise have been bad debts.

This service is available to all farmers, whether or not they are rehabilitation borrowers. Altogether, debt reductions totaling $531,287 have been negotiated for the farmers in your district. This represents a scale-down of 34.8 percent. As a direct result of these adjustments, $59,429 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

In making this special survey, our field employees reported that there are 3,559 families in your district who are eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans, but have been unable to get them because of the limited funds available.

In addition to the rehabilitation program, Farm Security is carrying out the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which provides a limited number of loans to competent tenants to enable them to buy family-type farms.

During the first 3 years of this program, we made 98 such loans in your district, totaling $497,669. This year we expect to make about 67 Bankhead-Jones loans in the Third District, amounting to approximately $306,769. Throughout the country, delinquencies of these loans have amounted so far to only 2.6 percent, or $23,658; and this has been more than offset by the fact that other borrowers have been able to make advance payments totaling $196,765, as the result of good crops and management.

I am hopeful that this rather detailed report may be useful to you; and if you would like to have any further facts about our program, I shall, of course, be glad to supply them. Sometime during the year, I hope that you may find an opportunity to visit some of the borrowers from F. S. A. in your district and see for yourself the efforts they are making to get a new start as independent, taxpaying citizens.

Sincerely,

C. B. BALDWIN,
Administrator.

Uncoordinated Is British-Aid Publicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK ON THE EDITORIAL PAGE OF NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of great stress and excitement, many statements are made by men occupying responsible positions that are often misleading. It is surprising that there is not more confusion when one considers the huge amount of propaganda poured forth each day over the radio and printed in the daily papers. I recommend that the Members of the House read the statement by Mr. Krock because I believe it demonstrates how difficult it is for the average citizen to determine the difference between true and false announcements.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times of June 10, 1941]

UNCOORDINATED IS BRITISH-AID PUBLICITY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—In round terms, the task assigned by the British Government to Sir Gerald Campbell is to bring American aid to his country up to the essential scale, insofar as publicity concerning the British war position can effect that. For at least three reasons this assignment is most difficult:

1. From the beginning of the war Sir Gerald's own Government has not been able to decide whether essential American aid can best be secured by optimism, hard realism, or pessimism in reporting the facts of the war.

2. The American Government, addressing Congress and the people, has wavered from the first position to the second, to the third, and then back again.

3. At no time have the two publicity policies been coordinated.

One illustration of the confusion is to be found in the reports concerned with the current visit of Ambassador Winant to this country. Since he had been only briefly at his post, his return was at first represented as impelled by an urgent errand. The newspaper correspondents on both sides of the Atlantic who so represented it did so because (a) for many weeks important administration officials have been saying that any further delay in all-out aid might be fatal to Great Britain before the year was out; (b) in the British Embassy here and in London Government and military circles (not from Nazi agents) correspondents have long been hearing the same thing; (c) Labor Minister Bevin, of Great Britain, had made the public statement that Hitler himself sent Rudolf Hess to Scotland, which could only mean that in Mr. Bevin's opinion Hitler had a proposal to make.

IN A RAIN OF CONFUSION

The effect of "a" and "b" was to invest the situation with a sense of acute urgency, which conforms to the wish of the British Government and many Americans in and out of official life. But the effect of "c" was to give life to the rumor, whether or not Nazi-encouraged, that some negotiation was being attempted. For none of this, or for the collision and confusion, was any reporter responsible; officials, on and off the record, were.

Mr. Winant came in a shower of such speculation and deduction. The President at last Friday's press conference struck out hard at the talk of peace negotiations, which had been evoked, in some measure at least, by Mr. Bevin's charge. When he was asked if Mr. Winant had brought a peace offer, whatever the source, the President replied: "Not even a tenth cousin of a peace offer, or anything like that, or any discussion of peace. Absolutely nothing like it."

This was good publicity for the British cause and for that policy of the administration which is termed "all necessary aid." It fitted perfectly into the pattern of what Sir Gerald is trying to accomplish. Intended as it was to rout the propaganda in this country that we should reserve all our armament for ourselves, it doubtless had that effect upon very many citizens.

But at the same press conference the President said no responsible source had reported that Great Britain could not continue the war more than a few months without greatly increased American aid. When asked if Sir Gerald had not made the public statement that Great Britain's situation was "very serious at the present time," he said this was one sentence lifted from its context and that if the whole statement were read a different idea would be obtained. The only logical presumption was that, in the President's opinion, a reading of the whole statement would produce the idea that Great Britain's situation is not "very serious at the present time."

WINANT'S CAPITOL CONFERENCE

Next day Ambassador Winant had a private conversation at the Capitol with four Senators. The Washington office of this newspaper made a most painstaking check on what Mr. Winant had said and reported it to have been this: Great Britain is in an "extremely grave position," both at sea and at home, but does not face "any immediate or impending disaster"; there is a "pretty good chance" to hold Egypt and Suez; Gibraltar can stand "any conceivable attack from the land"; the American Navy's Atlantic patrol is reducing shipping losses; the British have air superiority over the Channel and can stave off any invasion from the "near ports."

Another report of what Mr. Winant told the Senators was more optimistic: Britain's chances of victory are still favorable; there is no necessity for American intervention "provided this country intensifies its present aid program" (to what degree not indicated). Summing up, one Senator said: "It was not a gloomy picture at all," which would be true of both accounts. At the same time it was the description of a "very serious situation," as Sir Gerald said it was in the quoted sentence, and the President implied it was not.

The effect of all this is to strengthen congressional and public resistance to stronger military measures in aid to Britain, and that is bound to have a diminishing effect on some of the activities concerned with the defense program. Also, it dwindled the impression of urgency which Secretaries Hull, Knox, and Stimson gave in very recent speeches.

The British Embassy seemed to be upset by the mix-up, and no wonder.

Lady Eleanor—Veni, Vidi, Vici. Or Did She?

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of the ladies of the Mary Fletcher Hospital Auxiliary of Burlington, Vt., Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt visited Vermont last week, ostensibly to help, aid, and assist the above-named organization in its effort to raise a substantial sum of money for the support and maintenance of the Mary Fletcher Hospital.

The First Lady kept her agreement, arrived on time, made her speech in good form, and left as per schedule, but with all the proceeds from the sale of tickets in her pocket. She did not leave a cent for the auxiliary.

Incidentally, it is reported that she took with her approximately $100 more than was paid in by those who took advantage of the opportunity to see and to hear her and thus to contribute to a fund for the aid of the hospital.

The Barre Times of June 7, in its column "Vermont Affairs in Prevue and Revue," carries the following significant statement:

According to the best advices from Burlington, the address by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in that city Monday night was not very remunerative to the treasury of the Mary Fletcher Hospital Auxiliary which sponsored it. A report relayed from a reliable source is that after the expenses—including the stipend of $1,000 Mrs. Roosevelt is understood to have received—were paid, the deficit was somewhat over $100. Many had the mistaken impression that Mrs. Roosevelt's appearance was gratuitous.

S. J. R.

As a charitable venture to raise money for the hospital, the affair was a minus quantity. As a revenue producer for the First Lady, it was a success to the tune of the $1,000 she charged the ladies of the auxiliary and which they paid her for her efforts to "help, aid, and assist" this worth-while eleemosynary institution.

If reports received by interested parties are to be relied upon, the First Lady was running true to form.

Obviously, she believes that "charity begins at home," meaning, in the premises, in her bank account.

With Mrs. Roosevelt it would seem to be a question of how much she can get and take away, not how much she can do for the institution which sponsors her appearance.

But you make your own comment.

I know what I think.

I had better not tell you.

Convoys Urged and Strikes Condemned at Mass Meeting of Pittsburg County Citizens

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE McALESTER (OKLA.) NEWS-CAPITAL AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT PATRIOTIC MASS MEETING OF PITTSBURG COUNTY CITIZENS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the McAlester News-Capital telling of the patriotic mass meeting held recently in McAlester at which resolutions were adopted pledging loyal support to the President and the Congress, approving all-out aid to Britain, and urging that strikes be prohibited during the emergency.

This is the fifth such meeting held in counties in my congressional district and it is very gratifying to know that Oklahoma democracy is so overwhelmingly in favor of a program of total defense of America and keeping the horrors of this war removed from our shores by providing the necessary munitions of war to England and her allies.

The article and resolutions follow:

[From the McAlester (Okla.) News-Capital]

CONVOYS URGED AND STRIKES CONDEMNED AT MASS MEETING — PATRIOTIC GATHERING ADOPTS SEVERAL RESOLUTIONS—F. D. R.'S POLICIES APPROVED—DR. S. R. BRADEN SPEAKS

A patriotic mass meeting that was lightly attended last night because of numerous counter attractions, went on record with a pledge of loyalty to the national administration, and with some suggestions to Congress on means of handling labor problems in defense industries.

Mayor Robert J. Bell presided. The key address was delivered by Dr. Samuel R. Braden, who stressed the duties of citizens in the time of crisis. He cited the responsibilities and the part that the youth movement holds with its very important bloc of citizens.

Dr. Braden shunned controversial issues while pointing to the danger that exists. He urged that the ideals of those who founded the Republic be adhered to and that the principles of the democratic form of government be kept alive.

THREE OTHERS SPEAK

Among others who spoke briefly during the meeting were W. A. Lackey, Pres Lester, and Melven Cornish.

A resolution committee was composed of R. L. Crutcher, John Malloy Lester, Gould Bryan, and Tom G. Haile, the latter chairman.

Resolutions as submitted were later amended on the motion of Cornish to cover the recommendation to Congress on the rights of labor during the present national emergency.

The adopted resolutions expressed sympathy with the British Empire. It was urged that all possible assistance be given as quickly as possible.

SUBORDINATE PERSONAL GAIN

The President's policies and acts of Congress were approved and it was asked that all persons willingly subordinate personal gain to the public good during the emergency.

Divine guidance was invoked.

It was further resolved that the universal draft be approved, the lease-lend bill be endorsed, and that it be made 100-percent effective by the use of the United States Navy in convoying American and allied vessels carrying American-made goods on the high seas.

"We favor," said the resolution, "efforts to speed up production in our factories and workshops. We believe the Government should continue to recognize the rights of labor, organized and unorganized, to a fair share in the industrial war profits by equitable increase in wages; but once such increase, measured by the demands of labor and therefore won by strikes, has been attained, then and thereafter both strikes and lock-outs should be prohibited during the emergency."

Copies of the resolutions are being sent to the President of the United States, the two Oklahoma Senators, and to Representative WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, of this district.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is now raging in Europe a devastating war that seems destined to engulf the whole world and has already disturbed the domestic tranquillity of this and all other nonbelligerent nations; and

Whereas the patriotic citizens of Pittsburg County, alarmed at the threat of war, have been called into mass convention upon the petition of some 40 or more representative citizens of this community; and

Whereas we sincerely sympathize with our sister democracy, the British Empire, that is fighting single-handed the battle of democracy against the aggressor nations; and

Whereas we believe that all possible assistance should be given to her as quickly as possible; and

Whereas we believe our President and Congress are making every effort to protect and defend the freedom of the seas, a time-honored policy of this Nation, to the end that our aid may be effective; and

Whereas we believe that all our people are patriotic and that all those engaged in the defense program, both capital and labor, will willingly subordinate personal gain to public good during the emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the citizens of Pittsburg County in mass convention assembled, That we invoke Divine blessing on and Divine guidance for our people, the President, and Congress; that we pledge to them our patriotic and loyal support in their efforts to see that the liberties of the people do not perish from the earth; and be it further

Resolved, In order that the President and Congress may know the sentiment of this community—

First. That we approve the universal draft that has called our youth to the training camps to prepare them to become effective defenders of our liberties;

Second. That we approve the lease-lend bill designed to give all-out aid to Britain, and to make our aid 100 percent effective; we favor the use of our Navy in convoying American and Allied vessels carrying American-made goods upon the high seas;

Third. We favor and commend the efforts being made to speed up production in our factories and workshops. We believe the Government should continue to recognize the rights of labor, organized and unorganized, to a fair share in industrial war profits by equitable increase in wages; but once such increase, measured by the demands of labor heretofore won by strikes, has been attained, then and thereafter both strikes and lock-outs should and must be prohibited during the emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That we pledge Pittsburg County, Okla., to join hands with all liberty-loving people everywhere to the end that democracy may survive to bless and protect generations yet unborn; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, to our two United States Senators from Oklahoma, and to our Congressman from the Third Congressional District.

Respectfully submitted this 16th day of May 1941.

TOM G. HAILE,
Chairman.
P. S. LESTER,
R. L. CRUTCHER,
GOULD BRYAN,
JNO. M. MALLOY,
Members of Resolution Committee.

Cardinal O'Connell Reiterates His Opposition to United States "Participation in the European Chaos"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE PILOT, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from The Pilot, of May 17, 1941:

[From the Pilot, Boston, Mass., of May 17, 1941]

CARDINAL URGES WORK FOR PEACE IN PRESENT CRISIS—ADDRESSES K. OF C. COUNCIL MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 13—HIS EMINENCE SAYS THAT UNITY IN DEFENSE EFFORTS WITH ISOLATION FROM DIRECT PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN CHAOS IS RIGHT PATH OF ACTION

To the Massachusetts State Council of Knights of Columbus, holding their forty-seventh annual meeting at the Copley Plaza Hotel Tuesday of this week, His Eminence the Cardinal spoke in vigorous condemnation of the false war propaganda rife on all sides at the present time. His Eminence reiterated his statement made in a previous address that this country ought to keep out of foreign entanglements which must lead directly into war, and that the people of this country do not want to go to war.

The cardinal spoke with impressive sincerity which imparted the strongest conviction to his words. Eight hundred delegates, together with many of their relatives and friends, listened to the address of His Eminence, which was, in part, as follows:

CARDINAL'S ADDRESS

I don't intend to go into the big crisis in the world of today and the crises going on all over the world. I have said what I wanted to say on that subject, and I don't see any particular purpose in repeating it. In fact, repetition very often weakens rather than strengthens your statements.

I have good reason to know that what I did say on prior occasions went all over the country and, indeed, I think over a good part of the world. Now, that position I hold and I will still hold as being one of conviction for me. I will not repeat what I have already said two or three times. That, I think, is unnecessary.

You know where I stand on this matter of participation in the European chaos and you know also, as I am sure all America must know, that we are all entirely united on the question of defense. On the question of defense there is no disunity in this country, as far as one can see. Of course, I think there are always elements in every country that one has to watch, but they are infinitesimally small compared to the vast majority of the American people who stand for the defense of our Nation, and who also have gone on record again and again and again as being opposed to participation in foreign wars.

It seems to me that this has been announced and repeatedly said by men in the most eminent positions of state. Therefore, I wonder why anyone else should be surprised at the open statement of that position.

A GLORIOUS TITLE

Our duty as Catholics and Christians is to help to bring back peace to the world. When has that become a sin? Christ himself said, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God."

Yet to say the word "peace" nowadays would be almost to bring down upon your head a torrent of abuse. Is that rational or is it just hysterical?

There is no question about the fact that there is over the world some miasma that is producing disastrous effects. Indeed, sometimes it seems to be taking away the power of reasoning. People are now in such a tense, nervous mood that they get frightfully excited about nothing at all. Well, I think that is a part of the madness of war. Just for that very reason one has to be doubly on his guard and keep cool, keep calm, keep reasonable, keep rational.

Of all things in the world I think what we have to guard against are these slimy slogans that mean nothing. They are insults to one's intelligence. And worse than that, they are dishonest. "Make the world safe for democracy." "The war to end wars." Oh, how slick that is. It sounds so nice. "The war to end wars."

Of course, everybody wants to end war so they rush in to end the war that they begin. We have had wars ever since, and the worst one the world has ever known has come about since this slogan was manufactured to fool the people.

"The war to end war," "Safe for democracy." And you have heard some more. I won't repeat them. Freedom? Freedom for whom? Freedom of speech? Well, if this smearing goes on, it will be freedom of speech for only the deaf mutes who can't talk. Freedom. Oh, the great freedom of the Son of God, the great freedom of obedience to His laws. If the world would turn away for a moment to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount and stop all these silly slogans, which mean nothing but deception, the world would be a great deal better off.

A FIRM CONVICTION

And that is why, my dear Knights, you Catholic men who believe in principles must stand firm, unafraid, to love your God, to love your church, to love your country. You have helped to build it; you have helped to bring about its welfare. You are willing to give your life for its defense. Very well, then stand straight. And never mind the silly, slimy slogans that are being poured out merely to create confusion and to deceive people.

Now, I am not talking pointedly; I am talking generally. If it applies, I cannot help that. I don't make any application.

There is one thing certain. We cannot and we should not try to impose our form of government on the whole world. Why, other peoples don't want it. If you are going to impose it upon them, then you are doing an act of tyranny. Teach them by example; yes. Let them all learn to look to America as a great country where people are contented and happy and are working day in and day out for the welfare of their family, and their Nation—contented, honest, upright, obedient to the law of God and country; let them learn that.

By that example show the world what a great big united country this can be—made up as it is of all the different races of the world—united by love of country.

To try to impose our form of government on the world is a thing, of course, utterly impossible. I wonder if anyone really believes he could do that. If he doesn't believe it, why should he say it? It is not honest to attempt to deceive a whole people, much less the whole world. They know perfectly well what the American Government is, and many of them don't want it. Their traditions are all the other way. Very well; it is for them to decide, not for us.

But as for our going out and trying to impose our method of life on the whole world, it is not only nonsense and impossible but it is utterly wrong; it is tyranny. If they are happier in their way of life, let them alone. * * * That is the leadership America ought to have.

I remember well the story of a farmer who, whenever the fire bells sounded, left his plow and ran to the fire, even though sometimes the fire was miles away. One day he went to a fire and came back to find his own house in ashes and his family on the street.

Now, is America going to play this sort of silly game, running around to everybody's fire trying to extinguish all the blazes, and come back to find its own house in ruins? God forbid. That is what we mean when we say "defense." Yes; all out for defense, and then keep out of these foreign wars.

CONVENTION EXERCISES

The delegates attending a mass celebrated at St. Cecilia's Church on Tuesday morning. Rt. Rev. Richard J. Quinlan, diocesan supervisor of schools, gave the sermon. Msgr. Quinlan spoke in particular of the work which the Knights can do for the youth in an age when they are surrounded by many temptations and are peculiarly open to the influence of modern evils.

The reelection of the State council officers brought the convention to a close. They are Walter G. Powers, of Taunton, State deputy; Judge Frank W. Tomasello, of Boston, State secretary; James H. Flanagan, of Boston, State advocate; Edward A. Hurley, of Boston, State treasurer; William F. Brennan, of Chicopee, auditor; and Michael J. Hegarty, of Reading, State warden. The last office presented the only contest.

Other speakers at the business session were the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis L. Phelan, S. T. L., chaplain of the organization; Governor Saltonstall, and Judge John E. Swift, deputy supreme knight of the national order.

Put Your Finger on Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House frequent statements were made to the effect that employers are not doing their part toward national defense. That statement has often been made on the floor, and it is about time that at least someone of those who make it point out definitely just which industrialist or employer is refusing to go along with the national-defense program.

I am not referring now to employers who have been charged with unfair labor practices under the N. L. R. A. nor with failure to meet the wage or other demands of unions. I am asking some Member of the House to tell us one specific instance where an employer has refused to cooperate with the Government on the national-defense program.

It would not be polite to say "put up or shut up," but the information is requested.

This request is suggested by an editorial from the Detroit Free Press, headed "No miracle needed." It is as follows:

Col. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, in addressing a group of American shipbuilders in Washington, told them that they must "bring about a miracle" to furnish the ships necessary for the administration program.

"This war will be determined by a combination of sea and air power," he declared. "You have in your hands the responsibility for the success of one-half of this combination. Through you the democracies are going to win or lose."

The shipbuilders solemnly promised to do their best to perform the "miracle" demanded.

It is to be regretted that there was not one among them who had the courage to stand up and ask the Secretary why the administration should continue to maintain a condition so difficult of solution that "only a miracle" can solve it.

The dictionary says that a miracle is an event which deviates from the known laws of nature; or, transcending our knowledge of these laws, is brought about by some superhuman agency as a manifestation of its power. Colonel Knox is asking a lot of hard-boiled and altogether human manufacturers to perform something akin to the "miracle of the loaves and fishes."

He may be right in hoping for this. Only a miracle can overcome the handicap placed upon management by President Roosevelt himself in keeping such an incompetent as Frances Perkins in a position where she can hamstring all efforts to solve the problem of labor unrest.

There was a time in the beginning of civilization on this continent when the Pilgrim Fathers were inclined to look for miracles to save them. But hard-headed old John Eliot, Puritan preacher to the Indians, knew better.

"We must not sit down and look for miracles," he told them. "Up and be doing and the Lord will be with thee."

The Free Press is of the belief that the time has come when the people of this Nation have grown weary of the long-continued farce over our national-defense program at Washington.

While Secretary Knox is telling the shipbuilders to go out and perform miracles, 8,000 workers in the Great Lakes Steel Corporation at Ecorse walk out to the "surprise" of the union leaders who call a "spontaneous stoppage." The shipyards on the Pacific coast still remain idle unto the fourth week. Pittsburgh is threatened with complete paralysis in its steel production. And so it goes across the country.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, hard-headed and practical statesman, before the Senate Tuesday said that on May 31 there were 74 strikes against industries filling Army and Navy orders and only 3 of these had been certified to the National Defense Mediation Board by Secretary Perkins. These figures did not include, he said, the 21 strikes and threatened strikes in industries working on merchant ships.

Since the fireside chat of 1 week ago, as Raymond Clapper points out, the strikes have grown steadily more serious, despite the appeal of the President for peace in industry.

In his more than 8 years in the White House Mr. Roosevelt has not only been the friend but the stanch protector of labor, until the time has come when his administration is accepted as a labor government. In all his time in office he has never uttered one word of criticism of the unions except the famous "plague on both your houses" remark, when the war between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. flamed forth more bitterly than usual.

Not in one instance has there been any specific proof of any manufacturer of any consequence who has refused to conform to the Government's demands for production. Yet management, day after day, takes the abuse of administration spokesmen and not one word is ever uttered against the union leaders who openly defy the administration's pleas for their return to work.

Not only labor but the American people as a whole look to Franklin D. Roosevelt as the real leader of this American labor movement.

The responsibility for the present condition, therefore, is his and his alone as long as he prefers to remain silent.

The miracle for which Secretary Knox pleads must come from the White House.

And it requires no supernatural powers but just some plain, straight talk followed by action where it will do the most good.

Japan—Friend or Foe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE STURGIS (MICH.) DAILY JOURNAL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, home folks are inquiring. They would like to know. With the administration threatening Japan, but at the same time permitting the shipment to her of oil and other essentials for a nation at war, some of the home folks would like to know whether the administration regards Japan as a friend or a foe.

Note this editorial from the Friday, June 6, issue of the Sturgis Daily Journal, published at Sturgis, Mich.:

[From the Sturgis (Mich.) Daily Journal of June 6, 1941]

JAPAN—FRIEND OR FOE?

The people of Michigan have ample reason to be grateful that one of the few sane voices that is being heard in Washington is that of its senior Senator, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.

There can be no doubt that Senator VANDENBERG has correctly appraised the temper of his constituents. He understands that an overwhelming majority of Michigan citizens are opposed to the efforts now being made to rush the Nation into a European war for which we are not prepared and whose result, it becomes increasingly apparent, we cannot control.

The sentiment of the people of this State was made evident in the vote on the lease-lend bill when 14 out of Michigan's delegation of 17 Congressmen opposed giving the President blanket authority to shoot craps with the Nation's destiny.

In his most recent speech in the Senate Senator VANDENBERG urged the Roosevelt administration to upset the strategy of the Axis powers and eliminate the threat of a two-ocean war for the United States by making an agreement with Japan which would realistically assess the new situation in the Far East. The Michigan Senator pointed out that such a step would do more to simplify and sustain our own defense preparations than literally months of frantic efforts in speeding up our production of ships, guns, tanks, and planes.

About the time Senator VANDENBERG was making his suggestion Secretary of the Navy Knox was begging for a miracle from the shipbuilders to provide the United States with warships to protect the country from attack in two oceans.

Why has the United States gotten itself into such a predicament that it is exposed to attack from both the east and the west? There is ample evidence to support the belief that Japan would have welcomed an anti-aggression treaty with this country in preference to the deal she was forced to make with her ancient and logical enemies, Russia and Germany. Such a pact would have relieved the United States from all fear of attack in the Pacific and enabled it to concentrate what is now the world's most powerful navy in the Atlantic to block any plans Hitler might have for this hemisphere. Incidentally, such a concentration of our naval power would be enormously reassuring and helpful to Great Britain.

By our lack of diplomatic gumption we have allowed ourselves to be maneuvered into a desperate plight where it becomes necessary to depend on shipbuilding miracles to protect us from attack on two fronts.

Germany set an example that would have been sound sense for us to follow. Before Hitler launched his campaign for the conquest of Europe he made certain that Germany was not exposed to attack from the rear by Russia. Without the nonagression pact that Hitler's diplomats wangled out of Stalin, Hitler would never have dared to start his military adventure against France and England.

There will be those who will oppose Senator Vandenberg's suggestion by pointing out that Japan cannot be trusted to keep any agreement that it makes with the United States. Yet Germany has far more reason to distrust Russia than the United States has to doubt Japan's motives. There is the further factor that Japan needs our help even more than we need hers.

Japan is a nation of realists and it knows where its interests lie. There was a time when it would have welcomed a gesture of friendship from the United States, but all it has had from the Roosevelt administration is a series of insults and ultimatums that have forced it into the arms of Russia and Germany. There is no reason to believe, even now, that Japan is happy in this company. Even at this late date it might be possible to wean her away from the Axis Powers. It's worth the effort.

Rules Committee Requested To Hold Hearings on Resolution Exploring Need for Unified Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks on the floor at the beginning of today's session, I am reprinting in the RECORD at this point a copy of my letter to Chairman ADOLPH J. SABATH of the House Rules Committee. I do this because of the widespread interest which has been expressed by Members of the House in the important problems with which my resolution—House Resolution 228—deals, in its relationship to

proposals for modernizing and strengthening the air forces of the United States. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1941.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 5 I introduced House Resolution No. 228 which was referred to your committee. The purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Speaker to appoint a nine-man committee to hold an inquiry to determine whether our present arrangement of having separate air branches in the War and Navy Departments best serves the defense interests of the United States or whether our defense can be strengthened and modernized, in view of experiences observed in this war, by setting up a separate air department, or by the consolidation of our air, war, and naval forces under a single Department of National Defense, with each divisional chief having coordinate ranking.

I am sure that you and your committee are fully aware of the growing concern throughout America about this problem. Several resolutions and much newspaper and radio comment favor the immediate creation of a sensible policy to provide an inquiry such as I suggest to determine all the facts before any abrupt changes are made. Such an inquiry will present an opportunity to secure all the facts and its findings will be accepted by the country as authentic and thus set at rest the discontent and growing criticism resulting from simply continuing the present policy without giving Congress an opportunity to be certain that some other method of utilizing our air forces is not superior.

Yesterday we appropriated nearly $10,000,000,000 for additional defense for America; much of it is connected with the aviation aspects of national defense. Let us now complete our task in Congress by authorizing this inquiry so that we can be sure that we have the most modern methods as well as the most modern equipment with which to defend the Western Hemisphere. In this spirit, I am writing this letter to respectfully request that your committee grant me an early hearing on House Resolution 228 to determine the wisdom of permitting Congress to vote upon the authorization of such an inquiry as I propose. If my request is granted, I shall appreciate it if you will notify me in advance of this hearing as several Members of Congress, in addition to the writer, would like to present some additional data to your committee at that time.

I trust your prevailing sense of justice and your frequently demonstrated interest in the improvement of our national defense will cause you to grant an affirmative reply to this request.

Cordially yours,
KARL MUNDT, *Member of Congress.*

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER SUPPORTS SINGLE OVER-ALL DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, I also include a few passages from the recent book, Across the Busy Years, by President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University, which indicate some possible increases in efficiency which might come from the consolidation and coordination of all defense services of this country in a single Department of National Defense with Under Secretaries of equal rank in charge of the divisions of air, army, and navy. These quotations are from page 358 of volume 2 of President Butler's work:

My attention was first drawn to this subject (single Department of National Defense) when reading the history of our Civil War. Its importance was greatly increased when in later years I read the very illuminating story of the details of that war as seen by a member of Lincoln's Cabinet, his Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, of Connecticut, who lived until 1878. Later on, John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts, who was Secretary of War both in the Cabinet of President Harding and in that of President Coolidge, discussed with me in great detail and was most insistent that the relations between the Army and the Navy must in the public interest be quickly improved. He said there was but one way to accomplish that, which was to establish a single Department of National Defense, with an Under Secretary for the Army, an Under Secretary for the Navy, and an Under Secretary for the air force. Secretary Weeks told many stories which were certainly extraordinary in revealing the rivalry and friction which had grown up between the several military establishments.

Mr. Speaker, America's defenses must be second to none in the world either in the matter of modern methods or modern material. An inquiry such as I have proposed in House Resolution 228 will give all parties concerned an opportunity for a fair and unprejudiced hearing to the end that we can all be reassured that nothing is being overlooked in the important job of making this country and this hemisphere an invincible citadel of freedom.

Cardinal O'Connell Insists That the United States "Must Keep Out of This Madness Created by Hate"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM CARDINAL O'CONNELL READ AT AMERICA FIRST MEETING IN NEW YORK

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of telegram read at America First meeting held in Madison Square Garden, New York, May 23, 1941:

JOHN T. FLYNN,
New York, N. Y.:

Your touching appeal to me compels me to repeat once more the cry of a Christian heart to God begging Him, in His great mercy, to open the minds and hearts of those entrusted with the government of nations to the real horror of the present insensate conflict and make them realize the crime of continuing this inhuman slaughter and the utter desolation, material and moral, which threatens all civilization and civil order. To deny the possibility of immediate peace is to deny the presence of intelligence and good will on earth. Millions and millions are praying daily and working for peace among the nations. Practically the whole population of our dear country is averse to the continuation of this stupid and insane war. Nearly all the people of this country have decided already and still hold to their decision that the United States must keep out of this madness created by hate. Our country wants two things above all—the defense which makes it strong against its enemies and the peace which makes it strong at home. Christ blessed the peacemakers and therefore since the purpose of this meeting is to further peace and good will on earth Christ will bless you and aid you in your holy efforts to bring an end to this conflict. And I, in my humble capacity as a priest of God, send you my most cordial best wishes and blessing.

WILLIAM CARDINAL O'CONNELL,
Archbishop of Boston.

Poll of Citizens of Neosho, Mo., on Intervention of the United States in the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, a few of us from the Midwest who have been telling the Nation that our section of the country is for strong national defense and opposed to taking part in the European war were greatly surprised by the contents of an article printed in Life magazine of May 26, 1941. According to that particular issue of Life, we did not know the sentiment of our own people. I am pleased to say that we have been vindicated.

There has been much comment to the effect that the public press is trying to sell the American people upon the desirability of intervention in the current European war. In its issue of May 26 Life magazine printed an interesting article seeking to show that a typical midwestern town, typically American, was in favor of intervention. The town chosen as guinea pig was Neosho, in southwest Missouri. The conclusion of the Life correspondent was, I quote: "Most of its citizens are for intervention."

The America First Committee refused to accept this conclusion and paid for a poll which was conducted by Springfield Newspapers, Inc. The question asked was, "Do you favor United States entry into the European war?" Ballots were mailed to all Neosho citizens listed in the city directory of that town. Returns of the poll show that 69.6 percent of the people are opposed to intervention.

It is such observations as this that remind us of the serious responsibility the public press has to the people in giving fair and impartial statements on the crisis in international affairs. Loosely worded and haphazard calculations, such as made by Life magazine in this instance, tend to undermine confidence in the press and all publications which seek to give a news coverage.

The people of this Nation are not going to be frightened into another futile overseas expedition. They are for national defense and will fight to the last man for defense of our country. National defense is not served by provoking attack before we are adequately prepared

to defend our own shores. National unity is not served by biased, prejudiced, and inflammatory articles which seek to make beliefs of a loud minority the policies of the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles concerning this poll from the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press of May 30, 1941]

ALL NEOSHO TO BE ASKED TO VOTE ON INTERVENTION

How does Neosho, Mo., stand on United States intervention in the war against Hitler?

Seeking an answer to the question of how the Middle West stands on the subject, Life magazine chose Neosho as a sample—reported, "Most of its citizens are for intervention."

But the America First Committee refused to accept such a conclusion; its spokesman here, O. K. Armstrong, visited Neosho and reported a prevailing sentiment against intervention.

To establish the facts of the matter, the Springfield newspapers will poll the entire city.

Sometime over the week end, every citizen of Neosho who is listed in the city directory will receive the following letter:

SPRINGFIELD NEWSPAPERS, INC.,
Springfield, Mo., May 28, 1941.

DEAR CITIZEN: An article in the May 26 issue of Life discusses the attitude of the citizens of your city, Neosho, as observed by a reporter for that magazine. The subtitle of the article reads:

"Visiting this small and peaceful town in Missouri, Life's reporter investigates its feelings on the war and finds most of its citizens are for intervention."

In the article, the reporter says: "In talking to businessmen, shopkeepers, lawyers, factory workers, and farmers in Neosho, I find a unanimity of interventionist sentiment that surprised me."

It surprised quite a few others, too—some so much that they have sharply challenged the conclusion.

As a result, O. K. Armstrong, representing the America First Committee, visited Neosho this week and brought back an opposite report. He said he talked to about 20 Neosho people, and got the impression the town is 80 percent against intervention.

Life, of course, has long crusaded for America's more active and aggressive participation in promoting the war. America First is an organization which equally strongly opposes the entry of this country into war.

The Springfield Newspapers, Inc., do not know which report is the more nearly accurate. It looks to us as though an interventionist in Neosho found interventionist sentiment; and a noninterventionist found noninterventionist sentiment. Each seemed to find what he sought.

Neither side really answered the important question: Do the people of the United States, as represented in a typical midwestern town, Neosho, want this country to enter the World War?

To determine the answer as impartially and accurately as possible the Springfield newspapers are taking a poll of all Neosho citizens, mailing ballots to every adult person listed in the latest city directory.

In order to make this poll as complete and true as possible, will you please mark and mail immediately the enclosed card. It is not necessary to sign it. We shall be grateful for your prompt cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

SPRINGFIELD NEWSPAPERS, INC.

P. S.: Where two cards are enclosed, one is for husband and one for wife.

Enclosed with the letter will be post-card ballots bearing the one direct question: "Do you favor United States entry into the European war?"

[From the Sunday News and Leader, Springfield, Mo., of June 8, 1941]

NEOSHO 69.6 PERCENT OPPOSED TO AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN WAR—ARMSTRONG THINKS POLL SHOWS SENTIMENT THROUGHOUT STATE

(By Docia Karell)

By a vote of 69.6 percent "No" on the question, "Do you favor United States entry into the European war?" the Springfield newspapers' poll of Neosho has disproved Life magazine's conclusion that there is "a unanimity of interventionist sentiment" in that typical Ozarks city.

The poll ended yesterday with a return of 994 ballots marked as follows:

No, 692; yes, 276; uncertain, 26.

Of 3,153 ballots mailed out to every Neosho citizen listed in the latest city directory, 99 were returned undelivered, apparently because the addressees had moved from the community. That leaves 3,054 ballots for which to account—and 994 is practically one-third of that many. A one-third return on any such poll is considered average and satisfactory.

BALLOTS TO EVERYBODY

Most polls, to being with, pick only a limited number of typical persons to question, and consider the result representative. This one was all-inclusive; ballots were mailed to all, regardless of status or vocation.

The America First Committee paid the expenses, the poll having been suggested by O. K. Armstrong, America First worker, who questioned Life's report, and, after a visit to Neosho, made an estimate that 80 percent of the population opposes intervention.

Cost of the poll, paid by the America First Committee, was about $135, including postage, printing, and stenographer's fee.

Of the results of the poll, Mr. Armstrong said yesterday, "I am gratified. I believe it represents fairly accurately, not only the sentiment of Neosho, but also the sentiment of Missouri citizens as a whole throughout the State. Taking the entire Middle West, and including States like Wisconsin, where anti-interventionist feeling is very strong, I believe the same sentiment would run 5 to 10 percent higher.

"Life did select a typical small city in the Midwest," conceded Mr. Armstrong. "But Life started out with a purpose—it intended to show a majority in favor of intervention. We have presented accurate results (through the poll) correcting the misleading impression which Life gave."

"After all, the issue that has got to be settled is: Shall this country go to war? And I think it will be settled very, very soon.

"The fact that the Springfield newspapers conducted the poll, insured that it would be fair and impartial in every way."

The Springfield newspapers also considered the question on the ballot perfectly fair.

Their only purpose in taking it was to find what the real facts are—no effort was made to influence it; and, on the contrary, every effort was made to be impartial and fair to both sides. From the newspapers' point of view, it was strictly a news project—to report as accurately and completely as possible, what the sentiment is; not to promote either side.

It is probable that a few late, straggling ballots may still come in, but officially the count was completed yesterday. A few votes more or less would not change the result, anyhow, since the percentage—about 70 percent "noes"—has been running the same each day since the first returns began to be received.

Economic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an interesting and provoking summarization of the principles of economic freedom, prepared by a constituent of mine, Mr. C. T. Habegger, of Berne, Ind.

Mr. Habegger, a small-town businessman who has earned national recognition as a champion of local ownership and free enterprise, believes that there should be a clarification of the fundamental rights which go to make up "the American way of life."

Mr. Habegger goes straight to the point when he asks:

Just what are those fundamentals we talk about?

Why not begin with a clarification of those fundamentals so that we know what we mean by democracy in business, democracy in religion, democracy in government, and democracy of thought?

That's another way of stating the four freedoms—economic, religious, political, and intellectual.

To me it seems that we have a fairly clear picture of the last three, but an altogether blurred picture of the first. And yet the last three are dependent upon the first, for without economic freedom—democracy in business—the masses will demand a form of public socialism which immediately begets governmental dictatorship which becomes an octopus that can thrive only by destroying religious and intellectual freedom.

Mr. Habegger then proceeds to summarize what economic freedom means to him, admitting that it needs to be refined, polished, and perhaps shortened. His summary can be studied with benefit by all of us, and I am sure Mr. Habegger would appreciate your comment on it.

The article follows:

AN APPROACH AT THE SUMMARIZATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMIC FREEDOM

(By C. T. Habegger)

1. Men must be esteemed as sacred personalities—as inviolable souls, born with the undeniable right to live as freemen, economically, politically, and spiritually.

2. John Stuart Mill's definition of freedom, "That of pursuing our own good in our own way so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it," is still correct.

3. Individual and family welfare comes ahead of institutional welfare. The institution is created by man to benefit man, rather than man to benefit the institution.

4. The best form of government yet designed for a good society of freemen is a benevolent, capitalistic, representative democracy, providing freedom, opportunity, and rewards commensurate with the intrinsic worth and effort of all citizens.

5. Such a government voluntarily wins the loyal support of worthy citizens in its permanent welfare by providing a genuine opportunity to possess a deserving personal stake—not too little, nor too much—in its economic,

political, and spiritual benefits, permitting any citizen, regardless of his position at birth to rise by the route of merit to the highest honors in the land.

6. The highest concept of general welfare is not based on wealth, but contentment; not greed, but culture; not hoarding, but giving; not privilege, but justice; not servitude, but freedom; not efficiency, but happiness; not war, but peace. These intangible assets are priceless in comparison to any materialistic assets.

7. In the eternal struggle between the forces of materialistic domination (might) and the forces of humanitarian freedom (right), the former must yield always.

8. Our standard of living must be appraised by the quality of informed free men a government develops, rather than by the cheapness or the abundance of the goods its machinery can produce. Abundance with happiness comes only when free men can see and feel an incentive to work and venture under rules which guarantee equal opportunities for each generation.

9. Next to ignorance, we must recognize monopolistic, regimented enterprise, characterized by excessive absenteeism, as the greatest enemy of a free people. Absenteeism is a reactionary force, nullifying and disavowing democracy itself. It begets dictatorship in government.

10. Local control of local affairs, economically, politically, and religiously, is the foundation of freedom and democracy.

Post-War Plan Urged To Taper Off Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely article by Mr. C. B. Allen from the New York Herald Tribune of June 7, 1941:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 7, 1941]

POST-WAR PLAN URGED TO TAPER OFF PRODUCTION—MANUFACTURERS WANT UNITED STATES TO LET CONTRACTS RUN ON AS ANTISLUMP PRECAUTION

(By C. B. Allen)

As a long-range move to forestall as far as possible the disastrous economic slump that has followed forced-draft production in every previous national emergency, a number of defense-equipment manufacturers, it was learned today, are urging the Government to modify the War and Navy Departments' standard end-of-the-emergency cancelation clause in their contracts with industry.

Defense officials are said to favor the suggestion, the purpose of which is to taper off war-material production over several months or a year instead of bringing it to an abrupt halt when hostilities end.

Proponents believe the move would do much to cushion the country through the inevitably rocky period of readjustment to peacetime production which they foresee upon cessation of the present all-out demand for war supplies. Unless such action is taken, many of them feel that post-war unemployment conditions may attain chaotic and possibly disastrous proportions.

JOB AMORTIZATION

They point out that the Government, through its plant-expansion amortization and allied legislation, has already taken steps which safeguard capital to a certain degree against the heavy load it has been asked to carry in the national-defense and aid-to-Britain program. It is therefore logical, they maintain, that the Government should undertake what amounts to a job-amortization program for the millions of men and women who would almost immediately be thrown out of work if all defense contracts were summarily terminated as provided under their present end-of-the-emergency basis.

Specific proposals have been made that defense production be tapered off on a percentage basis, month by month, in order to give manufacturing concerns an opportunity to return to normal business, gradually absorbing the workmen thrown out of defense jobs.

One of the greatest advantages argued for such a program is that it not only would reduce to a minimum the discontent and other psychological factors which have attended the mass cessation of all previous war production efforts, but also would maintain the productive skill of factory employees up to the moment of their transfer to other jobs.

WOULD BAN DUMPING

One thing implicit in the proposal, however, is that military services agree to hold in reserve even those war materials such as airplanes, trucks, tractors, and similar equipment which might be turned to peacetime use, agreeing not to paralyze industry by dumping them on either the domestic or foreign market at sacrifice prices.

According to Labor Department estimates of last fall, from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 previously unemployed men and women will have been absorbed in national-defense jobs by the end of this year. This gives a good indication of the total number of workmen now engaged in the production of war materials.

Indications are that the proposal will be laid before Congress before the end of the present session, either by the industrialists who conceived the plan and are rallying behind it or by the Government's own long-range planning experts. The plan is said to be gaining favor in the latter quarter because it is realized that the Government will have to take care of the post-war unemployed either by direct relief or by some other means such as the job-amortization scheme, and that this seems to be a much more constructive procedure than the dole.

Advertisement and Sale of Alcoholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS OF FAIRBURY, NEBR.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a statement to the Members of Congress from a group of patriotic, Christian women of Fairbury, Nebr. These women are to be commended for their interest in and concern for the youth of America.

The statement follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned citizens of Fairbury, of the county of Jefferson, of the State of Nebraska, do respectfully petition you to help promote the welfare of the people of the United States by securing the passage of legislation which will stop, as far as possible by Federal law, the great advertising campaign for the sale of alcoholic beverages now going on by press and radio.

The States cannot adequately regulate or prohibit the advertising of liquor so long as Congress permits such advertising through the medium of interstate commerce: Therefore

We most earnestly urge your assistance in securing this proposed legislation, in order that State regulations and laws upon the subject may thereby be made more adequate and effective and that radio advertising of alcoholic beverages may be stopped entirely.

The Nation has called its young men to defend the flag, and we citizens do ask that these young men may be defended from alcohol, an enemy which will undermine their health, their physical strength, their mental faculties, their efficiency, and thus unfit them for the task to which they are called.

These young men, many no more than boys, come in large numbers from homes of high morals and religious standards, where alcohol is banished. Alcohol in the smallest quantities affects the brain and would unfit them for the high work they will be called upon to do; therefore

It is highly important that no alcohol be allowed to be served in their quarters, or where they can get it.

Our protection and our safety lies in a sober Army and Navy, and we call upon our Congress to see that our boys are kept free of the curse of this enemy of mankind.

(This is followed by the signatures of 22 ladies.)

Memorial Day, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE TABLET, BROOKLYN, N. Y., AT THE REQUEST OF RICHARD M. KEENAN, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

[From the Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y., of May 31, 1941]

MEMORIAL DAY, 1941

To the Tablet and the overwhelming majority of the people can fully appreciate how Pope Pius XII has felt on the war in Europe. Many months before the conflict commenced, the Holy Father warned the nations of the coming catastrophe. Just when the conflict

started he cried out for peace and at every opportunity since he has set forth the cry our Saviour would make to end this unnecessary and devastating war.

The Tablet has followed the lead of the Pope in appealing that the war be not spread. Like the Holy Father this paper sorrows that world leaders seemingly desire to carry to disaster the masses of the people who do not want war. And like Pope Pius, it will continue to pray for, work for, and talk for peace, realizing that God alone seems able to save the nations of the world and having confidence that the voice of the people will some day be heard.

As far back as 1938, this paper said: "Another war will come. The propagandists from abroad—notably Lord Marley and Pertinax—are here. You may call us alarmists but when war breaks out in Europe, the United States will be asked to take sides. First it will be sympathy, then money and war implements and finally men. From here on let us declare for peace." The program for war was arranged on a time table. It was for this reason we opposed every step, the changing of the neutrality legislation, cash and carry, conscription, the transfer of destroyers, and the lend-lease bill. We hesitated to believe those steps were meant to keep us out of war.

Millions of Americans gathered close to their radios on Tuesday evening last in anticipation of a speech from the President of the United States that would rank as one of the most momentous and epoch-making in the history of our country. We feel that many were disappointed. The President gave us no new facts on the national crisis; he emphasized as dangers what we have known for several years; he held up as ends to be fought for, if necessary, the same ideals we have been insisting upon; he called for a courage that Americans have always had; he asked for a realism that we have been pleading with our Government to adopt for the past several years; he pleaded for unity to a people who have been pleading with him for national unity of purpose and for an end to international comradeship with foreign belligerent governments.

The President disappointed also the millions who hoped that he would give some sign of recognition of the validity of their pleas, which have been flooding the White House. He lauded traditional American heroism and said we would be helpless if the Nazis gain control of certain air and naval bases: "When our enemy comes at you in a tank or a bombing plane, if you hold your fire until you can see the whites of his eyes, you will never know what hit you." He dedicated the Nation to the aim of preserving freedom of speech and unfortunately grouped the millions who oppose his belligerent policies into three unfair and unjustly attributed categories: Those who say we are disunited and cannot act; the timid; and those who "shut their eyes to the ugly realities."

We cannot but agree with the President upon his aims, insofar as they concern our national welfare and safety, but we do not approve of many of the means which he would adopt to attain those aims. For instance, we do not believe that upon the fate of Britain and China rests the fate of America, and that, therefore, we must disperse our already inadequate strength in Europe, Asia, and Africa lest we are to see Hitler in control of our industries, our farms, and our worship. We have a faith in American people which the President must share with us. We believe that the intelligence of the American people is above being stirred by emotional and imaginative fantasies. We believe that the American people are realistic enough to realize that America's immediate danger is one which the President overlooked, namely, the discontent and the disunity being fostered by small, powerful, and highly financed individuals and groups who are seeking to destroy within our own borders the very freedoms which the President himself so nobly expressed such solicitude for in foreign nations.

But one grim reality the President did not mention, one grim reality that the American people realize only too well and probably the one foreign issue on which the President could rally his people behind him: The reality of a Soviet that sprawls across Europe and Asia, which has almost a third of China under its control and which has a scientifically organized network of "fifth columnists" and saboteurs in every strategic unit of our own Nation.

We stand with our President in full loyalty in the national emergency that he has proclaimed. We will play our full part "without stint and without selfishness and without doubt that our democracy will triumphantly survive." In turn, we confidently expect our leader to support the wishes of the people that, to use his own words, "we will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

We are just past Memorial Day for 1941. This is an occasion when we go to the graves of our departed fellow citizens who died for America's safety. To them the United States was everything and from Europe's recurring wars they kept aloof. We pray that their spirit may live again and we pray for the living, that American mothers will not be asked to sacrifice their sons in distant lands and far-off seas in a war which they do not want, which is not their war. Even our President must join in such a Christian prayer.

Administration of Poor Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

AN ARTICLE BY CHARLES McCAMIC, OF WHEELING, W VA

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Honorable Charles McCamic, of Wheeling, W. Va.:

ADMINISTRATION OF POOR RELIEF IN THE VIRGINIAS

(By Charles McCamic)

The poor have been a problem since men have lived together. Biological inequalities among men, chance, political, industrial, and social organization of the particular community, religious beliefs, war, and devastation are among the principal causes, the forces of which are at times clearly discernible and at other times mingled and meshed in an inextricable confusion. Poverty is not a disease, the cure for which is a single specific. Throughout the ancient world, in the Middle Ages—wherever man has left a record—a part of it concerns the unfortunate and destitute. As with most problems that go beyond individual control affecting groups, a community, or a nation, there has never been a rational approach to the difficulty.

In some instances a poor man was regarded as a degraded creature, his poverty symptomatic of his want of character; in other instances, an object of alms; in others, a sacred obligation. The ancient Jews apparently felt that the difficulty lay not in the poor themselves but in the accentuation of advantages and differences which naturally occur among men. Hence, at periodic intervals, they had a redistribution and a leveling of men from which point they started all over again.

While such an idea has an engaging appeal, the confusion which must have resulted from its application can readily be imagined. Redistribution has not been a persistent force. The mere possession of wealth is formidable initial redoubt of resistance, and those who control society's administrations do not welcome a breaking up of the status quo. We, in America, have been imbued with the doctrine that equality of opportunity naturally exists and that the poor are such a small percentage of the total population as to be negligible. It is a human trait to dust off our consciences with the slightest concessions and mankind has been side-stepping and dodging—as with most problems—the ever-recurring specter of the problem of the unfortunate.

While the problem is universal, both in time and space, the generalizations of other times are more important than their detail. Accordingly, the historical continuity of our English-speaking peoples' approach is chosen for what, at best, must be an inadequate review.

THE POOR LAWS OF ELIZABETH

In 1601—the forty-third year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth—the English poor law was first codified. The immediate occasion was acute social turmoil. There were complaints from all sides that England was overrun with vagabonds. Ex-soldiers, ex-servants, farm laborers, and many others recruited the great swarms of wandering, idle, and in a great degree vicious men and women who covered England as a plague of locusts. Action by the authorities was forced and there resulted the legislation referred to.

The great plan was to charge the 15,000 parishes of England with the care of their own poor who eventually became tied to their locality and could be returned to their parish if they left. Workhouses were established; doles paid; the poor were farmed out and apprentices were bound out. The central idea was to provide work for the able-bodied, to furnish assistance to those for whom work could not be found, and to care for the aged and infirm. Begging was forbidden except upon license in certain parishes where the magnitude of the problem overtaxed the public resources. Those so licensed were compelled to wear a badge on the shoulder so they would be known as legal beggars. The unfortunate were classified—if somewhat roughly and rudely. Order was effected and the vicious could be put down; and the rich were made to pay.

It is beside the point to discuss the efficacy of the poor laws of Queen Elizabeth. Emphasis is laid upon the elaborate attempt—through legislation—to regulate the problem. The English efforts became the inheritance of the Virginia colony.

THE VIRGINIA COLONY

The charter of the Virginia Company was granted on April 10, 1606, to "certain knights, gentlemen, merchants, and other adventurers." These grantees secured the royal charter rights in part for purposes of trade and profit to themselves. It was hoped that the plan would be attractive to the surplus population of England and emigration ensue and thus in some measure ameliorate the hard times and onerous conditions existing in England.

All land in the Colony was to be held—in the now quaint phraseology of the charter—"in free and common soccage only" which meant simply free of the obligations of military service. It was necessary in the early days to manage the property jointly for the benefit of those contributing money and those who contributed services only, and for 7 years labor and effort were pooled and everyone

took out of the common store with unfortunate results. Capt. John Smith in 1624[1] described the situation very neatly:

"When our people were fed out of the common store, and laboured jointly together, glad was he could slip from his labour, or slumber over his taske he cared not how, nay the most honest among them would hardly take so much true paines in a weeke, as now for themselves they will doe in a day, neither cared they for the increase, presuming that howscever the harvest prospered, the generall store must maintaine them, so that wee reaped not so much corne from the labours of thirtie, as now three or foure doe provide for themselves."

The next step was a second charter in 1609 which made the Virginia Company a corporation, with complete governing power and authority. An allocation of lands was made—3 acres to every man. The authority of the corporation was complete until the first session of the legislature in 1619.

The first years of the Colony were full of privations and hardships. As life was hard, the laws were strict and severe. Obedience to authority was sternly enforced. The many punishments relating to stealing reflect the scarcity of food and the means of existence. Dire necessity only would nerve a man to violate the Draconic Code of the early years of the Virginia Colony.

As the population grew, as fields were cleared and regular crops planted and harvested, living generally became easier. The cultivation of tobacco early proved profitable. It soon became a medium of exchange. Church taxes and even the salary of the Governor were paid in tobacco. It also had the effect of inducing emigration.

Elizabeth's poor laws seemed incontestably to be due to the crowded condition of England. But now in Virginia, with plenty of land and a sparse population, the age-old problem of the destitute, the sick, lame, and aged bobs up again as a public problem within two score of years after the establishment of the Colony. In 1642 the relief of the poor by law was committed to the church vestry which was empowered to issue certificates to the commissioners of the county of residence of the individual "to testifie their poverty which shall free them from all publique charges except the ministers' & parish duties."[2]

THE CHURCH

In 1646[3] an act was passed reciting the passage by Parliament of various acts by which there was vested power in English justices of the peace to bind out children of the poor, and also vesting in the county commissioners power to choose two children, either male or female, of the age of 7 or 8 years, in each county, and send them to James City to be employed in public flax houses under a master or mistress in carding, knitting, and spinning, for which the children were each to "be furnished from the said county with sixe barrells of corne, two coverletts or one rugg, and one blankett: one bed, one wooden bowle or tray, two pewter spoones, a sow shote of sixe months old, two laying hens, with convenient apparell, both linen and woollen, with hose and shooes." Two houses to accommodate them were to be built, each 40 feet long, 20 feet broad, and 8 feet high, with a brick chimney in each house.

Eighty years later, the act of 1727[4] made it unlawful for the inhabitants of Virginia to entertain, hire, or employ, above the space of 48 hours, any tithable person, unless such person produce a certificate from the sheriff or church wardens that such person had paid the previous levies, or was a servant at the time of laying the levy; vagabonds were defined as able-bodied persons, fit to labor, who not having sufficient maintenance were found loitering, or begging; declared vagabonds could be committed to the common jail, and could also be whipped.

Poor persons upon complaint by a church warden of any parish were subject to be removed to their own parishes, and only those who had actually resided for 1 year in the parish were accounted as inhabitants.

If the vestry of the parish where such poor persons resided declined to receive them, the members were subject to a fine of 20 pounds—one-half to the Sovereign and the other half to the use of the poor of that parish from whence the removal was made.

Masters of ships bringing into the colony and turning loose sick and disabled sailors laid themselves liable to a 10-pound fine to the church warden, to be recovered by action of debt, bill, plaint, or information, and applied to the use of the poor.

Children of parents unable or neglecting to support them could be bound out as apprentices.

A few years later, in 1748,[5] a general act was passed for better securing the payment of parish levies, the restraint of vagrants, and making provision for the poor.

The method provided was generally that of the earlier law of 1727; i. e., for a complaint by a church warden before a justice of the peace that a poor person might become a charge upon the parish. In such case, the justice could direct that such poor person be removed to the parish where he or she was last legally settled; if such could not be done, the church wardens were required to care for maintenance and cure at the charge of the parish, providing a penalty if the church wardens declined to do so, with remedy against them, and further providing a penalty against any housekeeper who would entertain any poor person without giving notice to the church wardens of the parish.

The churchwardens collected tithes which were used for the minister's salary, the clerk's salary, the maintenance and building of churches and chapels, and for the support of the poor. Tithes were assessed against all males over 16 years of age. A later act of 1776 exempted societies of dissenters from contributing to the support and maintenance of the church,[6] from which time dates the decline of the influence and power of the vestrymen of the church.

THE WORKHOUSE

The workhouse was first established in Virginia in 1755.[7] The reason given in the act for such establishment is that the number of poor people of late years increased throughout the colony, and the most proper method for their maintenance, and for the prevention of great mischief arising from such number of unemployed poor is "to provide houses for their reception and employment."

Every vestry was charged with the duty to provide "one or more house or houses within their parish, for the lodging, maintaining, and employing of all such poor people as shall be upon the parish, or who shall desire relief from the vestry or churchwardens; and to employ all such poor persons, in such works as shall be directed by the said vestry, or churchwardens; and to take and apply the benefit of their labor, for and towards their maintenance and support, and to provide cotton, hemp, flax, or any other necessary materials, implements, or things, for setting the said poor to work; * * *." The relief was confined to the resident poor in the parish, and the churchwardens were empowered to place or send such poor to the workhouses with full power to set all such poor persons as might be sent there to work or labor according to their several abilities and the rules and orders of the vestry and churchwardens.

Persons in the parish found begging also could be sent to the workhouses, where they could be employed, not to exceed 20 days, in such works and labors as the churchwardens should adjudge them able to perform, and the profits of such beggars' labor were to be applied toward their maintenance. Either class—poor persons or beggars—could be dealt with by the lash for refraction, not exceeding 10 lashes at any one time or for any one offense. If a person ordered to the workhouse declined to enter, such person was thereafter denied poor relief except, if the vestry would find that, by reason of sickness or old age, such person was incapable of labor, it could order otherwise. The names of all receiving relief were to be kept in the wardens' books.

In addition, every person receiving relief from the parish and sent to the workhouse was required to wear upon the shoulder of the right sleeve of his uppermost garment in an open and visible manner a badge of blue, red, or green cloth, as the wardens should direct, and, on this badge the name of the parish to which such person belonged was placed. If such poor person neglected or refused to wear the badge indicating such status, the churchwardens had the power to inflict punishment, either by abridgement, suspension, or the withdrawal of allowance, or by whipping the offender. Thus entered in Virginia the label system applied to beggars previously existing in England. This act also permitted the care of the workhouse to be let to contractors who had the power to set all poor persons to work.

THE OVERSEER SYSTEM OF RELIEF FOR THE POOR

In May of 1780[8] the Legislature of Virginia passed an act reciting in the preamble that "great inconveniences have arisen from the mode prescribed for making provision for the poor and other duties of the vestries, as by law now directed in the counties of Rockbridge, Botetourt, Montgomery, Washington, Greenbrier, Augusta, and Frederick." The act thereupon dissolved vestry systems existing in said counties and inaugurated the election of overseers of the poor by sheriffs of the counties. The board of overseers, which consisted of five, was given general powers previously lodged in the vestry of the Episcopal church. This in a measure was a reversion to the English precedent of having overseers.

The dissolution of the vestries in the counties of Shanandoah, Henry, Monongalia, Ohio, and Berkeley followed with the act of May 1782[9] which in terms generally conforms with the previous act of 1780.

In October of 1785, an act was passed[10] retaining the overseer system of administering poor relief, and further providing that counties within the Commonwealth should be laid off into convenient districts and that election should be held in each district for the purpose of electing overseers and that, at such election, those entitled to vote should "consist of freeholders and housekeepers only." This act invested the overseers of the poor with the same powers and duties formerly prescribed for the various vestries under direction of the different county courts.

The legislature, in the preamble to the act of October 1786,[11] recited that "the act passed at the last session of assembly, to provide for the poor within this Commonwealth, hath been found inadequate to their relief." Also the act provided that the county court was

[1] The Generall Historie of Virginia, New England, and the Summer Isles, vol. 2, p. 17. Reprint in Capt. John Smith, Works 1608–1631, ed. by Edward Arber (Birmingham, 1884), p. 516.

[2] 1 Hening's Statutes at Large 242.

[3] Ibid., I, 336.

[4] Ibid., IV, 208.

[5] Ibid., VI, 29.

[6] Ibid., IX, 164.

[7] Ibid., VI, 475.

[8] Ibid., X, 288.

[9] Ibid., XI, 62.

[10] Ibid., XII, 27.

[11] Ibid. 272.

given the power of selecting overseers in places where elections had not been held to fill vacancies. The act further grouped the "poor, lame, blind, and other inhabitants of the said district as are not able to support themselves" and provided for houses, nurses, and doctors who should be paid out of the contingent fund which, if insufficient, was to be provided for in the succeeding levy. The blind and the lame, for the first time in the Virginia statutes, were recognized as distinct classes and they were grouped with the poor.

Strolling from one county to another was forbidden. Overseers were authorized to bind out poor orphans and children apprentices "until the age of 21 years, if a boy, or 18 years, if a girl," requiring that the indentures contain proper covenants to oblige the teaching of some art, trade, or business and also reading and writing, and if a boy, common arithmetic, including the rule of three.

On December 26, 1792 [12] a general act was passed providing for the poor and also declaring who shall be vagrants. This act continued the method of having overseers which, as we have seen, began in 1780. It provided that the overseers of each district "shall provide for the poor, lame, blind, and other inhabitants of the district not able to maintain themselves, and may also provide houses, nurses, and doctors, in such cases as they or a majority of them shall think necessary; the expenses of which shall be provided for in the succeeding levy."

Vagrants were also placed under the jurisdiction of the overseers of the poor with power to cause such to be employed in labor for a term not to exceed 3 months and for this purpose could be hired out for the best wages that could be procured, the wages to be applied to the use of the poor.

The administration of poor relief in Virginia, by the year 1792, had completely passed from administration by the church and its vestry to an elected political body. During the long period of the government of Virginia as a colony and Commonwealth, the Episcopal Church, through its vestries, had administered the poor relief and had also accumulated through public authority much property known as glebe lands as well as other realty. Glebe lands, generally speaking, were lands belonging to and which could be used for the benefit of the parish. The Virginia Legislature, in 1802,[13] provided for the sale of glebe lands by the overseers of the poor and that the money so received, after deducting costs, expenses, and debts existing against the same, should be appropriated by the overseers or a majority of them, "to the poor of such parish" unless otherwise directed. Properties acquired by the churches through private donations made prior to January 1, 1777, were excepted from the operation of the law.

It was further provided that taxes (called poor rates) were to be levied and collected as theretofore. The several corporate towns in the Commonwealth were to have their own overseers and make their own provision for the relief of the poor and the county courts and corporation courts were further authorized "to provide or build a poorhouse and workhouse for the reformation of vagrants," etc. Vagrants could be dealt with and the act provided for handling moral delinquencies of certain types.

A codification of the poor laws of Virginia is contained in the act of February 10, 1819.[14] The overseers were to be elected by the votes of freeholders and housekeepers only in the district. The poor, lame, blind, and other inhabitants of the district not able to maintain themselves were to be provided with provisions for houses, nurses, and doctors and the expenses to be cared for in the succeeding levy as theretofore.

Relief of itinerant persons who had migrated into the State within 3 years next might be reviewed by the overseers. The overseers were vested with the power to use charitable donations theretofore made for vestries which vestries had ceased to exist. The power was retained to bind out apprentices as formerly and to require the education of such apprentices but making it unlawful to require teaching of any black or mulatto orphans hereafter bound out.

A recent author observes [15] that the placing of the execution of the poor law in the hands of the county overseers of the poor was unfortunate since they were all too often an inefficient and politically minded group.

In the Virginia Codes of 1819, 1849, and 1860 the general system of handling the poor through overseers, places of general reception for the poor, county infirmaries, workhouses, and poorhouses continued with slight changes.

SEPARATION FROM VIRGINIA

West Virginia was separated from Virginia in 1861 and admitted to the Union as a State in June of 1863. In the first code of 1868 [16] we find substantially the same method of poor relief set up for the new State as obtained in Virginia at the time of the separation. A board of supervisors for each county of the new State supplanted the Virginia system of boards of overseers of the poor (supervisors in West Virginia later became known as commissioners of the county court). The poorhouse was retained—which detail has not yet been abolished by law. A manager was in charge.

The act further provided that the relations of a pauper, who are of sufficient ability, shall be liable to support such pauper in manner as approved by the board of supervisors of the county in which the pauper may be and pay the expenses of burial when the pauper dies. The order of liability: First, the father; second, if there be no father, or if he be of insufficient ability, then to the children; third, if there be neither father or children or if they be of insufficient ability, then to the mother; fourth, the other relatives—but no relation is compelled to receive any such pauper in his own house against his consent.

This idea of the liability of the relations of a pauper for his support was apparently gotten from the statutes of New York and Massachusetts.

As in the Virginia act taken for its model, there was authorized voluntary application for assistance by any person unable to maintain himself or by or on behalf of the family of any person unable to maintain it, if such applicant had a legal settlement in the county and such person could be kept at the place of general reception, or at the county infirmary, with authority requiring those kept at the place of general reception to work at reasonable and moderate labor. The proceeds of such labor were to be appropriated for the benefit of the poor. Also there was authority to assist the involuntary needy.

In the amended code of 1884,[17] the overseer system is continued, but the county court was substituted as the supervising body. The term "poorhouse" was dropped from the law and in its place there was established a place of general reception for the poor; also a county infirmary, workhouse, and other improvements necessary to the use and benefit of the poor. The law for the first time contained a provision to the effect that the county court may purchase land for the use of the poor, sell and convey land heretofore or hereafter acquired for that purpose, and may acquire stock and instruments of husbandry on any of said lands. The liability of relations of a pauper for his support was retained and in general it may be said that the act found in the amended code of 1884 was changed little from that contained in the code of 1868.

The Code of 1906 [18] also contains a provision first found in the act of 1901 [19] providing for the burial of indigent soldiers and sailors who have "served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Rebellion, the War with Spain or Philippines or any ex-Confederate soldiers, who shall hereafter die without leaving sufficient means to defray his funeral expenses, but such expenses shall in no case exceed $35."

The Code of 1913 [20] contains the poor law substantially as it is contained in the amended Code of 1884. There is a provision that the overseer of the district may furnish antitoxin to or cause to be vaccinated with proper vaccine matter any person in such district who is unable to pay for the same.

The supplement to the Code of 1918 [21] contains few changes in the poor law. Among others, the county court was authorized in its discretion to "pay for hospital service rendered not more than 1 year previously within the State of West Virginia to poor persons resident or found in the county, and for medical, surgical, or institutional treatment given to such persons within this State."

PENSION LAWS

There are also contained in the 1918 supplement two pension laws passed in the regular session of the legislature in 1917: These are the provisions for paying pensions to firemen [22] and the mothers' pensions.[23] Applications for relief might be filed under the mothers' pension law if the husband is dead, or if he has become permanently incapacitated for work by physical or mental disability, or is confined in some West Virginia institution, or if she has been abandoned, or she is the mother of two or more children under the age of 13 years; the application must be investigated by the county court; on such application, summons is to issue and a hearing is had in open court and, if the application is sustained on the hearing, the county court is authorized to enter an order paying the mother of said children on whose behalf the application is filed an amount of money to enable the mother properly to care for the child, not exceeding $15 per month, when such mother has two children under the age of 13 years and, if there are more than two children under such age, the relief granted is not to exceed $5 per month for each additional child but, in no event shall relief granted on such application exceed the sum of $25 per month; when any child shall arrive at the age of 13 years, the relief for such child is to cease unless such child be ill or incapacitated for work, in which case, during such illness or incapacity, relief is to continue until the child is 16 years of age.

The act is further weighted with conditions of relief, among others, that satisfactory reports must be given by the teacher in the district school stating that the children of the recipient are attending school—if they are of age and physically able to do so. The children must live with the mother; the court must find that it is for the welfare of the children to remain with the mother; and relief must be necessary to save the child

[12] Virginia Code, p. 189.
[13] Revised Code, Virginia, 1803, p 421.
[14] Revised Code, ch. 239.
[15] Mathew Page Andrews, Virginia, The Old Dominion (New York, 1937), p. 347.
[16] Ch. 46, p. 317.
[17] Ch. 46.
[18] Sec. 33, ch. 46. See also ch. 46 in the codes of 1857, 1891, and 1899. No changes of note are contained therein.
[19] Ch. 64.
[20] Ch. 46.
[21] Ch. 46.
[22] Ch. 15t.
[23] Secs. 13 to 24.

from neglect; but, if the mother is the owner of real estate or personal property other than household goods, or receives benefits from the workmen's compensation fund, she shall not receive relief.

Barnes' Code of 1923 contains a few amendments. A new chapter was added,[24] relating to delinquent and dependent children. In 1929 the legislature also authorized child welfare boards.[25]

The Code of 1932 [26] liberalizes the law with respect to treatment of diseased persons who were to be sent to the hospitals at the expense of the county. Article 2, chapter 9, revises the previous legislation and codifies the law as to mothers' benefits and there is established in the State, in article 3, a public declaration of policy as to the care and relief of aged persons, and providing for old-age pensions in an amount not to exceed $1 per day.

PUBLIC-WELFARE LAW OF 1936

The public-welfare law was enacted by the Legislature of West Virginia in 1936, patterned after the existing Federal model. Amendments have been passed in 1937 and 1939.[27] The State accepts appropriations of money authorized by Congress from the Federal Treasury for such purposes. The act repeals some of the former relief laws, but the State retains the poorhouse. The law is administered by and through a State council—called the State Department in the law, a county council, an appeal board, and also in some details by the county courts. The act also authorizes visits to homes of indigent persons by health officers, physicians, and nurses employed by the county, and the use in each county of the State of designated public or private hospitals for the medical and surgical care of indigent persons. Another relief authorized by the act is the development within the State of adult physical rehabilitation for the physically handicapped person, being one who, by reason of physical defect or infirmity, whether congenital or acquired by accident, injury, or disease, is or may be expected to be totally or partially incapacitated for remunerative occupation. The act adopts three classifications found in the Federal social-security law and, under its provisions, if funds are available, public assistance is rendered to the following:

(a) An aged person, also called "indigent," of 65 years, who has been a resident of West Virginia for at least 1 year immediately preceding application for assistance, who has not made an assignment or transfer of property, who is not in need of continuing institutional care because of physical or mental condition, who is not an inmate of a public institution, and who is actually in need and has not sufficient income or other resources to provide a subsistence compatible with decency and health. The limit of relief is $30 per month per person.

(b) A blind person with disqualifying blind defect sufficient to incapacitate him for self-support, who has attained the age of 21 years, and with substantially the same residence and other qualifications as set forth for indigent aged persons. The limit of relief is $30 per month per person.

(c) A dependent child, who has not attained the age of 16 years, who has resided in the State 1 year, or who was born within the State within 1 year preceding application, and who is deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent, and who lives with named relatives in a place of residence maintained by such relative as his own home, according to required standards of care and health. Limit of relief is $18 per month, and if more than one child in the same family, $12 per month for each additional child after the first.

The methods of securing public assistance require written application to be made to the county director of the county of residence, with investigation to be made by the county director of the application, and approvals of application to be made by the county council and State department.

If the application for relief is denied, there may be appeals to the board of review provided in the act. The law also permits complaints by citizens and provisions for hearing on such complaints against the grant or continuance of the grant, with attendant appeal.

Aged persons and blind persons with real or personal property (less certain exempted amounts) are required to acknowledge a lien thereon (also characterized as an "agreement to reimburse") for the benefit of the State as a condition before assistance is granted. Such lien is to be recorded in the county where the property is situate, and upon reimbursement to the State of the amount of assistance awarded, a release is to be executed by the State; such person must also assign as security to the State Department any life insurance policy, carrying State benefit.

Relief may also be awarded to indigent persons found to be (a) public charges, or in danger of becoming such; (b) in need of continuing institutional care because of physical or mental condition; or (c) in need of medical or surgical care whether in an institution or in his own house, if such indigent person is actually a resident of the county, and has resided in the State for 1 year next preceding the application; and where funds are specifically made available for such purpose, the State may extend the authority of a county council to grant general relief to persons who have not been residents of the State for 1 year.

Existing county infirmaries are authorized to be maintained if the county court so decides. While the county court manages and controls such institutions, admission thereto is by order of the county council. Persons who are admitted to the infirmaries may be required to perform certain duties and labor, but only to the extent reasonably permitted by their physical and mental condition.

The public-welfare law has one section [28] which created the office of the State veterans' service officer. He must be a citizen of this State, entitled to vote, and a veteran of the World War. His duties relate to veterans honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States of America, and he is charged with the duties of rendering assistance to all such honorably discharged veterans in properly presenting their claims before the Veterans' Administration of the United States or before any bureaus or departments of the Federal Government, the State of West Virginia, or any of the several States of the United States, when the claims arise out of service with such armed forces; in addition, he must keep in touch with all veterans' organizations engaged in the State in welfare and relief work and render to veterans and their families within the State all possible assistance and furnish information on compensation, insurance, rehabilitation, hospitalization, and allowances provided by the United States Government, the State of West Virginia, and by any other State, and also make careful inquiry into all claims presented for payment to the State treasurer from any appropriation hereafter made for the relief of sick, disabled, or indigent soldiers, sailors, or marines residing in this State, who served in the armed forces of the United States; in other words, the duties of such officer can be summarized as those of an information bureau.

Public assistance rendered is not subject to taxes except sales taxes; neither can it be levied upon by execution, garnishment, or other legal process.

The recipient of public assistance or of general relief is not now to be deemed a pauper. Thus, the new law differs fundamentally from the idea that had prevailed since about 1601.

The county court still has jurisdiction in all matters relating to apprentices, though compulsory apprenticeship is in part abolished, except as provided in the State institutional laws. This, however, does not permit, as formerly, the apprenticeship of a person merely because he is poor.

The minute particulars of the acts governing the care of the poor are omitted, so as to emphasize the theories underlying them. Current legislation is examined in some detail.

It is trite to observe that legislation must be fitted to the special problem involved and not the problem to the legislation. Implicit in any effective legislation dealing with the complex and continuing difficulties of human want and misery is a profounder knowledge and understanding of the subject by the legislators than has been exhibited heretofore. Causes are elusive and changing; what seems certain in one decade is uncertain in the succeeding. Decay and obsolescence occur in law as they do in corporeal things. At the time of Queen Elizabeth, the means of livelihood had been expropriated, dispossessing thousands literally of the right to live except they might exist upon the harsh and brutalizing terms of the acts of Parliament. The first effort in Virginia failed because too much dependence was placed upon human nature. The acts of Virginia and West Virginia were simply a panacea to meet a not very pressing situation.

The last 10 years have seen the emergence of new forces directly and positively augmenting the number of the poor, the indigent, and the unemployed, and also causing disturbance in the vast fringe of persons not yet quite poor, nor 65 years of age, nor quite blind enough, or too old to be a dependent child, but who, as well as the poor, the blind, and dependent children covered by the law, stand always in the deepening and lengthening shadows of the threat of the loss of a livelihood or of becoming burdens. When the United States was generally agricultural, the mass of the population was tied closely to the soil. The shop and factory worker was the exception. Poverty was isolated and could be ascribed either to strictly local conditions, to individual unfitness to earn a livelihood—not for the want of opportunity—or to the adventitious circumstances of sudden calamity such as flood or fire and the like. The poor were negligible in number. A single county poorhouse or farm with moderate aid from the county authorities sufficed to meet the situation. The able-bodied could always make a living. The movement from farm to factory and city accelerated rapidly since the World War. More rapidly our civilization became engulfed by advances in chemical knowledge, swift-paced machines, and mechanical economy. Agricultural production, transformed by mechanical aids, tended to center in areas greatly removed from the markets for products of the farm. The numerous small farms which but a few generations ago supported a teeming farm population have been abandoned as general farms. A man divorced from the soil, to live, must have a job, which is linked inevitably to a machine. He is a sort of migrant from job to job, from machine to machine, or from period of work to period of work; there is a normal unemployment in prosperous times, but with each depression, the unemployed are numbered by the dozen millions. In a sense, this produces a new kind of poverty and destitution in which individual unfitness to work is a small factor. A new economic despotism emerges, the results of which are evident but the causes are obscure and com-

[24] Ch. 46a.
[25] Ch. 60, Acts of 1923.
[26] Code, ch. 9.
[27] Code, ch. 9.
[28] VIII.

plicated. A proportion of those able to work are excommunicants from the means of livelihood as a normal phenomenon. Our economy has ceased to be a composite of local groups but one of undefined limits spreading over vast areas of the earth. Mankind is not accustomed to this new economy; suddenly transplanted from an agricultural stage of small units and local markets to a vast and complex organization of hundreds of millions of persons, the forces making for dislocations are not objective though the effects are all too evident. The individual is helpless and only can blink impotently at the inevitability of idleness and poverty.

Past legislative panacea is not apt. Apparently there are no historical guides. In the swift and overwhelming emergencies, the remedies are necessarily blundering. We have heard the continual wailings of poverty in the midst of plenty with the inference that the remedy is the easy one of legislative fiat.

Production is good and distribution is poor. Too many people live in an era of too few jobs. The Government tries its hand and people think of the Government in the usual anthropomorphic sense with an added touch of deity—an Uncle Sam—a great white father. The N. R. A. is the Government's attempt to put the wild and unpredictable economic forces into some sort of control; it ends in a debacle of confusion worse confounded with a gigantic mountain of uncoordinated edicts of code administrators and their subordinates, a vast administrative bureaucracy, neither spinning nor toiling, but parasitic upon those who produce; and, not least, the discovery that the Government is composed of men and they with what approached autocratic powers could not bring the economic forces into control.

The solution of the problem of distribution has been attempted through taxation. The idea is to skim off a part of the profits of production and to redistribute it in direct relief and in work-relief projects such as W. P. A. It is hardly necessary to point out that this does not solve the problem. It is only an expedient. It is wasteful in administration, inescapably political in practice, and serves but to intensify the conditions in business which called it forth. With every fresh tax demand, business will redouble its efforts in economy of operations which means greater unemployment.

Conditions in the last 10 years have produced an apprehension in the minds of millions. The unemployed touch every family and the debilitating psychology of an able-bodied man out of work contagiously affects those still with employment but fearful of its loss.

The man out of work is not one man but millions. And the man nearly out of work exceeds him in numbers. When the bulk of the Nation lived and worked on the farm, there was a feeling of security. The single, dominant thought of a majority of the Nation now is security. The crack-brained utopian schemes are really conspicuous by their small numbers considering the fertile soil in which they have to flourish.

The problem of the poor today has been submerged in the greater problem of the unemployed which crosses all State lines, making the efforts of a single State, uncoordinated with those of others, futile.

Legislation is not the answer until the objectives of legislation are more fully understood. The history of poor relief is not of much moment in the present crisis. The remedy, it seems, lies in a new appraisement of the situation, having regard and respect for the accompanying changes in conditions and philosophies, which will require scientific—not political—methods applied to a practical problem.

And, in the meantime, relief will go on.

Comin' Home From Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1941

POEM BY F. RAY PHILLIPS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by F. Ray Phillips, which was published in the Wilmington (Del.) Suburban News of May 29, 1941:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Suburban News of May 29, 1941]

COMIN' HOME FROM CAMP

(By F. Ray Phillips, May 27, 1941)

Of course my hands are tremblin'
An' I know my eyes are damp;
We got a letter from our boy—
He's comin' home from camp!

Perhaps it does look foolish
T' be makin' such a fuss,
But when the boy is comin' home,
It's a great event for us.

Sure, it is a trifle hard
For you t' understand
The tears a-glistenin' in my eyes
An' th' tremblin' of my hand.

Well, mister, that's a sign o' pride
An' in my heart there's joy
T' think that soon we'll welcome
Home our soldier boy.

Oh, yes, his visit will be short;
'Bout three, four days I'd say,
But remember, now he's workin'
Fr' th' good ol' U. S. A.

Yes, sir, he' jus' a private,
One of thousands in th' ranks
But they're th' boys, my friends, I'd say
On whom this country banks.

Why, every time I see him,
My chest jus' swells with pride;
An' I feel that I'm important
When I'm walking by his side.

Of course, it was a trifle tough
T' see him go away,
An' our thoughts are always of him
Every hour of th' day.

Th' mornin' that he left us,
We stood there, side by side,
His mother an' th' rest of us
A-grievin' deep inside.

No longer is he just our boy;
We've shared him since that day
With th' greatest country on God's earth,
Th' good ol' U. S. A.

An' every night before we sleep
We say a silent prayer
For him to our Almighty God
An' place him in His care.

So, mister, that's th' way it is;
There's sorrow an' there's joy
In th' hearts of every parent
When they have a soldier boy.

An' that is why I'm tremblin'
An' why my eyes are damp;
I'm jus' chock full o' joy, sir,
He's coming home from camp!

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] over the Washington Evening Star Forum on Monday, June 9, 1941. The subject of the address is, Strikes in Defense Industries.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The greatest danger to the United States tonight is not from without, but from within. That danger is the increasing number of strikes in industries where materials vitally necessary to our national defense are to be manufactured.

In the face of the tragic events in Europe, Africa, and Asia, and considering the possible consequences of these events upon our country, it is imperative that we find a solution for the strike menace now. The time for words has passed. The time for action has come.

Combined reports of the War, Navy, and other Government departments show that there were more persons on strike in plants making equipment for our national defense during last week than at any previous time since our defense preparations began.

President Roosevelt recently said, "Never before since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock has our American civilization been in such danger as now." In the light of this warning it seems unbelievable that strikes in essential defense industries, instead of decreasing, are constantly increasing both in number and extent.

This condition cannot longer be tolerated by either the Government or by the people of the United States. It is our No. 1 problem.

Neither can we forget that the United States is formally pledged by law to furnish all aid to Britain, short of war. Billions of American dollars have been appropriated to provide this aid, in weapons, munitions, and equipment.

It was but a few days ago that there was much debate in and out of our Government over whether or not the United States Navy should actually convoy ships to England. Many in our country favored this course, in spite of President Roosevelt's statement that "convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

However, I believe that even if we did convoy and by that means succeeded in taking every shipload of war equipment safely to the British, that convoying would not have prevented the loss of as much material for Britain as had already been lost through production failures due to strikes.

In short, more goods would likely reach the British without convoys if strikes were entirely eliminated here, than would reach England with convoys, but with strikes continuing.

Likewise, consider that taking more goods to Britain by the convoy method would in-

volve this country in war, whereas getting more goods to Britain through the elimination of strikes in the United States would accomplish the same results and not involve us in war at all.

It seems clear to me, therefore, that all steps urged upon our Government which will likely involve us in actual war are out of place until we do all we can to prepare ourselves and to aid Britain through measures short of war.

Now let me show you how very much we could do for our national defense, or for the aid of the British, without our involvement in war, by successfully solving the strike problem.

From January 1 to June 1 this year, strikes in plants making materials for national defense have resulted in the loss of approximately 4,000,000 man-days of work.

Do you know that in 4,000,000 man-days it is possible to build 1,400 medium bombing planes—planes weighing 15 tons each, and each capable of carrying 3 tons of bombs? Think what 1,400 of these powerful weapons of the air would mean to our national defense, if we had them today. And consider, too, what these 1,400 bombers would have meant to Great Britain either at home, or in Greece, or in Asia and Africa.

In these lost 4,000,000 man-days we could build 4,100 modern pursuit fighter planes. Think what these planes would mean to our national defense if we had them now, and what they would have meant in Britain, or in Crete.

To show you what else might have been done with these lost 4,000,000 man-days resulting from strikes, let me tell you that in that time we could have built 425 flying fortresses, those gigantic ships, those dreadnaughts of the skies, that have a cruising range sufficient to fly all the way across the ocean and back, and capable of carrying tons and tons of bombs. These flying fortresses are recognized by all as the very finest defensive and offensive weapons that any nation can possess.

We all know that our lack of adequate defense at home is dangerous as is our failure to supply the British with more weapons. Delay in accomplishing these objectives but prolongs the struggle and lengthens tragically the casualty lists. Moreover, such delays actually invite aggression, actually make attack upon our country more probable.

Remember, too, there are hundreds of thousands of young men in the military training camps of this country, men who but a few months ago in the shop and the foundry, in the countinghouse and on the farm, were following the pursuits of peace. From such work they were taken upon the order of our Government, told to give up their work, to leave their families and homes regardless of the sacrifice involved, and train for a year in a military camp at subsistence and pay beginning at $21 a month. They were told this was necessary because a great crisis confronted us—that the Nation's safety was imperiled. They were told they must master the use of new arms and weapons in order to defend America, and must do this quickly, without the slightest delay.

I wonder what these drafted men think of that now as they read daily of the increasing number of strikes in plants supposed to manufacture the weapons they await. What must they think as month after month passes and they still do not receive the planes, the antiaircraft guns, the artillery, the machine guns, the tanks, and the other equipment with which they must familiarize themselves? Much of this equipment they might have had and learned to use by now if 4,000,000 man-days had not been lost through strikes in 1941.

The soldiers, too, have heard that "Never before since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock has our American civilization been in such danger as now."

What must these soldiers think of a Government which takes them from their homes and work, compels them to go to camps in order to train with modern weapons, and then sits idly by while those who have not been drafted strike and stop the flow of weapons, without which weapons the sacrifice of the drafted man counts for nothing?

Undoubtedly they think exactly what you and I think about it. I am advised that it is the foremost topic of conversation throughout the training camps of the United States.

And who are these drafted men, these hundreds of thousands of young Americans who are now wearing the Nation's uniform? Are they not the sons, the brothers, and the husbands of the great masses of working people of this country?

While these strikes continue and spread, the faith—the morale—of soldier and civilian alike sinks lower and lower.

Morale is a thing of the spirit. Its very essence in faith. With the soldier it is the confidence that his government will support him; that it will leave nothing undone to see that he is supplied with everything necessary to make him effective, particularly when the Nation's safety is in danger. Without the highest morale, which stems from a faith in his government, the soldier's effectiveness as a fighting man is seriously impaired.

Consequently strikes are a double menace. First, they prevent the fighting forces from receiving the equipment they must have to defend themselves and the Nation; second, by so doing, the morale of the fighting forces and civilians alike is constantly lowered.

Then, too, it has been shown that many of these strikes have been forced upon the workers of the Nation by small cliques, well-organized and often operating by strong-arm methods. These small groups have not hesitated in cases to threaten, terrorize, and coerce the workers. I am unalterably convinced that the strikes in the United States, for the most part, are opposed by the overwhelming mass of the workers themselves. I am sure that the great mass of those in industrial establishments, employees and employers, are just as patriotic and just as willing to sacrifice, in this hour of national danger, as any other group of our people.

It is because of these circumstances that there is a rising tide of resentment throughout the Nation, against the increasing industrial stoppages. Everyone is demanding that the Federal Government take firm action. In the press, on the air, in the voice of the man in the street, we hear it again and again. They are saying:

"It is not right for the Federal Government to exercise its power to compel young men to leave their firesides to serve a full year in our Army camps and perhaps eventually to give their lives in defense of this Nation on some bloody battlefield; and at the same time for the Federal Government to fail to exercise its power to so regulate industrial relations as to make sure our fighting men shall have the arms and munitions which they must have quickly to defend America in her present hour of deadly peril."

Yet, in the face of strike after strike, the Federal Government has sat supinely by, applying a little salve here and there, asserting that the strike menace was not serious, while more and more valuable time is wasted, less and less munitions are produced, and essential equipment remains "on order."

I believe that this industrial unrest is in part caused by our one-sided labor policy, by the Government's tacit approval of the sit-down strikes, and of governmental coddling of communistic labor agitators during recent years. Quite often the Labor Act, as administered, is more of an aid to the professional agitator than it is to the laboring man. It has served in many cases as a vehicle for subversive elements to stir up disputes and unrest. It has proven in many cases as unfair to those it was supposed to favor as it has to the great mass of citizens who are indirectly affected by it.

This was abundantly proven by the exposure of the brazen labor-election frauds at one plant in the Middle West, the output of which was extremely vital to the entire national-defense program. Here was a strike forced against the wishes of the majority of the men in the plant, which closed down operations for more than 2 months.

Even if there were no present national emergency it would be a good thing for the employer, the employee, and the general public if the Labor Relations Act were overhauled and its defects corrected.

But whether this is done or not, ways and means must be found to remedy our growing industrial sickness, to insure the settlement of disputes between employer and employee, without resort to strikes, so long as the safety of this Nation is threatened by involvement in a devastating war.

Who knows? Upon the success of our whole national-defense effort may well depend not only the future of our own country but of the entire world And the heart and soul of our defense effort consists primarily in the production of arms, munitions, and equipment for our Army, Navy, and merchant marine, and for the British, at the earliest possible moment.

In the face of that situation, strikes in essential defense industries are luxuries which we cannot now afford. We must set up definite machinery which will settle disputes without strikes, so long as our Nation is in danger, so that products may continue to flow from our defense industries in the national interest.

And, as stated, so long as this Government, through the medium of the Draft Act, takes men from their good positions and their homes and compels them to serve a year in training camps, on mere subsistence and $21 a month, in the national interest, that same Government, if it means to give these men the full measure of support, must insist that industrial disputes be settled without resort to strikes.

In applying such a remedy, no essential right which labor now has need be taken away. Labor would retain its right to collective bargaining through representatives of its own choosing, to present to the employer its grievances, which should be reduced to writing. The employer should be required to answer, and both the complaint and the answer should be given to the public.

Finally, if it is impossible for employer and employee to agree, the matter should be referred to a board on which labor has a representative, the employer has a representative, and the public has a representative. A decision of the majority of the three should be final and binding on employer and employee alike. In other words, the public would make the decision by being the third member of the board. If the employer failed to accept this verdict he should be severely penalized and if labor failed to accept the verdict it should be severely penalized, too.

This is but an outline of the plan which I feel sure could speedily be whipped into shape. Or, if a better plan can be devised to end strikes, then let us have that plan instead.

The point is that strikes must end, that labor disputes must be settled by arbitration, that the Nation's welfare comes first, that the drafted men in the training camps shall not be let down, that the American Nation shall be put in a state of complete national defense at the earliest possible moment. To these ends, each man, employer and employee, farmer and urban dweller, rich and poor, high and low, must contribute his share. Such sacrifices are in the interest of the general welfare and are part of the obligation we all owe our Government as citizens.

I do not believe, certainly as an initial step, that it is necessary for the Government to take over the industrial plants, in order to eradicate the strike difficulty. I do not believe they should be taken over unless the employer has been in the wrong. The taking over of industrial plants is exactly what the Communists and the totalitarians want the Government to do. That is one of the primary objectives of the Communist Party, a fundamental tenet of its political philosophy. Communists and totalitarians are promoting these strikes, trying to obtain during this emergency what they were unable to secure in more normal times. We should not fall into the trap they are setting for us.

In sum, the American people want their Government to set up fair and equitable machinery for the settlement of industrial disputes and the outlawry of strikes in plants making defense equipment during the present emergency. They are entitled to have it.

Who knows? Unless we can meet this challenge, unless we can keep these plants open and in constant production of defense materials, unless we can achieve total national defense at the earliest possible moment, it may mean the difference between keeping and losing our American way of life, between keeping and losing a government of, by, and for the people, between keeping and losing the precious privilege of being a citizen of our beloved country.

We have seen this very lesson brought home during recent months on many a bloody battlefield. We have seen great cities, world-famed monuments and buildings, representing hundreds of years of work by man, reduced to a shambles in a few hours. In Europe we have learned of the death of tens of thousands of men, women, and children, too. Why? Because, before war came, such countries failed to put themselves in a state of adequate defense. Now their portion is blood and tears, toil and sweat.

Over there, no less than here, men talked continually of their rights and privileges and failed to think at all of their duties and responsibilities. Thinking thus and acting thus, they lost everything. Today they have neither privileges nor responsibilities. They are but slaves—men, women, and children—broken, disillusioned, hungry, and without hope.

This country must not walk that road. We must not embrace these tragic mistakes which have been the downfall of great nations. In this country we must prepare completely and quickly. Strikes must end. America must live.

Delaware in Parade of States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. TUNNELL, OF DELAWARE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address delivered by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], which was broadcast from Station WINX last night, the subject of the address being Delaware in Parade of States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A certain amount of pride in our State is not only pardonable but commendable. Our first settlement was at Lewes in 1631. Delaware was one of the Thirteen Original Colonies. Our climate and our soil give the advantage to our State of aiding in feeding the cities of the Atlantic seaboard. The soil is kind and responds to all efforts to improve it. The climate is temperate and shows the tempering effect of the Gulf stream. Because of these favorable conditions, the value of agricultural products in Delaware is as follows: $1,716,000 per year from vegetables; $2,685,000 per year from corn; $2,563,000 per year from meat animals; $2,500,000 per year from milk; $2,000,000 per year from commercial fruit; $22,000,000 to $25,000,000 per year from broilers; $378,000 per year from turkeys. But the State is strong in manufactured articles also. The great industrial activity in the north end of Delaware has developed the city of Wilmington. Its industrial activities are second to no city of its size in the Nation. Manufacturing interests are spreading to all parts of the State. The immense Nylon plant of the Du Pont Co. at Seaford is one of the outstanding sources of employment in the south end of the State. The large amount of standing timber and the mills and factories using lumber is a revelation to those who are not familiar with the State's resources.

Delaware is fortunate in having the whole of its east side with a navigable water front. The Chesapeake Bay is not far to the westward and the Nanticoke and other rivers draining into the Chesapeake Bay furnish the west side of the State with water communication. Delaware has a road system unsurpassed in the United States. It is said that no home in Delaware is more than 4 miles from an improved road. Every town in the State is reached by an improved modern road. We have, first, the Du Pont Road, reaching from Pennsylvania to the Maryland line. At Dover a connection of this road runs down the west side of the State to the Maryland line. Our fine school buildings and unexcelled teaching force are attracting the attention of the Nation to our educational facilities. School transportation over good roads for those who are at all distant from the school buildings is furnished by the State. The University of Delaware, by location, equipment, and tradition, stands as one of the leading schools of the Nation. The religious tendency of our people is attested by such shrines as Old Swedes Church in Wilmington, Old Drawyers near Odessa, Barretts Chapel near Frederica, and Old Blackwater in Sussex County. The fine condition of these churches is a memorial to a past generation's religious tendencies and stands as an explanation of the State's present religious faithfulness. The boundary disputes of Delaware which have affected its lines on all sides have been practically settled, after 200 years of disturbances.

Though Delaware is small, it has produced some of the greatest men of the Nation. The Claytons, Bayards, Saulsburys, Grays, and Du Ponts have made enviable reputations as national figures. Five Bayards have occupied seats in the United States Senate. The smallness of the State has caused it at times to become a temptation to political pirates, and to those who desire to experiment with various reforms.

Our State was one of the first to adopt the honor system in its penal code. A combination of mercy and intelligence has characterized Delaware's treatment of her criminals. This system has attracted favorable comment nationally and has been widely followed in other States.

Our forests of pine and oak add greatly to the wealth of the Nation. Our nurseries are among the largest in the world.

Our summer resorts along the Delaware River, Bay, and the Atlantic Ocean are largely patronized not alone by Delawareans but by people from all over the East.

Our banking system stood out as a model of efficiency and solidarity during the great banking crisis of 1933 and 1934.

There is in the Nation no more loyal State than Delaware. Communism, nazi-ism, and fascism do not develop in Delaware's intellectual soil. Here no pressure arises for a change in national leadership, except in the American way. No strikes to delay American defense arise in Delaware. American-born and foreign-born, Jew and gentile, men of all religious beliefs are amalgamated into one common wealth, one indivisible unit in a united country; one white star in a field of blue. In Delaware, political differences do not lead to national disloyalty. All lines of thought lead to governmental unity.

We Delawareans realize that comparisons are odious, but to those of us who owe our allegiance to the Diamond State, its birds sing more enchantingly, the aroma from its gardens and orchards is more alluring, its sun shines more brightly, its home fires burn more harmoniously, its hospitality calls more invitingly, and its patriotism stands more rigidly. First to adopt the Constitution, it shall be the last to infringe upon constitutional limitations. May the God of life and happiness, of peace and prosperity, of virtue and learning, bless our Delaware.

Who Says It Can't Be Done?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY DAVID LILIENTHAL

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by David E. Lilienthal, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Rotary Club at Knoxville, Tenn., on May 27, 1941, and broadcast over several radio stations. The subject of the address is, Who Says It Can't Be Done?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Eight years ago T. V. A. started building dams on the Tennessee River. A big cry went up that the dams were a waste, that there was too much electricity, there was a surplus, there couldn't possibly be a shortage of power. Right down the years these fears of timid men that there would be too much electricity has held back T. V. A. and held back this valley, held back the whole country's power supply.

Today we are in the midst of a crisis in the defense program. The timidity, the counsel of the scared minds that held back T. V. A., is now putting the brakes on our national defense. The country wants to go full speed ahead. The country has turned

over its boys for military service. The country has appropriated billions and billions of dollars, and yet every candid person will agree with the statements we have heard in the last few days, that the program of defense production is not in high gear. It is not in high gear because we haven't yet been permitted to use to the utmost and without stint the glorious strength that God Almighty gave to the United States of America.

A few months ago we were told not to worry about production—that there was plenty of capacity for steel, that there would be no aluminum shortage, that there would be no power shortage. Yet everybody knows that there are shortages. And you, my neighbors here in the Tennessee Valley, are facing this fact in a dramatic, personal way. For you have just been asked to cut down on uses of electricity in order to keep the aluminum plants operating at full capacity. And other regions are going to be rationing power before long.

Why in the name of common sense should there be shortages—shortages in a country that hasn't yet begun to do the production job it must do to survive and to win? The ugly fact is that we are trying to defend these shores with our right hand tied behind us, and it is time we talked plainly and to the point about it. The only thing on which we have had full production is the utterance of generalities about democracy. Most of us over America are fed up with being hog-tied; most of us want to do this, the biggest job we've ever faced, with both fists flying.

Who says this big job can't be done? Who says so? Why in heaven's name does the United States of America have to have a shortage of aluminum, we who can and do build aluminum plants where 6 months ago there was a cornfield? Who says we have to have a shortage of power? Not you here, for you have seen Cherokee Dam, not 40 miles from here; you have seen what American engineers can do to produce power in the speed of that record-breaking job. Who says we have to have a steel shortage, when every one of you knows that in the Birmingham district alone there are iron and limestone and skills that can send our capacity way up?

Let's get this straight. There need be no shortages of defense materials—of the materials essential to build the planes, the bombs, and the warships. Let's get this further fact straight, that we do not need to have to choose between guns or electricity. We can have guns and electricity, if we will use our strength, not throttle it in timidity and fear and doubt.

Down here in the Tennessee Valley you have been asked by your Government to save on the use of electricity, so that aluminum production for aircraft may be increased. In that, you will cooperate to the utmost; I know this area well enough to predict that. But the shortages that we now have and the curtailment we are asked to put into effect will be as nothing unless we are permitted to begin at once—at once, without the loss of a day—to use the energy, to use the resources that we have, and use them to the utmost—and the ghastly, insane part of it all is that these shortages are absolutely unnecessary. If we were a poor nation, if we didn't have billions of kilowatt-hours of energy in our streams, if we couldn't produce aluminum in vast and almost limitless quantities, and textiles and coal and coal oil and clothing and shoes, and all the things that are needed, both for our troops and our civilian population—if we were impoverished and had to fight like an invalid nation, that would be one thing. We would make the best of our disabilities. But we are strong, and we do have the resources. We do have the skills, and we are not using them. Think of it; it is almost beyond belief that at this hour of destiny we are not using the strength of our hills and waters and men.

Why? The electric-power situation illustrates what has been happening in one field after another. Electric power in great quantities is absolutely essential to this war in which we are the "arsenal of democracy"—in this war that God alone knows how long we will be able to stay out of. We in the T. V. A. have long been urging that T. V. A. be put to work at top speed.

That fateful month in 1935 that Germany told the world for the first time that a new and mighty army was on the march, T. V. A. was appearing before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. Representing the T. V. A.'s views, I called the committee's notice to the newspaper headlines and made as strong a plea as I could that T. V. A. was greatly needed for defense and that its work should not be slowed up. Three years later when war came to Europe we again pressed home the point that vast quantities of power were needed. For example, on the 29th of February 1940, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, I told an audience of distinguished businessmen of our view that there would be a shortage of power for defense production in 1941 if power supply was not greatly increased at once. I reminded them that it takes at least 18 months to build a power plant and urged immediate action all over the country. The speaker immediately following me, now high in defense matters pertaining to power, insisted that power supply would be adequate. A year ago, when we were almost frantic over the imminent power shortage we finally got action. After delays that were crucial and costly, on August 1 last year we were authorized to begin construction of Cherokee Dam and Watts Bar steam plant. Those plants are far ahead of a difficult schedule. But that block of power was too little, and it was too late.

We will have shortages of power; we will have shortages of aluminum and steel and magnesium and other basic commodities as long as we have a shortage of courage to put American resources to work. Until we fight with both fists, until we refuse to let anyone tie one of our hands behind us, and then tell us we can't do the job, we will have trouble and plenty of trouble.

T. V. A. can't solve the country's problems. We can't even solve the country's power or aluminum problems. But there are some specific production jobs we can do, and we can do them as fast as anyone in the United States. We can produce power, we can produce phosphate, we can produce munitions and for that matter, we are in a position to produce aluminum. We can't speak for others, but for this seasoned corps of 20,000 men and women, with a record behind them, I have a right to ask: Who says it can't be done? Who says this Nation can't have an adequate supply of power for an adequate defense program? Who says we must suffer under shortages? Who says we must choose between guns and electricity?

The time for nibbling cautiously at power supply is long since past. Here is what T. V. A. is ready to do for defense. We are prepared to create a pool of over 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity each year—the largest single pool of available energy ever created in the history of mankind—do it on the double-quick, do it on time. We are ready to triple T. V. A.'s power supply. Our engineers have been getting ready, and you can depend on them, depend on this organization to deliver.

And so the T. V. A. is making a specific recommendation: That this seasoned construction force, the most experienced dam-building organization in the world, be set to work on a job that is as big as the need we face. We are proposing and are ready to build a series of 10 new dams—4 on the Hiwassee River, a gigantic dam on the Little Tennessee to be the highest dam in eastern North America, other dams on other rivers, additional steam-plant capacity, completing Kentucky Dam a year ahead of schedule—a program that will add another one and a third million kilowatts to the half million kilowatts of power now rapidly nearing completion, a grand total of nearly 3,000,000 kilowatts. This program would cost a quarter of a billion dollars. That will seem a modest price to pay for the sense of security it will bring—and an end to a feeling that this great country in its hour of grave danger may be without the dire necessities for the defense of its independence.

Now, this program isn't going to save the United States. We don't offer it as anything except a specific program to do a particular job. But if in similar fashion in one industry after another there would be a similar release of the productive abilities, the skills, the organizing capacity of the men and women all over this country, we would give an answer that would rock the world. We would prove that America believes in its destiny, that it holds back nothing. And by this act of faith, we would fortify our people, our people who have given their young men and their dollars to their country, give them a new sense of accomplishment that would build American confidence so it could never be shaken or broken.

Let's put an end to weak and timid talk. Let our battle cry be: It can be done. It can be done.

You can't make up power shortages overnight. It takes not less than 18 months to build any substantial block of power, however you go about it. Even normal rainfall ending this long dry spell will only modify the stringency in the region, it can't suddenly cure it. And so we should ask: What about the immediate future of power supply in the Southeastern United States and the Tennessee Valley? I want to talk to you about that for a few minutes.

First of all, we are speeding our construction schedules and beginning this fall, large new blocks of power will begin to be available—a 50 percent increase in T. V. A.'s total supply in 6 months' time. In the meantime, you have been asked to cooperate in the defense program by conserving electricity for the next few months.

Make no mistake about it, the sacrifices you are asked to make are in the cause of national defense. They are not due to this unprecedented drought. In spite of the drought, the T. V. A. is able to fulfill to the last kilowatt-hour every one of its contracts for continuous power. I want to underline that: The T. V. A. has enough power and will continue to have enough to fulfill every one of its contracts for power to cities and industries and cooperatives and to permit the abundant and increased use of power that T. V. A. symbolizes in this country. T. V. A. could meet every one of these contracts if this drought should continue and make this year as bad a year for water as any in recorded history. For T. V. A.'s sales of year-round power are all based on the amount of power in the river in the worst kind of water shortage ever known. Everything above that is sold only as secondary or dump power.

Why then should you be asked to conserve, why should you be asked to forego unlimited expansion in your power use? The answer can be given in one word, "aluminum." Aluminum production for aircraft is short of needs; it must be expanded, must be kept at 100-percent operation. And aluminum producers, not having a contract right to all the power they need to maintain 100-percent output, must get that power through the voluntary sacrifices of all of us.

In order to secure the very cheapest rate for the vast amounts of electricity required to produce aluminum metal, the companies have contracted with T. V. A. to buy power that is surplus, in other words what is left over when we have filled the needs of our

contract users, the cities and cooperatives and industries that buy year-round power.

To operate the present plant of the Aluminum Co. of America at Alcoa on a year-round basis takes 250,000 kilowatts of electricity, takes two and a half times as big a power plant as Norris Dam if it were operating 365 days a year and 24 hours a day. But the Aluminum Co. has a contract with the T. V. A. for only 30,000 kilowatts, and they have 70,000 kilowatts in their own plants on the Little Tennessee. In other words, the Aluminum Co. is short 150,000 kilowatts, for which they have no supply of their own, and no contract with T. V. A.

In ordinary times, they would shut down their factory part of the year if surplus power couldn't be had. This year they cannot shut down; if they do, the fighting-aircraft program all over this country shuts down, too, for there are no piles of aluminum pig metal in reserve. So they came to us for an emergency supply of power, and we have been getting it for them. They have been getting it on a day-to-day basis. We could simply as a matter of legal right, cut them off at this moment. But that is unthinkable: the defense of the country requires that all of us prevent that happening. And it will not happen.

I think you may be interested to know some of the things that are being done to meet this critical situation. I want to emphasize that what is being done is all on a voluntary and cooperative basis. There have been no orders issued. There have been no recriminations and no crying over spilt milk. It does little good except as to the future to point out now that aluminum plants cannot be operated 100 percent of the time unless they have a firm and contracted source of power supply for 100-percent production. The important thing now is to find a way out. Many agencies have been working together on this problem: The Federal Power Commission, through its Chairman, Leland Olds; the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson; the Office of Production Management; these agencies have been diligent in seeking to find a way to keep aluminum production going without too great a dislocation of power supply to others.

The Duke Power Co., through its principal officers, has been exceedingly cooperative in devising ways of supplying a block of off-peak power that the Aluminum Co. can use. The T. V. A. has authorized the building under emergency conditions of a major transmission line to Hazard, Ky., so that over this line the American Gas and Electric Co. may be able to transfer off-peak power to the Aluminum Co. The Commonwealth & Southern companies, faced with a serious problem resulting from their defense requirements, are working closely with all the other systems of the region, so that nowhere will there be an idle generator or a wasted kilowatt.

What further needs to be done? How much curtailment of normal uses should be projected at this time? This is a subject that is receiving very careful study by all the power agencies of the entire South. Further details and conclusions will be available soon. T. V. A. does not recommend any sudden, drastic curtailment in the use of electricity. All of us are trying to find additional sources of supply for the Aluminum Co. without taking away from anyone the electricity he needs. Various plans are being weighed—measures that will least dislocate normal civilian life. Some of the plans under study are a change to eastern time in eastern and middle Tennessee, cutting down on ornamental lighting, show-window displays, etc. The recommendations that will soon be made will be based on a study of the facts. At this time all T. V. A. urges is that there be no waste of electricity, that no electricity be used that is not needed for ordinary, normal uses. This is a wise program under any circumstances, for careless waste of electricity, even if it is paid for, is like the waste of anything else that is useful.

There will be many people who will ask, What will we do with all this electricity when the defense needs are over? That is a natural question to ask, and one that requires careful thought and foresight now. But because it presents a problem does not mean that it is a valid reason for hobbling our defense. For if we are not successful in defending this country, neither electricity nor aluminum nor public debt will matter much. Many of you are businessmen. Let me remind you that under the system that is threatening Great Britain and the United States there are no businessmen in the sense that you know. Some of you are ministers of God. Let me remind you that if we are unable to defend these shores there will be no free ministers and no free churches in which to worship. These are not atrocity stories; this is merely the record of a dozen nations where businessmen and churches, as we know those two great institutions of freedom, have vanished from the earth.

Many years ago Walt Whitman used to wander along the Atlantic seaboard celebrating America. In words that ring he told his countrymen of the great strength and vigor and beauty of America. He sang of a stout and powerful land—strong and bragging of its strength. Old Walt shouted to the universe that this was the greatest country ever heard of. That was true then; it is still true. In closing let me read to you from the words of old Walt:

"Long, too long, America.
Traveling roads all even and peaceful, you learn'd from joys and prosperity only,
But now, ah now, to learn from crises of anguish, advancing, grappling with direst fate and recoiling not,
And now to conceive and show to the world what your children en masse really are."

Strikes Against the National Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the stupidity of those labor leaders who compelled the President to send troops in to break up the outlaw strike at the North American Aviation Co. plant at Inglewood, Calif., is incredible. There was, of course, nothing left for the President to do in the face of the defiance of those foolish labor leaders except to send in troops, take over control of the plant, and enable it to resume operations. Not only did this military action and governmental seizure of the plant result from this outlaw strike, but no single incident has done more to arouse the people of the United States and the Members of the Congress to a high pitch of anger against organized labor than this North American Aviation Co. event.

Coming on the heels of the defiant action of the woodworkers in the Northwest, and other unions led by communistic leaders, the California airplane plant situation simply climaxed a series of defiance strikes in key industries, which compelled summary action by the President. Unless the President not only takes such summary action as he did in the case of the North American Aviation Corporation, but sees to it that those striking workmen who had been given deferment from the draft, because of the importance of their work in the national defense, and only because of the importance of their work in the national defense, are put in the Army where they can soldier for $21 a month, the suspicion will continue that the administration was willing for the strikes to reach a point where the President would have to take over private industry for governmental control and operation.

There is no doubt that this incident has raised the whole question of the showdown between the Communists in the C. I. O. and the more conservative leadership.

Many Members of the Congress have been warning ever since the sit-down strikes, led by Richard Frankensteen and others, that the influence of the Communists in the C. I. O. was so strong as to represent a very great potential danger in event the United States had to build a national defense. That potential danger has now become an actual danger, although Frankensteen himself has renounced his old communistic buddies, and is now denouncing his communistic associates of long standing.

It is understood that threats were made recently to Philip Murray, and that those threats are now being renewed, that the leaders of the Communist-dominated unions of the C. I. O. have been agitating formation of a new and independent labor organization, and the secession from the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. of some of the unions controlled by the more radical leaders. The showdown is here. There is no question but that these radical "reds" who are leading the aviation unions, the automobile unions, the woodworkers' unions, and the teamsters' unions into deliberate strikes against the national defense, are traitors to the Nation, are dangerous enemies of the national defense, and should be summarily dealt with. Those leaders who are found to be aliens should at once be deported, and the tender solicitude that has hitherto been displayed by Madam Perkins, Secretary of Labor, for communistic aliens should harden into a firm determination to rid the Nation of these dangerous foreign vermin.

Those radical leaders found to be American citizens deferred from the draft in order that they might earn as much money per day in civilian work as soldiers are paid by the month should have their deferments canceled and they should be put into the Army, where the constituted officers know precisely what to do with recalcitrant gentlemen of the character of Walter Reuther, Wyndham Mortimer, and others of like ilk.

The citizens of America and the Members of Congress are sick and tired of this wave of communistically inspired strikes against the national defense. The administration has long been too lenient with this sort of sabotage of the national defense.

While it may seem unfortunate at the moment, this strike may turn out to have been a good thing for the Nation, and particularly for the workers themselves. It has demonstrated the desperate character, the unpatriotic attitude, and the utterly selfish temperament of these communistic labor leaders.

The ends of justice and national defense will not be served if these radical labor leaders are permitted to so influence their followers as to compel the Government to take over industrial plants and operate them.

The country is tired of labor leaders telling the Nation the workers will not strike in the very hour when the workers are being led into picketing and strikes by their leaders.

Why Must We Finance the Wars of Europe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 10, 1941]

WHY MUST WE FINANCE THE WARS OF EUROPE?

While World War No. 1 was raging in Europe some of the more emotional American citizens wanted America to get into it.

Other cooler heads—and perhaps colder hearts—felt that American interests would be sacrificed and no benefit gained by war.

Your columnist was one of those who opposed American entry into the war, but after war was declared did his utmost to bring success to our arms.

He advocated conscription as an essential of victory and supported the plans and purposes of the incumbent administration.

However, when the war was over your columnist reverted to his firm conviction that America should keep free from further foreign entanglement, and should not be involved in the intrigue of the League of Nations.

Senator Johnson of California, Senator Borah, of Idaho, Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania, and other distinguished statesmen and patriots made the campaign against involvement in the League and your columnist gave them journalistic support to the best of his minor ability.

In the course of the campaign against League entanglement the following letter was written to Mr. H. H. Tammen, one of the publishers of the Denver Post.

The Denver Post has reproduced this letter with kindly comment.

The comment and the letter are reprinted in this column with grateful acknowledgment.

"An amazing prevision of the state of the world under the League of Nations covenant and of the perils to the United States in such a world was set down in a letter which the Post publishes herewith—a letter written on March 29, 1919, by William R. Hearst, the newspaper publisher, to the late H. H. Tammen, who was then one of the publishers of the Denver Post.

"In this remarkable forecast of wars to come, written 22 years ago, Mr. Hearst forewarned of the exact situation in which the United States finds itself today, in an eloquent plea against our membership in the League of Nations or our entanglement in any way with the quarrels, greeds, and ambitions of Europe. The letter is commended for thoughtful reading by every American." (The Denver Post, June 8, 1941.)

NEW YORK AMERICAN, *March 29, 1919.*

MR. H. H. TAMMEN,

The Denver Post.

DEAR MR. TAMMEN: I notice in your Denver Post a cartoon representing Uncle Sam signing the contract of the League of Nations in order to save himself the cost of maintaining a reasonable Military and Naval Establishment. Do you really think we will save more money by getting into this riot of European wars than we will by staying out of them?

Do you really think that we will need a larger Military and Naval Establishment to mind our own business than we would to meddle in all the quarrels and conflicts of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia?

We know about what it has cost in the past to stay at home and build up our own country, and we are learning what it costs to be involved in European wars. We ought to be able to make a pretty accurate estimate of which plan is the cheaper and better.

I hope you will give careful consideration to the question of this proposed League of Nations. I do not consider it a league to keep us out of war, but a league to get us into war.

A man does not keep free from the smallpox by going to bed with four other people who have it, and we cannot keep free from war by tying ourselves up with nations like England, France, Italy, and Japan, which have the war disease in its worst form.

If we had four votes to their one, we, the peaceful nation, might keep them out of war; but since they have four votes to our one, they, the warlike nations, will merely put us into war, and, in addition, under the constitution of this League of Nations, allot what part we shall play and what price we shall pay.

Then there is the possibility of unrestricted oriental immigration to this country; the probability of European control of American affairs; the necessity of our people having continually to send our boys abroad to police Europe and Asia and Africa and to participate in all foreign complications and conflicts; the almost certain exhaustion of our country's resources through having to finance all these European nations and their selfish schemes.

All these things seem to me to threaten disaster to our people, who have hitherto fortunately kept free from each and every one of them.

Have we then so much faith in one man's ability and unselfishness that we can believe that all the other great statesmen of our history who warned us against foreign alliances are wrong and he who alone advocates foreign alliances is right?

It seems to me that this League of Nations is at best a very dangerous departure, a speculative experiment, and why should we risk our whole fortune, our national welfare, in a speculative experiment when we do not have to?

We have come to be the greatest and richest Nation in the world through abstention from foreign complications, through nonparticipation in the waste of wars and the enormous expense of military establishments, through minding our own business, and having the time and the freedom to attend to our own business our own way.

Why alter all that? Why change the boat when we are winning the race? Why be as reckless as stupid old Germany, which was winning everything through one policy and changed and lost everything through another policy?

We cannot exaggerate the loss which might come to us. We have had an uninterrupted record of growth in wealth, in population, in territory, in every element of greatness. But that was because of our isolation and because of our exemption from the conquests and disasters to which European nations are periodically subject because of their close contact and interrelations, their hereditary feuds, and hatreds.

Now we are proposing to become a part of this European snarl. We are to become one of this knot of hissing serpents, and we are hoping to change the whole character of this nest of venomous snakes by calling it a sweet name.

To my mind it is just as certain as sunrise that there will be not only the small wars in which we are called upon by the constitution of the League of Nations to participate, and which we will certainly have to finance, because the other nations are broke and cannot finance them, but there will inevitably be a great war, and by far the greatest war that the world has yet seen.

It will be a war either against the nations of the League or among the nations of the League. In this world war we will be compelled to take part, not as we did in the late war, when we were ready to do so, when we wanted to do so, and when we would decide the struggle between the exhausted antagonists in a few months by the overwhelming force of our unimpaired resources.

We will be compelled in this next great war, as a member of the League of Nations, to take part from the beginning and to endure to the end.

We will not be a voluntary associate. We will be a pledged and plighted ally. We will be an integral part of one or the other group of the belligerents.

We will be inextricably involved, because we shall have voluntarily entangled and enmeshed ourselves not only through the guaranties, but through the various acts of this league of foreign nations.

At the end of the war we will find ourselves not an arbiter, not holding ourselves unscathed and deciding the event at the last moment through our balance of power. We will find ourselves either belonging to the victorious group of belligerents or to the defeated group of belligerents.

If we belong to the victorious group, it will be better, but still bad enough since we have never anything to demand of victory. We will then find ourselves merely exhausted, partly depopulated, and wholly bankrupt, after the manner of the European nations, but with this difference—that we will have no easy mark to draw upon as the European nations have drawn upon us.

But suppose we should be on the side of the losing group. We should then be in the same position that the losing European nations now are—subject to the imposition of crushing indemnities, to the confiscation of our Navy and merchant marine, subject even to dismemberment, with the possibility of our Northern States going to the power that shall have possessed Canada, and of our

Southwestern States going to the power that shall occupy Mexico.

Our guardianship of the Western Hemisphere would be ended—our own primacy in the world destroyed for years, and perhaps forever.

Does all this forecast seem extravagant and impossible? Well, it only seems impossible because hitherto we have followed the advice of the wise founders of this Republic, and kept out of the foreign entanglements under which such situations are not only possible but of actual and regular occurrence as the result of every great war.

We have happily been free from such disasters.

Let us keep free from them. Let us maintain the policy which has kept us free from them—our historic policy of no entangling alliances with foreign powers.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. HEARST.

Inglewood Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

STATEMENT BY SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General, Office of Production Management, concerning the situation at the plant of North American Aviation, Inc., Inglewood, Calif.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When a dispute arose between the management and workers of the North American Aviation, Inc., at Inglewood, Calif., the Labor Division in the Office of Production Management lent its offices to both parties, as it has done in countless other instances, in an attempt to achieve a settlement and thereby avert an interruption of production of vital defense materials. When we became aware that this dispute could not be settled by the parties through routine processes of collective bargaining, we joined in asking that this dispute be certified to the National Defense Mediation Board. However, it soon became apparent that we were dealing not with a genuine labor organization but rather with an irresponsible group which had acquired certain key official positions in local 683 and had embarked upon a course of outrageous defiance. From the first their conduct spelled defiance of the charter under which local 683 operates as an affiliate of the United Automobile Workers of America. It is defiance of the duly constituted and responsible leadership of the United Automobile Workers of America. It is defiance of the duly constituted leadership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which has cooperated wholeheartedly in the defense program. It is defiance of the National Defense Mediation Board in its sincere effort to insure fair and equitable disposition of the demand of the North American workers for an increase in wages. It is defiance of the President of the United States and the United States Government in their determined effort to build a strong defense for this Nation.

This defiance is a challenge that goes to the roots of the entire democratic system—and the efforts of this democracy to preserve itself. To such a challenge there can be only one answer—and that answer has been given in the form of the Presidential Executive order issued this morning. The best interests of this Nation—the best interests of labor—demand this course.

We are engaged in an all-out defense program to prevent the enslavement of free people and free labor. Workers realize that their survival as free human beings depends upon the victory of democracy. We of the labor division at all times have cooperated with bona fide labor organizations and have striven to safeguard labor's rights in this emergency. The President's statement, accompanying the issuance of his Executive order, specifically preserves these rights. The President said: "Their (workers') fundamental rights as free citizens will be protected by the Government, and negotiations will be conducted through the process of collective bargaining to reach a settlement fair and reasonable to the workers and to the company."

A small band of irresponsibles have arrogantly assumed the right to speak and act for North American workers—workers who are loyal, patriotic, and law-abiding. This small band shall not be permitted to flout and betray the best interests of labor throughout the country. Their action must be regarded as contrary to the welfare and security of the Nation and of labor. I, therefore, follow the President, in joining with the leadership of C. I. O. and the United Automobile Workers, in calling upon the workers of the North American plant to return to their jobs at once. Neither the Government nor responsible labor can or will be expected to tolerate interference with defense production by irresponsible and subversive groups, irrespective of where they may be found.

National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM AMERICAN AGRICULTURIST

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the American Agriculturist of the issue of June 7, 1941, written by E. R. Eastman, the editor, the subject of the editorial being National Emergency.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Agriculturist of June 7, 1941]

NATIONAL EMERGENCY

(An editorial by E. R. Eastman)

Tuesday evening, May 27, 1941, will be recorded as a critical and perhaps turning point at the cross roads of American and world history. Whether the turn will be for better or for worse is in grave doubt. On that date President Roosevelt, in a world-wide radio speech, reviewed the World War situation. He went the limit for all-out support of Great Britain and other democracies, took on the defense not only of the United States but of all the Western Hemisphere, spoke out boldly for freedom of the seven seas, defied Hitler and other dictators and all their works, and declared an unlimited national emergency.

The speech amounted almost to an undeclared war.

Under this emergency proclamation the President now has practically all the powers of a dictator, and the proclamation is a culmination of the constantly growing amount of power placed in the executive branch of our Government in recent years. Under those powers which the President already has plus those given him under the declared emergency, the Executive controls and, if necessary, can manage practically all of the business and agriculture of America. He can fix prices, restrain competition and free trade, take over American industry for the Government, and prevent all strikes If the President and his associates exercise the power they now have to stop the war between labor and industry and to prevent strikes of a racketeering, radical nature, that at least will be some compensation for the loss of the people's liberties.

Under this new emergency proclamation, the President also has complete control of the radio, and thereby the people have lost ground in the exercise of free speech guaranteed to them by the Bill of Rights. It will be easy to progress, under the excuse of the emergency, from the control of the radio to the control of the press and of public meetings so that the people may hear only one side of the news and of public problems.

There is no doubt that the world faces a great catastrophe, and that danger is fast approaching our own shores. So probably these emergency powers, some of them at least, are necessary. I don't know. I do know that we have been rushed by our leaders toward war faster than a large majority of the American people were willing to go, and I'll always trust a majority of our people before I'll trust any one man or group of men no matter how sincere they may be. I am tremendously worried over the fact that it has seemed necessary on the part of our leaders to provide for the destruction or removal of practically all of our liberties even before we get started to defend them. I would have felt better over the President's declaration of an emergency if at the same time he had promised the people that their rights and liberties would be returned to them when the emergency had passed. He did not. But we, the people, must hereby highly resolve that we will get those liberties back. What else is there to fight for or to live for?

In any case, we must all realize that we are now in a different world, and a sadder one, than we have ever known, a world filled with work and sacrifice and blood and tears. The best any of us can do is, so far as possible, to keep from worrying and to do the job where we are the best we can. The common people of America had no part in this conflict. But farm folks have never been found wanting in other crises, and the President of the United States, and the rest of the Government leaders, can rest assured that we will not be found wanting this time.

What's Back of the Trade Treaties?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE KANSAS CITY (MO.) DAILY DROVER'S TELEGRAM

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Daily Drover's Telegram, of Kansas City, Mo., under date of June 5, 1941. This paper has been running for many years and is published largely in the interests of livestock men and farmers of this country. The article is entitled "What's Back of the Trade Treaties?":

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Daily Drover's Telegram of June 5, 1941]

WHAT'S BACK OF THE TRADE TREATIES?

The Constitution of the United States provides that the President may conclude treaties with other countries, with the advice and consent of the United States Senate. Treaties with Argentina and Uruguay are now under consideration by a committee of the Senate through a hearing of interested parties. The findings of the committee will go to the floor of the Senate, with approval or disapproval.

These proposed agreements are known as reciprocal trade treaties, in which one nation swaps the right to send to the other surplus industrial or agricultural products at lowered tariffs. The chief surplus product of Argentina and Uruguay is beef. What those countries desire and insist on having in trade treaties with the United States is tariff concessions that will make this country the permanent market for that surplus. In consideration of which, Argentina and Uruguay will lower the tariffs on our motorcars, refrigerators, or other commodities that are not produced, or underproduced, in those countries.

Nobody in a sane state of mind, knowing that the chief occupation of many Western and Southwestern States of this country is the same as the chief occupation of Argentina and Uruguay—the production of cattle for beef—can say that the proposed treaties are not unfair, inconsiderate, and hazardous to the trans-Mississippi population and thereby to the well-being of the Nation. Why, then, should the Department of State propose such a provision and why should the Senate of the United States give its consent? Can the State Department, the President, and the Senate be ignorant as to the vital character of such a swap on the economics of the great West?

That isn't likely, but the "solidarity" of the Western Hemisphere through mutual trade agreements is considered of greater importance than the well-being of this or that section of the United States. To act in concert economically is the basis if not guaranty of cooperation politically and militaristically.

Such is the program, the injustice of which is that economic sufficiency for various Latin nations of South America is to be promoted and secured at the expense of economic disaster for western United States.

If such solidarity is to be purchasable only in such a manner, it were better that the United States Government purchase the surplus beef of the nations that can't be handled otherwise and dump it in the Atlantic Ocean.

Let's turn this proposal around and see what happens. Let's say that Argentina and Uruguay are industrial nations and seek a market in the United States for their surplus refrigerators and motorcars. The first voice to be raised against the import into the United States of those industrial products would be the labor unions.

But what voice is raised by labor unions against the import of beef and its ruinous effect on the chief industry of the Great West? If these treaties are effected to admit beef in payment for hemispheric solidarity, this cattle country will buy fewer industrial products, so that whether we import motorcars or beef, the labor unions would suffer along with the cattlemen.

Some Clarifications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

TRANSLATION FROM IL PROGRESSO

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following translation of an article published by Il Progresso on May 25, 1941:

[Translation from Il Progresso of May 25, 1941]

SOME CLARIFICATIONS

There are still some half-baked snoopers intent on rummaging through old newspapers and old photographs to try to prove my anti-Americanism because of my affection for Italy, my respect for the government which the Italians have chosen, and my friendship for the diplomatic and consular representatives of Italy in the United States.

But have they found in their breathless search and their malicious gleanings a single act or word of mine against America?

This indeed would have been a vain search, because the United States has always been first in my heart. And why, therefore, should my very loyal Americanism have caused me to suspect that I would be blamed for my devotion to my native land and the interest and sympathy with which I followed every important Italian event while the most cordial, friendly relations existed between Rome and Washington, to the strengthening of which I and my newspapers gave every possible cooperation?

Now that—for the first time in their histories—Italy and the United States find themselves in opposing camps, I did not wait for impositions from above or below to take due account of the new situation and to proclaim without the slightest hesitation and without reservations that my duty—as that of every other American citizen of Italian extraction—is that of being profoundly loyal to America, just as we were before and always shall be.

I must remind those who reproach me for the Italian Red Cross fund and other Italian relief funds during the Ethiopian War that the enterprise had the sanction of the State Department. Funds were being collected for Selassie; and why, then, since the United States was neutral, should Italo-Americans have been deprived of contributing to funds for the relief of the wounded or of the families of Italians killed in battle?

Among the happiest memories of our community will always be the great relief rally I staged at Madison Square Garden on the night of December 14, 1935, which was attended by 22,000 people, while many others, unable to procure seats, jammed the surrounding streets to listen to the speeches carried to them by loudspeakers. The charitable purpose of that enterprise found eloquent proponents in prominent American and Italo-American citizens who addressed that meeting, such as the late Supreme Court Justice Salvatore A. Cotillo, Supreme Court Justice Ferdinand Pecora, the late Democratic Congressman from New York, Hon. William I. Sirovich, and Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia, who, after having congratulated the organizers for the great meeting "under the protection of the Stars and Stripes," added, "Your enthusiasm is fully justified, because I know that every cent which you have given will go to the benefit of the Red Cross and the other relief organizations of Italy."

A photostatic copy of a check for $100,000, bearing my signature, has been reproduced. Very well. That document—one of eight checks of similar amount turned over to the representative of the Italian Government—is glaring proof that fund drives of my newspapers are not shrouded in mystery and that I prefer to give the donors tangible proof that every dollar collected—not a penny less, as Mayor La Guardia pointed out—reached its destination. I am not in the habit of collecting funds from the public for a definite purpose without letting the donors know how their money was spent.

A grave accusation of this sort—collecting funds for a monument which was never erected—was launched in the House of Representatives against the head of a newspaper which, often covered by the banner of red internationalism, dares raise its voice against a charitable enterprise of mine for the benefit of Italy, forgetting, however, that I have collected and personally donated for the American Red Cross, for the relief of flood victims in the United States, for the Greater New York Fund, and for innumerable charitable and cultural American or Italo-American organizations, a list of which can be found in another section of this newspaper.

One of the latest fund-raising campaigns promoted through my newspapers was for the noble purpose of erecting a monument in Washington to the memory of Guglielmo Marconi, whose genial inventions have benefited all mankind. And the monument has already been erected and waits only its solemn dedication.

May I be permitted to ask why, to the explicit charge made by Congressman DICKSTEIN on the floor of the House of Representatives—where have the funds for the monument to Matteotti gone?—the accused has not yet answered. Probably he is among those who seriously believe that, in certain cases, silence is golden. * * *

I have always been against fascism in the United States, and I do not know of any Fascist organizations among Italo-Americans. It is for this reason that I consider useless all the noise being made by some groups of old or recently imported anti-Fascists, whose Americanism is of doubtful quality, since some of them come from the ranks of "red" subversivism and others are authentic ex-Fascists, who have been converted to anti-fascism only for personal reasons. Their insinuations and their libellous attacks directed against one or another lend themselves—and it is principally for this reason that I protest—to harmful generalizations which end by strengthening the most foolish prejudices and the most unjust discriminations against Italo-Americans, who are, in

their Americanism, far more patriotic than these accusers of many colors among whom there are some who, as they have betrayed their native land, might some day also betray America.

GENEROSO POPE.

The Aftermath of the Fireworks Chat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN A. DAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 2, 1941:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 2, 1941]

THE AFTERMATH OF THE FIREWORKS CHAT

It would appear that Mr. Roosevelt realizes that his war speech fell dead. It pancaked. The people were not stunned by his picture of their perils. They recognized the danger as one which does not exist and the unlimited emergency as something of an unlimited absurdity.

The Nazis, in Mr. Roosevelt's war propaganda, are an immediate threat to the Western Hemisphere. He said they have the military power to occupy Spain and Portugal and are bringing a threat "to the Atlantic fortress of Dakar and the island outposts of the New World—the Azores and Cape Verde Islands." The war, he said, "is coming very close to home."

British sea control had just been demonstrated. A ship the Germans thought was the most powerful afloat had been sunk as it attempted to enter the North Atlantic. When Mr. Roosevelt undertook to tell the country that the Western Hemisphere is in imminent danger of Nazi invasion the people knew he was trying to play on their fears. Two navies said there was no unlimited emergency or any other kind. The greatest of all now is the American Navy. It is ridiculous to tell the Nation it is in the immediate peril which would justify the war alarms concocted for deceitful purposes.

Mr. Roosevelt repeated his statement that the Atlantic is the graveyard of supplies intended for Great Britain. "The battle of the Atlantic," he said, "now extends from the icy waters of the North Pole to the frozen continent of the Antarctic. Throughout this huge area there have been sinkings of merchant ships in alarming and increasing numbers by Nazi raiders or submarines."

The best reports obtainable by Congress indicate that the loss of ships clearing from ports in the United States has been small. Admiral Land, of the Maritime Commission, revealed that his records showed only 8 of 205 such vessels had been sunk in the first 3 months of this year. Other figures put the total number of such ships lost for the entire period of the war at 28.

It does not suit Mr. Roosevelt as the head of the war party to trim his alarms down to the size of the facts. If he did, he would not have any emergency except emergencies he can find at home and has made. The speech didn't click. People who had been keeping their heads didn't lose them. People who were not for war didn't change their minds. A sense of failure may have led to the subsequent drive to frighten the people.

Mayor LaGuardia followed up Mr. Roosevelt's proclamation by proclaiming on his own hook. He proclaimed that "all residents of New York adhere to the requirements of said proclamation and adjust themselves to the state of emergency existing." Such of the residents as have retained a measure of sanity may be looking about for methods of adjustment to whatever is to be adhered to.

The mayor does not give them much help aside from demanding unstinted support of the Government "to the extent of personal sacrifice." The Little Wild Flower's output is a part of the concerted drive against the intelligence and common sense of the country. It has appeared in many quarters. It is officially inspired and directed. It is intended to create the impression that the Nation is at war and that it may be attacked at any moment.

The Memorial Day "alert" in the Army camps, the ports, munitions plants, and other spots where it might scare someone seems to have been a part of the alarm campaign. J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is darkly ominous about sabotage plots and officials of various cities have been warned.

An attempt is made to create a war atmosphere by telling the people that they must be ready to use less electricity and less gasoline, by suggesting that food rations may be imposed, and by collecting pots and pans in house-to-house visitations. All is intended to stir the blood, play on emotions and fears, and break down the common sense.

Have we ever before known such a determined attempt by government to drag the Nation into war? Have methods ever been so unscrupulous, falsifications so obvious, and intent so pernicious?

A Mischievous Utterance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUCIEN J. MACIORA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD (CONN.) COURANT

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of June 7, 1941:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of June 7, 1941]

A MISCHIEVOUS UTTERANCE

Until the death of Mr. Edelstein of New York as he ended a reply to Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi probably few persons realized the character of some of the utterances being made in the Congress of the United States at the present time. With the Nation in a state of unlimited emergency in order that it might the better equip itself and its friends in the war against nazi-ism, few would have supposed that the House of Representatives would have time, much less inclination, for speeches tainted by racial prejudice.

Unhappily, such is the case. In his speech Mr. RANKIN had declared that "Wall Street and a little group of our international Jewish brethren are still attempting to harass the President and Congress of the United States into plunging us into the European war unprepared." The animus of the statement is obvious. By attempting to fasten the responsibility for the foreign policy of the Nation at the present time on a small minority, the statement evidently seeks to create disunity now, as well as to name the scapegoat on whom can be shifted the blame in the event that the policy is regarded as a failure in the future. In the circumstances, the statement is pregnant with mischief.

In his reply, Mr. Edelstein correctly pointed out that such accusations as Mr. RANKIN had voiced were in large part responsible for the rise of nazi-ism in Germany, which evil force the United States has pledged its help in destroying. In almost his last breath, he decried the utterance, with entire justice, as being "unfair and un-American." His death put the incident in the blazing light of publicity. The people of the United States can well ponder its significance. If they do, they will give no faith or credit to men who speak as Mr. RANKIN did.

Racial and Religious Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

STATEMENT BY CITIZENSHIP EDUCATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Citizenship Educational Service, dated June 6, 1941, which should be read by every Member of the House because it emphasizes the importance of tolerance and brotherly love.

The statement follows:

A charge that statements of the type made yesterday in the House play into the hands of Europe's dictators was made today by Citizenship Educational Service, a coordinating committee of 24 national patriotic, religious, and welfare organizations with a membership of more than 30,000,000 Americans.

The text of the statement, which was issued by Palmer Bevis, executive director of Citizenship Educational Service, follows:

"The attack on the Jews which was made in the House yesterday with such tragic consequences is something which should never be permitted to happen again in a land which prides itself on its democracy.

"In ordinary times, an attack on a religious group such as this would be serious enough as a violation of the American doctrine of tolerance and understanding with respect to all classes, races, and creeds. Today, however, what is involved is something far more important. For today, such spreaders of prejudice are consciously or unconsciously playing the game of Europe's dictators who, through the most diabolical and far-reaching propaganda campaign ever conceived, are attempting in every country in the world to fan the flames of group hatreds, class conflicts, and religious bigotry as a means of spreading confusion and discord in the ranks of the democracies. This psychological warfare against America is no

myth. For if American groups can be set to fight among themselves, American defense will be sabotaged at its roots, our aid to Britain will be reduced, and the resulting indecision and delay will give the dictators their hoped-for chance to win a quick victory.

"America is a land where individuals are judged, not by their membership in any minority group, but by their individual worth, their individual abilities, their individual moral qualities as American citizens. Once America gives up these standards with respect to men and women of whatever religion or national origin, we are ourselves on the road to the destruction of the American way of life itself and the substitution for it of the fantastic "master race" theories of the totalitarian nations.

"The fact that foreign propaganda, to the extent of millions of dollars, is being poured out in this country to create just this kind of prejudice, is serious enough. But that any one of the people's Representatives in Congress, Representatives sworn to uphold the letter and spirit of the Constitution, should on the floor of the House of Representatives, aline himself openly with this foreign propaganda is an event which cannot go unchallenged by decent, self-respecting Americans everywhere.

"In his recent 'fireside chat', President Roosevelt spoke of 'the Bundists, the Fascists, and the Communists, and every group devoted to bigotry and racial and religious intolerance.' And, he continued: 'It is no mere coincidence that all the arguments put forward by these enemies of democracy—all their attempts to confuse and divide our people and to destroy public confidence in government * * * all of these are but echoes of the words that have been poured out from the Axis bureaus of propaganda. Those same words have been used before in other countries—to scare them, to divide them, to soften them up. Invariably those same words have formed the advance guard of physical attack.'

"In the spirit of this official warning to the American people by their President, we protest against the words spoken in the House of Representatives yesterday."

The 24 national organizations affiliated with Citizenship Educational Service are: Boy Scouts of America, Boys' Clubs of America, Catholic Youth Organization, Federal Council of Churches, National Conference of Christians and Jews, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Y. W. C. A., Roosevelt Memorial Association, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Knights of Columbus, Jewish Welfare Board, Y. M. C. A., Workers Education Bureau of America, American Friends Service Committee, International Society Christian Endeavor, Camp Fire Girls, Catholic Charities, N. A. A. C. P., A. F. of L., American Jewish Committee, National Self-Government Committee, Youthbuilders.

Fifth Monthly Report of Government Finances, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

LETTER AND STATEMENTS FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statements from the Secretary of the Treasury:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 10, 1941.

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By direction of the Secretary and in accordance with the arrangements made with you as outlined in his letter of January 31, 1941, I am enclosing herewith the following statements:

Statement No. I, general Budget summary—receipts and expenditures, comparing (1) Budget estimates for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 and actual figures for the fiscal year 1940; and (2) actual figures for the first 11 months of each of the fiscal years 1940 and 1941.

Statement No. II, effect of financing the deficit on the public debt, showing (1) Budget estimates for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, and actual figures for the fiscal year 1940; and (2) actual figures as of May 31, 1940, and May 31, 1941, respectively: This statement shows the extent to which the net deficit has been met through borrowings and reductions in the Treasury's cash balance. It also shows the debt at the beginning and the close of the period.

Statement No. III, statutory debt limitation, showing the amount of the debt outstanding which is subject to the debt limitation and the balance of the borrowing authority, i. e., the amount of additional debt which may be issued pursuant to existing limitations.

Statement No. IV, general fund balance, showing an analysis of the general fund balance and the changes therein during the period: This statement sets forth the balances at the beginning and the close of the period classified as to working balance, increment on gold, and seigniorage. It shows how the general-fund balance was affected by (1) borrowings, (2) excess of receipts or expenditures in trust accounts, etc., and (3) the net deficit as set forth in statement No. I.

Statement No. V, obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest as of May 31, 1941: This statement shows the contingent liabilities of the Government, i. e., the outstanding securities issued by corporations and credit agencies which are guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest.

Statement No. VI, combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies, as of April 30, 1941, based upon the latest official reports received by the Treasury: This statement shows the total assets of such corporations and agencies, the liabilities (including reserves), and their net worth. The liabilities are segregated according to obligations guaranteed by the United States and obligations not so guaranteed. The net worth is classified as to the amounts of the Government's proprietary interest and of the proprietary interests not owned by the Government. The total amount of interagency interests of all corporations and agencies included in this statement is also shown.

Following the suggestion in your letter of May 9, 1941, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, estimates of receipts and expenditures have been revised upon the basis of the latest information available. Accordingly the Budget estimates of receipts, expenditures, and net deficit used in statements I, II, and IV are the Budget Director's revised estimates as of June 1, 1941.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

I. General Budget summary—Receipts and expenditures

[On basis of daily Treasury statements, i. e., checks paid by Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to May 31	
	Budget estimates [1]		Actual, 1940	Actual, fiscal year 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1940
	1942	1941			
Receipts:					
Income tax	5,420.0	3,424.0	2,125.3	[2] 2,553.5	1,661.5
Miscellaneous internal revenue	3,135.0	2,942.0	2,344.6	2,702.1	2,143.7
Taxes under Social Security Act	847.0	789.0	712.2	784.2	708.3
Taxes upon carriers and their employees	145.0	135.0	121.0	110.8	94.6
Customs	390.0	397.0	348.6	353.7	320.5
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations		360.5	53.6	310.2	9.8
Other	177.0	173.7	219.5	176.9	202.2
Total receipts	10,114.0	8,221.2	5,924.8	6,991.4	5,140.6
Less net amounts transferred to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund	712.0	662.8	537.7	660.2	402.8
Net receipts	9,402.0	7,558.4	5,387.1	6,331.2	4,737.8

See footnotes at end of table.

I. General Budget summary—receipts and expenditures—Continued

[On basis of daily Treasury statements, i. e., checks paid by Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to May 31	
	Budget estimates		Actual, 1940	Actual, fiscal year 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1940
	1942	1941			
Expenditures:					
Departmental	888.0	759.0	809.9	[3] 745.2	743.0
Agricultural program [4]	1,202.0	1,220.0	[5] 1,425.0	1,080.1	[5] 1,355.4
National defense:					
War	6,940.0	3,740.0	667.1	3,128.4	602.7
Navy	3,950.0	2,150.0	891.5	1,970.1	803.1
National-defense funds for the President	353.0	136.0	----------	103.3	----------
Selective Service	32.0	19.0	----------	15.5	----------
Emergency ship construction (U. S. Maritime Commission)	200.0	25.0	----------	5.7	----------
Defense aid (lend-lease)	3,500.0	100.0	----------	6.7	----------
National-defense housing (Federal Works Agency)	225.0	30.0	----------	10.7	----------
Other agencies	300.0	250.0	(6)	(6)	----------
Total	15,500.0	6,450.0	1,558.6	5,240.4	1,405.8
Interest on the public debt	1,275.0	1,100.0	1,040.9	771.3	736.4
Federal Loan Agency	9.0	12.0	14.2	11.4	14.4
Federal Security Agency	872.0	843.0	799.3	[3] 887.8	754.4
Federal Works Agency [7]	1,121.0	1,667.5	[5] 2,066.7	1,543.7	[5] 1,913.9
Tennessee Valley Authority	40.0	36.0	39.1	[3] 43.9	36.3
Veterans' Administration	569.0	557.0	556.7	507.3	510.8
Transfers to trust accounts	268.0	234.6	207.9	234.6	207.9
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations	----------	[3] 339.5	----------	[3] 312.5	----------
All other	425.0	452.4	479.9	[3] 429.0	433.4
Total expenditures [8]	22,169.0	12,992.0	8,998.2	11,182.2	8,111.7
Net deficit (excess expenditures over receipts) [8]	12,767.0	5,433.6	3,611.1	4,851.0	3,373.9

[1] Revised June 1, 1941.

[2] In comparing actual receipts and expenditures for parts of a fiscal year with estimates for the full fiscal year, consideration must be given to the fact that moneys are not received and expended evenly throughout the year. For example, the larger amounts of income-tax payments are received in March and June quarters of each fiscal year. While certain expenditures occur evenly from month to month, some are seasonal and others vary according to circumstances.

[3] Includes national-defense expenditures augmenting regular activities.

[4] Net including departmental expenditures of Department of Agriculture.

[5] Revised to include revolving-fund transactions.

[6] Expenditures included in totals for Departmental, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Security Agency, and "All other." See footnote 4.

[7] Exclusive of national-defense housing activities shown above.

[8] Credits, deduct.

[9] Exclusive of debt retirements pursuant to sinking fund and other appropriations.

II. Effect of financing the deficit on the public debt

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to May 31	
	Budget estimates [1]		Actual, 1940	Actual, fiscal year 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1940
	1942	1941			
Net deficit (statement I)	12,767.0	5,433.6	3,611.1	4,851.0	3,373.9
Changes in cash accounts during period:					
Add: Increase in general fund balance during period	37.8	41.2	[4] 947.5	13.7	[3] 808.6
Total	12,804.8	5,474.8	2,663.6	4,864.7	2,565.3
Deduct: Excess of receipts over expenditures in trust accounts, etc., during period	37.8	[4] 41.2	135.6	111.4	197.1
Total financed by increase in public debt	12,767.0	5,433.6	2,528.0	4,753.3	2,368.2
Add: Public debt at beginning of period	48,401.1	42,967.5	40,439.5	42,967.5	40,439.5
Public debt at end of period	61,168.1	48,401.1	42,967.5	47,720.8	42,807.7

[1] Revised June 1, 1941.

[4] Decrease, deduct.

III. Statutory debt limitation

[Under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. As of May 31, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Limitation	----------	65,000.0
Deduct:		
Gross public debt outstanding May 31, 1941	47,720.8	
Unearned discount on United States savings bonds (difference between current redemption value and maturity value)	1,076.0	
	48,796.8	
Less: Debt outstanding not subject to statutory limitation	579.3	
Total	----------	48,217.5
Balance of borrowing authority	----------	16,782.5

IV. General fund balance

On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to May 31	
	Budget estimates [1]		Actual, 1940	Actual, fiscal year 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1940
	1942	1941			
Balance in general fund at beginning of period:					
Working balance	1,178.4	1,162.7	2,159.5	1,162.7	2,159.5
Increment on gold	143.3	142.8	142.4	142.8	142.4
Seigniorage (silver)	610.2	585.2	536.3	585.2	536.3
Total	1,931.9	1,890.7	2,838.2	1,890.7	2,838.2
Increases:					
Borrowings—net increase in public debt	12,767.0	5,433.6	2,528.0	4,753.3	2,368.2
Net receipts, trust accounts, etc	37.8	41.2	135.6	111.4	197.1
Total	14,736.7	7,365.5	5,501.8	6,755.4	5,403.5
Decreases: Net deficit (statement I)	12,767.0	5,433.6	3,611.1	4,851.0	3,373.9
Balance in general fund at end of period	1,969.7	1,931.9	1,890.7	1,904.4	2,029.6
Analysis of general fund balances at end of period:					
Working balance	1,195.8	1,178.4	1,162.7	1,157.5	1,303.1
Increment on gold	143.7	143.3	142.8	143.1	142.7
Seigniorage (silver)	630.2	610.2	585.2	603.8	583.8
Total	1,969.7	1,931.9	1,890.7	1,904.4	2,029.6

[1] Revised June 1, 1941.

V. Obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest, as of May 31, 1941

[In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Limit of authority	Outstanding liabilities [1]		
		Total	Matured [2]	Unmatured
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,400.0	696.2	----------	696.2
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000.0	1,269.6	0.2	1,269.4
Federal Housing Administration	[3] 4,100.0	17.1	[4]	17.1
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	[5] 4,750.0	2,420.4	11.5	2,408.9
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,644.7	1,741.3	----------	1,741.3
Tennessee Valley Authority	61.8	----------	----------	----------
U. S. Housing Authority	[6] 800.0	226.3	----------	226.3
U. S. Maritime Commission	[7] 200.0	----------	----------	----------
Total	----------	[8] 6,370.9	11.7	6,359.2

[1] Exclusive of obligations owned by the Treasury and accrued interest thereon.

[2] Funds have been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for payment of all obligations guaranteed by the United States, representing outstanding matured principal amounting to $11,700,000 and interest of $4,200,000.

[3] Limit of authority to insure mortgages. Debentures may be issued and tendered only in exchange for insured property acquired through foreclosure.

[4] Less than $50,000.

[5] The Corporation was authorized to issue bonds for an amount not to exceed $4,750,000,000 to be exchanged or sold to obtain funds for financing home mortgage loans or for the redemption of any of its outstanding bonds. Its authority to make loans expired on June 13, 1936, and the above limit may only be increased for the purpose of retiring its outstanding bonds by an amount equal to the amount of the bonds to be retired, which would not affect the net amount outstanding after June 13, 1936.

[6] Represents gross limit of borrowing authority. The Corporation has issued obligations totaling $478,256,000, leaving a balance of borrowing authority amounting to $321,744,000.

[7] Limit which may be outstanding at any one time with respect to the insuring of mortgages and the issuance of debentures.

[8] The total amount of assets of these corporations and agencies is in excess of the total amount of liabilities, including obligations guaranteed by the United States. See statement VI.

VI. Combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies as of Apr. 30, 1941

[In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Assets		Liabilities			Net worth	
	Exclusive of amounts due from Government corporations and agencies	Due from Government corporations and agencies	Obligations guaranteed by the United States [2]	Due to Government corporations and agencies	All other (including reserves)	Proprietary interest of the United States	Other
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,056.5	----------	697.5	140.0	118.9	100.1	----------
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,529.6	3.8	1,285.0	1.9	46.5	200.0	----------
Federal Housing Administration	83.7	----------	16.8	----------	3.9	63.0	----------
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	2,690.7	100.0	2,632.3	----------	48.8	109.6	----------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,762.0	894.5	1,745.1	40.2	342.5	528.7	----------
Tennessee Valley Authority	384.6	1.3	----------	57.6	16.9	312.0	----------
U. S. Housing Authority	406.8	----------	226.8	37.0	5.9	137.1	----------
U. S. Maritime Commission	347.3	10.1	----------	----------	200.6	156.8	----------
Federal land banks	2,233.0	10.6	----------	.7	1,809.4	213.3	220.2
All other	3,549.4	287.1	----------	578.9	941.0	2,114.9	201.7
Subtotal	14,043.6	1,307.4	[3] 6,603.5	855.7	3,534.4	3,935.5	421.9
Less: Interagency interest shown above	----------	−1,307.4	----------	−855.7	----------	−451.7	----------
Total	14,043.6	----------	6,603.5	----------	3,534.4	3,483.8	421.9

[1] Includes capital stock and paid-in surplus of Government corporations and agencies.

[2] Includes principal and accrued interest.

[3] Excludes $233,800,000 held by the Treasury.

NOTE.—The foregoing figures are compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury Department from the respective corporations and agencies. The amounts covering obligations guaranteed by the United States differ from those shown in table V for the reason that they are stated in this table as of Apr. 30, 1941, instead of May 31, 1941, and include accrued interest.

A Separate United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I introduced a bill which would create a separate and unified department for our air forces with a Secretary of Aviation, who would be a member of the President's Cabinet.

Among the letters and communications which I have received regarding this matter and my remarks pertaining thereto is one from Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, retired, United States Army, a graduate of West Point, who served with honor in all wars in which our country participated during the past 50 years. At the time of his retirement General Rivers was the inspector general of the Army at the War Department.

General Rivers saw service in the later red Indian troubles in the West, in Cuba, in the Philippines, and in France. He had a battle command in all our major combats in France.

I believe we should all give our earnest consideration to the remarks of General Rivers, not only as one who has had many years of valuable experience, but also as one who has a very deep sense of duty to his country and a great appreciation to the American people who educated him at West Point and gave him the privilege of wearing the uniform of his country for so many years.

General Rivers is from time to time writing brief studies of various things and giving occasional talks on the radio. He does not receive aid of any kind for his contributions, paying all the expenses of making and mailing his articles from personal funds, his income being the pension derived as a retired Army officer. A high sense of patriotic duty motivates General Rivers in giving his views on this subject.

His communication follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 9, 1941.*

To the Honorable HARRY SAUTHOFF,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There seems to be increasing discussion of our having a single United States air corps. I have seen the article by one of our well-known designers of airplanes, which was copied in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Wednesday, May 28. That article of Major De Seversky is entitled "The Twilight of Sea Power." He believes that our own primary defense is the long-range, land-based bombing plane and other airplanes—air power. Major De Seversky says also that modern military aviation has clipped the sea power of our own Navy, leaving the fleet strategically crippled—no matter how large a Navy we build—of its offensive functions unless our air force controls the skies above the fleets. Major De Seversky is convinced that "the ultimate round-the-world range of 25,000 miles for airplanes is at most 5 years away."

The capture of Crete in a few days' time in the narrow seas was a dramatic and clear-cut victory of air power. Britain controlled the sea. However, the British were unable to pre-

vent the landing of German forces, although Britain valiantly sacrificed in the fighting a number of powerful cruisers and destroyers. The British were in possession of Crete; they had an army there, with defended positions, artillery, tanks, and other heavy equipment. The naval force aiding the Germans was inferior to that of the British. The Germans took Crete without having tanks and other celebrated equipment of their previous campaigns.

Some of our Army officers have said in the past "The Army welcomes the airplanes; they are excellent as an auxiliary to the Army forces. But the airplanes are unable to seize and hold positions. Also, airplanes cannot transport artillery or tanks." We now learn that the soldiers in airplane transports, and in the gliders drawn by airplanes, can seize and hold positions. Also, that the swift and powerful dive bombers which accompany the transport airplanes are capable of taking the place of artillery and tanks in the battles.

Would it not be wise to allow the President an additional Cabinet officer, in order to insure the best use of our large air force? A Cabinet Minister of Defense would, as is done in Britain and in Germany, aid the Chief Executive in supervising the three coequal armed branches—the Navy, the Army, and the Air Corps. This Cabinet Minister of Defense would not only inspect the relative progress of the three branches and note where there are deficiencies, but he would also give orders on the spot to remedy any deficiencies. He would be in actual command of these three armed branches.

The way to control is to command. Coordination of three different forces—by a council or otherwise—involves, or at least invites, compromise and delay. It is interesting that Goethals, who constructed the long Panama Canal, said he made use of his assistants to aid him, but that he rarely used a committee or board of officials. He thought boards were often narrow and wooden. John W. Weeks, of Boston, who was Secretary of War in the Cabinets of Presidents Harding and Coolidge, was earnestly in favor of a single department of national defense. Weeks, a graduate of Annapolis, was successful as a banker and businessman. He was also a Senator in Congress. From his own experience Secretary Weeks stated there was, at Washington, administrative overlapping and administrative conflict—as well as departmental antagonism between the Army and Navy. Secretary Weeks believed that a Cabinet Minister of National Defense would be able to prevent duplication of activities and plants and wasteful expenditures of public funds.

Only by having one member of the Cabinet in charge of all the defense branches can Congress get the unpartisan and objective opinion of a civilian minister who devotes his whole time to studying and inspecting the relative efficiency, progress, and needs of the three armed services. One of the objections to a Department of Defense is the fear that the unity of command would be damaged. On the contrary, unity of command would be improved. The President would have only one member of his Cabinet to consult about defense matters as a rule. And one member of his Cabinet to whom he gave instructions about defense matters.

Unity of command for the Navy would result from having that part of the air force that goes to war under Navy command train under Navy command all the time in peace. The part of the Air Corps to go to war under Army command would train under Army command all the time in peace. Graduates of West Point and Annapolis would continue to be assigned for duty as at present with the portion of the Air Corps on duty with the Army and the Navy.

A natural question is often asked, "Is it reasonable to recommend a Department of National Defense if many of the officers of the Navy and the Army are of the opinion that such action would not be wise?" That our experts must be trusted. The most wise experts at times may make errors through their enthusiasm. In a matter involving the defense of the Nation it is well to examine and critically weigh the opinions of all—of experts and others.

The Cabinet Minister of Defense would be the head of the Department of Defense. The President at Washington can never closely supervise the work of 10 Cabinet officers. A civilian assistant would be at the head of each of the armed services—the Navy, the Air Corps, and the Army.

The single United States Air Corps would have its own laws for pay, promotion, and retirement. The Air Corps would be a homogenous body with a status equal to that of the Navy and the Army. The Chief of the Air Corps would have charge of the research, procurement and supply services for the Air Corps, and of the land aviation schools for elementary and preliminary training of men of the Air Corps. The Chief of the United States Air Corps would also have charge of a reserve air force—to be sent to aid the Army or the Navy—as the Cabinet Minister of Defense might direct. A small National Defense College would be created, under the Cabinet Minister of Defense. The students would be a limited number of officers of the services, with a few civilians from some of the other Government departments. The Cabinet Minister of Defense would need only a small staff. The three civilians at the head of the three coequal services would each have large staffs as at present.

Among those who have expressed their opinions in favor of a Department of Defense are the late John J. McSwain, head of the House Committee on Military Affairs; Lt. Gen. Robert L. Bullard; and the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell.

About 20 countries have in the last few years adopted in some form the plan for a single department of defense. Cabinet committees, or similar committees, are excellent as policy-making bodies but are as a rule not so effective as executives.

Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

The Horrors of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the headlines in the press would seem to indicate that the administration is searching for an incident, apparently any excuse, to get into the foreign war. I am wondering how much of an incident will be worth the sacrifice of thousands and perhaps millions of our young men.

The fathers and mothers of this country who offered their sons as sacrifices to the war lords and profiteers in the last war have still fresh in their minds what war means. To those who are not quite so familiar with this "glorious game of war," I wish to impress upon them what may be expected, if and when this administration succeeds in committing this Nation to another foreign war.

A bayonet driven through the body of a muscular boy is difficult to dislodge. It sometimes requires a shot to loosen the muscles or shatter the bones in which the bayonet is embedded, but such is the brutal technique of war. It is a highly specialized art to take a boy, tenderly nurtured from his birth, reared in an atmosphere of Christian love and transform him into a man of brutality and hate. There are boys whose individual minds break under the ghastly horrors of such a beastly program, as the pitiful mental victims of the last World War, now incarcerated in our hospitals, bear witness.

I was through several hospitals during the World War No. 1. The suffering I saw there is still etched upon my mind and heart. How can any man who has worked with and for fine young men erase from his memory the sight of torn and bleeding bodies and shattered minds. I saw long rows of legs, swung up by pulleys, with Dakin solution flowing over their lacerated flesh. Boys with arms or legs amputated. Others with eyes torn from their sockets, the flesh stripped to the bone from once handsome young faces. Some with severed spinal cords, destined, if kept alive, to suffer from paralysis. Yes; all this "to save democracy," or was it "a war to end wars"? Let the warmongers and war profiteers of World War No. 1 reply. I challenge the answer.

I recall a visit to the Millicent Dutchess of Sutherland Hospital, near Calais. Ambulances were arriving with men who had been gassed. They were taken into a large ward. These men had lain for hours and hours on the bullet-swept battlefields before they were picked up and carried back. Some of these fine lads, in their delirium of fever, were crying out the names of loved ones at home.

Can one forget what war means when you have seen boys with eyelids eaten away, the membrane of their lungs gone, tongues swollen, their young bodies racked with pain, and destined to live for only a short time on oxygen gas?

Must our young men again be called upon to go 3,000 miles to sacrifice their lives for the sordid plots and intrigues of inept leaders, foreign war lords, and profiteers? Is the American youth to be led to slaughter by the paid propaganda of those who would barter blood for financial profit or for those who see in such a course a path to greater personal and political power?

St. Paul's School Demonstration for Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

ADDRESS BY DOUGLAS W. FRANCHOT

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

by the president of the VI form, Douglas W. Franchot, St. Paul's School Demonstration for Britain, May 30, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen, men of St. Paul's, I address you tonight in an humble endeavor to express some of the feelings and sentiments and convictions that the fellows of St. Paul's have gradually but surely during this past year of trial and grief and crisis come to hold as guiding and dominating beliefs upon which they shall base their futures.

In the first place, this collection and celebration mean a great deal to us because they signify something that we have been wanting for months to express—our belief, our trust, our concern for the British in their struggle. We have read about, talked about the magnificent British valor and morale. We have cheered when they succeeded, sympathized when they failed, but we ourselves have endured no hardship, fought no battle, feared no bombs. We have been surrounded with good food, restful, happy days, a safe and care-free life, which few in the world today are permitted to enjoy, and which we have earned in no sense of the word. By parading and singing tonight we have given tangible evidence and voice to our backing of England. We have done something to show how deeply we feel about her struggle and how firmly we stand behind her. We avow that we are prepared to fight and sacrifice in coming years for what she is fighting and sacrificing now, and we make that avowal with a united and sincere determination to serve gladly and well when in a few years we are called to the colors.

We are convinced, I believe, that our relation to America's future struggle at Britain's side and her present effort to deliver the goods is about this: First, the rising generation, of which we are members, is even now being trained and armed to meet the threat of oppression to the free peoples of the world—to stand up against not only the invasion of our country but, what is more important, the invasion of our principles of Christian and democratic fellowship by a creed of subservience and barbarity. We are almost certainly headed for the Army in the next few years to receive actual military training; but there is another kind of training that we have long experienced and which St. Paul's gives to all her sons—the training of mind and body that prepares us to be real Americans, that instills in us a pride and desire for freedom, that makes our minds strong and keen for independence—the training on the athletic field that gives us strong bodies and the spirit of comradeship, the love and respect for the right and fine things in life that our association here has given to us. This most important part of our training has been and always will be St. Paul's contribution, and will make us more fit and useful in years to come.

Secondly, we are the generation that has been called upon to bear graver responsibility than any preceding one, for we must meet the perils of a time that is to determine whether America goes down to slow and cowardly decay before the treacherous inroads of our enemy, or on to greater glory as a great nation standing for right and light in the world. If we falter, if we shirk our duty, if we put off our reckoning with our foe, we and all that our predecessors have fought and died for, all the progress and achievements that are America, will fall with us.

Thirdly, we are destined to bear the responsibility of restoring peace and order out of the chaos and confusion that will follow our victory in a war-torn world. We must avoid the mistakes that were made last time, that have resulted in another World War. This time we must make sure that Germany never again threatens our safety; we must build a new and better world in which to live, making sure that another generation will not have to shed its blood to insure a life of peace and happiness for its children.

Lastly, I believe that we realize, above all, that we must combat the effects of cynicism and defeatism within our own ranks, that we must unite and strive toward the restoration of peace and freedom for all mankind, with a religious conviction and enthusiasm.

Many of us this year, at one time or another, have felt disillusioned and somewhat embittered that we should be faced with such a future of uncertainty and struggle, that our predecessors had been unable to create a world in which right rules might, in which peace and brotherhood have been unable to subdue savagery and cruelty. In the face of the futility and hopelessness of a world such as this that has been passed on to us, we have been groping for a sense of balance, a footing from which to work, a goal and ambition toward which to consecrate our lives.

We have found that footing and that goal now that the success of Britain's battle for freedom has fallen directly upon our shoulders. We no longer are bewildered and lost; we are no longer hopeless, for in Britain's desperate call for help, in the unavoidable revelation that their fight is ours, too, that their survival means our survival and mankind's release from bondage, we have found our future course clear-cut and inescapable. We are sure now of our destiny; we are convinced of our right and our might; we are unafraid; we are united; we shall—we must—measure up. America, as surely as day follows night, is finding her soul again in her life-and-death struggle beside Britain for the very principles that brought us into being as a nation.

To succeed we must rid ourselves of cynicism; we must show courage and devotion; we must live every moment of our lives to the fullest in appreciation of our benefits and in sturdy cheerfulness. These demands embody the salvation of America, for these very qualities were before the crisis slipping from our character, being replaced by discord and selfishness. America to survive must be tough in fiber and clean in spirit. We are witnessing and entering into her rebirth.

Let us never forget through all the times of hardship and bitter struggle ahead that we are Americans at the toughest time, at the time when she depends on us to come through, to protect and defend her name and honor against German oppression. Let us never forget that we should be proud to answer her call, calm and cheerful in our future of sacrifice and trial in the knowledge that we are fighting for something supremely worth the blood, the sweat, and the tears, and that to succeed means that we shall have saved the world for the little fellows, have sustained love and fellowship against tyranny and fear, and that should we falter before the challenge, we could neither find life bearable beneath the yoke of oppression or find the brazenness to look each other in the eye as slaves.

Limitation on W. P. A. Administrative Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the committee recommends for the next fiscal year a total limitation on W. P. A. administrative expenses of $35,466,000. This compares with a limitation for this fiscal year of $44,500,000 and for the last fiscal year of $53,950,000. This would mean a cut of 20 percent next year on top of a 15-percent cut this year. If the committee's recommendation is approved the average number of administrative employees next year will be limited to 16,000, which is a reduction of over 5,000 from the average employed this year.

NUMBER NOW EXTREMELY SMALL

It is my belief that the administrative limitation of $39,690,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget should be adopted by the House. This will permit the employing of an average of 18,350 persons. When you analyze the functions these persons have to perform and the area they cover, this number does not seem excessive but appears to be extremely small.

TWENTY-THREE THOUSAND PROJECTS IN 3,000 COUNTIES, OR APPROXIMATELY 8 PER COUNTY

The W. P. A. is operating over 23,000 work projects in more than 3,000 counties throughout the country. It is responsible not only for seeing that all of the work is properly and efficiently carried out but also for carefully reviewing the eligibility of all the W. P. A. workers, checking to determine whether they violate any of the provisions of the act with respect to citizenship, membership in the Communist Party, or a Nazi bund, assigning each worker to his proper project in accordance with his capabilities, preparing pay rolls, keeping accounts, and carrying out a multitude of other functions.

AVERAGE OF TWO EMPLOYEES PER COUNTY

As an illustration, one-third, or approximately 6,000 of the administrative employees are in the Employment Division. This means an average of two employees per county. Since a number of these persons must be concentrated in large metropolitan areas to handle the work there, it means that outside of these areas the average is less than 1 person for each county. It is a marvel to me how any less than this number of persons could possibly be required to check on the eligibility of all W. P. A. workers, assign them to their projects, and enforce all the other provisions of the Relief Appropriation Act concerned with project employment. The Operations Division has about 3,000 employees, which means that outside of the metropolitan areas 1 man is required to cover 2 or 3 counties, to make arrangements with sponsors concerning new projects, and to see that all the work under way is being properly carried out. Similar situations exist in other divisions of the organization.

BASIC ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS NOT CHANGED

Although the reduction in the total appropriation for the W. P. A. will cause some decrease in the administrative work, the decrease will be very small in comparison to the total reduction in the appropriation since the area to be covered is about the same and the basic administrative functions do not change. If the limitation recommended by the committee is not changed, as I said on the floor of the House yesterday, the

W. P. A. is going to be forced to close a majority of its district offices and consolidate the work in the remaining offices. In the small States it is even going to be necessary to consolidate most of the work into regional offices. In an organization which is designed for the purpose of operating projects for needy people it is imperative that the officials running the organization be close to the people and close to the sponsors of the projects on which they are working. I can think of no more disastrous result for the W. P. A. than having its officials removed to some distant office where they cannot give sufficient attention to the local problems which are constantly arising in this program. The daily contacts between W. P. A. representatives and city and county officials concerning the operations of the projects are essential to the success of the whole program.

COMPLAINTS CANNOT BE ADJUSTED WITHOUT PERSONNEL

Likewise, it is necessary that a W. P. A. representative be available to the W. P. A. workers and other persons who are seeking work or have questions concerning their eligibility or complaints which they wish to make. This is very important to Members of Congress. It is inconceivable to me how the W. P. A. can give the services which these people are entitled to from a district or regional office hundreds of miles away.

ONLY ASKING FOR RAISE TO BUDGET FIGURES

It is poor economy for us to vote nearly a billion dollars to an agency and then to so limit its administrative cost that it cannot do an adequate job in seeing that the money is efficiently spent. To do the kind of a job that this House expects it to do, the W. P. A. must have a reasonable amount of administrative funds. The limitation on administrative funds should be fixed at the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, which, I understand, conducted very thorough hearings concerning the W. P. A.'s administrative needs. The total limitation should be $39,690,000 with a sublimitation of $32,240,000 for salaries, $600,000 for communications, $3,600,000 for travel, and $400,000 for printing and binding. This amount of overhead compares very favorably with other Federal agencies and with private construction concerns.

PRINTING AND BINDING

The Bureau of the Budget recommended a limitation for printing and binding for next year of $400,000. This compares with a limitation this year of $320,000. Although this is an apparent increase it is not actually so. Practically all of the printing and binding expenditures are for operating forms. In June 1940, the W. P. A. had on hand a very large number of these forms amounting in value to more than $250,000. At the end of this June they will have less than $100,000 worth, which is as low as it is possible to be in view of the fact that forms must be ordered about 3 months in advance. Thus, by depleting its inventory the W. P. A. will actually have used during this year approximately $470,000 worth of forms. The limitation of $400,000 will permit them to use next year, therefore, approximately $70,000 less than this year.

Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration—Comparison of act limitation for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941 with the recommended act limitation for the fiscal year 1942

	Fiscal year		Recommended for fiscal year 1942	
	1940	1941	Bureau of the Budget	House Appropriations Committee
Total	$53,950,000	$44,500,000	$39,690,000	$35,466,000
Personal services	44,700,000	37,100,000	32,240,000	29,016,000
Communications	725,000	600,000	600,000	500,000
Travel	4,575,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	2,800,000
Printing and binding	475,000	320,000	400,000	300,000

DISTRIBUTION BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES

After considerable study the W. P. A. has adopted a clear policy defining the functions of an administrative employee. This definition follows the lines generally accepted both in private and public construction work and is in many respects even more rigid than the practices of other Federal agencies.

Project supervisory employees are limited to foremen, timekeepers, and others who are in immediate charge of the work on the project.

The definition is, I am informed, being strictly enforced by the W. P. A. The fact that the administrative staff has already been drastically reduced may in some instances have resulted in increased project supervisory cost, not because administrative functions were being transferred to the projects but because the insufficiency of administrative employees resulted in some decrease in project efficiency and increased project overhead.

Amendment of the Sugar Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

LETTER FROM JOHN CASHMORE, PRESIDENT OF THE BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter received from the Honorable John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York:

JUNE 9, 1941.

Hon. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On June 3 the Senate passed a bill, known as S. 937, which is a companion to the House bill H. R. 3582. If either of these bills is enacted into law, I assure you, it will be a serious blow to one of Brooklyn's important industries—the refining of sugar—and will create in addition much unemployment in the shipping, handling, storing, transportation, and selling of cane sugar, and also cause hardship to many who are otherwise dependent upon the welfare of these particular activities.

It is necessary to call your attention to the fact that Congress when, in 1937, it enacted into law the so-called Sugar Act, sought to stabilize the sugar-refining industry, which was then severely handicapped by excess production and disastrous competition, by setting up sales quotas for both cane- and beet-sugar growers, involving not only those of continental United States, its island possessions—Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—but also the Philippine Islands, Cuba, and other foreign countries.

At the suggestion of the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, there was embodied in the Sugar Act a provision that if the Philippine Islands for any reason were unable to fill their sugarcane quota the deficit in the quota should then be allocated to Latin American countries other than Cuba. This provision is in keeping with our good-neighbor policy, which was never so important as it is at the present time. To enact into law either of the two bills already referred to this country would thereby repudiate the 1937 assurances made to our sugar-producing neighbors in Latin America.

Both the Senate bill and the House bill now under consideration provide for the modification of the above-mentioned provisions by allocating all of the Philippine Islands deficit in their quota (excepting 75,000 tons) to the domestic sugar-producing areas, thereby upsetting the entire balance upon which the original act was based. In other words, the beet-sugar industry would expand at least 20 percent and there would be a serious curtailment, said to be $30,000,000, in our potential trade with Latin America.

Stripped entirely of all technicalities, these two bills have only one purpose in mind, and that is to expand employment and purchasing power, under subsidies, mark you, of the western beet-sugar States and to depress employment and purchasing power in New York and other seaboard States which trade in and handle raw cane sugar.

As these bills represent vicious sectional legislation they should be defeated with the active opposition of every Congressman from the East. Incidentally, I might add that practically all of the leading organizations in New York City are opposed to these measures.

Because of the foregoing facts, I earnestly request that you use your utmost influence in opposition to the passage of either bill, as it will materially reduce the overseas trade of Brooklyn and will be detrimental to the economic welfare of this borough.

Yours very truly,

JOHN CASHMORE.

Now He Calls It National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ERIE (PA.) DAILY TIMES

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Erie (Pa.) Daily Times:

[From the Erie (Pa.) Daily Times of June 9, 1941]

NOW HE CALLS IT NATIONAL DEFENSE

In a message to Congress emphasizing particularly the need of more electrical power for national defense, President Roosevelt calls for speedy passage of the Mansfield bill, which would commit the United States to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

"The enemies of democracy are developing every hydroelectric resource and every waterway from Norway to the Dardanelles," says Mr. Roosevelt. "Are we to allow this continent to be outmatched because shortsighted interests oppose the development of one of our greatest resources?"

National defense is now the theme upon which Mr. Roosevelt dwells in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway scheme. He urged it on other grounds in 1932, 1934, and even in 1938. Yes, and he says that the seaway is needed to provide a haven for shipbuilding. But national defense would wait a long time if it had to depend on completion of the St. Lawrence seaway—5 to 7 years. And yards for the building of deep-sea ships would have to wait on the deepening of harbors and channels. Thousands of skilled men urgently needed now in defense production would be diverted to the St. Lawrence enterprise.

The administration represents that the cost of it would be about $275,000,000; but this is far short of the mark. Trustworthy engineers, who are as much concerned to promote national defense as any new dealer, estimate the final cost at $1,000,000,000. For large sums would have to be spent to make all harbors on the Great Lakes conform to seaway requirements. Senator WAGNER estimated the outlay for each of the larger ports at $25,000,000. That figure of $275,000,000, then, falls far short of being even a half-truth.

If Congress has a proper sense of responsibility, it will defeat the Mansfield bill as calculated not to promote national defense but to retard it. If the need of more power is urgent, the thing to do is to construct steam-electric plants, which would be serviceable in a relatively short time. Then Congress should move to dissociate power development on the St. Lawrence from the navigation scheme so that when skilled labor can be spared from defense production the work of harnessing the river can be put under way. This would be sound public policy. No consideration of national defense can possibly justify the course which the administration proposes.

Utility Converts Motorcar From Luxury to Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the RECORD facts and figures showing the utility of the motorcar and its necessity both in industry and to the businessman in general as well as in national defense:

In the sixth study of its series to acquaint the public with the place of the motorcar in modern transportation and the necessity of continuing to supply cars in meeting the needs of the defense program, the National Automobile Dealers Association discusses the change of passenger car from a luxury to a utility. The change is explained as follows:

"As quaint as the vehicles themselves would be to us now are the terms used for the automobile back in the first World War days. It was then referred to as a machine or a pleasure car. Despite the all too frequent hardship of having to get out and get under, the automobile was bought almost solely for the purpose of giving the owner recreation or pleasure.

"What a change just a couple of decades have wrought. The old terms are extinct. The automobile is now a passenger car. Nothing has happened to diminish the pleasures of driving. On the contrary, they have multiplied. Dependability, comfort, speed, ease of handling, safety—all the attributes of an automobile have been immeasurably improved. The term "pleasure car" is far more fitting now than two decades ago, except for one thing—use. That alone changed the terminology.

"It wasn't long after the first World War that the public really put the passenger car to work. Demand grew. Volume of production increased. Prices came down. America geared its whole mode of living to a new and more efficient form of transportation—the private automobile. Now it is a necessity of the first order.

"Figures compiled by the United States Public Roads Administration, from 25 States, show that over 55 percent of the driving done in personal automobiles is for business purposes. For rural communities, approximately 64 percent of the mileage covered is on business, while for urban centers, it is 51 percent.

"Two decades ago, only 15 percent of all wage earners owned either automobile, motorcycle, or bicycle. Today, ownership of automobiles among industrial workers runs high, reaching 75 percent in some industries.

"In all other vocational groups, virtually all cars are used at least part of the time for utility purposes.

"In the United States, 2,130 cities with aggregate population of 11,844,124 have no local mass transportation, but depend on private cars, according to data compiled by the Automobile Manufacturers Association. These cities range in population from 2,500 to 50,000. The figures couple up with earlier findings that even in cities of the 500,000 population group, as many as 70 percent of the people entering the business sections on a typical day, do so by private automobile.

"This is only a small part of the evidence that can be marshaled to show the extent of present-day dependence on motor vehicles in this country. The situation contrasts sharply with that existing during the last World War. This country entered the year 1917 with only 3,297,996 passenger cars and 215,000 trucks, or a total of 3,512,996 motor vehicles. Preliminary figures for 1940 show 27,300,000 passenger cars and 4,650,000 trucks, or a total of 31,950,000 motor vehicles in use.

"In view of this, the efforts being made to restrict production and use of automobiles should be carefully studied, in order to prevent a serious disruption of our transportation system and endangering the success of the defense program."

W. P. A. Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

LETTER FROM GOV. SAM HOUSTON JONES OF LOUISIANA

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Governor of Louisiana:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Baton Rouge, June 10, 1941.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: Supplementing my letters of May 19 and May 29, I have read with considerable anxiety the Associated Press dispatch from Washington contained in the attached clipping from the New Orleans States of Monday, June 9, 1941. This reports, in effect, that the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has approved an appropriation of $875,000,000 for W. P. A. operations during the fiscal year beginning July 1, of which $50,000,000 would be transferred to the food-stamp plan, resulting in a reduction of that amount under the sum requested by President Roosevelt.

I am sure you realize what this would mean to Louisiana. If it becomes necessary to reduce the W. P. A. rolls by 44 percent, as the attached article intimates, more than 12,000 heads of families—representing approximately 48,000 individuals—probably will be released by the Work Projects Administration in Louisiana during July. The State does not have the money to carry this additional relief burden. It is our duty—mine as

Governor and yours as a Member of Congress—to see that adequate Federal funds are provided to meet any unemployment problem in our State.

Latest information at hand indicates that there are over 63,000 needy unemployed heads of families in Louisiana, including those presently assigned to W. P. A. jobs, those on the W. P. A. awaiting assignment roll, and an estimate of those who are not certified but who are in need of W. P. A. employment. On the basis of these facts I feel that the relief expenditures recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives are inadequate and, furthermore, that the President should be granted authority by the bill to expend the funds appropriated in less than the fiscal year, provided conditions justify.

Therefore, may I urge that you do everything in your power to see that Congress votes an appropriation commensurate with the relief needs of our State and Nation. Moreover, may I ask that you wage an active fight to eliminate those objectionable features of the present relief act which require a sponsor's contribution of at least 25 percent of the total cost of the W. P. A. program and the automatic release of all workers who have been employed continuously for 18 months.

Sincerely yours,

SAM H. JONES,
Governor of Louisiana.

Buffalo Council, Polish National Alliance, Pledge Support to the President in Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

LETTER FROM COUNCIL NO. 19, POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE, BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following communication from Council No. 19, Polish National Alliance, Buffalo, N. Y., pledging the support of its 6,000 members to President Roosevelt in the present emergency:

GMINA NO. 19, ZW. NAR. POL.,
COUNCIL NO. 19, POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE,
Buffalo, N. Y., June 4, 1941.

Hon. Representative ALFRED BEITER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: The members of the Polish National Alliance in Buffalo (6,000 in number), in this hour of great peril, promise to support, and ask you also to support, President Roosevelt in any course he may deem wise to safeguard the liberty of the United States and the entire world.

Yours very truly,

MELANIA NESTEROWICZ,
Committee of the Press and Resolutions.
JOSEPH NOWAK, *President.*
STEPHANIA PRZEWOZNA,
Vice President.

Increase of Compensation of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

LETTER FROM COUNCILMAN WILLIAM M. McCARTHY, OF NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter from Councilman William M. McCarthy endorsing S. 220 and S. 24, which will provide increments for postal employees based on years of service:

JUNE 7, 1941.

Hon. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEFFERNAN: I am enclosing herewith résumé of resolutions introduced by me and passed by the council of New York City on Tuesday, June 3, 1941. In view of your interest in the welfare of the postal employees, I am sure that you will be glad to know of the support given them by our body.

RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED BY COUNCILMAN WILLIAM M. M'CARTHY

"Whereas it is a commonly accepted American principle that for faithful service and conscientious performance of duty in any line of endeavor there should be commensurate remuneration; and

"Whereas that remuneration should be increased in the degree of the employee's value to this employer increases; and

"Whereas it is not conducive to the well-being of any individual to realize that at the end of 5 years he has already reached the maximum as far as salary is concerned; and

"Whereas there have been no salary increases for postal employees since 1925, the entrance salary for clerks and carriers being $1,700 per annum with annual increments until the maximum of $2,100 is reached; and

"Whereas the custodial employees of the Post Office average only $1,200 per annum; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States the longevity bill introduced in the Senate by Senators MEAD (S. 220) and MCCARRAN (S. 24) and in the House of Representatives by Representative FLANNERY, which will provide increments for postal employees based on years of service; and

"Whereas this bill has been endorsed by the leading civil-service organizations of this city—the New York Post Office Clerks Association, Branch No. 1, U. N. A. P. O. C., the New York Letter Carriers Association, the Civil Service Forum, the Municipal Office Employees Council, No. 51, and the New York Post Office Supervisors Association: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the council of the city of New York hereby respectfully memorialize the United States Senate and House of Representatives to enact this most worthy measure into law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives."

Passed by the council on Tuesday, June 3, 1941.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

LETTER FROM P. J. ANDERSON, OF GAINSBORO, TENN.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ANDERSON & ANDERSON,
Gainesboro, Tenn., June 4, 1941.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALBERT: Just a line to let you hear from the home front.

We are getting more than fed up with strikes which interfere with the defense program.

People here, and especially those who have sons who have left good paying positions to serve in training at $21 per month, say that it is a disgrace for the Government to commandeer the service of youth at $21 per month and then permit their work to be hamstrung by these strikes or any other interference.

For some reason unknown to me, but apparent to the ordinary observer, one is impressed with the fact that Hitler, almost at will and whenever he desires to do so, can take over another of the democracies in less time than we can determine on a course of action. The delays which have been permitted, regardless of the attaching blame, are enough to make one ill when he contemplates the dire need of Britain for those things which a determined drastic course of action would have assured them long since. In times of stress why wait until our friends are defeated before we aid them? If we intend to give all-out aid why is it not forthcoming? Why ask unheard of sacrifices by our people and multiplied billions, and then set back and permit a handful of malcontents to sabotage the whole thing?

I have given three sons to the service and am proud I can do something for our country, which I think worth fighting for, but I'll be darned if it doesn't irk me to madness at some of the things which happen and nothing done about it, or if anything is attempted it is of the milksop order, when a fist of iron should be felt where it will do the most good. Sometimes it looks as if our leaders are the last to realize what is occurring although everybody else knows all about it. Dallying with those who seek to delay our program is like temporizing with Hitler. I say to hell with such foolishness, and let's strike while the striking will do some good. The puny efforts which have been made to furnish planes to Britain compared with what could and should have been accomplished is little short of criminal, in my opinion.

I hope you will take off your coat, roll up your sleeves, and raise more hell about all this than the bone-dry law.

With best wishes for your continued health and success I am

Your friend,

P. J. ANDERSON.

Give Us An Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NEWSDAY

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the privilege of inserting in today's RECORD an editorial from Newsday, under date of June 5, 1941, on the subject "Give Us An Air Force."

This pertains to a United States air force under a Cabinet head with better and more equipment than any combination of powers that threaten our security.

Nearly every aviation authority in this country has advocated an independent air force for the United States, but we are still waiting for it. This is a crying need of aviation which America needs today.

The article follows:

[From Newsday of June 5, 1941]

GIVE US AN AIR FORCE

Early last January in this column we said: "Hitler tells the world that his air force will do a turn in the Mediterranean most any time now." The trick has been turned. Air power has accomplished what our military authorities in this country have persistently said was impossible. An island country has been occupied by air force alone and in the face of the opposition of a powerful fleet in complete control of the sea.

How much longer, Mr. President and the Seventy-seventh Congress, are we to defend ourselves without a United States air force? We have a splendidly officered and manned United States Air Corps as an auxiliary to our Army. We have a naval air force second to none in the world as an auxiliary to our Navy. These auxiliaries are essential to our Army and Navy and should be reinforced to any extent that the higher commands of these two services consider necessary. These auxiliaries should be, as they are now, under the tactical control of the Army and Navy.

Under the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics we also have unsurpassed aeronautical research facilities and laboratories.

However, in addition, we should have a United States air force under a Cabinet head, with a larger personnel and with better and more equipment than that of any combination of powers that threaten our security. Germany has such a separate air force and so has Great Britain. We have not such an air force because the higher commands of our Army and Navy have opposed it. The country of the Wright brothers, the country that created the dive bomber and the country that does more commercial flying than all the rest of the world put together, has not an air force.

The higher commands of the Army and Navy who lacked the vision to foresee how air power in German hands could destroy European civilization still exercise the influence to deny us an air force. This influence should be removed by the President and the Congress.

The airplane is continuing development so fast that aircraft types that are put on the drawing boards today will be obsolete on the drawing boards by the time the planes are put in production anywhere from 18 months to 3 years from now. Only a United States air force dominated by airmen can have the training and vision necessary to project an air force for the future second to none in the world.

The higher commands of the Army and Navy in making their requests for money appropriations to Congress can only consider aviation as an auxiliary to each of their respective services. If the appropriation for aviation is large, some other arm of either the Army or the Navy may suffer. Faced with that problem plus the lack of imagination that earth-bound generals and sea-borne admirals have demonstrated, air power in America will follow, not lead, that of Hitler's air-trained reichsmarshal.

The United States is not traditionally a military power, but it is potentially the greatest air power in the world. There is some doubt whether we can quickly become a great military power. There is little doubt that we can become the greatest air power in the world in a comparatively short time. There is also little doubt that if our air power is subordinated to our military and naval high commands, it may be too late before we achieve that air supremacy necessary for our defense to say nothing of the defense of this hemisphere.

History of the State of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, OF DELAWARE

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me on Parade of States program, Station WINX, Tuesday, June 10, 1941:

In the short time assigned me on this program, I can no more than touch on a few of the high spots of the history of the State of Delaware.

The name is derived from Lord De La Warr, whom the English claimed had discovered the Delaware Bay and River in a voyage to Virginia in 1610. Probably the bay and river were really first discovered by Henry Hudson while in the service of the Dutch East Indian Company in 1619.

It is established that the first settlement was made by a Hollander named De Bries in 1630 at Zwaanendael—the dale of Swans—near Lewes. The settlement having been destroyed by Indians, further settlement was abandoned until the year 1638, when the Swedes landed at what is called The Rocks, near Wilmington, and built Fort Christina. This, however, was not without protest from the Dutch, who later drove the Swedes out and took possession. In the meantime and afterward, Lord Baltimore, who obtained his grant of Maryland, was laying claim to the territory on the south of Delaware Bay and River. In 1664 the Dutch surrendered to the English, and in 1681 it was granted to William Penn.

I have not time to dwell upon the changes of ownership and the historic dispute between the Pennsylvania and Maryland proprietors and its settlement by the so-called Mason and Dixon line, a part of which was the famous Mason and Dixon line of Civil War history and is of more than local interest. It is to be noted that Delaware was settled by the Swedes, Finns, Dutch, and English. The three counties which constitute the State of Delaware are New Castle, Kent, and Sussex. The largest city in Delaware is Wilmington, located in the northern part of the State, in New Castle County. Its capital is Dover, in Kent County, and its statehouse is the second oldest in America.

The blue hen's chickens, which Delaware people are sometimes called, as derived from the fact that when the first Delaware regiment of the Revolutionary War went to join Washington's forces, Capt. Johnathan Caldwell, of Kent County, took with him some game chickens of a brood of a blue hen, famous in that county. History states that this Delaware regiment was the most efficient in the Continental Army; seeing fighting in most of the battles from New York to South Carolina, and losing about two-thirds of its officers. Judging from the fame of the blue hen's chickens, Captain Caldwell's fighting cocks lived up to the regiment's reputation. As a result of this, the blue hen's fighting cock has become the official bird of the State of Delaware. The State's motto is "Liberty and independence" and the State flower is the peach blossom.

The famous ride of Caesar Rodney from Dover to Philadelphia in order to break the tie in the Delaware delegation and cast the Delaware vote for independence has not yet received its full share in history and verse. The blue-hen State is the first State in the Union. This distinction comes from the fact that it was the first State to ratify the Constitution of the United States.

Delaware is a small State in territory, 1,978 square miles, land area; population, 266,505; but a great State in achievement. It is often referred to as the diamond State. While Delaware as a State is predominantly agricultural, the enormous relative magnitude of its one great city, Wilmington, and the industries concentrated around it, makes the northern end a very important manufacturing section. The first iron sailing vessel in the country was built in 1854 in Wilmington, which had previously been noted for building wooden ships; and that city has built iron and steel steamers of greater number and aggregate tonnage than any other single port in the United States. Pumping and mining apparatus and paper-making machinery and car wheels are famous specialities; in 1817 the first endless-sheet paper machine was set up in Wilmington, revolutionizing the business. Its manufactures of steam and street cars, machine tools, engines, boilers, etc., are known all over the globe. Next to iron and steel comes the dressing and manufacture of leather, in which Delaware takes a high rank. Wilmington has several of the largest morocco plants in the world. The vulcanized-fiber industries had its origin in the State, and about seven-eighths of the world's output is made there. It is said that the waters of Delaware, like those of Ireland for linen, are peculiarly adapted to the manufacture of that product. The canning industry throughout the whole State is very large. Delaware is the second State in tomato packing.

Wilmington is the ninth port in United States of America import tonnage. New Castle, one of the old historical cities in the State, is the home of the Bellanca Aircraft Corporation, builders of the well-known Bel-

lanca airplanes. A short distance outside of Wilmington is located the DuPont Flying Field, which is considered to be one of the finest and largest private fields in the country.

Also noted for its excellent roads, many visitors have proclaimed its system of highways to be among the finest in the Nation. It carries the reputation of having the best educational system in the United States. The University of Delaware, at Newark, a land-grant college, is in its one hundred and fifth academic year Founded as an academy in 1743, chartered as a college in 1833, it was incorporated as a university in 1921. Courses at the university include agriculture, engineering, education, arts, and sciences.

Sportsmen, migrating like ducks, travel hundreds of miles to the vast nesting and feeding areas along Delaware's eastern boundary. Highways are happy ways when they lead into the broad fields of outdoor sports of fishing, hunting, horseback riding, picnicking, swimming, and golf.

Most of the eastern boundary is situated along the Delaware River, Bay, and the Atlantic Ocean. At the lower end of the State in Sussex County is located Rehoboth Beach, which is considered one of the finest resorts along the Atlantic coast.

Delaware's main industries are agriculture, dairying, canning of fruits and vegetables, manufacture of iron and steel, machinery, railroad cars, explosives, dental supplies, meat packing, tanning, shipbuilding, and poultry.

Along with the other States, Delaware is playing a vital part in the national-defense plan. Some of the larger firms are manufacturing chemicals, powders, ammunitions, and small firearms; others are engaged in building various types of ships for our Navy.

I think I may close by saying that in no State in the Union can be found a better climate, kinder soil, better roads, better schools, or a happier and more prosperous and patriotic people. I pray that a kind Providence may preserve it and keep its people worthy of its glorious history.

United States News Pays Sterling Tribute to Integrity and Patriotism of the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the June 13 issue of the United States News, page 44, this authoritative magazine, which is in position to know the facts, pays a sterling tribute to the integrity and patriotism of the American farmer by revealing how efforts of the Secretary of Agriculture to use his Department as a sounding board to create war hysteria among the farmers of America and to lure them into the interventionist camp by an appeal to their pocketbooks proved to be a complete and colossal dud.

This item from the United States News demonstrates once again the fact that there are no more patriotic, loyal, and straight-thinking citizens in America than its farmers and small-town dwellers. Other groups in this country can well follow their example in rising above pocketbook motives in formulating conclusions on foreign policy and in following the patriotic policy demonstrated by the farmers of America in assaying all proposals in light of the best answers to the question, "What is best for America?"

[From the United States News of June 13, 1941]

AMERICAN FARMERS ARE NOT FOR SALE

The effort to sell the idea of United States war intervention to farmers through A. A. A. committees backfired so strongly that officials were forced to deny its sponsorship.

Americanism Must Be Saved by Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House of Representatives and chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the forum of the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs, at Glens Falls, N. Y., Friday, June 6, 1941:

There is always something inspiring in a gathering of eager, earnest, patriotic, young Republicans. It is a genuine pleasure for me to come to Glenn Falls, in this great State of New York, to attend such a conclave.

As we gather here today, our Nation faces perhaps the most perilous time of its existence. Gigantic tasks and vast responsibilities confront us.

The American people must once again defend their rights and liberties. This is strikingly revealed by the demand of the administration this week for the so-called commandeering bill introduced by Senator REYNOLDS, in conformity with a War Department request.

Here is a bill giving more power to the Executive than was asked to fight—with arms—and win the first World War. Think of it! The administration wants the power to take the watch out of your pocket; or the small savings account you have accumulated through years of thrift and toil. It wants the power to seize your newspaper, your business, your home, or your farm, and sell it to whomsoever it desires. It wants the power to take your property, real or personal, at any price the President fixes, and to sell it to whomsoever he may choose, at any price he pleases. It wants the power to thus take your property to sell, destroy, or to hold and operate for all time.

If this bill should pass the Congress, America would not only have to worry about dictatorships in other nations. It would be in operation here in America.

The mighty voice of the Nation must be raised in opposition to this proposal.

If the President needs some special power for defense, let him be specific. No Executive has ever had a more cooperative Congress than the present one.

The Chief Executive now has plenty of power to break any jam in defense production if he desires to do so.

There is no need or excuse for this demand for super constitutional powers.

A great responsibility rests upon you young people. I find it in my heart to thank God for the tremendous power of right action inherent in the ranks of the millions of earnest and able young people like you here today. You have youth. You have energy. You have vitality. You have understanding. You have vision. And, above all, you have freedom of speech and liberty of action. You can dare to do right without fear of a tyrant's anger or the lash of a despot's whip. You do not have to fear a concentration camp or a sudden knock on your door in the dead of night and a quick trip into oblivion. This is the America of today. It is the America we shall maintain.

One of the first things I want to tell you is your country is not at war yet. The declaration of an unlimited emergency has not changed things as much as some believe. It has not curtailed your right to speak. It has not brought about any abatement of the Bill of Rights. It has not set aside our forms and procedures under constitutional government.

America stands today in a world torn by hatreds, suspicions, and fears. The results of these hatreds and suspicions and fears are bloody war. Smoking ruins and mangled men, women, and children mark the path of those hatreds and fears in Europe and the Orient. Over there, civil rights, all personal liberties, all individual freedom have gone by the board. Men, women, and children are the driven, suffering slaves of despots who are themselves the driven slaves of their own insatiable lust for power and earthly glory. Only ruin, destruction, death, and disgrace can finally end such mad careers. We pray to God America may avoid all of these things.

Here in America we are faced by two sets of problems. All of them will be certain to affect your future, as young people, very drastically.

Some of these most dangerous problems are our internal ones. A national debt of incomprehensible magniture grows greater daily and is headed for a figure the size of which none of us can now even imagine.

We must put an end in this great national crisis to industrial warfare. Labor and industry must have real vision and be unselfish enough to put first the welfare and security of their country. It would do no one any good to win some temporary advantage and then lose all because we have failed to achieve an adequate defense.

Labor and industry both have rights. For the good of the country, it is to be hoped each will respect the rights of the other, and that both will respect the rights and security of the general public.

The rank and file—by far the very great majority—of all the wage earners of America are loyal, earnest, patriotic men and women who love their country and their fellow men. Make no mistake about that. Under sincere, unselfish, and patriotic leadership American workers will respond to the call of their country with an enthusiasm, with an eagerness, and with an efficiency which will astound the world. American working men and women want peace. They want to live and love and work without turmoil, without rancor, without envy of their fellows. They want progress for their children. They are the most intelligent, enlightened, honest, sincere, and capable workers in the world. The moment the false leadership is exposed and rooted out, those workers will be the salvation of America.

Only an exceedingly small percentage of businessmen and managers of industry would think of profiteering on their fellow citizens in this grave hour. The very great majority of the business men and women of this Nation are just as patriotic, just as eager to serve their country, just as sincere, just as honest, just as enlightened, and just as efficient as the wage earners or any other group of citizens to be found in the land. What the financiers and managers of business and industry need is to be treated and consulted as honorable, patriotic, and efficient citizens instead of as suspicious characters, criminals, or traitors to the Nation. In these times, when no man can know what the future may bring forth, we are all vitally interested in preserving the security of our Nation and our people. We are all vitally concerned in preserving and perpetuating our American way of government and of life. To do that we must now prove the efficiency and the superiority of our American way of government and of life. That calls for unity—true unity. Unity of spirit is as necessary as unity of action. Unity of action may for a time be compelled by despots driving their peoples with lashes and bayonets. Such unity and its works vanish the moment any sign of weakness appears in the authority or the control of such despots. The works of such a compelled concert of action fall like a house of cards at the first wind of adversity or defeat. Unity of spirit can be achieved only by leaders who are honest, sincere, and unselfish, who are seeking the real good of their country and their people.

We in America must have unity of spirit. We must have the unity of action, springing from a dauntless unity of spirit and purpose. We must have leadership which wants to perpetuate a government of, by, and for the people, with the power residing in the people. We must have leadership which will select able men of proved experience to direct our defense efforts and our aid to other nations. Radical theorists, inexperienced dreamers, and self-seeking bureaucrats cannot do the job properly or safely.

There are some people in our country who want to change our form of government into communism. Those who want communism should go to Russia. They will find plenty of what they call communism there. And they will find it to be bloody dictatorship. But these Communists do not want to go to Russia, where they assert communism works so well. They want to produce chaos and ruin in this Nation, they want to tear down our form of government, and our mode of life. Why? Because in the ruins of a magnificent nation, and in the hopelessness and despair of a magnificent people, they expect to find a chance to take over control and be dictators. The only communism these Communists want is a communism of power shared between a few of their own leaders.

There are other purveyors and proponents of alien doctrine. They are the Fascists. If they want to live under fascism, let them go to those foreign countries where they will find plenty of fascism. And if they do, they will find their fascism is bloody despotism and slavery. But these Fascists do not want to go to Europe. They want to overturn our free constitutional Government and produce economic ruin. In that ruin, and the despair of our people, they hope to find their opportunity to take over control and to rule.

We must be ready to oppose to our last drop of blood any effort to destroy our American form of government or our American way of life, whether that effort spring from enemies over the seas, or from designing enemies of free government here at home. Any enemy of American freedom, of the Constitution, of the Bill of Rights, is an enemy to be guarded against and defeated, no matter what his nationality may be, or where he may have been born.

We face rising taxation which inevitably will retard the progress of business and industry. Those taxes will bear heavily on the young people of America who are just coming into their trusteeship of this great, rich Nation. They—and all of us—must help to pay for the waste, the squandering, the inefficiency, and the corruption as well as for the legitimate and necessary expenditures.

American agriculture faces many problems. Some of them are new and result from pressures of the war hysteria and the frenzied efforts to build a national defense. America must have a prosperous and independent agriculture. American farmers must be able to have something beside toil and sacrifice.

Free enterprise, equality of opportunity, the rights of property, as well as the rights of labor must be protected.

Above all else, we must preserve the American system of biparty government. That task is largely yours, as young Republicans. I said on another occasion it is the job of the minority party to police and audit the administration. It is a vital part of our American system of free government for the minority party to function as the constructive critic, as the watchful force, to police and audit the majority.

Whenever any administration can silence criticism, crush opposition, and refuse to be accountable to the minority and the people for its acts, free government in the United States is dead and the American way is done. Even in war-torn Britain they respect the rights and the necessity of constructive criticism.

Unity we must have. We must build, and build quickly, a national defense adequate to protect us against any threat of aggression from any source whatever. But unity does not mean blind, unquestioning submission to the dictates of any political bureaucracy or oligarchy. Unity means intelligent cooperation. We Republicans have proved by our acts and our votes, in Congress and out, we are at all times fully ready to cooperate intelligently. We are just as determined upon an adequate national defense as any class of citizens in this Nation. We do not concede any political group, or clique, or bureaucracy, or oligarchy has a monopoly of patriotism. We do not concede any such group has any corner on America. This Nation is the Nation of all of us. The rights and the privileges, and the opportunities, and the freedoms, belong to all of us.

Now, as to problems presented by affairs abroad. Unquestionably events now taking place will have a profound effect upon our domestic economy. We must prepare to weather an economic storm after the wars have exhausted the nations of the world. That economic cyclone will make the financial hurricane of the last 10 years seem like a summer breeze. The great test of American courage, and resourcefulness, and self-reliance will come after the wars are ended.

Our first job—your first job—is to look out for America first. Let us preserve and make practical and workable the democracy at home which we want other peoples to have. Keep the flag of freedom flying at the masthead here at home so other peoples may know that freedom works. Keep the Constitution sacred here at home so there will be a Constitution for others to copy. Keep the American way of government, of life, and of liberty alive and effective here at home so they will live for peoples in other parts of the world to emulate.

If our American system of free government, the biparty system, the Constitution, go down in this Nation—even for a little time—the hope of the world is gone.

As I look out over this magnificent gathering of American youth, I realize with gratitude that Americanism will live. I realize the vast power inherent in your determination to keep the ideals of the American way vibrant and efficient. You can do it, and you will do it.

I honestly, earnestly believe in my heart the best interests of this Nation require the election of a Republican House of Representatives in 1942. And I honestly believe in my heart we will take control of the House of Representatives in 1942. The whole tendency of any overwhelmingly dominant majority too-long continued in power is to become arrogant and intolerant.

Now, my young fellow citizens, these are not political platitudes I am repeating to you. I am trying to tell you, and the rest of the youth of America, of all races, of all political faiths, that your future is menaced. The future of you and yours is at stake. Influences are at work to destroy the freedom, the liberties, the equality of opportunity which are yours, and which you must now fight to keep. Pressures, hidden pressures, are at work to impose alien doctrines and alien forms, social, political, and economic, on our Nation.

But our task—your task—is to safeguard by vigilance and courage the traditions of our American way and the foundations of our constitutional Government.

You will unite, of course, with the rest of the citizens in giving of your best to aid in building the national defense.

We will be alert, vigilant day and night, against any foreign menace, either military or economic. This is the part of prudence and the requirement of security. But while we are so doing we will not neglect to be alert and vigilant to internal dangers which could just as surely destroy us as foreign enemies might seek to do.

As national chairman I am fully cognizant of the contribution you can make to the future of the Republican Party. I have appointed a special committee to study plans for complete cooperation and for the foundation of a forward-looking program. I must have your support if we are to win the great battle for America.

Youth has the courage and the stamina to do the job of organization we must have. So go back to your home precincts. Enlist under your district leaders. Organize, organize, I repeat, organize down to the last voter, and we will have an unbeatable organization. Much depends on you. Do not fail us.

You are the young, fresh, powerful, energetic forces of Americanism in the Republican Party. You will do your duty and you will do it intelligently. I am willing to trust the future of America to your hands.

Memorial Day, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERN PARSONS, OF HOLLAND, MICH.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. Elbern Parsons, of Holland, Mich., made in connection with

Memorial Day ceremonies held at that city on May 30, 1941:

Mr. Mayor, members of the various patriotic organizations, fellow citizens, I think we may be justified if, after a formal recognition of the indebtedness which we in the present owe to the patriotic sacrifices made by those in whose honor we are here assembled, we proceed at once to consider the present and the future in the light of events transpiring since last we were assembled here in this same capacity and for the same purpose.

These honored dead have left to us a heritage of freedom under law. To decorate their graves with flowers while giving no consideration to the perils which today menace that freedom would be but poor homage indeed, unworthy both of them and us.

In 1917 and 1918, I found myself among the number garbed in the uniform of a soldier of the United States, engaged with some 2,000,000 or more others of my fellow citizens in what we were told was a war to make the world safe for democracy. As a part of the mechanics involved in that process and in the accomplishment of that program, this Nation, by the victory of its armed forces on sea, on land, and in the air, gave to its Allies in that war, and notably to the British Empire and the French Republic, a military victory over the German Nation and its allies, which, in effect, delivered the German Nation in particular into the hands of France and England, disarmed and helpless and bound in the end by the terms of a treaty which gave those victors the right to maintain that condition of disarmament and military impotence for many years to come. We made no profits out of that war. Our Government deemed it vital to our own safety to destroy, or at least defeat, the armed might of German militarism. Our people paid—are still paying—the price for the attainment of that end. And today, in the face of the demand for new and perhaps greater sacrifice, we have a right, and it is our duty, to pause and consider what in the past little more than 20 years has become of the fruits of that victory. Certainly, the world did not for long remain safe for democracy, however safe we may have thought we made it. As we look back over the events of the last few years and consider the position of national emergency proclaimed to exist today, we did not even make the world safe for ourselves, to say naught of others and nothing of democracy. It is a fair conclusion, in the light of events, to say that the statesmen of Europe, to whose unworthy hands the destinies of their respective nations were committed, have by their incompetence, blindness, greed, and criminal stupidity permitted the security and the liberty which we helped to win for them to slip from their palsied grasp, with the result, as now appears, that all must be rewon, at the cost of tears, of treasure, and of human life as well. Certainly no nations ever had a better chance, by the exercise of naught but common prudence, to prevent the present world disaster than did France and England after the complete triumph of their cause in 1918. Yet they sat idly by and watched an egomaniac, in violation of the treaty they had made, rearm and remilitarize the German Nation, all the while having proclaimed in a book he wrote his plans for revenge and conquest. For years he openly prepared for the present conflict. There was once a time during this long period when, motivated by nothing more statesmanlike than realistic self-interest, England and France, or one of them alone, could, all within their rights under international law, have put a stop to the whole deadly business. They, and not we, must answer to the verdict of history for their failure to do so.

Of course, all this does not change the fact that once again we are being told, after the lapse of less than a quarter century, that victory of the British Empire over Nazi Germany, in the war now waging overseas, is vital, indispensable to our own national safety. Perhaps it is. However, as a veteran of the last war, with a son of military age for this one, I must say this doctrine is dreadfully reminiscent of that day in 1918, when, like a host of other American young men in uniform, I said good-bye to the woman I loved, to sail away for a European battlefield. That war when it began was a foreign war like this one is. I was but one in hundreds of thousands, and we made light of it as we saw the shores of the United States of America grow dim and fade, but we weren't kidding anybody. And while I have been advised against saying anything like this next remark, thank God I still can say it, I am not going to be satisfied, I am quite sure you are not going to be satisfied, and the people of the United States have no business to be satisfied, and the hour of the end of our own democracy has struck, if our leadership, our Government, is to accept for us and in our name, and commit this Nation, to a program that calls for us to fight a European war every 25 years or less to save either the British Empire or the French Republic from the loss of a war with the German nation. We have a right as a great people to demand, and unless we do demand and enforce it, the hour of our doom has struck; that at the end of the road on which our Government has set our feet, where Hitlerism is to be blasted from the earth, from the sea, and from the air, its seeds shall be destroyed, not merely scattered. If the German nation, as now on the face of things appears, cannot be trusted to keep the peace, then its complete and permanent disarmament and if need be dismemberment and extinction as a nation must be permanently accomplished and kept accomplished. And there must be no more presentation to England and France of a victory served as it were on a platter of American gold, garnished with hundreds of thousands of American dead. They are, I fear, wholly incompetent to make any intelligent use of such a sacrifice. We must demand of our leadership, of our Government, if you please, efficient steps, not only for the defeat of Hitlerism, now that we seem to be committed to its defeat, but to put into effect those measures necessary to end for all time this business of periodic European rescue expeditions. We cannot survive as a nation of free men and women, if indeed we can survive as a nation at all, if we must pay the price of a victory over a rearmed Germany, or over any other organization of pirates, brigands, and murderers, every few years.

You remember the Neutrality Act, aid short of war, the lend-lease bill, all logically leading up to our present position, whatever that is. Whether those who insist that we must, for self-preservation, carry on our present undeclared war on Germany, to save England in order to save ourselves, or whether we should confine our efforts to an all-out program to arm the United States, is a question that may never be answered since the adoption of one alternative precludes proof of what would have happened had we adopted the other. That we are in great national peril is an accomplished and generally accepted fact. As to just what the greatest peril is is a matter of some difference of opinion. The orators are discussing it. And you might, if you have not already done so, with profit read this week's editorial in the Saturday Evening Post. This is not the day nor the occasion for me to elaborate on these great national questions, on which hang perhaps the future of the world. We must, I believe, with all speed, proceed to arm ourselves to the teeth. We cannot hope to defend ourselves against pagan outlaws by mere expressions of our disapproval. And so from this day forth, for a time not now predictable, it is and must be the duty of us all to contribute to the limit of our capacity and opportunity to the national program of defense, placing all selfish desires, motives, and interests in subordination to our supreme duty to this Republic. But we shall do this as free men and women and not as slaves. And, let us here and now resolve to demand of our Government and its responsible officials that they plan surely and well, and take us into their confidence, and in due time enforce and establish all those measures necessary to preserve the fruits of victory, over our present peril, which by this loyal sacrifice we shall attain. We know that we cannot depend upon European statesmanship, so-called, for long, to act intelligently for the protection of the safety of world peace. If, as asserted, the only thing we need to fear is fear, it may, I trust, still be said that there are some things besides fear we have a right to be concerned about. One of them is the plans of world leadership, including our own, for the reorganization of the post-war world. Now, and in the days ahead, eternal vigilance continues to be the price of liberty.

And now, my comrades and fellow citizens, let us go hence from this place of hallowed memories, sanctified by previous association with many who in happier days have joined with us in other beautiful ceremonies, and then preceded us into the great beyond, highly resolved that no part of the priceless heritage of liberty they left to us shall be lost because of our neglect to do our full duty even as they did theirs. And let us pray that in the difficult days ahead, we shall all be guided in all our public conduct, and in the opinions we form and express, not by hysterical propaganda, but by reason and common sense.

Ability-to-Pay Tax Factor as Applied to Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in this critical period, when billions are to be poured out to strengthen our national defense, it becomes imperative that additional taxes be levied to meet the National Treasury's needs.

It is true that no industry wants its product taxed, but we all realize that the money must be raised.

Ability to pay, not ease of collection, should be the guiding principle.

Those who hold the responsibility of formulating the tax policy of the Federal Government could profit by the excellent example set by officials who are guiding the Federal housing program.

Near San Diego, the Government is building the biggest governmental housing project in America. Planned to contain 3,000 homes, the project will provide adequate housing for the men engaged in defense work at huge aircraft factories

in the area, and their families. This new city has many interesting and novel features. But the most revolutionary and beneficial of its innovations is the method which has been devised for assessing rentals.

Neither the size of the house, its location, nor its design, will have anything to do with the rent which must be paid to occupy it. Instead, the rental scale will be geared only to the wages which the occupant receives. For example, a worker who earns from $16 to $20 a week will rent a house for $14 a month, regardless of how many bedrooms the house contains. The same house will cost $50 each month to the fellow who receives wages amounting to more than $60 per week.

CONSIDERS ABILITY TO PAY

Here, in public housing, is complete consideration of the ability-to-pay factor—and the United States today would possess a far more equitable system of taxation if the same ability-to-pay factor had been given equal consideration in this respect.

As a matter of fact, if the ability-to-pay factor had been accorded its just importance, it is probable that the Federal gasoline tax never would have been levied.

Studies by the Federal Government itself disclose that the average motor-vehicle owner earns between $20 and $30 weekly. Experts point out that about one-quarter of all gasoline-consuming vehicles are owned on farms, and, most certainly, no person seriously will contend that the meager income enjoyed by farmers can be stretched to support a heavy tax bill. Truckers, traveling salesmen, workers who must use their cars to get to and from work—and all other classes of citizens who use their vehicles in connection with earning their daily bread or to haul the family to church—almost invariably are found to be persons of modest income.

GASOLINE-TAXPAYERS' ABILITY VIOLATED

The compelling reason for the construction of the San Diego project was, of course, to remedy the deplorable lack of housing which is typical in areas of expanding defense industries. In order to keep their families under a roof, many workers in the San Diego plants were being forced to drive up to 80 miles to get from their homes to the job and back again.

The worker's 80-mile drive to the plant provides a splendid example of how the gasoline tax violates the ability-to-pay principle. The California State tax of 3 cents per gallon—which is considerably lower than the national average—costs this worker about $66 in the course of a 300-day working year on his trips to his job alone. The 1½-cent Federal gasoline levy adds another $33 annually to this cost, which totals about $100. Thus, if this commuting worker is in the $16 to $20 weekly earnings bracket, and moves into the new Government housing project, he will save enough in annual gasoline taxes to pay his rent for 7 months. It is difficult to imagine any worker failing to make the move under these circumstances.

Now, the State gasoline tax, severe penalty though it is, partially may be justified on the grounds that the revenue therefrom is expended for the highways which the worker uses. Nevertheless, the tax obviously costs this worker far more than would a tax payment warranted by his small income.

But no justification can be found for the Federal gasoline tax, which is not a road tax, but is levied solely to provide revenue to finance the general functions of government, and which, like the State tax, bears no relation to the taxpayers' income.

ABANDON PROPOSAL TO INCREASE TAX

At the moment revenue is immediately needed, and it may be untimely to consider the repeal of the existing Federal gasoline tax. But, assuredly, current proposals to increase the levy rapidly will be abandoned if proper weight is given to the ability-to-pay factor. This factor, in all fairness, should be a paramount consideration in assessing the costs of general government, which should be borne by all citizens alike.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY PRESTON DELANO, COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I present for publication in the RECORD an excellent address delivered by Hon. Preston Delano, Comptroller of the Currency, at the convention of the District of Columbia bankers at Hot Springs, Va., June 5, 1941. In my judgment the address is a most excellent presentation of a subject currently of great public interest.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few weeks ago the president of a national bank located in a middle western town had occasion to visit Washington and spent an hour in my office discussing the state of the Nation, and particularly the present outlook for the Nation's banks. It was inevitable that there should be some discussion of the much abused subject of inflation. Mr. Cooper (as I shall call him, and that, of course, is not his name) apparently had mulled that subject over in his mind pretty thoroughly. I think that you will be interested in his views, because they represent a somewhat characteristic attitude of some of our friends.

"I'm not worried about inflation," Mr. Cooper said. "On the contrary, I think that our bank, and I suppose most others, stand to gain from a reasonable degree of inflation. Of course, I'm not talking about a runaway printing-press inflation, such as Germany had in 1923.

"Let's look at our bank for a concrete instance. We have deposits of about $2,000,000 and our capital and surplus is about a quarter of a million. Speaking roughly, our resources are $600,000 of cash, $800,000 of loans, and $800,000 of Government and industrial bonds. We own our building and also a couple of dozen pieces of d. p. c. real estate.

"Suppose inflation were to come," he went on. "I haven't any idea about the theoretical economics of it, but I think I can see how it would affect our bank. Inflation helps debtors by making money more plentiful and easy to come by, so they have less trouble in paying their debts; it injures creditors because the money they get back isn't worth as much—won't buy as much—as when it was loaned. Well, banks are in a peculiarly protected position in this respect, because a bank is equally a debtor and a creditor; its liability to its depositors is a certain amount of money, but its assets are also money, either the cash itself or the money obligations of borrowers, the Government, and corporations. So, regardless of any reasonable inflation fluctuations, a bank is safe, because its gains or losses as a debtor to its depositors are always offset by the side of its balance sheet on which it figures as a creditor."

Our visitor warmed a bit to his subject and continued, "As a matter of fact, I think we actually stand to gain from a boom in prices and profits, even if the general apparent prosperity is fictitious as the professors claim. Over the course of the past 15 years our bank, like most others, has managed to accumulate some assets which are not first class. We have certain bonds that are in default and selling for half what we paid for them; we have a number of slow or even doubtful loans, some collateralled by stocks and bonds and others being the regular line of a local manufacturer or merchant who just doesn't quite break even every year. And we have a group of residential and Main Street properties taken in foreclosure, and one real lemon—a nice empty furniture factory, which fell on us late in the depression. Of course," he objected somewhat hurriedly, "all this weak stuff is adequately charged down or entirely charged off, but the bank still holds them, hoping for the best.

"Well, if inflation comes and prices, wages, and profits go up and the public and businessmen have more money in their pockets, we would be in clover on a lot of these items, as I see it. The corporations with the defaulted bonds would get out of the red and clear up arrears; the bonds would climb back to par and we would get rid of ours fast. That applies also to several of our weak local borrowers, who would get back on their feet, just as many marginal producers did in the last war. As the market price of stocks goes up, our underwater collateral loans will be in the clear again. And our 'other real estate' could be disposed of at least for a reasonable amount and perhaps at a profit; I recall how Main Street blossomed in 1919 and how many people bought homes As a matter of fact, I wouldn't be astounded if somebody nibbled at our furniture factory, because people have to do something with their extra money after spending a little more for better food and buying a few dresses and silk shirts, and you remember how furniture prices skyrocketed during the World War inflation.

"In addition—and this is important," he said, "there ought to be plenty of opportunities for putting to work some of our idle cash and possibly even some of the increased deposits that will flow in. Business expansion goes with inflation, and aggressive businessmen will borrow to expand their plants and get a larger share of profits, and also to build up inventories before prices go still higher. Interest on such loans will be almost pure profit because our overhead won't increase much even if we doubled our business. So, a reasonable dose of inflation doesn't worry me. Any damage to our stockholders because of the depreciated purchasing power of dividends will be offset by the increased value of our substandard assets."

Now, the interesting thing is that a great deal of what our fictitious Mr. Cooper has said is true. The major fallacy, of course, lies in the assumption that if nothing is done about it these inflationary forces which are now at work will run a reasonable or minor course, arresting themselves at some theoretical halfway station before actually beginning to undermine our free economy. Like the jinni in the fable, inflation is a force which, once loosed, is not easily persuaded or squeezed back into its bottle. The second fallacy emerges from the realization that it is quite impossible to experience even a reasonable dose of the inflationary spiral which Mr. Cooper is welcoming without ultimately running into the compensatory deflation with which we are altogether too familiar. Mr. Cooper overlooked something which a banker who lived through the post-war period should well remember—that the prosperity of American bankers rises and falls with the prosperity of the country. All of us, regardless of what business we may be in, are integral parts of society, the interdependency of which cannot be disputed. Anything which materially affects one part will inevitably and ultimately affect the whole, even though for some the day of reckoning may be delayed.

Let us take a minute to look at the problem. Inflation is perhaps well defined as "an increase in the general level of prices growing out of an increase in expenditures while goods available for purchase are not correspondingly increased in amount."[1] I think it will be clearer if we take an example.

Let us suppose a particular country has a maximum potential annual productive capacity (that is, the utmost that can be turned out, working full blast) of 30,000,000,000 units—call them francs, dollars, or pounds. After various bottlenecks have been widened—a difficult task—this productive capacity, consisting of men and machinery, is finally being fully employed, and the Nation's annual expenditure for goods absorbs the entire annual production. But now the country has embarked upon a war or a national-defense program costing $10,000,000,000 annually, and the money for this purpose is obtained through loans made conveniently easy by the large excess reserves of the banking system. The production of the required munitions, planes, and tanks necessarily takes that amount of consumers' goods out of the market in which the public buys. The result is that the public is left with thirty billions of purchasing power with which to buy the twenty billions of goods available. The law of supply and demand comes into operation, and the general level of prices rises.

If this tendency were completely uncontrolled, it would proceed in snowball fashion. Prices having increased 50 percent, with wages, etc., lagging only slightly behind, the next year the public would have forty-five billions to buy goods worth twenty billions at pre-war price levels; in a word, we would already have a better than 100-percent inflation.

The preceding example, of course, is greatly oversimplified. It disregards entirely, for instance, the situation created when labor's successful demands for increased wages anticipate and precede any general rise in the price level. Nevertheless, it shows in a crude way what can occur when a nation either willingly or unwillingly devotes a substantial part of its production effort to armaments, without exercising appropriate control (either voluntary or mandatory) over consumption and prices.

This is not mere theory. It was demonstrated throughout the world during and after the first World War. In the United States, for example, the total realized national income increased from $33,000,000,000 in 1915 to $68,000,000,000 in 1920. The average earnings of all American workers approximated $600 in 1915 and exceeded $1,300 in 1920.[2] Per capita income in dollars rose from $320 to $640, but the amount of food, clothing, housing, etc., which that $640 would buy in 1920 was no more—actually perhaps slightly less—than the amount which $320 bought in 1915.[3] In other words, the cost of living more than doubled during the 5-year period, so that the real income of the average American did not advance.[4]

As we all know, the result of such a violent economic dislocation is an arbitrary and quite unjust redistribution of wealth and of income. The widow or thrifty retired worker supported by the return from endowment-type insurance policies or annuities, from pensions, or interest from Government or corporation bonds, is injured through no fault of his or her own. During and after the last war such persons in the United States had taken from them at least one-third of their real income, in England about one-half, seven-eighths in France, eleven-twelfths in Italy, and virtually the whole in Germany, and in the successor States of Austria-Hungary and Russia.[5] On the other hand, a corporation or individual with a large indebtedness incurred before inflation obtains an unexpected and undeserved windfall.

Nor should it be imagined that the whole matter is straightened out by the deflation which always follows an inflationary period.

"If the new money—that is, the increased currency and bank credit—is withdrawn from the channels of trade after the price and income structure has been wholly or partially adjusted to it, the price level can be pushed down again, but the result is not to redress the injustices, but to start another series of inequitable transfers of wealth, and to increase greatly the burden of public and private debt. In addition, the contraction of money tends strongly to discourage productive activity."[6]

Redistribution of the Nation's wealth and income may possibly be desirable, but no one contends that it should be accomplished through such hit-and-miss, haphazard lotteries. An important concomitant of such effects of inflation is a justified dissatisfaction with the economic status quo. This dissatisfaction not only discourages the saving process essential to successful capitalism, but in extreme cases may even engender strains and maladjustments leading to social upheaval.

It was this deflationary tendency following inflation which, more than anything else, accounted for the unprecedented number of fatalities among American banks in the years 1920 to 1933. Speaking directly on this subject in August 1931, J. M. Keynes foresaw the possibility of critical breakages among banks of the United States, warning that "a decline in money values so severe as that which we are now experiencing threatens the solidity of the whole financial structure."[7] There is little reason to suppose that an inflation at this time would differ from all the previous inflations of our history and fail to be followed by a crippling deflationary period.

So I think it is becoming increasingly obvious that something must be done about this jinni which already threatens to get one arm and his head outside the bottle. No government today dares take the risk that inflation will not get out of hand. It must move to control the tremendously destructive forces which are inherent in all such movements just as soon as they appear, and to bring these forces under restraint before they become actively dangerous. A government which temporizes with this menace is culpable indeed. Somehow, either by free concerted effort or by legal compulsion, the restraints must be imposed.

It is right here—the extent to which Government is compelled to impose restraints—price ceilings, priorities, rationings, and all the regimentation that such things imply, that the danger to a free economy lies, and the real threat to Mr. Cooper's bank becomes apparent. What we should all be interested in is what can be done to make these governmental restraints as few and as light as possible. In a great crisis, how much can the people do in the way of self-discipline, how much will we do voluntarily to control ourselves, thus relieving the Government from the necessity of controls and at the same time preserving our traditional freedom and liberties? Man's progress is measured by the restraints he imposes upon himself and by far the most important and significant of these restraints are not those written into statutes but those which flow naturally from inner conviction and the development of character. Certainly this is the democratic and the better way.

And if we want to do this thing in the voluntary and democratic way, what are the steps to be taken? It seems to me there are several important things that we as bankers can do in the field of our competence. We have seen that inflation comes when people have more money and want to spend it, and the supply of the things they want hasn't increased, or at least hasn't increased as fast as their supply of dollars. Obviously, the problem is to hold down the volume of purchasing power clamoring for consumers' goods, so that it will keep step, by and large, with the available supply of such goods.

There are in the United States today some 15,000 banks. They are the nerve centers of our economy. The officers and employees of these banks share the responsibility of informing our citizens of the great changes imposed by the national emergency. In the matter of direct action, there is the limitation on credit to be extended either for the production or purchase of consumptive goods with particular reference to installment contracts. (As a matter of interest, consumer credit is at an all-time high.) A strong control over loans for speculative purposes is, of course, obvious, but it is in the realm of the fiscal education of the public that the banks of the country can really make their contribution toward the preservation of a decent world in which to live. The public must understand the importance of voluntarily withholding a substantial segment of its money income from ordinary purchases, diverting all it can possibly spare to savings or better toward the purchase of bonds which the Government is offering to finance its defense program. The people must understand the somewhat complex mechanism of inflation and its control—and that neither voluntary saving and self-restraint nor even the payment of higher taxes actually deprives them of any real benefits, but merely assists in checking a potential movement which could not fail to deeply injure the entire Nation. This is the task of each and every banker.

Clear and correct thinking on these fundamental economic problems is as essential in a democracy as is rapid production of the materials of warfare. It has been wisely said that—

"* * * the ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed, the world is ruled by little else. Practical men,

---

[1] Rogers and Chandler, Inflation and Deflation, in 8 Encyc. Social Sciences (1932), pp. 29–30.

[2] Paul H. Douglas, Real Wages in the United States, 1890–1926 (1930), pp. 391–393.

[3] R. F. Martin, National Income in the United States, 1799–1938 (National Industrial Conference Board, 1939), pp. 6–7.

[4] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1930, p. 327.

[5] J. M. Keynes, Essays in Persuasion (1932), p. 90.

[6] Charles O. Hardy, Wartime Control of Prices (1940), pp. 37–38.

[7] J. M. Keynes, Essays in Persuasion (1932), p. 176.

who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back. * * * Soon or late, it is ideas, not vested interests, which are dangerous for good or evil."

It is in the field of ideas that the Government now looks to you as natural and trustworthy leaders. "Give light and the people will find their way."

Rehabilitation in the Republican Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. HUGH A. BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement by me at the first annual meeting of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, at McCook, Nebr., on June 10, 1941, on the subject Rehabilitation in the Republican Valley.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I had been looking forward eagerly to attending your meeting, and was planning to accompany Mr. John Page and others up and down the valley to acquaint them with recent flood damage and with irrigation possibilities. So it is with extreme regret that I am compelled to dictate this greeting to you, just before leaving the State to fly back to Washington.

Every man has a wide variety of interests, and a set of convictions concerning the swift pace of national and international events now taking place. As one of your representatives in Washington, I, too, have a number of matters which are receiving my earnest attention because of the bearing they have upon the stability of agriculture and business in Nebraska. I believe that the program of your association, seeking as it does flood control, irrigation, and soil and water conservation, meets almost completely the views of the administration. It would, therefore, appear that it is one Nebraska program which promises definite accomplishment—if diligently pursued. For this reason, I have frequently said, and say again, that in my mind it now is one of the most important, if not the most important, programs of our State.

Officers of the association told me the other day that nearly all Federal agencies now operating in your valley or in position to aid you are to be represented at this meeting. I think they have complimented your organization by their presence and have definitely indicated their interest in what you are doing. I hope that a large number of your landowners, county commissioners, and others will be present as an indication of the definite interest which our own people have in the objectives of your association.

Many of you may not know that I am an engineer, having practiced that profession in my early life. I have employed my limited knowledge in that field on my own farm property in the Republican Valley and have personally employed many of the principles and methods being advocated generally for landowners in the Republican watershed. As a means of guarding against flood control I have placed riprap along the banks of the river as it flows through my farm. I am pumping from wells to provide supplemental irrigation when inadequate rainfall is experienced. I have worked hard and spent my own money to accomplish soil conservation and to check soil erosion. I have sought to restore grass cover and to push forestation in my section, since these two operations are definitely linked with successful control of soil erosion. I regard my own time and expenditures in these fields as sound investments. Therefore, when I pronounce the objectives of your association as sound it is after my own personal experience.

I can remember only too well the great productivity of our watershed up until about 1930. The valleys annually produced abundant feed crops and sustained a large population of livestock which lent a high degree of stability to agriculture in the area. The table land was fertile, producing fine grain crops, and affording splendid pasture. Today, because of overgrazing, drought, and erosion, the picture of much of this land has changed. From 65,000 to 90,000 acres of flood plain in the valley are matted with undergrowth, timber, and poisonous weeds. At least a third of our inheritance in the Republican valley has been lost through the combined forces of flood, drought, and erosion. The Soil Conservation Service, I am informed, estimates that a $175,000,000 decline in assessed valuation of farm real estate occurred between 1930 and 1935 alone. This was about one-third of the valuation in 1930. Further extensive damages have been sustained annually since 1935.

Many parts of our drainage basin are not producing the annual volume of farm products they did as long ago as 1891, 50 years ago. Other sections today possess only 15 or 20 percent of the livestock they did as recently as 1930. You know of the loss of 65,000 in human population since 1930. These are hard, cold methods of measuring the economic distress which has come to a formerly rich and fertile section of the Great Plains. It is true that the Federal Government has generously sought to cushion the hardships by many forms of direct and indirect assistance. But when they have reached the point where they have expended, on an average, upward of $3,000 in loans and grants and various forms of relief for every farm we possess, and we still see more people migrating away, we must conclude that these practices do not afford an adequate remedy.

No matter what some Members of Congress think about Federal expenditures, I say solemnly to you that it is not right to spend billions of dollars of Federal tax money or borrowed money as a temporary remedy method to keep people contented or to enable them to merely live from one day to the next. If, however, there is a way to provide loans and grants which will truly rehabilitate an entire watershed, and make the residents self-sufficient thereafter, then I believe that to be a proper Government function. Had the Federal Government moved in this manner, beginning a decade or so ago, the money expended in this basin would, in all probability, have been sufficient to bring under permanent and complete control the entire soil and water resources of this watershed. This is no time to merely criticize what has gone before. But we would be lax indeed if we did not seek to bring about true rehabilitation with all further Federal, State, and county tax dollars which are to be expended from here on in this valley.

A few years back a cloud in the sky or a drop of rain would have brought hope and optimism to our area. Now it is a mingled hope and fear which we experience—frightened because of flood threats. Twice within the past 3 weeks damaging floods have swept down the valley and its tributaries. Valuable water resource was entirely wasted, instead of being conserved and beneficially employed later, when it would double a crop yield on adjoining farm lands. It is wrong to let this happen year after year.

The W. P. A., for instance, had a regulation drafted by Congress 2 years ago which permitted them to come in and help an area following a damaging flood. As many as six times within a year, I am informed, they were privileged, under this regulation, to enter one of our valleys to repair damages sustained in a flood. But the same regulation prevented them from doing those things which would permanently correct the situation. An amendment is now being offered to the W. P. A. regulations in the current bill before the Appropriations Committee of the House which would correct that unreasonable situation. Let me give you another illustration. As many as four times in a single year the bridge across the Republican at Oxford has been swept away, and each time it has been repaired and rebuilt much as it was before. That's like getting a part of a pair of half soles every week. This is not economy, nor is it protection to our people and our valleys.

If your cities, towns, and counties in southwestern Nebraska and in those parts of Kansas and Colorado which lie in the Republican watershed can continue your organization and maintain the same type of dignified, earnest promotional activities which you have evidenced since last October, I am sure that Senator NORRIS, Representative CURTIS, and myself will continue to give all possible aid and encouragement at Washington. There is little question in my mind that the very soundness of your program will win for you complete cooperation and understanding from all State and Federal agencies which are permitted, under law, to perform the type of services required in the permanent and complete rehabilitation of our entire watershed. Stick to it, fellows, and you'll win.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE KNICKERBOCKER NEWS

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Knickerbocker News, of Albany, N. Y., of date Friday, May 23, 1941, entitled "Jim Farley Still Idol of Public," with which I agree.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., of May 23, 1941]

JIM FARLEY STILL IDOL OF PUBLIC

(By Don Whitehead)

NEW YORK.—There is no privacy for Private Citizen James A. Farley.

Although he has been out of the national limelight for 8 months, the big fellow has about as much chance for obscurity as a movie idol on Broadway.

He's reveling in his role as a big businessman and enjoying his new freedom from the pressure of 8 terrific years as Democratic national chairman and Postmaster General.

He has no regrets, he says, over climbing outside the ropes of the political arena, while his family is delighted to have him once again as a more or less stable member of the household instead of a once-in-awhile visitor between hops about the country at the rate of 50,000 miles a year.

But, nevertheless, Jim Farley still belongs to the people, and his office would look like a convention hall today if all those trying to see him were permitted past a cute blonde reception girl and his efficient secretary.

They shield him from a horde of callers—job hunters, fellows who met "Good Old Jim" at a political rally back in Podunk Center, publicity seekers, panhandlers, and scores of others who have no legitimate reason for a call.

Even then he receives dozens of callers—businessmen, politicians, prize fighters, baseball players, and just plain folks. He carries on a tremendous personal correspondence with his political friends in every State in the Union who continue to keep him advised on the national situation.

He couldn't entirely shake loose from his political bonds if he wanted to, because of the close personal ties he formed throughout the years as ringmaster of the Democratic political circus.

But those years in Washington—beating the Roosevelt drum, keeping a finger on the Nation's voting pulse, ironing out intraparty strife, and flying across the continent just to make a speech at a post-office dedication—gave him a financial beating.

Now he's trying to recoup his losses.

Those with an appointment to see Farley these days are told by the blond receptionist to have a seat, please, and Mr. Farley will see you in a few minutes.

Then a door opens and there is private citizen Farley with his hand outstretched and a broad smile on his face as though an old friend had dropped in for a chat, when perhaps he never saw the visitor before.

He looks as fit as a fighter in training, and if the years in Washington maelstrom left any mark on his honest Irish face, there isn't a trace of it.

Only his surroundings seem strange. He moves a great deal in the plush-carpet quiet of big business as president of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation and president of the Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Boston.

Soft-voiced aides move in and out of his office. Muffled typewriters barely can be heard, and buzzers buzz discreetly in the distance.

That's the picture of genial Jim Farley that his multitude of friends in every congressional district in the Nation hasn't seen. They know Jim Farley as the center of milling, sweating, loud-voiced meetings of politicians in hotel rooms blue with cigar smoke, where political campaigns were mapped and elections won.

It probably is inconceivable to them that he has no political ambitions and is happy in his new businessman role, but that's what he says.

"I have no plans to return to politics," Farley said in an interview. "I have no political ambitions. I'm more concerned now with the well-being of our country and the hope that we come through without getting involved in this war.

"And, too, I can't afford political ambitions."

There's talk, of course, that Farley be drafted to run as mayor of the city of New York or as Governor of the State. Many believe he could be elected to either position if he took off his coat and went to work for one of them.

Farley isn't interested in either the power or the glory, his friends say, declaring his 8 years in Washington left him with debts of more than $50,000 and the annual salaries of mayor and Governor ($25,000) would not permit him to make up these losses because of outside expense involved in holding such a position.

There's a possibility Farley could be lured back into the national political ring by the assurance of nomination as President or Vice President.

But he declines to discuss these speculations, just as he avoids any talk of his rift with President Roosevelt over the third-term nomination at Chicago last year. His political activity is confined to his work as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee.

Despite this "retirement," Farley can't step outside his office that he isn't stopped by a mail carrier or an old friend for a chat. There's a constant demand for his services in civic work—which he gives generously. At present he's chairman of the greater New York fund campaign to raise money for charity.

"Actually, I don't think the return to private life has meant much change for me," he laughs, "except I get to be with my family more often. I've been with them more during the last 8 months than I was during the entire 8 years in Washington."

There's the same round of conferences, meetings, rallies, speeches—except they aren't political.

It's no secret that Farley's greatest ambition at present is to get control of the New York Yankee baseball chain. He heads a syndicate which still is dickering for the American League property with executors of the estate of Col. Jacob Ruppert.

Farley always has been a Yankee fan and a baseball addict ever since he played first base as a youth on the village team at Grassy Point, where he was born May 30, 1880, the son of a brick manufacturer.

Sports have been his hobby and from 1925 to 1933 he was New York boxing commissioner. He still can be found at a ringside or at the Yankee ball park whenever he can find the time.

His greatest baseball hero was Babe Ruth, and there's a possibility if he can get control of the Yankees, he will try to bring the Bambino back to the game. The team of Farley and Ruth would be a potent combination in the national pastime.

Whether it's business, politics, civic work, sports or the general run-of-mine office calls, Farley still packs more activity into one day than almost any other individual on Manhattan Island.

"The days would have to be 60 hours long for the boss to meet all the demands on his time," a secretary remarked.

That's what "political retirement" means to Private Citizen Farley.

Judge Ben B. Lindsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ARTICLE FROM ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Rocky Mountain News of Sunday, June 8, 1941, entitled "The Kids' Judge," by Lee T. Casey, relating to Judge Ben B. Lindsey.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rocky Mountain News of June 8, 1941]

THE KIDS' JUDGE

(By Lee T. Casey)

It was my privilege during a recent vacation to spend part of a day with Colorado's most famous ex-resident—Judge Ben B. Lindsey, of the Los Angeles Superior Court. I take pleasure in reporting that Judge and Mrs. Lindsey are doing very well.

Right at the start I might as well admit partiality. Judge Lindsey and I, I am most proud to say, have been friends for many years. I first met him back in 1908 or 1909, when I was a cub reporter for the Kansas City Star and he had just been found, according to a poll conducted by the London Times, one of the three most notable Americans—the others being Theodore Roosevelt and Thomas A. Edison. He was kindly and helpful at that first meeting. He was that on many other occasions after I came to Denver. I underwent matrimony at his hands. As a newspaperman, I had a close-up on some of his countless fights. With the rest of Denver, I saw him in victory and, eventually, in bitter and humiliating defeat.

His disbarment was a blow that would have crushed almost any other man. The fact the State supreme court later repudiated the action and reinstated him on its own motion—in other words, denounced the entire affair as a frame-up—did not soften the shock at the time. After having been a great world figure, after having done more for the youth of the land than any other man, after having revolutionized the system of jurisprudence in matters affecting the welfare of children, Judge Lindsey was thrown out of his job (by a frame-up) and finally out of his profession. Personally he was broke; officially he was repudiated and discredited. He was more than 50 years old. Few men indeed could have survived.

AMIDST BATTLE

But the rock Denver rejected has become the cornerstone of the Los Angeles Temple of Justice. Less metaphorically, Judge Lindsey is more famous than ever, more powerful than ever, more enthusiastic than ever, more secure than ever.

I found him in the middle of a fight, which makes the picture of Lindsey happiness complete.

Last fall he was reelected for a 6-year term. In the primary he got a clear majority over no less than 18 opponents. In the general election he received the largest vote ever given to a candidate for office in Los Angeles, with a plurality of a half million over his nearest competitor. The job pays $10,000 a year. In 5 more years, if he chooses, he can retire at full salary for life.

But, even in Los Angeles, it's something of the same old story. The politicians don't like him any more than they liked him in Denver. Neither do the stodgier members of the bar. His department is the court of conciliation. Mainly, his aim is to keep families together and to prevent divorce for the sake of the children concerned.

TO THE PEOPLE

In these preliminary proceedings the narrow rules of judicial procedure are not always followed, partly because the aim is not separation but conciliation, partly because Judge Lindsey has retained his contempt for those legal forms that fatten fees and block justice. So a committee of the bench and bar recently "investigated" his court. The members found a subordinate, previously dismissed, had made some errors

while Judge Lindsey was absent on a mission for the Governor, and that the judge himself had on occasion dispensed with certain formalities to get straight to the heart of a matter. With this report as a pretext, a legislative committee is considering a bill to abolish the court of conciliation

My guess is that the legislators will not take that risk. If they do, the fighting judge will take the case straight to the people. He did just that with 12 measures for children that now are in effect in California and should be in effect in Colorado some day, and he won. At 65, he is in fighting trim and a dangerous opponent.

Granted, that Judge Lindsey is less than perfect. Granted, that reticence is not among the Lindsey virtues, if indeed it is a virtue. Granted, that Judge Lindsey has a tendency to view antagonists as scoundrels—a view which, in his particular case, has by no means been wholly wrong. Nonetheless, I think that Colorado should rejoice in this great Coloradan who has kept right on fighting a winning battle for the cause he holds most dear—the cause of children and of the oppressed among mankind.

That he has won financial security for his wife and child is incidental. For many years he has lived under the fierce bright light of publicity. And I have never known a man who demanded less for himself or more for other men.

The War Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

LETTER FROM CLARENCE L. IRELAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, today I received a most timely letter from a distinguished citizen, a former attorney general and a World War veteran of my State, with reference to the question of the hour—the most serious question, by the way, ever to face the American people. This letter deals in a realistic, logical, and common-sense manner with the advisability of participating in the wars which are raging throughout the world. This letter expresses my own attitude toward the issue so completely that I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues and the country; and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRELAND & IRELAND,
Denver, Colo., June 9, 1941.

Hon. ED C. JOHNSON,
Senator from Colorado,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: Heretofore I have not burdened you or any of our Representatives in Congress with any letters on this war situation. I have waited until the matter has become clear in my own mind as to what seemed the position this country should take, and in making up my mind I have read articles on both sides of the question, as well as listened to the speeches coming from both camps.

I think, without question, the thing that is now most clear to all of us is the fact that the United States is not prepared for war and cannot get prepared for offensive war for several years to come. Without question, the German Government, under the direction of Hitler, has been able to prepare and build a war machine far beyond anything even believed possible by our people. Lindbergh, so far as I can see, did not overstate the strength of Germany's position, and all that he prophesied and more has come true. No European country was prepared, and we are not prepared now.

Obviously, it would be to the advantage of the United States to spend considerable of her wealth and manpower in bringing Hitler and the German Government to its knees, if that were at all possible. It is now apparent to one, even in my position, that that is not possible. When Harry Hopkins writes an article, as he did in the American, stating that we can overcome Germany with our unlimited supplies of natural resources, the wish is father to the thought. Since Hitler has now taken over 14 countries, and within a short time will undoubtedly take others; he has without question placed Germany in possession of natural resources sufficient in quantity, with few exceptions, to keep ahead of the United States and Britain. I cannot, therefore, agree with Harry Hopkins.

It is now apparent also that if we do enter the war, it will be in the Pacific and not in the Atlantic, and that the battle will start in the East Indies and at Singapore. This we cannot afford. The possibilities of losing are too great and the consequences too enormous.

Senator Pepper talked here June 5 at East Denver High School, and the sentiment there expressed was definitely against our entering this war in any manner I have contacted from time to time a number of our young men in college, and they are definitely against entering this war. These boys are not afraid of war, but they do see the hopelessness of the situation.

It seems to me, therefore, that the only position we can rightfully take is to encourage England to make the most favorable peace possible and keep ourselves in a position to aid England in bringing about as favorable a settlement as can be secured. This is no time to be bragging about our strength, because we are simply not prepared for the kind of war that will be ahead of us. We can prepare only by putting this Nation under a dictator—we haven't begun to get prepared. We can prepare under our present form of democratic Government, however, for the defense of this country—and that we should do with all possible speed; but to prepare for offensive war—that is a horse of another color. We must not only match Germany, but we must surpass her and be twice or three times as strong as she is before we send our boys to fight on foreign fields. Any objective less than the invasion of Germany would be futile, if we entered the war at all.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the President and his aides are in possession of much more information than are even Members of Congress, and undoubtedly you, as a Member of Congress have much more information than the people have. Therefore, it was the duty of your constituents to trust you and have confidence in you to guide the people properly for their best interests; but now we have developed in this country two classes of people—those who want to aid England at any cost and who believe the United States can, by entering the war at this time, eventually win the war; and the other class who seem to be looking the cold facts in the face and who realize that there are some things that even the United States cannot accomplish; and I am now definitely in the latter class. We must remember that if the war is brought to an end and Hitler has no longer an excuse to keep the armies in the fields, even the German people and the German soldiers will return somewhat to normalcy. They are still human and undoubtedly still have some ideas of fairness, decency, and there is a possibility that a leadership will develop within the German nation to bring out those elements. It seems to me at any rate we can better afford to gamble that that attitude will prevail, than to take the attitude at this time we cannot trust any German leadership at any time, and that we must fight a war to the end. To pursue the latter course seems to me will lead only to destruction of this Nation and to absolute dictatorship here. To pursue the former course, democracy and freedom has an opportunity to return, even to the people of Germany and Europe; and we have a better opportunity to preserve democracy here. We cannot afford to play the ostrich and stick our head in the sand and not look forward to what is the inevitable. To employ in this country the means necessary to win, and that is putting this country under a dictatorship, because without it we cannot get the efficiency necessary to conquer Germany, would in itself destroy democracy in this country.

I hope, therefore, that as representatives of our fair State of Colorado, you will all continue to do everything within your power to keep this country out of war, build a strong Army for the defense of our own shores, and keep this Nation in a position to assert its influence toward bringing about a peace in Europe that will be fair on both sides.

Yours very truly,
CLARENCE L. IRELAND.

Priority of Production for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) DAILY NEWS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a thoughtful editorial appeared in the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News on June 4, which raises a question so basic to all national policies that I believe it should be called to the attention of the Congress. I, therefore, ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield Daily News of June 4, 1941]

PRIORITY FOR DEFENSE OR FOR NEW SOCIAL ORDER

Now that William S. Knudsen and Sidney Hillman, as directors of the defense program, have formally declared that the production battle is just starting and have appealed for cooperation to put it through, we should like to have it made entirely plain that the Fed-

eral Government gives it first place. There is so much of unrestrained activity in undermining the program that there is occasion for questioning about it. The specter of the so-called new social order comes into the foreground whenever anyone in high authority urges cooperation and the speeding up of defense.

First and foremost is the plan for adjusting strikes by having the Government take over the plants when trouble breaks out, following the disastrous experiences in Russia in control and operation of industry by the Soviets. As a means for settling labor troubles, the taking over of industrial plants will in all probability result in retaining the strikes and all their attendant troubles only with the difference that labor will then be striking against Government instead of against corporations. A better way would seem to be to discourage strikes rather than promote them.

Concerning the defense program, it is noted that Uncle Sam has taken upon himself the new role of a public junkman, going about everywhere gathering in pots and pans of aluminum to eke out the dwindling supply needed for airplane production. This is an element of vital importance which has been quite overlooked in recent years except as activities persisted year after year in persecuting the aluminum industry, notwithstanding the fact that the prime importance of the product was fully known.

Also it is noted that Harry Bridges, radical labor agitator, is still harbored and defended against all moves by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for his deportation covering a period of many, many months. So we rise in this Congress of our democracy for information, not from curiosity but because Americans are entitled to it. We should like to know whether national defense is in first place or whether the new social order is first and defense somewhere down the line in importance.

Reorganization of the Federal Government—Plans I–V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE BY CORNELIUS H. SULLIVAN, JR.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to insert excerpts from an article showing the charges made by Reorganization Plans I–V, prepared by Cornelius H. Sullivan, Jr., of the technical staff of the Edward Thompson Co., of Brooklyn, legal publishers and one of the official compilers of the United States Code. The excerpts are as follows:

REORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—PLANS I–V

(By Cornelius H. Sullavan, Jr.)

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF PLANS

The changes made by the reorganization plans affected every one of the 10 executive departments and many of the bureaus within them, not to mention a host of independent agencies. They range from simple transfers to more complex abolishments and consolidations. What is more, the President expected them to save the taxpayer as much as $21,700,000 annually.

The Reorganization Act of 1939, which authorized the President, within limitations as to time and scope, to submit his proposed reorganizations to the Congress, declared five definite purposes:[1] (1) To reduce expenditures, (2) to increase efficiency, (3) to consolidate agencies according to major purposes, (4) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions and by abolishing such as may not be necessary, and (5) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

In effecting these purposes President Roosevelt promulgated five reorganization plans. The first, which was transmitted to Congress on April 25, 1939, took effect July 1, 1939, and was designed to improve the over-all management of the executive branch. It was followed on May 9, 1939, by Reorganization Plan No. II, effective July 1, 1939, which was intended to effect a better allocation of certain agencies and activities among departments. Plan No. III, submitted to Congress on April 2, 1940, and effective June 30, 1940, was a step to improve intradepartmental management through internal adjustment in certain agencies. The fourth plan, promulgated April 11, 1940, and effective June 30, 1940, provided for a number of interdepartmental reorganizations designed to increase efficiency in the administration of Government services by a more logical grouping of certain functions and by a further reduction in the number of independent agencies reporting directly to the Chief Executive. The last of the plans, Reorganization Plan No. V, was submitted to Congress on May 22, 1940, to afford more effective control over aliens. It transferred the Immigration and Naturalization Service from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice, effective June 14, 1940.

EXPLANATION OF TABLES

The two tables set out below present a consolidated compilation of all basic changes effected by Reorganization Plans Nos. I–V.

Table I is an alphabetical listing of agencies and functions as they existed prior to the reorganization plans, the second column describing the nature of the change, and the third showing the post-reorganization repository of the old agency or function.

Table II shows the post-reorganization structure of executive departments and independent agencies insofar as they were affected by the Reorganization Plans. The second column gives the pre-reorganization status of the affected agency or function, and indicates the nature of the change which took place.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

Parentheses are employed in the tables to show status. Brackets indicate functions.

Abbreviations have been freely used in the tables for the purpose of conserving space. A complete list of these appears below.

A., Department of Agriculture.
A. A. A., Agricultural Adjustment Administration.
Abol., abolished.
Admin., administration.
Admr., administrator.
Assoc., associate.
Asst., assistant.
Bd., board.
Bldgs., buildings.
Bur., bureau.
C., Department of Commerce.
C. A. A., Civil Aeronautics Authority.
C. A. B., Civil Aeronautics Board.
Co., company.
Commn., commission.
Comr., commissioner.
Consol., consolidated.
Corp., corporation.
D. C., District of Columbia.
Dir., director.
Div., division.
Exec. Off. Pres., Executive Office of the President.
F., Federal.
F. H. L. B. B., Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
Fisc., fiscal.
F. L. A., Federal Loan Agency.
F. S. A., Federal Security Agency.
Funct., functions.
F. W. A., Federal Works Agency.
Hosp., hospital.
I., Department of the Interior.
Ind., independent.
Isl., island.
J., Department of Justice.
L., Department of Labor.
Mt., mount.
N., Department of the Navy.
Natl., national.
P. O., Post Office Department.
Pub., public.
S., Department of State.
Secy, secretary
Serv., service.
St., saint.
T., Department of the Treasury.
U. S., United States.
W., Department of War.

[1] 5 U. S. C., sec. 133.

TABLE I.—*Before reorganization*

Agency or function	Nature of change	Disposition after reorganization
Admr. of Civil Aeronautics (Ind.).	Transf.	C. A. A. (C.).
Air Safety Bd. (Ind.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	C. A. B. (C. A. A., C.).
American Printing House for the Blind—Secy. of T.'s funct. re admin. of appropriations, except perpetual trust fund.	Transf.	F. S. A.
Asst. Secys. of T.—certain financial funct.	Transf.	Fisc. Serv. (T.).
Asst. Secy. of T.—vacant office.	Abol. & funct. transf.	Fisc. Asst. Secy. (T.).
Assoc. Chief of the Bur. of Biological Survey (I.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Fish and Wildlife Serv. (I.).
Attorney General—compromise approval funct. under F. Alcohol Admin. Act.	Transf.	Secy. of T.
Bd. of Trustees of the Natl. Training School for boys (Ind.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	J.
Bd. of Trustees of the Postal Savings System—postal savings disbursement funct. otherwise transferable to T.	Transf.	Bd. of Trustees, Postal Savings System (P. O.).
Branch of Bldgs. Management of the Natl. Park Serv. (I.).	Transf. & consol.	Pub. Bldgs. Admin. (F. W. A.).
Bur. of Biological Survey (A.).	Transf. & consol.	Fish and Wildlife Serv. (I.).
Bur. of the Budget (T.).	Transf.	Exec. Off. Pres.
Bur. of Fisheries (C.).	Transf. & consol.	Fish and Wildlife Serv. (I.).
Bur. of Insular Affairs (W.).	Transf. & consol.	Div. of Territories and Isl. Possessions (I.).
Bur. of Lighthouses (C.).	Transf. & consol.	Coast Guard (T.).
Bur. of Pub. Roads (A.).	Transf. & renamed.	Pub. Roads Admin. (F. W. A.).
Central Statistical Bd. (Ind.).	Transf.	Bur. of the Budget (Exec. Off. Pres.).
Central Statistical Committee (Ind.)	Abol. & funct. transf.	Dir. of the Bur. of the Budget (Exec. Off. Pres.).
Chief of the Bur. of Biological Survey (I.)	Abol. & funct. transf.	Fish and Wildlife Serv. (I.).
Chief of the Bur. of Insular Affairs and subordinate offices therein (W.)	Abol. & funct. transf.	Dir. of the Div. of Territories and Isl. Possessions (I.).

TABLE I.—*Before reorganization*—Continued

Agency or function	Nature of change	Disposition after reorganization
Chief of the Bur. of Pub. Roads (A.)	Transf. & renamed.	Comr. of Pub. Roads (F. W. A.).
Chief of the Food and Drug Admin. (A.)	Transf. & renamed.	Comr. of Food and Drugs (F. S. A.).
China Trade Act Registrar—duties (C.)	Transf.	Foreign Serv. (S.).
C. A. A. (Ind.)	Transf. & renamed.	C. A. B. (C. A. A., C.).
C. A. A. (Ind.)—certain funct.	Transf.	Admr. of Civil Aeronautics.
Civilian Conservation Corps (Ind.).	Transf.	F. S. A.
Codification Bd. (Ind.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Div. of the F. Register (Natl. Archives).
Columbia Institution for the Deaf—administrative funct. of I.	Transf.	F. S. A.
Comr. of Accounts and Deposits (T.).	Transf. & renamed.	Comr. of Accounts (Bur. of Accounts in Fisc. Serv., T.).
Comr. of Fisheries (I.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Fish and Wildlife Serv. (I.).
Comrs. of immigration (L.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	District dirs. of immigration and naturalization (Comr. of Immigration and Naturalization, L.).
Comr. of the Pub. Debt (T.).	Transf.	Bur. of the Pub. Debt (Fisc. Serv., T.).
Commodity Credit Corp. (Ind.).	Transf.	A.
Consumers' Counsel of the Natl. Bituminous Coal Commn. (I.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Solicitor of I.
Department of Agriculture—officer of.	Made member of.	Bd. of Foreign Serv. Personnel for the Foreign Serv. (S).
Department of Commerce—officer of.	Made member of.	Bd. of Foreign Serv. Personnel for the Foreign Serv. (S.).
Department of the Treasury—accounting funct. of personnel.	Transf.	Comr. of Accounts (Fisc. Serv., T.).
Deputy Comr. of Fisheries (I.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Fish and Wildlife Serv. (I.).
Dir. General of Railroads (Ind.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Secy. of T.
Disaster Loan Corp. (Ind.)	Transf.	F. L. A.
District comrs. of immigration and naturalization (L.)	Abol. & funct. transf.	District dirs. of immigration and naturalization (Comr. of Immigration and Naturalization, L.).
Div. of Bookkeeping and Warrants (T.)	Transf.	Bur. of Accounts (Fisc. Serv., T.).
Div. of Deposits (T.).	Transf.	Fisc. Serv. (T.).
Div. of Disbursement (T.).	Transf.	Fisc. Serv. (T.).
Div. of Loans and Currency (T.).	Transf.	Bur. of the Pub. Debt (Fisc. Serv., T.).
Div. of Marketing and Marketing Agreements of the A. A. A. (A.).	Consol.	Surplus Marketing Admin. (A.).
Div. of Paper Custody (T.).	Transf.	Bur. of the Pub. Debt (Fisc. Serv., T.).
Div. of Pub. Debt Accounts and Audit (T.).	Transf.	Bur. of the Pub. Debt (Fisc. Serv., T.).
Div. of Savings Bonds (T.).	Transf.	Bur. of the Pub. Debt (Fisc. Serv., T.).
Div. of Territories and Isl. Possessions—Dominican Customs Receivership funct. (I.).	Transf.	S.
Electric Home and Farm Authority (Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
Export-Import Bank of Washington (Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
Farm Credit Admin. (Ind.).	Transf.	A.
F. Alcohol Admin. (T.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Bur. of Internal Revenue (T.).
F. Emergency Admin. of Pub. Works (Ind.).	Transf. & renamed.	Pub. Works Admin. (F. W. A.).
F. Employment Stabilization Office (C.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Natl. Resources Planning Bd. (Exec. Off. Pres.).
F. Farm Mortgage Corp. (Ind.).	Transf.	A.
F. Home Loan Bank Bd. (Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
F. Housing Admin. (Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
F. Natl. Mortgage Association (Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
F. Prison Industries, Inc. (Ind.).	Transf.	J.
F. Savings and Loan Insurance Corp. (F. H. L. B. B., Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
F. Surplus Commodities Corp. (A.).	Consol.	Surplus Marketing Admin. (A.).
Food and Drug Admin.—except funct. re Insecticide Act of 1910 and Naval Stores Act (A.).	Transf.	F. S. A.
Foreign Agricultural Serv. of the U. S. (A.).	Transf. & consol.	Foreign Serv. of the U. S. (S.).
Foreign Commerce Serv. of the U. S. (C.).	Transf. & consol.	Foreign Serv. of the U. S. (S.).
Foreign Serv. Bldgs. Commn. (Ind.).	Transf.	S.
Freedmen's Hosp. (I.).	Transf.	F. S. A.
Home Owners' Loan Corp. (F. H. L. B. B., Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
Howard University—Administrative funct. of I.	Transf.	F. S. A.
Immigration and Naturalization Serv. (L.).	Transf.	J.
Inland Waterways Corp. (W.).	Transf.	C.
Interbuilding messenger serv. in D. C. (various agencies).	Transf. & consol.	P. O.
Mail transportation between Government agencies and post office in D. C. (various agencies).	Transf. & consol.	P. O.
Mt. Rushmore Natl. Memorial Commn. (Ind.).	Transf.	Natl. Park Serv. (I).
Natl. Bituminous Coal Commn. (I).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Secy. of I.
Natl. Emergency Council—except Radio Div. and U. S. Film Serv. (Ind.).	Abol. & transf.	Exec. Off. Pres.
Natl. Park Serv.—certain D. C. pub. bldgs. funct. (I.).	Transf. & consol.	Pub. Bldgs. Admin. (F.W.A.).
Natl. Resources Committee (Ind.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	Natl. Resources Planning Bd. (Exec. Off. Pres.).
Natl. Training School for Boys (Ind.).	Transf.	J.
Natl. Youth Admin. (Works Progress Admin.).	Transf.	F. S. A.
Office of Education (I.).	Transf.	F. S. A.
Postmaster General—postal disbursement funct. otherwise transferable to T.	Transf.	P. O.
P. O.—postal disbursement funct. otherwise transferable to T.	Transf.	P. O.
Pub. Bldgs. Branch of the Procurement Div. (T.).	Transf. & consol.	Pub. Bldgs. Admin. (F. W. A.).
Pub. Health Serv. (T.).	Transf.	F. S. A.
Radio Div. of the Natl. Emergency Council (Ind.).	Transf.	Office of Education (F. S. A.).
Reconstruction Finance Corp. (Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
R. F. C. Mortgage Co. (Ind.).	Transf.	F. L. A.
Register of the Treasury (T.).	Transf.	Bur. of the Pub. Debt (Fisc. Serv., T.).
Recorder of the General Land Office (I.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	General Land Office (I.).
Rural Electrification Admin. (Ind.).	Transf.	A.
St. Elizabeths Hosp. (I.).	Transf.	F. S. A.
Secy. of A.	Made member of.	Migratory Bird Conservation Comm. (Ind.).
Secy. of A.—wildlife, game, and migratory bird conservation funct.	Transf.	Secy. of I.
Secy. of C.—fur seal and animal protection funct.	Transf.	Secy. of I.
Secy. of C.—Pribiloffs Isls. and natives, funct. re.	Transf.	Secy. of I.
Secy. of C.—Whaling Treaty Act funct.	Transf.	Secy. of I.
Secy. of I.	Made chairman of.	Migratory Bird Conservation Commn. (Ind.).
Secy. of I.—funct. re pub. construction wage payment enforcement.	Transf.	Secy. of L.
Secy. of T.—funct. re pub. construction wage payment enforcement.	Transf.	Secy. of L.
Section of Surety Bonds (T.).	Transf.	Fisc. Serv. (T.).
Social Security Bd. (Ind.).	Transf.	F. S. A.
Soil Conservation Serv. — soil and moisture conservation funct. re lands of I. (A.).	Transf.	L
State marine or nautical schools — Secy. of N.'s funct. (N.).	Transf.	U. S. Maritime Comm.
Treasurer of the U. S. (T.).	Transf.	Fisc. Serv. (T.).
Under Secy. of T.—certain financial funct.	Transf.	Fisc. Serv. (T.).
U. S. Employment Serv. (L.).	Transf. & consolidated.	Social Security Bd. (F. S. A.).
U. S. Film Serv. of the Natl. Emergency Council (Ind.).	Transf.	Office of Education (F. S. A.).
U. S. Housing Authority (I.).	Transf.	F. W. A.
U. S. Marshals—disbursement funct. otherwise transferable to T. (J.).	Transf.	U. S. Marshals (J.).
War Finance Corp. (Ind.).	Abol. & funct. transf.	T.
Weather Bur. (A.).	Transf.	C.
Works Progress Admin., except Natl. Youth Admin. (Ind.).	Transf. & renamed.	Work Projects Admin. (F. W. A.).

TABLE II.—*After reorganization*

Agency or function	Former status and change
Agriculture Department	Preestablished.
Commodity Credit Corp.	(Ind.) Transf.
Farm Credit Admin.	(Ind.) Transf.
F. Farm Mortgage Corp.	(Ind.) Transf.
Rural Electrification Admin.	(Ind.) Transf.
Surplus Marketing Admin.	New.
[Div. of Marketing and Marketing Agree.]	(A.A.A., A.) Consol. as Surplus Marketing Admin.
[F. Surplus Commodities Corp.]	(A.) Consol. as Surplus Marketing Admin.
Commerce Department	Preestablished.
Civil Aeronautics Authority.	New.

TABLE II.—*After reorganization*—Continued

Agency or function	Former status and change
Commerce Department—Con.	
Admr. of Civil Aeronautics	(Ind.) Formerly "Administrator"; transf. and renamed.
Civil Aeronautics Bd	(Ind.) Formerly C.A.A.; transf. and renamed.
[Air Safety Bd.]	(Ind.) Consol. with Civil Aeronautics Bd.
Inland Waterways Corp	(W.) Transf.
Weather Bur	(A.) Tranf.
Executive Office of the President	Preestablished.
Bur. of the Budget	(T.) Transf.
Central Statistical Bd	(Ind.) Transf.
[Central Statistical Committee.]	(Ind.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Natl. Resources Planning Bd.	New.
[F. Employment Stabilization Office].	(C.) Abol. & funct. transf.
[Natl. Resources Committee.]	(Ind.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Office of Government Reports.	New.
[Natl. Emergency Council.]	(Ind.) Abol. & funct, except Radio Div. and U. S. Film Serv., transf.
Federal Loan Agency	New.
Disaster Loan Corp	(Ind.) Transf.
Electric Home and Farm Authority.	(Ind.) Transf.
Export-Import Bank of Washington.	(Ind.) Transf.
F. Home Loan Bank Bd	(Ind.) Transf.
F. Savings and Loan Insurance Corp.	(F. H. L. B. B., Ind.) Transf.
Home Owners' Loan Corp.	(F. H. L. B. B., Ind.) Transf.
F. Housing Admin	(Ind.) Transf.
F. Natl. Mortgage Association.	(Ind.) Transf.
Reconstruction Finance Corp.	(Ind.) Transf.
RFC Mortgage Co	(Ind.) Transf.
Federal Security Agency	New.
[American Printing House for the Blind.]	Funct. of Secy. of T. re admin. of appropriations transf.
Civilian Conservation Corps.	(Ind.) Transf.
[Columbia Institution for the Deaf.]	Funct. of I. transf.
Food and Drug Admin	(A.) Transf.
Comr. of Food and Drugs.	(A.) Formerly Chief of the Food and Drug Admin., transf. & renamed.
Freedmen's Hosp	(I.) Transf.
[Howard University]	Funct. of I. transf.
Natl. Youth Admin	(W. P. A.) Transf.
Office of Education	(I.) Transf.
Radio Div	(Natl. Emergency Council, Ind.) Transf.
U. S. Film Serv	(Natl. Emergency Council, Ind.) Transf.
Pub. Health Serv	(T.) Transf.
St. Elizabeths Hosp	(I.) Transf.
Social Security Bd	(Ind.) Transf.
[U. S. Employment Serv.]	(L.) Transf. & consol. with unemployment compensation funct. of Social Security Bd.
Federal Works Agency	New.
Pub. Bldgs. Admin	New.
[Branch of Bldgs. Management, Natl. Park Serv.]	(I.) Transf. & consol.
[Natl. Park Serv.]	(I.) Certain D. C. pub. bldgs. funct. transf. & consol.
[Pub. Bldgs. Branch, Procurement Div.].	(T.) Transf. & consol.
Pub. Roads Admin	(A.) Formerly Bur. of Pub. Roads; transf. & renamed.
Pub. Works Admin	(Ind.) Formerly F. Emergency Admin. of Pub. Works; transf. & renamed.
U. S. Housing Authority	(I.) Transf.
Work Projects Admin	(Ind.) Formerly Works Progress Admin.; transf. & renamed.
Interior Department	Preestablished.
Bituminous Coal Div	New.
[Natl. Bituminous Coal Commn.]	(I.) Abol. & funct. transf.

TABLE II.—*After reorganization*—Continued

Agency or function	Former status and change
Interior Department—Con.	
Div. of Territories and Isl. Possessions.	Preestablished.
[Bureau of Insular Affairs].	(W.) Transf. & consol. with Div. of Territories and Isl. Possessions.
Dir. of the Div	Preestablished.
[Chief and subordinate offices of the Bur. of Insular Affairs].	(W.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Fish and Wildlife Serv	New.
[Assoc. Chief of the Bur. of Biological Survey].	(I.) Abol. & funct. transf.
[Bur. of Biological Survey].	(A.)| Transf. & con-
[Bur. of Fisheries]	(C.)| sol. as Fish and Wildlife Serv.
[Chief of the Bur. of Biological Survey].	(I.) Abol. & funct. transf.
[Comr. of Fisheries]	(I.) Abol. & funct. transf.
[Deputy Comr. of Fisheries].	(I.) Abol. & funct. transf.
General Land Office	Preestablished.
[Recorder of the General Land Office.]	(I.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Mt. Rushmore Natl. Memorial Commn.	(Ind.) Transf.
Secy. of I	Preestablished.
[Secy. of A.]	(A.) Wildlife, game, and migratory bird conservation funct.
[Secy. of C.]	(C.) Fur seal and animal protection funct.
[Secy. of C.]	(C.) Pribiloff Isls. and natives, funct. re.
[Secy. of C.]	(C.) Whaling Treaty Act funct.
[Soil Conservation Serv.]	(A.) Soil and moisture funct. re land of I. transf.
Solicitor of I	Preestablished.
[Consumers' Counsel of the Natl. Bituminous Coal Comm.]	(I.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Justice Department	Preestablished.
[Bd. of Trustees of the Natl. Training School for Boys.]	(Ind.) Abol. & funct. transf.
F. Prison Industries, Inc	(Ind.) Transf.
Immigration and Naturalization Serv.	(L.) Transf.
Natl. Training School for Boys.	(Ind.) Transf.
U. S. Marshals	Preestablished.
[Disbursements]	Funct. otherwise transferable to T. retained.
Labor Department	Preestablished.
Comr. of Immigration and Naturalization.	Preestablished.
[Comrs. of immigration]	(L.) Abol. & funct. transf.
[District comrs. of immigration and naturalization]	(L.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Secy. of L	Preestablished.
[Enforcement of wage payments on pub. construction]	Funct. of Secys. of I. and T. transf.
Migratory Bird Conservation Commn.	Preestablished.
Secy. of A	(A.) Designated member.
Secy. of I	(I.) Designated chairman.
National Archives	Preestablished.
Div. of the F. Register	Preestablished.
[Codification Bd.]	(Ind.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Post Office Department	Preestablished.
Bd. of Trustees of the Postal Savings System.	Preestablished.
[Disbursements]	Funct. otherwise transferable to T. retained.
[Disbursements]	Funct. otherwise transferable to T. retained.
[Interbuilding messenger serv. in D. C.]	(Various agencies) Transf. & consol. in P. O.
[Mail transportation between Government agencies and post office in D. C.].	(Various agencies) Transf. & consol. in P. O.
State Department	Preestablished.
Dominican Customs Receivership.	(Div. of Territories and Isl. Possessions, I.) Transf.
Foreign Serv. Bldgs. Commn.	(Ind.) Transf.

TABLE II.—*After reorganization*—Continued

Agency or function	Former status and change
State Department—Con.	
Foreign Serv. of the U. S	Preestablished.
Bd. of Foreign Serv. Personnel.	Preestablished.
Officer of A	(A.) Designated member.
Officer of C	(C.) Designated member.
[China Trade Act Registrar.]	(C.) Duties transf.
[Foreign Agricultural Serv.]	(A.)| Transf. & con-
[Foreign Commerce Serv.]	(C.)| sol. with Foreign Serv.
Treasury Department	Preestablished.
[Attorney General]	(J.) Funct. re approval of compromises under F. Alcohol Admin. Act transf.
Bur. of Internal Revenue	Preestablished.
[F. Alcohol Admin.]	(T.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Coast Guard	Preestablished.
[Bur. of Lighthouses]	(C.) Transf. & consol. with Coast Guard.
Fisc. Serv	New.
[Asst. Secys. of T.]	(T.) Certain financial funct. transf.
Bur. of Accounts	New.
Comr. of Accounts	(T.) Formerly Comr. of Accounts and Deposits; transf. & renamed.
[T. personnel]	(T.) Accounting funct. transf.
Div. of Bookkeeping and Warrants.	(T.) Transf.
Bur. of the Pub. Debt	New.
Comr. of the Pub. Debt.	(T.) Transf.
Div. of Loans and Currency.	(T.) Transf.
Div. of Paper Custody.	(T.) Transf.
Div. of Pub. Debt Accounts and Audit.	(T.) Transf.
Div. of Savings Bonds.	(T.) Transf.
Register of the Treasury.	(T.) Transf.
Fisc. Asst. Secy	New.
[Asst. Secy. of T., vacant office.]	(T.) Abol. & funct. transf.
Div. of Deposits	(T.) Transf.
Div. of Disbursement.	(T.) Transf.
Section of Surety Bonds.	(T.) Transf.
Treasurer of the U. S	(T.) Transf.
[Under Secy. of T.]	(T.) Certain financial funct. transf.
Secy. of T	Preestablished.
[Dir. General of Railroads.]	(Ind.) Abol. & funct. transf.
[War Finance Corp.]	(Ind.) Abol. & funct. transf.
U. S. Maritime Commission	Preestablished.
[State marine or nautical schools.]	Secy. of N.'s funct. transf.

Racial Discrimination

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, until recently I chose not to believe the numerous complaints of racial discrimination which I have heard from time to time. I rather believed that these complaints were imaginary, and that they were made by persons who thought they

had no other way of explaining whatever disappointments they suffered.

However, by virtue of some matters which have come to my notice, I am forced to the conclusion that, in spite of my deep-seated desire to believe otherwise, the fact is that discrimination is taking place. It is almost unbelievable that such a condition should exist in our country. Most people do not like to believe it because it tends to take away something dear to them in their appraisal of American ideals.

You and I were taught in our American schools to respect, to revere, and cherish the principles which have been laid down as the basic foundation of our American form of government by those great characters of American history who courted, and many of them did actually suffer, death to the end that you and I might enjoy equal opportunities in this great land, under our American system of government, free from prejudice because of race, color, or creed. We have lived our lives thus far believing and practicing what we were taught. Is it any wonder, therefore, that many of us hate to admit that today, because of the workings of propagandists, bent upon the division of our peoples into hostile classes, such a condition actually exists?

Upon what do I base my contention of the existence of this condition? Is it because I am easily led by the chronic complaints of this nature, made by those who are otherwise unable to explain their shortcomings? No; that is not the reason. The true reason is that I have evidence of the existence of such a condition from a source which I consider unimpeachable.

The Governor of my State, appreciating the existence of this condition, appointed the State Industrial Commissioner, Frieda S. Miller, as chairman of the Governor's committee on employment discrimination. What has this committee uncovered along these lines? I cannot attempt at this point to give detailed facts of each individual case which the committee has had brought to its attention, but I do believe that it is very appropriate to quote from a statement made by Commissioner Miller in connection with this subject. This quotation reads as follows:

> We are particularly concerned with two forms of discrimination. The first bars from defense employment many citizens of Italian and German extraction, even though they have unquestionably proved their complete loyalty to this country. The second makes it difficult for qualified Negroes and Jews to secure defense jobs.
>
> Citizens who have served in this Nation's armed forces and hate the present governments in their countries of origin have been barred from work in factories which turn out clothing, kitchen utensils and other nontechnical items.

Is it any wonder why I have had to revise my earlier opinion on this subject? Think of it. Ex-service men being discriminated against in the exercise of their right to work.

When Commissioner Miller's statement, as above given, was called to my attention, I wrote to her and asked her to be so kind as to advise me as to the source of her information. I received a reply, in which she stated that one of the sources of her information consists of reports received from managers of local offices of the New York State Employment Service. Therefore, it is evident that this fear of discrimination is not a fancied one, but based on actual facts.

I come now to the question: Just what is behind this ugly practice? Do the persons who are guilty of this conduct feel that they are helping the cause of national unity? Do they not realize that they are being used by propagandists who are endeavoring to divide Americans amongst themselves and set class against class and group against group? We have never wanted these things to exist at any time, but, certainly, now less than ever.

All good Americans, regardless of origin, are ready to contribute to the preservation of our democracy and the freedom that we cherish. America must be preserved for all Americans and not for particular groups. Every American must be made to feel that he has a definite interest in the preservation of the ideals of this country and he must not be led to believe that he is excluded from any of the privileges which this country offers because of his race, color, or creed. The only limitation which good Americans recognize as to these privileges is the duty incumbent upon each one to conduct himself in a manner which will best contribute to the present and future safety of our country.

Let us all remember, whether we be Jew or gentile, native-born or foreign-born, white or colored, that no one of us has had any control over these natural facts. No one can say that he is personally responsible for where he was born, what he was born, and the color of his skin. The most that can be said is that we are what we are because of the accident of birth, but, as to whether we are good, loyal Americans, is something which is peculiarly within our own ability and within our own control and, therefore, a person's Americanism should be tested, not by what he orally professes, but is to be measured by his willingness to make sacrifices in the service of America. No one is rendering any service if, by his utterances or deeds, he sets the example of intolerance. He will best serve America who, both by word and deed, will so conduct himself as to treat his fellow-Americans, irrespective of race, creed, or color, in such a manner as he would himself like to be treated. It is by the observance of this rule that we shall get back to the road of sanity, to the road leading to complete national unity.

It is quite obvious that any discrimination against any class of Americans will necessarily interfere with the wholehearted cooperation on the part of those persons discriminated against. Naturally, they must be made to feel that they have a stake in the welfare of America and they cannot be permitted to believe that, as to them, there is no future. It seems to me that, when Americans are called upon to make sacrifices for their country, we do not limit the Americans from whom we would expect sacrifices to be made. We have the right to expect that all Americans, irrespective of race, color, or creed, must join in the common effort of serving our country. And so we find a great many individuals now serving in the armed forces of our country who come within the definition of the classes of Americans mentioned in Commissioner Miller's statement. If they are good enough to be expected to offer their bodies as targets of enemy aggression and good enough to be expected to pay taxes for the upkeep of our country they are certainly entitled to be given the same consideration by industry as all other Americans when they present themselves as applicants for employment. I maintain that the only test for employment in the defense industries should be loyalty to America, provided, of course, that the person is otherwise fit for the position.

We, as Members of the House of Representatives, are looked upon by our various communities as important factors in our Government. Let us go back to our respective districts and bring this message home to our people. Let us, by our example, show the way of tolerance, which, in turn, leads to a united America, so necessary in the present crisis.

I know that in uttering these sentiments, the people of the district which I have the honor to represent stand united in their approval.

Maximum Production for Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the House my letter of May 21 to Hon. William S. Knudsen, Director General of the Office of Production Management, and his reply of May 22, and my letter of May 21 to the Honorable Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, and her reply of June 9:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1941.

Hon. WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN,
Director General, Office of Production Management, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KNUDSEN: In connection with the framing of a defense-tax bill calculated to raise an additional three and one-half billion dollars of revenue, I have been asking sundry witnesses questions concerning the effect of the 40-hour week on defense production. And because of my interest in the defense program, I ask the privilege of submitting the following questions to you and your associates:

First. Has the application of the 40-hour law with heavy penalties for overtime interfered with production under the defense program?

Second. To what extent have these heavy penalties for overtime increased the cost to the Government?

Third. Is it true that all defense contracts now being negotiated carry clauses under which the manufacturer passes on to the Government overtime penalties, with a fur-

ther agreement for the Government to assume any further increases in wages?

Fourth. If our objective in the defense program is to be an expenditure of $2,000,000,000 per month, when will full employment in defense industries be reached?

Fifth. And when full employment is reached and it is no longer necessary to use overtime penalties to spread employment, should, for the remainder of the emergency, the restrictions of the 40-hour law be relaxed and, if so, to what extent?

Sixth. In plants where overtime has been resorted to, has there been a falling off of production per man-hour for the first 40 hours?

Seventh. If from the standpoint of unselfish patriotism, industrial workers of the Nation are willing to yield overtime payments for a workweek in excess of 40 hours, to what extent should industrial corporations be willing to yield to the Government in excess-profits taxes the additional profits that would flow to them as a result of the defense program?

In conclusion, if the Office of Production Management feels at liberty to do so, I would welcome an expression of its views concerning the policy to be adopted to secure maximum production in this emergency with fair wages to the workers and fair cost to the Government and to consumers of nondefense goods that will be affected by the Government program.

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1941.

The Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: Replying to your letter of May 21, I shall try to answer your questions in the order in which they appear.

First. On some fixed-price contracts there has probably been some delay, but not much.

Second. On firm-price contracts, none; on negotiated or fixed-fee contracts, from 5 to 10 percent, depending on the spread of overtime.

Third. Escalator clauses are included only in fixed-price negotiated contracts, not in bid contracts, and in fixed-fee contracts the Government pays the actual cost, including overtime premiums.

Fourth. March or April 1942.

Fifth. I do not see any need for that.

Sixth. Not very much; on straight machine work, none.

Seventh. I expect that the tax requirements will include heavy excess-profits taxes, which I think is only right.

I do not know whether this covers your questions; if not, if you will call at my office some afternoon around 5 o'clock I shall be willing to clarify any point.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1941.

Hon. FRANCES PERKINS,
The Secretary of Larbor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: Being deeply interested in the defense program and hopeful that we can profit by the mistakes made in the defense program of 1917–18, when uncontrolled prices added $15,000,000,000 to the cost of the program and several times that amount to the cost of domestic consumer goods, I will appreciate your kindness in giving me answers to the following questions:

First. Has the 40-hour-week law curtailed production (a) in defense industries, (b) nondefense industries?

Second. How much overtime at time and a half has there been since October 1940 in (a) defense plants and (b) nondefense plants?

Third. To what extent has reemployment been affected by the 40-hour law, and how many employables are now unemployed?

Fourth. Assuming a national income next year of more than $90,000,000,000 and an effort to raise defense expenditures to the level of $2,000,000,000 per month, do you not expect a labor shortage in the spring of 1942?

Fifth. Do you favor legislation to relax the restrictions of the 40-hour week when unemployment has been eliminated during this emergency; and if your answer is in the negative, please indicate your reasons.

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 9, 1941.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTSON: I am very glad to reply to your letter of May 21, and I regret that it was not possible for me to do so sooner. I most certainly share your hope that in preparing for national defense at the present time we will avoid the mistakes of 1917–18.

I shall deal with your questions in the order in which you have asked them:

"First. Has the 40-hour-week law curtailed production (a) in defense industries, (b) nondefense industries?"

There is no evidence that the wage-and-hour law has curtailed production in either defense or nondefense industries. It was not until March 1941 that average hours of work in all manufacturing industries reached and exceeded 40 a week. For that month the average was 40.4 hours a week. While this is the most recent figure available, and expansion undoubtedly continued during April and May, the March average indicates that as yet overtime schedules have not become heavy. Production has been expanded primarily by increasing employment rather than by lengthening hours, and present indications are that shortages of basic materials constitute a much more serious problem in defense production than shortages of labor supply.

Attached is a schedule showing average hours of work in March in a representative group of defense industries and the over-all averages in the durable and non-durable-goods industries. You will note that in such industries as the machine-tool group, which are under severe pressure to maintain production at maximum levels, hours of work have been extended well beyond 40 a week. Information gathered directly from industries by several agencies in this Department seem to show that when the volume of business available requires overtime operations they are used unhesitatingly. It should be recalled that under the wage-and-hour law overtime may be worked in the discretion of employers and employees without the necessity of any administrative action upon the part of the Wage and Hour Division. The only requirement of the law in respect to hours of work for covered employees is that if they exceed 40 a week the employee must be compensated for the excess hours at time and a half the regular rate at which he is employed.

"Second. How much overtime at time and a half has there been since October 1940 in (a) defense plants, and (b) nondefense plants?"

The amount of overtime employed since October 1940 has varied widely from industry to industry, depending on the extent of available facilities and the character of operations. In the steel industry (blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling mills), for example, capacity operations have been sustained with little overtime, weekly hours in February and March averaging only 39.9 and 40.1 respectively. Schedule B, which is attached, presents average weekly hours of work in durable goods, nondurable goods, and all manufacturing industries for each month from October 1940 through March 1941. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has conducted a series of surveys of important defense industries to determine the extent to which multiple shifts are being used, prevailing practices regarding the week-end shut-down, and the importance of the overtime factor. The material developed is contained in a reprint from the "Monthly Labor Review" and a series of brief reports which also are enclosed. These data, together with those contained in Schedules A and B, previously referred to, probably constitute the best available answer to your second question. Perhaps the most significant conclusion to be drawn from the information available is that in most defense industries, as well as in nondefense industries, there is still considerable opportunity for increasing production by increasing the forces employed in second and third shifts so that overtime for the individual worker need not yet be resorted to.

"Third. To what extent has reemployment been affected by the 40-hour law and how many employables are now unemployed?"

It is not possible to state in absolute terms the extent to which reemployment has been effectuated by the wage-and-hour law. Employment has been steadily increasing for more than a year. It is not possible to say in each instance how much has been due to the demands of the defense program, and how much has been due to the wage-and-hour law. We have in the files of the Wage and Hour Division a large number of statements made by individual employers, and reports of wage-and-hour inspectors, attributing employment increases in individual instances solely to the overtime provision of the wage-and-hour law. Many such reports come from establishments which are not engaged in defense production.

The Department of Labor compiles no estimates of the number of employables now unemployed.

"Fourth. Assuming a national income next year of more than $90,000,000,000, and an effort to raise defense expenditures to the level of $2,000,000,000 per month, do you not expect a labor shortage in the spring of 1942?"

Since the industrial workweek is an elastic factor, with average weekly hours at their present relatively low levels, and since the future is obscured by such influences as potential shortages of raw materials and probable development of specialized industrial facilities—factors which are not related to any possible restricted labor supply—it is impossible to forecast any general stringency in the near future.

The possibilities of increasing the labor supply by utilization of women not presently in the labor market, such as was done in the last war, and the shifting of unneeded agricultural workers to urban centers, will be studied. Taking all these factors into account, and assuming an intensive effort to train these workers in the necessary skills, I cannot visualize a general shortage of labor in the forseeable future, although shortages in particular crafts undoubtedly will develop.

"Fifth. Do you favor legislation to relax the restrictions of the 40-hour week when unemployment has been eliminated during this emergency; and if your answer is in the negative, please indicate your reasons."

So many factors must be weighed that only a qualified answer is possible. Employees in the principal defense industries, particularly skilled workers, are working under collective bargaining agreements which require the payment of time and a half wage rates—and in certain instances even more—for hours in

excess of 40 a week. In basic iron and steel it is estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that 67 percent of all employees are subject to such agreements, in steel fabricating 50 percent, in rubber 67 percent, in shipbuilding 50 percent, in aircraft and parts 33 percent, in automobiles and parts 75 percent. Legislative relaxation of the 40-hour week would not, of course, affect these organized workers; it would merely deprive the unorganized, who generally are the lowest paid and therefore in greatest need of protection, of the overtime benefits.

Retention of the 40-hour week provides the employer with an incentive to improve the efficiency of his operations in order to obtain maximum productivity from his labor. The relationship of longer hours of work to national health and worker morale should be taken into consideration. Finally, the ability of employers to pay the penalty overtime rate should be ascertained.

If the time should come when greater production is needed after all employables have been put to work, after everything has been done to increase output by improved efficiency of labor and management, and if, in addition, it appears that employers are unable to pay the penalty rate for overtime beyond 40 hours, then I should be in favor of the legislative relaxation which you mention. But even in that event thought should be given to whether the relaxation should be given to all industries, including those not concerned in the defense effort, or whether it should be extended only to those immediately concerned with defense production. Relaxation for all occupations might have the effect of stimulating certain of the luxury goods industries to a point where they would begin to divert needed labor from defense production.

It seems to me that our problem is not so much one of working hours as of training. Relaxation of the overtime provision, in my opinion, would have the effect of also relaxing the training effort; it would contribute to the exhaustion of our present supply of skilled labor and leave us unprepared at a future time when our necessities may be even more critical than they are now. As some one has said, our problem is not merely to win the 50-yard dash but to make sure that we win the 4-mile run.

I do not mean to imply that some overtime will not be necessary to meet the requirements of the projected defense load. But the considerations I have mentioned lead me to the conviction that the known disadvantages that would result from the elimination of the overtime penalty are far greater than the advantages that could be expected to result from its retention.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

[Enclosures (8).]

SCHEDULE A.—*Average hours worked per week in manufacturing industries, March 1941*

Industry:	*Average hours*
All manufacturing	40.4
Durable-goods group	42.0
Non-durable-goods group	38.8
Representative defense industries:	
Aircraft	45.2
Automobiles	41.4
Blast furnaces; steel works, and rolling mills	40.1
Forgings, iron and steel	45.9
Foundry and machine-shop products	44.7
Chemicals	41.0
Electrical machinery, apparatus, and supplies	44.3
Engines, turbines, and waterwheels	46.0
Explosives	40.5
Machine tools	51.9
Rubber products	39.7
Shipbuilding	44.2
Smelting and refining of copper, lead, and zinc	39.1

SCHEDULE B.—*Average hours worked per week in manufacturing industry, October 1940 to March 1941*

Month	All manufacturing	Durable goods	Non-durable goods
1940			
October	39.3	41.0	37.6
November	38.6	40.2	37.1
December	39.8	41.2	38.4
1941			
January	39.0	40.6	37.3
February	40.0	41.6	38.3
March	40.4	42.0	38.8

My letters to Mr. Knudsen and Secretary Perkins were prompted by my keen interest in and my desire to secure maximum effort in our defense program, and that presents three separate questions: First, how to secure maximum production regardless of cost? Second, are rising costs, due to penalty payments, on top of wage-rate increases inimical to our national interests, including the question of inflation?

In agricultural sections a shortage of labor already exists. It is reported that military authorities have experienced difficulty in purchasing canned goods at what it considered to be fair and reasonable prices, and some believe that the present wage-and-hour law is affecting the output and the prices of canned goods, aggravated by a shortage in some crops, such as peas. Last week the Chairman of the Social Security Board reported that reports from reemployment offices throughout the country indicated a shortage of labor in 100 different occupations connected with the defense program, for 16 of which not a man could be furnished by any reemployment office. Last week an official of the Office of Production Management estimated that by next spring 4,000,000 additional skilled workers would be needed in the defense program if we are to produce defense matériel in accordance with present plans and expectations. Funds for five different agencies have been appropriated to train new workers for these jobs, but it should be apparent to all that 4,000,000 additional workers cannot be trained in that period. And from now on every farm boy taken for military service or a defense industry will accentuate the existing shortage of labor in agricultural sections.

It has been developed in the hearings of House and Senate committees that camp and other emergency construction in the defense program encountered a shortage of skilled workers as a result of which the Army was forced to pay much overtime. It was estimated that on the Camp Meade project alone overtime amounted to $200,000 per week. Practically all industry engaged in defense work is now working overtime and the Government, which in the final analysis means all the people, is footing the bill for penalty payments. Every major strike since the first of this year has been settled on the basis of increasing the base wage until the hourly or daily rate of pay exceeds anything heretofore known in this or any other country. Some of those increases may have been justified, and certainly I have never had the disposition to deny the fundamental fact that the laborer is worthy of his hire. On the contrary, I recognize the dignity of labor and will welcome the time when the financial reward for one who does a good job with his hands will be on a par with a good job with his head. In view of the fact that labor represents anywhere from 30 percent to 60 percent of the cost of a manufactured article, if we are to avoid a dangerous spiral of rising prices, we must cease treating overtime penalty payments as a proper wage scale and consider them in the light in which they were proposed to us in 1935 and as such written into the wage-and-hour law, namely, as a penalty designed to spread employment.

And if, as many of us believe, a satisfactory standard of living for all cannot be maintained in peacetime on a 40-hour week, it necessarily follows it cannot be maintained when we are called upon for the greatest productive effort in our national history. Those who will take the time and trouble to read the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee on the pending tax bill will find considerable testimony bearing on this subject. This week the Secretary of the Interior has called upon all householders who can afford to do so to buy now their coal for next winter on the ground that the coal mines running at full capacity will be unable to meet the demand at that time. Yet a new coal contract has just been negotiated for a 35-hour week, with a base pay of $7 per day, time and a half for overtime, and double time for certain other periods. That pay increase will of course be shortly reflected in a sharp increase in the price of coal, to say nothing of the shortage to which Secretary Ickes referred.

It is futile, of course, to attempt to designate any one thing that brought about the downfall of France, but many now agree that the French people were foolish to cling to a 40-hour week when their need for full production was so urgent. And it is reported when the Government took over the production of airplanes in France, the production of military planes fell to 38 per month, while Germany, working on a 60-hour week, was stepping up her production to 1,200 per month.

In my opinion, the situation that now confronts us is far more critical than the situation that confronted us in the spring of 1917. At that time Germany, with nothing comparable to her present war machine, was confronted by Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia, and Japan. We knew if we entered the war, our Allies could certainly hold Germany to the continent of Europe until we were prepared to render substantial assistance. Yet, on March 4, 1917, and before we knew definitely that we would enter the war, the Congress passed a bill authorizing President Wilson to suspend during the declared emergency the operation of the 8-hour day. It is now well recognized that if Great Britain goes under, we will be left facing Germany alone, and with

no assurance in such contingency that Hitler will not be able to force the British as well as the French to turn over their fleets to him for operation in the Western Hemisphere. It will pay those who have not done so to read the article in the June issue of Reader's Digest on the plans of Hitler's brain trust for operations in the Western Hemisphere when his present program reaches that point. In a word, the situation that confronts us calls for our best productive effort consistent with health, and I, for one, do not believe our best productive effort can be made on the basis of a 40-hour week during this great national emergency. But whether or not I am right on that, I bring the situation to your attention with the hope it will from now on receive your best attention and the best attention of the executive branch of the Government. It is my purpose to shortly introduce a resolution calling for a study and a determination of this question as the basis for the adoption of a congressional policy, unless the joint committee now investigating defense expenditures include that in their study.

Shipment of American Oil to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the discussion in the press recently in regard to the eastern seaboard being threatened with gasless Sundays and other economies to supply petroleum supplies for national defense, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD an informative article by Joseph Driscoll which appears in the Herald Tribune today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 12, 1941]

EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND BARRELS OF OIL A MONTH GOING TO JAPAN—WITH GASLESS SUNDAYS IN OFFING, UNITED STATES MAY MOVE TO CURB SHIPMENTS OF FUEL

(By Joseph Driscoll)

More than 800,000 barrels of American oil are being shipped monthly to Japan, it was learned yesterday, at a time when New York, the New England States, and the whole eastern seaboard are facing gasless Sundays and other economies to conserve petroleum supplies for national defense.

Investigation reveals that an embargo on oil shipments to Japan, a step urged by friends of invaded China, would permi conservation in this country of millions of gallons of oil, and, in addition, would permit return to the American flag of tankers now being used to transport the oil across the Pacific. Such tankers are badly needed to move oil from Texas and Gulf ports to New York and Baltimore, and to Canada and Great Britain.

Prodded by Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, the Roosevelt administration is reported to be considering the feasibility of halting oil shipments to Japan.

"If excessive shipments of oil to Japan are contributing largely to tanker shortage in the Atlantic, I think the situation should be corrected," Representative WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr. Democrat, of Maryland, wired the New York Herald Tribune in response to a request for his views. Mr. COLE has been leading the administration's fight in the House for passage of his bill to offset the shortage of tankers by facilitating construction of pipe lines in the Atlantic seaboard area.

Rear Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, former commander of the Asiatic Fleet, and honorary chairman of the American Committee for Nonparticipation in Japanese Aggression, has been a leader in the long campaign to deprive Japan of American war material used to kill Chinese. He believes an embargo on exports to Japan would not result in hostilities against the United States, and that it would be suicidal for Japan to tackle the American Navy.

Recalled to active duty last January 3, Admiral Yarnell is for the time being unable to speak out about American supplies for Japan. He wired the New York Herald Tribune from Newport, R. I., yesterday:

"In view of fact that I am now back on active duty, I feel it would be inadvisable for me to make any statement regarding oil supplies to Japan."

According to many authorities, Japan could not continue her undeclared war on China were it not for the generous shipments from the United States of petroleum, and other goods required to keep the war machine rolling. The United States Government could cut off these supplies immediately by officially recognizing that a de facto state of war exists between Japan and China. In that event, however, Japan might demand that the United States also cut off supplies to China.

FEAR RETALIATION MOVE

Even without recognizing the Sino-Japanese war, the State Department, through its Export Control Board, could refuse licenses for export of oil to Japan, as it has done with certain other products classified as essential to American defense. It is understood the State Department hesitates to take this step through fear that Japan, cut off from American supply sources, might strike in desperation at the oil fields of the Dutch East Indies.

Information obtainable here and abroad confirms the fact that the Japanese need for American and Dutch oil to run its navy, its army and its air force grows more acute each month. For 5 months a Tokyo mission has been negotiating with the Dutch East Indies for a new trade agreement to fill Japan's need for oil. These negotiations have just broken down; British-American support of the Dutch is blamed by the Japanese press, which is making veiled threats that the Japanese may resort to force to get the oil necessary for warfare.

Meanwhile, American oil is being shipped to Japan at the rate of 800,000 to 900,000 barrels a month, perhaps much more. Exact figures are difficult to obtain, since the Department of Commerce has curtailed its monthly summaries of American exports.

American oil sent to Japan is still considerable, although gradually being reduced. During 1940 oil exports to Japan averaged close to 2,000,000 barrels a month, the year's total being more than 22,000,000 barrels.

In March, the latest month for which figures can be had, the United States exported 1,553,000 barrels of petroleum products to Japan, compared with 1,279,000 barrels in February and 1,491,000 barrels in January. This year's reduction is attributed to a worldwide shortage of tankers, due to sinkings, and to American restrictions on the export of large metal drums and containers used for transporting crude oil and gasoline.

SHIP DATA KEPT SECRET

Complaint has been heard in Congress that the Maritime Commission, which has jurisdiction over American merchant ships, is unwilling to disclose how many American tankers, or former American tankers, are presently engaged in the oil export business. Detailed information on movements of American shipping is withheld as a military secret.

Upon inquiry an official of the Commission said no American tankers have gone to Japan for the last 3 years, although six tankers are plying to the Philippines and also to China "when they can get into China." The inquirer was assured that Japan is getting her American oil in bottoms flying foreign flags, not American.

There is a joker in this, study indicates, in that some of the tankers serving Japan formerly flew the American flag, were American owned and presumably are still largely American owned, having been transferred to the flags of small neutral countries to avoid supervision by the Maritime Commission and responsibility under the American neutrality law. For instance, it has been reported without contradiction that three American tankers recently were transferred to the flag of the Republic of Panama and were promptly chartered to Japan.

Japan, of course, has tankers, but they have been engaged mainly in ferrying oil from the Dutch East Indies. To haul oil from the Western Hemisphere, she has been obliged to charter tankers which until recently flew the flags of the United States, Norway, and other maritime powers but which now owe nominal allegiance to Panama, not heretofore famous for its merchant marine.

QUESTION ON OWNERSHIP

In Congress recently, during debate on the Cole pipe-line bill. Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat of Texas, said: "I believe this Congress owes it to the people to determine what has become of the transport fleet owned by the oil companies of this Nation. What are the tankers doing that have been transferred into foreign registry? What oil are they carrying? Who is carrying oil to Japan today? I want to know who is carrying that oil. I called the Maritime Commission and they cannot tell me. They could not tell me how that oil is going. I cannot find out who in authority in this Nation will admit knowledge of how that oil is getting there, although there is no denial that the oil is moving across the Pacific Ocean, taking many times as long to make the trip across that ocean as it takes to bring a load of oil from Port Arthur to New York or from Houston to Baltimore."

With several other House members, Representative POAGE suggested that, if the State Department delayed action, Congress should take steps to prohibit oil exports to hostile nations, all the more so since the Berlin-Rome Axis was expanded to take in Tokyo.

Representative John M. COFFEE, Democrat of Washington, estimated the United States is now shipping 800,000 barrels, each containing 42 gallons of gasoline, to Japan every month. Representative Cole replied that the figure was actually higher, being around 30,000 barrels daily. And he added:

"I believe if the State Department would explain the reasons supporting the present policy the people of our country would appreciate their position."

The Manufacture and Production of Magnesium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss for a few minutes the question of the manufacture and production of magnesium. Very little is known by the average citizen with reference to this commodity. Some are inclined to associate it with magnesia or with manganese. It is a different product entirely. It is a product that resembles aluminum and is used largely for the same purpose.

Magnesium is better adapted to many usages than is aluminum. The demand for it in the world is increasing tremendously. There is no danger that it will displace aluminum because there is a great demand for both of these products. In fact the demand for defense purposes is so great that the demand is far in excess of the supply. By reason of this fact, many commercial plants manufacturing aluminum articles will soon be restricted in their production because of the demand for aluminum in the national-defense program. The same is true as to magnesium. Scientific men of the Nation are driving themselves to discover methods and to perfect plans whereby the production of magnesium can be increased. It is estimated that 30,000,000 pounds will be produced in the United States in this year, 1941. This compares very favorably with the fact that 12,500,000 pounds were produced in 1940. The amount produced in 1940 was twice as much as that produced in 1938. Magnesium was used during the World War only for very unusual work. The amount produced was so small that it was practicably negligible in the production of war materials. Magnesium is used now in its regular form in the production of some war material but its use is multiplied when it is used as an alloy mixture with aluminum and zinc and other metals. This metal is in great demand because of its lightness as well as its tensile strength and its reaction to high degrees of heat.

Magnesium is produced only in a few places in the United States. The Dow Chemical Co. of Michigan is, without doubt, the largest producer of this important metal. A very great percentage of this production is produced from salt brines taken from the earth and from salt water taken from the sea. I think that all the production of the Dow Chemical Co. is from salt brines. There is some production from rock in which some form of magnesium is found. The Government has been experimenting very extensively with reference to the production in this method. It is likely that the inventive genius of the American scientists will unlock Nature's door and will find sufficient stores from which this very necessary metal can be manufactured.

The salt brines can be located in many parts of the country. In southeastern Ohio, where the district which I have the honor to represent is located, can be found unlimited quantities of salt brine in which there is a very heavy magnesium-chloride content. For years salt brines have been developed in that section and a large quantity of salt has been manufactured in Meigs County and in other counties in that territory. This manufacture of salt has been carried on for the last 75 or 100 years. At one time the salt industry was more flourishing than it is now. These salt brines are reached by drilling wells. In some places the brines are found to be shallow and reachable without much drilling, while in other places they are located deep and the process of drawing them from the earth is rather difficult and expensive.

For several years these salt brines have been tapped in the section around Charleston, W. Va., and in that section is now located one of the largest chemical manufacturing centers in the world. This location is only 40 or 50 miles from the territory in southeastern Ohio to which I have already referred. There have been many experimental wells drilled in southeastern Ohio. Some of these in Lawrence County have been operated and the salt brine has been resolved into its component parts and has been disposed of for various purposes all over the world. These brines yield many byproducts that find their way into the channels of commerce. At the present time there is a great agitation in that section of the State by reason of the prospects of the manufacture of magnesium. The residents of Athens, Perry, and Hocking Counties have been very much interested in salt brines in that section. Many wells have been drilled and the products of the wells have been analyzed. Those who are especially interested in these operations assert that the brines in that section of the country are more thoroughly charged with magnesium chloride than the waters of any other section. One scientific analysis has indicated that these salt waters are charged with 203 different valuable ingredients. Mr. Philip Faine and Mr. Charles Jaynes, of Athens County, Ohio, have been very active in presenting to the world the merits of the salt brines available in their section of the country. The people all through southeasten Ohio are confident that time will prove that the supply of magnesium chloride in that section of Ohio is inexhaustible and that if developed it will answer the needs of the country and the world for this very necessary and valuable metal.

It is to be hoped that the Government scientists will immediately investigate these salt brines in southeastern Ohio and that they will find there a source of supply for which they have been looking.

The Dow Chemical Co. has, and I think with some encouragement from the Government, established a plant at Freeport, Tex., which is on the Gulf of Mexico. This plant will attempt to manufacture magnesium from sea water. It is expected that within a year this Freeport plant will be in operation, and if the experiment is a success will produce probably 25,000,000 pounds a year. This experiment may prove a success because the sea water is an inexpensive product, easy to get. Those who are familiar with the manufacture of magnesium, however, maintain that salt brines located in southeastern Ohio contain a very much greater content of magnesium chloride than does the salt water of the sea.

I am glad to call this matter to the attention of the House. I also hope that the Federal Government through its various agencies will exert every possible influence toward the manufacture of this very necessary product. It is well known that no country in the world has been so forward in the production of these new materials as our own great country. We produce a very great percentage of all the aluminum produced in the world, and it is my hope that we will be producing an equal quantity of magnesium within the next 2 or 3 years. Our section of the country, which has given to the country unlimited quantities of the finest coal produced anywhere, is ready, willing, and anxious to make its contribution to the production of another great commodity which the world needs so badly.

Gasoline Taxes and the Farmer

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I often feel that I was born at a most fortunate time. It has been my privilege to witness the passing of much that was old and the coming of more that is new. In memory I still see long lines of covered wagons passing the old farm home in Missouri, the occupants on their way to take up new lands to the west. While the linchpin wagon had even then become a curiosity, I recall having seen such. Gradually, as a family vehicle, the farm wagon, provided with extra seats on Sunday, gave way to the spring wagon or hack, the buggy, and then to the more pretentious carriage. Next came that great revolutionary change in transportation—the automobile.

The first automobile, a crude "horseless buggy," owned west of the Mississippi River, as far as I have been able to learn, was brought to Boonville, Mo., in my old home county, by Ferd E. Arn, a local gunsmith and dealer in firearms and accessories. I recall with what pity, ridicule, or contempt, as the case might be, Mr. Arn was looked upon. Some questioned his sanity, practically everybody his judgment. Surely such a thing as a horseless vehicle was out of the question. While there was much resentment that such a horse-frightening monster should claim the rights of the road, there was, of course, curiosity.

At the time referred to, I was connected with the county fair. Anxious to in-

crease gate receipts, a deal was made with Mr. Arn, owner of the "devil buggy," as automobiles were then frequently called, to take his car a distance of 15 miles to the fairgrounds and drive it around the half-mile track, for which he was to receive $50. The event was widely advertised; the result was most disappointing. Many, who otherwise would have attended the fair on "big Thursday" remained at home for fear they might meet the monstrosity burning up the road at 15 miles per hour. Remember that in those days horses were not accustomed to cars.

It is a far cry from the day of that pioneer Missouri automobile to the present, when many millions of cars are owned in the United States, more by far than in any other country. So every car owner, every truck owner, every tractor owner is directly interested in legislation which the Congress is about to consider. I refer to proposed higher Federal taxes on gasoline. While my concern is for all, I am thinking first of the farmer.

The great majority of the people whom I am privileged to represent in Congress are farmers. Nor have I ever been without farm ownership and interest. The story of Ferd E. Arn, coupled with familiar scenes of today on every street and road, on every farm and in countless fields, is without a parallel. In this connection the years have brought a most revolutionary shift from animal power to mechanical power on the farm. The extent to which such substitution has taken place is generally well enough appreciated to make unnecessary any great elaboration on my part.

But I cannot resist a brief reference to the widespread use of the farm tractor in the planting, cultivating, and harvesting of farm crops; its use in bringing in the hay, in hauling wood, in repairing farm roads, and in providing power for other farm work.

I mention, too, the use of the stationary gasoline engine on farms to run threshers, ensilage cutters, feed grinders, small sawmills, and water pumps, or its extensive use as the power unit to generate electricity where R. E. A. or other electric power is not yet available.

I also mention briefly the economic importance of the automobile and the truck to the farmer and his family. Before the development of the automobile and motortruck, the farmer's trading area was limited by the transportation provided by "flesh and blood" animal power. The farmer's market was the nearest market unless he enjoyed an unusually favorable location on a railroad. In the business of farming delays are costly because the products are usually perishable. Even livestock may lose weight during shipping delays on the way to market, the farmer's income being thereby reduced.

The farmer has turned to mechanization not because of any desire to avoid hard work nor because he has had excess money to burn. The problem of the farmer in any economic system is to produce as efficiently and as unfailingly as possible. Farmers as a group have found the development of mechanisms powered by internal-combustion engines an invaluable aid in the solution of that problem. Commercial farmers who fail to mechanize their operations frequently face increasing difficulties resulting from the more efficient operations of competing farmers.

I hope I have been able to make clear to you in a few words the truly essential importance of the internal-combustion engine, which really is the basis of agricultural mechanization to the farmer and to his business. The importance of the internal-combustion engine to the farmer stresses the importance of the gasoline used to operate these engines. Gasoline is as fundamental to farm production as is much farm machinery long in common use and is as essential to modern means of transportation as is the wheel. Probably the principal factor responsible for the widespread use on the farms of mechanisms driven by internal-combustion engines is the reasonable cost at which gasoline has been available.

Twenty-odd years ago our farmers were told, "Food will win the war." The war was won—if, in fact, wars are ever won—and food from America's farms had a big part in the winning. Now, with much of the world again at war, the importance of food is again stressed. There is, though, a very decided difference as compared with a quarter century ago. Gasoline-powered machinery is now, on a great number of farms, used instead of horses and mules. So any burdensome Federal tax on gasoline would fall heavily on the farmer.

It has been said that the cost of gasoline is as important an item in the cost of running a farm as in almost any other business except that of the commercial trucker.

The Federal Government for the past few years has been striving to improve the lot of the farmer by bringing farm prices at least up to the cost of production, the present House having gone far toward making parity prices possible. The good that has been done should not now be undone by the levying of a much higher Federal gasoline tax, which would add greatly to the cost of farming.

Farmers are said to use about one-quarter of all the gasoline consumed in the United States each year. Their success depends to a great extent on the ability to grow crops and to transport them to market as cheaply as possible. The cost of gasoline is one of the most important factors in determining these costs. So, Mr. Speaker, I trust that in the revenue bill now being written no additional Federal tax on gasoline may be found necessary.

In closing I wish to make one additional observation, digressing to some extent, but still having in mind the automobile—yes, and its owner and the man who services it.

Along the highways of our country there are today thousands of well-kept filling stations and tourist camps, many of them beautifully landscaped, and with flowers and shrubs so arranged as to make most attractive surroundings. Almost without exception, so far as my experience goes, the owners, attendants, or others in charge are most courteous, ready to extend every assistance. "Service with a smile" is not limited to patrons but is extended alike to all travelers. Furthermore, I have found these men—yes, and there are efficient women in charge of filling stations, too—exceedingly well informed. A pretty good rule when seeking information in any community is to follow the advice, "Ask the man at the filling station."

Referring to courtesy and consideration, would that the conduct of the average man in the automobile characterized these qualities so completely as does the conduct of the men who sell him gas and service his car. Road courtesy has changed during the few decades which have passed since Ferd E. Arn first tried out that early and crude car in Missouri. This, though, is no reason why a burdensome Federal gasoline tax, which would fall most heavily upon the farmer, should be levied.

Unselfish and Helpful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BRIDGEPORT (CONN.) LIFE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the February 15 issue of the Bridgeport Life, Bridgeport, Conn., comes the following editorial:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Life of February 15, 1941]

MORE ABOUT ELEANOR

At one of Eleanor's press conferences—oh, yes, both the President and Mrs. President have their press conferences—the First Lady of the land was asked, "What is the name of the charity to which you claim you are giving your earnings as a columnist and a lecturer?" Eleanor ducked the inquiry and the question remains unanswered. It will be remembered that Congress voted to exempt her from paying income taxes on her earnings, as she claimed she gave them all to charity. The echo still is, "What charity?"

Up in Pittsfield, Mass., they tell another good story about Eleanor's charity business. It seems the big Democrats of that community were staging a charity drive and thought by engaging Eleanor to open the drive with one of her sympathetic appeals to all mankind, it would pack the hall and increase the funds. A letter to the First Lady inquiring the price and the date was answered regarding date only, which gave the committee the idea there would be no charge for her services in such a good cause.

The affair was given to a half-filled auditorium and the gross receipts hit only $450. Now for the shock. Two weeks later the committee received a bill from the First Lady for $1,000 for the lecture. The committee was forced to pass the hat among the townspeople to collect the other $550. This tops the concert singer who appeared as the star in the President's birthday drive when the receipts were $2,400 and she demanded $2,000 for her services. Charity is not such a bad racket after all.

Mrs. Roosevelt loves money as much as she does the workers. She loves money as much

as she does publicity. This is her right, but why be so hypocritical about it all?

Overcoming Bottlenecks In Strategic, Critical, And Essential Materials In National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

REPORT BY THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in forging ahead with our national-defense program, each day we are confronted with the lack of sufficient supply of certain strategic, critical, and essential materials needed in defense production. Mr. Stettinius, Director of Priorities in the Office of Production Management, states that our defense orders will require 95 to 100 percent of all available aluminum, including scrap, during the month of June, by reason of increases in quantities going into aircraft, naval construction, and steel mills for alloys and other purposes. As a result, serious curtailment of civilian uses of this metal becomes necessary. The 53,000,000 pounds of aluminum produced this month will go to defense production, and it is estimated that expansion in the production of this essential metal will boost the 1940 yearly output of 420,000,000 pounds to more than 800,000,000 pounds by July 1942. As a matter of fact, it seems probable now that this increased output will be wholly insufficient to meet our defense demands, regardless of civilian needs.

Through speeding up of power production on the Columbia River, we are now producing in the Columbia Basin 30 percent of the present aluminum demand. Mr. Gano Dunn, of the Office of Production Management, states that there will be a deficit of 1,400,000 tons of steel production during the calendar year 1941, and a deficit of 6,400,000 tons for 1942 is forecasted. He advises that at the present time 75 percent of current steel production is going into purely civilian use.

The United States has the natural resources and power and plant potentialities to make us practically self-sufficient in these materials so vital to national defense. There is included in the supply bill for the Interior Department an item of $130,000 for the purpose of presenting ways and means to establish broader uses of Bonneville power in helping to solve this problem by locating and developing natural deposits contiguous to the Bonneville project, which will add to our supply of many of these essential materials. There are vast deposits of metals and nonmetals in the whole Northwest area which, together with cheap electric power, may be the means of adding materially to the stock piles so urgently needed in furthering our program of defense.

By substituting various materials for those which are scarce and difficult to obtain, we may also find a partial solution to this vexing problem. The Research Institute of America recently made a survey and report on the substitution of materials for those which are scarce which is illuminating and gives valuable information on this important subject and, under leave heretofore granted me, I include as a part of my remarks the report, which is as follows:

A REPORT ON NATIONAL DEFENSE
(By the Research Institute of America, New York, N. Y.)

SUBSTITUTES FOR SCARCE MATERIALS

The increasing production due to the defense program is creating serious shortages in items essential to many businesses. In particular, nondefense industry is being hit by the fact that essential materials are being diverted, in some cases almost completely, to defense industry while nondefense industry faces starvation. The system of priorities is one of the factors responsible. The Director of Priorities has frankly stated: "Wherever there is a priorities situation, somebody is going to get hurt." In some cases, price rises make it uneconomical for a businessman to use materials formerly going into his products. The necessity for diverting shipping facilities for the carrying of war materials also creates a problem for nonessential industry where it must have its supplies—particularly those from abroad—transported over large distances.

In order to avoid going out of business, firms confronted with such problems have either of two alternatives. They may (1) convert their activity to defense production or (2) seek substitutes for the unavailable materials. The following pages list substitute possibilities based on suggestions made by the Office of Production Management's Conservation Unit and on measures taken by institute members to meet the problem.

Research Institute of America recommendation: In order to solve problems of this kind, the Government has set up a Conservation Unit in the Office of Production Management under the direction of Robert McConnell. It works in close cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences and the Bureau of Standards. Do not hesitate to take your problems to the Conservation Unit, Office of Production Management, or to the United States Bureau of Standards, both in Washington, D. C. Another valuable source of information is your own trade association. If it has not already begun to study the problem of substitutes, take the initiative yourself in urging that it be done.

ALUMINUM

Article	Material substituted
Refrigerator ice-cube trays	Steel.
Refrigerator interior fronts	Steel, cadmium-plated.
Trim on refrigerator humidaire compartment	Plastic.
Refrigerator thermometer housing	Do.
Washing-machine agitator	Bakelite.
Vacuum-cleaner dome	Injection-molded plastic.
Lathe face plates and sanding disks	Cast iron.
Rotary tool handle grip	Plastic.
Decoration on handle to portable sander	Do.
Minature skeet trap	Cast iron.
Ski-pole rings	Rattan.

ALUMINUM—continued

Article	Material substituted
Camera cases	Plastic.
Film spools	Do.
Picnic jug tops	Do.
Thermos bottle cups	Do.
Gas-range burner heads	Cast iron.
Gas-range vent grilles	Steel stamping.
Deep well range cooker	Porcelain enameled steel glass top.
Cup and shoulder for vacuum bottle	Tin.
Eyelets for athletic shoes	Enameled steel.
Bicycle lights, horns and sirens	Do.
Fishing rod handles and reels	Plastic covered steel.
Bathtub molding	Discontinued.
Electric appliance parts	Chromium-plated steel.
Small wares	Tin, plastic, glass.
Cooking utensils	Enamelware.
Milker pails	Tinned steel.
Drive pins	Brass.
Neck-bearing rivet	Copper.
Garden-hose label	Vulcanized rubber.
Mason's level	Brass.
Baby walkers	Steel; baked on enamel.
Aluminum dishes and baking sets	Tin, plastic, glass.
Infant feeding set	Enamelware—steel base.
Dinette table tops	Steel edging.
Gas-range lighter tubes	Steel.
Gas-range burner heads	Cast iron.
Gas-range connectors	Copper.
Linoleum edging	Stainless steel.
End bell	Steel.
Refrigerators	Copper or steel.
Face plate	Cast iron.
Gear case	Iron.
Wringer	Do.
Fixture parts	Cast iron.
Service switch	Gray paint.
Rope hoists	Green enamel.
Arc welder	Cast iron.
Welding rods	Discontinued.
Grindstones	Black enamel.
Bits and spurs	Steel.
Disks on shearing cutter and comb grinders	Iron.
Marimbas	Plastic composition.
Variable condensers	Lead-coated steel.
Gas range broiler pan	Enamel steel.
Electric range cooker	Do.
Bar clamp	Steel.
Floor nozzle	Plastic.
End-bell flange	Steel.
Blower coupling	Do.
Hose adapter	Do.
Thermometer	Do.
Refrigeration cabinets	Steel, painted.
Refrigerator shelf slide	Steel, tin-plated.
Aluminum sheet	Porcelain enameled steel.
	Rubber on steel electro or dip.
	Metal finishes on steel (metal finishes include corronizing, chrome electrocopper, electrocadmium, electrospeculum copper, lead dip, cadmium dip, tin dip, flo metal).
	Plastics and synthetic resin finish on steel.
	Glass.
Aluminum strip	Procelain enameled steel.
	Metal finishes on steel.
	Plastics.
	Plated plastics.
	Synthetic resin on steel.
	Strip copper.
Aluminum forger die cast	Steel forgings.
	Steel castings.
	Iron castings.
	Laminated plastics.
	Steel and bakelite.
	Powdered iron compacts.
	Lead, iron, or cadmium base die casting.
	Steel stamping.
Aluminum casting	Steel forgings.
	Steel castings.
	Iron castings.
	Laminated plastics.
	Steel and bakelite.
	Powdered iron compacts.
	Lead, iron, or cadmium base die casting.
	Steel stamping.
Aluminum paint	Barite and carbon black paint vehicle—gray.
Extruding aluminum	Plastics and plated plastics.
	Copper.
	Lead and lead alloys.

ZINC

Article	Material substituted
Air charger	Cast iron.
Pulleys	Pressed steel.
Wn. head	Cast iron.
Wr. control hand	Do.
Pack gland	Do.
Handle cover	Steel.
Skid	Do.
Skid bracket	Do.
Position handle	Cast iron.
Wr. head	Do.
Galvanized range boiler	Porcelain.
Cabinet hardware	Steel.
Stoker transmission case	Cast iron.
Chain hoists	Bright finish.
Record changer parts	Steel stampings and bakelite.
Kerosene range tanks and oven linings.	Glass.
Outlet boxes	Black enamel.
Turnbuckles	Cadmium finish.
Thimbles	Do.
Pinion bearings	Cast iron.
Agitator bearings	Do.
Wr. sh. bearings	Do.
Pump assemblies	Do.
Swivel tube	Do.
Tank cl. handle	Steel—rubber.
Ref. handle	Plastic.
Ref. door handle	Injection-molded plastic.
Drill presses—spindle cap	Pressed steel.
Guards for power wood saws.	Plastic.
Cast iron furnace—inner liner.	Black steel.
Camera mounting plate	Bakelite.
Wire and fencing	Corronized coating.
Sprayer line	Corronized sheet.
Zinc die casting	Steel forgings. Steel castings. Iron castings. Laminated plastics. Steel and bakelite. Powdered iron compacts. Lead, iron, or cadmium base die casting. Steel stamping.
Zinc sheet	Porcelain enameled steel. Rubber on steel electro or dip. Metal finishes on steel (metal finishes include corronizing, chrome electrocopper, electrocadmium, electrospeculum, tin-electrocopper, lead dip, cadmium dip, tin dip, flo metal), Plastics and synthetic resin finish on steel. Glass.

STEEL

Racks for croquet sets	Wood.
Kitchen utility cabinets	Do.
Dinette table tops	Laminated wood or plastic.
Galvanized steel sheets	Asbestos.
Refrigerator evaporator (formerly stainless steel).	Copper, hot tinned (next step will be to porcelain enamel on steel).

LEATHER

Midsoles for athletic shoes	Fiber.
Football helmets	Do.
Shoulder pads	Do.

NICKEL

Bicycle lights, horns, and sirens.	Enameled steel.
Shelving finish	Tinned.
Range and heater trim	Plastic.
Clarinets	White metal.
Cooking utensils	Chrome stainless.
Stainless steel table cutlery	Chrome steel without.
Nickel in bright metal trim	Porcelain enameled steel. Metal finishes on steel. Plastics. Plated plastics. Synthetic resin on steel. Strip copper.
Nickel alloy-gray iron casting.	Copper. Molybdenum. Chrome in gray iron.

CHROME

Article	Material substituted
Handle on floor sander	Baked enamel.
Electric motors	Do.
Hand grinders	Cadmium finish.
Range and heater trim	Plastic.
Chrome in bright metal trim.	Porcelain-enameled steel. Metal finishes on steel. Plastics. Plated plastics. Synthetic resin on steel. Strip copper.

RUBBER [1]

Bases for bowling bags	Fiber.

NEOPRENE

F. V. clock faces	Nonbloom black.
Neck-bearing cushion	Steel.

BRASS

Football and basketball inflators.	Steel.
Wall brackets	Do.
Kerosene-range connectors	Do.
Gas-range connector	Do.
Boat whistle	Plastic.
Bicycle locks	Cast iron.
Bow and stern boat handles.	Malleable iron.
Flag-pole sockets, bow chocks and cleats.	Do.
Gun-cleaning rods	Steel.
Brass sheet	Porcelain enameled steel. Rubber on steel electro or dip. Metal finishes on steel (metal finishes include corronizing, chrome electrocopper, electrocadmium, electrospeculum, tin electrocopper, lead dip, cadmium dip, tin dip, flo metal). Plastics and synthetic resin finish on steel. Glass.

ASBESTOS

Kerosene-range kindlers	Glass.

PLYWOOD

Floor cabinets	½-inch plywood substituted for 1½-inch plywood.

COPPER

Kerosene range tubing	Steel.
Refrigerator evaporator	Porcelain enamel on steel to replace copper now being substituted for stainless steel.
Copper wire	Cadmium plate on steel.
Copper sheet	Porcelain enameled steel. Rubber on steel electro or dip. Metal finishes on steel (metal finishes include corronizing, chrome electro copper, electro cadmium, electro speculum, tin-electro copper, lead dip, cadmium dip, tin dip, flo metal). Plastics and synthetic resin finish on steel. Glass.

WOOD

Bleached maple furniture	Bakelite.

TIN

For plating	Porcelain enameled steel. Metal finishes on steel. Plastics. Plated plastics. Synthetic resin on steel. Strip copper.

[1] Some companies are taking steps to reduce the number of sizes and kinds of tires carried, eliminating nonessentials and trimmings.

BRONZE

Article	Material substituted
Bronze casting	Steel forgings. Steel castings. Iron castings. Laminated plastics. Steel and bakelite. Powdered-iron compacts. Lead, iron, or cadmium base die casting. Steel stamping.

LEAD

Lead sheet	Porcelain enameled steel. Rubber on steel electro or dip. Metal finishes on steel (metal finishes include corronizing, chrome electro copper, electro cadmium, electro speculum, tin-electro copper, lead dip, cadmium dip, tin dip, flo metal). Plastics and synthetic-resin finish on steel. Glass.

SUBSTITUTE MATERIALS USED IN GERMANY

The institute has studied the use of substitute materials in Germany where a most extensive campaign for the development of substitutes has been waged since 1933. The German Society of Engineers and other organizations issued frequent industrial standards for substitute materials and literature discussing possible substitutes in the light of their durability, machining qualities, resistance to stress, wear, temperature, etc. Below are some of the most popular of the German substitutes.

Article	Material substituted
Acid-proof vats, tanks, containers, chemical equipment of corrosion-resistant metals—lead, nickel, copper, tin.	Plastics, in particular Haveg plastic and Havegit cement for ceramic joints, tiles, etc.
Agitator rods (in chemical industry particularly rayon).	Glass.
Alkali-proof vats, tanks chemical equipment.	Various plastics, in particular I. G. Dye Trust alkali-resistant cements for ceramic joints (Asplit cements), alkali-resistant plastics (Havegit).
Asbestos	Glass wool.
Asbestos filler in plastics	Wood as sawdust or pulverized.
Bathroom fixtures, plumbing (metal).	Glass and porcelain.
Bearings friction (heavy duty).	Synthetic resin.
Beer brewing equipment (copper).	Glass, porcelain.
Bristles, pig	Whale hair and beard, plastic bristles.
Bearings, tin alloy	Lead, bronze, nickel-containing lead alloys, cadmium alloys.
Cables, electric (lead covered).	Plastic covers.
Chemical equipment. (See Alkali-resistant and Acid-resistant.)	
Copal	Synthetic copals.
Cork (bottle)	Poplar wood.
Cork for men's hats	Pressed flaked "foam" plastics.
Cork (heat insulant)	Rubber, foam, plastic foam, glass wool, aluminum foil, cardboard, diatomite, kieselguhr (these substances cannot easily be used as cold insulants as they are not water resistant).
Corrosion-resisting piples, containers.	Porcelain and other ceramics.
Doorknobs	Glass or plastics.
Doorplates (for locks)	Do.
Drapery rods	Glass.
Electric condenser foil (tin, lead).	Pure aluminum or magnesium-aluminum alloy.
Furniture fittings (metal)	Plastics.
Gear wheels, bearings	Laminated phenol plastics.

Article	Material substituted
Guttapercha	Plastics.
Hot-water boilers, copper (for small residences).	Copper-plated steel or aluminum sheets, zinc plate, enameled sheet metal.
Insulants	Glass wool, glass cotton, glass wool on wire netting, corrugated cardboard, spun-glass mats, strips of glass wool.
Insulation against water in cellars or building.	Synthetic resin sheets, bitumen sheets.
Insulants, heat resisting	Glass wool.
Insulant, sound proofing	Do.
Leather, decorative	Plastics, in particular Mipolam.
Leather packings	Synthetic rubber (Buna).
Light fixtures (wall brackets, etc.).	Glass.
Linoleum (cork, sisal, etc.)	Various plastics such as Igelit, Mipolam, Stabol.
Linoleum filler	Flaked plastic "foams."
Mattress filling	Rubber foam, plastic foam, glass wool, slag foam.
Packings, leather	Synthetic rubber (Buna).
Pipes and other plumbing fixtures, metal.	Porcelain and other ceramics.
Pipes, cast iron, zinced	Bituminous coverings.
Pipes, copper, used in food industry.	Glass.
Pipes, low pressure (cold water).	Thioresins (Mipolam).
Platinum metals as electric contact points.	Small bands of platinum-iridium or palladium silver imbedded in bronze by rolling.
Radiators, cast-iron	Sheet metal (33⅓ percent saving in weight).
Red lead	Iron oxide.
Rods, agitator (in chemical industry, particularly rayon).	Glass.
Rods, drapery	Do.
Roofing, metal	Slate and tile.
Steel shapes in residential buildings.	Bricks, arches, brick work.
Tin plate for canning	Glass.
Toilet flush water containers, metal.	Glass or porcelain.
Towel racks	Glass.
Tubes, containers for foods and cosmetics (tin, lead).	Aluminum.
Warm water heaters (for kitchens and small residences).	Pressed glass.
Washboards	Do.
Waste water plumbing	Glass or porcelain.
Waxes, natural	Various synthetic WAXES.
Weights for fish nets	Pressed glass.
Wicker for furniture	Plastic materials.
Zinced sheet metal	Pressed glass.

Resolution of Executive Committee of San Francisco Chapter of "France Forever"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the San Francisco chapter of "France Forever," relating to the critical conditions in the world today.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the executive committee of France Forever in New York did, on the 16th day of May 1941, address to the President of the United States a communication expressing the views of said executive committee upon the present French situation, manifested by the action taken by the Vichy regime in acquiescing to the demands made by the Nazi Government; and

Whereas it appears to the members of the executive committee of the San Francisco chapter that the forced collaboration imposed upon the Vichy regime by the Nazi forces of evil threatens the liberty of all the freedom-loving people of the world, as well as the security of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the granting of the use of naval, air, or military bases by the Vichy regime in France, North and West Africa, to the Axis Powers is a threat to the safety of the United States and its historic Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas Gen. Charles de Gaulle has demonstrated that he is a fearless, conscientious, and courageous leader of the free French forces, and there is continually rallying to his said forces the liberty-loving Frenchmen throughout the world, including those who are able to escape from the Nazi dominated French territories: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the San Francisco Chapter of France Forever:

1. That we are in accord with the views communicated by the executive committee of France Forever to the President of the United States under date of May 16, 1941; and be it further resolved;

2. That it is urgent to protect against Axis penetration into Martinique, North Africa, Dakar, and Indochina, penetration which is helped by Vichy agents; and be it further

3. That we believe that the time has now arrived when the free French forces, led by Gen. Charles de Gaulle, should be recognized by the United States Government as the only free and independent government of France; and be it further resolved,

4. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the chairmen of the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees, and to United States Senator DOWNEY, of California.

Attested a true copy.

A. CUEVERDID,
President, San Francisco Chapter, France Forever.

PAUL CRUCIANO,
Secretary, San Francisco Chapter, France Forever.

Shall the Nation Passively Submit to the Desecration of Its Own Flag?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

LETTER FROM CAPT. JAMES P. McGOVERN, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed, under date of June 10, 1941, to Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, from the capable pen of Capt. James P. McGovern, of the District of Columbia Bar, a letter which relates to a measure now pending in the House of Representatives in which I am very much interested, a bill to prevent the desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States.

In its original form the bill, indexed and numbered as S. 218, was introduced in the Senate on January 8, 1941, by Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS, of Florida. Supported by numerous patriotic organizations, including the American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution, the bill, amended as to form in accordance with the suggestions of the Attorney General of the United States, passed the Senate on April 4, 1941.

Prior to its enactment in the other Chamber, Senator VAN NUYS, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, submitted the measure to the Attorney General, who, after study, endorsed the proposed legislation and suggested that, in the interest of uniformity, the form of the bill be changed so as to conform to a similar statute now in force in the District of Columbia, a suggestion which was readily complied with.

Discussing the legislation, the Attorney General said:

> There is at present no Federal statute of general application making it a criminal offense to desecrate or mutilate the flag of the United States. * * * Legislation on the subject appears to be desirable. The bill under consideration, however, would not sufficiently protect the flag against use for advertising purposes. It is suggested that perhaps the best approach to the matter would be to extend the existing law relating to the District of Columbia to the rest of the United States.

Captain McGovern, the author of the communication to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on the Judiciary, to which I have referred, is a lawyer of great ability and national reputation, whose public expressions in respect to public issues command the attention of the country. As a veteran of the World War, with a record of service with the American Expeditionary Forces, there can be no question of his right to be heard in relation to the subject with which he deals.

Those who are so fortunate as to find the time to give consideration to his learned and constructive comments upon this very timely legislative proposal will agree that that which he had to say is well worthy of the serious consideration of the Congress, I am quite sure.

Captain McGovern's letter follows:

McGOVERN & McCARTHY,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1941.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Re S. 218: An act to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is not my purpose to make a Flag Day speech in reply to your letter of April 23, 1941, nor to intrude on your patience by reviewing legislative history regarding the flag, with which you are most familiar. However, the approach of the one hundred and sixty-fourth birthday of our national emblem arouses my patriotic fervor to such a degree that I feel constrained to make a further attempt to alleviate, if not overcome, the opposition which you have indicated to the above bill. In so doing I shall

address my appeal to your judicial temperament and not resort to any flag waving.

The purpose of Senator ANDREWS' bill, S. 218, which passed the Senate April 4, 1941, and has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, of which you are chairman, is to provide Federal or national legislation "to prevent desecration and mutilation" of the national emblem. As originally introduced, S. 218 was limited to provisions to prevent the desecration and mutilation of the flag, but as reported and amended by the Senate Judiciary Committee and subsequently adopted by the Senate, it followed the language of the present act applicable to the District of Columbia and included restrictions against the use of the flag for advertising purposes. Such revised bill is in accord with the opinion of the Attorney General relative to S. 218 dated March 5, 1941, which stated, among other things, that—

"There is at present no Federal statute of general application making it a criminal offense to desecrate or mutilate the flag of the United States. There is such a statute applicable to the District of Columbia, which forbids the public mutilation or defacement of the flag and which also prohibits the use of the flag for advertising purposes (U. S. Code, title 4, sec. 3). Legislation on the subject appears to be desirable. * * * It is suggested that perhaps the best approach to the matter would be to extend the existing law relating to the District of Columbia to the rest of the United States."

Your objections to S. 218 appear to be based on the fact that all the States have enacted various, but not uniform, laws affording a measure of protection to the flag, and that the States can be trusted to enforce such laws. Many, if not all the States, have adopted their own State flags, and I am sure you are acquainted with some of the city flags of various municipalities. The people are and should be proud of these emblems, Federal, State, and municipal, but it is no reflection on their attachment to these standards to be reminded that the Stars and Stripes, Old Glory, is the flag of the people in their capacity as citizens of the United States as distinguished from their capacity as citizens of the State and municipalities. It therefore seems a little strange that the representatives of the people in their capacity as citizens of the State have taken steps to protect the national emblem and that the representatives of the people in their capacity as citizens of the United States should do nothing about it. In answer to this, you express the view that, if the principles of democracy are to prevail, all governmental powers which they can discharge should be held back in the States and local units and that the people back home "must be kept on the job if they are to retain their interest, their serious responsibility, and develop their governmental capacities." You also state that "it would be a much healthier thing for all communities for the constable to arrest a person desecrating the flag, or that the people in the community do it, have them tried in a local court by local officers elected by the people, than to have them arrested by a Federal marshal and tried in a court commissioned by Washington." These sentiments might well be applied to many Federal laws but, concededly, there are conditions under which the people may not be able to act locally. If there is any purpose or merit in a law to prevent the desecration and mutilation of the flag, I propose to show that there may be circumstances under which such protection cannot be extended except pursuant to Federal legislation.

As stated by Mr. Justice Harlan in *Halter* v. *Hayward* (27 S. C. 419, 422), in which case the Supreme Court recognized the right of the State to adopt legislation for the protection of the national flag, the flag "signifies government resting on the consent of the governed, liberty regulated by law, the protection of the weak against the strong, security against the exercise of arbitrary power, and absolute safety for free institutions against foreign aggression." He also stated that "one who loves the Union will love the State in which he resides, and love, both of the common country and of the State will diminish in proportion as respect for the flag is weakened." The flag being a symbol, it seems unfortunate that laws must be enacted to insure its protection and respect, but such laws have apparently been found necessary. If laws, like flags, could be regarded as emblems of those principles which we, as citizens, are proud to maintain, there would be no occasion to impose fines and penalties for their infringement. I have witnessed the respect and emotions of people standing before the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and even the Magna Carta on display in the Congressional Library, but it is very doubtful that they would doff their hats in the presence of the Federal Statutes at Large.

Although, as indicated, all the States have adopted laws to prevent the desecration and mutilation of the flag, a very interesting situation arises in regard to the enforcement of such laws on lands or property acquired by the Government in such States. Until recently it was generally accepted that all lands and property acquired by the United States were within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government and prosecution for offenses occurring on Government lands and property could not be maintained under State laws. This question of jurisdiction, as you will recall, arises under article I, section 8 (par. 17) of the Constitution, which provides, in part, as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation * * * over all places purchased by consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

In view of the rapid expansion of the acquisition of lands and properties by the United States for governmental purposes, the nature of the jurisdiction over such lands becomes very important. In the recent case of *James, etc.* v. *Dravo Contracting Co.* (302 U. S. 134, 58 S. C. 208), decided December 6, 1937, the Supreme Court held, in effect, that the extent of the jurisdiction acquired by the Government over such lands, etc., depends on the degree of sovereignty conveyed or surrendered by the States. The Court stated as follows:

"It is not unusual for the United States to own within a State lands which are set apart and used for public purposes. Such ownership and use without more do not withdraw the lands from the jurisdiction of the State. The lands 'remain part of her territory and within the operation of her laws, save that the latter cannot affect the title of the United States or embarrass it in using the lands or interfere with its right of disposal.' Clause 17 governs those cases where the United States acquires lands with the consent of the legislature of the State for the purposes there described. If lands are otherwise acquired, and jurisdiction is ceded by the State to the United States, the terms of the cession, to the extent that they may lawfully be prescribed, that is, consistently with the carrying out of the purpose of the acquisition, determine the extent of the Federal jurisdiction."

Acting under the above provision of the Constitution, the Congress has defined certain crimes and made same punishable under Federal law when committed within or on lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States "for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other needful building" (U. S. Criminal Code, ch. 11, sec. 451, par. "third"; 18 U. S. C. A. 451). Said provision, as recently amended by the act of June 11, 1940, provides as follows:

"The crimes and offenses defined in this chapter shall be punished as herein prescribed: * * *

"Third. When committed within or on any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof, or any place purchased or otherwise acquired by the United States by consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other useful buildings."

The act of June 11, 1940 (H. R. 8119) inserted "or concurrent" after "exclusive" and before "jurisdiction" and omitted "exclusive" before "use of the United States." As indicated in the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (No. 1708) on said bill, the amendment was necessary to overcome the effect of the above Dravo case in which it was held "that a State may properly maintain partial or concurrent jurisdiction over certain Federal reservations," and that "the bill will have the effect of giving the United States concurrent jurisdiction with the States over criminal matters arising on such reservations where the United States does not have exclusive jurisdiction."

Following the reasoning and logic of the Dravo case and prior decisions of the Supreme Court, it is difficult to understand how the Congress can confer jurisdiction on the United States where the State has withheld it. The jurisdiction acquired by the United States depends on the nature and extent of the grant by the States. If the State reserves a measure of jurisdiction or concurrent jurisdiction the United States acquires something and undoubtedly the amendment was intended to allow the United States to proceed under such jurisdiction as it acquired—although it might not be exclusive.

However, chapter 11 of the Criminal Code, in which the above provision appears, relates only to the crimes therein specified. Needless to say, there is no reference in said chapter to desecration and mutilation of the flag, but the following interesting provision does appear:

"Whoever, within the territorial limits of any State, organized Territory, or district, but within or upon any of the places now existing or hereafter reserved, or acquired, described in section 451 of this title, shall do or omit the doing of any act, or thing which is not made penal by any laws of Congress, but which if committed or omitted within the jurisdiction of the State, Territory, or district in which such place is situated, by the laws thereof in force on February 1, 1940, and remaining in force at the time of the doing or omitting the doing of such act or thing, would be penal, shall be deemed guilty of a like offense and be subject to a like punishment" (U. S. Criminal Code, sec. 289, as amended, June 6, 1940; 18 U. S. C. A. 468).

As stated by the Supreme Court in *People of Puerto Rico* v. *Shell Co.* (302 U. S. 253, 58 S. C. 167), "Prosecutions under this section are not to enforce the laws of the State, Territory, or district, but to enforce the Federal law the details of which instead of being recited are adopted by reference."

Assuming that violations of the State laws relating to the desecration and mutilation and even advertising of the flag may be prosecuted in the Federal courts under the above section, the question nevertheless remains as to the extent of the jurisdiction acquired by the United States in and to the lands or property on which such violations occur. In any event it is extremely doubtful that such crimes can be prosecuted in the Federal court if they are committed on lands other than those acquired by the United States "for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other needful building."

If the above observations arrest the attention regarding the extent of jurisdiction

acquired by the United States, as it is believed they should, the situation becomes more serious and important as to lands and property acquired under the act of August 21, 1935 (U. S. C. A., ch. 1 (A)), entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of historical significance," etc., it being declared to be "a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States." Under said act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make surveys, researches, and investigations to determine what properties possess value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States and to acquire, in the name of the United States, by gift, purchase, or otherwise, any such properties or to enter into agreements with States, municipalities, associations, and others to restore, protect, maintain, and operate the same. The Secretary is also authorized to perform all acts and to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act, and any violation of such rules and regulations is made a crime. Among the many historic sites and objects which the Federal Government has acquired and now being maintained by the Interior Department "for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States" (to say nothing of the great national parks) may be mentioned Gettysburg, the Lincoln Memorial, the Lee Mansion, the Statue of Liberty, and Fort McHenry, over which fort the national emblem was flying to afford the inspiration for the national anthem. Said act contains the following significant provision:

"Nothing in this act shall be held to deprive any State, or political subdivision thereof, of its civil and criminal jurisdiction in and over lands acquired by the United States under this act" (sec. 5).

The fact again remains, however, that the nature and extent of the jurisdiction acquired by the United States over lands under the above act depends on the nature of the consent or grant by the States. It is very doubtful, to say the least, that the provisions of chapter 11 of the Criminal Code, referred to above, including those adopting State laws, apply to lands acquired under the act of August 21, 1935, but are confined to lands acquired "for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other needful building."

In conclusion and reverting to the doctrine of "States' rights," if not "State responsibilities," emphasized in your letter, it might be argued that the Federal Government has taken over and assumed the concurrent power of enforcing all State crimes on Federal lands acquired "for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other needful building," but I am constrained to the view that as to other lands—and there are many such—the jurisdiction of both the Federal Government and the States must depend on the nature of the grant by the latter to the former.

The Attorney General has apparently not given the provisions of section 289 of the Criminal Code the general effect which others might attach thereto, for, as stated, he has advised that "there is no Federal statute of general application making it a criminal offense to desecrate or mutilate the flag." If all State crimes have been incorporated in Federal law "by reference instead of reciting them," including those relating to the desecration and mutilation of the flag, the adoption of S. 218 would clear up all uncertainty in this regard and surely there could be no harm at least in these times, for the Federal Government to place itself on its record that an insult to its flag would result in its condemnation.

Cordially and respectfully yours,

JAMES P. MCCOVERN.

American Federation of Labor and Its Affiliates Cooperate With National-Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein the address of Mr. George Meany, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, before the New York Building Congress at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on June 3, 1941.

I commend this address to the Members of this body today, because it outlines the fine record of achievement of the American Federation of Labor since its inception, as well as its record of cooperation with the present defense activities of the Government. In my opinion, it is unjust and unfair to penalize the entire membership of the American Federation of Labor for the isolated abuses inimical to the public interest that might exist. This fine organization represents the great majority of the working men and women of this country who are members of a labor organization, most of whom join with us in deploring the existing strike situations in those industries vital to the national defense.

The American Federation of Labor, on behalf of its membership, has stated publicly its position of complete cooperation with the defense program, and its record speaks for itself. I think that this record is a great tribute to its outstanding leadership, which has put forth tremendous efforts to maintain order and discipline within the ranks of this organization during the national crisis. I am aware, too, of the fine spirit of cooperation of its affiliates and their efforts to avoid strikes within their particular organizations. I am particularly familiar with the efforts of the International Longshoremen's Association, under the able leadership of Joseph P. Ryan, which is located in my district. The conduct of this organization in connection with the vital shipping problem has been exemplary. The record of the checkers, watchmen, bricklayers, wire lathers, and all other patriotic affiliates of the building trades of the American Federation of Labor is equally commendable. This joint effort is truly deserving of the commendation of the Congress as a contribution to the preservation of harmony and good will within the ranks of labor in these trying times.

The Congress should accordingly deliberate long and carefully before indulging in the hasty action of placing legislation on the statute books which will adversely affect the rights of millions of loyal and patriotic Americans who are glad and willing to work, for many years to come, in order to penalize the abuses of a very small minority, which may be penalized severely in other ways. Do not let us legislate collectively to punish the innocent victims of an un-American assault on the rights of labor; to correct a wrong that may be dealt with in another manner.

The betterment of the working conditions of labor has always been the pride and joy of our democracy. The American Federation of Labor, and its affiliates, typify the true, loyal, and patriotic laboring man. Let us express our confidence in its continued cooperation with our Government instead of enacting unjustifiable legislation at this time.

The address follows:

Organized labor's responsibility in the present national emergency is to do everything humanly possible to cooperate with our Government in its defense efforts, and at the same time continue to pursue its traditional objectives. This responsibility is gladly shouldered by the workers who make up what we feel is the outstanding trade-union of all history—the American Federation of Labor.

The objectives of the American Federation of Labor are well known. They are the objectives of any vigorous, free trade-union movement, which are to improve, through organization, the conditions under which wage earners must work and must live. And these objectives have been attained. Despite depressions and other setbacks from time to time, the American worker today stands, and for a great many years past has stood, head and shoulders above the workers of the rest of the world in conditions of work and of life. And it is not a mere claim, but a matter of recognized historic fact that the envied position of the American workingman has been produced in very large measure through the activities of the American Federation of Labor, and of the unions affiliated therewith. But our organization has always had another objective that runs concurrent to that of raising wages, reducing hours, and improving working conditions for the toilers of our Nation. The American Federation of Labor has from the very day of its inception been dedicated to the defense, the protection, and the preservation of the democracy under which it has been possible for trade-unions to contribute so much to the national welfare.

In the final analysis, this is nothing more than plain horse sense. The workers of America have attained a higher standard of living than have any other workers through the free collective-action machinery of their trade-unions. The free trade-union system exists because we operate in this country under a governmental formula under which it is possible for workers as well as employers and all other groups to collectively strive for improvements in their particular field of activity. Hence the preservation of that governmental formula means the preservation of the opportunity for workers not only to maintain the standards already secured but raise these standards to an even higher level.

It is this sincere, deep-running determination with which the workers of the American Federation of Labor's building trades, metal trades, and all other crafts are imbued, which has distinguished the American Federation of Labor from rival labor movements that have sprung up in this country at intervals during the past 60 years, made a furor for a few years, and then disintegrated and disappeared from the scene.

Just a week ago, in an address to the people of America, our President made it plainer perhaps than ever before that we cannot maintain our free governmental sys-

tem in a world dominated by Nazi Germany. The rule of brute force rather than the rule of justice and reason is unacceptable to the American people. I think it is plain now to everyone possessed of ordinary common sense that there can be no compromise between our system of free institutions and the brutal, inhuman system sponsored and practiced by Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini. There may be some who disagree with this theory—there may be some who feel that we can maintain our system and achieve a decent, equitable relationship with a Nazi-dominated Europe—but very recent history tells us that this is not possible. In Norway, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, and in other countries of continental Europe there were many who felt this way a year or so ago, but I am sure that you would have an extremely difficult task if you were to visit these countries today seeking to find someone who sincerely and honestly believed that appeasement of dictators is a good policy.

I think it is appropriate to point out at this time that the American Federation of Labor saw Hitlerism for what it was 6 full years ago—a long, long time before the people of our country achieved such a virtual unanimity as now exists with respect to this so-called government. To most people at that time Hitlerism was a pretty remote sort of thing. They read about it, they heard about it on the radio now and then, and that was about all.

But the labor movement of this country realized, as long as 6 years ago, that the Nazi regime constituted a threat to the cherished privileges of democracy even in a nation so distant from Germany as is the United States. We denounced Hitler and Hitlerism then, we denounced them repeatedly, and we have for many years now maintained a strict boycott of Nazi-made goods in an effort to contribute something to the destruction of totalitarianism.

As in the case of Mr. Hitler's dictatorship, where subsequent events proved that the American Federation of Labor had been 100-percent correct in its appraisal of the Nazi system of cruel oppression, so it was in the case of Mr. Stalin and his dictatorship of the left.

The American Federation of Labor never had any illusions about the Communist dictatorship and did not hesitate to point out its most vigorous disapproval of the Russian brand of tyrannical rule. We refused to see any substantial difference between the Fascist type of dictatorship and the Communist type, and the unholy pact between Stalin and Hitler 21 months ago—the pact which was the signal for Hitler to start this war—proved that the American Federation of Labor had been right in its refusal to draw any line of demarcation between a dictatorship of the right and a dictatorship of the left.

I am pointing these things out to give you the background of the American Federation of Labor's forthright opposition of totalitarianism going back over a period of many years. Those of you who are affiliated with the labor movement undoubtedly are familiar with this background, but the representatives of management here today may not realize that the American Federation of Labor has the longest and most consistent record of hostility to nazi-ism of any group in this country. So far as the 5,000,000 workers represented by the American Federation of Labor are concerned, there is no need to educate us to the vicious character of nazi-ism, for we have had it seared into our consciousness for close to a decade.

Seven months ago, at the sixtieth annual convention held in the city of New Orleans, the American Federation of Labor unanimously pledged that it would rally to the cause of democracy and make every necessary sacrifice to aid national defense. The convention further pledged that American workers, as represented by the A. F. of L., would do everything in their power to avoid strikes and to speed up production.

Last January the building and construction trades department of the A. F. of L., which represents more than a million and a half construction workers throughout the country—bricklayers, carpenters, electrical workers, engineers, plumbers, lathers, roofers, laborers, sheet-metal workers, iron workers, plasterers, painters, and the other building trades—held a conference in Washington.

The building and construction trades department pledged the Nation that stoppages on defense projects because of jurisdictional disputes or for any other reason would be avoided. And the department established machinery to see to it that this policy was made effective.

Now we have seen headlines galore in which the word "strike" appears. We have seen the essays of columnists and the writings of editorial authors and the drawings of cartoonists all seeking to give the impression that labor is striking left and right and impending the national-defense program. The American Federation of Labor cannot be held accountable for the actions of other groups. This is so obvious that it should not be necessary to take the time to say it. Yet the fact remains that the columnists and the cartoonists and the editorial writers, with only the rarest of exceptions, have not differentiated between the A. F. of L. and these other groups. Nothing could be more inaccurate; nothing could be more unfair.

Let us take a look at the American Federation of Labor's record and see whether or not we have kept our pledge to keep working and to work out solutions of differences in a peaceful manner. Let us look specifically at the War Department's and the Navy Department's building construction programs in which, as everybody knows, the workers involved have been A. F. of L. workers. Has the A. F. of L. been merely giving lip-service to the defense program? What does the record show?

Recently Secretary of War Stimson issued a very interesting report. This report dealt with the $1,200,000,000 construction program of the War Department, authorized by Congress so that accommodations would be available for the young men inducted into the Nation's new Army. Did the building trades of the A. F. of L. impede the cantonment construction program? Or did they buckle down and turn in one of the finest pieces of cooperation in history? The report of Secretary Stimson supplies the answer. The answer is this: Out of a total of 40,607,000 man-days worked on the cantonment program, only 14,875 man-days were lost as a result of labor difficulties.

This percentage of delay was so infinitesimally small that it amounted to only three one-hundredths of 1 percent. In other words, if there had been 33 times as many stoppages as there actually were, the delay would still have amounted to only 1 percent. Is this cooperation? I submit that it is—cooperation of the most outstanding type, cooperation which has not been surpassed by any other part of the national community.

And on the Navy's air-training station and other building construction the story is much the same. The Navy Department has not issued a report on labor's cooperation similar to the one issued by the War Department, which I have just described. But the records of the Building and Construction Trades Department show that there was only one stoppage. This was in Boston, where there was a dispute over the employment of W. P. A. workers. This was the only stoppage.

John P. Coyne, the president of the building and construction trades department, stepped into that picture promptly, and within 2 days this lone strike was at an end. So here again, with reference to the building-construction program of the Navy Department, man-days lost, as compared with man-days worked, amount to only the most microscopic fraction of 1 percent.

And when we look at the situation as regards the construction of arsenals, factories, and other buildings imperatively needed by the Nation in this emergency, we find once again that the bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, engineers, and other A. F. of L. building-trades mechanics have been doing their part and that stoppages have been practically nonexistent.

Yet, despite this truly wonderful cooperation in the national effort, you have seen and heard little praise of labor. On the other hand, you have seen quite a few brickbats tossed. However on that score we won't worry a great deal. Labor representatives are not the least bit thin-skinned and being on the receiving end of fast-traveling brickbats is no new experience.

Now I have mentioned the 99.97 record of uninterrupted work on the part of the A. F. of L.'s building trades in the defense program, which in my opinion, is more than enough to have earned for the building trades a permanent place in the Hall of Fame of service to the Nation. But this is not all that the building trades have done. As a matter of fact, I couldn't begin to tell the whole story if I kept you here for a week. But there is time for one typical example of what I have in mind.

At Corpus Christi, Tex., which is down on the Gulf of Mexico, the Navy Department decided that it would like to erect a naval air-training station. Not just a little proposition, mind you, but a project to cost the sum of $44,000,000.

The mission of this station is to train thousands of young men to defend their country in the air, where so much of the fighting in this war is taking place. In July of 1940 the first ground was turned at Corpus Christi. Eighteen thousand men were employed in the gigantic job of constructing that air base for Uncle Sam.

Big as the State of Texas is, and it's the largest State in the Union, Texas couldn't begin to supply the thousands of craftsmen needed to construct this training station out in the wilderness beside the Gulf of Mexico. The Navy Department advises me that one-fourth, or almost 5,000 of the workers had to be brought in from outside Texas. And most of these did not come from just the other side of the Texas line. Most of these came from as far away as Chicago and New York, and San Francisco, and Seattle.

How was this done?

Through the machinery of the building and construction trades department. No other agency, public or private, could have accomplished this job of producing such large numbers of trained men, for no other agency has the facilities or the organizational set-up required to accomplish such a feat. The building and constructions trades department had made an inventory of available manpower, and when it was informed of the job requirements, the department reached out for these men and dispatched them to Corpus Christi. These men were brought in without it costing the Government a single penny for transportation costs.

The A. F. of L. mechanics at Corpus Christi put up with primitive living quarters—tourist camps, trailer carts, and beach shacks—without complaint. For they knew that these were not normal times. They knew that they were making their contribution to the preservation of our American way of life. They worked hard. And the result was that the Corpus Christi training station was completed months ahead of schedule.

This sort of cooperation has been given by the A. F. of L. time and again. We expect to continue to give this type of service to the Nation.

Now, while I come to you today as a representative of labor, not as a spokesman for management, I would be less than fair if I

were to attempt to leave with you the impression that labor alone is solely and exclusively deserving of credit for the splendid record of cooperation in the national-defense program.

The truth is that this record of uninterrupted work would not have been possible but for the fact that the Government, when it started on this vast building program, awarded the contracts to outstanding firms who had enjoyed contractual relations with the building-trades organizations of the American Federation of Labor for many years. These employers had many years' experience with collective bargaining, with the unionized condition of their workers, with the set-up, in short, in which workers and employers pull together harmoniously most of the time and, when a difference of some sort does arise, it is quickly adjusted in a peaceful manner.

I would be less than frank if I were to say that in all other fields of national-defense effort records have been made quite as good as that made in the construction end of the defense program. On the other hand, it is a fact that, so far as the American Federation of Labor is concerned, records of uninterrupted production have been made which are far superior to what was done in 1917 and 1918. The millions of working men and women in the rank and file of organized labor have made sacrifices, maintained strict discipline, and kept the wheels of production turning.

Yet today we find that the rights and freedom of these patriotic American workers are threatened right here at home, by the forces of reaction within our own land, as well as by the menace of the Nazis abroad.

There is today before Congress a proposal known as the Vinson bill which provides—with criminal penalties—for a 25-day compulsory work period before a strike could take place. This measure is a vicious antilabor proposal which would destroy the traditional rights of free American workers under the pretence of aiding national defense.

The advocates of this bill beat their breasts and say that it is really not an antilabor bill. They say that the bill merely calls for a compulsory cooling-off period before a strike begins. This compulsory cooling-off period, they point out, is limited to 25 days.

But the time limit is of no consequence. If Congress has the power—despite the thirteenth amendment to our Constitution which abolished slavery in this country for all time—to force men and women, under threat of criminal punishment, to work against their will, not for 25 days, but only for 25 hours, or 25 minutes, or even 1 minute, than Congress obviously has the power to compel them, by the same method, to work indefinitely without their consent. And that is slavery. That is what Hitler has done. That is what we are supposed to be building planes and guns and tanks and ships to prevent from coming to our country.

It is one thing when we have voluntary cooling-off periods as a result of contracts between labor and employer voluntarily entered into. You men in the construction industry know that; as a matter of fact, this is one of the standard provisos in such contracts and has been for a period of many years. That, I say, is one thing.

But it is quite another thing indeed when Government undertakes to impose a doctrine of force upon workers; it is quite another thing when Government proposes to wipe out the fundamental American principle of free labor in a free nation; it is quite another thing when a worker is made to face a fine of $5,000 or 1 year's imprisonment if he refuses to be subjected to a system of involuntary servitude identical with that which exists in Nazi Germany and Nazi-conquered countries.

There is no need for such legislation as this vicious bill I have described. Furthermore, if this bill were passed, it would hamper rather than further the progress of our national-defense effort. It could not be enforced without the extreme use of police power. It would cause such resentment as to bring about a chaotic condition in industry which would seriously impede the defense program.

The Vinson bill seeks to establish a totalitarian principle. That principle, in the opinion of organized labor and, I may say, in the opinion of enlightened employers, has no place on the statute books of a nation like ours, which is dedicated to liberty and justice.

The great national effort in which we are now engaged calls for a spirit of national unity based on the fundamental principles of the democracy in which we all share a common vital interest. We cannot defend that democracy by methods which are repulsive to all who cherish liberty nor by methods which by their very nature destroy democracy itself.

But this does not mean that the American Federation of Labor recommends or urges strikes in this time of critical national emergency. Quite the contrary.

By proclaiming an unlimited national emergency, the President has brought home to the American people that it is incumbent upon all of us to make sacrifices for the national defense. Forces beyond our control have disrupted the usual procedures of our daily lives. We are not living in normal times. If we try to pretend that there is no emergency, we invite the tragedy which has befallen nation after nation in Europe.

In recognition of this critical situation in which our country now finds herself, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor has now followed up its no-strike policy, which was first enunciated when the national-defense program began. Let me read this declaration of the executive council, which was adopted at the council's meeting in Washington only last week, so that you may see for yourself just where the A. F. of L. stands today with respect to national-defense production. This is what the council says, and I quote:

"The President of the United States has said that national-defense production must not be interrupted or obstructed by industrial disputes." He has appealed to us in all good will to utilize the conciliation and mediation machinery set up by the Government to avoid stoppages of production.

We must do this. We can do this. And we pledge our good faith as Americans to the President that we will do it.

Therefore, we call upon every union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor to refrain for any reason whatsoever from calling a strike interfering with national-defense production until full opportunity has first been given to the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor and to the National Defense Mediation Board to bring about a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

The American Federation of Labor will take disciplinary action itself against any local union coming under its direct jurisdiction which violates this policy.

That is the statement of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, and it seems to me that if anybody at this late date had any doubts as to whether or not the American Federation of Labor was or was not cooperating in the national-defense program, this statement should put any such doubts at rest for good and all.

The need of the hour is for national unity. Sound management, constructive liberal government and free, loyal labor—we must all unite in this effort, we must all roll up our sleeves and we must work. We must work as we have never worked before. We must all work and we must work together. People talk and people have written of the production which Adolf Hitler achieved in Nazi Germany, but I say to you now that when our industrial set-up here in free America really begins to roll, no country on earth will be able to equal the production rate attained.

Organized labor, as represented by the American Federation of Labor, stands four-square behind the President of the United States. Organized labor knows better perhaps than any other group of citizens what happens to the liberties which we cherish when democracy goes under and totalitarianism comes into power.

Trade unions—nor for that matter, any other form of freedom—cannot exist under a dictatorship. By the same token, dictators cannot long hope to maintain their power, where free trade unions operate.

As in 1916, 1917, and 1918, so again in 1941 the American Federation of Labor, made up as it is of millions of workers who know that we cannot be good trade unionists unless we are, first of all, good citizens, is giving and will continue to give, to our national Government the most wholehearted type of cooperation. I cannot speak for other organizations claiming to represent American labor, but so far as the American Federation of Labor is concerned, that is where we stand.

And so the answer to those who would inquire as to labor's responsibility in this emergency is very simple. Labor's responsibility—labor's job, if you please—is to use its trade-union machinery to the very limit to achieve a national defense that dictators will fear as well as respect. How will labor discharge this responsibility? How will it meet this supreme test? Speaking for the millions of workers affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, I can say to you here and now, that we will discharge our responsibility in a way that will prove beyond question that the American system of free institutions maintained by free men is superior to any other system the mind of man has ever been able to devise.

Cost-Plus Evils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) DAILY ARGUS-LEADER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader of June 7, 1941]

COST-PLUS EVILS

Representative ENGEL of Michigan has rendered a rather notable individual service to the Nation. Hearing many reports a few months ago about heavy expenditures in the construction of Army camps, he decided to make a personal investigation. He visited camp after camp, conferring with contractors, Army officers, and others. He obtained figures on construction costs, analyzed them and ascertained just why the expenditures in many instances were far in excess of estimates.

His surveys were published in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, providing a factual basis for additional comment and action.

Now he comes forth with the sharp accusation that about $250,000,000 of the $800,000,000 appropriated for cantonments has been wasted. He blames much of this waste to the fact that these jobs were handled on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract basis.

"It is my recommendation," he concludes, "that all construction contracts hereafter be advertised and let on a competitive-bid system, giving the job to the lowest qualified bidder. I am firmly convinced that every cantonment project could have been let on a competitive-bid basis with a loss of very little, if any, time at a saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayers."

To appreciate his thought, one must understand the cost-plus system. Under it, the contractor takes a job with the agreement that he is to be paid for the total costs plus a percentage fee. Thus the more the job costs, the larger is his fee. In consequence, there is no particular reason why the contractor should resist efforts to advance either material or labor costs. And there are reasons why he should welcome them because the more the camp costs, the more he gets.

In private business, cost-plus contracts often work out satisfactorily but the relationship there is different. The private spender will check carefully and if the contractor spends too much money, his reputation will suffer. But no such attitude prevails in respect to Government business.

As we consider this subject, we are reminded of an incident described recently by C. A. Christopherson, of Sioux Falls. As a Member of Congress, he served on a committee checking World War costs shortly after the cessation of hostilities. One item was the expenditures made for mules. The Government, it seems, needed many mules. So a man was hired to go and get them. He was awarded the job on a cost-plus basis. If we recall the figures rightly, he received a fee equal to 5 percent of the purchase price. Thus, if he bought a mule for $100, he got $5. But if he paid $200 for the same mule, he got $10. Well, it seems, the prices for mules went sky-high. The buyer didn't argue with the sellers when they said their mules were worth $200 or $300 or even $500 each. The Government got the mules, to be sure, but the buyer made a fortune out of his share in the transaction.

We should not make the same error this time, having the experience of the World War as a guide. Representative ENGEL's current recommendation merits consideration.

Of Rich and Poor, 1891–1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Record of May 15, 1941:

[From the Philadelphia Record of May 15, 1941]

OF RICH AND POOR—1891–1941

(By Gervase N. Love)

Fifty years ago today a man of the mountains, one of the greatest intellects of his century, wrote a letter from his prison in Rome. The letter went to the far corners of the earth, and for half a century it has influenced, directly or indirectly, the thinking of men great and small, of princes and bishops, teachers and students, workingmen and those who employ them.

The imprisoned mountaineer was Pope Leo XIII. His prison was the Vatican. His letter was the famous encyclical—addressed to his bishops on five continents—on the condition of labor. It is known as Rerum Novarum, from its first two words.

The encyclical was the voice of the Catholic Church, crying against principles of materialism and false liberalism which in a recently industrialized world had made the lot of the workingman an unhappy one. It was the voice of the church pointing out what the world had forgotten—the dignity of those who work and of their labor, the social justice that could stem only from religious principles.

THE EVIL AND ITS REMEDY

Pope Leo pointed out with unerring finger the grievances of working people. Then he restated with new clarity and authority the traditional teaching of the church on the relations of employers and employees and on the rights and duties that accompany property, and applied it specifically to conditions that in great degree are nearly as widespread now as in 1891. He upheld the right of private property and refuted socialism, then outlined the remedy for the evil: The joint action of state, church, employer, and employee.

"It is no easy matter," he wrote, "to define the relative rights and duties of the rich and of the poor, of capital and of labor.

"But all agree—and there can be no question whatever about it—that some remedy must be found, and found quickly, for the misery and wretchedness pressing so heavily and so unjustly, even at this moment, on the vast majority of the working classes.

"The custom of working by contract and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals have brought about a condition of things by means of which a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself."

These words have a familiar ring today.

Socialism, the Pope maintained, did not offer a way out of the difficulty. First to suffer under its doctrine that private property must be abolished and come under common ownership, to be administered by the state, would be the worker, he asserted.

"When a man engages in remunerative labor," he wrote, "the impelling reason and motive of his work is to obtain property, and thereafter to hold it as his very own."

To acquire and hold private property by legitimate means, he contended, is the natural right of man.

It is impossible to reduce society to a dead level as socialism would do, he claimed. Inequalities in fortune are the natural result of inequalities in capabilities, intelligence, health, and strength.

Basically, he added, all men are equally the children of God; as human beings they share the same human rights and liberties. He denied flatly that one class is naturally antagonistic to another. Capital and labor complement each other, he asserted, and are not by nature intended to live in conflict.

GUIDEPOSTS OF RELIGION

Religion, the Pope declared, sets up guideposts for each class in its relations with the others.

The worker, the church teaches, must carry out in good faith all equitable agreements he makes with his employer. He must respect his employer's person and property, and must not indulge in violence or rioting to gain his ends.

The employer, it teaches, must not regard his workers as his slaves. He must not treat his employees as a soulless commodity, the source of so much muscle or skill to be used to build up his fortune.

"To exercise pressure upon the indigent and destitute for the sake of gain, and to gather one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws human and divine," he wrote.

STATE MUST ACT

If mankind lived by these precepts, he said, the problem would be resolved and industrial strife banished. But many "worldly and ambitious" men to whom punishment for an injustice is something in the vague future will not live by them. Hence, wrote the Pope, the state must step in when controversy arises.

"When workpeople have recourse to a strike," he wrote, "it is frequently because the hours of labor are too long, or the work too hard, or the wages insufficient.

"The grave inconvenience of this not uncommon occurrence should be obviated by public remedial measures, for such paralyzing of labor not only affects the masters and their workpeople alike, but is extremely injurious to trade, and to the general interest of the public.

"On such occasions violence and disorder are generally not far distant; and thus it happens that the public peace is seriously imperiled."

It is the duty of the state to eliminate such troubles by legislation removing the cause, he claimed.

Pope Leo next took up the question of wages.

"Wages, as we are told, are regulated by free consent," he said, "and, therefore, the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part, and seemingly is not called upon to do anything beyond."

But—

"Let it be taken for granted that workman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and in particular should agree freely as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, that remuneration should be sufficient to maintain the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort.

"If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice.

"(Concerning) * * * the hours of labor in different trades, and the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, it is advisable, in order to supersede undue interference on the part of the state * * * that recourse should be had to societies or boards * * * or some other mode of guarding the interests of wage earners, the state being appealed to should circumstances require, for its sanction and protection."

THE NEED FOR UNIONS

Most important of all such societies are unions of working people, declared Pope Leo. He approved the ancient guilds, but held that unions should be adapted to the present.

"It is gratifying to know that there are actually in existence," he wrote, "not a few associations of this nature, consisting even of workmen alone, or of workmen and employers together.

"But it greatly were to be desired that they should become more numerous and more efficient. * * * Let the state watch over these societies of citizens, banded together for the exercise of their rights, but let it not thrust itself into their peculiar concerns and their organizations; for things that move and live by the spirit inspiring them may be killed by the rough grasp of a hand from without."

That resounding utterance came at a time when unions, in most countries, had few friends among rulers and legislators. Such elementary things as picketing were allowed or restrained upon judicial whim.

The philosophy behind Rerum Novarum is, of course, that of the Catholic Church and as such is based in Revelations. Perhaps the greatest influence upon Pope Leo was that of the Jesuit teachers, at whose feet he sat from his childhood through his ordination. From them he learned respect and love for St. Thomas Aquinas (died 1274), greatest teacher of the church.

Perhaps the foremost popularizers of the encyclical in this country are the Catholic Central Verein and Catholic Women's Union, the Jesuits, and the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems.

The Catholic Central Verein and Catholic Women's Union is an outgrowth of the active interest in social reform carried to the United States by German emigrants in the last century. Tonight its members in Philadelphia will mark the anniversary of the papal letter they have so long worked to put before the public.

In St. Boniface's Hall, Hancock Street below Diamond, Dr. Anthony L. Ostheimer, of the faculty of the Roman Catholic High School for Boys, will speak on the encyclical that won for Leo the name of the "workingman's Pope."

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of June 11, 1941:

[From the Boston Herald of June 11, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The lukewarm interest of the public and Congress in the President's renewed proposal for a Canadian-American-St. Lawrence waterway seems to foreshadow another refusal to authorize such a project. Senate and House conferees have voted already against the use of R. F. C. funds for it, and there is evidence that Canada is so hard pressed financially and otherwise that Ottawa will not see fit to urge the undertaking. The matter stands about where it was in 1934, when a treaty failed in the Senate. The only difference is that the administration now presses for an agreement instead of a treaty, the reason being that a majority in Congress would suffice for such an arrangement, whereas a treaty requires a two-thirds approval by the Senate.

The President's new statement of the case is not impressive. To his assertion that there will be a shortage of electricity and of shipbuilding, a shortage which the project would remove, opponents reply vigorously and effectively. The required electricity could be obtained more quickly and more economically from steam plants, which could be built where they are needed most. They could be producing in a year and a half. The waterway hydroelectric machinery would not be operating until 1945.

There is also the powerful objection that the building of the huge waterway would divert men and materials, of which there is an actual shortage now. The best-informed men in Boston and New England question whether any benefit would come to us from the loss which it is claimed New York would suffer.

"First things first" is the strongest of all the protests. A costly undertaking which would not mature for 4 years is entitled to little consideration in a crisis when months, weeks, and even days are of vital importance. Planes, tanks, and guns for immediate delivery are what we must concentrate on at present, plus expansion of the facilities already available for shipbuilding. The reluctance of Canada to sign the agreement carries its own implications.

"Reds" Coddled in Washington, Prelate Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that Bernard Ades, a former Baltimorean, is now employed with the United States Housing Authority. He is a leader affiliated with communistic groups. With so many worthy people seeking employment why should the Government employ people like that?

I immediately called the offices of Mr. Nathan Straus, Administrator, Mr. Leon Keyserling, and Mrs. Case, of the personnel department, and demanded his immediate dismissal.

In the Baltimore Sun of this morning His Excellency Archbishop Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, D. C., in his address at Mount St. Mary's College commencement, stated that the United States must fight the "red" Nazi doctrine. When a clerical leader such as Archbishop Curley must forcibly bring to the attention of the people of this country a situation such as this, it is time that we awaken to the menace of the "red" and "pink" Nazi Communists. The last place that we should expect to find them is in the Government employ. What a sad state of affairs that our taxes are being used to pay their salaries.

The article follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 12, 1941]

"REDS" CODDLED IN WASHINGTON, PRELATE SAYS—ARCHBISHOP CURLEY MAKES DECLARATION IN ADDRESS AT MOUNT ST. MARY'S—POINTS TO DAMAGE DONE IN SCHOOLS AND LABOR BY PROPAGANDA

EMMITSBURG, MD., June 11.—Archbishop Curley today declared "Washington coddled Communists even when our own President was hissed as he addressed some of the seemingly misguided youth of the Nation."

Speaking at Mount St. Mary's College commencement exercises this afternoon, the archbishop said "the greatest danger to our country comes from the splendidly organized propaganda of those who swear allegiance to the murderer of Moscow and the philosophy of Karl Marx as interpreted by Lenin, Trotsky, and the present occupant of the dictatorial throne in Moscow."

WORKERS LOSE FREEDOM

The archbishop asserted that "minority groups in labor control the workers to a point where the latter lose their freedom to work, and we have witnessed only a few days ago the position where organized minorities snapped their fingers not only in the faces of their recognized labor leaders but also in the face of the Government itself."

He also declared "it is not so long ago since the lady occupying the highest place in the country spoke in favor of strikes—not limiting them to any time.

"Now when she finds herself confronted with the present sort of situation, she deems it just a pity that our Army had to be called out to protect the workingman in his rights to earn an honest living and at the same time to give his services for the immediate welfare as is demanded in our present course of national defense.

"The whole attitude is so stupid that to me it is one of the minor mysteries which somebody else must solve."

CONDITIONS IN EUROPE

Taking a phrase a speaker had used at the exercises, "What do we face in the future?" the archbishop said:

"You face the Army camp and $21 a month."

After outlining the present conditions in Europe, the archbishop continued:

"Nation after nation in Europe have lost all that they held dearest, their liberty and all the privileges that go with free men who govern themselves.

"The first monuments of European culture have been wiped out. But still worse, the fields of Europe have been fertilized with the blood of hundreds of thousands of fighting men—and not only fighting men but noncombatants, men, women, and children, without any consideration whatsoever given to their status.

"This is the common knowledge of all who read the pages of our daily press."

IMPRESS ON AMERICA

"No events such as we have witnessed during the past 2 years can take place without leaving its impress on our own country, which although separated from Europe by nearly 3,000 miles of sea, is today close to foreign lands as a result of improved methods of transportation.

"Someone said in the past that the Nazis must be counted as the No. 1 enemy of Christianity and civilization.

"They may be counted No. 1—call them what you will—but I feel that while the Nazis may wreck and destroy as they did during the last war before 1917, the greatest danger to our country comes from the splendidly organized propaganda to those who swear allegiance to the murderer of Moscow."

WORK OF "RED" PROPAGANDA

"If the Nazis seek, as I am persuaded they seek, to control the world, it is, nevertheless, a fact that before Hitler ever came to power, Communist propaganda was doing its work in practically every section of our country and along two well-defined lines.

"They succeeded in getting a foothold in our schools, colleges, and great secular universities to such a point that when pressure was brought to bear on our democratic administration to recognize the so-called government of Stalin and his associates whose hands were dripping with the blood of millions—that pressure came not directly from Moscow or from the Internationale (which after all means the same thing) but from well-known professors and teachers in our own American educational system and from left-wing writers who stormed the White

House and Congress with demands for recognition of 'Russia's great democratic system.'"

EXAMPLES NEAR HOME

"There is no man who has kept in touch with conditions in our American system of education who does not know that communism has made itself felt among teachers and the pupils. We have had examples of that influence quite near home.

The second line of communistic propaganda was among the laboring classes. Well-trained propagandists for this type of work endeavored to obtain for themselves key positions in groups of splendidly organized American workers with the result that the power of an organized minority was felt very soon in union after union.

"The purpose of communistic propaganda is not to better conditions of the workingman; their chief objective is to arouse discontent, and that will be their objective even if the workingman were receiving double the union wage of today.

"It was the old method of Lenin and his followers in the years preceding 1917—it is their method today, and the unions that permit themselves to be guided by such so-called leaders are blind to their own best interests and the best interests of our Nation.

"What I cannot understand is that this whole system of communistic propaganda must have been known to those elected by the people to steer the ship of state in our beloved country, and yet the fact remains that Washington coddled Communists even when our own President was hissed as he addressed some of the seemingly misguided youth of the Nation.

"WOULD BE HAPPIER

"I have often said—and I repeat it—that the less one knows about the situation in Washington, the happier he is, and if he were as far removed from the Capital City of Washington as the North Pole he would find himself very probably a better American with finer loyalty to the men who are the heads of our Government today.

"This is a time when Americans everywhere are confronted with a mighty task of emerging from a recognized state of unpreparedness to a position where we can defend our own country at least—and, if possible, make that defense more effective by helping lovers of democracy everywhere.

"The time for coddling has gone. The Nation needs strength and vigor in those who are responsible for its welfare, but those qualities are never evinced when the findings of the Dies committee are referred to as a 'sordid procedure.'

"CALLS FOR ALERTNESS

"This 'sordid procedure' calls Americans everywhere to be on the alert. And now our Attorney General tells the Nation that the strikers on the Pacific coast are more in the nature of an insurrection than a strike.

"When all is said and done, there is little difference between the Nazis and Communists of the present time since Hitler and Stalin have kissed and made up. The propaganda today must be called the Nazi-Communist propaganda.

"Our country is the victim of it and it is a fertile field for the growth of the principles of Hitler and Stalin."

PLEADS FOR UNITY

John E. Haltigan, senior attorney for the Veterans' Administration, Washington, urged the graduates to adhere to the "home-spun virtues of honesty, sacrifice, loyalty, and industry in the struggle for existence in an unstable world."

Pointing out that conditions now parallel those of 1916, when his class was graduated and that some members of that class "died on the battlefields of France to preserve our form of government," Mr. Haltigan pleaded for unity among the people and loyalty to the Government.

In its 133 years, he said, Mount St. Mary's "has taught the principles of human liberty, justice, and the dignity of man" and "students of the college always have been ready to defend the liberties of our people."

Congratulating the Right Reverend John L. Sheridan, president, on his work, Mr. Haltigan said "alumni all over the country have noted that their alma mater is taking an eminent place in Catholic thought and action in this section of the country."

Appropriation for W. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me, from my observation of the working of the W. P. A. in my section of Ohio, that the rule requiring dismissal of workers after 18 months has been productive of little or no good. It has just brought worry and deprivation to families. The monthly income of the worker is insufficient for him to lay aside money to keep his family when the 18-month period expires, so the first thing he has to do is to obtain restoration to the relief rolls. The whole arrangement of transferring from one agency to the other uses up valuable time of administrative officers. In the end the W. P. A. worker is knocking at the doors for reinstatement to the W. P. A.

The rule was established on the theory widely held that W. P. A. workers shirk other work in private fields. That may be true in individual cases. By and large, however, the W. P. A. worker is eager to better himself. Otherwise 855,000 of them would not have voluntarily left the rolls in the first 9 months of this fiscal year.

In my home county of Stark, in the State of Ohio, the total of W. P. A. employees is 1,522, whereas a year ago it was 3,506. That sharp decrease is understandable. We have important defense industries in the country. The Government is erecting a large additional plant for defense purposes. The work is there and the W. P. A. workers are accepting the new employment.

In the neighboring county of Tuscarawas, the population is 68,816. This compares with a population of 234,887 in Stark County. Yet Tuscarawas County, only one-fourth as large as Stark, has a W. P. A. roll of 1,000. This shows a drop from 1,462 on January 1, 1940. Why should Tuscarawas County have so many idle compared with Stark? The answer is easily found. Tuscarawas County has not received the benefits of defense orders. In the past years that county suffered severe economic losses, such as removal of railroad shops, exhaustion of coal mines, and the dismantling of two sheet-steel plants employing 1,600 men due to industrial consolidation. Today in Tuscarawas County one-fourth of the W. P. A. workers are former steel workers and one-fourth former coal miners. Many of them are now too old to find work in other industries.

A good many of us have been contending that older workers on W. P. A. find difficulty adjusting themselves to new trades. This argument has been scoffed at in some quarters. Yet General Hershey of the Selective Service Administration has painted a darker picture of the usefulness of older men. He asked for exemption of men over 30 years from Army service, saying:

> Men are too settled after that age. They are past their physical peak, and others find it hard to learn new skills. That has been our experience in the draft to date.

Many employers in the industrial field take the same view, and that is one reason why W. P. A. rolls do not diminish at a faster rate.

It Doesn't Make Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ORLEANS ITEM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of June 10, 1941:

[From the New Orleans Item of June 10, 1941]

IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

When Mr. Roosevelt speaks of the electric power which may be had—after 4 years or more—from his St. Lawrence seaway scheme, we Louisianians who are concerned in immediate national defense should blame ourselves for having left the President ignorant of our own facilities for providing power immediately. The President can't know everything, not even with Mr. Ickes' help.

For years Washington has known Louisiana principally as a political stench. We have failed to put its better side before the country. So the national administration treated our dictatorship to a few cheap jobs, a lick here and a sop there, in recognition of political "nuisance value," while it did serious business with other States.

Jeff Davis, our oil editor, showed 2 years ago that in the immediate neighborhood of New Orleans enough natural gas was escaping from wells to run all of the factories of a city twenty times the size of New Orleans. Wasted gas is just so much wasted power. But Louisiana's gas could probably be delivered here or anywhere, in its own form or as electricity, in 4 months instead of 4 years.

Louisiana has the greatest gas fields in the world. Why, then, does Washington not put its defense industries near these gas fields?

Why does it pass bills to spend from $70,000,000 to $100,000,000, and use up 2 or 3 years and a lot of labor, building pipe lines to carry our gas up there, needlessly to aggravate the economic atrocity it has committed by foolishly squeezing all that industry into a few unduly favored States?

New Orleans and the Mississippi River cities are strategically central to 70 percent of all the oil produced in the world. Oil is fuel. Fuel is power.

Here it is. Yet the sages in Washington prepare to pipe it to the East through lines subject to sabotage for more than a thousand miles.

To do the obvious and economic thing, to set up their emergency industries where the fuel, power, and transport are, has not even been seriously considered.

Why? In part because of our own inertia in not impressing these facts on Washington. But only in part. There must be other causes. These are in Washington.

Power can also be generated cheaply and well at the mouths of the coal mines in Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Illinois. But if the coal must be moved elsewhere, it can be moved in barges for about a quarter of the rail rates. We have the barges.

Federal lines on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and the Warrior River, tapping most of the coal and iron of America, are an ideal method of offsetting the rail and highway congestion and the ship shortage of the East. Notwithstanding that the Government has spent its own money on this barging system, Washington gives little evidence that it knows the barges exist.

With cotton production restricted, hundreds of thousands of men and women in these Southern States are idle. We have the greatest surplus of labor on the continent. Our responsible unions have passed resolutions binding themselves not to strike against defense industries. They did so not as a bid for their fair share of Federal work, but because the southern people are taking the needs of the country seriously and patriotically. Foreign agents, Communists, and other troublemakers don't find favor among these people. Most southerners are old-time Americans.

The Government asked New Orleans to do some shipbuilding during the World War—looking to 4 or 5 years of conflict. Our people responded by building the industrial canal. It cost them $40,000,000 and is fit for defense industries of most kinds. But it has been completely ignored in Washington. After years of struggle one shipyard is building on it, but this is a local enterprise.

By possession of power, oil, gas, coal, mild climate, large labor supply, safety against attack, Louisiana has everything a defense industry needs—and they are immediately available. Yet the President and his advisers ignore them all to go into a congested area of great labor shortage to set to work on a billion-dollar seaway scheme which may provide us 5 years hence with power which is actually going to waste right now in Louisiana.

Many months of the year the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes are closed to shipping by ice. Our Lake-to-Gulf waterways are navigable the year round. Someone should convey such information to Washington.

Intelligent southerners are tired of hearing the South described as Economic Problem No. 1 by Washington sages, who hope to uplift its people to the point of wearing shoes and pretend to help it by ignoring its just claims and by starving it through economic discrimination.

We have heard more than one thoughtful person express the view that the Nation's economic problem No. 1 is the administration at Washington.

Looking Into the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House of Representatives, at the seventy-fifth commencement exercises of Dean Academy, Franklin, Mass., on Tuesday, June 10, 1941:

Mr. President, members of the faculty, the student body, and visitors, many precious memories come to me here today. I used to visit this academy to play baseball and football. Dean was a tough rival for us schoolboys of those days. Visitors seldom took away with them the laurels of victory.

As I looked over your beautiful campus today I recalled a hard-fought football match of long ago played on that ground. A gravel walk divided the field just about the middle chalk line. It almost hurts yet when I think of the punishment we took that day. It was strange, but it seemed most of the plays were concluded on that gravel walk. At the end of the game it was a badly battered, scratched, and defeated team which left the field in the twilight of a crisp October day. And yet—or is it the years creeping up on me—it seems to me those were good old days. Those were good days for America because happiness, security, opportunity, and confidence were everywhere. American boys and girls knew they had a real chance to get ahead. America was on the march. With determination, courage, a passion for work and thrift, we were helping to build what has become the richest and most powerful Nation of all history.

We were a people unafraid. We had faith in ourselves and in our future.

Today doubt, confusion, and despair are universal. Even we in America face questions of greater gravity and more potential danger than ever before, except, possibly, when the Revolutionary War was decided upon, and when the Civil War rent the Nation.

Despite all these threats, I still believe in the future of our Nation. We will struggle through because the spirit of our pioneering ancestors is not extinguished. Self-reliance still animates the American people. What we most need to do is to be on guard, so that purveyors of fear cannot undermine the confidence of too many of our people. Whatever may befall, we will face it as a united nation, unafraid. Unity of spirit and unity of action will overcome any threat to our security and freedom.

I welcome this opportunity to talk to young people. We of my generation are getting ready to turn over to you younger citizens the trusteeship of this great, free Nation; this rich heritage of priceless liberty and equality of opportunity. You, in turn, will hold it in trust, and enjoy its advantages until you pass it on to the hands of those who shall come after you.

I do not want to say too much, my young friends, about what we, of the passing generation, have done with our stewardship of this great Nation and its resources. I am afraid we do not hand the country over to you in the condition it should have been. However, nothing is to be gained from recrimination or vain regrets. There is a job ahead for the youth of America to get this Nation back on an even keel.

It is, I believe, the custom at commencement exercises to say, "The world lies before you." It does. And you are courageous enough to face the truth frankly and unafraid. It is a tough world which lies before you. Problems which hold within themselves the fate of civilization will be passed on to you by the present generation to be solved.

On the one hand, we face the onslaughts of men who lust for power and dominion; they are ready to shed blood, bomb cities, blast innocent men, women, and children into mangled forms, and destroy the noblest works of men, to attain power and dominion.

On the other hand, we are confronted by internal problems. They have to a great extent been obscured by the hysteria of war, and the frenzied defense activities. But they have not in the slightest degree been solved. They have been aggravated instead. There is just as much danger to be guarded against in these internal problems as there is in any external threats.

Our national debt is already far above any figure hitherto dreamed of. How much higher it must go, no man can say. You are coming into activity at a period when taxes will be heavier than ever before in the history of this Nation. These taxes will retard expansion. They will make progress of the individual difficult. They may well become so burdensome as to threaten our whole system of private enterprise. That would not be displeasing to a well-organized group in this country which is stronger than many suspect. It is a group to be closely watched.

We must begin again to practice the old New England habit of thrift and economy. There is need for many billions for our national defense. There can be no stint in the building of that defense. We must build and maintain a two-ocean Navy. We must become all-powerful in the air. We must build up and maintain an efficient army, fully mechanized and equipped. These are all essential for our security in this age when the world has gone war-mad.

These vast demands make it imperative to reduce drastically our non-defense expenditures. Every dollar unwisely expended is a blow against our national security. Every dollar wasted means a dollar less for vital airplanes and warships.

We must eliminate expenditures which in normal peace times would be highly desirable. We cannot meet the needs of national defense without sacrifices and self-denial. We must have the courage to put our affairs in order.

Men are being called to the colors to make this Nation secure. Those who stay at home have an equally difficult and patriotic task. They must be a powerful stabilizing force for a sound government. They must be a mighty force to uphold democracy and make certain that in this free land of ours there shall not be one-man or one-party rule. Absolutism in any form is incompatible with a free people or a free government.

You young people are entering upon your trusteeship of this Nation in an era when too many of our people are being persuaded, free constitutional government lacks efficiency in this modern day. Don't be fooled by that. Constitutional government does not lack efficiency. Some of the people who are charged with operating our Government may lack efficiency, but there's nothing wrong with constitutional government when it's run right.

You of the graduating class are now going out from this peaceful academy which has done so much for your spiritual and cultural

progress. You will take your places in a confused and fearful world. You must consecrate yourselves as citizens to your task of maintaining that eternal vigilence which has ever been the price of liberty. You must meet with courage and determination the attempts which are being made to destroy the American way of government and of life. This is a battle which will take all the courage of which loyal American men and women are capable. Our internal problems, the problem of want in the midst of too much of everything; the growing dependence of the people on the Government for support; foreign propagandists, and proponents of alien philosophies who would overthrow our American system of government and of life; all of these problems must be met—and solved—here in America.

You have so much to offer, so much to give; there is so much you young men and women can do for your country, for yourselves, and for posterity. While the situation calls for great sacrifices, it also offers tremendous opportunities for leadership; for the happiness and the satisfaction which comes from a sense of doing your duty well.

Those men and women of a past day who patriotically sacrificed their own lives, or the lives of their loved ones, cherished their Government and their country because they gave so much to establish the American way. And so today we must prepare to sacrifice for our Government and our way of life. But the one thing which is greater than to die for one's country is to live for it.

We—you—must at all hazards preserve Americanism. When we speak of the American way we are speaking of a form of government—rather a method of government—and a way of life, which have evolved here in the United States. Our American way of government is a bi-party system; it is based upon the concept that men can approximate truth and justice most closely, short of Divine inspiration, by our method of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise.

Our American way of life, under our constitutional republican form of government, is the way of free enterprise.

For several years we have witnessed a growing tendency to increase concentration of power in the Federal Government at Washington. Such centralization of power operates to the impairment of the rights and liberties and powers reserved by the Constitution to the States and the people. All trends toward the concentration of power in the Federal Government at Washington are to be regarded with grave suspicion and a very critical attitude. Statesmen and students of other years have warned us over and over that the whole tendency of government is constantly to seek to increase its power. They have warned us that every bit of power given to government will be utilized by the Government, whenever the opportunity offers, to acquire still greater power for itself.

You young ladies and gentlemen of this academy have had a rare opportunity to fit yourselves for the struggle which lies before you to maintain Americanism and to protect and perpetuate the Constitution. You are well prepared to continue the trusteeship of the great Bill of Rights. That Bill of Rights holds for you all the liberties and privileges which make life worth living.

I want to speak a few words directly to three of you students who I understand will have fulfilled the requirements for a junior-college diploma. What a real distinction is yours to be the first three graduates of the Dean Academy Junior College. You should be proud of that distinction. In the years to come it will be a source of very great pleasure to each of you to be able to say "I was one of those first three."

I hope you will not forget to pay tribute in your hearts to a great and able man who is known as the father of the American school system. Just about 2 miles from here is the birthplace of Horace Mann. You all know something about that great American statesman and educational reformer. He was born at Franklin in 1796. I think I have a special reverence for him because he started out in life a poor boy. He struggled in poverty to acquire an education. He loved an education because he sacrificed so much for it. He wanted you young people of today to have a broader opportunity for higher education than he had. He labored hard, indeed, to bring it about. Out of the great heart of Horace Mann, out of his great lover for his fellow men, has come that practical affection for you, whom he never saw. It has resulted in your having this opportunity at this academy for the education you are receiving.

I wish I had time to discuss more fully Horace Mann, and the tremendous and undying work he did for the furtherance of American education. But, as your headmaster so very sensibly observed in one of his letters to me concerning this talk, "No souls are saved after 20 minutes."

I do want to give you, however, and I hope you will write it large upon the tablets of your memories, one of the last statements made by Horace Mann, in 1859, a few weeks before he died at the age of 63 at Yellow Springs, Ohio. In his last baccalaureate address he said to his students:

"Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity."

Your great task, my young fellow citizens, the great struggle which lies before you, is to preserve our American way of government and of life. Pressure from many different directions is being exerted to break down the ideals of our forefathers. We must not give up our faith in ourselves. We must not lose confidence and reliance in ourselves. Our forefathers, fleeing from oppression, came to the uncharted shores of this continent seeking liberty. From its unwatered plains and trackless forests they carved out the greatest nation ever achieved by any people since the dawn of civilization. They did it through self-reliance and courage. The United States today contains 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of its population. It normally consumes 48 percent of the world's coffee, 53 percent of its tin, 56 percent of its rubber, 21 percent of its sugar, 72 percent of its silk, 36 percent of its coal, 42 percent of its pig iron, 47 percent of its copper, and 69 percent of its crude petroleum. The United States operates 60 percent of the world's telephone and telegraph facilities. It owns 80 percent of the motorcars in use and operates 33 percent of the railroads. It produces 70 percent of the oil, 60 percent of the wheat and cotton, 40 percent of the lead and coal output of the world.

The United States possesses more than $17,000,000,000 in gold, it has two-thirds of civilization's banking resources, and the purchasing power of its population is greater than that of 500,000,000 people in Europe and much larger than that of more than a billion Asiatics. Its capacity to produce armaments of war or the needs of peace is greater than all the nations of Europe combined.

That, my young friends, is the kind of a country you are inheriting. You can make of it what you will.

Have faith in yourselves. Have faith in your citizenship. Have faith in your people. Have faith in your Nation. Be not daunted by any threat of any assault from dictator-driven peoples. Slaves were never the masters of free men—and never will be. You will have to sacrifice much. You will have to bear much. You will have to give much to support your Government and your country. In those sacrifices, in the support, in the giving, you will find your richest blessings and your greatest happiness. Your lives certainly will not be drab or dull. Struggles give opportunities for victories and victories mean thrills. You will get a lot of fun out of them.

Let me say to you that, as the years roll on, long after these pleasant corridors of this quiet academy have ceased to echo your footfall, when time has frosted your brow, you will learn what so many of us have learned before you; only in giving, in giving the best of yourselves, to your country and to your fellow men, can you really find the joy of living which, if you do not find it, leaves human experience a puzzle of unhappy confusion and futility.

Let me again say to you in the words of Horace Mann:

"Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity."

The Farmer's Fight for Parity Crop Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

EDITORIAL BY CLARENCE ROBERTS, EDITOR OF THE FARMER-STOCKMAN

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial by Clarence Roberts, editor of the Farmer-Stockman, entitled "The Farmer's Fight for Parity Crop Loans":

THE FARMER'S FIGHT FOR PARITY CROP LOANS

(By Clarence Roberts, editor of the Farmer-Stockman)

The fight for crop loans of 85 percent of parity was one the farmer could not avoid. The fight was forced on him. He has no apology to make and, if forced to, he would do it again.

The idea of cheap food based on low farm prices was spreading dangerously through the Nation. Cabinet officials had endorsed it. The consumer, of course, did so.

The farmer faced not only a growing public opinion in favor of low farm prices, but also increasing prices of things he must buy. He had to act quickly, and vigorously, in his defense.

Much of the criticism to which the farmer has been subject is most unfair. Here are two examples:

The president of the American Bakers' Association threw one fit right after another when Congress passed the 85-percent parity bill and urged the President to veto it.

Now, the baking industry is one which takes flour made from 1.5 to 2 cents' worth of wheat, as the farmer sells it today, and makes it into a loaf of bread for which the consumer pays 10 cents.

If the farmer gave his wheat away, that 10-cent loaf of bread would still sell for 8 cents. The farmer contends that he is entitled to 2 cents out of a dime loaf and that a farm price of 96 cents (85 percent of parity Oklahoma basis) is only a fair price. And for that contention he will keep on fighting.

The president of the Association of Cotton Spinners was also highly critical of the 85-percent parity bill. He worked desperately to defeat it.

While cotton was going up 2 cents a pound to the farmer as the result of the parity bill, cotton yarns went up 8 cents a pound. After allowing for waste, the mills had put on an increase equal to three times the increase in the price of raw cotton.

So greedy did the cotton spinners become that a price ceiling was clamped down on certain yarns as a measure to protect the public. Yarns which had been hiked to 42 cents a pound were cut down to 30 cents.

Complete data has been widely circulated among farmers to show that even at 50 cents a pound cotton mills will make plenty of profit. Their profit from a 42-cent price, had they been permitted to get it, would have been enormous.

When the farmer considers such criticism from those apparently ready to hike prices to the sky, he gets just a little cynical and wonders how many friends he has among the general public.

It is estimated that the national income this year will increase by $10,000,000,000 over last year. On the basis of population, the farmer ought to get one-fourth of that, or 2.8 billions. Instead, he merely hopes to get one billion of it. And he will get that one billion by grace of the 85-percent parity bill, without which his income would be little greater than in 1940, while paying higher prices for everything he buys.

The farmer is not exactly happy over the fact that he must fight in Congress for a fair share of the national income. But he well knows he didn't start the fight. It started long decades ago when industry demanded and secured high tariffs. It was then taken up by labor, which has secured ample legislation for its protection. The farmer has no choice but to fight on.

At last farmers are agreed on what they want and must have—a fair price for farm products. It is not going to be easy to swerve them from that objective.

A Plea for Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

ARTICLE OF JUDGE JONAH J. GOLDSTEIN, OF THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS, NEW YORK

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by an outstanding American, the Honorable Jonah J. Goldstein, a judge of the Court of General Sessions, county of New York, State of New York, which I regard as being most timely and appropriate. A translation of Judge Goldstein's article was recently published in Il Progresso Italo-Americano, a publication of New York City.

The article follows:

Whenever I hear of a case of intolerance shown to an individual in this great city I am grieved. I know that it happens—and if it just happens once, that is once too often. We all know that upon occasion some person, firm, or organization will put an "ad" in the paper seeking employees; the "ad" may finish up with the words, "Americans only need apply." Anyone who uses such language and harbors the thoughts that these words imply when used in this way just doesn't know the meaning of the word "American." I love America and everything for which it stands. In my heart the very word symbolizes tolerance, freedom, and equality of opportunity. It should, for America has been very good to me more particularly and generally to all the people of the city of New York. The fact that I love America first, foremost, and always does not blind me to the virtues of the peoples from other lands. In fact, a great many of them have come to live here, and the opportunity to observe them has enlarged my life and has made it possible for me to know the virtues of their countrymen. We all know that no group of individuals nationally, racially, religiously, or any other way, has a monopoly on either the virtues or the vices. America has her artists, but Italy had her Benvenuto Cellini, Holland her Van Dyke, Germany her Durer. Our Nation has had a George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt; Italy has had her Garibaldi, England her Cromwell, and all the other countries have had their national heroes. Their descendants and their countrymen's descendants have come to our shores. In every field of life they have brought with them the characteristics and qualities that made them worthwhile citizens in their native lands. Those who are here are Americans, as am I. I know that to all Americans it is a matter of keen regret that so many countries have made it a national policy to persecute and discriminate against the members of minority groups. I honestly believe and prefer to believe that in the vast majority of cases it is not a true expression of national feelings, not a true expression of thoughts of the individuals who live in those countries.

But we as Americans rejoice in the fact that our country is built on a foundation which does not permit of prejudice. The principles of our Constitution do not allow room in this country for bigotry or intolerance. There must be do discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color. That is a principle worth having. What is worth having is worth preserving, and what is worth preserving is worth fighting for.

The daily press, the radio, and our own common sense tell us that those who would destroy our American way of life are united in thought and action and have the will to sacrifice to accomplish their ends. Common sense should tell us that to avoid destruction of our way of life and to preserve our form of government requires from us unity of thought, unity of action, and the will to sacrifice. The fundamental principles of which I spoke guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all and must be preserved not only for ourselves but also for our children and civilization generally. Independence can be effected only if all those who want it will live and work in harmony, not discord. The theme of our symphony of peoples is all for America and America for all of our people.

It can be done. We can live that way. I know from personal experience. It has fallen to my lot to be a candidate for public office and I have been chosen by the people of New York County as one of their judges. In neighborhoods where the population has consisted largely of Italians (for example), some born here, many who came here, I received overwhelming majorities. They did not vote against me because I came from a different religious, racial, and social group, just as I am sure that on other occasions they did not vote for others of their own race because of that fact alone. I know that they voted in accordance with their political beliefs and their consciences and I take pride in the fact that I was elected by my fellow Americans.

That is the American way of life. It must be preserved not only politically and socially, but also economically. I deplore the attitude of anyone who says, "No Italians wanted here." "No Jews wanted here." "No colored men wanted here." "No Catholics wanted here." No man can say that or have that feeling in his heart and fairly call himself an American. Thoughts of that kind are being encouraged by those who would destroy us. These expressions of prejudice are wedges which they are attempting to drive among the many peoples who go to make up our Nation, to create discontent. It does not become anyone in this day and age to have such thoughts. It is up to us to preserve the American way of life and the very first thing to do is to make sure that all of us, regardless of where we or our ancestors came from originally, continue to do our part to keep the harmony of our symphony of America.

Food for the Democracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, before we further consider taking part in another foreign war, should we not give some consideration to a plan for making available some of our surplus foodstuffs to the starving millions of Europe? With our granaries filled to overflowing, will not those victims of aggression—the old people and the little children with their stinted bodies—have reason to blame us equally with the aggressors for their horrible plight in the dark days ahead? Whether it be the plan as suggested by our former President, Herbert Hoover, or some other plan, is it not our Christian duty to give some thought to these starving millions?

I enclose herewith an editorial that appeared in Collier's for June 14, 1941, together with short excerpts from recent editorials from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune and the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel:

[From Collier's of June 14, 1941]

FOOD FOR FRANCE

Every time an American food ship unloads flour, vitamin concentrates, etc., at Marseille, and pathetic school children troop out to welcome it, the question boils up again whether we're doing as much for France as we might.

What makes the matter especially heartrending is the fact that the Vichy government is doing nothing to strengthen the case for large-scale American food shipments.

The truth about France appears to be as reported by various observers who have visited both the occupied and unoccupied areas since France checked out of the war; namely, that 95 percent of the French people are pro-Ally, but are being run by the remaining 5 percent, who hope to live rather handsomely on crumbs from Germany's table in event of a German victory.

We're for helping the French people as extensively as may be, as well as the people of other occupied countries.

But the set-up at Vichy is so frail throughout and so phony in spots that it looks as if we'd be suckers to trust it in the handling of any substantial amounts of the food. What is evidently needed is a relief organization such as the one Herbert Hoover operated during the other war. Mr. Hoover is still in active circulation. He could round up a staff of hardheaded humanitarians in short order. What's preventing a fair trial of the plans he has already set forth?

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune]

Mr. Hoover properly continues to emphasize the fact that Great Britain, along with other parts of the civilized world, would be seriously menaced by the social and political results of starvation in the continental countries overrun by the Nazis. British shortsightedness in the matter, because of the war crisis confronting the British, can be understood, but understanding of it does not commit Americans to subscription to it.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel]

Europe (and the world at large) will not be helped toward stability if the populations in its most progressive countries now held captive are to be haunted after this war by bitterly resentful recollections of privations which might have been prevented had American officials persuaded their British beneficiaries to relax the food blockade for relief of noncombatant innocents. After all, to the Belgian or the Hollander or the Frenchman or the Finn, his life and the lives of his loved ones are as important as the lives of the English.

Is It Our War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a speech which I made before the Bergen County branch of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies at Englewood, N. J., June 9, 1941:

Mrs. Morrow and ladies and gentlemen of the committee: There is no truer demonstration of the American spirit of fair play and the belief of our people in the Bill of Rights than my presence on this platform tonight. I come as no stranger to the city of Englewood. The leaders and the good people of this city have been my friends, supporters, and counsellors since my entrance into public life several years ago. I was born in Leonia, just south of this city, 33 years ago, and I have lived since I was a child in Haworth, a few miles to the north of here. My religious, educational, and social life are so well-grounded in this atmosphere that I feel obliged to answer the outrageous and untruthful charges of this committee pertaining to my beliefs and ideals in direct contradiction of the American spirit of tolerance and decency. For instance, in its latest release the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies said that I was "a friend of Hitler and his Fascist and Japanese satellites."

I am taking this opportunity to tell you something about these ideals of mine in my own words.

Nazi and Communist are evil names to apply to a young American raised in the bosom of a great, liberal faith and a product of the public-school system of America. From the pulpit of my church and in its Sunday school I was taught all of the Christian virtues and the commandments and rules of life that are in themselves abhorrent to Nazis and Communists. I was taught to love my neighbor, to shun the word "kill," and I was taught over and over, "Blessed are the peacemakers." And in all of these teachings I believe.

In our great, free, school system I was taught the Bill of Rights, our Constitution, and the right of one man to disagree with another and still remain true to American principles and maintain his own and his neighbor's respect.

Want Britain to win? How could any American, proud of his heritage of freedom and kindness for all men, want any other victory?

In September of 1940, before the latest election, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies asked my position on aid to Great Britain, in a questionnaire, prepared by the committee, and in reply I wrote:

"Yes; I favor aiding Britain.

"Yes; I favor the sale of whatever material can be spared from our Army and Navy, without weakening our national defense.

"Yes; give priorities to Great Britain in the production of our arms, planes, tanks, and other military supplies, without impairing our rearmament program.

"Yes; I favor the use of American ships to bring mothers, children, old, and sick people to our land.

"Yes; I am opposed to attempts to appease Hitler. As a strong advocate of peace I favored a general world settlement based on economic and human realities. I urged Secretary Hull to this course long before the European war started.

"Yes; I favor a maximum effort to preserve civil rights and civil liberties, while taking strong action against 'fifth column' activities."

Do those answers sound like a Nazi or a Communist? But let us remember this fact. At that time, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies was headed by William Allen White, great American editor, whose keenest wish, and whose every effort was directed toward keeping America out of war by aiding the then allies. What happened to Mr. White? That fine old man of American letters was pushed out of the chairmanship of this committee by war-minded groups in New York and Washington and before he had time to return to his desk in Emporia, Kans., he was branded an appeaser and a Laval by these insolent warriors of intolerance and hate. I leave it to the members of this committee: Has the committee changed or have I changed? When I answered that questionnaire, I said your ideas and mine in large measures coincide.

I have been accused by this committee of "being a bottleneck" a "friend of Hitler" and other scurrilous characterizations unworthy of the many fine people who are members of this committee. Does this committee now want war?

Can this be because I am opposed to a declared or an undeclared war? I cannot believe this to be so, for all of our elected officials, executive and legislative, are supposed to keep our Nation at peace unless we are attacked, and some of us are even pledged to do so. Can it be because I am opposed to declared or undeclared dictatorship in our own country? Surely we would not think of fighting the world to force the "four freedoms" on all peoples and lose our own liberties at home.

It cannot be because I am opposed to an American expeditionary force, for Mr. Churchill himself has said "We do not need men. Give us the tools and we will finish the job." And on Saturday our Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, Mr. Winant, said: "I see no necessity for the United States to intervene provided this country intensifies its present aid programs." No; I am called these names because President Roosevelt and the political Janissaries responsible for our defense program have fallen down on their jobs, and this committee, wittingly or not, has joined with these new dealers in a mass smear campaign without equal in American history. In my opinion, mud slinging will not change the views of the majority of American people.

I have tried to represent you in the Halls of Congress in the manner outlined by our founding fathers in the Constitution. There is no one but myself responsible for my acts or my votes. They represent my considered judgment and my idea of representative government. I do not appear here to apologize for, alter, or change any of these views or actions. Your committee claims that I do not represent a majority of my constituency in my desire to keep this country out of the war. That's their guess and hope. Let me say this right now: It is more important to me to be right than be reelected, and that minority or majority pressure does not mold my opinion. To race with the tides of public opinion would require the crystal gazing of George Gallup and the conscience of Boss Tweed. I come to stamp out the infamy of those false leaders who foment discord, seek to create a false division among our people, capitalize on the generous impulses of sincere Americans, and who are the "fifth column" of disunity in our country.

I will state as briefly and simply as possible my position on armed intervention.

I do not suppose that there are more than a handfull of people in the United States and certainly none in this room who wish to see a German victory. We have too much in common with Great Britain, too much hatred for Nazi oppression, and are too solidly agreed that we desire no changes in the type of government under which we live from without or from within. We have, with the British, a common language, a common literature. We do business the same way. We enjoy and love the same liberties and the same traditions. Conversely, we despise the methods that Hitler employs, and we hold dear and sacred those liberties and freedoms which he denies to those he rules.

But even beyond those cultural reasons, we desire a British victory for very practical reasons. Britain has provided us by her heroic struggle with Hitler with the time which we so short-sightedly have wasted and which we so desperately need to provide for our own impregnable defense, and for very much the same reasons we should not intervene in this war.

The first and gravest question we must ask ourselves, and it is a question which will answer all the others: Is it our war?

If the answer is yes, then we are playing the most despicable role in history. If it is our war, then we are indeed the most dastardly kind of cowards to let England fight it alone. If it were our war and if I believed it were our war, I would go to Washington tomorrow and demand of the Congress that we get into it at once. That would be the only course of honor.

Great Britain is fighting the battle for the British Empire. That is a very real cause for the British people. But it is not our cause. Our cause is the safety, the future, and the destiny of America, and that, as it always has, lies right here in America.

Believing that, let me repeat again: As long as I am a Member of Congress I will never vote to send American boys to die on foreign battlefields.

But, supposing that we do enter the war either by the back door by having someone shoot at our patrols or convoys, or whatever new name they may devise for them, or by the front door by deciding belatedly that it is our war. What will happen?

In the first place, with the first shot all aid to Britain ceases instantly. Public opinion will demand, and rightly, that our men

be armed first. We are not now in a position to arm ourselves and to supply Great Britain. We have chosen to supply Great Britain. With that I have no quarrel. But we can't do both, and if the bitter truth be known, because of the scandalous break-down of our national defense, we are not successfully doing either. If there is a bottleneck in our defense program, it is the Chief Executive, who has refused to delegate power in this crisis to competent industrialists and managers and to take the people of the United States into his confidence.

The administration makes ringing pleas for national unity. We have national unity on every issue of importance. We are united on aiding the democracies. We are united on our defense program. We are united on stamping out subversive activities. We are united on staying out of war.

It is not my intention to make a belittling or undignified attack on the office of President of the United States. I have no thought of carrying on partisan debate. Even in war-torn Britain the Government is not immune from criticism of its policies by the press or by the representatives of the people. For the same patriotic motives I will not deny to myself or others the right to censure the inadequacies of the defense of our country. To do otherwise would be treasonable.

The administration is now and has been for many months in possession of the true facts on the labor situation. It has either refused or been unwilling to take the firm stand that would end needless work stoppages. More than any single factor they are responsible for the break-down of our defense program.

The use of troops is a fraudulent solution. Edward Collins, financial editor of the Herald Tribune, had this to say this morning: "It is true that the use of troops indicates that the President is out of patience with labor and wants at last to do something about defense strikes. But seizure of a privately owned plant as a solution for labor troubles is hardly a thing to be regarded as hopeful. On the contrary, it is evidence of the administration's bankruptcy as far as a real labor policy is concerned."

In view of the facts now at our command an invasion of Europe would be the most appalling, ghastly military expedition ever conceived in the mind of man. We can be of vastly more help to Great Britain by staying out than by getting in. By fighting in Europe we play Hitler's game. We fight where our communications are all external, where they have to be protected by ships and planes, and where the enemy has all overland communications. If we fight here, which pray heaven we will not have to do, then all of those advantages accrue to us. It would be the course of madness and suicide for us to fight in Asia, Africa, and Europe. What, then, is our course?

I think this:

Supply material aid to Great Britain, in as great quantities and as speedily as we can; build our defense until it is so impregnable that we need fear no attack and fearing none, none will come; remember that America's destiny lies in America; stamp out subversive elements in our midst; make our defense effort work; run out the bureaucrats; put production men in places where they can work; stop political and theoretical interference; crack down on any influence of labor, capital, or government which tries to sabotage the defense program; steer away from propaganda; take a sane, thoughtful, tolerant American viewpoint toward our problems and their solutions.

Let me say, with Mr. Van Dusen, whose words I quote from the Christian Century: "Those who wield public leadership at this hour are not merely toying with ideas. They are handling issues and decisions which will control the fate of multitudes. What may be at stake is the lives of tens of thousands of people, the deepest existence of millions, now and for countless years to come."

Longevity-Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me, I wish to insert a speech I made over station WICC, Bridgeport, Conn., on June 7, in support of H. R. 1057, the longevity-pay bill:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, as a Member of Congress I take to the air tonight in behalf of a most humane piece of legislation, namely, the longevity-pay bill for employees of the Postal Service.

Enactment of this legislation is long overdue. It is by no means an attempt to raid the Treasury of the United States but is a reward for loyal and efficient service. Adoption of this measure will tend to hold in the Service—and properly so—men who have learned their job in their first few years and who are anxious to remain when they realize that their skill, acquired by years of experience, is being rewarded in a modest way. In another sense they are receiving something in nature of a promotion.

The people in whose interest I am speaking tonight, in my opinion, are among the most loyal and capable in the Government service. They are the representatives of an excellent governmental department which is operating within its income. I speak of loyalty at this time because if ever, in the history of this Nation, we need loyalty, it is now.

Getting away from the subject of my talk for a minute, I must say that we have those in this country with disloyal tendencies, who would honeycomb the very foundation of our Government. In these critical times we must work within as well as without. Actions which brought about the downfall of other great nations are taking place in this country today, and I shudder when I think of the wide scope of these activities. I, for one, intend to crack down on these disloyal groups at every opportunity afforded me.

So I come to the assistance of a loyal group tonight and urge that this group be rewarded for its splendid service. The longevity-pay bill does not call for any tremendous increase of salary for employees of the Postal Service, but simply says that employees shall be granted $100 per annum in addition to their base pay as now or hereafter fixed by law, upon the completion of 10 years' service; and an additional $100 per annum upon the completion of every 5-year period of service thereafter, provided that no credit shall be given for service after the thirtieth year of employment.

Several bills, all similar in nature, are pending in Congress, but I am advocating the passage of H. R. 1057, introduced by Congressman FLANNERY, of Pennsylvania.

The last general salary reclassification for postal employees became effective on January 1, 1925, or more than 16 years ago. At that time the entrance salary grade for post-office clerks was set at $1,700, with annual automatic promotions of $100 provided for until the maximum grade of $2,100 was reached. It does not, however, necessarily follow that since the enactment of this legislation all employees have thusly been promoted. In order to attain the grades frequently referred to as automatic, employees must maintain an exceptionally high degree of efficiency. If this is not done, the employee stands not only to be deprived of his so-called automatic promotion but may be reduced to a lower grade. Also, the Economy Act of 1932, in addition to carrying provisions for salary reductions and payless furloughs, provided for the discontinuance of automatic promotions, regardless of the degree of efficiency attained.

The proposal as contained in the longevity bill does not constitute any innovation in the Government service but merely proposes the extension of a just and equitable principle which has already proven its worth and justified its adoption over a period of years in its practical application to the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, immigration and naturalization examiners, and customs inspectors. Inasmuch as its successful operation in the branches of the Government service just referred to cannot, in my opinion, be challenged, I firmly believe that it could be made applicable to the Postal Service with equal or even a greater degree of success.

Mr. William I. Horner, legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, at a recent hearing on the longevity bill, advanced the following reasons why, in his opinion, this measure should be adopted. I quote: "(1) Such promotions as are thusly provided for seem to be reasonable, just, and equitable, and in harmony with logic and sound reasoning in that it would be a fair reward for long and faithful years of service and experience and would justly differentiate itself from the present system, which provides for no automatic salary promotions after the first 5 years of service, or the top automatic grade of $2,100, has been reached.

"(2) Post-office clerks are skilled workers requiring years of assiduous study in order to qualify themselves, from an efficiency standpoint, to meet the exacting demands of the service. It has been said, and I think rightly so, that the time necessarily required for a clerk to familiarize himself with the various services he is to render is equal to that required in acquiring a college education. After this, study and review must continue, which improves the efficiency of the employee, based on experience ripened by years of service with no commensurate monetary reward.

"This experience gained through many years of service is valuable to the Government, and we are not in the least reluctant to advance the contention that such experience gained over the years should be fairly and adequately compensated for. Especially is this true, since it is an experience that has value only to the Postal Service and cannot be commercialized by the employee in outside industry. The statement that the Postal Service is an efficient branch of the Government service cannot be successfully challenged or contradicted, and certainly that efficiency is attributable to experience gained by employees through years of constant application to duty.

"(3) It would tend toward a career service and the morale of the employee would be improved to an extent that the increased cost necessary to provide this legislation would probably be entirely offset by such improved morale and increased efficiency.

"(4) It is not an experiment. The principles involved, where they have been applied in modern, progressive industries, have proven to those most vitally concerned the value of the venture where it has been given a fair trial, based solely upon its merits.

"(5) The percentage of employees without families is small, and it is but natural to conclude that as the family grows the material needs likewise grow and the family budget must from time to time be increased to meet such needs. If this is impossible, as it is under present salary conditions, the result will be unfavorably reflected in the citizenship of tomorrow.

"(6) Mordecai Ezekiel, in his book entitled '$2,500 a Year' says: Abundant living means that each family would have an adequate supply of physical necessities and comforts and sufficient leisure in which to enjoy them. In another instance he states, as follows: 'To live in modest abundance, a family of four needs $2,500 a year.' The author defines the standard to which his dollar estimate applies as follows:

"Decent shelter, decent clothing, and adequate food for growth and health. Under American conditions, a family can hardly be said to be sharing in abundant living unless it can also enjoy the comforts of civilization which many Americans have come to regard as necessities. Those include running water and modern plumbing, adequate heat, the telephone and electric light, newspapers, magazines, dentists, an automobile, and some opportunity for travel, recreation, amusement, and higher education. For the average city family of four persons, an annual income of $2,500 is probably the minimum on which such comfortable living can be attained. In fact, such an income would probably not be high enough for most families to enjoy all the comforts listed. Rather than set our standards too high, though, we may regard such an income as being the minimum needed to enable a family to live a moderately full life under American conditions."

Additional reasons, in my opinion, are: (1) Taxes have already increased to an appreciable degree; the tax base broadened to include the salaries of many groups in the Postal Service and with further increases inevitable. (2) Commodity prices are rising and will continue to do so for the duration of the present emergency and probably for several years thereafter. (3) Labor turnover in the last war, or great emergency, seriously affected the Postal Service. In many cities throughout the country, with the low salaries paid postal employees, it was almost a matter of impossibility to maintain a working force, in competition with outside industry, sufficient to handle the ever-increasing volume of mail. This condition is regrettable when we take into consideration the fact that this agency is the greatest medium for the dissemination of human intelligence and of the most vital importance to the welfare of the Nation in times of great national stress.

This measure carries the support of a large number of leading Members of Congress. The bill is now pending before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. I have urged this committee to report the bill to the House of Representatives, and I have every reason to believe that it will come before the House. When it does it will have my active support for adoption, as I feel that it is the only remedy for an inequality which had existed for many years in one of our most outstanding governmental departments.

Strikes Please Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ROYAL OAK (MICH.) DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial of June 10, 1941, from the Daily Tribune, of Royal Oak, Mich., my home city, written and published by my warm and able friends, Floyd J. Miller and Lynn Miller, its editors.

The cause of true Americanism and appreciation of the opportunities, privileges, and rights of the American citizen under our Government are ably served and nobly advanced through the editorials of this outstanding newspaper and its distinguished editors.

The editorial follows:

[From the Royal Oak (Mich.) Daily Tribune of June 10, 1941]

STRIKES PLEASE NAZIS

At last President Roosevelt has taken action to stop the strikes that were interfering with the defense of America. It has been difficult to understand the delay, for many of these strikes have injured the United States as much as though Nazi bombs had been dropped on airports or battleships. Naturally every German and Russian secret agent in this country has been doing his utmost to cause as many strikes as possible and to delay building of the war equipment we need so urgently.

During the last few weeks those who have been studying the battles of the present World War have come to realize how vastly the methods of fighting have changed. Even the most trained army of men, with ordinary rifles and machine guns, is helpless against tanks and a hard-hitting force that can be moved rapidly in automobiles and motorcycles. The whole world watched and learned this lesson when the Germans overran Holland, Belgium, and France.

Even in those fateful days of the spring of 1940, though, it was apparent that airplanes provided an indispensable part of the attack. In general, the Germans never succeeded in winning a victory with their tanks and mechanized forces unless they had command of the air.

It is the very fact that planes are so vital that makes any stoppage in their production dangerous.

We have now in training an Army of a million and a quarter men. Perhaps your son or brother is, or will be, in this force. If so, his chances of defending himself and you are lessened every time an airplane that might have been produced is destroyed by the refusal of somebody to turn it out.

Let the People Finance This Undertaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, from information I am able to obtain it does not appear to me that our people are at the present time performing more than 25 percent of what they will eventually be forced to participate in if the undertakings directly related to the present war and which we have certainly assumed are to be consummated in an American manner.

It is, in my opinion, within the realm of truth to assert that at this moment there is by far much greater financial material, spiritual, and human power within the United States and controlled by our people than in any other section of the world. When more than 150 years ago the free people of this country established our form of government, and proceeded with a program of permitting the individual to grow and expand and develop his own personal powers, we set in motion the forces which have brought to us those very instruments of communication and transportation which in this day and hour make it utterly impossible for the United States to maintain a high degree of isolation. As a matter of fact so long as these inventions which have been developed by our free pople are permitted to operate it will be impossible for any group of people who can use them to maintain a fair degree of isolation.

Today the Government of the United States and its people are becoming completely enveloped in those far-reaching and fundamental forces which involve the so-called Anglo-American undertakings. Following the close of the War of 1914–19, it appears that both England and France proceeded to establish a high degree of isolation insofar as paying close attention to the developments in Germany in particular, and certain other areas of non-Russian Europe were concerned. It appears that the leaders of England and France fell asleep and that insofar as those two countries were concerned little material attention was given to the activities of German leadership for the period from 1920 up to and including 1938. France was unprepared, and the French people and the French Government as we have known it for decades, ceased to function. It would appear that England, if she is to survive, will have to form alliances with other powers giving sufficient combined strength to enable this last-mentioned combination to materially control non-Russian Europe; or through an affiliation with the Scandinavian countries and perhaps France, make it impossible for any other non-Russian European power to dictate the political, economic, and financial policies of non-Russian Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the British people have engaged themselves to influence the people of the United States to join with them in the latest effort to permanently arrest the program of German leadership—and not stopping there to set up a control with a foundation so constructed that its objective will be to preserve in the hands of Anglo-American management, along with their Allies, a continuing control which will for generations prevent a recurrence of what happened in 1914–19, and what is now in progress.

Mr. Speaker, this program to which the American people have dedicated themselves will call for a degree of financial management, and a program of financial sacrifice to the American people such as we have never experienced. It is my firm opinion that what now lies ahead of us will far exceed the sacrifices and suffering of our people in those early days of the formation of our country, as well as that which was involved in that period leading up to and following the Civil War.

Mr. Speaker, it must be clear to all close students of the present contest that

in due course the British leaders will call upon the United States for millions of men in the form of troops to render service on the European Continent and in Africa. It must be clear to all students that serious trouble will have to be faced by us throughout Latin America—consisting of Mexico, Central and South America. The forces of the hour are now operating in such a way that these responsibilities cannot in the least be evaded. It is clear to all students that the British and the Americans are now maneuvering for additional time. But if that time is granted and if the British and American people are wise enough to place themselves in an offensive position, it will then be necessary for us to strike and to strike with all our might, and the job will not be completed until there is an invasion. This, briefly, is my opinion of some of the broader aspects of the job which we have undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress in particular and many of our leaders throughout the country are well informed as to the amount of the present interest-bearing debt of the Federal Government. They are also well informed with reference to the recent commitments by the Congress in the form of appropriations and authorizations. As has been pointed out by Secretary of Commerce Jones, we can easily visualize an interest-bearing debt of $90,000,000,000. As we move further into the financing and equipping of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and of our offshore allies—whoever they may be, it is not fantastic thinking to assume that our interest-bearing Federal debt could reach $125,000,000,000 and then go to $150,000,000,000 and move on to $200,000,000,000 before the present contest ends.

Having in mind our capitalistic system and method of Government financing, what segment of our people, or which of our financial institutions are to purchase the securities which this Government of the United States must market in order to raise the funds to be used for the financing of the purchase of equipment and the maintaining of that equipment, the supplies which it will consume, and our troops in the field wherever they may be located?

The gross public debt as published by the Treasury Department under date of June 7, 1941, amounted to $48,476,118,796.20.

In the committee report on H. R. 4965, approved by the House on June 9, this week, we find a schedule setting forth $30,115,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and other defense agencies for 1941 and 1942. Including lease-lend and the amount the Navy estimates will be needed for the completion of ships, the grand total would be $43,115,000,000.

In the May 1941 bulletin of the Treasury Department on page 1 we find a table which shows that 6,125 of our banks and 775 insurance companies hold $27,602,000,000 of the Federal marketable interest-bearing securities. This information was obtained by a recent survey conducted by the Treasury Department. It should be noted that only 6,125 banks out of a total of more than 13,425 banks are mentioned.

Therefore, when all of these 13,425 banks and institutions are considered one can appreciate that perhaps as much as $30,000,000,000 or more of the interest-bearing Federal obligation is now held by these lending institutions.

The bank credit situation today is one sufficient to create alarm in the minds of all students of fiscal policies of Government. The member banks of the Federal Reserve System located in 101 leading cities and comprising approximately two-thirds of the banking assets of the country, increased their loans to business during the calendar year 1940 to the extent of about $665,000,000, or an increase of approximately 15 percent. In the past 5 months of 1941 these institutions increased their loans $655,000,000, or almost the total of 1940. Furthermore, this same group of banks increased their holdings of Government obligations by $1,534,000,000—which brought their holdings to almost one-third of the total direct Government issues outstanding. And during the past 5 months of 1941 their increase in holdings of Government obligations was greater than the total increase in 1940. It is clear that by commercial loans and the purchase of Government obligations the banks have put to work more than $4,200,000,000 since the beginning of 1940, and this is no doubt largely due to the defense program. With the expansion of loans and investments by the banks their deposits have increased and it appears that while in previous months bank deposits moved upward largely as a result of gold imports, that investments and loans of the banks are now rapidly increasing deposits as gold imports decline. For instance, during 1940 gold stocks increased more than $4,200,000,000, while in the 5 months of 1941 the increase was slightly over $575,000,000—considerably below the 1940 figure. With the banks rapidly investing in Government securities and extending commercial loans, deposits continue to increase at a rapid rate and the reporting member banks had deposits of approximately $40,000,000,000 at the end of May—over $2,000,000,000 since last December.

Mr. Speaker, this rapid increase in bank deposits constituting the greater percentage of the means of payment holds, as has been repeatedly pointed out, a potential threat of inflation. The money supply increases more rapidly than the production of consumer goods and we witness a growing burden in the form of increased cost of living due to price advances.

The Treasury Department opened a selling campaign on savings bonds and certificates last May 1. During the last month our people purchased less than $450,000,000 worth of these new issues. If we are to avoid destructive inflation we should be purchasing the new issues of Government obligations at the rate of $2,000,000,000 per month, so that it would be absolutely unnecessary for the commercial banks to further expand the foundation of inflation and increased demand deposits as a result of additional purchases of Government issues. Sooner or later it will undoubtedly become necessary for every precinct, every township, every luncheon club, every unit of industry, and every organized group of our people, irrespective of the type or kind, to be definitely geared into the program of educating our people to the necessity of their individually purchasing out of their savings and their incomes the Government obligations which will have to be issued under our capitalistic system for the purpose of financing the war undertaking which our people have assumed.

It appears to me that our chief fiscal officer, the Secretary of the Treasury, should be given the full support of our people in this vast undertaking. Otherwise, he will no doubt be forced to place the securities in the portfolios of the commercial banks or resort to outright printing-press money. For the RECORD I submit the recent radio address of the Secretary, which deals with this highly important undertaking. Let the people finance this undertaking from their savings and earnings and thereby prevent additional inflation of demand bank deposits.

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR., SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Good evening: Just over a month ago the President of the United States bought the first of the new Defense Savings Bonds and Stamps. On that occasion he spoke of the defense savings program as a privilege and an opportunity for every American—"an opportunity to share in the defense of all the things we cherish against the threat that is made against them."

Tonight, from my desk at the Treasury, I should like to report to the people of this country on the way they have answered the President's call.

I now have complete figures showing that in the month of May, the first month of what is to be a long and continuing effort, the American people bought $438,230,000 in defense savings bonds and $3,552,000 in defense savings stamps. This is a wonderful start. It is more than any of us in the Treasury had dared to expect. It is, to my mind, a great demonstration of the desire to serve America.

In this first month the people have bought enough stamps and bonds to pay for 4 of the giant battleships we are now building, or enough to pay for the building of 20 cruisers, or 100 destroyers to guard the ocean lanes. If this total could somehow take instant shape in new fighting planes, we should have more than 4,000 of them; and if it could be translated into long-range bombers it would buy 1,000 of them.

The sales of the series E bond, the new baby bond which is within reach of almost every pocketbook, were almost twice as much in May of this year as the sales of the old baby bonds a year ago. I find it very encouraging also that total sales have held up consistently around $100,000,000 a week. This makes me feel that there is a steady interest which will show itself in continuing sales, day by day, week by week, month by month, as the year rolls on.

I don't want to say too much tonight, however, about figures alone. We decided long ago that our success should be measured not only by the amount sold but also by the number of people who invest their savings in American freedom. We have found that more than a million individual bonds were bought in the first month. Almost 10,000,000 savings stamps were bought in the same period. Even allowing for repeated purchases by the same individuals, these figures show that great numbers of men and women and children became partners of their Government during the month of May. To those people I say to-

night: "You have given direct help in the defense of your country. You have done something distinctly worth-while to safeguard your democracy."

But there is something else, quite irrespective of any figures, which makes me very happy as I look back over the first month's efforts. This is the spontaneous cooperation of Americans in all walks of life, through their voluntary organizations, in all parts of the country.

Labor, for example, has proved again what I always knew to be true—namely, that the patriotism of the American worker is as sound today as when the Minute Men left their farms and dropped their tools to fight for freedom at Lexington. You may remember that the heads of the three great labor organizations in this country came to see me several weeks ago. Mr. William Green, of the A. F. of L.; Mr. Philip Murray, of the C. I. O.; and Mr. J. A. Phillips, of the Railroad Brotherhoods, all promised me their unqualified support and help in the defense-savings effort. They could not possibly have been more cooperative or more understanding of the objects of our program.

These offers of cooperation have now begun to take tangible form. I read with great pleasure the other day that Mr. David Dubinsky, president of the great International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, had telegraphed President Roosevelt that the union members are investing the union's funds in United States defense bonds. Last week I had word from Michigan that 30,000 members of the Teamsters' Union in that State had unanimously endorsed our program and had expressed their wish to set aside a part of their earnings, regularly and systematically, for defense bond purchases.

Employers in many States, in big industries and small, have reported to us that they are ready to establish systematic savings plans—in every case in cooperation with their employees. From all parts of the country we are getting reports of this kind of spirit among the men in our factories, the men whose toil and sweat are furnishing the materials that will make this country safe and strong.

The spirit of American labor and industry has been matched by that of American bankers. No praise of mine can be too high for the willing, helpful cooperation of bankers, great and small, East and West, in getting behind the Treasury's program. Ten thousand banking institutions, including commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations, now act as our selling agents, without any commission or any inducement except patriotism; but they do much more than sell for us. They have helped to educate us all by spreading information about the new bonds and stamps. Every one of the leading bankers' associations that has met during May has, without exception, passed a public resolution pledging complete endorsement and cooperation in the defense-savings program. I should like to tell the bankers of America here and now that I appreciate what they have done. The first month's results could not possibly have been so successful if the bankers had not put their shoulders to the wheel.

The same is true of the Post Office Department, which has worked cheerfully and efficiently to make the defense-savings program a success. The Post Office has given truly indispensable help, from Postmaster General Frank Walker down to the clerk behind the window in every one of the 16,000 post offices that sell defense stamps and bonds.

The Treasury has also counted on existing community groups of all kinds to spread information about what these defense-savings bonds are, and what they do. The American Legion has called upon all its posts to give us every possible help. The Boy Scouts have distributed 1,200,000 posters for us; the women's clubs have made our program a part of theirs. The response from foreign-language groups has been especially encouraging. It proves again that whatever their origin, and whatever language they may speak, the overwhelming majority of them are true Americans, united behind their Government in defense of American freedom.

All sections, all creeds, all economic groups, all American parties have done their share and will continue to do their share. We have had during this first month a preview of that national unity which this country must have if it is to surmount the crisis that now faces it.

We could, of course, have conducted this campaign in a different way, and perhaps we could have sold more bonds. We could have compiled slacker lists, and we could have coerced or frightened people into buying, whether they could afford a bond or not. But democratic unity and morale are not built in that way. Our results prove that we do not need to employ such methods.

This, after all, is a continuing effort. There are no quotas for the country or for any community in it. There is no time limit. A major object of this program is to give the American people the habit of systematic saving for their country's sake and for their own. I believe that with our present methods we are on the right track.

Everything that we have had in the way of radio time and talent, or newspaper space, or motion-picture time and skill, has been contributed freely and generously by the industries concerned, or by other advertisers. No paid advertising of any kind has been used. At this time I should like to pay my tribute to those agencies which have given us such willing and patriotic service; to the radio chains and independent stations, to the newspapers and magazines, great and small, to the motion-picture industry, and to all who have helped to bring our message to the American people. They have enabled us to carry on our program more economically than any similar effort in the history of our country.

We started this program with only 6 States organized, because we preferred to start slowly and surely rather than make mistakes which we might later regret. We now have 22 States organized or beginning to organize with nonpartisan committees composed of outstanding citizens. This process of organizing the States and cities will continue until we have reached every community in the country.

What has been done in the first month is a fine beginning, but it is only a beginning. We must keep up the good work from now on.

Events across the seas cry out to us every day to speed up our effort in every direction. The threat from abroad has come so close to every American home that the President has proclaimed a state of unlimited national emergency.

So far, our defense-production program has only begun to rouse the giant industrial strength of this continent. In the same way our defense-savings program has barely begun to reach the immense earning capacity of the American people.

Now, as never before, I believe that all of us are ready to demonstrate, in a concrete form, our partnership with the Government—a partnership, as the President said, entered into to safeguard and perpetuate all those precious freedoms which the founders of our Republic gave us as our heritage.

Thank you all and good night.

It Can Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

ADDRESS BY HAROLD V. REILLY

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a Memorial Day address delivered at Hackensack, N. J., by the Honorable Harold V. Reilly, executive committee for Bergen County, N. J., of the American Legion, department of New Jersey, as follows:

We meet today on this historic green to honor, as we do every Memorial Day, the soldier dead of our wars. Down through the fleeting years we have come to realize what their last full measure of devotion to their country has meant We know now full well that the preservation of the Union in 1865 welded a great Nation, a Nation which had its precarious beginning when our colonial forefathers dared battle a powerful tyrant king for that freedom and independence which is our heritage.

We know, too, that the men who marched in '98 and again in 1917, never to return, bequeathed us an obligation to continue to hold high and unsullied the flag they followed unto death. We who remain to carry on pause this morning in sober retrospection, and again consecrate ourselves to those high ideals of Americanism which fired them to make the supreme sacrifice.

All honor to our fallen heroes. Their deeds on the field of battle will forever enrich the pages of our Nation's glorious history.

Today, however, we can regard the past but for a passing moment because all of those things for which our hero dead fought are imperiled by a madman whose great military machine has conquered and enslaved almost all of Europe. Hitler's dream is definitely that of world domination, and so it is to the future that we must look.

It is difficult for us, gathered peacefully here today, to believe that world events could conspire to deprive us of that peace—which we all so much want—and force us to go forth to the black hell of war in defense of our native land. Yet a brief review of the swift progress of the armed conflict on the other side of the Atlantic tells us that our peril is not imagined.

It can happen here!

The devices manufactured for the destruction of mankind have increased a hundredfold since the days of Chateau Thierry and the Argonne.

On annihilating wings they speed that destruction at a fearful rate, both in time and space. Amid the ashes of London and Coventry, men, women, and children, bleary-eyed from loss of sleep, shocked into insanity, their loved ones and their worldly goods blown to eternity, stand living testimony to the terror that is modern lightning war.

Yes; it can happen here.

I wish I possessed the ability to paint a word picture that could visualize for you the utter, desolate, chilling horror that settles over a people subject to air attack. It is far, far worse than anything the first World War

produced, and I have personally experienced air attacks in that war.

I am not prophesying that fate for us. Nor am I courting sensation when I soberly remind you that it could happen here. The Atlantic Ocean, over which the American Expeditionary Force sailed 24 years ago, is no longer days from Europe's shores. It is hours away now, and we would be guilty of crass stupidity if we failed to take cognizance of that fact.

This Memorial Day finds the American people confronted by a real menace. It also finds us committed to a course of action which demands a national unity even greater than in the days of 1917.

I have persistently and consistently opposed the domestic economic policies of President Roosevelt and his administration. My opposition was honest and I was indulging in the priceless right of every American to speak his mind. Such is part of a democratic process we in America prize above all of our blessings.

Then our differences were domestic and I spoke both as a citizen and as a leader of the Republican Party. Our domestic situation has now faded into pale significance in the strong light of the common danger that beats upon us all, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, alike.

And so, when it comes to our country's foreign policy, the time would seem to be at hand when we must forsake our partisan political faiths for the only faith that can now matter. We must no longer say or think merely, "I am a Republican," or, "I am a Democrat." We must stand up and proclaim, "I am an American."

Being an American in the crisis that is upon us arrogates to each a responsibility and a duty. We must, without complaint and with fortitude, endure that which we have to endure. We must sacrifice if sacrifice is to be our lot, and it will be, though to what extent we cannot tell now.

We must rally behind the President of the United States, for, right or wrong, he is our leader in the cataclysm that impends. We must exhibit no sign of weakness in our common front. We must not be afraid, remembering our President's admonition that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

We must not permit ourselves to become confused on the issue before us, for to be confused is to be weak. To be weak is to be lost.

It has been aptly contended, "A nation plagued by doubts and torn by inner controversies cannot help others, cannot even save itself."

We must summon a full measure of courage, firm in the belief that we are in the right, that Almighty God will bless us in our struggle to preserve not only our homeland, but that which is equally precious, our American way of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This very moment we are on our way. How far into the shadow of the valley of death no mortal man can foretell. Let us take each other by the hand and go on together, one great Nation, one great people, firmly united behind our democratically chosen leader, holding high above all else—high as hope's great throbbing star above the darkness of the dead—our love of country, our love of freedom, our love of right.

I know those who have gone before would have us do no less, because out of the impenetrable chambers in the silent halls of death I hear the voices of our hero dead of all wars wafted to me by the zephyrs that caress their last earthly resting places. They are saying: "Living Americans! For yourselves, for us the dead, for God's great humanity, unite—have courage, have faith. Carry on! So that we shall not have died in vain."

Should the United States Fight in This War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered yesterday over the radio:

To my radio audience: As I address you at this hour, there is still ringing in my ears the words of the President of the United States when he said in 1936:

"If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink at the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

"They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to the belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

"It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond; to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that came from a false prosperity.

"To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

"If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—'we choose peace.'"

The President's speeches today sound much different than they did at that time. Perhaps conditions have somewhat changed, but if we should go to war, what are we going to war for? The President tells us we are going to war to save the democracies. I am just wondering how long we would be able to save them. Would we be able to save them for another 23 years, like we did when we helped fight the first World War?

The democracies that the President presumably has in mind are England, China, Greece, and possibly Turkey. Turkey is a dictatorship; Greece is a dictatorship; China is a dictatorship, and as far as England is concerned, in 1928 Mr Anthony Eden, now Foreign Secretary, speaking in behalf of a bill extending the suffrage, felt it necessary to say to the House of Commons on that occasion:

"We have not got democratic government in this country today; we never have had it, and I venture to suggest to the honorable members opposite that we shall never have it. What we have done, in all the progress of reform and evolution of policies, is to broaden the basis of our oligarchy."

There is no doubt in the speaker's mind, or, I feel, in a very large majority of the minds of the people of this country, that they prefer the Government of Great Britain to the governments of her allies or her enemies. Britain is a constitutional state and has been the inspiration of many constitutional states. We of the United States prefer the governments of China, Greece, and Turkey to those of the Axis Powers, but let us not use the word "democracy" to describe every country that is or may be at war with the Axis. I am wondering, if Russia should happen to be attacked by Germany, whether we would immediately classify her as one of the democracies of the world.

What will be America's fate if we should enter the war and it proved to be a long, hard, and bloody one? During the past 10 years we have had on an average of about 10,000,000 people unemployed. As a result of our participation in another war that number would be increased materially. We have an enormous debt of approximately $48,000,000,000 at the present time, besides some $6,000,000,000 that the Government has guaranteed that is not included in this debt. Having exhausted our resources in a long war, what would we have left to take care of the social gains that we have made in the 150 years of our existence? We would have but very little left for food, housing, relief, social security, or education. When we were through we would have want and fear, and we would have the maintenance of order by a government scarcely distinguishable from those we fought against. In my own opinion, it is fairly certain that capitalism will not survive our participation in this war, and it is under the capitalistic system that our country has grown great.

Fear and ignorance wrote the last peace. It grew out of the fear of the French and the British of what the future would be, and the ignorance of all the other nations as to what was taking place. From this fear and ignorance there resulted a peace that has made this present war possible. Certainly there is no less fear and uncertainty and no less ignorance today of what the purposes of the present war and what its results will be.

There are two very good reasons why we should not enter this war. First, it is not our war. We did not start it, and so far as the speaker knows, no one connected with our Government was consulted as to whether we wanted war or not. And, secondly, we are not today adequately prepared to fight a successful war on European soil. I shall discuss briefly these two reasons.

A great deal has been said, in and out of Congress, about this being our war. Of course, such a statement is false and is made for the purpose of solidifying, in the minds of the people, a false idea. The present conflict in Europe broke out without our advice or consent, so far as the American people know. It was Great Britain and France who declared war upon the German Government after being clearly forewarned of Germany's military strength by one of our outstanding citizens, who has been discussed a great deal in the newspapers of late, Col. Charles Lindbergh. He not only told these countries, but he told the United States, that it would be utterly impossible for England and France to compete with the German air force, and every battle since the war began has indicated the truth of his statement. If the present war is our war, we should have been in it from the start and not be gradually talked into it.

We hear a great deal about Great Britain being our first line of defense. Neither Great Britain nor any other country should be our first line of defense, but our defense should be ourselves, and we should be prepared to assert it. When the war began in Europe, no one in the United States was willing to say that it was our war, nor did either Great Britain or France claim that it was our war. Only after months of insidious propaganda over the radio, on the screen, and through the press; and only after Congress had passed one law after another bringing us closer to

actual involvement, all of which laws were passed in the name of peace, have people begun to say that this is our war. The catchphrase used to propagandize the people of this country is that the war is one for humanity and democracy, and to preserve civilization. These are very high-sounding terms, and to the World War veterans who participated in the first World War, they have a vividly familiar ring. They fought at that time to "make the world safe for democracy," and "to end all wars"—and the present world situation is a tragic evidence of the failure of their objectives. Although we were able to put 2,000,000 men in Europe to fight at that time who spilled their blood and spent our treasure, we came out of the conflict without a dollar of indemnity, or a square acre of territory, and it is evident to everybody that we did not achieve any of the objectives for which we fought in that World War. All we got out of it was 10 years of depression, 10,000,000 men unemployed, $13,000,000,000 of bad war debts which we have never collected from foreign countries, veterans' hospitals filled with the physical and mental wreckage of war, and four cemeteries in France.

This war, like all wars, is an economic conflict, the result of selfishness and greed and a battle to control the seven seas and to dominate the world's trade. It is just one more struggle in world history among the nations of the old world. We have been warned by both Washington and Jefferson against entangling alliances and against attempting to solve Europe's problems or to police the world. Both the Republican and Democratic political parties in the campaign last year pledged to the American people that American boys would never again be sent to Europe to fight, and that we would not fight any war unless we were attacked. No nation has yet attacked us. None of our American ships has been sunk, and no American life has been lost. That is some record after the war has been going on in Europe as long as it has. This record is especially impressive when we think of the provocations that some countries have had to help us get into this war. We have not been neutral. We have taken sides in this conflict and our attitude has been evident to everybody.

During the campaign last fall, both the President and Mr. Willkie pledged to the fathers and mothers of America that their sons would not be sent to fight in any foreign war. These pledges should be more than "campaign oratory" for no man is better than his word. Pledges should be kept and promises should be fulfilled.

Now for the second reason why we should not enter Europe's war. It is evident to Congress and your speaker this evening that all Americans are united in a program for national defense of our own country and while we are making some progress, in spite of many strikes that have delayed our program for defense, anyone who is actually acquainted with our present state of preparedness knows that we could not successfully fight a war on European soil.

When we entered the last war, our national debt was $1,225,000,000. Today, the interest on our obligations is more than this amount. Today, our national debt, including authorizations for the present defense program and certain contingent liabilities, is nearly $90,000,000,000. The first line of defense of any nation is its own financial solvency.

In the last war, the Allies had Japan, Russia, and Italy on their side and France and Belgium were countries where we could land troops. Today, Belgium and France are occupied by Germany and the other three powerful nations I have just mentioned are her allies instead of the allies of Great Britain. We are all willing to admit that the United States is a great and wealthy nation. We have vast natural resources, an enormous reservoir of skilled labor, and the greatest industrial plants in the world, and perhaps, in a long-drawn-out conflict, with the expenditure of billions more of dollars and the sacrifice of many millions of the best youth of our country, we might win. But certainly we could not fight a winning war in Europe at the present time, so far from our own base of supplies.

On the other hand, there is no nation in Europe, or combination of nations in Europe, that can successfully attack us on our home ground if we prepare proper national defense here. We cannot get over there and they cannot get over here, so why enter this war in Europe, exposing our west coast to an attack from Japan who would certainly attack us if she thought there was any chance of winning, and weakening us with our defense on our eastern shores. To me it seems the height of folly.

Regardless of our inherent or inherited prejudices and in spite of where our sympathies may lie in the present European struggle, our first allegiance and our first duty is to the United States and our own people. The wise thing for us to do at this hour is to center our thoughts, our attention, our prayers, and our energies upon our own country, and not upon some foreign country or countries. The moment we enter this European struggle, it is very questionable whether our economy would survive bankruptcy; if it did not, our democracy would die and our Republic would be supplanted by a totalitarian state. The civil liberties of the people would be destroyed and a military despotism established.

America should put forth all of her efforts to make herself impregnable and invincible to attack from abroad and remain in a position to exert a moral influence, by example, for peace and justice in the world.

The Germans may be highly unethical from our point of view, but this war is not a question of ethics. It is a question of mathematics. We cannot wish these Germans back inside their former borders, nor bring this about just by having high ideals. The real problem is: How can the 200,000,000 Anglo-Saxons apply the necessary armed force to the 70,000,000 to 80,000,000 Germans to beat them back to their own country and restore some kind of sovereignty to Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Yugoslavia, and Greece?

Hitler has from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 men under arms and highly trained. To get at him in Europe, we, and all others participating in this war against Germany, would have to establish a bridgehead somewhere in Europe, preferably on the French coast. Judging from the recent highly carbonated conversations between Secretary of State Hull and French Ambassador Henry Haye, the French won't give us such a bridgehead "free for nothing." We would have to fight for it.

As things look at the present time, it would take 10,000,000 soldiers to do this. It could not possibly be done before the end of next year and it looks very much like it might take 10 years to do it. And there would be no sure guaranty that we would win in the end because we would be operating 3,000 miles from our bases while Germany would be operating at home.

The great trouble today is that too many of our own people do not understand the four freedoms that Secretary Hull has spoken about. If we stay out of the war, some day perhaps we may understand and practice freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. But after 150 years, it seems that many people are just beginning to grasp the meaning of these words. Words like these have no significance unless they are put into actual practice. Just think, we talk about assuring the four freedoms to the world while here, in our own country, one-third of the people are underfed and ill-clothed. The sharecroppers, the Okies, and other similar classes have neither freedom from want nor freedom from fear. Many of them hardly know they are living in a moral order or in a democracy where justice and human rights are supreme. The latest figures of the National Resources Board show that almost 55 pecent of our people are living on family incomes of less than $1,250 a year. On this basis, more than half of our people are living below the minimum level of subsistence. More than half of the Army which will defend democracy will be drawn from those who have had this experience of the economic benefits of our American way of life.

We in America have hardly begun to understand and practice the ideals that we are asked to force on other nations. We all have hope that some day, somehow, we can achieve these ideals. We have the form of government under which we should be able to bring them to realization. We have energy, imagination, and brains. We have made great progress since the beginning of our Government and some day, with us all working together, we may see justice, freedom, and democracy working successfully in our Republic. If we should go to war, it probably would wipe out the gains we have made in the United States over a period of 150 years. It might take us 100 years to regain what we would lose in this war. It would affect education, and our development of local communities would suffer.

Instead of putting any effort at all toward getting into this war, we should put every effort into preparing a defense for the United States against all comers and do everything within our power to remain at peace. Aid others where we can, but always remember that self-preservation is the highest ideal of a free people. If we have a strong defense, a well-developed understanding of the ideals upon which our Government was organized, and a belief in our form of government and the principles for which it stands, we need fear nobody in the world.

W. P. A. Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the members of the Louisiana delegation received a communication from the Honorable Sam Jones, Governor of Louisiana, relative to the proposed appropriation for the W. P. A. for the fiscal year beginning July 1. That letter was placed before the Members of this House by my distinguished colleague from north Louisiana, Mr. OVERTON BROOKS.

At this time I want to again bring to the attention of the Members of this House several important observations which Governor Jones made in that communication and to subscribe in full to his conclusions.

It is my understanding that several amendments will be offered on the floor of the House amending the present W. P. A. appropriation bill. It is my understanding that these amendments will include an increase in the amount of the appropriations, elimination of the clause

providing for the automatic release of all workers who have been employed continuously for 18 months, and the elimination of the present clause which requires a sponsor's contribution of at least 25 percent of the total cost of the W. P. A. program. I shall vote for each of these amendments and support each wholeheartedly.

A reduction in the W. P. A. rolls by 44 percent at this time would affect some 12,000 heads of families in Louisiana which represents 48,000 individuals. The State of Louisiana, as Governor Jones has pointed out, does not have the money to carry this additional relief burden, and I recognize my responsibility as a Member of Congress from Louisiana to do everything in my power to see that adequate Federal funds are provided to meet any unemployment problem in my State.

According to my information there are over 63,000 needy unemployed heads of families in Louisiana, including those presently assigned to W. P. A. jobs, those on the W. P. A. awaiting-assignment roll, and an estimate of those who are not certified but who are in need of W. P. A. employment.

I further agree with the Governor of Louisiana that on the basis of these facts I feel that the relief expenditures recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the House are inadequate and furthermore that the President should be granted authority by the bill to expend the funds appropriated in less than the fiscal year, provided conditions justify.

We cannot, Mr. Speaker, blind our vision in the face of the facts as they exist in the national-defense program. The South has not received anything but a mere drop in the bucket of the great defense-program contracts. It cannot be logically concluded therefore that the need of continued W. P. A. assistance in the South will be eliminated as a result of the current national-defense program. On the contrary, there is as much need as ever that the W. P. A. program be continued in the Southern States and in those other centers in the Nation which have not benefited through the national-defense program.

It is all well and good, Mr. Speaker, for those from areas where a vast portion of the defense project money has been assigned to say that the unemployment slack has been taken up and W. P. A. appropriations should be cut, but what about those areas of this country where there has not been any appreciable allotment of defense projects? There is just as much need for continuation, and even expansion, of the W. P. A. in those areas as before.

How about those men who cannot be absorbed in the national-defense program, as was so ably pointed out on yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]. I believe it is the Government's responsibility at this time, more than any other time, to give the opportunity to every citizen who wants to work that chance and that privilege.

I am well pleased with the results of the national-defense program in my own particular district, which includes the lower half of New Orleans and the parishes of Plaquemines and St. Bernard. In my own district is located a new shipyard which will employ six or seven thousand persons, and on the shores of Lake Pontchartrain are to be found a 1,000-bed hospital, an air-training school, a bombardment wing, and an observation squadron. I, therefore, am not selfish in urging additional appropriations for the entire State and in those States not affected by the national-defense program.

Louisianians, Mr. Speaker, are loyal citizens and are solidly behind the defense program and the President. Louisianians are ready and willing to contribute their time and their money and their lives, if need be, for the continuation of the American way, and I believe in all justice to them their needs and the needs of equally loyal citizens of other States should be given serious consideration by this Congress.

Let us, Mr. Speaker, adequately provide for our people, and we will have a happy people who make for good government and who will not be found wanting when the test comes to defend that Government.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PONTIAC (MICH.) DAILY PRESS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press on the St. Lawrence seaway:

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Daily Press of June 7, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Completion of the St. Lawrence seaway can mean much to Michigan in many ways. It will cut transportation costs to eastern seaports of our own products and make Great Lakes ports entries for foreign goods needed from Central and South American countries. Its completion, which the President says can be accomplished in 4 years, should bring the advantage of cheap water transportation now enjoyed by coastal cities to our farms and industries. Its effect would be to bring this State a great new source of revenue. By eliminating the 14-foot bottleneck in the St. Lawrence river, it will permit Michigan shipyards and other Great Lake ports to play an important role in the ship-building program.

Some details of how this area would profit is furnished by the Detroit Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway committee which points out that Michigan farmers could move dairy and poultry products to the eastern markets at 20 cents a pound below current transportation levels. Fruit and agricultural growers would enjoy comparable benefits. The automobile industry could ship finished cars to customers along the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts $10 cheaper than at present, and could supply Europe at $40 less a car.

The three hundred different commodities imported from foreign lands by the automotive industry could be on the Michigan assembly lines at a cost one-third below present levels. This means lower car prices, wider markets, larger pay rolls, and better business for the automotive cities such as Pontiac. Coffee from Brazil and citrus fruits from Florida would reach the Michigan markets at a third of present transportation costs. Endless benefits might be listed. This saving would be passed on to the consumers. The profit would be mutual. Completion of the seaway could have a stimulating effect upon Michigan's economic life.

The project of the St. Lawrence seaway has been before the public of Canada and the United States for many years. It has been endorsed by several Presidents and Canadian leaders. But at last the time seems ripe to bring about this great project. President Roosevelt has recommended legislation by Congress authorizing immediate construction. He sees in the water power to be developed a great aid to national defense of both the United States and Canada, as well as the trade benefits which we visualize. He believes that under the emergency we can complete this long-delayed project in far less than the normal estimated time of 4 years. "I know no single project of this nature more important to this country's future in peace or war," says he.

Michigan is back of his efforts to start this great undertaking.

Major de Seversky Endorses Mundt Resolution Asking for Inquiry on Need for Unified Air Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a steadily increasing number of letters and newspaper comments are reaching me daily in support of my resolution, House Resolution 228, now before the Rules Committee, which would authorize the Speaker to appoint a nine-man committee to examine the relative merits of our present set-up for utilizing the rapidly growing air power of the United States compared with the possible establishment of a separate air branch or the consolidation of all defense activities in a Department of National Defense with separate heads of Air, Army, and Navy having coordinate rank under the unified direction of the Department of National Defense.

The following letter from Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky has special significance in view of the fact that administration forces selected him to reply to the analysis made by Col. Charles Lindbergh of the air power of the major countries of the world:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 10, 1941.*

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have recently read of your resolution to create a special committee to investigate the advisability of establishing a separate air force, and I wish to congratulate

you on your foresight and understanding of the problems which our country faces.

It is my belief that our national security depends on an independent and hard-hitting air force, with a personnel completely divorced from Army and Navy supervision, trained upon the new principles and conditioned to the new strategy, tactics, and psychology of aerial warfare. It must be done at once, before we commit ourselves to a program of error which can only result in our ultimate defeat and humiliation at the hands of the enemies of democracy.

Whatever knowledge and experience I may possess in aviation matters is at your disposal in your endeavor to create such an air department. I am enclosing herewith a few articles which I have written on this subject. If any of the material contained therein can be of service to you, you are at liberty to use it in any way you see fit.

With my best wishes for your success, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY.

With his letter to me, Major de Seversky enclosed articles which he has recently had published in the American Mercury, Reader's Digest, Look magazine, and the Daily Mirror, all stressing the advisability of unifying the air forces of the United States so that the most modern methods may be utilized in utilizing this most modern of all forms of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I have also just received a letter from Col. Roscoe Turner, America's No. 1 speed pilot, endorsing my resolution, offering his assistance in presenting evidence before Congress, and enclosing some statements by him to demonstrate the importance of a unified air control in the United States.

The defense of America and of the Western Hemisphere is the No. 1 job of this country today, Mr. Speaker. To this paramount task this country is devoting its united effort and dedicating its collective purse. We all join in insisting that American soldiers, sailors, and airmen have the most modern and effective equipment in the world. To that end, we have this week appropriated an additional $10,000,000,000 to the vast sums heretofore appropriated. More appropriations for more modern defense machines are to come and the most exacting methods are used to test and inspect all this modern equipment before it is turned out in mass production or accepted to protect the lives and toughen the effectiveness of America's defense personnel. This is as it should be, for the defense of our way of life in our sphere of influence is not to be entrusted to antiquated machinery of defense or untried and untested innovations in the field of invention.

BUT OUR METHODS SHOULD BE TESTED AS CAREFULLY AS OUR MATERIALS

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, America should examine and investigate the effectiveness of its methods of defense in the same dispassionate and unprejudiced manner as we examine and investigate the materials of our defense establishments. Only the best answer to the fundamental question, "What is best for America?" should be the standard for determining which materials to accept or reject and which methods for utilizing these modern materials to perpetuate or discard. It is in this spirit that I introduced House Resolution 228 which would empower a congressional committee of highly qualified Members to examine and investigate, without prejudice and without preconceived conclusions, the best method for utilizing the vast new air power which the United States is rapidly creating. If a complete and careful inquiry reveals our present method of utilizing air power as an adjunct to our Army and Navy best answers the question, "What is best for America?" so let it be. And following such a finding from such an investigation, let there then be an end to the constantly growing wave of criticism from military sources as well as editorial sanctuaries.

If, on the other hand, such a candid analysis and inquiry reveals that a separate air force can best train our pilots, develop the full effectiveness of war planes, gliders, parachutists, and so forth, and provide protection for the Western Hemisphere, let the change be made without regard to sacred traditions and established usage. Finally, if, as many people believe, including your speaker, the time has come in America for the creation of an over-all Department of National Defense to consolidate all defense establishments under one head, with separate chiefs of coordinate rank in charge of air, Army, and Navy, and such a congressional inquiry demonstrates this to be the most effective method to organize and operate the defense of the Western Hemisphere, let this change be made. America can afford the best defense establishments in the world, and we can create the best organization in history to get the best results from these establishments.

It is not a healthful condition to have so many authoritative commentators and critics advocating drastic changes in our defense set-up without having any board of inquiry to examine the merit of our existing arrangement or to test the value of the proposed innovations. Such a congressional inquiry as I propose will provide a proving ground in which to demonstrate and evaluate the respective merits of all systems—past, present, and proposed. Once such an authentic and all-out inquiry has been completed and its conclusions made, America will enlist with renewed determination and confidence in the support and development of whatever arrangement is pronounced to be best fitted to finally and fully answer the question, What is best for America?

What the Seaway Means to New York and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE APRIL-JUNE ISSUE OF THE WESTSIDER

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a reprinted article from the April-June (1941) issue of the Westsider. The article, entitled "What the Seaway Means to New York and the United States," was written by Lee S. Buckingham, president of the Clinton Trust Co., of New York City.

As president of this large banking institution, Mr. Buckingham has been seriously concerned over the effect the proposed St. Lawrence seaway would have upon the present commerce and transportation facilities of the country. Of course, he is particularly interested in the losses to the port of New York. Some of the results of his studies along this line are contained in the article which I feel sure will be interesting to my colleagues who are now seriously considering the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The article follows:

Any port which handles one-half of the value of all the salt-water tonnage of the United States must certainly play a prominent part in the country's commerce. It follows that the entire Nation owes it to itself to protect and promote that port if confusion and turmoil are to be avoided. Bringing this basic truth down to a specific case, the so-called selfish argument of New York's port against the proposed St. Lawrence seaway is an argument which has national significance.

One might go further and add that the same arguments apply with equal emphasis, though in lesser degree, to the great ports of Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, or New Orleans, since the seaway would adversely affect all of them. Let us confine ourselves, however, to the New York area in our efforts to show that the losses to this port would affect the entire country if the seaway were approved.

Figures of the United States Army Engineer Corps show that in 1937 approximately 386,000 tons of Great Lakes freight were exported from or imported to Europe by means of the New York State Barge Canal, and that an additional 647,000 tons of coastwise freight were handled in the same waterway. The total value of this freight, all of which had to be transshipped through some New York port channel, amounted to $66,000,000. These figures do not, of course, include the millions of dollars' worth of freight brought from the Great Lakes ports to New York by railroads and trucks. This is an important consideration, since there are 4 or 5 months during the year when the barge canal boats and Great Lakes steamers are not in operation. Such figures are not readily available. We do know, however, that the exports from the Hudson River channel alone in 1937 of four commodities which come principally from the Great Lakes region—wheat, automobiles, copper ore, and iron and steel—had a value of $210,000,000. This amounted approximately to one-quarter of the export business of that particular channel. We do not know the value of similar cargo in the other channels of the port, but in weight it totaled 1,544,000 short tons, as contrasted with 1,677,000 tons shipped from the Hudson River channel.

It would seem reasonable, therefore, to estimate the total value of the business done in these four commodities as being in the neighborhood of $400,000,000. If the seaway were built, and the claims of its promoters were realized, practically all of this business would be diverted from New York. If it were transshipped from Boston, Baltimore, or New Orleans, the national phase of our argument would be considerably weakened, but such is not the case. It would go directly without transshipment to Liverpool, Southampton, Cherbourg, or Bremen.

Would the saving in the elimination of the transshipping cost be reflected in higher

prices to American producers or manufacturers? Certainly not. In a comparable case in 1929 the American railroads, at the request of the Government, reduced the export rates on grain in order to stimulate exports and increase farmers' prices. Almost immediately the market collapsed and prices hit a new low level. The net result was that the farmers received less for growing the grain; the railroads received less for hauling it; while the foreign traders and consumers reaped a harvest. There is no economic reason to expect a different result in this instance.

Now with these facts at hand, let us go back to the basic statement that the entire country is, or should be, interested in preserving the prosperity of this port area. In the first place, 10 percent of the population of the country resides therein. It possesses 17 percent of the country's buying power, 27 percent of its marginal buying power, 14 percent of its retail sales, 17 percent of its grocery sales, 11 percent of its drug sales, 20 percent of its wearing-apparel sales, 15 percent of its household sales, 20 percent of its new-building contracts, and 15 percent of its department-store sales. Its total retail sales volume aggregates more than $4,500,000,000 yearly.

Is there a single section of the country which would not be affected in the matter of distribution of its produced or manufactured goods if New York were to lose an annual business which in value amounts to $400,000,000? Certainly no one can gainsay the fact that if income is reduced, which it obviously would be, purchasing power will be reduced in the same ratio.

Suppose we consider the single item of fruits and vegetables, for which figures on New York's consumption are readily available. In 1939 the New York area purchased fruits and vegetables to the number of 2,626 carlots from Arizona; 40,724 from California; 40,004 from Florida; 2,051 from Idaho; 583 from Louisiana; 6,181 from Maine; 3,174 from Maryland; 779 from Michigan; 240 from Mississippi; 4,602 from North Carolina; 2,012 from Oregon; 6,698 from Texas; 247 from Utah; and 3,287 from Washington. Out of a domestic total of 199,000 carlots of fruits and vegetables consumed that year, only 46,000 carlots were produced in New York State. The remainder came from 46 other States of the Union. Rhode Island alone was missing in the matter of fruits and vegetables.

In the matter of meats, New York in 1939 consumed 502,625,000 pounds of western dressed carcasses, 115,696,000 pounds of western dressed cured meats, and 166,818,000 pounds of western dressed fresh and frozen cuts. Added together, these supplies from the Mississippi Valley and the western plains totaled exactly 50 percent of New York's domestic consumption for that year.

"One might go on indefinitely and consider household supplies, furniture, wearing apparel, other food products, cosmetics, lumber, metals, iron and steel, aluminum, soaps, glassware, textiles, and hundreds of other commodities. In every instance the results would show that the prosperity of some part of the country is dependent upon New York's purchases. There have been times in the past when much sectional jealousy existed concerning New York, but the dissemination of statistics, such as those just quoted, has made it evident in recent years that New York must be prosperous if the rest of the country is to enjoy economic success."

Of course, outside of its limited number of supporters, nobody seriously believes that the St. Lawrence seaway could provide sufficient economic inducements to justify the diversion of all this business. In that case the seaway would probably reach the highest pinnacle of man's folly—but it would still have to be paid for by American taxpayers.

Boiled down to logical conclusions, we are faced with a proposal which, if successful, would ruin the commerce of the Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf of Mexico for the benefit of foreign purchasers and which, if not successful, would still cost the United States and Canada something like $1,000,000,000. It seems almost unnecessary to add that the entire country should demand that this uneconomic proposal be permanently shelved.

United States Trade in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY C. V. WHITNEY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I submit an address by Mr. C. V. Whitney, chairman of the Pan American Airways System, entitled "The Challenge to United States Trade in Latin America," and request that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This address was delivered before the National Association of Credit Men at New Orleans on May 13, and is of such importance that I wish, in addition, to call it to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO UNITED STATES TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA

First, let me say that this talk about Latin America may be a mixture of the pleasant—with the grim. Only by considering both can we fully realize the conditions which we, as businessmen and Americans, face today. I hope the combination of the two will leave you and the citizens of this city with an impression that I am urging you to face facts. At no time in our history have we so needed to be realistic.

To New Orleans and to the State of Louisiana I have a message to be spoken as chairman of the board of directors of Pan American Airways. And to those of you at this convention, I believe I have a message of particular importance because my subject affects the trade, the unity, and the defense of all the Americas.

For years New Orleans has been a great center of our Nation's commerce. Today this city and this port have become of vital importance in our national program for the unity and defense of the hemisphere. For the task that lies ahead, New Orleans has at its command splendid rail, river, and sea transportation. To these will soon be added the airplane—the swiftest trade vehicle used by man—which will make New Orleans a base for speeding its cargoes of trade and democratic good will between the Americas.

Pan American Airways, which pioneered America's international air trade routes, today awaits only our Government's go-ahead signal to make New Orleans our country's newest springboard for greatly increased expansion of trade and commerce between the Americas. We hope to build—within the shortest possible time—a bridge of planes across the Mexican Gulf to connect New Orleans with the Pan American network of airways to every Latin American capital and commercial center. Given these new facilities for modern commerce, the day is not far off when New Orleans will flourish on the air routes, as it has on the river and sea routes, as an aerial terminus for inter-American trade moving from the center of the United States through this port, by the shortest possible route, into the heart of South America.

Geographically speaking, your meeting here in New Orleans expresses a hope welling out of the heart of the United States. That hope is symbolized by the majestic force of the Mississippi, which collects its waters from smaller arteries that tap the largest developed industrial and agricultural area in the world. The flow of the Mississippi is southward. Here in New Orleans it forms a natural arrowhead pointing toward Latin America.

This is the direction in which a large section of American business is now headed. In the variety of your interests as credit men, you tap the daily values of local and national production, and you, therefore, represent the power of business on the march toward the unification of the Americas.

Ahead of you lies an important task. But to succeed we must all realize beforehand that there are powerful opposing forces at work, forces which are seeking to curb the aims of free trade—even of democracy, and liberty—in the Americas.

As one of the men who brought Pan American Airways into being 14 years ago, I remember well the constant struggles, the little victories and the defeats of the last decade. Nevertheless, we have seen a little air line start from a perilous 90-mile flight between Key West and Habana in 1927, then progress and grow until it now speeds American commerce and good will across half the earth.

This task was not accomplished by men with philosophies of defeatism. Nor can the job ahead of you be accomplished if you say, "It cannot be done," or if you believe that it is too late, any more than we can safeguard our own security here at home if we follow those who say that democracy in Europe cannot survive the present conflict. Believe me, it is not too late to help England in her present struggle to preserve freedom and democracy. Nor it is too late to consolidate the Americas into a strong and prosperous community of nations that will stand for all times.

The war has focused our attention upon the other side of the Atlantic. Our country is concerned with delivering great quantities of materials, and particularly aviation equipment, to the battlefields of Europe, Asia, and Africa. But today the peace of South America is being broken by undeclared political and economic warfare in which the airplane is also playing a strong role. There are few today who will not agree that the most significant political fact of our time, and for the future, is the certainty that the air is the new road to power and trade. The Axis Powers, especially, are conscious of this in South America.

Contrary to popular supposition, the demands of the war in Europe have not weakened the force of the Axis Powers in their drive to control the air over South America. The outbreak of the war caused suspension of Great Britain's plans to establish a network of air lines on the southern continent. The Dutch are tenaciously clinging to one small line on the north coast of South America. The aircraft of air France have been grounded. But into this same field the Axis forces in the air continue to move deliberately and aggressively.

It may surprise some of you to hear that the Axis air powers in South America are stronger than ever before. Over the trans-Atlantic route which the French were forced to abandon, Fascist Italy has set up a new air line which links Rome and Berlin with the great capitals of eastern South America. On the South American Continent itself air lines owned or in large measure dominated by Germany, parallel or oppose America's air services along nearly 22,000 miles of strategic trade ways.

The very existence of these foreign elements in the Americas has been described as a "time bomb laid at the most vulnerable part of the United States—its economy." These Axis planes, we know, spread the Nazi gospel in our neighboring republics. They are penetrating the most remote sections of the continent—where no commercial air line can be justified by the existing need for transport and communication. Commercially, these are unprofitable enterprises. Yet unending subsidies flow across the seas and continue to make up for their steady commercial losses.

I need not tell you that these foreign air services in Latin America are not aimed toward commercial goals alone. In many ways they serve other purposes. For instance, planes of the German-controlled Condor Syndicate make mysterious flights out over the South Atlantic for no reasons which can be justified by the commercial character of their legally chartered operations. The Brazilian Government learned that, as late as March 27, an Italian trans-Atlantic plane, ostensibly on a flight to test engines, disappeared off the coast of Recife, Brazil, and was gone 8 hours before returning to its base.

It could, of course, be pure coincidence that after this "test flight" two Italian steamers heavily laden with war supplies slipped from the Brazilian port—and through the British patrol—on their way to Europe.

In Argentina, the Government recently authorized a new air line to establish a local service out of Buenos Aires. An American manufacturer offered to supply the necessary equipment, if it could be spared from our defense production. The terms were attractive, but cash. The American's German competitor, dealing through the Nazi Condor Syndicate, was ready with a counter-proposal—to loan the Argentine air line two modern transports of German manufacture, complete with operating crews, for 6 months. By that time, they assured the Argentine operator, new planes for replacement would arrive from Germany. And these new planes they were prepared to deliver without deposit and to accept payment in installments spread over the next 5 years.

Gentlemen, I am no alarmist. I am not the first to report these and many similar instances. But I can assure you that they bear constant repeating. What we are witnessing in some South American countries now is simply a variation of a process of economic aggression which Axis Powers have worked successfully in Europe over and over again. The method calls first for the softening of the intended victim through this type of economic malpractice. Later the country itself which, through its commerce, has become obligated, suddenly is faced with the threat of military aggression. We have seen how the small nations, particularly, have had to give up with scarcely more than a diplomatic struggle.

Our Government at Washington has for many months been working on a program to solidify democratic interests in the American republics and to find ways and means of expanding our mutual trade as an offset to foreign economic aggression.

This program can succeed only if it has the absolute loyalty and up-to-the-hilt cooperation of every businessman in America. It represents a goal which requires long-range planning and constant, consistent effort. It may even demand the sacrifice of initial profits in order to enable you to withstand the political and economic thrusts of foreign competitors. But I know you will stand ready to make such temporary sacrifices without reservation if and when they confront you, because you know that they will be important for our national welfare. Large dividends are certain to come later.

Inter-American unity and defense can be built only upon a broad economic base aimed at the permanent establishment of commercial relationships. I do not mean to boast in pointing to the dynamic activity of Pan American Airways on this score. Nor do I wish to infer that what we have been able to accomplish, in raising American air transport to unquestioned leadership in Latin America, is possible of duplication, to the same extent, in all other commercial enterprises.

Pan American Airways started out 14 years ago with a realistic program and with the determination that, despite set-backs and discouragement, we would continue to build toward a permanent place in the life of the Americas. True, we constantly had to adapt our development to changing conditions both at home and abroad. True we modified plans or made entirely new ones to meet the changing strain of unorthodox methods wherever necessary. But we were never forced to deviate from our primary course. And—I believe this is significant—we have never had to abandon the cardinal principles of American business morality.

For the task ahead you businessmen of America have at your command today not only greatly improved transport and communication but many specialized aids as well.

For example, only a few weeks ago, I visited the offices of an import-export magazine publishing house in New York City. Toward the rear of a huge room there was a large round object which at first I thought was a table of unwieldly proportions, the kind around which perhaps 50 men could sit comfortably at the same time. I asked my friend, the publisher, about the table. He brought me closer to it. I then saw that this was no table at all. Its sides were fitted with compartments containing telephone directories from virtually every foreign city in the world. My friend pressed a button by his side and the whole object, telephone books and all, began turning like the base of a merry-go-round. Through this ingenious device any member of his staff could in a moment find the name, address, and telephone number of every business house in every major country of the world. The device also made it possible to check credit ratings within a few minutes.

In a similar manner you credit men have at your fingertips intimate information about the lives and businesses of millions of men and women throughout the United States. South American businessmen are not basically different from us, and information regarding the state of their trade and commerce is almost as easily available. If this information is not within quick reach, the airplane has brought it closer than ever before.

All of this is by way of bringing home to you the fact that a credit risk in a foreign country at peace should not be any greater than many right in your own home city.

Of course, there are bad credit risks in foreign countries—just as there are bad risks here at home. But I am sure that those of you who are members of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau will support me in criticizing the blindness of those who are unwilling to move beyond the borders of our own country because of an allegedly increased credit risk. We have found, through analysis, that credit is temporarily disturbed by political or social factors. But real credit, which is based upon the integrity of the individual himself, is not so disturbed.

Credit men everywhere know this to be true. And it is of the first importance that all American businessmen understand that foreign credit, just as domestic credit within our own United States is, in the last analysis, based upon the individual. You will find, as we have, that business in Latin America, just as business here at home, is negotiated and administered by individuals who share the same qualities of integrity which we so highly respect within our own business community.

You may say that I feel this way because I am interested in a company that chose South America for development and that, naturally, we must have adapted ourselves to the requirements of such a project. That is true. Yet it is only because Pan American Airways has succeeded in their American trade that I presume to speak to you with any authority at all. We have met in the past, and continue to face today, the same problems which confront all businessmen who are active or seek to be active in Latin America.

As credit men, you have a grave responsibility for maintaining the best principles of American trade and business practices in our inter-American relationships. Your help is needed if we are eventually to eliminate the unsound economic relationships which exist in this important field. If you will but use your resources and your business contacts to encourage a freer flow of trade, in both directions between the Americas—and with an equal opportunity for profits for both South and North America—you will help to remove a major obstruction from the road to true hemisphere unity.

In citing this point, I do not want to miss this opportunity of recalling the wholehearted way in which you and other members of your profession have been employing arbitration to help inter-American trade. From my own activities with the American Arbitration Association, I have come to know and have enjoyed working with several of you. The National Association of Credit Men holds a service membership in the Arbitration Group, and I know that many of you contribute financially to the support and development of arbitration. Many of you, too, have taken an important lead in this work. I need only name one—the manager of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau, Mr. Campbell, who is also chairman of the Inter-American Committee on Trade Relations which was organized by the American Arbitration Association .

But in other fields, too, I have come to know the value of your cooperation. I know that you hold the trust of the American business community. I ask you to offer similar cooperation and to employ that trust in the cause of the defense and unity of the Americas. I cannot emphasize this need too strongly. Just as the Mississippi, on whose banks we stand, is the main artery for the wealth and commerce of such a large section of our Nation so is credit the lifeblood of business. Since you and other members of your organization administer this lifeblood, the task ahead of you is a clear one. I trust that, through your expert guidance, a "Mississippi" of new credit may flow across the Gulf.

You, the credit men of America, can do more than any other single group to help the peoples of both Americas to reach a common economic understanding.

I urge you. Teach the American businessman everywhere to disregard the bugaboo of social and political intrigue. I urge you to lead the way—to reach out across such temporary barriers to the business spirit of the individual beyond our frontiers. It is you—and he—who have within your hands the molding of the economic future of the American republics.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley, Former Postmaster General, Delivered at the Graduating Exercises of the New York Military Academy, Cornwall-on-Hudson, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, AND INTRODUCTION BY HON. CHARLES HARDY, OF NEW YORK

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James A. Farley and introduction by Hon. Charles J. Hardy, Sr., of New York City:

INTRODUCTION BY HON. CHARLES J. HARDY, SR.

Ladies and gentlemen and young men of the graduating class, it is my very pleasant duty to present to you the distinguished gentleman who puts aside for the moment the cares of a busy life and honors us by his presence today.

He needs no introduction from me, so I shall attempt none. His name is a household word throughout the length and breadth of our land, spoken always with admiration and with a depth of affection that testifies most eloquently to the place he holds in the minds and the hearts of our people. He typifies the highest ideal of American citizenship, which is the embodiment of all that our academy stands for—loyalty to the principles upon which our Republic is founded; steadfastness in right doing; square and fair dealing toward all men, the Honorable James A. Farley:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. Hardy, Colonel Pattillo, honored guests, and members of the graduating class of 1941, it gives me great pleasure to address the graduating class of 1941. I sincerely hope and trust I will have the pleasure of being present on a similar occasion 5 years from now, when I hope my son, Jimmy, who is one of the younger students here, will take his place among the many fine citizens who have been trained for life's work in this famous academy.

I have been personally acquainted with the high standing of the New York Military Academy ever since my boyhood days. It was because I knew intimately about your ideals that I was happy to have one of my own come under the influence of your distinguished faculty and historic traditions. I trust that my remarks today to the class being graduated will contain a few nuggets of worthwhile observation to be helpful to them in the pursuit of their careers.

The most grevious loss to mankind in my time has been a decline in respect for the pledged word, for promises, either our own or the other fellow's, and in mutual good faith. In saying this I am preaching from no dogmatic motto card. I think that what I have to say on this subject is the most realistic doctrine in the world.

The whole structure of civilization was built upon respect for truth and upon honor in keeping promises and discharging obligations. For example, there was no supergovernment in international law, no final force, no force at all except that of good conscience. The peace of the whole world rested on one single concept—reliance on promises in treaties and Christian principles of mutual respect for the smaller and the weaker peoples. When it was demonstrated, by the "scrap of paper" incident in 1914 that a brutal and sinister influence had crept back on humanity from the prehistoric cave man era the principal prop of international peace and security began to fail. There was no reliance left except threat and force counterbalancing force and threat. By that decline of peace through honor and honesty the whole world courts chaos and destruction. There is no peace. The nations are armed camps. Mutual respect has given way to mutual suspicion if not hatred. Spiritually the world has returned to the moral gloom of the Dark Ages—and all this because of the easy error of regarding truth and honor as little more than words in a schoolboy's copybook.

I do not need to labor this point. You can see it today wherever you look from pole to pole. "Macbeth hath murdered sleep" and international trickery hath murdered the peace of the world without which civilization cannot survive. Christ is crucified again more brutally, more terribly than ever happened at Calvary.

You do not need to look beyond your own daily experience to see another aspect of my point. It is not alone in international relations that civilization rests on truth, honor, good faith and reliance on mutual promises. Our family relations are the basis of our domestic security and peace. They are all that distinguish civilization from savagery. In them there is little eventual effective legal compulsion. They rest on the high moral determination of decent men to fulfill their obligations to their dependents.

Yet I need not ask you to imagine the destruction of everything that is sweet and enjoyable in this life, if those reliances should fail and the sacred institution of family and community life among us should become such a mockery of honor and good faith as has perverted so many international relations that depended on the same kind of truth, good faith, and honor.

To bring this argument into an even more realistic area, does it ever occur to you, that our whole economic life—commercial and industrial—rests absolutely on faith in the promises in contracts, express or implied? Not a wheel could turn in industry or transportation, not an individual would be secure in his employment for a single day, not a breadwinner for a family, rich or poor, could put his head on his pillow peacefully without some assurance that the engagements of promises, taken and given by him, would be faithfully fulfilled.

Laws can support but they cannot insure this tranquillity. It rests almost wholly in the confidence of each of us in the good faith of all of us. For that reason, every time one of us suffers even a momentary lapse in these vital obligations of truth and fair dealing he, by so much, strikes a little blow—slight perhaps, but of the same nature—as the terrible volcanic blastings that are being struck abroad today at every pillar of human happiness and security.

We are standing here almost within sight of the scene of the treason of Benedict Arnold—a brave soldier, a competent general, but a little man, a petulant man, a selfish man—which may all be compressed in two words—a "disloyal man." The immediate object of his military conspiracy failed, but the effect of his transgression on the minds and spirits and strength of the sorely beset defenders of this Nation and the architects of our future could have been disastrous.

What I am trying to say to you is that the homely, ancient virtues—truth, honor, and loyalty—are never to be taken lightly. They are not merely the basis of civilization in general but of our free American system in particular and of the highest hopes of mankind.

There is abroad in the world a substitute doctrine. It is not new. It is as old as tyranny and oppression. It recognizes that no nation is stronger than the sum of the strength of all its citizens. But it says also that the individual is too weak and untrustworthy to be depended upon to discharge the obligations of which I have spoken and upon which culture and civilization rests. For the moral and mutual responsibility of each of us separately and all of us together as the bulwark of national strength it substitutes the will of a dictator. For the compulsion of conscience and good faith it offers the compulsion of bondage, imprisonment, and the firing squad. For the leaven of good faith in human hearts it offers the whiplash of overwhelming force on human backs.

In other words, it is not only your own peace and security that depends on your faithful adherence to all that has been considered best among us, it is also your freedom. If our beliefs in our ancient virtues do not make us strong enough to resist and overcome this primitive dark and bestial doctrine, it will overcome the world, and civilization will go back to the nothing it set out from.

In this tragic conflict of ideas, perhaps tyranny has one great advantage. It speaks with a single mouth and relies on a single performance. Its millions of minions are puppets. Our system relies solely on the spontaneous and unfailing devotion to our ideals of millions of free men. The duty of keeping us true to them and so preserving our national strength and happiness is on no superior. It is on each of us separately. In that sense each of you is a sentinel on duty over a key point in the defense of humanity against an ever-present vicious and deadly dangerous enemy. Your military training tells you what that means. Yours is a trusteeship for us all—a responsibility high, direct, and acutely personal, and so is mine, and so is that of every one of us. The general and special orders are simple, but in this crumbling of all old values throughout the world, I cannot overestimate to you the value of their very triteness. "Be honest, truthful, faithful, and loyal and our country will have little to fear, no matter what happens elsewhere on this earth."

There is one more quality as precious as the others I have named. It also may be abstract in statement or sound like another Sunday school maxim, but in the sense of which I speak it is as concrete, practical and necessary as a well-formed brick. Let me say here a word about courage. I don't now refer to any parade of physical fearlessness. I am talking to you about the silent intestinal fortitude that is yours alone in the still watches of the night—4-o'clock-in-the-morning courage—confidence in yourself and in the future of our country that never fails or even wavers.

There has been too much sentimentality recently about the handicap of our present youth, their "gloomy outlook," and the "lost generation." There is no doubt also that you start out under dark skies—that you are born to sacrifice and hardship. But these are precisely the things that forge the metal of men. Especially are they the things that have hammered out the character of America.

Let's skip a generation or two. There is nothing glowering over your skies today that begins to equal the danger and the challenges that met the pioneers in the conquest of this continent and the making and preservation of this Nation.

Tyrannical powers threatening from abroad? Why, in those days they were not

even abroad. They were entrenched here in the Western Hemisphere surrounding us—north, south, and west of our beginnings.

Lack of equipment and preparation and dismay at threatening dangers? Why we started out on the edge of a howling wilderness. Savage men, savage coasts, unknown country frowned upon those generations from every side. With little more than their bare hands, the silent courage of their souls, their undoubting confidence in themselves, and the future of their country, they were willing to tackle anything. They did tackle everything and they peopled a continent in the shortest time, with the richest and most powerful civilization ever known in human history. You are confronted with no such task and menace as that. In comparison your lot is easy and your future high.

Dark days alternated with bright ones. Nothing that comforts you remotely resembles the dangers and dismay that threatened this country much later. For months the flag of an enemy floated within sight of the Capitol at Washington, and those were years when the dissolution of our country seemed inevitable. Then there was the Civil War, and recently the depth of the dreadful depression in 1933.

And let me say this to you also. No generation that has been produced in this country ever faced a desperate crisis as well prepared as you. In our earlier days only a few of the young could be given by their parents and their country even the rudiments of education. Also little was formerly known of proper principles of child health, diet, and culture. With each forward step this condition has been improved. You are the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time.

I was pleased and astonished recently to read that the great national cross-section of the draft, last taken in 1917 and 1918, and being repeated again today, revealed that young men selected so short a time as 23 years ago were, on the average, between 1 and 2 inches less tall and about 15 pounds lighter than the present crop. This is in the nature of a scientific miracle.

It is only necessary to sit for a short time and talk to this generation to realize how far they are ahead of the youth of my day in knowledge and education. There is no yardstick to measure this and there may be exceptions. But my contemporaries are unanimous in telling me that the advance in mental equipment is as great as that in physical equipment.

In all that you can take great pride. But never forget this, your elders can take an even greater pride. This didn't just happen. It came because those who went before you and begot you, never lost sight of those spontaneous obligations of family and other relations of which I have told you—the very foundation of American institutions. There is nothing in this regard that you enjoy or shall in the future enjoy that was not handed down to you through the sacrifice and self-denial of elders who loved you from childhood, watched over you from the cradle in a determination that whatever was denied them in youth should not be withheld from you.

I know an old lady who sometimes and truly says: "There was never a pair of clean white hands that came to majority without one or more pairs of hard and sometimes grimy hands behind them to make it so." Never let that thought escape your minds.

You go forth in the pride and the confidence of country and of all American generations that have gone before you. That may and should be a sense of great gratification to you. But it should put in your hearts an even greater sense of duty and responsibility. You are their heirs and the product of their sacrifice. You must be grateful and show your gratitude by works and not mere words. You cannot let your country or your elders down. It is not enough for you to repeat their records and their triumphs. You shall have fallen short if you do not greatly better them. I know you will.

Emergency Relief Appropriation, Fiscal Year 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on this floor, both pro and con, on the emergency relief appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1941. For the present fiscal year there was $1,350,650,000 available for the purpose of this Government agency. In view of the present national-defense program, many beneficiaries of the W. P. A. have been absorbed in defense industry, and in his original budget, the President requested $984,000,000 for this department. This figure was revised on May 20 to $875,000,000, the idea being advanced by the bill's proponents that this additional slash should also be made in the name of the absorption of workers in the defense program, and that the original amount is now not needed. In addition to this, there is an amendment which will make a further reduction of $50,000,000 by transfer to the food-stamp plan which will naturally further reduce the amount of people that can be gainfully employed by the W. P. A.

I am not intimately familiar with conditions in the other States which have received a lion's share of the defense contracts and industrial production, but I can definitely speak for Louisiana and most of the other States in the deep South, where national-defense contracts and industrial activity is the exception rather than the rule. If this bill is allowed to go through in its present state, with its 44 percent reduction, more than 12,000 heads of families, representing approximately 48,000 individuals, will be released from employment by the W. P. A. in Louisiana commencing next month. Louisiana is in no financial condition to carry this additional relief burden, so I ask you gentlemen of the House what shall be done with these people who are unable to find employment elsewhere after they have been dropped from the relief rolls? Our relief rolls have not been lessened by the national-defense program. As a matter of fact, we still have many applicants for relief who have waited in vain for many months for the assistance our Congress has pledged to give, and who will now face utter starvation should this slash materialize.

According to my information, the average age of W. P. A. workers is 43 years, and it is a known fact that industry almost invariably will refuse to give employment to a person over 40 years of age. Should these people be treated as castoffs and, with their families, allowed to suffer starvation and need, as indicated in the following poem:

In savage tribes where skulls are thick,
And primal passions rage,
They have a system, sure and quick,
To cure the blight of age.
For when a native's youth has fled
And years have sapped his vim
They simply knock him on the head
And put an end to him.

But we in this enlightened age,
Are built of nobler stuff,
And so we look with righteous rage
On deeds so harsh and rough.
For when a man grows old and gray
And weak and short of breath,
We simply take his job away
And let him starve to death.

In addition to helping those unfortunate people who are unable to get employment elsewhere, the W. P. A. program has done our country an immeasurable amount of good. You may recall only a few years ago, before this program started, we had utter chaos, fear, insecurity, and near revolution. Through this agency we have helped the unfortunate and at the same time have generally benefited by the construction of public buildings and schools, highways, streets, airports, improved drainage, hospitals, recreational facilities, and every other type of public improvement imaginable. It has also furnished direct medical and health services and lunches for school children. It has definitely proved that we can be our brother's keeper, which has been the ultimate aim of governments for years. Upon this system the greatest country on earth has been built. This philosophy has now spread from our brother to our neighbors, and at the present time we are spending billions of dollars all for the alleviation of suffering to our neighboring nations and for the protection of our democratic ideals, yet there are those here who would continue dishing these billions to neighboring countries and at the same time take away from their own people not only a few small luxuries they now enjoy but also the bare necessities of life. At a time such as this, when we should stand out as an example to the lesser nations of this earth, we destroy our own souls. Is this Americanism? Is this democracy? I say, "No." I say charity should begin at home. I am 100 percent for helping our neighbors in distress. I am 100 percent for sacrifices we may have to make for the cause of democracy. But in aiding our neighbors and in helping our democratic cause let us not forget our own back yard. Let us not forget that we are leaders in better citizenship. Let us not reduce this appropriation to a point where our own people will suffer. Instead, let us increase this amount so that our own unfortunate people may not only help themselves but may continue the wonderful work they have done for the past few years in various public improvements.

Additional Appropriation for T. V. A. Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the passage of House Joint Resolution 194, appropriating $40,000,000 to the T. V. A. for the construction of four additional dams.

From time to time on the floor of the House, the T. V. A. has been severely criticized, but today I am sure its most vigorous critics will agree that we would be in a desperate plight for power and our national-defense program would be severely jeopardized if we did not have the T. V. A.

The vision of those who have advocated the T. V. A. through the years is now generally approved as sound. In my opinion, it is the best investment the Government has made since the acquisition of the Panama Canal.

The T. V. A. is in a position to fulfill all of its contracts for power in spite of the unprecedented drought throughout the southeastern section. The difficulty is that the Aluminum Co. of America, which has large plants at Baden, N. C., and Alcoa, Tenn., would only contract for 30,000 kilowatts of primary power. These plants have now been extended. It is necessary that they have almost 200,000 kilowatts of prime power, and the Tennessee Valley Authority is called upon to supply them with this amount. We realize that these plants must be kept in full operation. The T. V. A. officials have been supplying them on a day-to-day basis. They have secured all the power available throughout the section. There is no available power to meet the increased demand. The building of these 4 dams would furnish an additional 116,000 kilowatts. They can be constructed quickly. The record shows that this would be the cheapest power that could be provided. In addition, the dams will have some flood-control value. I feel that it is absolutely necessary that they be constructed.

It should be pointed out that in addition to the electricity being furnished the Aluminum Co., the T. V. A. is furnishing more than 250,000 kilowatts to other industries which have resulted from the Government's defense program. The Reynolds Metals Co. requires 10,000 kilowatts; the Monsanto Chemical Co., 50,000 kilowatts; and the Victor Chemical Co., Southern Ferro Alloys Co., Firestone Rubber Co., and the Electrometallurgical Co. also require a tremendous amount of electricity. These companies are all making vital defense materials. Thus it is apparent that the T. V. A. is serving a most necessary purpose in our defense program, and this enlargement of its electrical capacity should be provided for.

Strikes Against the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. E. E. COX, OF GEORGIA

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Cotton Manufacturing Association of Georgia, May 29, 1941:

Mr. President, 11 months ago America began its program of defense. Authorizations and appropriations for the Army for the fiscal year 1941–42 total almost $17,000,000,000; for the Navy more than $7,000,000,000; for other agencies more than $2,000,000,000; and for the lease-lend measure $7,000,000,000—a grand total of more than $33,000,000,000 for national defense.

Industry was called upon to perform the greatest task ever undertaken by the Nation—a production job requiring 28,000,000,000 man-hours of work to be performed in 27 months.

The youth of the Nation—500,000 of them—were called into active selective service in order that they might be trained to use the equipment produced by industry or to aid in its final delivery overseas. All the Nation entered upon the greatest preparation for defense in the history of the Republic. Then labor struck. Not against industry, not against management; not against ownership; but against national defense: against the safety and security of 500,000 American youth waiting for the weapons of defense; against the safety and security of American homes; against the civilization of America; against the very existence of America.

During this year alone 1,700,000 man-days have been lost through strikes in plants producing for the Army. What does this loss mean? It means that during these lost man-days there could have been produced 40,000 Garand rifles, 1,000 completely armed light tanks, 200 Curtiss-Wright pursuit planes, 100 training planes, 3,000 50-caliber machine guns, 500 75-millimeter gun carriages, and 30,000 antiaircraft shells. It means that the April coal strike reduced steel production by an estimated 370,000 tons of ingots—enough to build 12 battleships or 8,000 medium tanks.

The strike of 1940 against the Vultee Aircraft Co. tied up $43,000,000 worth of national-defense contracts for more than 12 days. This strike, together with others which occurred in 1940, compelled the defense industries of the Nation to lose the services of the 547,000 strikers, involving a loss of 6,500,000 man-days.

During 1939, 1,170,062 striking workers caused the Nation's industries to lose 17,812,219 man-days. In 1937 the Nation witnessed the beginning of the sit-down strike, and, more recently, strikes have grown constantly worse as the national emergency has grown more serious. The strike at the River Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co. affected 85,000 workers, with an additional 35,000 workers in Ford Co. plants throughout the Nation. Ford defense contracts aggregating $150,000,000 were tied up.

For more than 2 weeks a machinists' strike has tied up 11 shipyards in the area of San Francisco Bay, involving more than $500,000,000 worth of Navy and maritime construction and threatens now to extend to a twelfth. And the end is not yet. Labor, in its conspiracy with bureaucrats—aided, supported, indulged, and championed by bureaucrats—defies the Congress, frustrates the efforts of industry, flaunts the wishes of the people, and jeopardizes the safety of the Republic.

On Wednesday, May 28, the Office of Production Management, the key agency of the Nation's defense program, was 1 year old. It reports at the end of this first year that it is not satisfied with the progress of defense to date, but that "production should increase with every month from now on." William S. Knudsen, Director General of the Office of Production Management, says we have "made a start" and that we needed the help of "every manufacturer, engineer, and production worker to get this industrial machine speeded up to its highest efficiency." Yet labor struck; labor continues to strike; and labor gives no indication that it plans to cease to strike, despite the emergency, despite the progress of the aggressor, despite the threat to the safety and security of all the people.

We have made no real progress in solving the disputes engendered by labor in this period of national crisis; we have effected no permanent settlement of recurrent strikes; we have not abated labor's threat to the safety of the Nation; we have not effected an industrial peace necessary to the progress of defense.

We have not done so because we have permitted, and still permit, labor to carry on a national conflict within its own ranks involving industrial, agricultural, professional, and maritime workers while the Nation waits for equipment for defense.

We have not done so because we have no effective machinery armed with adequate authority for the settlement of the disputes raging within the ranks of labor itself or which labor now wages against the industry of defense.

We have not done so because of our bureaucratic encouragement of collective bargaining—a form of collectivism—through the labor provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act, declared unconstitutional by a Supreme Court constituted at the time so as to perform its functions as intended under the Constitution. We have not done so because of the enactment of the Wagner Act, the National Labor Relations Act of 1935; and we have witnessed the results of the Wagner Act in the unionization of an additional 5,000,000 men and women since 1935, as well as in the changed status of employers in their relation to their employees.

We have not done so because we have no effective governmental machinery to cope with the collectivist threats of labor. True, the Office of Production Management has a mediation staff, but what can the people hope from a staff under the guidance, direction, and instruction of its present head. A Maritime Labor Board mediates disputes in the marine industry—with what results you all are familiar. And the United States Conciliation Service has an army of alleged conciliators wandering about the Nation at the expense of the taxpayers.

We have not done so because collectivist unionism almost has grown out of hand. It has become a huge, almost uncontrollable power that defies Federal and State government alike, that threatens all the citizens of the Republic with its power to blockade any State, to starve out any community, its leaders unopposed by government and apparently protected from punishment under existing law by the decisions of the Supreme Court.

I have urged repeatedly that the continued strikes in defense industries, causing delay in the production of equipment for national defense, should be met by the only effective machinery available to the people—mandatory no-strike legislation enacted by the

people's representatives in Congress and made the law of the land. In his historic and momentous address of last Tuesday the President took cognizance of these conditions that imperil the progress of national defense, and it is to be hoped that he will exercise a part of the tremendous power now at his disposal to bring to an end the obstructive practices of unionist collectivism.

It is unionist collectivism that hampers, retards, and hinders production for defense today—that defiantly ignores the public interest, threatens the public welfare, and cripples industrial operations by striking at a time of national emergency. It is unionist collectivism that threatens to destroy private ownership and individual initiative—that places a premium upon indolence, indifference, disaffections, and violence. It is unionist collectivism that has given rise to the labor agitator who fattens upon increased fees and increased power at the expense of the national safety.

Unionist collectivism needs to be reminded that, after all, in America, it is still the security and safety of all the people that is the supreme law of the land, and that it must act within reason under that law. Unionist collectivism must be made to understand that the real cause of labor suffers most when it makes unfair and excessive demands and seeks to accomplish its ends through disloyal conduct.

Union collectivists have demonstrated unmistakably that they are more loyal to their union than they are to their Nation—that they regard the national peril merely as an opportunity to enforce demands that could and would not be granted under any other circumstances. Union collectivist leaders hold millions of honest, loyal, and patriotic American workers captive in unionist groups through the weapons of fear and force, while they seek to exploit the national emergency to add millions more to their ranks by intimidation and coercion.

If collectivist leaders continue to promote the interests of their unions at the expense of their Nation we might as well surrender to the aggressor now, accept the terms he may offer us, and give up the struggle before our cities and homes and churches and schools have been destroyed; for collectivist agitators are already at work in their efforts to destroy our civilization.

America cannot, and I believe it will not, tolerate a power that seeks to place itself above and beyond the law—the safety and the security of all the people.

Some of the magazine writers recently have designated me as the self-appointed watchdog of industry, but the designation is not altogether characteristic. If I am a watchdog of or for anything it is for the American people, whose country I do not want to see succumb to the philosophy of the greasy Muscovites who honeycomb every department of the Government and who have taken over the control of thought in many of our great universities and lesser educational institutions. My interest in American industry is only incidental to my interest in keeping America American. The effort to socialize the country and federalize all of the activities of the people I have resisted because I know that it means the surrender of all our liberties. I have wanted to stop somewhere short of the end of the road that leads to Moscow.

The record of the Government as concerns the labor situation constitutes, in my opinion, the blackest page in all its history. I sometimes wonder if a Government that has not the spirit to defend itself against the vandals and racketeers at home is a Government that is worth defending against the vandals and racketeers abroad. There has been no serious effort on the part of the Government to deal effectively with the gangsterism of labor. The Federal Government has refused consistently to consider any proposal to curb either the powers or the activities of unionist leaders and agitators. Federal authorities, Federal bureaucrats, Federal courts shade all decisions in favor of unionist collectivism. The Mediation Boards that have been set up are but additional weapons put in the hands of labor to further browbeat and terrorize industry. The whole scheme is to let conditions become so bad as to afford an excuse for the Government to take over industry—the very thing which the leftists are seeking and have been working to bring about. The collectivism of labor constitutes a greater danger to the Republic at this very hour than does Hitler and all his kind.

I believe in the capitalistic system—that is, work for pay and pay for work; and I decry the effort to hurry us into some form of labor despotism or collectivism.

If the racketeering policies and practices of unionist labor leaders and agitators are not stopped, America will go the way of France. The extortion of exorbitant fees from workers on defense projects is outrageous. It can neither be excused nor condoned by any fair-minded person. It is dangerous to the welfare of national defense. It is inimical to the security of the Nation. It is downright gangsterism. For labor leaders to take advantage of the stress of the Nation, for them to use national defense for further organization purposes, to demand holidays with pay, shorter hours, and increased wages is a public disgrace.

What about the boys who have been taken from the bosom of their families and the security of their jobs and drafted into the Army? They get no double pay for night work, no time and a half for overtime. Industry has been given no holiday during the building of national defense, and there is none for the taxpayer. The boys who have been drafted into the Army do not have the privilege of striking or of picketing the camps if they do not like the colonel's orders. They may not like the hours or the conditions or the pay for which they soldier, but they cannot strike about it. They cannot quit; and, better than that, they do not want to quit.

If the conditions which confront us are half as desperate as we are assured they are, then there is no time for a single strike. There is no time for a single hour's stoppage of work on defense. If conditions are as desperate as we are told they are, then this is not a question of carrying on business as usual—union business—it is a question of striving desperately, frantically, to get our national defense built in time. If this attitude on the part of organized labor continues, public opinion, the most powerful force in America, will compel President Roosevelt and the military officials to regiment labor out of the sheer necessity for national defense. I should prefer to see all labor on its own motion initiate a movement for voluntary mediation and arbitration. But if labor will not do that, then we must have compulsory arbitration. It has been said that efforts for mediation and arbitration have failed to halt strikes. I readily concede that the history of both mediation and arbitration shows that these efforts have failed. But if mediation and arbitration have not worked, it has been because labor did not want them to work and Government has not had the spirit to make them work.

The contention of labor leaders that they are striving to better the condition of the worker is true only in part. Their main purpose is to gain for themselves more and more economic and political power. The politician quails before them and does their bidding. The officeholder becomes their pliant tool and conspires to turn the Government over to them. It is un-American and dangerous to our liberties for labor to refuse to mediate or arbitrate its disputes and to continue to insist on stopping work on defense projects.

I am convinced that there are thousands of individual workers in the ranks of labor who, if they had their choice, would not strike against the national defense, who would not walk in a picket line, who would not jeopardize the defense of the Republic. But loyal Americans in the ranks of union collectivists are cowed by the abuse of power exercised by leaders who never should have been given that power in the first place and who should not now be supported by Government bureaucrats in the continued exercise of that power.

I hope that if there be any wise leaders remaining in the ranks of organized labor they will see the danger signal in time and will come forward with proposals for voluntary mediation and arbitration. But they have no time to lose. Our national defense must be built. It must be built as economically, as efficiently, and as quickly as it is humanly possible for us to build it. In the creation of the national defense, no section of the people has a more important function than the workers. If they do not rise to ideals of patriotism sufficient to motivate them in preventing these stoppages in work through strikes and walk-outs, then Congress must provide for compulsory arbitration in order that the whole Nation may not be endangered because of the selfishness and blindness and stupidity of a few labor leaders.

This is our common country. And this is a common cause, a common national defense. It is the common good, the common welfare, the common safety and security, and the common prosperity and liberty that are involved, and any labor leader who persuades his followers to insist upon their demands regardless of the effect upon the national defense is a traitor to his country and to this common cause.

Unfortunately, we have come to witness the day when private ownership is challenged by a collectivist philosophy, when private management is challenged by organized groups led by self-seeking agitators, when private operators, owners, and management have been made dependent upon the will of unionist agitators and the dictatorship of bureaucratic agents as to the manner in which they may conduct private industry, even for national defense. Private ownership stands at the mercy of both Government bureaucrats and unionist dictators.

The history of America, the success of America, has been in part the freedom of industrial enterprise. Ours has been a system of individual effort, individual activity, independent industry, in which each citizen has been free to choose for himself, free to follow his own desires, free to do that for which he regarded himself as best qualified. America's free industrial enterprise has given us more and better things, it has contributed to our advance and to our happiness. It has fostered, championed, and encouraged the progress that has been reflected in the comforts and conveniences that surround us and are a part of our daily lives.

They who would destroy our private industry, either directly or indirectly through bureaucratic regimentation, class hatred, intolerance, or sinister or subversive economic weapons, fail to recognize that private industry as we know it in America provides us with food, clothing, and shelter; that it has made the machine a slave in the service of humanity; that it has multiplied our powers and created new opportunities; that it has placed the resources of the world at our command; that it has surrounded us with comforts and provides us with abundant leisure for our self-development.

They who would destroy America's industry through unionist collectivism fail to realize that when industry loses we all lose; that when industry is prevented from completing its contracts for national defense, industry alone does not lose, but that all the Nation loses—labor included.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me say that I believe the great rank and file of our laboring men and

women are just as patriotic, just as eager to help build our national defense as any of the men and women in any class in any section of the United States. I believe that only a very small percentage of labor leaders are so blind and greedy and stupid as to want to take advantage of the necessities of the national defense in order to make unreasonable demands. Those labor leaders will have to be weeded out, and if they cannot be weeded out by the unions themselves, then the Government must step in and do the job. These greedy racketeers must not be permitted to endanger the entire Nation.

Bellwood, Pa., Develops Novel Cure For Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE ALTOONA (PA.) MIRROR

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, waywardness in young people has for years been the cause of deep study by educators, parents, and law-enforcement agencies.

Efforts are being constantly made to remove many of the pitfalls that beset the path of every youth, confident that there is truth in the saying, "as the twig is bent, the tree inclines."

Bellwood, Pa., located in my congressional district, has developed a novel plan to combat youthful waywardness through the Bellwood Junior Safety Council, an idea conceived by Burgess Edgar McKinney. That the plan is successful is attested to by the widespread approval given to the junior safety council.

The following article appearing in the June 11 issue of the Altoona Mirror published at Altoona, Pa., indicates the scope of the idea and its practical application:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of June 11, 1941]

YOUTH SAFETY SET-UP FIGHTS DELINQUENCY—BELLWOOD BURGESS AND MINISTER FIND NOVEL CURE FOR WAYWARDNESS IN YOUNG PEOPLE

Down in Bellwood—population 2,774—a veteran Blair County peace officer and a young Presbyterian minister are showing America how to solve its child-delinquency problem, by letting the children solve it themselves.

Rev. Eugene G. Slep, pastor of the Logan Valley Presbyterian Church, says the credit for the idea behind Bellwood's new child self-government program goes to Edgar McKinney, Bellwood's burgess, justice of the peace, and, incidentally, veteran former captain of Tyrone's famed Sheridan troop of the Pennsylvania National Guard.

At any rate, the Bellwood minister and the burgess, for many years a Pennsylvania Railroad policeman, are at present merely supervising an astute Bellwood junior safety council, police department, detective force, and bicycle club, composed of boys and girls from 10 to 17 years of age. They don't have to do more than supervise; the children, proud of their new responsibility, do all the rest.

HOW THE PLAN WORKS

Before describing how this little Blair County town became child-delinquency-conscious enough to do something about it, a few instances of how the plan works might be cited:

Recently, a bicycle was stolen. Within 4 hours child detectives discovered who stole the bicycle and who purchased it. Junior policemen returned triumphant with the bicycle, the money paid for it, and the culprit. And children tried him and set the penalty. Not long after the formation of the junior self-government organization, which includes a stern set of regulations for bicycle riders, one of the juvenile policewomen merrily zigzagged her bicycle down a main thoroughfare. Out from behind a tree came one of her comrades on the new child police force.

"You ought to be ashamed," he said (or words to that effect). "You're sworn to uphold the law. Don't you know what you're doing is dangerous?"

Reverend Slep tells how Burgess McKinney evolved the child self-government idea some months ago, how the two of them patiently ironed out difficulties in its organization, how children were first interested in it, and how it was finally formed when the new juvenile mayor, Carl Trego, signed the roster of its mayor, council, and police department last May 3. Results were soon felt, he claims:

"Already Bellwood businessmen comment on the decrease in juvenile delinquency. We think we have a real solution for the problem."

CREATES BETTER CITIZENS

The purposes of the new plan, according to Reverend Slep, are: First, to teach better citizenship; second, to build better character; third, to teach better cooperation with legal authorities. All three are accomplished by permitting junior officers to arrest their own offending playmates, to fine them, to hold trials where the seriousness of the crime warrants.

"The only trouble with allowing the children to fix the penalties," Reverend Slep smiled, "is that they are apt to be more severe than adults would be. So Burgess McKinney and I supervise. And we try to teach the young jurors to 'make the punishment fit the crime.'"

The next step planned by the two supervisors is a mass meeting of Bellwood children and their parents when Judge George G. Patterson and Miss Mary G. Davis, Blair County probation officer, will be asked to attend. "We want their suggestions to build our organization even further," say the sponsors. "And we want to offer it as a suggestion to towns plagued with juvenile delinquency. Already we're keeping a lot of cases out of the county courts with our method."

RULES GOVERN GROUP

Just to show that the children of Bellwood mean business, here are the rules regularly submitted and adopted at the first meeting of the Bellwood Junior Safety Council:

"Rules, regulations, and ordinances

"Bellwood Borough Junior Safety Council

"1. The riding of two persons on one bicycle is prohibited.

"2. Bicyclists will ride to the extreme right of the highway at all times.

"3. A white light at the front must be shown after dark, a reflector (red) on the rear after night.

"4. Positively no hitching on the side or rear of any vehicle.

"5. Bicyclists must stop at all stop signs and observe all safety rules when making turns at street intersections; positively no weaving in and out of traffic.

"6. Pedestrians must be given the right of way. Watch for cars pulling out of driveways and parking places and watch for opened doors on automobiles.

"7. Keep bicycle, especially brakes, in good condition at all times.

"8. Bicyclists must have a device to warn pedestrians of their approach.

"Penalties: First offense, a warning; second offense, riding privilege restricted for 10 days; third offense, riding privilege suspended 30 days.

"These rules and regulations and ordinances read by me and approved this 3d day of May A. D. 1941.

"Attest:

"JANET WALKER,
"Secretary of Council.
"BETTY CHERRY,
"President of Council.

"Approved this 3d day of May A. D. 1941.
"CARL TREGO, *Mayor.*"

PERSONNEL OF OFFICIALS

The personnel of Bellwood's Council includes, in addition to the foregoing:

Council members: Raymond Strunk, William Summers, John Campbell, Shirley Ort, and Junior Campbell.

Chief of police, James Campbell; assistant chief of police, Robert Ehrisman; lieutenant of police, Nancy Jane Slep; patrolmen, Robert Rumbaugh, Roberta Stone, Hermie Espigh, Mollie McGraw, Harold Laird, Eugene Turbaugh, Eugene Endress, Oliver Tennis, William Smith, and Jack Burns.

Detective chief, Merrill (Sonny) Dorn; assistant chief, Kenneth Woodhall; lieutenant of detectives, Lucille Treece; detectives, Tom Isenberg, Gerald Treece, Peggy White, Ronald Raugh, Kenneth Woodhall, and Paul Garahan.

Youthful offenders in Bellwood are apt to look at a formidable array like that and ponder, "What's the use? Crime can't pay with a junior cop behind each telephone pole on Main Street."

And it doesn't any more. But it might pay other communities to study why.

Arguments for a Speedy Completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Washington Post of Friday, June 13, 1941, this morning, by Mr. Ernest K. Lindley:

[From the Washington Post of June 13, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

ARGUMENTS FOR ITS SPEEDY COMPLETION

A stout blow—perhaps the stoutest—has been struck for the St. Lawrence waterway and hydroelectric project by William S.

Knudsen, on behalf of O. P. M. In endorsing both phases of the St. Lawrence development as part of the defense effort, Knudsen spoke not only for himself but for his O. P. M. associates: Sidney Hillman, Secretary of War Stimson, and Secretary of the Navy Knox. Stimson and Knox are scheduled to back up their approval in personal appearances before congressional committees.

The O. P. M. verdict is a deadly reply to the contention that instead of furthering national defense, the St. Lawrence project would divert men, materials, and machines which could be put to better use. Knudsen, Knox, and Stimson, all Republicans, are not new dealers who would take a stand out of loyalty to the President. They came in the Government to help defend the country and win the war. And both Knox and Stimson belong to the forward group in the administration who, in appraising the war situation, have been alert consistently to immediate needs. It is not conceivable that either would favor the St. Lawrence project if it would interfere with maximum aid to Great Britain and China during the next few critical months, and the most rapid mustering of our own national defense.

The St. Lawrence can be useful to our defense only if the war is prolonged. That is admitted on all sides. It will be from 3 to 5 years before the seaway and hydroelectric installations can be completed. The President, in ordering a resurvey, has expressed the hope that the seaway would be made available for emergency use in 2 years. This may be a trifle optimistic, although there is little doubt that under emergency conditions the project could be rushed to completion in less time than the original schedule called for.

If the President's present war strategy succeeds, the war may be over before the St. Lawrence development can be finished. Before then the Germans will have been bombed out and the Nazi regime broken up. But no forward-looking and cautious person can rely on the success of this strategy. We are building a two-ocean navy on the supposition that the British, with our aid, may not be able to hold. We are building and planning battleships and aircraft carriers and cruisers which will not be launched until 1945 or 1946.

If we are justified in building a two-ocean navy which cannot be completed for another 4 or 5 years—and by then may have to be increased still more if it is to protect us in both oceans—it would not seem lacking in foresight to build a seaway and hydroelectric project which will require no longer time for completion. The argument for going ahead becomes all the stronger when it is realized that the seaway will make possible the shift of some major naval construction from the coasts to the Great Lakes.

In the Great Lakes, on the American side, are 30 yards with building berths at least 500 feet long. On the Canadian side are 15. Not all of these can be used for building, for example, cruisers. But some can be, and others can be made available with relatively simple refitting. A cruiser rests on the ways for about 18 months, and requires up to 3 years for completion. A freighter of the ugly duckling type rests on the ways only 3½ to 4 months. By the time cruisers begun next spring could be completed, the St. Lawrence waterway probably would be ready to provide their exit to the sea. And for every cruiser shifted to a Great Lakes yard, at least four or five desperately needed freighters could be launched on the coast.

The defense arguments, pro and con, do not conceal, of course, the other interests and motives involved in the St. Lawrence project. It is an old dream of the President's. The first treaty looking toward joint development of the waterway was signed almost 2 years before his public career began in the New York State Senate. The first surveys were made in the Wilson administration. Every President since that time has advocated that the waterway be built.

As Governor of New York, Roosevelt was especially interested in the hydroelectric phase—as Al Smith had been before him. The St. Lawrence is the missing member of the four great publicly owned power yardsticks which he advocated as a Presidential candidate in 1932. The others are Boulder Dam, T. V. A., and the Columbia River development centering on Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

The basic alinement of forces for and against the development has changed little in recent years. And until our national-defense program got under way no new argument had been heard on either side.

Naturally, both sides are attempting to harness to their own uses every argument bearing on our national security. Nobody can deny that the additional electric power and the seaway to the Great Lakes would now be extremely valuable. If Roosevelt's advice had been heeded years ago, the Nation would now be more secure and more powerful.

No one can say flatly that the St. Lawrence project does or does not require immediate attention, as against competing claims for men, materials, and machines. But the united and emphatic stand taken by the members of O. P. M., charged with the heavy responsibility of developing the defenses of the Nation, is a heavy blow to the opposition.

W. P. A. Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in considering House Joint Resolution 193, being appropriation bill for work relief for this year, I think it is essential that certain facts should be borne in mind. Various proposals for cutting this appropriation bill as recommended by the President are before the committee. In considering these proposals, it is consistently urged that the national-defense program is taking up unemployment.

This may be true in the localities that are getting defense contracts, but I would call your attention to the fact that 70 percent and more of the contracts to date have been given to four States. It is also apparent that at least $10 of defense money will go into the Northeast area, already overindustrialized, to $1 of the defense program that is spent in the section from which I come.

I would ask that you bear in mind these facts relating to the concentration of defense expenditures when you examine table 3 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, found on pages 120 and 121 of the hearings. Table 3 is as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Estimated number of workers eligible but not assigned to Work Projects Administration employment, by States,*[1] *Apr. 30, 1941*

State	Eligible but not employed	Certified but not assigned [2]
Continental United States	1,263,924	413,220
Region I, total	47,404	7,652
Connecticut	3,467	137
Maine	[3] 2,465	1,074
Massachusetts	[4] 32,304	4,926
New Hampshire	1,261	477
Rhode Island	3,992	665
Vermont	3,915	373
Region II, total	162,319	53,443
Delaware	[3] 1,780	91
District of Columbia	1,193	872
Maryland	3,318	1,059
New Jersey	[3] 40,136	7,479
New York	61,725	[5] 5,120
Pennsylvania	54,167	38,822
Region III, total	278,475	62,279
Florida	42,351	9,746
Georgia	24,675	5,493
Kentucky	32,973	7,653
North Carolina	48,608	5,204
South Carolina	41,486	12,858
Tennessee	61,305	18,987
Virginia	[3] 27,077	2,338
Region IV, total	220,053	95,222
Illinois	61,048	23,789
Indiana	20,601	10,011
Michigan	28,394	8,849
Missouri	48,499	23,465
Ohio	28,754	12,456
West Virginia	32,757	16,652
Region V, total	55,391	17,801
Iowa	11,099	3,131
Kansas	9,784	4,834
Minnesota	9,944	1,225
Nebraska	7,339	2,163
North Dakota	3,352	134
South Dakota	2,826	632
Wisconsin	11,047	5,682
Region VI, total	415,717	135,661
Alabama	68,813	18,629
Arkansas	50,876	19,119
Louisiana	34,249	5,297
Mississippi	30,317	13,263
Oklahoma	[3] 113,243	35,408
Texas	[3] 118,219	43,945
Region VII, total	39,971	13,888
Colorado	8,083	5,220
Idaho	566	566
Montana	2,466	754
New Mexico	20,300	4,088
Utah	3,094	260
Washington	4,103	1,816
Wyoming	1,359	1,184
Region VIII, total	44,594	27,274
Arizona	6,331	1,372
California	36,626	24,989
Nevada	380	17
Oregon	1,257	[6] 46

[1] Estimated by State work projects administration and State department of public welfare unless otherwise indicated.

[2] Data represent reported number of workers certified and available for assignment on Apr. 30 in the continental United States: in the Territories an additional 115,631 certified workers were available for assignment.

[3] Estimate submitted by State work projects administration.

[4] Joint estimate with local rather than State departments of public welfare.

[5] Data shown represent cases in process of assignment in New York exclusive of New York City. No file of certified persons is maintained by Work Projects Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the above table shows that in the continental United States there are eligible, but not employed, 1,263,924 workers. Of this total number, in regions III and VI, comprising the 13 Southern

States, are found 684,192 of these workers, showing that more than 50 percent of the people eligible for employment on W. P. A., but unemployed, are located in that section of the country that is receiving less than 10 percent of defense expenditures.

The district I represent is largely an agricultural district. These people have been especially hard hit during the past season. The strawberry farmers in the central part of my district had one of the most disastrous seasons in their history. The Irish-potato crop has proven equally unprofitable. Both of these crop failures were due to inclement weather, and the failure of these crops will undoubtedly mean that more people will be forced on relief in that section. These will be in addition to the number estimated as of April 30, 1941, in the above table.

I submit herewith another table showing the potential relief needs of the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana, by parishes, as of April 30, 1941. This table was prepared by the State Administrator of the Work Projects Administration, and is as follows:

Potential relief needs as of Apr. 30, 1941

Parish	Assigned to W. P. A. projects	Awaiting assignments to W. P. A. projects	Temporarily ineligible for assignment because of sickness, temporary private employment, etc.	Total	Department of public welfare estimate of persons eligible for W. P. A. referral who have not applied	Total potential load
District total	3,480	392	2,826	6,698	5,614	12,312
Ascension	196	64	266	526	89	615
East Baton Rouge	965	36	182	1,183	4,311	5,494
East Feliciana	60	13	143	206	4	210
Iberville	201	44	55	300	75	375
Livingston	171	7	637	815	25	840
Pointe Coupee	61	6	39	106	125	231
St. Helena	147	21	233	401	26	427
St. Tammany	458	38	217	713	62	775
Tangipahoa	508	49	417	974	220	1,194
Washington	576	61	299	936	532	1,468
West Baton Rouge	135	25	47	217	59	276
West Feliciana	12	18	291	321	86	407

Anthony Wayne Military Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

LETTER OF HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE, OF INDIANA, TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter which I have just addressed to the President of the United States:

JUNE 13, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to respectfully call to your attention what I consider to be the importance, from both defense-time and peacetime standpoints, of a military highway which would extend from Indianapolis to the Canadian border, through Fort Wayne, Ind., and Toledo, Ohio.

I have in mind a highway following in part the military route of Gen. Anthony Wayne, during his campaign against the Indians in the Northwest Territory, along the Maumee River between Fort Wayne and Toledo. Its purpose would be, of course, to provide a strategic outlet to the north which could easily connect with important Canadian highway arteries at Detroit.

The usefulness of a military highway which would facilitate the rapid movement of troops and munitions from industrial and military centers of Kentucky, Indiana, and northern Ohio, to the Canadian border, would seem to present advantages which are readily apparent. From the viewpoint of United States-Canadian defenses, a highway of this nature and in this location would possess great strategic value.

Consideration should be given to the new and expanding military camps, ordnance plants and industrial units located in this section. I am thinking particularly of such Indiana establishments as Fort Benjamin Harrison, at Indianapolis; the new Army Air Corps base, at Fort Wayne; the Indiana Ordnance Works and the Hoosier Ordnance Plant, near Charlestown; the Jefferson Proving Ground, at Madison; and the Kingsbury Loading Plant, at La Porte. Each of these establishments could be served, directly or indirectly, by a defense highway from Indianapolis to Canada.

It would probably be possible to construct an Anthony Wayne military highway under the provisions of the proposed new Federal-aid defense highway program, or it could be undertaken in a separate measure as a tactical military road. I presume that provision would be made for aircraft landing strips at suitable points along the route and that other devices necessary to meet military requirements would be included.

In the future, this route could be developed into a memorial parkway which would serve to honor the memory of General Wayne, who in 1794 led his Federal troops up the Maumee River in the final phase of the Revolutionary War, breaking the resistance of the Indians and saving for the United States a territory embracing most of the present States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

Such a project would accomplish, in part, the purposes set forth in House Joint Resolution No. 406, passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress, creating an Anthony Wayne Memorial Commission, and in subsequent legislation providing for a survey of the proposed Anthony Wayne Memorial Highway.

It would bring a step nearer to realization the vision of a great scenic artery, connecting such historic sites at Fort Wayne, Fort Defiance, Fort Deposit, Fort Miami, the Battlefield of Fallen Timbers, encampments and burial places of Wayne's soldiers, as well as Blue Jacket Town, Pontiac's birthplace, Girty's Island, and other sites of historic interest.

I make this suggestion as being in harmony with the urgent defense needs of today and in harmony with the previously expressed desire of Congress to provide a suitable memorial to General Wayne and his conquest of the Northwest.

Perhaps you will wish to refer this suggestion to the War Department and to the Public Roads Administration for consideration. It might also prove of interest to the National Resources Planning Board, which is now carrying on a commendable program of postemergency planning.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Member of Congress.

"When Wealth Is Publicly Owned, Forms of Slavery Develop"—Public Ownership of Property and Destruction of Private Wealth are the Policies of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEORGE SOKOLSKY

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the New York Sun of June 7, 1941:

[From the New York Sun, of June 7, 1941]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

TOTALITARIAN AMERICA

If we omit the words "fascism" and "communism," which no longer are specific, and employ the word "totalitarian," which is clear-cut and beyond cavil, the pattern of the new life in America becomes perfectly bold and unmistakable. Since the days of the N. R. A. that pattern has been amaking.

No one man has done that job. This is a plastic that is the result of powerful pressures; it is a product of the interplay of huge forces—overwhelming forces which could have been withstood and which might have been resisted by daring and courageous men. Instead, Mr. Roosevelt and his associates enjoyed the play; they succumbed to pressures; they flattered themselves into believing that they were manipulators of historic events. They are now being tossed about in a billowy sea without pilot or compass. Their confusions add to the tragedy of our age.

As brutal as such a statement must be, it is, nevertheless, a historical truth that the

main characteristics of any civilization are determined by the nature of the ownership of wealth. When wealth is privately owned there is likely to be a large measure of human freedom; when wealth is publicly owned forms of slavery develop—and there is no use playing on that word "slavery." The so-called wage slave, to whom the Communists like to refer, has always been a freeman—and he has been free because he earned a wage in a capitalistic economy. The wage earner in Russia has never been in any respect a freeman because he has been a slave to the state, which concentrated within itself the total ownership of the means of production and distribution and all tangible and intangible wealth. The principal evil of the present war is that it is forcing upon the whole of mankind the total ownership of wealth by the state. Every country is adopting that pattern.

Paul Einzig, in his study, The Economic Foundations of Fascism, makes the point:

"In the corporate state private property is respected just as in any capitalist country. There is no expropriation without compensation. The state reserves the right, however, to limit and guide the employment of the means of production, and to intervene in the process of distribution, in accordance with public interest."

Although this book was published in 1933, this definition specifically descibes the basic philosophy of the New Deal as it has been developed by acts of Congress and decisions of the Supreme Court. The New Deal, for all its billingsgate against the Fascists, has pursued the underlying principles developed in the totalitarian states concerning the relationship of government and property. Henry A. Wallace produced an excellent book, Whose Constitution? in which he played upon the theme of "general welfare" much as Einzig explains the "public interest." The words are different; the ideas are identical.

Resistance to the totalitarianism of the New Deal appeared in two irreconcilable quarters. Organized capital, even in the later N. R. A. days, fought and delayed the movement in the direction of this type of totalitarianism. Unfortunately, they rarely were able to focus their minds on the essential fact that it was capitalism they were defending. They wallowed all over the field in weak and often evil compromises, and they were constantly being betrayed by their own kind, who discovered early that lots of money could be made out of this new arrangement. Their lawyers usually advised them to commit suicide slowly, as representing superior common sense.

The other groups, curiously, were the Communists and the C. I. O. The Communists, from 1933 to 1935, believed that the New Deal was an agency to save capitalism in America, but in 1935, under direct orders from the Comintern, they supported every New Deal effort and measure and joined New Deal activities and got jobs for themselves and their fellow travelers in the agencies of government. This continued up to the Hitler-Stalin alliance, when the Communists and the New Deal split over foreign policy. The Communists have always believed that the New Deal would produce their type of totalitarianism. They believe now that they have to destroy Mr. Roosevelt's totalitarianism to produce their own. They seek to achieve this through capture of the C. I. O. and the eventual destruction of Mr. Roosevelt's policy and administration by constant and costly strikes. They may succeed, in various combinations of opposition to the New Deal, unless Mr. Roosevelt displays more courage than he yet has.

Organized capital is today powerless. The organization of national defense, the Russell-Overton amendments, and the amorphous O. P. M. have left them without the powers of articulation. And now comes the proposal of the Army virtually to nationalize private wealth. That proposal never originated in the Army; it is just an additional rung on the New Deal's totalitarian ladder. It is but a clarification of the totalitarian pattern. The fact that it originated in a gang of Wall Street lawyers does not make it less sinister.

Chief Justice Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama:

My soul longeth for the courts of the Lord; my heart crieth out for the living God (Psalms lxxxiv:2).

CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES

Just a brief time before the great Chief Justice Hughes
Had attained his threescore years and ten,
On account of the soundness of his legal views,
And the straightforward course that he always pursues
In his dealings with measures and men—
And because he was never known once to resort
To injustice to meet some great end—
And was never swayed by good or evil report—
He was placed on the bench of our own Supreme Court—
For all men could upon him depend.

In the highest positions of honor and trust,
In the State of New York, has he served,
With a modest distinction, revolting at lust
For unmerited phrases, which he declared must
Not be sought, from which he never swerved.
He declared that the office should seek for the man
Best prepared for the duties therein,
And that on this malpractice should be put a ban,
For but few acts could be less American than
The commission of this selfish sin.

Recognized as a great jurist, learned in the law,
With an insight to see things afar,
He expressed no opinion of his till he saw,
Or at least thought he saw, in it no obscure flaw,
To be wrongly construed by the bar;
So, when Chief Justice Taft passed to God's Great Beyond,
And the vacancy sought Justice Hughes,
Since his stately robe must by another be donned,
Justice Hughes in his heart felt restrained to respond
To the call—and he dared not refuse.

As Chief Justice, he wisely conducted affairs
Of our great Court of Final Resort—
For his weightier questions and problems and cares,
From his knees, he lifts ever aloft thru his prayers
To the Great Judge of High Heaven's Court—
And from this Perfect Judge, superhumanly wise,
Came the wisdom to write his decrees
In accord with His will, for on Him he relies—
And will ever continue to do, till he dies—
Whom he seeks, above all else, to please.

The great Chief Justice Hughes knew, if his court decrees
Pleased the Great Judge of heaven and earth,
That there'd be no just cause why they should fail to please
All who seek truth and justice, thru prayer, on their knees,
Irrespective of station or worth.
Without faith, hope, and charity within his heart,
No man ever stood high in God's sight;
But in Chief Justice Hughes these played nobly their part,
Down the years—from his noble career's early start—
Making his life a great shining light.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

California Assembly Backs Anti-Poll-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to learn that the Assembly of the State of California, by a vote of 60 to 1, has joined with the General Court of Massachusetts in memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections. The joint resolution follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 51

Joint resolution relative to poll taxes

Whereas many States of the United States require a poll tax to be paid by its citizens as a prerequisite for voting; and

Whereas this requirement is contrary to the fundamental principles and concepts of the American form of government and democracy, and results in pernicious political activities in that such taxes are frequently paid by persons other than the voters as an inducement for voting for certain candidates; and

Whereas it is necessary in order to insure honesty in Federal elections that the Congress of the United States forbid the requirement that poll taxes be paid as a prerequisite for voting at such elections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress are hereby respectfully urged and requested to enact legislation declaring it unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the authority of the laws of a State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote, at any election for a President or Vice President or Presidential elector or Senator or Member of the House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in Congress.

Peonage in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the text of the announcement by J. Albert Woll, United States district attorney in Chicago, Ill., May 29, 1941, of the indictment of William Toliver Cunningham and Hamilton McWhorter, both of Lexington, Ga., on a charge of conspiracy to retain and hold Negroes in a condition of peonage and slavery on the cotton plantations of Cunningham at Lexington.

It was more than 20 months between the time that the crimes related in the indictment were committed in Chicago and the date of the indictment. The history of that period is interesting and illuminating.

It was on September 8, 1939, that four men who had at previous times escaped from the peonage plantation of Cunningham, were arrested in Chicago. One of them, Ed. Raines, was arrested and placed in custody without legal process of any kind. The other three, Solomon McCannon, Doc Woods, and Otis Woods, were held on extradition warrants from the Governor of Georgia. The charges of theft of 2 bushels of corn in December 1935, were placed by Cunningham and McWhorter, who were in Chicago at the time of the arrest, seeking to force return of these and three other men to the Cunningham plantation.

At the extradition hearings ordered by the late Governor Henry Horner, of Chicago, the burglary charges were proved to be baseless and the extradition refused, largely on the basis of evidence produced by Attorney William Henry Huff, representing the four men, to show the conditions of slavery existent on the Cunningham plantations. All this information was formally presented to the office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Chicago. Numerous escaped slaves from the Cunningham plantations were brought to the F. B. I. office in Chicago, and there made statements regarding the conditions of servitude under which they had been held. Incredible as it may seem, there appear to have been literally scores of such escaped slaves living in Chicago and other Middle Western cities, having come up from Georgia by a modern version of the "underground railway" of pre-Civil War days. All lived in constant fear that Cunningham would by fair means or foul force them to return.

Attorney Huff was informed that all this information had been forwarded to the F. B. I. in Atlanta. He later sent additional information to the Atlanta agents.

In answer, Attorney Huff received a letter from R. G. Danner, special agent in charge, F. B. I., Atlanta, dated December 27, 1939, which stated:

> You are advised that investigation in incident case was completed on October 24, 1939, following which the facts were presented to the United States attorney at Macon, Ga., who declined prosecution of the same, stating that it did not constitute a violation of the peonage statutes.

The International Labor Defense in Chicago then set up the Abolish Peonage Committee of the International Labor Defense, which began a campaign against the un-American institution of peonage, concentrating on seeking prosecution in the Cunningham case. These cases were flagrant. They involved numerous slaves and ex-slaves. The facts were easily available to the Department of Justice.

On February 10, 1940, over the signature of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Attorney Huff received the following letter:

> I wish to advise the matter concerning which you wrote has been presented to Assistant Attorney General Rogge and he has advised that no further investigation should be made in the matter. The case, therefore, is being carried as closed in our files.

Attorney Huff obtained additional evidence of peonage in the form of affidavits and sent it to W. S. Devereaux, special agent in charge, Chicago. Devereaux replied that he had filed the affidavits but on advice of Rogge had dropped the investigation.

> The case, therefore—

He wrote—

> is being carried as closed in our files.

The International Labor Defense, however, did not take this "no," for an answer. On February 23, 1940, Solomon McCannon, Otis Woods, and Will Fleming, escaped peons from the Cunningham plantation, were brought to Washington. There they went to the office of Mr. Rogge, accompanied by a group which included Mr. John P. Davis, secretary of the National Negro Congress; J. Finley Wilson, grand exalted ruler of the Negro Elks; Attorney Huff, Judge William H. Hastie, and Dean Charles Houston, of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People; William L. Patterson and Louis Colman, of the International Labor Defense. In an interview with Mr. Rogge this group obtained a promise that the case would be reopened for investigation, and an admission that there seemed to be definite basis for presentation to the grand jury of the information already in the hands of the Department.

The International Labor Defense did not rest on this promise. Further information was secured and forwarded to the Department of Justice. The facts were made widely public, to secure the support of the public for the attempt to secure prosecution of this flagrant violation of civil rights.

Perhaps without this pressure the Department might have acted eventually, but it is significant that more than a year passed before any steps were taken even to present the case to a grand jury, which did return an indictment on May 29, 1941.

It is to be hoped, Mr. Speaker, that prosecution of this case will not be dilly-dallied with as the obtaining of an indictment has. It took the Department 20 months to act on the basis of facts in their possession. Now they have acted, and I submit that the indictment of Cunningham and McWhorter is an important victory for the antislavery forces in this country, the action should continue, speedily.

Nor should it stop with this one case. There are many more of cases of peonage, in half a dozen Southern States. The white Georgia Baptist convention, in 1939, noted that there are more people affected by peonage—debt slavery—in the United States today than were held as slaves before the War Between the States. Yet it has taken 20 months of intensive effort to persuade the Department of Justice, so eager to prosecute labor leaders like Harry Bridges, to make a presentment to a grand jury in a single case. It is noteworthy that the indictment was brought in Chicago, on a conspiracy charge in connection with events there. No indication is forthcoming that direct charges of holding persons in slavery will be made in Georgia itself, though the evidence in the one case would sustain such action in the other, and could, in fact, be multiplied a hundred times in a Georgia procedure. Is it possible that there is one line of procedure for the representatives of the Department of Justice in one part of the country, and a contrary line of procedure in another—both directed from Washington, where the right hand knoweth not what the left hand doeth?

The statement released by the office of J. Albert Woll, United States district attorney, Chicago, Ill., on May 29, 1941, follows:

> United States Attorney J. Albert Woll announced today that the Federal grand jury sitting in Chicago had returned an indictment against William Toliver Cunningham and Hamilton McWhorter, both of Lexington, Ga., charging them with conspiracy to retain and hold Negroes in a condition of peonage and slavery on the cotton plantations of Cunningham at Lexington, Ga.
>
> The indictment charges that for many years Cunningham has enslaved Negroes on his plantations, inducing them to come to work by promises of wages and by getting them out of jail or off of the chain gang. Once on the plantations, the indictment recites, the Negroes were no longer free. They received no wages and Cunningham instilled in them the fear of running away by lashing them with straps and by causing them to be imprisoned on a Georgia chain gang if they attempted to run away.
>
> Assistant United States Attorney Paul M. Plunkett was in charge of the presentation of this case to the grand jury. He was assisted by Mr. Joseph Lyman, a special assistant assigned to United States Attorney Woll.
>
> The defendant Cunningham is a Georgia planter, aged about 50. He owns two plantations in the vicinity of Lexington, one of which is known as the Sandy Cross Plantation. He is married and has a daughter and

one son, William Toliver Cunningham, Jr., and a brother George, a former road commissioner of Oglethorpe County, Ga.

Hamilton McWhorter is an attorney at law and maintains a law office at Lexington, Ga., with his son, Hamilton McWhorter, Jr. He is a former president of the Georgia Senate and prominent Georgia political figure.

Woll stated that the Federal court in this district has jurisdiction of this case because overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy were performed in Chicago. The indictment charges that in furtherance of the conspiracy Cunningham and McWhorter came to this city in September 1939 with extradition warrants and attempted to arrest three Negroes who had escaped from the plantations. The Negroes were charged with burglary, but the indictment alleges that the sole purpose of the defendants was to return the Negroes to peonage and slavery on Cunningham's plantations.

The Negroes who were arrested in Chicago at Cunningham's instigation are Otis Woods and Doc Woods, 2958 South State Street, and Solomon McCannon, 2959 South LaSalle Street. It is understood that the crime they were charged with was the theft of 2 bushels of corn from Cunningham's barn in December of 1935. The Negroes remained on Cunningham's plantation for a year after the alleged theft and Cunningham did not cause their indictment until after they had fled. Governor Horner removed the extradition hearing to Springfield, where, after a showing of the conditions on Cunningham's plantations, the extradition was denied.

Edward Raines, now a private in the United States Army, Clyde Smith, and Ella Smith are also named as fugitive Negroes, and apparently Cunningham sought to cause them to be arrested also while in Chicago, although he had no warrants for them.

The case of Cunningham's plantations has been under investigation by the Department of Justice for some time and numerous complaints have been received from various parts of the country of his brutality toward his Negro help. Working hours on the plantations are from dawn until dark with an hour for a noon meal. The Negroes receive no salaries but are fed from Cunningham's commissary rations of fat-back and meal. "Fat-back," as the name implies, is the fat portion of the hog, containing no lean meat, and retailing for approximately 6 cents a pound.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, these strikes in defense are only the bread on the water returning, earlier cast by Madam Perkins.

There is a general opinion on Capitol Hill that there is a "cooling-off" on jumping into the foreign war.

Any grant of additional Executive powers or unchallenged usurpation will increase the peril of this Republic.

"Roosevelt to Visit Harvard, to Talk on British Unity," is a headline this week in the Christian Science Monitor.

Isn't it funny the sinking of our ship creates no hysteria, after all were forecasting that it was the spark the warmakers wanted?

My last talk with the late Phil Campbell was to offer him my ticket for the inaugural. Thanking me, he said he didn't want to go either.

"Us 'reds' are delighted! Hewitt is back on Equity Council for another 5 years."—Horace Casselberry, of Actors Equity Association. Walter Winchell seems to be just as happy over it, too.

A little sincerity on the part of the Government would have picked out the known agitators responsible for the plainly unreasonable strikes and placed them where they could do no harm.

The appointment of Harlan Fiske Stone as Chief Justice was logical and the best possible—don't let anybody say I never spoke well of the President. Also, Byrnes and Jackson are not the worst.

We wonder if Harry Woodring drove over with his horse and buggy from Lecompton to Kansas University to hear Harold Smith intervent. Harry knows best of all that if Harold didn't do his stuff he wouldn't continue to be the Budget Director.

Mass Army or Mechanized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK SUN

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Sun:

[From the New York Sun]

MASS ARMY OR MECHANIZED?

Anything that Representative Ross A. COLLINS, of Mississippi, has to say about the kind of Army that the United States ought to have merits respectful attention, for Representative COLLINS was a pioneer among American legislators as an advocate of mechanization and motorization of the Army. In the current issue of the Reader's Digest he puts and answers the question, "Do we want a mass Army?" His answer is an emphatic negative. He insists that the United States should stop drafting men by the million and should concentrate on developing a smaller mechanized and armored Army. His description of the Army of today is that of "young men in cantonments learning to fight yesterday's war" under the tutelage of officers, many of whom do not think in terms of modern war and most of whom are too old for their jobs.

One thing that Representative COLLINS says deserves particular attention. It is that no democracy can afford both a powerful mechanized army and a mass army. It must choose between them. Our choice seems to be a little of both, with more than 1,300,000 men in the Army, but with scarcely a single division ready for combat in the modern sense. Secretary Stimson's recent hint that he may ask for an appropriation of $4,000,000,000 over and above what the present program calls for tells of the astronomical cost of a mass mechanized army. Almost everything that an army needs and uses costs more than it did a generation ago. Representative COLLINS, who for a decade has been advocating a compact, hard-hitting, fast, well-trained army, does not believe that the United States needs a mass army for its defense. The important point is whether Representative COLLINS' colleagues will listen to his arguments.

Lighthouse in the Storm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of May 15, 1941:

[From the Philadelphia Record of May 15, 1941]

LIGHTHOUSE IN THE STORM

The material progress made by man in the nineteenth century constituted the most rapid advancement ever accomplished in any 100-year span.

Yet as that century of technological invention, organizational genius, and widening natural horizons drew to a close, prescient men foresaw the present chaos in society.

The overture to the tragic drama of the twentieth century was marked by warnings, analyses, and solutions.

Of these, the one that has best withstood the test of time is the social philosophy expounded by Pope Leo XIII in a series of letters, the first of which, Rerum Novarum, was published just 50 years ago today.

It was hailed (or denounced, depending on the viewpoint of the critic) as a defense of private property and, on the other hand, as a charter of workingmen's rights and of social justice. It was both. Rerum Novarum was the first clear-cut, succinct, practical contradiction of the two dominant and growing philosophies of the nineteenth century—the anarchy of unrestrained capitalism and its antithesis, the slavery of socialism.

The "classic" economics and sociology of the nineteenth century, largely a businessman's philosophy of society, emphasized "free" contract, extending it to the most improbable spheres.

They favored unlimited freedom of trade and unlimited freedom in the fixing of wages and hours in contracts between employees and employers.

This philosophy sank another taproot into the biological discoveries of Charles Darwin. With the assistance of Herbert Spencer, a new "school" proclaimed a genteelly phrased jungle law of human society opposing any "interference" to alleviate the lot of those who were going under by the millions in the sharpening social struggle.

As to the "survival of the fittest," it was only 5 years ago that a distinguished justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court attacked governmental relief by pointing that a herd of elk on a Government reservation had grown soft and become a prey to its natural

enemies and to disease because it had been fed by the Government keepers.

On grounds of human dignity, moral law, and practical social stability, Leo XIII rejected the principle that the workman was worth only what he could obtain in a "free" market. And in one of the most memorable passages of modern thought he exposed the fallacy of the "free" wage contract between an individual employee and an employer:

"Let it be taken for granted that workman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and in particular should agree freely as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, that remuneration should be sufficient to maintain the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort.

"If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice."

To reestablish the balance of what we today would call the bargaining power of the worker, the Pope supported development and extension of labor unions, the encouragement of unions by the state, the passage of social legislation, and of restrictions upon the growing power of capital.

But he left no doubt that he held capitalism to be rooted in private property, and that the right of private property should not be violated by the state. He asserted that the worker toiled so that he could acquire private property of his own, and that any attempt to array the worker against property as such merely enlisted the worker in a struggle against his own material goal.

At this point Leo marshaled his intellectual and moral strength against another growing menace—that of socialism. The doctrine of absolute control by the state over economic life had grown naturally from the ghastly failure of "classic" economics to solve the problem of misery and degradation of the masses of the people.

Not only did Leo warn against the control of all economic life by the state; he even mentioned such specific dangers as the control of labor unions by the state, a control that was to destroy the labor unions a few decades later in Russia, Italy, and Germany.

It would be absurd and an insult to the intellectual dignity of Leo XIII to say, as some have, that he sought a middle way between the extremes of capitalist anarchy and socialism. The social philosophy of Leo was not a compromise but an application to modern life of principles considerably older than either socialism or capitalism.

The 50 years since Rerum Novarum have not, unfortunately, seen the fruition of the thought contained therein.

The storm has grown in intensity, but the lighthouse of reason built by Leo XIII still burns steadily.

Petitions for Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this morning I filed a petition with 14,805 signatures.

Fourteen thousand eight hundred and five petitioners have signed the following petition urging that Congress uphold the right of labor to bargain collectively, strike, and picket:

PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Abraham Lincoln said: "Thank God we have a system of labor where there can be a strike" (Hartford, Conn., March 5, 1860). The right to form and join organizations of the peoples' own choosing, the right to bargain collectively, to strike, and to picket are established American rights. The right to strike is essential to the preservation of democracy. If the right to strike is destroyed, trade-unions will be destroyed and American democracy will be destroyed. We, the undersigned, petition that the Congress shall adopt no legislation and shall repeal existing laws which directly or indirectly curtail or endanger any of these rights.

These signers are musicians, teachers, artists, social workers, farmers, actors, lawyers, industrial workers, Government workers, housewives, young people, newspaper writers, Negroes, clergymen, and members of patriotic and civic groups—a cross section of the American people. They live and vote in thousands of communities in 36 States and Alaska: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

This petition was prepared and is presented by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, an organization devoted to the task of preserving those civil liberties which are the basis of our traditional American democracy.

The following is a list of the organizations represented in the signatures:

Industrial Union Council, San Diego, Calif.
American Federation of Musicians, No. 400, Hartford, Conn.
Cigar Makers Union, Hartford, Conn.
Connecticut Conference on Social and Labor Legislation, New Haven, Conn.
United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers, California.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, California.
State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, No. 79, Detroit, Mich.
Chemical Workers Division, United Mine Workers, Lansing, Mich.
Bay City, Mich., Industrial Union Council.
United Auto Workers, No. 51 (Plymouth), Detroit, Mich.
United Auto Workers, No. 652 (Olds.), Detroit, Mich.
Civil Rights Council of Northern California, San Francisco, Calif.
East Bay Teachers Union, California.
Contra Costa County Industrial Union Council, Martinez, Calif.
United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers, No. 68, Saginaw, Mich.
United Auto Workers, No. 208, Detroit, Mich.
Alaska Cannery Workers Union, California.
United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers, Chicago, Ill.
Copper Workers, No. 523, Hancock, Mich.
Minnesota Industrial Union Council.
Cement Mill Workers, No. 175, Des Moines, Iowa.
Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Minnesota.
Tobacco Workers, Philadelphia, Pa.
Attorneys, Philadelphia, Pa.
National Maritime Union.
Corpus Christi, Tex., Industrial Union Council.
Candy and Nut Packers, Virginia.
Chemical Workers Division, United Mine Workers, Barberton, Ohio.
United American Artists, San Francisco, Calif.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Douglas, Ariz.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 74, Bisbee, Ariz.
United Office and Professional Workers, No. 19, New York (Social Service Employees Union).
Descendants of the American Revolution, New York, N. Y.
Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Lackawanna, N. Y.
Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation, Milwaukee, Wis.
New Theater League, New York.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers, New York.
Journeymen Tailors Union, No. 1, New York, N. Y.
United American Artists, New York.
American Communications Association, No. 51 A, Buffalo, N. Y.
Fur, Floor, and Shipping Clerks, New York, N. Y.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 2, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Searles Lake Ladies Auxiliary, No. 75, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Trona, Calif.
League of American Writers, New York, N. Y.
American Wire Weavers Protective Association, Ohio.
Committee to Aid Agricultural Workers, Hollywood, Calif.
United Mine Workers, No. 5937, Florence, Colo.
International Association of Machinists, No. 86, Denver, Colo.
Silverton Ladies Auxiliary, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Silverton, Colo.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 393, Leadville, Colo.
Colorado Labor Advocate, Denver, Colo.
Junior Labor Leaders, Denver, Colo.
Cleveland, Ohio, Industrial Union Council.
San Francisco, Calif., District Industrial Union Council.
Carquinez Ladies Auxiliary, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Richmond, Calif.
Peanut Workers, No. 110, Suffolk, Va.
United Mine Workers, No. 7327, Jewell Valley, Va.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, No. 1665, Alexandria, Va.
United Auto Workers, No. 95, Janesville, Wis.
American Youth Congress, Milwaukee, Wis.
Milwaukee County (Wis.) Industrial Union Council.
Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, No. 1114, Milwaukee, Wis.
United Auto Workers, No. 244, Racine, Wis.
Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, No. 2181, West Allis, Wis.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 16, Great Falls, Mont.
Butte (Mont.) Miners' Union, No. 1.
Farm Union Elevator Co., Hinsdale, Mont.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 234, Morris, Mont.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 83.
Ladies' Auxiliary, No. 71, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Butte, Mont.
United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, New Britain, Conn.
Monroe Newspaper Guild, Monroe, La.
Louisiana Farmers' Union, New Orleans, La.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 79, Deepwater, Mo.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 108, Joplin, Mo.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 447, Deepwater, Mo.
United Mine Workers, No 5841, Brilliant, Ala.

United Mine Workers, No. 5932, Winfield, Ala.
Huntsville (Ala.) Industrial Union Council.
Winfield (Ala.) Industrial Union Council.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 442, Sunrise, Wyo.
American Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, No. 1028, Duluth, Minn.
Duluth (Minn.) Industrial Union Council.
Transport Workers' Union, No. 29, Duluth, Minn.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 415, Carlsbad, N. Mex. (Carlsbad potash workers).
Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, No. 381 (Genasco asphalt workers), Madison, Ill.
American Newspaper Guild, Chicago, Ill.
American Federation of Teachers, Chicago, Ill.
Midwest Federation for Constitutional Liberties, Chicago, Ill.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 84, Beckmeyer, Ill.
Master 22 Phosphate Workers, No. 278, Mount Pleasant, Tenn.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 97, Moundsville, W. Va.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 392, Magna, Utah.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 99, Park City, Utah.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 354, Murray, Utah.
Eastern New England Congress for Equal Opportunities, Boston, Mass.
Greater Boston (Mass.) Industrial Union Council
Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, No. 2078, Eveleth, Minn.
Federation for Constitutional Rights, Pittsburgh, Pa.
United Office and Professional Workers, No. 2, Philadelphia, Pa.
Berks County Industrial Union Council, Reading, Pa.
Berks County Civil Liberties Committee, Reading, Pa.
Dover Miners' Union, Washington, N. J.
New Jersey Detinning Workers, No. 521, Carteret, N. J.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 407, Pioche, Nev.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 9, Mullan, Idaho.
Maryland Association for Democratic Rights, Baltimore.
Oil Workers' International Union, No. 257, Bristow, Okla.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, No. 468, Los Angeles, Calif.
United Canner, Agricultural Packing and Allied Workers, Chowchilla, Calif.
United Canner, Agricultural Packing, and Allied Workers, Elwood, Ind.
Fairbanks (Alaska) Mine Workers' Union, No. 444, Fairbanks, Alaska.

The Government at Washington Still Lives—And Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS GAZETTE

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of June 11, 1941:

[From the Arkansas Gazette of June 11, 1941]

THE GOVERNMENT AT WASHINGTON STILL LIVES—AND ACTS

For the great body of American people who are the living flesh of the Nation, President Roosevelt's action to end the production tie-up in the North American Aviation plant meant more than resumption of work in one strike-bound defense industry. It showed the American people that they have a government—a government that can and will govern, not a spineless jellylike mass incapable of unifying and leading and serving the country at a time of the gravest emergency.

The plant which the Army has taken over in California has facilities for turning out 10 war planes a day, 300 a month, 3,600 a year. The Nation needs every one of those planes for strengthening its own defense and aiding Britain. But the Nation has needed the psychological—no; the spiritual—reinforcement which swept over the country when the firm hand of government reached out to protect the defense effort from virtual sabotage.

During recent months certain local or regional labor leaders have been betraying labor's own cause by calling strikes not authorized, and sometimes actively opposed, by leaders of their national organizations. By their obstruction of defense progress, such leaders and their followers have been imposing on the most prolabor President who ever lived in the White House. The public has waited anxiously to see how far a friendly President would let them go. Now that question has been answered, not by words, but by action.

These self-willed and less-responsible labor elements have hurt all organized labor, but God be thanked they are not representatives of the great mass of Americans who work for wages. Those millions are represented by the men who left their jobs for military-training camps; by those who have only to be called if the country should have more need for their service as soldiers than for their service as producers; and by all the millions, organized and unorganized, who are patriotic, loyal, and devoted in the emergency that confronts America.

Sales of Oil and Gasoline to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the "gasless Sundays" plan, proposed by Secretary Ickes for the people of our country, would be a rank injustice in the face of the existing facts. We have been exporting oil and gasoline to Japan, and that country has been storing it, for her own use, and she has also been exporting quantities of this same commodity to Germany, for her use. The great increase of our exports of oil and gasoline to Japan, within the present year, has been outstanding. It appears that we are aiding both the Axis Powers and the Allies in this conflict, because we are aiding Britain, and the democracies by giving them guns, tanks, and planes and "all-out aid," and now we are selling oil and gasoline to Japan, in great quantities, and she is storing this much-needed commodity for her own use against China, and the democracies, and she is also selling a part of her supply to Germany, and perhaps Italy.

This is a most inconsistent position for our country to occupy. We furnished scrap iron to Japan in large quantities over a long period of time, and the Congress submitted a resolution more than 1 year ago to prohibit the further sale of our scrap iron to her, yet the sales continued until it was finally stopped a very few months ago. That scrap iron which we sold to Japan will, no doubt, aid her materially in her preparations for war. She might, in the end, use that scrap iron against our country in case of our involvement in this war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with this same policy of selling oil and gasoline to Japan in great quantities, and at the same time we find that the people in our own country are to be limited in their use of both gasoline and oil by Secretary Ickes, who has been named to administer those commodities during this so-called emergency. If the Secretary would issue an order that the sale of oil and gasoline to Japan should be stopped, then he will have terminated that aid we are now extending to the Axis Powers, which includes Germany. If he should issue such an order, the people of our own country will have ample gasoline and oil for our own consumption and for all purposes required by our armed forces, including the Army and the Navy. If there is danger of our involvement in this war, it is very essential that we begin to prepare to defend our own country and to cease in aiding the preparation of those who would ultimately become our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening editorial appeared in the South Bend Tribune, of South Bend, Ind., of date June 8, 1941, on this same subject, which I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks on this highly important matter, which editorial follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of June 8, 1941]

"UNCLE SAP" AGAIN?

The United States is shipping oil and oil products to Great Britain on the assumption that they are indispensable to survival of the British in this war. The British are sending some oil and oil products to Japan. The United States is selling some oil and oil products directly to Japan. The Japanese are sending some oil and oil products to Nazi Germany. The Russians, whose transportation facilities are being used for this movement of supplies from Japan to Germany, have increased the freight levies by as much as 300 percent. That means a tidy profit in any language, including the Russian.

If it were only a matter of ordinary foreign trade, the American people might think little of it. If it were only a military matter, as among Japan, Germany, and Great Britain, it would not be reassuring to Americans but they might be disposed to grin and bear it. But the United States has just acquired a national-defense oil dictator in the person of Honest Harold Ickes, and he is talking of gasolineless Sundays and setting oil-heater thermostats 5 degrees lower as a mere starter.

The United States has sufficient oil and oil products to furnish enough to Great Britain to enable the British to continue sending

some to Japan. The United States also has enough to ship directly to Japan. The Japanese, in turn, have enough to supply Nazi Germany, that "menace to civilization," as well as themselves. But there is not enough oil and gasoline in the United States, or at least the oil-transportation facilities are not sufficient to enable the American people to drive and to heat their homes in the manner to which they are accustomed. Is Uncle Sam growing another set of goat horns?

Thirty-Day Payless Vacation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUCIEN J. MACIORA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, this House has long pursued a practice—and it is a wise one—of ascertaining the attitude of the affected department of Government before acting on pending legislation. Except where there are especially good reasons for doing otherwise, the departmental recommendation is respected and followed.

In this instance, W. P. A. is on record as approving striking out the requirement for an enforced 30-day vacation for W. P. A. workers. That recommendation is based upon years of administering and observing the W. P. A. program. Records have been kept and reports made on facts concerning workers under this program. The recommendation is studied; not haphazard or sentimental. There is no sound reason for rejecting it.

To begin with, the net cost to the taxpayer will be no more if the 30-day payless vacation is stricken out than it will if that unwise regulation is continued in force and effect.

The argument advanced in favor of retaining this provision is that private employment, arising out of the defense program, has lessened the need for year-around employment for W. P. A. workers. It seems to me that such an argument falls of its own weight. Certainly no one who gives even passing thought to the comparative wage paid in private industry, and that paid to W. P. A. workers, will regard these fields of endeavor as competitive in any sense. Surely there is no attraction in the physical labor demanded in almost every W. P. A. program that would prompt any person to cling to a W. P. A. job and spurn the more remunerative and less arduous private employment. Does anyone suppose W. P. A. employment is work which any man or woman would really want to follow as a career?

The fact of the matter is that persons now on W. P. A. are men and women who cannot obtain private employment. I think you could search with a fine-toothed comb for a W. P. A. worker who, on the very limited earnings fixed by the law, can afford to take a payless 1-month vacation. They are on W. P. A. because they are in need—dire need. They need more—not less—income. In most cases they cannot afford the bare necessities of life on their present earnings, to say nothing of the luxury of a 30-day vacation.

Surveys have shown that only a small fraction of the number of persons dropped by W. P. A. by reason of appropriation cuts have been able to find employment in 3 or more months after their separation. There are many reasons for this: The average age of a W. P. A. worker is 43 years, an age at which men find an almost insurmountable barrier against private employment. One out of every five W. P. A. workers is a woman, and it is common knowledge that the defense program has created precious little employment for women.

We are appropriating billions for defense, and it is right that we should. I have voted for every defense appropriation that has been submitted. We are spending, or soon will, millions of dollars to promote morale, to encourage national unity. That is fine; I am all for it. But is it consistent to vote these billions and spend these millions if we are to short-circuit the drive for national unity by throwing men and women out of the lowest-paid employment the Government of the United States has ever offered a civilian?

That strikes me as a glaring inconsistency; a fundamental weakness in our thinking and planning. I hope this amendment will prevail.

Justice James F. Byrnes

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to congratulate the President of the United States and the country upon the appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States of one of the ablest men who ever served in this House, Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES, of South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES served with distinction in this body for many years. He is not only an able and experienced lawyer, but he is energetic, conscientious, and courageous. He is well grounded in the fundamental principles of our American institutions. He is an ardent supporter of and believer in the Constitution of the United States. He is a lover of the American way of life. His appointment is a God-send to the American people at this time.

Thomas Jefferson warned us that if our institutions were ever destroyed, they would be destroyed by the courts.

We do not want our Constitution changed by construction, or misconstruction. Such a method is but a manifestation of the wormwood of governmental decay.

The people of this country want the Constitution applied and construed and not changed or destroyed. If changes are to be made, let them be made in the manner provided by the Constitution itself. Changing it by construction shakes the very foundation of our free institutions and destroys the faith of our people in the stability of the greatest Government the world has ever known.

These innovations may at first adversely affect only the Southern States, or the industrialists, or the small businessmen or the farmers of the Nation, but their evil influences will spread and grow until our free institutions and our American way of life may disappear and be replaced by some form of totalitarianism.

There is ample power within the framework of the Constitution to do evrything that needs to be done to promote the safety and well-being of our people. They do not want any foreign ideologies written or construed into that sacred document.

Therefore, I say again that the people of this Nation are to be congratulated on the appointment to that august tribunal of such a man as the Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES, of South Carolina.

There Shall Be No Gestapo in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. VITO MARCANTONIO, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the Mutual Broadcasting System June 12, 1941, entitled "There Shall Be No Gestapo in America":

Four million so-called aliens fingerprinted and registered; 500 noncitizens rounded up and imprisoned without bail; strike broken by troops using bayonets against workers; concentration camps being prepared; work-or-fight order is given to workers, minister of justice urges concentration camps and wholesale deportations. These were the news flashes which were coming from Nazi Germany in 1936. Take out the words "minister of justice" and substitute "United States Attorney General" and we have the news headlines of May and June 1941 in these United States.

These headlines are not unrelated. They are the newspaper reports of integrated incidents in the gigantic conspiracy against the peace and liberties of the American people.

Never before in the history of any country has there been as much resistance to participation in war as there is on the part of the American people. It is precisely because of this resistance that suppression, persecution,

and hysteria have been employed in order to smash the opposition of the overwhelming majority who have consistently refused to allow themselves to be dragged further into this imperialist war.

The pattern which is being followed is no different from that adopted by Hitler in the employ of his Gestapo against the people of Germany. On May 18, under the direction of the Attorney General, more than 500 were arrested in the so-called round-up of people who had entered into the United States illegally. These round-ups were widespread and reminiscent of the raids of Attorney General Palmer, under the supervision of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in 1919 and 1920. The generalship of the offensive against the liberties of the American people then is the same generalship of the offensive against the peace and liberties of the people today. The purpose of this activity was provocative and intended solely to work up that hysteria which would condition the American people to become easy victims of the war conspiracy and to lure them into any easy surrender of their liberties.

The statements of the Attorney General and of newspaper reports, to the contrary notwithstanding, not a single person arrested in those raids up to today, has been disclosed to be even remotely an agent or a spy or a saboteur. They are men, many of whom have American wives and children, who some years ago had entered the United States without passports or who had overstayed their permits in the United States. I doubt if any of these men had even failed to register under the Alien Registration Act. And yet the impression has been created that this spectacular dragnet had brought in enemies of our Republic.

I challenge the Attorney General, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and all others connected with these raids to establish that these innocent, hard-working, law-abiding men, so-called aliens, who are now lingering in the immigration detention stations without bail, many of whom were arrested even without a properly sworn-out warrant, are spies or saboteurs or have in any manner endangered the interest of our Nation. Now that the American people have witnessed these Gestapo raids, they ask for an accounting. They want a bill of particulars from you, Mr. Attorney General, and from you, Mr. Hoover.

The foreign-born, besides having contributed their sweat and blood to the building of America, have also become an important part of the progressive movement. They are members of trade-unions and other organizations, joining with their native-born fellow workers in the fight to make democracy live in America. They are part of the great movement against war and dictatorship in the United States. Hence they have been made the object of persecution.

These super-detective and Gestapo-imitating raids were conducted in such an indiscriminate manner as to terrorize the people. The raids were made by the F. B. I. and immigration inspectors, accompanied by local police, in sections where workers live. It is in these sections where the opposition to war is greatest. It is significant that clubs and restaurants where workers meet were the places at which these raids and arrests were made. It is also significant that many of those arrested were union members. Thus terror was spread where peace sentiment is strong and where union men congregate.

This attempt at intimidating people who are engaged in a struggle for peace and trade unionism becomes further obvious, in that these raids took place at a time which marked the beginning of the big drive to put over the Hobbs concentration camp bill, H. R. 3, in the Congress of the United States. This bill, among many other infamous things, provides for the detention in prison without bail and without trial of noncitizens ordered deported, but whose deportation cannot be effected. Nondeportable aliens can be detained in prison for 5 months, or a year and 3 months. Those subject to deportation because of political or economic beliefs can be imprisoned for life without bail and without trial.

This bill has the approval of the Attorney General. It is a concentration camp bill in that it sets up a system whereby men and women, noncitizens, may be detained and placed in jail for 5 months in some instances, for 1 year and 3 months or for life in other instances without trial, without even the slightest semblance of due process of law. I make that statement on my responsibility as a Member of Congress. I quote no one else for authority than the Solicitor General of the United States himself, the Honorable Francis Biddle. On June 2, 1941, before the National Conference of Social Workers, at Atlantic City, N. J., in referring to the Hobbs concentration-camp bill, he stated (1) that the bill had the backing of the Department of Justice, and (2) "the bill is in a sense revolutionary because it permits detention without trial by jury, but where aliens cannot be deported some such control is necessary.

It is a very serious curb on civil rights made essential by the circumstances of war. So that in the name of a war which, we are told, will be waged for the overthrow of Hitlerism—a war incidentally to which the American people are overwhelmingly opposed—we are establishing detention without trial by jury, which is admitted to be a very serious curb of civil rights. So that in the name of fighting Hitlerism over there, the Hitlerism which has become repugnant to the American people precisely because of the concentration camp, or detention without trial by jury, we are asked by the Attorney General and the proponents of the bill to establish Hitlerism over here—yes; the concentration camp—detention without trial by jury.

In this period of stress and tension we thus find the Department of Justice engaged in activity in support of its advocacy of legislation which will establish in America everything that we despise in Hitler Germany. The Attorney General, in an address at the annual meeting of the American Judicature Society, stated, "Every period of our national history which has felt great stress and tension from abroad has left a trail in the administration of justice that we do not retrace with pride." With just how much pride will our children be able to retrace the administration of justice under the present Department of Justice and under the present Attorney General?

The concentration-camp bill, the Alien Registration Act, the mass raids by the Department of Justice, and this entire offensive against the noncitizen has brought about a condition of discrimination which is repugnant to every concept of decency and Americanism. I quote for my authority for this statement the Social Security Board, which, in its report on labor shortages of January 30, 1941, stated as follows:

"From virtually every industrial State come reports that employers are refusing to hire noncitizens, and that employers are going far beyond the legal requirements fixed by the Government.

"By act of Congress, the employment of aliens in private industry working on Government contracts is not prohibited but restricted.

"Employers' specifications extend far beyond the requirements of citizenship. In some instances it does not suffice that the worker himself be born in the United States, but both parents must be American-born. There are even instances where the grandparents as well must be American-born."

The order of the day is not only discrimination against the noncitizen but against his native-born children and even his native-born grandchildren. It carries out the accusation that I have repeatedly made that the attack on the noncitizen becomes, after the first charge, an assault on the citizen as well. No defense of democracy can be successful if we close our eyes to the attack on the foreign-born. The defense of the rights of the foreign-born, of the Negro, and of political, racial, and religious minorities is a defense of democracy at the bridgehead.

Once we permit a break through at these bridgeheads of democracy, then our last line of defense becomes subjected to the fire of those who under the guise of so-called national defense and in the interests of the prosecution of an imperialist war seek to destroy the democratic rights of every single American. We cannot defend democracy anywhere else in the world unless we first make it safe in the United States of America.

This is not the first time in the history of our country that we have witnessed legislation and activity against the foreign-born. In the very beginning of our Republic the forerunners of those who advocate concentration camps today and the persecution of the foreign-born, legislated against the interests of the American people, and enacted the alien and sedition laws of 1798. Then, too, the apprehension of spies and saboteurs was used as the smoke screen behind which the enemies of American liberty sought to destroy it. Then, too, there was a war in Europe. Then, too, Thomas Jefferson, great founder of our American democracy, was called a foreign agent. Then, too, Thomas Jefferson exposed the conspiracy against the peace and liberties of the American people when he said:

"One of the war party, in a fit of unguarded passion declared some time ago they would pass an alien bill, and a sedition bill. * * * I consider these laws as merely an experiment on the American mind, to see how far it will bear an avowed violation of the Constitution. * * * The alien bill is a most detestable thing."

Then, too, the American people rallied, repealed the Alien and Sedition Acts, and destroyed the prowar forces that were responsible for them. Now, too, there is a war in Europe. Now, too, the enemies of the peace and liberties of the American people are driving against them behind a smoke screen of spy and saboteur hysteria. Now, too, those who stand up and fight for the peace and freedom of the American people are called spies, foreign agents, and aliens. Now, too, the attack is made on the foreign born, the Negro, political, racial, and religious minorities. Now, too, the warmakers are imposing alien and sedition laws on the American people in order to destroy our peace and freedom. Now, too, the American people recognize that these attacks are attacks on all of the people. Now, too, the American people will rally and with historic firmness say to the President, to the Attorney General, and to the Congressmen and Senators, "There shall be no Gestapo in America."

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter that I have received from a constituent. This letter is typical of a number of other letters that I have received. Mr. Anderson is one of the substantial farmers in his community.

BURDICK, KANS., *May 4, 1941.*

Congressman EDWARD H. REES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REESE: I am and have been actively engaged in farming and stock feeding for the past 32 years. I was born and have lived in the same community all my life. I was 16 years old when I started farming, rented a 160-acre farm, and went in debt for all my farm equipment. When 19 years, I bought the 160-acre farm that I was renting for which I paid $10,000, paid down $1,500, and went in debt for the balance. Since then I have bought other land until today my wife and I, and daughter, 21, graduating from college this spring, and son, 17, finishing high school this spring, own 312 acres of fertile land on which we have built $20,000 of improvements, including a modern home. While we still have a Government loan on this property we do not have any back interest or taxes due.

So much for that. What I am interested in now is the future. I am wondering how we farmers and stockmen are going to continue in the future with the Government setup of farm programs and marketing quotas telling us, the farmers, what we can plant, what we can sell, and what we can feed to our livestock.

I am wondering about the future for the American farmer. By the American farmer I mean the real farmer—the family that is really trying to make an honest living and trying to pay their honest debts by honest labor and efforts. And I don't mean the farm family that is always some place in their car and is always trying to figure out some way that they can crook the Government out of a larger farm payment or some individual out of his honest earnings by dishonesty. There are too many of this type and the number is increasing every year. And I believe that the farm program has done much to increase this condition.

I believe in, and I am in favor of, the Government giving to the American farmer the American market for his products instead of buying beef and other products from other countries. I believe that this way the American farmer will come nearer making an honest, comfortable living than he can with the conditions as they are today. Today there are millions of dollars spent through the farm programs which dictate to us farmers how we are to run our farms, and this is done in many, if not in most cases, through men that know very little about farming and in many cases have made failures themselves.

I know this to be a fact, for in my own township we have seven men at the head of the program, including the county chairman. Out of the seven, six have lost their farms through foreclosure or by deeding their land to the loan company prior to foreclosure, and the seventh has been on work relief. Today these seven men are telling the rest of us how to run our farms. This is the class of farmers who are in favor of the farm program and who undoubtedly will vote on the marketing quota on wheat, if given a chance.

Now, if this marketing quota is voted in and we farmers are compelled to pay a penalty before we can even feed our excess wheat to livestock on our own farms, then I say our liberty is gone, and I think there will be more trouble right here at home in every community than there is in Europe today.

We have not been able to raise corn in this community for some time. In fact, I feel certain that there have been more bushels of seed corn planted in this township the last 9 years, or since 1932, than there have been bushels harvested and cribbed. But we have raised good wheat and I, as well as many of my neighbors, have fed lots of wheat to hogs, cattle, and poultry with good results. I consider a bushel of wheat worth more than a bushel of corn for hogs. Why not let us raise and feed the crops that we are equipped to raise and can raise instead of forcing us to ship or truck in grain that we cannot raise for a long distance at great expense?

I hope that you will agree with me that the farmer, as a whole, in the past, has been considered an honest, hard-working class of people, but I believe that if this farm program is continued that this will not be true in the future. I believe this to be true because I think if he can get a larger payment by giving in false yields or figures it is going to tempt him to do so because it comes from the Government, and too many people don't know who the Government is or where the money comes from.

I urge you to vote so as to retain the farmer's liberty, and I feel sure that the farmer will do a better job of operating his own farm than anyone can do from Washington, D. C., or even at our own county seat.

Thanks, and hoping for our liberty I am,
Respectfully yours,

W. J. ANDERSON.

New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, Pledges Support of National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the resolution adopted at the forty-sixth annual meeting of the New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on May 30 and 31, 1941:

Whereas the war now raging in the Eastern Hemisphere continues to bring ever-increasing destruction of life, leaving in its wake starvation, ruin, and chaos; and

Whereas the United States of America is in a position to use the weight of its tremendous influence to contribute to a cessation of hostilities and to bring to a halt this wanton destruction and restore a just peace based on charity and justice for the rights of all; and

Whereas the American people are bitterly opposed to the anti-Christian philosophy of government of the totalitarian state, and are deeply concerned with the concentration of all our powers, spiritual and physical, on the protection of our country against this serious threat to our traditional principles; are likewise fully conscious of the fact that the responsibility of the President and the Congress is especially heavy at this time when all are so anxious to provide for our country's adequate defense and to avoid involvement in the war, in keeping with the desires of the vast majority of our citizens; and

Whereas our Holy Father Pius XII has pointed out that "nothing is gained by war that cannot be achieved by peace," and that "in war, all is lost"; and

Whereas the archbishops and bishops of the United States, in an official statement made through the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Council, have declared that "the will of America today is set on peace, not war, as the aim of our defense program"; and

Whereas in a statement signed by Catholic and Anglican bishops of England it was said: "The present evils of the world are due to the failure of nations and peoples to carry out the laws of God," which statement urged that the Government of England give serious consideration to the five-point program of Pius XII for peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, in convention assembled, representing 51,000 members of the State of New York, while prayerfully hoping that the President and Congress will use their good offices as an effective means of keeping America out of war and in assisting the world to come to a just and lasting peace based on principles of Christian charity and justice, hereby pledge our fullest support for the defense program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

This is to certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted at a session of the annual meeting of the New York State Council held in the city of Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on May 31, 1941.

HUGH A. DOYLE,
State Deputy.

Attest:

FRANCIS J. NILAN,
State Secretary.

The Sore Thumb in the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 11, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 11, 1941]

THE SORE THUMB IN THE DRAFT

The shortcomings and absurdities of the present draft law and its national administration stick out like a sore thumb in the case of John D. Rigney, Chicago White Sox pitcher, who was deferred by his local board

on the ground that he would lose too much salary if he answered the call. Rigney pulls down from $12,000 to $15,000 a year, paid in five installments during the summer months. He wants to wait until he has collected it, plus a bonus, before he reports.

The primary trouble does not lie in his claims for deferment. There might be a basis, due to the plan on which he is paid, if others got the same treatment. But the Detroit Tigers gave up Hank Greenberg, star outfielder, and he gave up $50,000 a year—without a squawk. He did not ask a day. And Bobby Feller, of Cleveland, has announced that he will ask no deferment. Feller stands to lose $45,000 a year, almost as much as the $48,000 now being lost by the drafted former head of the New York Stock Exchange.

But to leave ball players, this wide variation in treatment runs all through the draft administration, due to the fact that there are no rules and that local boards can decide as they please. One board takes away the partial support of a widowed mother, and another board defers a man who earns $1,350 a year because he has a wife, who also earns $1,350 a year. These are from the records. There are many such cockeyed instances.

In the case of Rigney, the Illinois director of selective service did right in appealing the decision of the River Forest board. You cannot let such things stand and have any morale in selective service. It becomes too selective. We hope President Roosevelt will see the seriousness of such discriminations when the appeal against the Rigney deferment reaches him.

And let it be hoped that Congress will shake off its shell shock and get around to the draft question soon, enacting some rules for the present draft law and also a permanent law under which all future registrants will be placed—a law that will put responsibility for a year of service, either in the Army or in defense industry, on the young men rather than on the draft boards.

They would know when they registered at 18 that they had a year to serve. They would be given opportunity to complete their schooling and also a considerable latitude of choice in other ways. But there would be no dodging over marriage, dependency, or loss of fat salaries.

Associate Justice James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

LETTERS IN REFERENCE TO APPOINTMENT TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1941.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: No man in the United States has watched with deeper and keener interest your effort to appoint worthy men to office than I. I wired you from Chicago in 1937 highly commending your judgment and courage in the appointment of Associate Justice Black to the Supreme Court bench. I am writing now to endorse Senator JAMES F. BYRNES to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court bench created by the resignation of Justice McReynolds.

I have known Senator BYRNES for about 30 years. Aside from being an outstanding lawyer and statesman, he is a genuine new dealer, courageous and honest, and just to his fellow man. It has been a source of great satisfaction and pleasure to me to confer with Senator BYRNES since I have been a Member of Congress, and to note his broad vision and his determination to be fair and just to all Americans, regardless of race or color. It is my opinion that Senator BYRNES is without doubt one of the best, if not the best, qualified men in this country to fill the vacancy.

I sincerely hope that in your wise judgment you will see fit to appoint him to this place on the bench where I am sure he will continue to render that superlative degree of service which has characterized his career over a long period of years. Thousands of well-thinking people of my race join me in making this request of you. We hope and pray that you can grant it. I am,

Very sincerely and gratefully years,
ARTHUR W. MITCHELL.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 20, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MITCHELL: Please accept the President's thanks for your letter of May 17. He wants you to know that he appreciates your courtesy in telling him of your high estimate of the qualifications of Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES for appointment as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Very sincerely yours,
M. H. MCINTYRE,
Secretary to the President.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
May 20, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MITCHELL: I am in receipt of copy of a letter addressed to the President by you with reference to the appointment to the Supreme Court. Because this expression of your good will is unsolicited, it is all the more appreciated.

When Justice McReynolds retired, some of my colleagues suggested that since it was a southern vacancy I should be appointed. Naturally I was flattered. Like most lawyers, I regard the appointment to the Court as a great honor. As time has passed, I confess that I have doubt as to whether, after my active life in the legislative branch of the Government, I would be happy in the work of the Court. Consequently I have urged my friends not to do anything to influence my appointment. However, there will be time enough for me to decide whether I want to leave the Senate, should the President see fit to offer me the appointment. I am telling you now of my views only because I appreciate your friendly interest.

You have proved a sound and constructive leader. I am not indulging in flattery when I say you have rendered to your people a service excelled only by your preceptor, Booker T. Washington, whose life undoubtedly has influenced your thinking. When you express the opinion that I have been fair and just to all people, regardless of race, it is a real compliment.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JAMES F. BYRNES.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE MANISTIQUE (MICH.) CITY COUNCIL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the City Council of Manistique, Mich., urging the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway at the earliest possible date due to the immeasurable benefits it would bring to this county:

Whereas the President of the United States did, on June 5, 1941, send a special message to Congress urging the Congress to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas this city council suggests that the construction of this project at the earliest possible date would be of immeasurable benefit to this country in its defense program; and

Whereas the present rate of ship tonnage being sunk by the dictator nations is far in excess of our ability to replace the same unless shipyards on the Great Lakes are enabled to participate in this building program; and

Whereas shipyards located on the Great Lakes are so far removed from either the Atlantic or Pacific seaboards as to make them less vulnerable to attack in the event of war; and

Whereas there now appears to be an enormous shortage of oil and oil commodities along the Atlantic seaboard due to lack of tankers available to transport oil and oil products, which, if the seaway project were now a reality, would come by pipe line to the Great Lakes and then be transported to the seaboard; and

Whereas the projected Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project would not only provide the facilities for getting large oceangoing ships and their cargoes from the ports and shipyards on the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean, but would also provide an enormous amount of cheap electrical energy sorely needed at this very moment in our defense program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we unanimously endorse the President's action in urging the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project at the earliest date possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN, Hon. FRED BRADLEY, and to all of the remaining Michigan Representatives in Congress.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution made and unanimously

adopted at a regular meeting of the Manistique City Council held on Monday evening at 7:30 p. m., June 9 A. D. 1941.

[SEAL] L. B. CHITTENDEN,
City Clerk.

Independent Air Force Proponents Are Active

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain editorial and news comment indicating the growing strength of proposals for an independent air force. Today I have learned that the gentleman from New York, Representative BARRY, has introduced a measure on the subject. This bill has been referred, as has legislation by the gentleman from New York, Representative BEITER, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative OSMERS, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I have two measures, H. R. 3795 and H. R. 4532, before that committee. The first would establish a Department of National Defense, and would set up the establishment of a separate air force as a branch equal to the status of the Army and Navy. The second proposal would bring about the establishment of a Department of Air Defense which would be administered by a Secretary of Air Defense who would take over the present functions of the Secretary of War relating to military aeronautics.

The gentleman from South Dakota, Representative MUNDT, has pending a resolution which would call on the Rules Committee to create a special group of House Members to thoroughly investigate the subject of a unified air force. There are also many of our colleagues who are deeply interested in seeing action at this time. I am hopeful that hearings can be arranged in the near future.

In connection with this matter I include at this point an article from the Evening Sun, Baltimore, Md., under date of May 31:

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 31, 1941]

WILL AIR POWER REALLY SUPERSEDE SEA POWER?

"Today we are witnessing the twilight of sea power. Tomorrow the whole epoch of modern history conditioned by that weapon will be ended." The statement is that of Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, who, in the June issue of the American Mercury, warns that air power is taking its place.

Our two-ocean Navy will not be completed for 5 or 6 years. By that time Major de Seversky contends that such advances will have been made in aviation that the Navy will be useless, ready for the scrap heap. The Douglas B-19 bomber now has a range of nearly 8,000 miles, and a Martin flying boat is being designed for far greater distances. In the major's opinion, there will be, within 5 years, a plane with around-the-world range of 25,000 miles. "When that is achieved," he says, "there will remain no major tactical task heretofore entrusted to navies which has not been swallowed up by aviation."

Already, Major de Seversky asserts, the airplane has robbed the navy of its offensive power. Experience in the present war, he says, confirms the following axioms:

1. That surface forces, including naval units, cannot operate if the sky above is in enemy control.

2. That aviation carried along by the fleet itself is ineffectual against hostile land-based aircraft.

3. That only air power can effectively fight air power.

He calls attention to the futility of the British Fleet in its effort to prevent the Nazi invasion of Norway in the face of the Nazi control of the air, how it had to keep out of harm's way while Nazi transports, protected by planes, went back and forth across the Skagerrak. He reminds that it was the temporary British mastery of the air over Dunkirk, rather than the British Navy, which made possible the evacuation of the British Expeditionary Force, and that it is the R. A. F. and not the Navy which has thwarted and still thwarts the attempts at invasion of the British Isles. Nazi positions along the English Channel are within range of the Navy's guns, but it is the airplanes that are counted upon to attack and destroy them. No longer, he says, is it possible for the fleet to lay siege to the coast. It can only launch a sudden attack, trusting to surprise and weather conditions unfavorable to airplanes.

Major de Seversky admits that the British Fleet has operated successfully in the Mediterranean during the past year, but he argues that that was because Italy's air force is antiquated. The picture changed as soon as the Nazi Luftwaffe appeared on the scene and, he declares, the continued operation of the British Fleet in that corner will depend upon whether or not Great Britain eventually will control the air.

Had he written his article after the events of the last few weeks Major de Seversky might have added to his list of air-power achievements the destruction of many units of the British Fleet by dive bombers in the narrow waters around Crete and the important part which airplanes played in the shadowing and crippling of the *Bismarck* that preceded her sinking.

Major de Seversky charges that the exponents of naval power base their arguments upon the present status of airplanes without taking into account the progress which will continue to be made. "Now imagine the range of air power expanded three to five times—as it inevitably will be in the next few years," he says. "The Atlantic then becomes another Skagerrak, every bit as vulnerable as the North Sea. Unless they have land-based aviation better than the foe's, navies must then escape from the Atlantic—even if that foe were entirely without a navy. America will then be in precisely the same strategic position as the British Isles today, with the Atlantic Ocean equivalent to the English Channel, and its control, like control of the channel today, depending on relative aviation strengths."

The author touches upon the comparative costs of battleships and planes. He figures the cost of a capital ship at $100,000,000. For the same amount of money it would be possible to construct 250 bombers capable of flying to a European target, dropping their explosive loads, and returning. He estimates that each of them could carry 20 tons of explosives, making their striking power equal to 10,000 Stukas.

Unquestionably Major de Seversky makes out a strong case for air power. If our two-ocean navy will have to be scrapped as soon as it is built, why should it be built at all? Would it not be better to drop all plans and devote entire attention to the air force? As impressive as the arguments for air power are, there still remain objections to putting complete trust in it.

In the first place, in discussing relative costs, the major does not allow for the fact that while 250 bomber planes would be obsolete in a few years, a $100,000,000 battleship might be expected to have a life of from 15 to 20 years.

Furthermore, as impressive as air power has been in the present war, it has not been the complete answer. In spite of the devastating raids on British cities, the cities still survive. There is considerable doubt as to whether air power alone can bring about a decision. There are few people who believe, for example, that if Great Britain gains mastery of the air, she will be able to conquer Germany without the assistance of an expeditionary force which would certainly call for the services of a navy.

The progress of aviation which the major assumes may be too optimistic. Besides, he does not allow for improvements which may be made in the protection of ships against planes during the same period. Indeed, while air power has accomplished wonders, on the other hand, it has been handicapped where it has not had the assistance of other branches of military power. The answer would seem to lie, not in the supremacy of air power to the exclusion of naval power, but rather in a combination of the two. In fact, Major de Seversky, in spite of his enthusiasm for air power, seems to arrive at the same conclusion, for, at the end of his article he remarks: "I am not arguing for the immediate scrapping or limitation of naval strength. While naval utility has been seriously restricted it has not yet been entirely wiped out. What I am arguing for is a broader, more modern approach to the whole problem of America's national security; one that recognizes the changes in the science of war-making enforced by the growth of military aviation." Nobody is likely to differ with him on that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the well-known aviation writers, Joseph S. Edgerton, recently wrote the following article in the Washington (D. C.) Star:

[From the Washington Star]

SEPARATE AIR FORCE BACKERS MAY FORCE CONGRESS SHOW-DOWN—RANDOLPH WILL PRESS FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS ON HIS PROPOSAL

(By Joseph S. Edgerton)

Efforts to bring about a show-down on the long-standing controversy over creation of a separate air force before the end of the present Congress were forecast today.

Since the fight for a separate air force virtually ruptured the high command of the Army Air Service and resulted in the resignation from the Army of the late Gen. William Mitchell in 1926 there has been no more controversial problem in connection with American air defense.

Author of a bill to establish a Department of Air Defense ranking equally with the War and Navy Departments, Representative RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, said today he would seek a public hearing on the measure and, if necessary, would undertake the circulation among Members of Congress of a petition to force consideration of the matter. There is, he said, increasing support for such legislation in Congress, which long has fought shy of the separate air force problem.

TRANSITION STEP PERILOUS

"If we are going to have a separate air force at all," Mr. RANDOLPH said, "it should be established, trained, and in working order before the emergency facing this country becomes acute. The transition to a separate air force is too major a step to be under-

taken during the course of a military campaign."

Successes of the German Luftwaffe, which ranks equally with the German Army and Navy, and of the British Royal Air Force point to the need for creation of a separate aerial striking force capable of independent action or of cooperation with either the Army or Navy, or both, in the opinion of those who are supporting the Randolph bill.

The Randolph bill avoids one of the most serious aspects of the separate-air-force problem. This is the role of naval aviation. Under the Randolph bill, naval aviation is not disturbed, remaining, as now, a part of the Navy, subject wholly to naval control.

More extreme plans have provided for transfer to the proposed separate air force not only of all Army aviation but also of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard aviation. In the face of bitter opposition to anything which would disturb the present highly efficient functioning of naval aviation, however, all of these plans have died aborning. Even the British, who sought to set up an independent air force during World War days, soon found that it did not work insofar as the Navy was concerned, and have freed the naval air arm from the Royal Air Force.

AXIS PROBLEMS DIFFERENT

The Germans, lacking a navy, which requires integral aviation, have not had to face this problem. There are no German aircraft carriers. Italy also has neglected naval aviation—a neglect for which she paid heavily in recent Mediterranean actions.

Another serious problem to be considered in connection with a separate air force is that of Army cooperative aviation. Observation aviation has become an integral part of the ground Army. Each Army division has its own observation squadron, organically a part of the division. These are integral corps and Army aviation units. Observation balloons, as well as airplanes, are organically a part of the ground forces under the present set-up.

Leaving out naval aviation and such Army aviation as is now organically part of the ground forces, there is little to incorporate in a separate air force, but the remainder of the Army Air Corps and the General Headquarters Air Force. These are the units which would be affected by the Randolph bill.

The bill would transfer to the Department of Air Defense all the functions and duties of the Secretary of War relating to military aeronautics. All officers and employees of the War Department whose duties relate to military aeronautics would be transferred without change of classification or compensation.

FUNCTIONS EXPLAINED

The plan proposes the creation in the Department of Air Defense of a general staff with functions, concerning the air force, similar to those of the War Department General Staff today. The chief of staff of air defense and assistant chiefs of staff would be selected by the President from officers of the present Air Corps.

Under such a set-up military operations requiring cooperation between the air and ground forces, air and naval forces, or all three, would be carried out by task forces composed of the necessary units of any two or three of the services. This would be similar to the present German plan of action and, to some extent, similar to the British method of operating.

Command of the task force would be vested in the commanding officer of the service predominantly represented. In other words, a military mission primarily naval, but conducted with support of units of the air force and the Army, would be comanded by the senior naval officer. If the Army were making the main effort, with support of minor units of the air force and the Navy, the joint effort would be under command of the senior Army commander.

Roosevelt's Frankenstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS HERALD

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of June 12, 1941:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of June 12, 1941]

ROOSEVELT'S FRANKENSTEIN

For 8 years Franklin D. Roosevelt devoted most of his time to building up and putting into positions of power the radicals who have found a haven in the United States. For 8 years he nursed them along and they repaid him with two reelections, one for the unprecedented third term, and with tremendous contributions of money as well as votes in his campaigns.

For 8 years he has kept in his Cabinet a woman entirely incompetent for her position and one whose principles of Americanism are, to say the least, decidedly warped.

For 8 years Mr. Roosevelt has played with the Communists and others who were willing either to destroy our form of government by violence or were seeking to bring about a new social order by peaceful methods, but which nevertheless mean revolution.

For more than a year Mr. Roosevelt has known that this country was facing perhaps the greatest crisis in its existence. He has sought to build up a defense against the menace, a defense which requires the labor and the sacrifice of everybody who lives within the United States. For 8 years Mr. Roosevelt has sought to harass and to destroy all great corporations, has baited without cessation all public utilities, and has squandered the wealth of the people in the process of rearing up to fullest strength the new order based upon the superiority of the radical element. What now does he find?

He finds that despite his pleading, despite all he has done toward making that element powerful, despite his leniency toward unworthy radicals, despite his seeming popularity with that kind, they refuse to heed his summons, refuse to obey his wishes and the country's needs, that they will not produce the defense material we must have, that at last he must make use of the Army to keep the radicals from destroying not only our efforts to produce but that which already has been produced or is in process of production.

He finds that in the emergency he must call upon and depend upon the efforts of the great corporations he has previously sought to destroy, that the utilities which he has so consistently harassed cannot now produce the power needed, that the money that has been wasted is sadly needed today, and that the force which, with that extravagant spending, he built up has no love nor respect for him, except so long as he is willing to accept payment only in votes but not in labor for defense.

He has found that it was not his real popularity which they supported, but the billions of other people's money he was willing to pour into their coffers.

He has found now, and perhaps too late, that he has built up a Frankenstein which lives only to destroy him and our country with him.

Revenue Revision of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. W. R. POAGE, OF TEXAS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on revenue revision of 1941, May 1941:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, I full well appreciate the heavy obligation resting on this committee to formulate a tax bill that will produce a tremendous increase in the income of the National Treasury. I realize that this great amount of money cannot be collected without placing heavy burdens on business and industry. I realize that any levies on which you decide will be burdensome to some and will be distasteful to those who have to pay the bill. While you cannot levy painless taxes, and while you cannot avoid some burden on industry which in many instances will appear somewhat discriminatory, I know that you will at all times endeavor, and I believe that you will in large measure succeed in avoiding any substantial injustice to any one product or industry as compared with other subjects of taxation.

It is to the discriminatory nature of the proposed increase in the Federal tax on gasoline that I desire to direct my remarks. I understand that it is proposed to increase the Federal tax on gasoline from 1.5 cents per gallon to 2.5 cents per gallon. This is an increase of 66⅔ percent in the Federal tax on a product already taxed by both the Federal and the local governments at rates far in excess of the rates imposed on any other article of such general productive use.

I realize that most of us are prone to see the evils of a tax that falls on our own people. Sometimes in our proper solicitude for our own people we overlook the broader public good. While I come from the greatest of all oil-producing and gasoline-refining States, I represent a district that neither produces oil nor refines gasoline. The people of my district are farmers and small-town merchants and professional people, but we live closely enough to the great petroleum industry to know something of its importance to a great section of this land. I therefore believe that I can, and I shall certainly attempt to, view the problem fairly. I want oil and its great derivative, gasoline, to pay their fair share of the defense burden, but I want this committee to always remember that gasoline is but a source of power that is used just as is coal and falling water to do man's work and move his goods. Gasoline is the absolutely indispensable handmaiden of modern industry and commerce; it is not a luxury or a nonessential like tobacco or liquor, the only other articles of general distribution on which

we now levy anything like the tax we already impose on gasoline. To recognize that gasoline is a necessity of the most basic kind, let us look at the warring nations. Would not any one of them give up almost any article or product more readily than it would give up gasoline?

The man in the street thinks of gasoline in terms of 5 or 6 gallons for a dollar. The man who is familiar with the oil industry thinks of the refinery price of about 5 cents per gallon. He realizes that oil must be produced and refined for that small figure. He also knows that a difference of one-fourth cent per gallon in the refinery price spells the difference between a profit and a loss. He, therefore, is very aware that the average State gasoline tax is a 90-percent levy on this price, and that this State tax plus the present 1½-cent Federal levy amounts to considerably more than the refinery price. In other words, Government costs have doubled the price of this product at the refinery. Is it any wonder, then, that he is filled with foreboding at the prospect of an additional 1-cent Federal levy? It is just as though his production costs were arbitrarily to be increased. When he contemplates such figures he certainly must wish that he engaged in some other business where sales taxes range from 2 to 3 percent.

I cannot believe that the existing Federal tax of 1½ cents per gallon on gasoline should be increased. The highway users of the country are already paying their full and proportionate share of all general taxes. In addition to that they are contributing, in round figures, about $2,000,000,000 a year in special highway taxes of various kinds—Federal, State, and local. This sum is approximately equal to 14 percent of the total revenue accruing to all the units of government in the United States. Roughly speaking, State and local taxes on highway transportation amount to $1,500,000,000, while the Federal Government is collecting about $500,000,000 a year from this source. State taxes imposed on gasoline now average 4.4 cents per gallon. The existing Federal levy of 1½ cents per gallon brings the total to 5.9 cents. Adding another cent per gallon for Federal purposes would bring the average total to 6.9 cents per gallon. At the present retail price of gasoline, this would represent a sales tax of more than 50 percent. To the wholesaler it is a tax of more than 100 percent on the value of his product. Of course, it must be passed on to the consumer.

When the revenues derived from gasoline taxes are expended in improving and maintaining the highways, there can be no legitimate criticism. However, it must be kept in mind that much of the gasoline purchased by farmers is used for plowing, threshing, filling silos, sawing wood, grinding feed, and for other purposes that do not involve any use of the highways. Many States, including my State of Texas, properly refund the tax to farmers on gasoline used in such ways as have been enumerated. Other States do not make these refunds. So far as the Federal tax on gasoline is concerned, no refunds whatsoever are made. To increase the Federal gasoline tax would therefore result in increasing the farmer's cost of production. The same can be said for many other lines of business that use gasoline for nonhighway purposes.

The intrusion of the Federal Government into the gasoline-tax field cannot be regarded as desirable. Such appropriations as the Federal Government has made for highways can all be justified from the standpoint of national defense, to facilitate the transportation of the mails, and for other purposes benefiting all the people alike. It definitely is an unsound policy to allow two independent taxing authorities to heap excise or sales taxes upon one commodity, especially when that commodity is an everyday essential.

The States must be given some source of revenue. The field of gasoline taxation was first occupied by the States on the sound basis that, since they provided most of the cost of public roads, that it was proper for them to levy that tax. The field has been fully occupied. Gasoline already pays taxes out of proportion to its value. Only tobacco and spirituous liquors are taxed in amounts even remotely approaching the taxes on gasoline. Gasoline is a vital necessity of modern life.

The present discriminatory taxes imposed on gasoline can only be explained on the erroneous assumption that the Federal tax, like the State taxes, has some reasonable relation to benefits conferred by the Federal Government—that is, as a highway tax. We have, however, long since passed the stage where we could make that claim. Now it is frankly admitted that we propose to tax the most widely used motor fuel simply because we can make gasoline consumers pay. The theory is the same as that used in some European countries that tax salt, but it has other far-reaching and unjust implications.

Gasoline-propelled motor-born transportation is in direct competition with steam-propelled railroad transportation. What tax is proposed on the coal that the railroads use? Why not levy a tax of $5 per ton on soft coal? It will produce revenue. The Government needs the money. Is there any reason in morals or justice why all of the cost of supporting the Government should be heaped on one form of transportation and competitive forms should go free and, in fact, be guaranteed a profitable price by law—both on the transportation furnished by the railroads and the coal furnished by the mines?

I fully recognize the necessity under which this committee labors of devising a tax bill that will produce revenue. I only ask that the burden be equally distributed. I ask no special favors for gasoline or the users of motor vehicles, but I do plead with the committee to give this great commodity and those who use it equal and fair treatment.

Housing and the Nation's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, before the National Committee on the Housing Emergency, Inc., at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on June 12. The subject of the address is: Housing and the Nation's Defense, Present and Future.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this splendid 2-day meeting the National Committee on the Housing Emergency has had the benefit of the advice of many experts. I make no claim of being an expert, but my amateur enthusiasm for housing is so great that I found it impossible to resist Mrs. Rosenman's invitation.

It happens that for many years I have studied the ups and downs of the building cycle and have often pondered on how to iron out those cycles on a higher and progressively rising level of housing standards. Back in 1933 I belonged to that group which felt that one of the best ways of ending the depression was to start building on a large scale. Marriner Eccles, Winfield Riefler, M. L. Wilson, and a number of others, used to meet together from time to time to formulate the principles which finally were written into the several housing laws which have done so much to unleash the energies of private capital, lower the cost of money, and increase the standards of building excellence.

Before I came to Washington I was director in a building and loan association, and in recent years building-and-loan people have come to me and spoken of the interests of building and loan being different from those of the Federal Housing Administration. My key to resolving such conflicts has always been how to get the job done best, not who is to do it. There are at least a dozen different Federal agencies engaged in house-building activities of one kind or another. When I was Secretary of Agriculture the Farm Security Administration did a lot of house building for low-income farmers, and it gave me a great deal of pleasure to work with the engineers in cutting the cost of building these houses in two. We finally got so we could build a pretty good house for the South for $1,400. When peace comes, farm housing will be recognized as one of the most important jobs before the American people. But at the moment we are talking about housing in relation to the war emergency.

It is time to point out clearly the difference between wartime prosperity and wartime necessity with respect not only to housing but to everything else. They went through this in Germany about 6 years ago. Hitler started his vast rearmament program in 1933, when Germany was at the very bottom of the depression, with about one-third of her people out of work. The huge armament expenditures created an artificial prosperity, and those who had formerly been unemployed began to buy. But after the people became fully employed it became apparent that wartime prosperity must not be allowed to interfere with wartime needs, and General Goering came out in December of 1935 with his famous statement that the German people must choose between guns and butter.

The United States today is passing through the preliminary prosperity stage before we get down to real business. We have increased our production of both guns and butter and will no doubt continue to do so until such time as we begin to run genuinely short of labor. In the first quarter of this year the people of the United States built 32 percent more houses and bought about 20 percent more household furniture, about 40 percent more refrigerators, and 30 percent more passenger cars. No wonder sales of many other things have also increased, for factory pay rolls were nearly 30 percent greater than they were a year ago, corporation profits were 22 percent greater, and the money buying power of farmers also increased 8 percent. The cost of living has risen only 3 percent, and thus millions of our people are better off than they have been in many years.

The fact that we are now producing about four times as much in the way of defense materials as we did a year ago at this time has had an enormously stimulating effect on the great majority of our farmers, workers, and businessmen. Our effort so far has been easy and rather painless, and for the most part we have merely been putting idle industrial capacity and men to work rather than building new factories. By producing more guns, we have made a greater market for

butter, automobiles, houses, and house furnishings.

The honeymoon of wartime prosperity will not last forever. Sooner or later higher taxes will begin to eat into the purchasing power of most of us, while at the same time we begin to see how defense needs are restricting our freedom of purchase. Our battle cry during the months immediately ahead must be "First things first."

Certain types of housing deserve to rank with the speedy building of bombers and ships. Other types of housing may need to wait until the war is over. We want to use our Federal Housing, United States Housing, and all the other Federal organizations, in cooperation with the private agencies, to build as rapidly as possible the houses which are necessary to take care of the defense workers, especially in those localities where defense industries and Army camps are located and where the population has doubled almost overnight.

There should be much additional housing also in towns where Army camps are located. Wives who wish to live near their husbands while they are serving in the Army can, if they have comfortable quarters at reasonable rents, do an even better job of building Army morale than they are now doing. Anyone who has visited towns like Newport News, Va.; Fayetteville, N. C.; Alexandria, La.; or San Diego, Calif., knows the magnitude of the housing problem which has suddenly been created by our defense efforts. The splendid Americanism shown by those living under congested conditions is one of the most inspiring things in America today.

We are better organized to do a speedy, creditable housing job today than in World War No. 1. We have public agencies, both for construction and for aiding private business, that are well past the experimental stage. They have done a good job so far in 1941, and they will do an even better job during the rest of this year.

From now on, until peace comes, there will be as much need for the various housing agencies holding down on the wrong kind of house building as for stimulating the building of houses where they are most needed. Perhaps new housing of the luxury or higher-income type can be curtailed in favor of housing essential for decent living conditions for defense workers and low-income groups. In this great effort there is no room for inefficiency or for conflicts which interfere with defense action. The job is big enough to keep all the private and public housing organizations busy in the defense areas, and they will not measure up to their opportunity unless there is the utmost of harmonious cooperation. National unity demands that the various housing agencies pull together as they have never pulled before.

I mention the need for harmony and good will because the agents of the dictators are continually at work among us trying to stir up discord. Every disagreement among ourselves is a free gift to Hitler. And so I hope the various housing organizations will compete to see who can do the most work, and that they will not allow themselves to become entangled in conflicts of a sort which will only give pleasure to the dictators. Our job is to compete with each other in promoting the general welfare and the common defense with the greatest speed possible.

There is still another reason for emphasizing need for harmony. The better the job our housing agencies do now in cooperating in behalf of the defense program the greater will be their opportunities to do the socially right kind of housing job for the Nation in the post-defense period. I, therefore, trust that the National Committee on the Housing Emergency will direct its effort toward promoting cooperation, not merely to get defense housing built with all possible speed, but also to consider the way in which housing can be used to help break the economic shock of the peace. I am one of those who believe that peace can be made to mean more and better housing, more and better food, less unemployment, and more security for old age. There are forward-looking businessmen in both the United States and England who realize more than ever before that the test of democracy is whether or not it can provide good food, decent shelter, and security.

There are men in government, business, labor, and agriculture who are willing to plan now as they have never planned before, for they want to make sure that we shall not again lose our hard-won peace. In all countries the people are hungry for that kind of peace which will give them freedom from the terrorism of the Gestapo; freedom from the fear of unemployment, hunger, and lack of shelter; and freedom from the fear of future war. The people of free democracies are fighting for this kind of peace. Eventually, 90 percent of the people in the dictator countries will be hungry for it, too, and, with the help of the democracies, will drive out the dictator and his gang who now deny them these freedoms and this peace.

The democratic way is for each citizen of this country to figure out for himself, as he listens to the radio and reads the newspapers day by day, a personal standard of priorities. In the months immediately ahead, we may want to cut down very greatly in our purchases of things which we can do without now but which we will want to buy when peace comes. If we thus adopt personal-standard priorities with intelligence, determination, and unselfishness, we shall be able to outproduce the aggressor nations and take the heart out of the dictators.

Aroused democracy has just begun to fight. In present-day mechanized warfare, the measure of our fighting power is the volume of our defense production. The National Committee on the Housing Emergency is going to make its contribution toward pushing the right kind of housing in the right places with the greatest speed possible. It asks for the cooperation of labor, industry, and Government. But, above all, it asks for the understanding cooperation of you who are listening in tonight, eager to do your utmost in your own democratic way.

A Pagan Philosophy of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA, AT WOOSTER COLLEGE, OHIO

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this morning, at the commencement exercises of the College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] delivered the commencement address. In his very able address Senator NORRIS presented a wonderfully graphic and challenging picture of the international situation as it confronts our country today. I wish that every man, woman, and child in America could read the address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these unprecedented days of sorrow and world-wide suffering, when century-old nations are falling like the leaves of the forest, honest men and women are wondering what has happened to our civilization. Students of history are searching literature in vain for any similar period in the world's history. Our present-day civilization seems to be sinking to the dismal abyss of dishonor, misery, and woe. The code of honor which has governed men and women has, to a great extent, lost its power and sunk into oblivion or has been forgotten.

What has happened to our world that we thought had reached such a high degree of civilization? The pillars of peace, erected by men and nations of honor and integrity, are crumbling all over the world. The laws of humanity, made by honest men and nations, have been repudiated by ruthless and murderous attacks upon civilization, paying no heed to the suffering of the innocent, but inflicting cruel and unholy vengeance upon unoffending millions of victims whom it crushes to death upon pagan altars. All over the world we hear the wailing cry and the dying moan of the suffering victims of this pagan philosophy until all of civilization, in the agony of its sorrow, like Christ on the cross, raises its eyes to Heaven and exclaims, "My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

Four of the great nations of the earth are led by a desire to kill and enslave peaceful and harmless people who refuse to submit to the ravages of hate, and to bow and bend the knee in meek and humble slavery to the pagan rulers who are bent upon the destruction of home, fireside, and the love that God intended to exist among his people. Civilization, against great odds, is struggling to preserve fidelity, honor, and honesty among the peoples of the earth, to save itself from destruction and slavery, and to maintain law and order in this troubled world.

Japan, without reason, without cause, and practically without notice, seized Manchukuo and subjected its people to the domination of a despotic ruler.

Mussolini, likewise, without reason or cause, murdered and slaughtered the weak and helpless men and women of Abyssinia—without giving any excuse for this onslaught and the destruction of a people who had never given any offense either in thought or deed.

Russia, like an unrestrained demon, took Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and, without pretense of authority or reason, made war upon Finland and, because she was powerful enough to do so, took a large part of that little nation into her own domain and later on took a portion of Poland.

Hitler, with a heart of stone and without any semblance of reason, murdered the men and women of Poland, seized her territory without excuse and, in the continuous march of his disgraceful course, by dishonorable subterfuge and deception, conquered Austria, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Greece, until now, without any cause, without any reason, and without any authority, he is the dominant ruler of nearly all of Europe.

There is no love between these four dictator nations. In truth, they hate each other with a hatred that is now kept under control but each one of them knows that, before he can attain his ambitions, there must be a war of extermination between them. The time for fighting among themselves has not yet arrived. They are controlled by no code that has ever existed between men and nations of integrity or honesty. Like the beast of the

jungle, Hitler pounces upon the innocent peoples of Europe and reduces them to slavery. Each one of these dictatorial rulers is imbued with the idea that he is to become the ruler of all the earth. There is no secret about these ambitions. The Japanese believe that ultimately Japan will rule the world; Mussolini, controlled by his own cruel instincts and moved by his ideas of superiority, believes that ultimately Italy will be the power that dominates all creation. The doctrines of Stalin are openly proclaimed over the world and the boast is made that eventually Russia will be the ruler of all. Hitler has implanted in the hearts of his people the belief that they are a superior race and that their destiny is to march on and on until every nation in our civilization is subdued. He has taught his people to believe that they are born to rule—that all other peoples are born to serve his conquering hosts—and that, by their superiority of intellect, and through their murderous and disgraceful methods of inhuman slaughter, the world will finally be brought into subjection and the inferior nations will be slaves, while he sits in undisputed possession of the throne which shall govern the world.

Should England be conquered, no great nation stands in their pathway except our own and it is to the interest of every one of them that they should now be combined inasmuch as the common goal demands that the United States must be conquered before the world can be subdued. Of all these four dictatorial powers, Hitler stands out preeminently as the most prominent and as the leader of them all. He dominates them all today and, at the present time, his will is superior to any of them. He is the evil genius who will be the guiding spirit in the great battle to control the Western Hemisphere. In order to get control of North and South America, he must first conquer England. The conquering of England, however, is only one step in the march toward world domination. It is a necessary step and, if he fails to conquer Great Britain, then he will be defeated beyond the possibility of further success. Hitler is not moved by any thought of justice, of kindness, or of mercy. This pagan philosophy has within it no place for justice even to the innocent and to the unoffending. His theory is that he has an absolute right to conquer any nation or any people if he has the power to do it. He can conquer the weaker nations without any struggle as he boasted when he conquered Czechoslovakia "without the firing of a shot." His philosophy is one of deception as his own writings and his own conduct show beyond the shadow of a doubt. He does not hesitate to resort to deception of the vilest kind to attain his end and his ambitions are well known. He makes no secret of them.

To be conquered by Hitler is to be subjugated into a bondage of human slavery. In his march of inhuman triumph, he tramples under his heel both the babe in the cradle and the old and infirm standing upon the brink of the grave. At the present time, Great Britain stands in his way. She has, by a defense of bravery and courage never before witnessed by mortal man, thwarted his attempts and defied him with a fortitude which is unequaled in the history of nations. Hitler makes no promise that if he conquers England he will be satisfied, but even if he did, who would believe him? How often, in his successful and tyrannical march, has he made such promises! The world knows that he has violated these promises without any hesitancy. If England goes down, there is no doubt but what, as soon as he has made the necessary preparations, his march of conquest will continue. All the world knows this to be true. Hitler does not deny it. Everyone knows that after he has conquered England, his next step would be to come to the Western Hemisphere and that the only power in the Western Hemisphere which is prepared to offer any resistance is our own country.

I think everybody in America realizes this struggle with Hitler must come sometime. There is a divided opinion—an honest division I think—as to when and how soon that struggle will come. I am not one of those who think that the fall of England will be followed at once by an attack upon this hemisphere. Nor am I one of those who thinks an attack will come, in the first instance, upon us. It will come through South and Central America. It may take several years before he is ready and these will be years of preparation.

If England falls, the United States will be entirely shut out of the European trade. Hitler can get what he wants in South America. He already has his "fifth column" supporters in many of the South and Central American countries. These countries produce the raw materials he needs. Hitler will supply them with the manufactured products. As a commercial proposition, it will be almost a perfect setting. He will establish business connections with every nation in South and Central America. Europe, dominated by Hitler, will become the market for their goods, and the trade will be prosperous for both Hitler and for his South American clients. Does anyone believe, judging from past experience, that he will fail to plant his trusted men in every country to the south of us? When we have lost our European trade and South and Central America have it all, will not the time be ripe for him to practice his deceptive methods of winning the peoples of these nations? How long will it be, after England falls, before Hitler will have established friendly relations with all of these countries?

In the meantime, he will be building up a navy. I know it is said that, while this is going on, we will be building up a navy. Undoubtedly we will, but let us see how this race for naval supremacy will come out. Hitler will have Japan, Russia, and Italy united with him in the struggle for greater armaments. Every one of these nations will increase its army. This race will not all be on one side.

Those Americans who beat their breasts and boast of our great resources, our strength, our power, and our courage, forget that four other nations will be engaged in the same race. Do we not know that they can produce the same amount of military armament for one-half less than it will cost us? Suppose this race goes on for 2, 3, or perhaps 10 years, how are we going to fare? The commercial trade between Hitler and South America will be prosperous and increasing year after year. Our trade with Europe will have vanished. The four dictator nations will be building battleships, submarines, and airplanes. They will build them for much less than we will be building ours, and is there any reason to think that they will not build them faster than we do? Will a sensible man say they will do nothing while we are going on with the expenditure of billions of dollars every year to increase our armaments and our Navy? We should never make the mistake, either in business or in any other walk of life, of underestimating the power and resources of an enemy in any kind of a controversy. When we look back over the last few years and see the wonders that Hitler has performed, we must realize he has done almost the impossible. He has built up a dominating power in the air—he has done it so secretly that the world knew nothing about it. He has today the largest airplane force of any power on earth. Even within a few years he has surpassed us in the air. Although blockaded by the British Fleet, he has built at least two of the greatest battleships that have ever floated upon the seas. Not until one of these battleships had been destroyed was it known to any of the experts in any country on earth that he had such a battleship. It is now known that he has another one just like it. No one knows how many more. He has been building up a navy without the knowledge of his enemies. Apparently he has done this without any money. He has done it in violation of all the ordinary rules of procedure. He has more submarines in the bosom of the ocean today than all the rest of the world put together. He has done this out of nothing. When you ask, "How is it possible?" the answer is, "It is already accomplished." He has come well-nigh controlling the commerce of the Atlantic Ocean by these submarines. They prey upon the commercial as well as upon the armored ships in the middle of the night. Like a serpent stealing toward its victim, he pounces upon his enemies, in violation of all ethics and all honor, sinking his victims to the bottom of the sea. We should not underestimate his power. In some respects he stands without a peer in the history of the world. He has accomplished many things the experts have said over and over again were impossible. Although he is without semblance of any truthfulness or any honesty, he is, nevertheless, one of the great geniuses of the world.

It must be remembered, too, that, if England goes down and a period of several years of preparations on both sides goes on, he will have the airplane factories of Europe at his back. If he does in that race what he has been doing during the past several years, he will produce an air force greater than we can possibly produce in the same length of time, and producing airplanes on his side will be Japan, Russia, and Italy. Assuming that England is out of the picture, then the factories of England will be producing at his will. With all this combination against us, can we expect to keep up in that race? The same possibilities will exist in the building of ships, submarines, and armament. This will all be done by persons who will not be paid a living wage to the extent now enjoyed by our people. To a great extent it will be carried on by men who get no wages—or, at least, just a bare subsistence.

Let us see what we will be doing. Those who are willing to let England fall know that after England does fall the war will come to us sooner or later, and they boast how we will produce all kinds of military machines to such an extent that the world cannot compete with us. And yet we are united in the desire not to subject our people to the same methods of living as prevail under Hitler. We are going to pay a living wage; we are going to pay profits to manufacturers; we are going to keep up the high standards of living which we now enjoy. How will we produce the goods? We know now that they will cost many times more than our enemies will have to pay. We know also that while this is going on we will be deprived of the trade of Europe and that we will probably lose most of our trade with South and Central America. We know that, under all the circumstances, Hitler can offer a greater inducement for that trade than we can.

With this curtailment in our foreign trade, we will have to levy taxes to meet these added burdens. Where will they end? It requires only a few moments' thought to see that we cannot successfully carry on this race. We are certain to be beaten in the race for military supremacy. While we produce one airplane, our enemies will produce at least a dozen; while we produce one battleship, our enemies will produce three or four; and our enemies will outnumber us a dozen to one in the production of submarines. Their taxes will not be as high as ours. Ours will be ascending rapidly step by step. Deprived of world trade, we will have to take care of our own surpluses. We will have to reduce our people to the level of Hitler's people or meet ignominious defeat in that race of war preparation. So that the longer the race lasts, the greater the probabilities are that our production will not compare with that of

our enemy. What will happen under these circumstances with our increased taxes? We are already burdened almost to the limit. Every man knows there is a limit to taxation and that the very burden of taxation, if continued indefinitely, will crush us. Is the result not plain? Do we not know the outcome even before we begin? We stand no show in that kind of a race under the circumstances which will exist. How long can we keep this up and maintain ourselves? How long will it be before we will have to meet the sad fate of other nations and face a revolution at home?

The outcome is plain. In this kind of a struggle, we will go down to defeat without a shot being fired. This is the way that Hitler has already narrated that he expects to win. He knows he can produce cheaper and, with his allies, faster than we can, and he would not object if this armament race went on several years until he won without the using of his navy, his army, his airplanes, or his submarines.

I know this is a sad picture I am painting. It has in it very few, if any, stars of hope and, yet, I believe it is a true picture and we should face the truth no matter how humiliating or distressful it may be. If England wins over Hitler, all this will fade away. The war will be ended and this struggle which I have described will never take place.

The answer then, it seems to me, is to help England win and help her now. If we can supply her with airplanes, with food, and with military material, I believe she can and will win, and the war will be over. If she falls and we must go on with these years of preparation for greater armament, the probabilities are that we will fail but, even if we did not, we will be sending soldiers to South America and we will be sending soldiers to Central America. Suppose we help England now. Does anyone believe we are going to send soldiers to Europe? So far as I know, no one believes that. If Hitler starts a war against us because of the assistance we have given to England, it will be only a fight upon the sea. If we wait for the war that is to come after the fall of England, it will be a war not only upon the seas but American boys will be sent to South and Central America to preserve this hemisphere. If England falls and we start in this race for military supremacy—which everybody admits we will—with all the chances against us, will life be worth living during that period? When we see our enemies increasing military preparations faster than we can increase them; when the burdens of taxation are binding us to the earth; when we are finding it impossible to have any enjoyment or comfort in life, with the full knowledge that our young men are soon to be sent to the wilds of South America to fight, will life be worth living? The chances are that we would go down at the end of the struggle and become the slaves of conquering Hitler. So that, if the theory of those who oppose England be true, we are very likely, in the years to come, to be doomed to a life of suffering and toil and, during those years, we will have to live a life that is worse than death itself.

There is another point which I have in mind and which, so far as I know, has received no attention. If England falls, and we are doomed to a life of military preparation, where that is the dominant thing in our lives, where every effort and every energy of our people is moved by military considerations; if we are to be subjected to that kind of a life and it is to become permanent, many of our people will lead a life of bitterest poverty and military sentiment will dominate completely and absolutely our Nation and our lives. If carried on for a sufficient length of time it will convert our people into a military-minded population and will gradually but eventually obliterate completely all the greatest pleasures and joys which can come to a liberty-loving people.

Hiter could not have the control he now has over the German people if there had not been this preparation which has been going on for centuries. The Germar of today was born into a world of military preparation and military control. He has known nothing else during his entire life. His father was the same before him. The child is taught that military supremacy is the highest ideal of the Nation; that to bring about military supremacy it is necessary to have absolute subjection of the people to their masters. The little child, from the beginning, is taught to respect the commands of the officials in the higher ranks without asking any questions. This becomes a part of the make-up of the human being. It comes into all walks of life. It degrades womanhood. She becomes a slave in order that men may spend their time in the Army preparing themselves to slaughter and be slaughtered on the battlefield. All these things have been taught the German people for generations and so they were prepared for the next step when Hitler came into the picture. It was only another step from what they had been doing to place themselves under the domination and control of that evil genius. The German citizen of today does not complain about any injustice he may suffer at the hands of his government. He tries to make himself believe it is not an injustice and, if he cannot understand it, he tells himself that it is the command of those who know more than he does and, after all, it is for his own good. The women are taught to perform the work of the men and, after a generation or two they believe it to be their duty. They apparently enjoy this sacrifice in order that they may make their Nation more powerful in a military way. If free speech, free press, and the right to speak one's mind or to criticize even in a very modest way, is suppressed, the person who has lived through that life passes it off on the theory that the command comes from those who can do no wrong.

That result will come to us just as surely as we start on a national course that has nothing but military supremacy for its object and yet we are face to face with that kind of a picture. When we have to meet a demon like Hitler with the power he possessess, there is nothing else for us to do. If those who do not want England to win have their way, and we go on with our military preparations and arm ourselves so we can defy the world, that is one of the dangers which will face us and we cannot avoid it.

To my mind this is one of the greatest dangers which we face today. I cannot see how it can be avoided because we are faced with an enemy powerful and strong and it is generally conceded that we must meet him some day on the battlefield. It seems plain that, even at the risk of war which will not extend, so far as I can see, to the sending of an army to foreign lands but will be confined to warfare upon the seas and in the air, it will be far better to take that chance than to see England fall and thus automatically compel us to go through the preparation which will be necessary to meet the foe at a later date.

But will helping England win bring us into the war? We have already done many things which could be taken by Hitler as a justification for war upon us, but does he want us in the war now? Is it sensible to think he wants to add to his enemies in the desperate struggle now going on in Europe?

It seems reasonable to say that, regardless of the course we take, he will avoid war with us if it is possible. At the present time, he does not want to add to his belligerent enemies and, therefore, aid to England does not necessarily mean that we will become engaged in the war itself and, even if we do, it is improbable that we will send an army of American soldiers to foreign lands. The war which will come if England falls, and which everybody admits will follow, will mean that our soldiers will be sent all over South America.

It seems plain and reasonable and the probabilities are that, if through our aid to England, we get into war, it will not follow that we will send an army to fight on European soil. It is practically a certainty, if we follow the course of those who are willing to let England go down that, later, we will have to send thousands, and perhaps millions, of our boys to South and Central America to fight Hitler there. If England is saved, and Hitler is defeated, the probabilities are that no American boy will lose his life on foreign soil. If England falls, and Hitler wins, it is almost a certainty that our soldiers will die in untold numbers in practically every country of South America.

We are told by those of our countrymen who oppose further aid to Great Britain that the example of the last World War illustrates that, in the end, aid to England does not mean the saving of democracy in the world. It is said we were deceived then and made to believe we were fighting a war to save democracy, but that, as a matter of fact, the fighting of that war did not mean any safety for democracy. I believe there is truth in this assertion. We were, in my opinion, unjustified in entering the last World War, but conditions which confronted us then have no similarity to the conditions which confront us now. At that time there was still honor among nations and men, even though they were enemies upon the battlefield. The enslavement of peoples was not then at stake. There was no likelihood then that the life of our own Nation, as well as that of every other democracy in the world, would be endangered, no matter what the outcome of the war might be. There was no claim or belief in the mind of anyone that, if Germany won that war, it would be followed by a war in this hemisphere. Our liberties, and the freedom of our people, were not involved. However, in this war, we are confronted with an enemy whose ambitions are known to the world and that means the destruction of every democracy in the world and, since we are the largest of those democracies, it means more to us than to any other country.

The democracies are confronted with an enemy whose avowed purpose of destruction and enslavement of our people is but thinly veiled if it is indeed covered at all. The same pagan philosophies he applied in the conquering of the weak and peaceful nations of Europe apply with equal force to our own. We are confronted with an enemy who has thrown international law to the winds—who openly avows that the German people are superior to any other people on earth and that it is their destiny to conquer and rule the earth. His methods are disreputable, dishonorable, and deceitful. The ruin which will follow his victory would bring destruction and suffering to most of the human race where liberty prevails and freedom is enthroned. It means slavery to the conquered nations. To us, it means a life which would be worse than death. Everything we hold dear, everything for which we have struggled for more than a century, is at stake, and although we may be innocent, our innocence will avail us nothing. Although we may be blameless, that will not save us from destruction and from slavery if Hitler conquers. His success means that the Christian religion will be wiped off the face of the earth and that freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of petition will fade out of our lives forever.

Those who oppose further aid to England point to her long history and say she has been guilty of conquering other nations without just cause. A fair study of English history must convince us that there is much truth in this charge. If the same charge were made against our own country, I think, in

honesty, we, ourselves, would have to plead guilty. If the sins of the past are to be charged up to those who want a higher and a better life, then all hope of future happiness and joy for the people of this world must vanish.

In this struggle no one has claimed that those who are defending liberty and justice are themselves entirely free from sin but England has made great progress along the road toward greater democracy. We, ourselves, fought her in the Revolutionary War to obtain our own freedom and, yet, the world knows that today the people in England, and her possessions, are enjoying liberties which compare very favorably with those we enjoy here. The world today acknowledges that England and the United States are the two outstanding nations where freedom and liberty are respected more than in any other countries. Moreover, recent events have shown the honesty of British pledges and that a greater freedom and a happier way of life will follow the defeat of Hitler's misguided followers.

Our own country has already acknowledged that exterritoriality in China will cease when this war is over. That step will be a bright page in American history. England has already announced that, when Hitler is conquered, a fuller life of liberty, freedom, and justice will come to the millions in far away India. That, too, is another step showing an upward and onward march of British sentiment toward the rightful enjoyment of life which should come to the people of India. Those acknowledgements from our own country and from Great Britain should fill the heart of every human being who loves freedom and liberty with pride and joy. That those promises will be kept no one doubts. They shine like bright stars in the earth's firmament, showing conclusively that a higher and better life will be the object of these two great world powers in the future.

Taking it all in all, it seems that, if England wins, and Hitler is defeated, the lessons she has learned, and the lessons we have learned from our own suffering, are going far toward establishing a universal sentiment all over the civilized world for the obliteration of wrongs and for the upbuilding of a universal sentiment in favor of greater justice, a higher life, and a greater brotherhood of man.

It seems to me, in concluding my remarks, I should say something about the peace which should follow the overthrow of Hitlerism. In the last World War the victorious nations, including our own, exacted a humiliating surrender from our enemy. It was, in my opinion, an unjust peace which was imposed upon the German people. It was as humiliating as it was possible to make it. The doctrine of an "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" was applied. The treaty of Versailles was not only humiliating to the vanquished but it was disgraceful on the part of the conquerors. The victorious nations demanded from their foe financial impossibilities. That treaty engendered a sentiment of revenge which has had its effect in establishing in power such a man as Hitler. The peace which should follow the destruction of Hitler and his pagan philosophy of government should be one which would give prominence to the liberality of the conqueror in the day of his victory. There should be no reparations or indemnities. This may look like a concession on the part of the victors. Considering past history, it would be a concession, but one we should be willto make if we desire to preserve a world of perpetual peace. The treaty should recognize the fact that it is impossible for any nation, conquered or otherwise, to meet in financial language the payment for the destruction which has been brought about by Hitler's warfare. Even the subjection of the conquered peoples to perpetual slavery could never compensate in money for the damage Hitler has done to the world and to world civilization. This is a debt a revitalized world ought to be willing should never be paid—first, because it is impossible; and, second, because it would be unjust and mean the sentencing of the conquered people to a life of servitude.

The peace treaty should provide for the complete disarmament of Germany. Their submarines should be sunk to the bottom of the sea, their battleships destroyed, and their munition factories razed to the ground. Their bombing machines should likewise be destroyed, and their forts and arsenals dismantled and completely obliterated. The treaty should provide for the complete restoration of every one of the nations Hitler has taken. This should be followed by promises on the part of the victors so that, as soon as peace is completely restored and Germany totally disarmed, a repetition of his disastrous campaign for destruction is made impossible. Both England and the restored nations should be called together in conference and an earnest effort made to bring about disarmament the world over. If the world is disarmed, everlasting world peace will follow. If there had not been this race for supremacy of armament among the nations of the earth, the World War would have been impossible and complete disarmament would be a cure for future wars. An arbitration administered by impartial courts of justice the world over would mean that future generations, although saddled with a debt it will take generations to pay, will nevertheless enjoy freedom, liberty, and a way of life which will bring happiness, comfort, and joy to all the world. In a few years the doctrine of hate would disappear and it would be replaced by a brotherhood of man which would be followed by confidence in each other on the part of all the nations of the world. Hatred of Germany, hatred of France, hatred everywhere would disappear from the minds of men, and people all over the world would soon learn the truth of the divine injunction "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

The victors at the peace table will have an opportunity to perform an act which would take away from the minds of men the idea that war has a place in the world, and rule by force would in time become a thing known only to students of ancient history. It is that kind of a peace which should follow this world catastrophe and it is that kind of a peace which will follow if the victors are moved by sentiments of mercy and of human love. Our Nation should take a leading part at the peace table when that time comes. We should be willing to sacrifice whatever may be necessary to bring about such an international condition. I have no doubt but that we can take a leading part in that peace conference. It will bring to the peoples of the earth the greatest satisfaction that has ever been theirs to enjoy. It will bring to every American citizen a pride in the fact that our own country has been a leader in bringing about such a peace. In the midst of a disarmed world, with our flag floating in the breeze, we could unite in repeating the words of our own great poet:

> "Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
> Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
> Humanity with all its fears,
> With all the hopes of future years,
> Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

Supplying Food to People of Belgium and Other European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over radio station WIBW on June 8, 1941, urging our State Department to arrange with England and Germany to allow limited supplies of food for the suffering people of Belgium and other European people threatened with starvation as a result of the blockade of practically all Europe.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, I was 1 of 37 Senators who last week joined in sponsoring the resolution urging our own State Department to arrange with England and Germany to allow limited supplies of food for the starving people of Belgium and other continental European peoples threatened with starvation as the result of the blockade of practically all Eurcpe.

Leaving aside for the moment the humanitarian problem involved, I seriously question the effectiveness of this blockade in aiding England to win its war with the Axis Powers. The blockade was intended to starve out Germany, as was done in the previous World War. Terrible as it is to contemplate starving women and children and the aged of a nation in order to compel the fighting men at the front to capitulate—that is war. Under the stern necessities of war, it is regarded as justifiable, in fact as necessary—if and when it can be done.

But from what we can learn, in this war England is not starving Germany, with whom she is at war, but the Belgians, British allies, and the French, who were Britain's allies, and peoples of other nations who either were allied to or friendly toward the cause of Britain.

In the last war Germany and Austria, completely encircled by land and sea, were unable to draw foodstuff from the rest of the world. So the British blockade was an effective blockade against Germany.

In this war Germany is not encircled. She is getting foodstuffs from Russia, from the rest of the continent of Europe. True, she is doing this ruthlessly but she is doing it. With all of continental Europe and Russia to draw from, the German people are going to be the last ones in Europe to feel the pinch of starvation.

Now, just suppose you lived in conquered Europe, and knew that the people of the United States were able and willing to supply you and your children and your neighbors with some foods at least—milk and food par-

ticularly for your children. And suppose a blockade was maintained against you by a military power with which you were not at war. If that condition continues over a period of 2 years, or 3, or maybe 10 years—I ask you, what would be the attitude toward the blockading country?

We have seen what is happening in France; France is turning against England. I very much fear that the net effect may be to turn all Europe against the British cause—while Germany gets enough to eat, despite the blockade.

In the last war Herbert Hoover was able to work out a program by which the starving women and children of Belgium were saved from starvation. And there was general agreement then that the program worked; that none of the food from America sent to Belgium got into German hands or was of material assistance to the cause of Germany or of material detriment to the cause of the Allies. At that time Britain and France not only acquiesced in the Belgian program, but assisted in every way to make it effective.

Today the exiled Belgian Government in London is pleading with the British Government to allow a limited supply of foodstuffs, principally milk for children, to be allowed to go through the blockade to these hapless people.

Today the small democratic nations of Europe—the democracies whose cause Britain is fighting; the cause for which we have become the arsenal of democracy—are under the heels of the conqueror. These peoples, allies of Britain, resisted to the limit against the onrush of German might. Their peoples are suffering from malnutrition; they face starvation after the coming harvest.

John Cudahy, former ambassador to Belgium from the United States, in a recent issue of Life magazine, paints a touching picture of what is happening to the children of Belgium.

"There is something revolting and depraved in the spectacle of suffering inflicted upon a child," says Mr. Cudahy. "It is like witnessing the slapping of a blind man's face (only worse) and I felt hurt and grieved and bitterly resentful.

"Brussels is a city of walking wraiths, but Dr. Noll told me his main worry was not about grown people. What concerned him above all was the blighting effect upon the rising generation who could never grow without the materials for growth and who, because they could not get these materials, were rapidly developing deficiency diseases like rickets, edema, partial blindness, bronchial pneumonia, tuberculosis, pellagra, eczema, and anemia."

Mr. Cudahy's description of conditions is simply appalling. Surely, there is something we can do about it.

The American Committee on Food for the Small Democracies recently made a proposal for a trial feeding in Belgium by which 3,000,000 children, women, and unemployed men would be fed from soup kitchens. This would require monthly 25,000 tons of breadstuffs, and 20,000 tons of meats, fats, beans, peas, and rice for soup materials and milk and cocoa for children.

The Germans have agreed to furnish the soup kitchens, 25,000 tons of breastuffs monthly, to refrain from requisitioning imported and native food supplies, and not to attack mercy ships.

The exiled Belgian Government has strongly urged the British Government to give the program a trial, and has offered to finance it. The trial feeding would be administered by a neutral commission. Only small quantities would be imported into Belgium at a time. If the German Government disregarded its pledges—it generally was agreed it did not disregard its food pledges in Belgium in the last war—the imports could be stopped immediately.

The resolution which I sponsored jointly with the other Senators respectfully urges that the Secretary of State endeavor as quickly as possible to work out, in cooperation with the British Government and the other governments concerned, the setting up of food relief administrations for the small democracies, beginning with the trial in Belgium. I think we should by all means do this. Let the United States send some milk and soups and foods to Europe; not only implements of death and destruction and terror.

You might be interested to know who the Senators are sponsoring this action. A third of them, by the way, are not interventionists, but voted for the lease-lend bill. Here they are: Senators THOMAS of Oklahoma; AIKEN, of Vermont; ANDREWS, of Florida; BALL, of Minnesota; BANKHEAD, of Alabama; BARBOUR, of New Jersey; BILBO, of Mississippi; BREWSTER, of Maine; BROOKS, of Illinois; BROWN, of Michigan; BULOW, of South Dakota; BURTON, of Ohio; BUTLER, of Nebraska; CHAVEZ, of New Mexico; CLARK of Idaho; DANAHER, of Connecticut; DAVIS, of Pennsylvania; GILLETTE, of Iowa; HOLMAN, of Oregon; JOHNSON, of Colorado; LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin; MCCARRAN, of Nevada; MALONEY, of Connecticut; NYE, of North Dakota; REED, of Kansas; REYNOLDS, of North Carolina; SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota; SMITH, of South Carolina; TAFT, of Ohio; THOMAS of Idaho; TOBEY, of New Hampshire; VANDENBERG, of Michigan; WALSH, of Massachusetts; WHEELER, of Montana; WILEY, of Wisconsin; WILLIS, of Indiana; and CAPPER, of Kansas.

I say this program worked out by Mr. Hoover and his committee should be given a trial. As you know, I hate war, but above and beyond that, I abhor and cringe from helping make war on helpless children, women, and aged people through starvation which is death by slow torture.

Fraudulent Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an able, appropriate, and patriotic address delivered by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] on Thursday evening, June 12, 1941, on the subject of Fraudulent Freedoms.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now you see it, now you don't.

For weeks and weeks our country has been beset with no end of contradictions and with fears which have countenanced all manner of conclusions.

One cannot view the siege through which we have come without concluding that there is large ground upon which to build a belief that the greatest "come on" game of all time has been played upon Americans, with trickery leading us to goals undefined. We find the little ball under one shell and then the other, but never know where it might be at the moment. Our people have been taken for a ride in a game of guessing, until the Nation stands utterly bewildered in its inability to tie to anything.

The interventionists, aided by the administration in force, have been for weeks striving to sell the American people the theory that without America's full out war aid, England, the British Empire, and the British Navy were doomed to destruction. Then along comes Ambassador Winant fresh from London, as reported in the New York Herald Tribune of June 8, with the word that the British can win without America in the war. This declaration allegedly was made in the presence of five leading Senate Democrats, and has not been denied. The fact that the interview was not generally reported by the press is probably good evidence that it was not considered proper for the American people to know what were the observations of men close to the scene of pressure in London.

Then on the next day came the announcement by former Ambassador to Belgium John Cudahy, asserting upon his return from Europe that if the present World War is not pushed to a military decision by October that the world is in for another 30-year war.

Then, too, and while the Nation was entertaining the fear that had been planted, to the effect that a new dominance in Europe was going to mean the end of American foreign trade—then comes Bernard Baruch, an outstanding business authority, with the most emphatic declaration that come what will abroad so far as totalitarian strength is concerned, the United States can undersell the totalitarians in the world markets, and that Germany is the one that would be on the spot economically if she won the war.

All of this from such immediately prominent sources of necessity drives a people to wonder what in the world has all of this recent siege by the Cabinet, by Willkie, by the columnists, really meant—these programs of throwing fear broadcast over the land and driving the Nation ever nearer to war. Are we simply trying to start a fight, or are we wanting to emulate the drunk who found his pal in the gutter, and failing every effort to lift him up, declared: "I can't get you out of there but I can get in with you."

It becomes more obvious daily to Americans that things are probably not as they have been made to seem to be by those who have been leading America down the path to involvement in Europe's war. The causes and purposes which these leaders enunciate more and more lend themselves to the charge of fraud. We have been told about the freedoms which the United States was bound to defend, to carry to all the world. The lead-up, or come-on, to the lend-lease bill last January was the President's address to Congress in which he proclaimed it American duty to carry to all the world, in our time and generation, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. Minister Eden of Great Britain was quick to pick up this call to duty as being the cause for which Britain was fighting. It is fair to assume that Mr. Eden was entertaining as many mental reservations concerning these freedoms as the President was entertaining when he declared for them.

But more recently comes a fifth freedom about which much has been said since the chat by President Roosevelt some 2 weeks ago, which has been referred to in some

circles as the fire-alarm chat. Freedom of the seas returns to us once again as the challenge of the hour. Just how many wars have been fought to win freedom of the seas without winning it does not now matter. The truth is that in our time and generation a war was fought for that lofty cause by a people who somehow failed to forget that freedom of the seas was not an accomplished fact, even though we had won the war. But here it is again. Freedom of the seas, thrust at Americans as a challenge which Americans must meet.

Again comes Minister Eden, echoing "freedom of the seas" as a cause for which Great Britain was fighting, and we would fight, if only we would aid Great Britain in her present struggle. I am not at all surprised that Premier Churchill did not himself choose to echo the President's call to arms in the name of "freedom of the seas," for, for him to do that would have been to make of himself the laughingstock of the world, in light of his own attitude on the subject of "freedom of the seas" when it was presented as an issue for decision following the World War.

Any call to arms beside Great Britain in the name of "freedom of the seas" is fraudulent. The World War was brought to an end with President Wilson's 14 points as the basis for consideration. Even before the armistice was signed these points were being weighed. Foremost among the points was President Wilson's demand for a war settlement that would insure freedom of the seas. The Allies played with President Wilson on this point and finally denied it a chance for life. David Lloyd George, in his Memoirs of the Peace Conference most emphatically demonstrated that the last thing in the world that Britain would tolerate would be freedom of the seas. Writing in 1929 in his book entitled "The Aftermath," Winston Churchill declared that Lloyd George was absolutely right when, during the peace discussions, he turned his back upon freedom of the seas as presented by Woodrow Wilson. So clearly was it demonstrated then that neither England nor France would tolerate freedom of the seas that it seems to me to be rank fraud today for any spokesman for Britain, such as Eden, to be successfully selling us the idea that Britain might today be for freedom of the seas.

What Britain wants is what she has had for centuries, not freedom of the seas, but dominance and sovereignty of the seas, that condition which has kept Europe in constant turmoil, that condition which has been costly to the tradesmen of America in their undertakings to enjoy world trade.

When Mr. Eden, or any other British spokesman undertakes to put his country in the light of favoring freedom of the seas, Americans will do well to conclude that there is a big colored youngster somewhere in the wood pile and that America will do well to approach with greatest caution that precipice to which these representations would lead us. It should not be possible for Britain to fool the American people on this score and I cannot believe that Britain can fool President Roosevelt on it either.

When we were through with our last experience with Europe, we came to discover how utterly fraudulent were the representations of causes for which we thought then we were fighting. That fact undoubtedly contributes largely in this hour to what the interventionists call the apathy of the American people toward the war in Europe. It is not apathy in any sense, it is simply plain good judgment that the American people are exercising when they let experience, rather than propaganda, be their teacher. The American people will be the first to fight for principles which are declared to be involved in this present conflict, when the people can know that those principles really are the causes involved in the war. There has as yet been no representation that clearly demonstrates that the causes allegedly involved are the real causes, or are causes that can be won. That is why the American people are standing so steadfastly by their resolve against any step that will involve us actively in Europe's present war.

Magnificent has been the way in which the American people have stood up against the blitzkrieg of expression that was obviously intended to lead America all the way into the war. The manner in which they have made themselves heard by official Washington has been an eloquent compliment to the intelligence of the American people. The manner in which the administration here in Washington has checked what appeared to be the march to war is a tribute to the success of our democracy when its people will but make themselves heard.

But we must not now assume that the challenge is ended, for we must know from what we see day after day, that the cause of the interventionist is being constantly organized and pushed, seemingly with a view that ultimately the hour will come when our Government can be moved directly into the war. Some of the newspaper columnists are clearly revealing what is in the mind of the interventionists. One of these columns, unusually sympathetic to the cause of intervention, and especially close to the White House, has this week been daily pressuring the President into immediate action. This column in reporting the President's answer to those advisors who are urging him to act at once, reports that the President "always recurs to the case of his former chief, Woodrow Wilson."

"President Wilson, he points out, was far better placed when he led the Nation into the first World War. A succession of incidents, in which American lives were taken and American property was lost, had inflamed public opinion over many months. The debate on the armed merchantmen bill had revealed an almost united Congress. There were only 12 in the little band of willful men whose Senate filibuster forced Wilson to arm the merchantmen on his own authority. In the end, when Wilson went to Congress and requested a declaration of war, he could be certain that every dissident voice would be drowned out by the roar of enthusiasm from a truly United States."

"Against the case of Wilson, the President then lays his own. While admitting he can count on majority support, and by crystallizing public feeling may make the majority extremely substantial, he remarks that the unshakable minority is both well organized and hysterically violent. This minority, he adds, is enough larger in Congress than the opposition to Wilson to carry on an interminable and highly dangerous filibuster against proposals for action of any sort. Resort to Congress is useless. Therefore, he says, he cannot act without the pretext of an incident, preferably a German attack on an American ship in the Atlantic, which will pull the country together and simultaneously permit him to order the Navy to fight back.

"The President's reasoning is undoubtedly correct."

Now, I submit that if these columnists are truthful in their representation to the effect that a strategy is being resorted to that is dependent upon the sinking of an American ship, and the loss of American lives, I say now that any strategy which would provoke the loss of American lives in order to take an unwilling people to war is so base, so cowardly, and so immoral that it ought have no place in American thought.

I cannot and do not believe the representation of these writers respecting the attitude of the President, but there ought to be at once a quick repudiation by the President and his administration of any contention that such strategy is an administration proposition or thought.

I submit that this is the hour when Americans can ill afford to be resting on their oars and assuming that the danger of our being moved into this war has lessened to a point that warrants a ceasing of the forceful manner in which the American people have been making themselves heard in their opposition to involvement in Europe's war. Eternal vigilance is the price of our liberties. And our liberties are going to be worth little or naught if we can again be prevailed upon to waste our lives and our resources for others who would never consider doing for us what they seem to expect us to do for them. We need in this hour to be applying to our own country the thought which British statesmen apply to their country. This thought was best expressed by Lord Palmerston when he said: "England has no eternal enmities, and no eternal friendships. She has only eternal interests."

America's place in this hour, when so many fraudulent causes are being dangled before our eyes, is to religiously stay out of that war, preserve our resources, maintain as large a degree of solvency as is possible, to the end that when the hour of exhaustion comes to Europe, we can be the anchor and the helping hand that the world is going to so desperately need if it is to be saved from worse than war.

Citizenship as a Living Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on June 8, 1941, at Racine, Wis., on the subject of Citizenship as a Living Legacy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and fellow-Americans, we meet today to observe Citizenship Day. We are not meeting on the day officially designated by the Chief Executive for this purpose, but we realize that in a larger sense our observance of the privileges and the obligations of citizenship must be a daily reconsecration, and it is fitting and right that on this Sabbath we should covenant our citizenship here in Racine, particularly, where the children and the grandchildren of those who fled from the tyrannies and oppressions of central and eastern Europe have learned to prize their American citizenship so highly.

Racine has been a mixture of many bloodstreams. The Americans of this city since the turn of the century can trace their forbears to at least 14 racial or national groups largely from the peoples of northern and central Europe.

RACINE A MONUMENT TO CITIZENSHIP

It is almost presumptuous for me to speak of citizenship here in Racine where your city

itself is a living monument to citizenship in this land.

Your city, with its smokestacks and water towers and church steeples, silhouetted against the sky, is also a living memorial to your forbears who came here and envisioned in this land of opportunity under the priceless privileges of American citizenship, the possibility for building a great city.

Long before the city's great influx of immigrants, there were men who jerked out the oak stumps from the middle of Main Street. They were the men who incorporated Racine in 1841. They were the men who constructed your harbor in 1844 and chartered your city in 1848. They were the men who raised your wheat and built your wheat warehouses.

They were the men who created your factories, and they were the men who greeted the new citizens who flooded Racine in the 1850's. They were the men who extended the hand of opportunity to the immigrants as they filtered into Racine.

They were the men who founded your newspapers, your charities, your churches. They were the men who created great industries, great mills, great factories, and, what is infinitely more important, a race of great men and great women, strong in body, mind, and soul.

RACINE'S IMMIGRANTS BECAME GOOD AMERICANS AND MADE CONTRIBUTIONS

I think it is vital in these days, when we need tolerance so badly, that we remember that Racine gave America great men from its hardy stock of foreign-born Americans—men who gave their every allegiance to the land of their adoption—America, the land of opportunity.

In the yellowed pages of the old record books of the Racine County courthouse, you will find the name of one of these immigrants who made an outstanding contribution to American life. His name is Col. Hans Christian Heg, and here in Racine I need not retell the story of his life, because in the words inscribed on his tombstone in the Norway Hill Cemetery, "He who dies for country, dies not, but liveth evermore."

These men and scores of others whose forebears came from other lands made a great contribution to American life and they compensate us for those aliens who abuse our hospitality and spread subversive foreign "isms."

It is not alone the great men who have made a contribution, however. The average immigrant woman, who came to Racine with her peasant shawl clutched about her bent shoulders, who reared her sons strong, and straight, and tall, and with a fervent allegiance to America—that peasant woman and her humble peasant husband—they, too, made a great contribution to America.

NO PLACE IN AMERICAN LIFE FOR HATREDS, INJUSTICE, AND INTOLERANCE

Today we hear a great deal about race hatred. Actually that is not the correct use of the word "race." In reality the term would be nationality hatred. Totalitarian leaders have capitalized on race hatred, because through it they can create blind, unthinking quarrels.

There must never be race hatred in the United States. Lincoln said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." We cannot adopt any of the European patterns for living. We cannot subscribe to race hatred.

We do not believe in pogroms. We do not believe in blood purges. We do not believe in torturing the people of any race. We are all Americans. We are all of one race. As Walt Whitman said: "Come, I will make the continent indissoluble. I will make the most splendid race the sun ever shown upon." And I believe we are doing that, you and I. We are building a new great race called American, without hatred, intolerance, and injustice.

I mention the varied racial origins of many of the Americans in Racine today because on Citizenship Day our citizenship observances are directed particularly at the newly naturalized alien and at the new citizen who has just reached the age of 21.

Our new citizens number about two and one-half million. There are two groups of new citizens. The largest group consists of native-born Americans who have reached the age of 21, and as such are entitled to the privilege of the franchise. Some of these new citizens may have been descendants of the 24,000,000 immigrants who came to the United States in the past 50 years and some of them may have descended from *Mayflower* stock.

NATURALIZED CITIZENS HAVE TO PROVE RIGHT TO CITIZENSHIP

The second group of new citizens is the group of those men and women who have won their citizenship through the naturalization process. That group usually numbers about 300,000. These are the men and women who did not achieve citizenship as the rightful heritage of free-born Americans. They had to prove their fitness to assume the obligations and the rights of citizenship. The largest portion of these groups have attended some type of naturalization school in order that they might secure information which would enable them to become good citizens.

In recent years applicants from almost every country in the world have flooded our naturalization offices with applications. During the 6 months' period from July 1 to December 1, 1940, there was a monthly average of 37,922 applications for first papers, and during that same time we had a monthly average of 46,154 applications for second papers.

At the present time there are fewer aliens in this country than there were three decades ago. At the present time we have a smaller percentage of aliens that we have ever had in the history of the United States, and there is every reason to believe that this alien population will decrease as time goes on.

CITIZENSHIP CEREMONIES A MILESTONE FOR FOREIGN-BORN CITIZEN

For those of you who are becoming citizens through the process of naturalization, these ceremonies represent a definite milestone in your lives. After an alien has satisfied a court that he will make a good and faithful citizen he is required to take an oath of allegiance to the United States.

I feel very keenly that the newly naturalized citizen must recognize in every fiber of his being the privilege of American citizenship because, in his mind's eye, he can still see the oppression and the tyranny of the Old World; and in his ears still ring the anguished cries of those who have cringed under the whiplash of pillage of tyranny in other lands.

For the newly naturalized citizen, then, our primary task must be the educational task of explaining fully the obligations and the rights of American citizenship.

FOR NATIVE-BORN CITIZEN WE HAVE TO DISPEL IDEA OF TAKING CITIZENSHIP FOR GRANTED

For the native-born American who has turned 21 and assumes the mantle of American citizenship, we have a somewhat similar task, but here we have also the task of dispelling the mental inertia whereby too many of our young people have taken American citizenship for granted.

For too long have we accepted our citizenship unthinkingly. That is why Congress passed a resolution requesting the President to issue annually an I Am An American Day proclamation.

Wisconsin pioneered in the field of citizenship training, and partly as a result of Wisconsin efforts Congress passed legislation, approved on May 3, 1940, which resulted in the issuance of a proclamation by the President of I Am An American Day.

This movement began originally with the community-wide celebrations, resulting from county-wide educational programs to teach new voters the organization, function, and operation of their local government in relation to the State and National Governments. The citizenship classes also sought to teach new citizens the rights, privileges, and duties of American citizenship. The entire program has been a sincere educational effort to prepare the new citizen for active, intelligent participation in government.

CITIZENSHIP OBSERVANCES EQUIP YOUNG CITIZENS WITH UNDERSTANDING TO MEET PROBLEMS UP AHEAD

Through the citizenship-day observances and their accompanying educational programs it is possible to equip our young citizens with a background of understanding, so that they can intelligently make up their own minds when they face the Gethsemane that is ahead for this generation—a Gethsemane where they will select the method they believe most effective in preserving the rightful heritage of every free-born American.

I was a member of the two-man Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to consider this legislation to authorize the President to proclaim a national citizenship day each year on the third Sunday in May. Our subcommittee gladly voted the bill favorably to the full Judiciary Committee, and the measure was favorably reported by the full committee.

The patriotic principles and the impressive ceremonies marking "Citizenship Day" represent a vital contribution to our national life. Through the educational program and through the ceremonies, where the new citizens officially embrace their American franchise and pledge allegiance to our Nation, we emphasize a covenant to use sacredly the rights of the franchise for the perpetuation of the ideals and the traditions of our Republic.

The days up ahead will be days requiring intelligent, active participation in the affairs of government by informed, enlightened citizens, who feel keenly their responsibilities and their interests in our Government.

Of course, the idea commemorating citizenship is not new in this generation. We know that more than 2,000 years ago, in Athens, there were examinations and ceremonies for the young men who reached the age of 18, at which time they received a kind of probationary cititzenship for 2 years. During this period they became ephebe. They took the ephebic oath, and that oath contained a number of pledges. One of these pledges read: "I will hand on my country greater and better than I found it." That pledge is, in a sense, still implied in our citizenship observances and it is a magnificent challenge to youth.

There were other countries where similar ceremonies were held, and it may be said that from earliest times most peoples have created a tradition for the person who becomes of age and who assumes the obligations of participating in community life.

WHAT IS CITIZENSHIP?

Today we know that in a world of chaos, an observance such as this is particularly important. It raises the important question: What is citizenship?

It is a privilege, an obligation, and a right.

We may have our differences as citizens about the great issues of the day—that is a healthy sign; but on the great question of loyalty to America there is no room for difference. In these perilous times there is no place in America for traitors or "fifth columnists."

If war should come—and I pray God that will never be—then there must be no division of loyalty. We stem from many bloodstreams. But our forbears and those who came here to join with us—we are all now a new and different breed, called the American.

This American breed of freemen cast off the shackles of Europe—its race hatreds, its limitations, its outmoded political theories, its Machiavellian diplomacy; and in their place we have freedom, equality of opportunity, and our own way of life.

HOW CAN WE PRACTICE OUR CITIZENSHIP?

How shall we practice this loyalty to our be'oved land—America?

1. We should study and learn to know and love its Constitution, its Bill of Rights. I wish I had time to enlarge on this idea—it is all important.

2. We should practice industry, loyalty, and love of our fellow Americans. We must dwell together as brethren. Are we not Americans?

3. We should appreciate our significant job of citizenship. Included therein is the privilege and obligation to protect our great freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of worship, trial by jury, the right to sell our own labor and collect our own wages, the right to own property, etc. They obtain no other place on the globe. They are ours to enjoy, to preserve, and to hand down unimpaired to future generations.

4. We should learn to be tolerant of those who differ with us in politics, in religion, in all fields of human knowledge. It is well to get acquainted with your fellow citizen who thinks differently. When you do that you will find in most cases he is a fine fellow. No mortal has a monopoly on truth.

5. We should develop in ourselves a sense of orderly living, realizing that as a people we have not solved all our problems. We have social, economic, and political problems to solve. In America we believe in the law of growth. It is for us to meet the tasks of the present head-on, and by our conduct set an example for those who come after.

6. We should have faith—faith in this great people we are a part of; faith in America's future. We should cast out the defeatist. Let no one divide us. We have but one allegiance, and that is to this America of ours.

7. We should have vision—not clouded by distrust or fear, but lifted high so we can see that this is the promised land of freemen. It was and is the cradle of freedom. What a glorious task you and I have as sons and daughters of this great land—some by birth, some by adoption—to watch over and preserve her.

8. In these perilous times we must make sure that all smugness and complacency are cast out and that we are alert and ready to meet whatever would tend to undermine America. Let us get into the habit of praising her, loving her, sensing her true meaning. The opportunity is here for growth, for development, for national prosperity, for building the greatest race of men ever known to earth. The saboteur and the defeatist must be cast out. Each of us must become a builder. Like Nehemiah of old, we must be so busy with our job of building the walls of America that we will not be diverted by propaganda or any other means from our task.

9. There are many other ways of practicing loyalty to America. Become acquainted with her history, of the march of a people across a continent; become acquainted with her literature, her poetry; become acquainted with her geography, her lakes, her streams, her mountains, her prairies, her art, her music, her inventions, her tremendous development of material wealth; become acquainted with her schools and colleges, her museums and churches, her homes and her people.

But all these things are but the material symbol of her spiritual reality. Greater than the soil itself that we live on, greater than the wealth that we as a people have produced, greater than all her institutions, is this thing we are all a part of. In that great song, America the Beautiful, there is an indication of what I am driving at.

In other lands there is a blitzkrieg on freedom and a black-out of democracy. To prevent that in the United States it is vital that we continue to instill traditional American ideals in our new voters as a reaffirmation of our faith in America and her ways.

CITIZENSHIP MUST BE A LIVING LEGACY

Citizenship must be a living thing. Democracy must be dynamic. The ideals of our republic must live and grow.

Our way of life cannot stand still. There is no retreat. We must go on building.

These impressive ceremonies today dramatize citizenship. To all of you who have just attained your majority, I can say that twenty-one years ago the United States was entering upon a decade which was to see unparalleled prosperity.

That decade of prosperity brought us to a period of material plenty. It brought us a material feast, but a spiritual famine.

It brought us fruitful prosperity, but in another sense it was a barren and sterile era.

It was a "blue chip" age. It was the age of "big bull market." We put our trust in material things. The intellectuals of the country—and some of them are the very writers who today talk loudest about patriotism—laughed at Fourth of July speakers. They called patriotic speeches "flag waving" and "tub-thumping."

We were living in the aftermath of the post-war neurosis. It was an age of jazz and flappers. We had plenty of material resources, but limited spiritual resources. When the crash came, when the material resources were gone, we had little on which to fall back.

I am gratified that today we are leaving that adolescent stage when the intellectuals were ashamed of patriotism. I am happy and proud that today we are again "coming of age" in the sense that we revere patriotism as it should be revered.

WE MUST GO BACK TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

Today we must go back to first principles. Today, in our citizenship program, we must do everything we can to restore the health of our social organism through faith in God and faith in the great destiny of this Nation.

We have a hard road to travel up ahead. It will not be a road of ease and luxury. The task confronting the citizens of America today will not be an easy one. And yet, I find some consolation in that very fact, because I feel that, with few exceptions, America has always emerged from periods of crisis stronger and finer than ever before.

I feel that tomorrow's citizens may be stronger and better, because we have to meet the challenges of these times. Because there will be challenges, we will strengthen our moral fiber so that we can meet them. We will make sacrifices to safeguard our freedoms, and our form of government will be dynamic and growing. Great challenges and critical times produce great men.

Holland said:

"God, give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands."

These are days when the field of citizenship is expanding. As the interest of our citizens in Government expands, there will be fewer pressure groups to lead us up blind alleys, and there will be fewer political profiteers.

WE CAN SPIN OUR OWN WEB OF DESTINY

It is true that to a degree we are ensnared and involved by circumstances in the web of our destiny, but even more is it true that we can spin our own web of destiny.

There are more than 130,000,000 people in America, and yet there are only 80,000,000 possible votes. Only 49,000,000 people voted in the last Presidential election. This is a challenge. We need not believe that the only challenges which confront our way of life are those challenges which can be met by men in uniform.

There are other challenges which meet us in our daily lives as citizens of the United States. When we become citizens it is our obligation to use the sacred right of the franchise. It is our obligation to become informed on the affairs of government, so that we may intelligently become part of an enlightened public opinion. It is our obligation to participate in the affairs of government. It is our obligation to make those sacrifices which are necessary in maintaining our financial stability, in increasing our production; and, above all, it is our obligation to use wisely the sovereignty which rests in the people.

In other lands sovereignty is vested in small venal groups and in self-seeking leaders. In other lands men exist for the government. In this land government exists for the people, and the group exists for the individual. In this land sovereignty rests with the people and is exercised by their representatives.

A NATION IS ONLY AS STRONG AS ITS INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS

A nation can only be as strong as its individual citizens, and a citizen can only be as strong as his convictions, his faith, and his strength permit him to be.

As Longfellow said:

"Not in the clamor of the crowded street,
Not in the shouts and plaudits to the strong,
But in ourselves, are triumph and defeat."

History will record these days as the story of the quick and the dead among nations. It is my faith and my fervent belief that America will meet the challenges of this chaotic era and will continue to build a dynamic democracy in a Republic.

In that job of building, groups such as these will play a leading role, and citizenship rather than being a gift from the dead hands of those who came before will be a living legacy.

Do you want to make your life rich and full and complete—life abundant? Then respond to the urge of this hour and day—feel within your soul the meaning of "I am an American." Life then will have a greater meaning. You will be called out of the rut of the commonplace to become a protector, a trustee of things American—the American way. You will feel a new exaltation, a great uplift, such as great souls have always felt who have preserved great values, great freedoms for the race.

Yes; the hour is here for men and women with poise, with tolerance, with valor, and understanding to give of themselves to America. Lift the fallen—those who fail to know and love America—and cleanse our ranks by getting rid of the saboteurs and "fifth columnists" who abuse America's hospitality, and bring to every new generation the meaning, value, privilege, and obligation of being an American.

In that hope, my friends, and in that belief that you, each of you, will meet the challenge of this hour, I conclude.

America Unites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening last, June 10, my colleague, Mr. BREWSTER, delivered a brilliant ad-

dress over the Columbia Broadcasting System. The subject of the address was America Unites. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak to you tonight not merely as a Member of the Senate, but also as one of 3,000,000 parents with a boy in training in the armed forces of the United States.

I might better say the unarmed forces of the United States since their artillery is of pre-World War vintage and antiaircraft guns are almost nonexistent in these days when aircraft more and more dominate the scene.

A Republican from the State of Maine is not to be suspected of Presidential idolatry.

I do not agree with the President in his handling of the Lindbergh affair. It seemed to me not in accordance with the American tradition and politically inept.

I should like to see Colonel Lindbergh—decorations and all—sent to Berlin as military attaché for aviation, and let Mr. Hitler think that over. No one could be better qualified to divine whether Germany is really building 400 planes a day, as one returning American diplomat reports.

But in foreign policy the founding fathers recognized the necessity of a unified command. The Supreme Court throughout the last century has repeatedly declared the primary responsibility of the President under the Constitution in the conduct of our foreign relations within certain well-established limits. Only the Congress may declare war and all treaties with foreign nations must be ratified by the Senate by a two-thirds vote. Within those limits, however, the President must be allowed broad latitude.

No confusion of counsel must paralyze our defense. One of the greatest military strategists of all times warned that one bad general is far better than two good generals.

Down in Maine we have been brought up on the sea, and when the ship gets out of sight of land we recognize the captain is the boss.

With breakers ahead and a storm raging it is not practicable to hold a town meeting every time we port the helm or reef a sail.

All will agree on these general maxims. Each must apply them for himself. For me they mean not to jiggle the captain's arm too often in rough weather. They mean to be careful about back-seat driving when the road is slippery.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER declared again yesterday on the floor of the Senate that he was satisfied that the President was resisting the attempts of certain of his advisers to rush the country into war. Certainly this should reassure any who may doubt the determination of the President to think of America first and last in this terrific crisis in the world.

There is abounding evidence that the President is trying very earnestly under terrific strain to carry out the carefully considered policy of the country and the Congress to help Britain by all means possible short of war.

The President has been successful up to the present time. Britain is still fighting and America is not at war in spite of all the direful predictions that April again would witness our involvement.

Every American may be grateful that the English Channel is still the frontier for European dictatorships.

As President Roosevelt has well said we cannot now wait until we see the whites of their eyes—or the glint of our nonexistent searchlights on their planes. Then it will be too late.

Somewhere out in the Atlantic and the Pacific lies the American frontier drawn in accordance with the development of modern weapons of offense and defense. The President is constitutionally obligated as Commander in Chief to defend that frontier in terms of 1941. That is all that he has said.

America is safe from involvement in this conflict for the present because it does not suit Hitler's purpose to have us in. Hitler has other fish to fry. He would very much like to know how far President Roosevelt intends to go. The uncertainty has a most unsettling effect upon his domestic situation. That is why the President cannot take us fully into his confidence.

Hitler is fully occupied in Europe for some months at least to come. He has the capacity to ignore distractions. America is not on the slate for this year.

But it is interesting to note that Hitler makes no claim for good intentions so far as America is concerned—unlike some of his apologists in this country.

In his recent amazing interview with a former American diplomat Hitler answers the suggestion that he may attack America by declaring such an attack is impossible—not by the same sleeping powder of his benevolent intentions by which he lulled to fitful slumber most of his earlier conquests.

Hitler confirms by implication the charge of Colonel Lindbergh that Germany is now dominated by the philosophy that might makes right. Surely so rich a prize as the Americas would not count themselves secure in a world two-thirds of which was dominated by so ruthless a dictator—unless we are to accept his assurance that it is impossible for him to assail us.

Yet in his latest speech to the Reichstag recounting the scalp of the tenth innocent country fastened to his belt, Hitler proudly boasted that these victories showed (I quote).

"Nothing is impossible for the German soldier."

Americans may decide for themselves which Hitler they are to believe—the Hitler of the Reichstag or the Hitler of the Cudahy interview.

Now about this dictator business here at home.

Let us remember that George Washington was repeatedly denounced as a dictator.

Let us remember that Lincoln carried on for 3 months what proved to be one of the bloodiest wars in history without even calling the Congress in session.

Let us remember that Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation revolutionizing our economy and our whole concept of vested rights built on the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court without even consulting the Congress.

Let us remember that the Congress is now in constant session—ready to give the President whatever further appropriation or authority is necessary to make America prepared.

Let us make sure that to debate shall not mean to stagnate.

America does not want to be in the position of France with its mind never made up as a result of internal dissension and with its industries paralyzed by continuing disputes between capital and labor. The time for action has come.

America is still young and dynamic. America believes in doing things, and it is pretty nearly time to play ball.

I did not vote for the captain but, along with one hundred million other Americans, I am still a member of the all-American team.

All Americans are agreed that it is time for America to be prepared. Let us begin by realizing that we are woefully unprepared to defend the Americas.

Let us expend our boundless energies and resources in preparing the assembly lines to turn out planes and tanks and ships and guns and all the other paraphernalia of modern defense in quantities that shall leave no doubt in the mind of any dictator as to American preparedness.

American boys must not again be sacrificed on the altar of American unpreparedness.

Along with 3,000,000 other parents I want to see my son not only properly trained but adequately equipped with all the intricate mechanism essential for defense in the present day.

I do not want him indefinitely training on a field piece invented in 1897 and brought here from France in 1922. Styles in guns are changing according to the press.

William Knudsen is right in saying that America has a productive capacity twice as great as any other nation. He knows whereof he speaks. But he is also sadly right when he says we have not yet begun to strike our stride in preparedness.

Even in America we cannot match the industrial giants of Europe with one hand tied behind our back—and that is our position at the present time.

Every time we make a defense item for our country we make four other items for our own personal use.

In Germany and England today their entire production is on a 50-50 basis. Their country gets one-half their productive effort.

This year in America we planned to give one-fifth of our production to defense, but we are 25 percent behind that very modest program. We have not yet begun to tighten our belts.

Let every patriotic American ask this question each night: Have I helped or hindered my country today? Have I consumed more than I have produced? Am I an asset or a liability to my country?

The American frontier today is on the production line. There the future of America will be determined. Each of us has a part to play.

Let every American consider how he individually may help—by producing more and consuming less—by working harder and wasting less—by praying more and talking less—by making America strong and imploring Divine guidance for our President in as terrible a task as has faced any of our Presidents in the history of our United States.

Workers of America, arise and put your armor on. United we stand.

Action of Darlan-Laval Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY HULL

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement issued by the Secretary of State under date of June 13, 1941, and which has appeared in the press of the country generally, with reference to the Darlan-Laval group in the Vichy Government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In response to further inquiries since his statement of June 5, 1941, the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, today said:

"From the standpoint of the French people, and others who have a love for freedom, and

have freedom, the attitude of the present government of Vichy is a matter of the deepest disappointment and sorrow.

"The original scheme of the Darlan-Laval group to deliver France politically, economically, socially, and militarily to Hitler seems now to have been brought out into the open by a succession of public statements by French authorities and especially those by Messrs. Laval and Darlan.

"When Germany recently desired to make use of Syria to attack British forces in Iraq no objection, much less resistance, to this action was made by France, although the terms of the armistice between France and Germany did not require that France permit territory under French control outside occupied France to be used as a base for German military operations, and Marshal Petain declared as recently as a few weeks ago that he would not permit such use. The use of Syria is a vitally important part of the general plan of Hitler's to invade Iraq, Egypt, the Canal area, and Africa. When the French authorities in Syria, acting under the Vichy government, made no effort to prevent German use of Syria as a military base, and when they permitted even the shipment from Syria of military supplies of French manufacture to be used by the Germans against France's former ally, they permitted Germany to extend the theater of war into French mandated territory. To resist this further expansion of German aggression the British forces in the Near East entered Syria to prevent German actions there which the French, under the direction of the Vichy government, were permitting if not abetting. Yet the French authorities in Syria have considered it necessary to contest bitterly this British effort to prevent Syria from being used as a German base. These facts unmistakably demonstrate that the German military effort is making use of France and that the German initiative in Syria is resulting in a conflict, not only of France against Britain but of Frenchmen against Frenchmen. Germany seems to have prevailed on the Vichy government to do Germany's fighting in the Syria area of the general German advance.

"But, aside from the situation in Syria, and considering the broader aspects of Franco-German collaboration, the public statements of the Darlan-Laval element demonstrate that the people of France are expected not only to surrender permanently and unconditionally their loyalty to all French traditions, institutions, liberties, interests, culture, and the entire way of life which made France great, but actually to transfer all of these loyalties—all hope of the future—to Hitler, in the hope of securing his personal favor. The general adoption of Hitlerism would set the world back 5 to 10 centuries.

"In a statement on June 10, Admiral Darlan, Vice Premier of France, urged the French people to conquer their illusions and consent to sacrifices and indicated that France would be utterly destroyed unless the French people should take this unprecedented and revolutionary action.

"Unless a military invader is devoid of all human attributes he extends to the conquered all of those considerations and recognitions contemplated by the rules and principles of civilized society. An armistice signifies a temporary cessation of hostilities between the parties to it. It does not contemplate that the successful belligerent shall make inhuman demands upon the country and people of the defeated belligerent, nor does it contemplate that they shall be bludgeoned into becoming allies of their enemy. If, therefore, Hitler cannot be depended upon, as implied by Darlan's statement, to observe such rules and laws in dealing with the conquered, how much less can he be depended upon to show the least consideration in these vital respects should the conquered peoples prostrate themselves before him and bestow upon him unrestrained license to deal as he may see fit with their lives, their liberties, and their entire future welfare.

"It remains to be seen whether the French people accept this preposterous status and thus pave the way for them to find themselves assisting Hitler as his cobelligerents in his desperate effort to conquer Great Britain and secure control of the high seas.

"In the prevention of such a possibility, both the French people and the people of the United States have a common interest of tremendous importance to the future."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

STATEMENT BY STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes waterway project, issued by the State Department under date of March 21, 1941. I think this statement should be in the RECORD for future use by the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Press release of the Department of State, March 21, 1941]

An agreement was signed between the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, providing for a cooperative development and utilization of the water in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin for navigation and power. The signatories to the pact, concluded at Ottawa, were the Honorable Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission; the Honorable Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; and the Honorable Jay Pierrepont Moffat, American Minister to Canada, on behalf of the United States; and the Right Honorable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, President of the Privy Council, and Secretary of State for External Affairs; the Honorable Clarence D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply; and Mr. John Read, legal adviser to the Department of External Affairs, on behalf of Canada. The agreement contemplates an early completion of the seaway between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean by the St. Lawrence River, as well as the development of the vast hydroelectric resources of the International Rapids section of that river.

The agreement is subject to approval by the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada.

An exchange of notes preceding the agreement revealed that the construction of this project is regarded as directly associated with both the power supply and shipbuilding phases of our national-defense program, including the plan for defense of the Western Hemisphere and the determination to supply all possible aid to Great Britain, the members of the British Commonwealth, and their allies.

In a personal message to Prime Minister Mackenzie King, the President pointed out that "while our countries must put forth the maximum immediate defense effort, we must also prepare for a protracted emergency which will call upon the industries on both sides of the border to meet constantly expanding demands." He called attention to the fact that, in terms of the time factor, the St. Lawrence project could be completed as soon as vessels of war for which money is now being appropriated

The President concluded that "failure to take advantage of the possibilities of this project would be short-sighted, in no way contributing to an increase in our immediate defense effort, while limiting our defense program in the difficult years which lie ahead."

The essential features of the agreement may be summarized as follows:

PROVISION FOR GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE BASIN COMMISSION

In article I the two Governments agree to establish and maintain a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission, consisting of not more than 10 members, with each Government designating an equal number. The duties of this Commission would be to prepare and recommend general plans and specifications for the construction of works in the International Rapids section, prepare a schedule allocating the construction of these works to the respective Governments, approve all contracts, and supervise the construction work. The Commission would submit periodic reports to the two Governments on the progress of the work.

UNDERTAKING BY CANADA

In article II the Government of Canada agrees to construct the works in the International Rapids section allocated to Canada by the Commission to operate and maintain the works in Canadian territory, and to complete, not later than December 31, 1948, the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway. There is a proviso that the period within which the waterway links are to be completed may be changed by mutual agreement to meet the requirements of continuance of war conditions or of defense.

UNDERTAKING BY THE UNITED STATES

In article III the Government of the United States agrees to construct the works in the International Rapids section allocated to the United States by the Commission, to operate and maintain the works in United States territory, and, not later than the date of completion of the essential Canadian links, to complete the works allocated to it in the International Rapids section and the works in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie required to create essential links in the deep waterway.

To counterbalance expenditures already made by Canada in the Welland Canal link in the deep waterway, the Government of the United States also agrees to provide funds for all works in the International Rapids section except machinery and equipment for the development of power and works required for rehabilitation on the Canadian side of the boundary.

INSTALLATION FOR POWER AND USE OF WATER

In article IV the two Governments agree that each may arrange for the installation in its own territory of machinery and equipment for the development of power at such time or times as may best meet its power requirements, and that, except for the water which Ontario plans to divert from the Albany watershed into the Great Lakes Basin, each country shall be entitled to utilize one-half of the natural flow of water available for power purposes in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

In this article the two Governments also agree that the flow of the water shall be

controlled and regulated so as to protect the navigable depths in the harbor of Montreal and in the navigable channel of the St. Lawrence River below Montreal. They also agree to maintain facilities for 14-foot navigation during the construction period.

MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING RIGHTS

In articles V, VI, and VII the two Governments agree that nothing done under the agreement shall alter the rights of the Governments within their respective territories, that either Government may at any time construct at its own cost alternative canal and channel facilities for navigation within its own territory, and that existing rights of navigation in both the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River shall be maintained.

DIVERSIONS TO AND FROM THE GREAT LAKES BASIN

In article VIII the two Governments agree that either country diverting waters into the Great Lakes system, from other watersheds lying wholly within its borders, shall have the exclusive right to the use of equivalent amounts of water for power below the port of entry, so long as it constitutes a part of boundary waters.

In this article the two Governments also agree that if any diversion of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, other or greater than diversions permitted in either country on January 1, 1940, is authorized, the Government of such country will give immediate consideration to any representations which the other country may make. In case no settlement is reached, on the request of the other Government, such country will submit the matter to an arbitral tribunal which shall be empowered to direct such compensating or remedial measures as it deems just and reasonable.

PRESERVATION AND USE OF NIAGARA FALLS AND RIVER

In article IX the two Governments agree to provide for the preservation and enhancement of the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, and for the most beneficial use of the waters of that river, as envisaged in the final report of the Special International Niagara Board. Such provision would include:

1. Plans to be prepared by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission for works designed to distribute and control the waters of the Niagara River, to prevent erosion, and to insure at all seasons unbroken crest lines on both the American and Canadians Falls. The construction of such works would be arranged by exchange of notes.

2. Permission, on completion of such works, for each country to authorize an additional diversion at the rate of 5,000 cubic feet of water per second for power purposes within its borders.

3. Recommendation by the Commission, after exhaustive tests, for the best and most equitable use of the waters of the Niagara River, with particular reference to preservation of the scenic beauty of the Falls and rapids, the requirements of navigation and power. The agreement provides that, on the basis of the Commission's recommendations, the Governments may by exchange of notes and concurrent legislation determine the methods by which these purposes may be attained.

CLAIMS, DAMAGES, AND LAND ACQUISITION

In article X the Governments agree on provisions for the disposition of claims and for responsibility for damages. Each Government assumes responsibility for the acquisition of lands or interests in lands in its own territory.

EMERGENCY SPEEDS NEGOTIATIONS

Negotiations leading to the present agreement were initiated in 1936. The outbreak of the war in 1939 and the events of 1940 which compelled adoption of a policy of hemispheric defense made it obvious that an agreement was of major importance. Accordingly, the technical features of the project were reviewed by experts from both Canada and the United States. On October 17, 1940, President Roosevelt allocated $1,000,000 of one of the early special defense appropriations to the Federal Power Commission and the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army for preliminary investigations, particularly engineering surveys, of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. At the same time the President established a St. Lawrence Advisory Committee consisting of Messrs. Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission; Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Corps of Engineers, United States Army; and Gerald V. Cruise, executive secretary and acting chief engineer of the New York State Power Authority. The function of this committee has been to advise the President in the necessary preliminary planning and to cooperate with the appropriate agencies of the Canadian Government, particularly the Canadian Temporary Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Committee, a comparable body designated to assist the Canadian Government. These two committees completed a joint report on January 3, 1941, which has been submitted to President Roosevelt and Prime Minister King.

In this joint report the results of engineering investigations are submitted. The principal conclusion contained in the report is that the so-called 238-242 single-stage control project is the plan best adapted for the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. Such a project, according to the joint report, "combines the essential features which have been continuously advocated by the representatives of both countries throughout the long period of study and negotiation devoted to the undertaking," and involves a construction program arranged "so that delivery of power can be begun and navigation provided within 4 years of the time when active work is initiated." Accompanying the joint report there were analyses of the main features of the single-stage project and a revised series of cost estimates which take into account rising construction costs and additional expense likely to be incurred in expediting the work in the interests of national defense.

These engineering data were submitted jointly by Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and the Honorable Guy A. Lindsay, engineer in charge of the General Engineering Branch of the Department of Transport of the Canadian Government. They were assisted by Olivier O. Lefebvre, vice chairman of the Quebec Streams Commission; T. H. Hogg, chairman and chief engineer of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario; M. C. Hendry, assistant engineer, Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario; Roger B. McWhorter, chief engineer, Federal Power Commission; and Gerald V. Cruise, executive secretary and acting chief engineer, New York Power Authority.

COST OF INTERNATIONAL RAPIDS SECTION PROJECT

According to the cost estimates, the total cost of the project in the International Rapids section will be $266,170,000. This will provide for completion of the 2,200,000-horsepower power project as well as for the deep waterway improvement in this section of the river. In addition, there will be expenditures for the improvement of navigation channels, both below and above the International Rapids section, in order that a waterway to accommodate vessels requiring 27 feet draft may be provided throughout the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, from Lake Superior to Montreal.

America's Place in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESSES BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two speeches delivered by me, the first before the Switchmen's Union of North America, at Buffalo, N. Y., on June 9, and the second before the Post Office Employees' at their communion breakfast, on Sunday morning, June 8, 1941.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD, CONVENTION, SWITCHMEN'S UNION OF NORTH AMERICA, BUFFALO, N. Y., MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1941

This is a real pleasure for me. I feel that I am among real friends. It is a privilege to acknowledge the introduction of our international president, Brother Tom Cashen, whose matchless leadership has earned the plaudits of railroad union executives, railroad management, as well as the respect of leaders of Congress and high officials in the executive departments of the Government.

I am only sorry that, in this renewal of old and friendly associations, I cannot bring a rosy report on conditions of national concern.

I want to tell you as briefly as I can what this great Republic of ours is up against, and what your responsibilities and my responsibilities necessarily must be in this grave crisis.

There is no point in beclouding or belittling the issues at stake. It would be less than patriotic if I were to represent the situation as I see it in any way which would be misleading or which would, in its effect, serve to lull into a sense of false security you who are devoting your utmost energies to the national needs of the hour.

We all know what the circumstances are. But let us hastily review them. During the past 8 years we have witnessed the rise of despotism in Europe. While democratic nations were wrestling with economic, labor, and social problems dealing with the security of its citizens, these despots of Europe were concentrating all available material wealth and human strength into the construction of a mighty military machine calculated to challenge and conquer the world.

Communism took root, flourished in its Russian homeland, and then extended its tentacles menacingly into other lands. Communism became a supergovernment, with centralized power exerting complete state ownership and total authority over man and private property. Nazi-ism and fascism, fungus political growths, sprang out of economic chaos and developed into vicious imperialistic regimes.

They put private capital in a strait jacket and regimented human labor. These three totalitarian systems flouted practically every principle of self-government and of inherent individual rights. Surcharged with old

hates and half-forgotten prejudices, electrified by socialistic, demagogic, utopian promises, and guided by scheming, abnormal, sadistic geniuses, millions upon millions of peace-loving people were led straight down the road to a campaign of vilification and aggression, which can find no victory and from which there can be no honorable retreat.

The European war will be 2 years old in September. During its duration we have seen the mechanized might of the despots roll over 15 countries and crush to earth the personal rights and political privileges of millions of innocent men, women, and children.

We have seen the weapons of aggression explode and destroy all hope and semblance of peace and security on the map of Europe. We have seen heroic resistance rendered futile because courageous hearts and empty hands are no match for the diving Stukas or the onrush of armored tank and Panzer divisions.

Today, on land, in the sea, and from the air, the ruthless aggressors continue to wage their campaign of death and destruction, aimed to pierce the heart and break the back of the one last remaining great democracy abroad.

In this country, and throughout this hemisphere, we have witnessed these developments and we have debated, with characteristic democratic thoroughness, the course of action we should take. We have been careful not to drift toward war, but, to the contrary, we have sought to insulate ourselves against the conflagration abroad, and to withdraw our ships, our money, and our men from the war-infested areas. Peace was our objective.

But the war has been constantly and quickly closing in on us. Every success of the current conqueror of Europe has had to be translated as a new danger to our way of life.

To meet these new dangers and to combat this expanding menace which begins to threaten the peace and the security of people everywhere, the Congress of the United States has taken several significant measures. Congress repealed the Arms Embargo Act; it adopted the Selective Service Act; it approved huge and unprecedented military and naval appropriations; it granted the authority contained in the lend-lease bill to give all-out aid to the embattled democracies abroad.

Furthermore, the leadership of our country consummated successful negotiations for the establishment of naval and air bases on British and Danish island possessions, stretching all the way from the northern reaches of Greenland to the semitropics of the Caribbean Sea.

Two weeks ago the President of the United States, in a clear pronouncement of America's needs and objectives, pointed out the dangers which confront us and called for an accelerated defense effort which requires the complete unity and cooperation of all of our people.

With the seriousness of the President's message to the American people has come a realization of the additional contributions which all of us must make and of the sacrifices which will be entailed in order to see this program through.

That great debate has ended. Our country's policy is now crystal clear. We are going to build up the mightiest defense program in the history of the world. We are going to build ships and planes and tanks and guns to make America secure, and to preserve for ourselves and our children and our children's children the blessings of freedom which have been our own happy heritage.

We are going to place in the hands of the resisting democracies abroad the food, the equipment, and the weapons they so sorely need to repel and to keep at bay this new European threat to civilization.

Into this vast and inestimably necessary program of defense production, American labor must throw all of its resourcefulness, initiative, and energy. Labor is charged with a severe and taxing duty. It will meet the demands which are now thrust upon it, and it will carry out its responsibility in this crisis because labor has an all-important stake in a victory over totalitarianism.

American labor knows that under communism, fascism, and nazi-ism labor on the Continent of Europe was stripped of all of its hard-earned gains and was placed in bondage. Labor in bondage—regimented, regulated, and shackled—was forced into the production of the dictators' war machine. This convention just couldn't happen over there. The strong-arm methods of the storm troopers, the crafty cunning of the Gestapo, and whip lashes in the concentration camps were some of the means employed to destroy the rights of labor in Europe and to direct mass productive energies into the construction of lethal weapons.

Could American labor ever find a measure of security in a world dominated by tyrants to whom labor is only a commodity to be used as a tool to build armaments for the invasion, persecution, and conquest of defenseless minorities? Could American labor find any measure of security in a world which would have to bow to the dictates, industrially and commercially, of despots?

No; American labor does not want that kind of a world, and it does not want that kind of a nation.

Labor has learned from observation and experience that communism, fascism, and nazi-ism form unsurmountable barricades across the pathway of labor's progress.

Here, labor wants no "ism" but genuine Americanism. American labor knows that its destiny, prestige, and effectiveness are safe where a democratic government is found. In this country labor has found strength, dignity, and nobility. Here, exemplary labor leadership has been developed; labor standards and working conditions have been improved; class hatreds, serfdom, and slavery have been eliminated as possibilities in this Republic. We shall preserve and improve these standards.

To turn to railroad labor specifically, we all know that our railroad workers were among the first group of wage earners in the United States to establish unionism.

The locomotive engineers organized in 1863, the conductors in 1868, the locomotive firemen and enginemen in 1873, the trainmen in 1883, and our own switchmen's union started at Kansas City, Mo., in 1894.

These were early indications of labor's privileges in the United States. Our union, as well as other labor unions, has not always had a placid history, but over the years we have achieved prestige, popularity, and success. Today practically all groups of railroad workers are covered by collective agreements, negotiated by national labor organizations. These agreements have been made possible as a result of your leadership through legislative victories. They have been effective in their operation because railroad labor has universally fostered arbitration and the peaceful settlement of their disputes. Railroad labor respects the integrity of contracts.

Since the passage in 1926 of the Railway Labor Act, the history of railroad labor mediation has been a happy one. This act stands as the Magna Carta of railroad labor.

Under its provisions, local employee grievances receive the attention of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, composed of 36 members, 18 representing the employees, and 18 representing the carriers. Occasionally, the Board fails in its task and the matter is turned over to the National Mediation Board which is directed by law to appoint a referee and to settle the question at issue.

The National Mediation Board, for the most part, offers a tribunal for the peaceful arbitration of all major disputes. It has been eminently successful in the past. It will be, I am sure, in the future.

This system of conciliation and arbitration has proved its effectiveness in several minor emergencies that have developed. Its machinery is fortunately available now and railroad labor can be assured of the continued enjoyment of the protection it affords.

That grievances and disputes can be peacefully and acceptably arbitrated, is a proven fact so far as railroad labor is concerned. The satisfactory settlement of an important case at this time would prove exemplary to the country. It would be a boon to the Nation in this defense crisis today if similar mediation machinery were available to all elements and factions of labor in the country.

We all know that there have been some tempestuous chapters in the history of organized railroad labor, but, on the whole, the cause of unionism has been cleanly fought, earnestly defended, and fairly won. No finer leadership is to be found anywhere than that which has been developed in our standard railway unions.

Today, regrettably, railroad labor, generally, is faced with a burden of great magnitude.

In this all-embracing program of defense, however, labor can see its goal clearly in sight.

There will be no permanent black-out of labor's well-established gains. We will extend rather than restrict democracy here. There will be further rewards to compensate for the sacrifices which are now demanded. In this struggle between democracy and despotism, we cannot afford to take half-way, half-hearted measures. We must accept our individual and appointed responsibilities in the spirit of true Americanism. But we will make it clear that we are not permanently surrendering our hard-fought economic or social gains.

Organized labor generally has never been found lacking in a national emergency. It has never shirked its responsibility in a great crisis. American labor has made one contribution after another to our national security in the past. Railroad labor likewise will continue to uphold, enrich, and strengthen our American way of life. It will continue to shun the bigot, the demagogue, and the agitator. It will not tolerate the Communist, the bundist, or the Fascist. It will continue to contribute to national unity, increased tolerance and social progress. It will continue to stand by our country's Constitution, to advocate the philosophy of our Declaration of Independence, to pay its complete loyalty to the flag of our Republic.

There will be difficulties ahead, as there have been in the past. But from now on, in keeping with the President's urgent appeal, disputes must be referred for arbitration and there must be no work stoppages in the national-defense program of our Nation.

We will see to it, in keeping with the traditions of America, that work stoppages do not occur by reason of labor injustices; that employers do not utilize the emergency to exact undue penalties from labor or to profiteer at the expense of the American people.

With these requirements uppermost in mind, we now close ranks behind our courageous President, the truest friend labor ever had in the White House—Franklin D. Roosevelt—who is determined to carry out the Nation's policy, which has been adopted in accordance with the will of the majority of our citizens.

The day for outspoken, destructive criticism has now passed. Those who call for a new policy now, or for a new leadership now,

do the vast majority of the American people a disservice in this emergency.

Like true Americans, we will uphold and respect the leadership of our elected and chosen officials; we will carry out to the letter the urgent demands that are made upon us.

I know that you members of the switchmen's union will contribute unselfishly and unstintingly to your Nation's supreme defense efforts. I know that you will not permit doubts to assail you or specious arguments to detract you from the primary policy now guiding the destiny of our great Nation.

With Stephen Decatur, you will say: "My country, in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right. But, right or wrong, my country."

SPEECH BY SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK, DELIVERED AT POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES' COMMUNION BREAKFAST, BUFFALO, N. Y., ON SUNDAY, JUNE 8, 1941

Postmaster Driscoll, Right Reverend Monsignor Britt, honored guests, my fellow countrymen, in the common exercise of the unrestrained right of the traditional privileges of American citizenship there is bound to be some confusion, in times like these, as to the duty and obligation of the people to their Government and to their duly elected leadership.

A review of the progress of totalitarian aggression and a summation of our legislative steps will be helpful in fixing our course as exemplary Americans.

My attitude may not square with yours in every detail. It may be assailed by some, doubted by others. But it finds support in the utterances of great Americans in emergencies of the past.

Now, setting aside every consideration except the considerations we owe to God and country, let us review the years since the peace of the world was interrupted by the madmen of Europe.

Officially, the European war will be 2 years old in September. Unofficially the war was 8 years old this spring, because it was 8 years ago that Adolf Hitler usurped responsible leadership of the German Reich.

Hitler has been charting his mad course of vengeance and of personal ambition through all of these years. Playing on the sensitivities of the defeated nation of the World War, stirring up the emotions of a high-minded, patriotic people, holding forth glib socialistic promises of human security which could not be fulfilled, intimidating the hesitant with the clubs of the storm troopers, coercing the opposition with the cunning and the ruthless methods of the Gestapo, crushing the souls and bodies of the recalcitrant within the foul walls of concentration camps, this modern tyrant of Europe enforced a program of savage abnormality on some 80,000,000 people.

While other nations of the world wrestled with the burden of economic depression and with the problems of human needs, Hitler, with compelling and regimented force, built up a powerful, productive war machine. It was a machine that drafted the labor of a nation into the miserable task of creating invincible weapons of human destruction.

All other needs were surrendered to the one primary demand—that of a military superiority capable of challenging and conquering the world.

The peace-loving German people were goaded into the construction of a Frankenstein monster. That monster was one day to become a mighty military machine that was to roll ruthlessly over the Continent of Europe and to crush to earth the personal liberties and political privileges of millions of its neighbors.

Into this program of death and destruction were fed the material wealth of a nation and the collective energies of all of its people.

Today across the narrowing Atlantic we see the fruits of Hitler's maniacal labors. It is a repulsive and fearsome sight. We see 15 European nations that have been betrayed and beaten; 15 nonbelligerent neighbors, whose only acts of violence were those in their own defense against invasion from without; 15 nations that have been attacked, conquered, occupied, and impoverished.

We see innocent men, women, and children starving in order that the army of the aggressor may be fed and sustained for further acts of violence.

During the 15 swift scenes which have made up the first bloody act of this modern tragedy of Europe, America has become aware that the curtain of this drama of murder and abuse will rise on more acts, the scenes of which will feature still other nations.

We have become aware that the weak and the unprepared and the peace-loving nations of the world are seized upon as easy prey for the Axis dictators. It has been unmistakably demonstrated to us that the cloak of neutrality offers no protection against the lust for power of the current conqueror of Europe. The weak are despised, overrun, and liquidated. Those who attempt a courageous but ill-equipped defense suffer the reprisals of the diving Stukas and the onrushing hordes of numberless tanks which swarm over the victim nation like legions of insatiable and devouring locusts.

America is now well aware of the fatalism of unpreparedness. We are well aware of the bestial and unquenchable thirst for world domination which motivates the leadership of the Axis powers.

To profit by the example of the defenseless victims of aggression in Europe and to forestall the possibility of consequences here comparable to those which afflict and mortally threaten the British Isles, America has determined to steel herself against the unpredictable future.

The intrigues and the bubbling volcano of the Orient, the daily assault on Britain, the clashes in Africa, the bloody struggle in the Near East, and the deadly battle of the Atlantic dictate what necessarily must be our policy. The pride we take in our relatively advanced economic and social position, as well as in our more perfected system of government, adds to our determination to adhere to that policy.

This Nation has been conducting a prolonged debate on what role we should properly play in this crisis. Now that debate has ended. Our own little battle of nerves—our own little war of words—is through.

Our course is clear, our policy determined, our objectives defined. We have not been drifting toward war. War has been closing in on us. It is now perilously close.

With Europe in chains, with the Atlantic a sea of lurking death, and with Africa and Asia in flames, our President, bespeaking the will and the unshakable conviction of the overwhelming majority, has plainly stated our aims.

He has announced the existence of an unlimited national emergency, and he has reflected the will of the Nation only after, and in traditional democratic fashion, the merits, and the needs, and the measures of our course have been exhaustively debated on the public platform, over radio stations, in the press, and in legislative chambers throughout the United States.

The Representatives of the American people have debated almost every conceivable angle and detail of the questions at issue on the floors of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. Discussions, deliberations, and debates have been prolonged and complete. I repeat—the debate now has ended.

We have determined now, under the leadership of our President, our elected Representatives, and our chosen officials, that we will undertake the greatest defense-production program in the history of the world, and that we will extend all-out aid to the embattled democracies which still repel and hold at bay the ruthless invader who, at the first indication of equivocation or weakness, proposes to close in for the kill.

We have determined that we shall not sacrifice our right to the freedom of the seas at the dictation of any despot. We have determined that the sanctity of the Monroe Doctrine is not to be forfeited, and that, if need be, we shall defend that policy with our very lives. We have determined that we shall not cower before the will of the totalitarian tyrants. These determinations constitute the foreign policy of the United States.

To implement them, the Congress of the United States has taken several significant steps, among which should be included the repeal of the arms embargo, the Selective Service Act, the huge military and naval appropriations, and the Lend-Lease Act for aid to the democracies. These steps, without exception, followed the course outlined for legislative action by the framers of our Constitution.

Congress shall in the future take such additional steps as may be necessary to make secure and effectual the policy of action upon which we are now agreed.

We have builded and we are now continuing to build our Nation's defenses with amazing speed. The maximum attainment for which we strive has been stepped up to meet the challenge of graver threats. The military training of our young men has been accelerated and is now under full swing. Our all-out aid to the defending democracies abroad has already shown its effectiveness. Our goods and our weapons of armed defense are now going into the hands of those who fend off the attacking forces.

We will send more and more goods—more and more implements of defense to those people. We will not permit the fruits of our production to end up in the watery depths of the Atlantic or the Pacific. In the words of our Chief Executive, it is our determination that they shall reach certain destinations, and we shall insist that they do quickly and successfully reach those destinations.

We have taken dramatic and protective steps, in collaboration with the friendly democracies, to establish naval and air bases on island possessions in the western Atlantic. Our bases, under present plans, will be quickly established on outlying islands extending from Greenland to the Caribbean Sea. In addition to these bases which are being established on British and Danish possessions, I have advocated an effort on the part of our Government to enter into friendly negotiations with the French Government at Vichy for the establishment of naval and air bases on the French possessions in this hemisphere.

While we are taking and, in some instances, now discussing these important steps of hemispheric defense, the aggressors across the sea turn ambitious and covetous eyes on potential sites for bases in Africa, in Iceland, and on islands in the eastern and central parts of the Atlantic.

These ambitions may seem, in one sense, to parallel our own, but an all-important distinction must be drawn. Our bases are being established in friendly cooperation with all the republics of this hemisphere and for defense purposes and for the duration of the emergency only. In the instance of the Axis Powers, however, they seek bases for the purposes of offense and invasion, and there is no thought of just temporary acquisition. They seek permanent possession and permanent acquisition in any and all directions where there is not adequate resistance.

As these activities progress with a tempo characteristic of the blitzkrieg, our collective task becomes magnified. Our great debate

is ended and now we must close ranks behind the leadership of America.

Each of us must do our individual and appointed task just a little bit more diligently; we must accept the sacrifices which are entailed in a spirit of patriotic devotion to the cause for which we labor.

I firmly believe that the hour for outspoken destructive criticism of the regularly adopted national program has passed. The right to free speech and free press are among our most jealously guarded prerogatives. We will protect and preserve those institutions so long as this democracy endures. However, in a crisis of this magnitude, it would be a calamitous mistake to permit a handful of defeatists and distorted disciples of pseudo-Americanism to undermine, to confuse, and to thwart the efforts of our leadership and the plain, well-defined will of the majority.

The President of the United States has appealed for unification of productive effort. The majority, through its elected representatives in Congress, has spoken in like manner. From here on, it is our obligation to be bold and courageous and, if the word is suitable, single-minded, in this accomplishment of our grave objectives.

The demand is for unity in support of a clearly defined national policy, of all classes, sections, races, religious, and political parties. The responsibility rests equally upon each of our citizens. The lumberjack in the far-off regions of the Northwest, the cowhand on the Texas Panhandle, the tenant farmer on the plantations of the South, the most humble laborer in the industrial North, and the farmer of the Middle West—all share equally in this national responsibility. The housewife, the high-school student, the rich and the poor, the aged and infirm, all have places of responsibility and trust in this unprecedented program of defense and production. Not one individual can be spared. Not one drone can be tolerated. Not one strike on the part of labor that can be settled by arbitration, and not one act of profiteering on the part of private enterprise can be permitted to stop this Nation defend its way of life.

I appeal for an acute awareness of the magnitude of the task upon which we are now employed. The coming months will bring these demands closer to the individual citizen. The requirements for more work and for more sacrifice will become apparent. But we are a strong people, morally fortified by the blessings of freedom, and physically fit by virtue of wholesome conditions of comparative abundance.

We will execute this job in complete unity and accord, not only in fulfillment of the request of the President, but in excess of the program now projected. In the end, this struggle will see the dignity and rights of mankind elevated to a proper place in the conduct of human affairs. Those who have proposed to live by the sword will, in fact, perish by the sword. We are a peaceful people and we despise this business of war. But now that it is clear that our national interests are threatened—now that there is no alternative to the need for arms of defense—now that the die is cast—as exemplary citizens of a great republic, we will see it through in the American way.

On the words of the immortal Daniel Webster, uttered in an earlier emergency, we take our stand. Webster, in a crisis of his day, declared: "I have differed with the President, as all know who know anything of so humble an individual as myself, on many questions of great general interest and importance—but all these differences afforded, in my judgment, not the slightest reason for opposing him in a measure of paramount importance, and at a moment of great public exigency. I seek to take counsel of nothing but patriotism, to feel no impulse but that of duty, and to yield not a lame and hesitating, but a vigorous and cordial support to measures, which, in my conscience, I believe to be essential." We can do no better, in this grave crisis of today, than to emulate the forthright, illustrious and patriotic Webster.

Rather than to heed the advice of those who now daily advocate a new plan of new leadership, we should close ranks behind the President of the United States and recall the inspiring words of the audacious Stephen Decatur who asserted: "My Country, in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right—but, right or wrong, my country!"

Acquisition of French Possessions in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

CORRESPONDENCE OF HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK, AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between the Secretary of State and me with reference to the acquisition of French possessions in the Western Hemisphere.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 21, 1941.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In keeping with the defense-minded activities of our Government and with the urgent problems of the hour with which you are constantly dealing, I contribute a suggestion which unquestionably relates to a subject of utmost gravity now under full consideration by the State Department.

The feasibility, from a national-defense standpoint, of the acquisition by the United States of French possessions in the Western Hemisphere is receiving widespread attention throughout our country. Leaders who are generally critical of our present foreign policy are quick to agree that these possessions should be taken over if such action is indicated as necessary to the adequate defense of the Western Hemisphere.

It is my own viewpoint that our Government might well undertake negotiations with the government at Vichy for the establishment of defense bases on the above-mentioned French possessions which, I understand, would include the islands of St. Pierre, Miquelon, Martinique, Guadeloupe, St. Bartholomew, and Clipperton. To that list I would add French Guiana.

If such negotiations were suggested by our Government, they could, in my judgment, be advanced in a neighborly fashion which would invite the sympathy and support of a large portion of the French population.

In accordance with the traditional policy of our country, it should be clearly understood that the French Nation would not be deprived of ownership of the islands in question but that the United States would seek only the right to establish naval and air bases on the possessions for the duration of the present emergency.

It could be suggested, for example, that the Vichy government grant lease rights to the United States for the above purposes through one of the following methods:

1. By cancelation of a portion of the French war debt to this country.

2. By establishing French credits here for the provision of nonmilitary supplies to French possessions and to unoccupied regions of France.

3. By any other acceptable formula arrived at by the negotiating parties, provided, that it be unmistakably demonstrated that the United States has no imperialistic aspirations and that the defense of the Western Hemisphere is our sole objective.

A proposal to negotiate along such friendly lines as here suggested could scarcely provoke criticism from the real friends of France. If a proposal to negotiate were rejected by the Vichy government such a rejection could hardly be interpreted as anything else than an action taken as a result of extreme pressure from the contemporary continental conqueror.

Should a proposal to negotiate be rejected or should such negotiations fail, the temporary seizure by the United States of the possessions referred to would be less objectionable to the French people and would be more acceptable and better understood by our South and Central American neighbors.

I understand, of course, that should negotiations be undertaken, the terms and implications of the recently approved Pact of Habana would be fully respected and observed. Perhaps, under the terms and the spirit of that pact, a commission representing the Americas could be formed to visit Vichy and to confer with officials of that government.

I would emphasize that our establishment of defense bases as herein suggested would be purely a temporary acquirement. So long as there is a Free French Government in the world the ownership of these possessions would remain undisturbed. Should events in the future cause a change in this status, adjustment of ownership would be made in keeping with the terms of the Habana Pact and in full recognition of the rights and claims of all governments in this hemisphere.

To sum it up, the meat of my suggestion is that our Government, in keeping with the historic friendship between the United States and France, recommend friendly negotiations with the Vichy government for the acquisition of certain desirable military bases on the French possessions located in the Western Hemisphere. Should this effort prove futile and should it be the judgment of our Government that the interests of this hemisphere are in jeopardy, seizure by force should be accomplished without delay.

With expressions of my esteem and regard, I am,

Yours sincerely,

JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 2, 1941.

The Honorable JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MEAD: I have received your letter of May 21, 1941, setting forth the desirability, from a national-defense standpoint, of the acquisition by the United States of French possessions in the Western Hemisphere and suggesting that this Government may undertake negotiations with the Government at Vichy for the establishment of defense bases in the French Islands of the Antilles, St. Pierre-Miquelon, as well as on French territory in French Guiana.

The Department is giving full and careful consideration to all aspects of the problem presented by these French territories in this hemisphere and its possible implications as regards national security and defense. As you are no doubt aware, the policy of this

Government as regards the French West Indies, which includes all territories subject to the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner for French territories in the Western Hemisphere, is governed by an agreement entered into at the Habana Conference in 1940 by all of the American Republics, including the United States, as well as by the arrangement entered into between the High Commissioner and Admiral Greenslade, U. S. N., and later confirmed by both Governments. This arrangement provides certain guarantees regarding the movement of French vessels in American waters and commits the French Government to prior notification regarding any shipments of gold. It also permits the establishment of a daily patrol by vessel and by plane of the Islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe, and a naval observer is at present stationed at Fort de France, Martinique, to check its observance.

This Government is also releasing on a monthly basis a restricted amount from French funds blocked in this country to permit the islands to make purchases in this country of foodstuffs and essential supplies to maintain the economic structure of the islands and French Guiana. It has been agreed that supplies purchased through the use of these funds shall be limited to products urgently required on the islands themselves and shall not be for reexport from the islands to French North Africa or Metropolitan France.

Should evidence develop so that further action by this Government in the interests of national defense be required, you may be assured that any action contemplated will accord with the agreement reached with the other American Republics at the Habana Conference.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Railroads in Defense of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

REPORT BY JOHN J. PELLEY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Mr. J. J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, at Washington, D. C., June 13, 1941, entitled "A Report on Railroads in Defense of the Nation."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am here to report to you on the part which our railroads play in the rearmament of America. That means reviewing briefly what has been done since war broke out in Europe nearly 2 years ago; outlining the situation as it stands today; estimating the job ahead.

That job will be bigger than anyone anticipated. It may come faster than anyone foresees—but it can hardly grow faster or more surprisingly than did the demand for transportation when war began in Europe in September 1939.

Between May and October of 1939 there was a rise of more than 50 percent in railroad traffic—but the railroads handled it, and handled it without congestion or delay.

The American rearmament effort began in the summer of 1940—just a year ago. It was apparent then that the supply of freight cars was sufficient for 1940—as, in fact, it proved to be. But, looking ahead to 1941, the railroads undertook a program of providing 100,000 new cars for service this year. That is being done.

Still looking to the future the railroads have embarked on a plan of adding 120,000 cars to the supply for the traffic of 1942—to keep themselves ready to do their part in a defense effort which has doubled and redoubled and redoubled again

By this fall the railroads will have added 195,000 new and rebuilt cars to their fleet since war started in Europe. Besides this, they have put their cars in repair until today there are fewer bad-order freight cars in the United States than ever before. By what we call in the railroad world a "side window inspection," the observant passenger on the trains can sense that situation for himself.

Here are some of the things which the railroads have done, so far, in the defense effort:

They have delivered an average of 5,000 cars of freight a day to the 150 or more Government defense construction projects, and have done it so well that there has been no loss of time due to any failure of rail transportation.

They have delivered export freight so smoothly and with so little difficulty that few persons know that freight is flowing through the ports in a volume which at times has approached that of the war year of 1918.

They have handled in the first 4 months of this year more than 1,000,000 members of the armed forces of the United States, while maintaining their regular passenger service.

To sum it up, the railroads in 1941 have moved more tons of freight more miles—nearly 25 percent more, in fact—than they moved in the same months of the war year of 1918. They have done it without any of the congestion, delays, and car shortages of that time and have done it with fewer freight cars than they had in 1918.

The number of cars the railroads have is important, but the use made of the cars is more important. There were enough cars in this country in 1917 and 1918 to handle the business. The record of 1941 in handling one-fourth more ton-miles with fewer cars shows that. In 1917–18 the trouble was, too many freight cars were loaded that could not be unloaded promptly at destination. Therefore, the loaded cars became warehouses on wheels instead of being used as vehicles of transportation, which they really are.

Probably, the most outstanding illustration of using railroad cars as warehouses on wheels during 1917–18 is found in the first report of the late William G. McAdoo, who was Director General of the United States Railroad Administration during the last war. As Mr. McAdoo put it, one of the potent causes of congestion of that time was the attempt to control transportation by Government priorities, with no control over priorities, and cited the following fact: Piling was needed at the Hog Island shipyard. Piling was bought and loaded on flatcars. Priority-rush tags were put on the cars, and they were rushed to Hog Island until—before anyone was ready to receive and unload them—there were actually on hand more than 5,000 cars of piling. And there they stood for days, weeks, some even for months—cars out of service, taking up terminal space, interfering with the movement of other things.

The handling of railroad transportation has changed since the World War days. In the first place, we have better railroads than we had then. We have better track, longer sidings, more terminal trackage, better signals, better shops. We have fewer cars and fewer locomotives, it's true, but they are much better. The locomotives are more powerful and efficient. The cars carry more, break down less. The railroad plant, in short, is a different sort of plant. And railroad operation today is a different sort of operation from that of the last war. Trains run faster and carry more; their hourly output of transportation is more than double what it was—due to the improvements carried forward at great cost since the last war.

Equally important—perhaps more important—is the second change since World War days. As a result of the experiences of that time, all of us acquired a keener appreciation of the fact that transportation is an enterprise which requires cooperation both among railroads and between railroads and those who use them. Today the railroad industry is well organized for that sort of cooperation.

Railroads themselves work together through the Association of American Railroads. Shippers work with the railroads through 13 regional shippers' advisory boards, and a national association of these boards. The membership of these boards is composed of shipper representatives of industry throughout the country. Railroads work with port authorities and steamship lines through an organized port-control section. They work with the defense departments of the Government through a military transportation section—none of which were in existence at the time of the last war.

With our vastly improved railroad plant, with our new organization through which we have the full cooperation of the railroads with one another, the cooperation of shippers and of departments of the Government, the railroads are ready to supply the Government and the public with the maximum amount of rail transportation. I will give you one important illustration as to the way railroads function today. There has been much apprehension about the movement of the large winter wheat crop, the harvest of which is just starting. As is generally well known, a large part of the 1940 wheat crop is still in storage in the Wheat Belt and some of it has just begun to move, taking cars east at the time we are moving cars west for handling the new crop. Notwithstanding this unusual situation, we have built up a reserve supply of about 25,000 grain cars in the Southwest for the movement of the new crop, which is ample to enable the railroads to move all of the new winter wheat for which storage space can be provided.

This movement was handled by the car-service division of the Association of American Railroads, which has the authority of all railroads to move or transfer equipment to meet any emergencies which might arise at any point in the country.

The facts I have stated show that the railroads are alert to the job ahead and are working on it. They know that they may be called upon to take over more of our internal transportation, due to the transfer of ships now in the Panama Canal service to foreign services. They are prepared to do that. They may be called on to carry a larger portion of the supply of oil to the eastern seaboard. For many years the railroads have been a diminishing factor in the transportation of oil, as the oil companies have built up their own transportation systems of tank ships, barges, pipe lines, and tank trucks. But to the extent that tank cars are and can be made available, the railroads will do what they may be called upon to do in connection with this situation.

The Office of Price Administration, the Consumers' Counsel of the Bituminous Coal Division of the Government, and the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense have each advised the early purchase and storage of coal in advance of

the increased demand upon railroads which is to be expected this fall. With that advice we are in thorough accord. Its wide adoption will lighten the peak loads to be expected this fall.

But when all is done that can be done there still will be a heavy demand on the railroads to do their essential part in commerce and in defense. We don't know just what that demand may grow to be, but we do know that the railroads have the capacity and the organization to keep pace with its growth.

There has been no break-down of rail transportation since war started in Europe or since the American defense program began. There is nothing of the sort now. And there will not be.

Our report to you on rail transportation in the defense of the Nation therefore is just this:

Rail transportation is adequate to meet present demands. It will be kept adequate. For 2 years the railroads have met the rising demands of commerce and the multiplying needs of defense. That they will continue to do.

Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

RESOLUTION BY OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a press release several days old, issued by the Office of Production Management, Division of Labor, at the instance of Mr. Sidney Hillman, in which he refers to the strike of the International Association of Machinists in the San Francisco Bay area, and other strikes on the Pacific coast. It sets forth a condemnation of all these strikes by the Labor Policy Advisory Committee of the Labor Division of the Office of Production Management. I ask unanimous consent that the press release be printed in the RECORD as showing the attitude of the Office of Production Management.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
DIVISION OF LABOR.

Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General, Office of Production Management, today issued the text of a resolution adopted this morning by the Labor Policy Advisory Committee, Labor Division, Office of Production Management. The text follows:

"Whereas Lodge No. 68 of the International Association of Machinists has called and continued a strike in the shipyards and ship-repair shops in the San Francisco Bay area, together with the local union No. 1304 of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee in the same area; and

"Whereas this strike is in direct and flagrant violation of valid existing contracts entered into in accord with established collective-bargaining procedure under which Lodge No. 68 has operated; and

"Whereas this strike seriously retards and menaces the construction of ships crucial to national defense; and

"Whereas, officers of local union No. 683 of the United Automobile Workers of America, during the progress of negotiations before the National Defense Mediation Board, and in complete and irresponsible disregard of proper trade-union practice have instigated a strike in the North American Aviation Company plant at Inglewood, Calif.; and

"Whereas this strike does immediate and irreparable damage to the vital and important plane-production program for national defense; and

"Whereas officers of the International Woodworkers of America have unjustifiably continued a strike of lumbermen and loggers in the Puget Sound region; and

"Whereas these same officers have issued violently false and inflammatory attacks upon the National Government and its agencies; and

"Whereas this strike threatens to interfere dangerously with national defense; and

"Whereas these several actions reflect adversely upon the integrity and patriotism of the American labor movement and are directly contrary to the best interests of American labor and this Nation and in essence reject the appeal by the President of the United States that labor cooperate with agencies of the National Government for adjusting disputes in defense industries: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Labor Policy Advisory Committee of the Labor Division, Office of Production Management, wholeheartedly endorses and supports the appeal by the President of the United States that Nation-wide machinery for conciliation and mediation be employed 'to prevent interference with production of materials essential to our Nation's security'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Labor Policy Advisory Committee unqualifiedly condemns and denounces the foregoing strikes and the union officials guilty of them; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we do here and now appeal to all legitimate union groups in the country to join with us in this condemnation and urge strongly upon public-spirited officers and members of the unions affected by these above-named strikes that they themselves take action to terminate these stoppages and return immediately to their jobs in these national-defense industries."

A Toast to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

BY JOHN J. DALY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a Toast to the Flag, by John J. Daly.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TOAST TO THE FLAG

(By John Jay Daly)

Here's to the red of it,
There's not a thread of it,
No, not a shred of it,
In all the spread of it,
From foot to head;
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and lead for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing in red.

Here's to the white of it,
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it,
But feels the might of it,
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it,
Made manhood dare for it,
Purity's pray'r for it,
Keeps it so white!

Here's to the blue of it,
Beauteous view of it,
Heavenly hue of it,
Star-spangled dew of it,
Constant and true;
Diadems gleam for it,
States stand supreme for it,
Liberty's beam for it,
Brightens the blue.

Here's to the whole of it,
Stars, stripes, and goal of it,
Body and soul of it,
O, and the roll of it,
Sun shining through;
Hearts in accord for it,
Swear by the sword for it,
Thanking the Lord for it,
Red, white, and blue.

Shall We Go to War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SHORELINE (CONN.) TIMES

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take advantage of my unanimous consent to insert an extraordinarily able and courageous editorial from one of the most representative papers covering many of the so-called small towns in my district, the Shoreline Times:

[From the Shoreline (Conn.) Times]

SHALL WE GO TO WAR?

Although not put in words before, this editorial has been in the process of being written for the last 10 months. We have shrunk from writing it because we weren't sure we knew what we wanted to say. We're not sure now. We wish as earnestly as we've ever wished anything in our life that it were possible to dispel the confusion that is in our mind regarding the world situation that we face today. We envy certain friends who can sincerely say that they are sure of what must be done * * *. "We must beat Hitler," say they, "by going to war against him." It would be so easy to fall in with their attitude * * * it is, of course, the popular one. But the more we think about it the more impossible it becomes for us blindly to sound such sentiments.

We want Hitler beaten. We fully realize that there can be no lasting peace * * * no normal life again until this madman, this megalomaniac, and the totalitarian way of life for which he stands are thoroughly crushed and wiped off the face of the globe. But we can't bring ourselves to believe that plunging into war is the way to beat Hitler.

To our way of thinking, war is the most destructive force that man has ever faced. It defeats victor and vanquished alike. It is like some loathsome disease that consumes every sinew of the body and finally rots the mind. War is a horrible, beastial waste.

If we must adopt war as a means to end the scourge of Hitlerism, we are taking a cure that is as bad—yes, in some respects, worse than the sickness itself. We say this with full knowledge that there are those who will call us appeaser and coward and other epithets even less pleasant. That's why it's tremendously difficult to write this editorial.

"What do you propose that we do, then, if you believe Hitler should be stopped, and yet you don't think we should go to war to stop him?" That's a fair question. We believe Hitler's empire will fall of its own weight, just as that of every tyrant has fallen in years gone by throughout the history of mankind. We believe that he cannot subjugate millions of people and keep them beneath his heel for long. And it is on this certain knowledge * * * this everlasting faith that we pin our hope for a new day.

We should stay out of the holocaust abroad so that we may be strong enough * * * so that we may possess sufficient perspective to guide and aid the peoples who will some day certainly rise from the enslavement of Hitler. We can guide them only by study and thought and prayer, and never by shooting and stabbing and killing.

A Country Editor Speaks to Disloyal Unionists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DOWAGIAC (MICH.) COMMUNITY NEWS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the day has gone by when any appreciable number of our people oppose unions, object to collective bargaining; but the day is fast approaching when our people will no longer tolerate the demands of a few politically ambitious and personally selfish labor leaders who use union organizations either to increase their financial gains, ride into office, or interfere with national defense.

Throughout the country, the smaller independent weeklies and dailies are expressing the opinion of the people of their vicinity. One of those opinions so concisely, so forcefully, states the viewpoint of the vast majority of our citizens that it is printed below. It is that of Bob Wilson, editor, published in the June 13 issue of the Community News, Dowagiac, Mich. Bob writes:

[From the Dowagiac (Mich.) Community News of June 13, 1941]

A DISGRACE TO THE NATION

We read with interest—and regret—that it was necessary for 3,000 United States soldiers to march into the North American Aviation plant at Inglewood, Calif., to insure continuation of production of $200,000,000 worth of bombing planes for the Government in its defense program. Following their entry, cars with public-address systems drove around the throngs of strikers and announced, "Hold to your demands; the Government needs your services and will pay whatever you demand."

How this must thrill the $21 a month draftees who have left their families, many of them unwillingly to serve for us—you and I—anywhere they are ordered, to do whatever they are told whether they like it or not; eating what is set before them; knowing nothing of what they may have to do in another month. Is this the backing these young soldiers deserve?

It is true that the Government needs the services of these factory workers. But what good are guns without men to fire them? What good is an army at the front without proper equipment? How can soldiers keep up their morale knowing that civilians will not keep a supply of necessities coming unless they gain the remuneration they demand?

While we feel that it matters little to this Nation whether Hitler or Britain wins this combat in Europe—either one will cut our economic throat with a smile to gain their point (past history certainly proves this)—if it is necessary to have a huge army trained for action, it is even more necessary that we have every material these men need available before they need it. Bombing in Europe shows that civilians are in as great danger for their lives as soldiers, so we should not let any plant shut down, regardless of reason, if we need production. France didn't back up her military forces—where is she today? We can, and should, take a lesson while there is time.

Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HOLLYWOOD CITIZEN-NEWS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hollywood Citizen-News of June 10, 1941:

[From the Hollywood Citizen-News of June 10, 1941]

CONVERSION

With all the laughing at the expense of President and Mrs. Roosevelt over their delayed conversion to the fact that everything done in the name of union labor is not necessarily right, one should be thankful for the fact that the Nation's first citizens were open to conversion.

If the President and Mrs. Roosevelt had not been disturbed over the North American Aviation plant strike which was acting as Hitler's agent in destroying 10 war planes a day, then the Nation would have had to bow its head in shame. The fact that they were disturbed is evidence that they are concerned in their country's welfare to the extent that they will not willingly remain blinded indefinitely to true conditions.

A short time ago Mrs. Roosevelt was ridiculing anyone who condemned the defense industry strikes. They were of little importance compared to the whole defense program, the Nation's First Lady argued. Now she is ready to admit that the strike situation is "sad."

President Roosevelt, who appointed Gov. Frank Murphy as Attorney General and then as Supreme Court Justice after Murphy had refused to enforce the law against sit-down strikers in Detroit, has finally come around to a half-way admission that there are times when strikers should obey the country's laws.

Progress is being made in opening the intellects of other New Dealers.

Attorney General Robert H. Jackson declared that the "situation at the North American plant more nearly resembled an insurrection than a labor strike." That shows that while Jackson hasn't given other strikes any consideration he really has been looking at the North American situation. If he had taken a little more time for observation he would have noted that the criminal defiance of duly constituted authorities at the North American plant is of the exact nature as that which has taken place at many plants where it was called a "labor strike."

The Attorney General says that the distinction "between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe." Mr. Jackson at last sees the Communists as challenging the Government of the United States.

That's a real admission for a New Dealer. One recalls how President Roosevelt accepted a half-million-dollar contribution from the C. I. O., then filled the offices of the National Labor Relations Board with appointees approved by the C. I. O., then, when a few citizens complained against the Communists in the National Labor Relations Board organization, the New Dealers derided the critics as the enemies of humanitarian government, and defended the Communists.

When the Dies committee started its investigations of un-American activities the New Dealers rushed to do battle against the committee. Communists who were claiming to be New Dealers and were welcomed as guests at the White House were to be protected by the New Dealers at all costs. There was to be no exposure of any Communist who claimed to be a New Dealer.

The New Dealers ought to be able now to change their minds about another thing. In the past it has been their contention, as so strongly expressed by Supreme Court Justice Murphy, that officials should refuse to enforce the law against strikers on the grounds they might cause bloodshed.

C. I. O. State President Connelly told Mayor Bowron that if the police attempted to make it possible for men who wanted to work to go through the picket lines there would be bloodshed.

Well, the Army took charge, showed the strikers that the Government of the United States was going to be respected for once, and the strikers marched away in front of the gentle prodding of bayonets. The talk of bloodshed was a bluff that had been used once too often. Strikers are no idiots. Once they see that they cannot criminally bluff law enforcement, they will obey official orders.

That striker who appeared in the picket line with the United States flag was sadly misusing his country's emblem. He didn't care, however. He thought that he could fool a few ignorant workers into believing that the flag of the United States stood for the

open defiance of law. He thought that some people had so little intelligence that they would believe that the things for which the flag of the United States stands were founded upon the criminality of the country's citizens and upon mob rule.

Then there was the guy who thought that he was making a point out of alleging that the use of the United States Army to command respect for the law was "the way Hitler did it." That poor fellow had just been victimized by cunning labor leaders who took advantage of his low degree of intelligence.

Hitler represents dictatorship. The dictatorship attempted at the North American was the dictatorship of the mob, which attempted to assert that because of size it could criminally prevent other citizens from exercising their right to work.

Hitler knows no right excepting his own to do as he pleases. That is what the mob of strikers at North American were insisting upon.

Democracy isn't built upon the theory that everyone can do just as he pleases. Democracy is built upon the theory that everyone's liberty ends where the fundamental liberties of others begin.

Democracy is built upon the theory that respect for law must be maintained and that the use of arms by law-enforcement officials will be resorted to if that be necessary to curb criminal disobedience to law.

Col. Charles E. Branshaw, under whose command the soldiers stopped the lawlessness of the strikers at the plant, made this statement: "Word has reached me that some North American Aviation employees and their families have actually been threatened and that other employees may be threatened with bodily injury to themselves or to their families if they return to work at the North American factory."

That gives one an idea of the type of criminals who are violating laws in the name of union labor. That shows the issue before this country today. It is, whether or not union labor, in addition to the right to organize, bargain collectively, strike, and peacefully picket, is to commit any crimes it desires with the sanction of the majority of the country's citizens.

America, Awake!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

SERMON BY DR. GEORGE HAMILTON COMBS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able sermon entitled "America, Awake," preached by Dr. George Hamilton Combs, our ablest pastor in Kansas City. He is the father of Representative George Hamilton Combs, who served with distinction in the House of Representatives. This address covers our present situation, and I think it ought to be incorporated in the RECORD.

Dr. Combs is finishing his forty-ninth year as a minister in Kansas City and is at the present time the oldest active minister there. During the last war he had three sons in the service, and he himself was with the Y. M. C. A. in France for more than a year before the armistice was signed.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The most amazing spectacle in the world today is not a beleaguered Britain, nor soldier bodies floating on Mediterranean waters, nor Libyan sands reddened by human blood, but America asleep. Asleep while marching events on three continents are shaping the destinies not only of those continents, but our own, and that, maybe for a thousand years.

Asleep, and dreaming, and talking in her dreams, talking of business as usual, profits as usual, pleasures as usual, everything as usual, while the world is burning down.

A recent survey by the New York Times disclosed that in the Northeast, Southeast, Southwest sections of our country sleep is lightest; that the coast, once isolationist, because of widespread and prolonged strikes is stirring in its slumbers; that of all sections the Middle West is soundest in its sleep and loudest in its snores.

America asleep, and it is not as if she had had no warning. The platform has thundered, the radio has screamed, the press has sounded its trumpets, the camera has blanketed her with the pictures of cities blasted, ships going down at sea, the roaming homeless millions, men and women dying midst northern snows and southern sands, yet still the poppy juice glues her eyelids down, and still she is unawakened from her sleep.

It is an inglorious slumber. We may sing as we do America the Beautiful, but though we sing it till our voices crack and every vocal cord be torn out by its roots America is not beautiful when America is asleep. Character has gone out of her face. It is an ugliness just this side the ugliness of death.

To what should America awake?

1. To the realization that she cannot live unto herself no matter how hard she may try. At times we all wish it might be so. The world has gone mad. Imperialisms, ambitions, greed, hate, have made three continents an insane asylum and a charnel house. Let us get away from the horror of it all. Ah, if only we could. But we can't. A Chinese wall cannot be rebuilt even in China, much less here. And much less now. Not since the Atlantic has shrunken to a strait, not since the coming of the ocean cable, the wireless, the radio, the swift-going ship, the bomber that can cross and recross the ocean without folding its wings. If we could hitch America to another planet, we could live apart from other nations, but not as long as it remains a part of this ball we call the earth. America is the most nearly self-contained of all countries but not without grievous hurt to her economies, her politics, the things of the spirit, could she live unto herself. She might, indeed, build round her a wall of defense so strong that enemy armies could not break through it, but she could never build it so high that corroding ideas and ideals could not fly over it.

You can't catch the winds of earth in a pocket handkerchief and bury them; round the whole earth they'll howl and rend. Nor can we catch the storm of totalitarianism in a blanket and bury it out of sight. And so long as that storm rages across the seas, it threatens us. We are world citizens. Our fortunes are tied up with the fortunes of all the nations of the earth and with them we rise or fall, we live or die.

It is irony of history that the man who first showed us that the Atlantic is but a ferry should now be exhorting us to live this side that ferry.

2. Awake to the recognition that by governmental act our Nation's cause has already been charted. We have crossed our Rubicon. The die is cast. In wisdom or in folly we've done what we've done and now there is no going back. We have committed ourselves to the material aid of the democracies and it is ours to live up to the vows we've made.

Present criticisms of a national policy already buttressed by congressional action and Executive decree serve no useful purpose. they only confuse and divide. They are but cries over water that has already gone over the dam. Colonel Lindbergh, to whom our admiration went out in his epic flight and to whom our sympathies went out in the tragedy that befell his home, we hold still in honor, but when challenging the wisdom of the Congress and the President in what they've done he calls for a "new leadership," we may hold that call coming from his heart and not his head, for, short of forswearing the validity of democratic processes, short of the overturn of our Government as we have it at present, there can be no new leadership. We can have no new congressional leaders inside a year and a half, can have no new President inside 3½ years. Meanwhile, under the present leadership, the American people are to find unity if they shall find it at all, and without that unity we are lost.

It must have given our Wheelers pause when on last Wednesday John Whitaker said that Hitler sees the necessity "of luring Japan into the war against America while the American people are still divided and paralyzed by its isolationists." And bear in mind that as Raymond Clapper said at Lawrence last week, this division of opinion, this tragedy of disunity, this paralysis of effort has been brought about chiefly by the questioning of what we have already done. Political post mortems like all other post mortems come too late.

3. America should awake to the recognition that her defense has only in smallest way passed from plan to performance. Blueprints are a thousand miles ahead of construction. Designs have outrun deed. On paper, thousands of tanks rumble across our fields, tens of thousands of fighting planes and bombers fill the air, two navies command the sea—yes, on paper. In reality, as yet, we are only a third-class military power. Viewing our potentialities, we swell with pride and declare that we can lick the world, but potentialities as compared with production are as the moon to a wagon wheel.

We are fronting a possible combination of four great world powers whose every economy is geared to war, who for a decade have been preparing for war, whose factories and the factories of subjugated peoples are turning out the implements of war; slave labor tilling their own fields that their nationals might be at the battle front, yet our output of military material is only a dribble when it should be a flood.

Nobody knows precisely how much aid we are extending Britain, but everybody knows that it's too little. And what is our national attitude toward this tragic deficiency? Complacency. Are we working furiously to make up for past laggings? We are not. Five days in the week, we work 8 hours per day, when workers in totalitarian countries toil 10 hours per day, 7 days in the week. Fact is, labor labors only when it has a mind to and when it isn't so minded it strikes.

This is the intolerable situation we face today—strikes called and strikes carried on, not just in the factories turning out curling irons or lip sticks, but in plants turning out tanks and planes and guns—strikes in shipyard, strikes in aircraft industries, strikes in munition plants. Strikes running through days, running through weeks; strikes carried on in spite of recommendations and

pleas of conciliation boards and Presidential entreaties; strikes stubbornly persisted in and which, if much longer carried on, will make our every defense effort futile and lead our 135,000,000 as lambs to the slaughter. This can no longer be tolerated. Friend of labor all my life, I solemnly declare to it today that it is in the way of losing all its half century gains. When strikes have gone so far that Mussolini's mouthpiece, Gayda, says: "They have caused the loss of nearly a quarter billion working hours and held up the execution of nearly $200,000,000 of our defense contracts," and when he further declares that "this is the first phase of our civil war," it's time to call a halt.

Call it a right if you will—the right to strike—nevertheless there are some rights that have precedence and claim over all others and chiefest of these is the right of self-defense, the right to protect our own, the right to live. He who blocks that right is traitor. If our Government in self-defense has right, and it has, to go into our homes, summon our boys to the camp, the drill grounds, and if need be to fields of battle, it has right to say to workingmen, "This is a job as important as that which we are calling our young men to do and without whose doing they can do nothing. Their lives depend on you. Carry on." Strikes had largely to do in bringing France to her knees and present humiliation. We will not longer suffer them here. Henceforth strikes in defense industries should be put where they belong, among the "fifth columnists," the saboteurs, traitors. Strikes in these industries is nothing short of treason.

Time has come when America, awaking to the littleness of what it is doing, must make an honest-to-God all-out effort to aid Britain without which aid Britain will surely go down.

4. Awake to the recognition that the tempo of time itself has quickened. Events today move at such a dizzying pace that awakening from an hour's slumber, we shall see greater change than did Rip Van Winkle after his 20 years' sleep. Map makers of today must wait for the latest editions of their morning newspaper. What changes in Europe's map since last June! What changes will another year bring? It makes you catch your breath to realize that before ever the green leaves now on the trees shall turn to brown, Britain may be either on the way to the preservation of her freedom or beaten to her knees and shackled as a slave; that Hitler shall be either master of Europe and Africa and well on his way to world rulership or, another Napoleon, nearing his Waterloo and on his way to a lonely Mediterranean isle. So swiftly moves time and so slowly move we. Yet, in this 1941, the clock of destiny is striking.

The time has come when America should get its ostrich head out of the sands, realize that a world tornado swirls, that it moves with the speed of light, and, that a 12 months will show whether Britain—Britain to whom we have sworn solemn oaths to aid—shall through our help still be standing, or doomed to fall—a fall that will shake the earth.

The sands in the hour glass are fast running out, but ours is not the tempo of the running sands. The Congress appropriates billions. The President calls for speed, more speed, but America has only a tortoise crawl. Sparks by the millions fly from a fireside chat, but they fall on sodden hearts and kindle no conflagration.

Oh that heart-tearing phrase of Lloyd George, "too little and too late." Is this also for us? "Too little?" That holds. Commensurate with our might our aid has not been given. "Too late?" Pray God, no. Oh America, thy day of opportunity is quickly speeding by. The morning's gone, the noon's going and in a little while, oh such a little while, will come the night—the night in which we can no longer do. Awake! Awake!

5. Awake to our present peril. Yes; peril; no other word will do. All that we have and all that we love are in dire peril. I know there is a minority though, an extremely vocal minority, that pooh-poohs such a declaration, that brands as warmongers all who sense this peril. Those who tell us that even with a Hitler-dominated Europe and Africa we should not be endangered. That the conqueror of two continents would be content to rest on his laurels and that America would still be as safe as safe can be. I should like to ask these hushers these questions:

(1) Have they not read Hitler's book? Have they not read his speeches? Have they not read the deliverances of his chief henchmen? These are the blueprints of the "world revolution," the "new order." A "world revolution," not a European or African revolution. "A new order"—a new order for the world. They are the blueprints of a world horror and these blueprints have already passed into construction on the Continent of Europe. Are they pleased with the picture? Was Hitler lying when he said he would go all the way? Is he always lying?

(2) Do they not know that nazi-ism is geared to war and that peace would bring as profound dislocation of Reich economy as would war to us? Do they not therefore know that Hitler cannot stop.

(3) Do they not know that though the totalitarian powers should win on all other continents, they would yet be impoverished? And do they think that any consideration would restrain them from attacking us, a nation with three-quarters of the world's gold and our heaped up riches of factory and of farm?

(4) Do they believe Herr Hitler when he declared to John Whittaker the other day that he has no designs on the Western Hemisphere? Hasn't he said that, too, of every country he has ravaged? Will they accept as truth the promises made by a man who in book and speech has justified the lie and whose lies to subjugated countries are still in our ears?

(5) Do they not know that not only does Hitler despise American democracy but hates it, rages against it, and though, thus far, we have done tragically little in Britain's aid, that little is a grindstone on which he is sharpening the axe of his revenge?

It's too late to placate Hitler even were we base enough to try. Only our Quislings would find favor in his sight.

So, I repeat, America is face to face with deadly peril. What is in peril? Our democracy, freedom is imperiled, individualism, the whole American way of life. What is in peril? Our culture. What has happened in the Reich would happen here. What has happened there? Free enquiry is no more. Universities have become cultural prisons. German scholars, one time the world teachers, are in exile. The Gestapo heads, the schools trail the procession. The land of the scholars has become the land of the goose-steppers. Learning totters, art languishes. Culturally, Germany has become a barren land. And so would we become.

What is in peril? Morality, as we understand it. In totalitarian countries, the ethical concepts evolved by the human race in its long pilgrimage out of the night have been rooted out. The accepted standards of morals have been trampled in the mud. The "nots" have been taken out of the Ten Commandments. The lovely ethics of the Sermon on the Mount have been bespattered by the slaves of dictator contempt. The simple duties we learned at mother's knee wake only derision in the halls of Berchtesgaden. "Wave of the future," Mrs. Lindbergh? Oh gentle, too trusting Anne, the wave of the future that draws your eyes is a wave sucked from the lowest depths of man's bestialness, flashing for a moment at the crest, then falling back into noisome depths from whence it came. Pray God that in the brief moment of its cresting, we become not a part of it to be sucked down into the eternal dark.

What is in peril? Our religion. Are we willing to see it go? To see churches turned into garages as in Russia? Proscription of protestantism, as in Italy? An insidious campaign waged against it as in Germany, ranging from its uprootings in the schools, to the barbarism of the concentration camps? Hear it, and on this matter, at least, I speak with authority: Hitler is out after nothing less than the destruction of all religions, holding them alike superstitions. He would have the Christians of Luther lands go back to the worship of its old Norse gods. And he's logical, for Hitlerism and religion cannot live in the same world.

What has happened there would happen here. What the black flag of the pirate once meant at sea, the swastika would mean here. Yes; all that happened there can happen here. "Fifth columnists" can sprout on New England hills, in southern cotton fields, on the steep sides of the Rockies and beyond as well as in Denmark or Yugoslavia.

Chamberlains may hoist their umbrellas in New York as well as London. Stanley Baldwins can smoke their pipes of complacency in Senate conference rooms as well as on Downing Street. Lavals and Quislings can be found in America as well as in Norway and France. Chains may clank here as there. What happened there is warning. Will we heed it? The far-from-hysterical Saturday Evening Post, until of late a die-hard isolationist, in last week's issue editorializes:

"Liberty is fighting for its life. If the aggressor be not destroyed, he will devour the world. America is in peril. Only by heroic and sacrificing exertions may we hope to save ourselves. There is no time to spare."

No time to spare and yet America is not yet awake. How can she sleep? How can she sleep while her implacable foes are drawing ever closer around her a cordon of steel? How can she sleep while her few allies, mauled already to grogginess, are buckling at their knees? How can she sleep when wisdom is crying from the housetops, "tomorrow may be too late?" Oh, how can she sleep? God in Heaven, wake us. Pound on the anvil of Thy wrath till its poundings shake us from our dreams. Rekindle within our hearts the patriot fires that have gone out. Blow on the cold ashes till they become a living flame.

Oh God! Oh God! Open thou our eyes. Oh America, land of Pilgrims' pride, of patriot love, land of glorious yesterdays, wake up! Wake up!

We Must Keep America Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I in-

clude the following address which I delivered yesterday over the radio:

Before I was elected to the Congress of the United States, I promised the people that I would take the radio and issue a call for their support when I found that the Nation which we love so dearly was in danger. I am completely satisfied that a grave peril now confronts us. Unless we act immediately and a vigorous protest from all loyal citizens reaches Washington at once, our form of Government under the Constitution and our American independence will be overthrown not by a foreign invasion using military force but by a treasonable betrayal which is already in the making.

There is a powerful movement thoroughly financed throughout the British Empire and in all parts of the United States to surrender great, free America into a permanent confederation or union which will cancel the Declaration of Independence written by Thomas Jefferson in 1776 and completely undermine the Constitution of the United States. Hore Belisha, former Secretary for War in London, this week stated publicly that the plans have been worked out and it now awaits a word from Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt to complete the colossal surrender of all time. While we have been engaged in discussing the wars in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and whether the United States will be involved, the first secret steps have been undertaken.

Millions of good Americans were shocked when the Congress passed the lend-lease bill. What did it mean? What was to become of the Johnson Act forbidding loans to nations which have not paid their debts owing to us from the first World War? What was to become of the Neutrality Act, with its cash and carry provisions? Why did President Roosevelt turn over 50 of our destroyers to Britain without payment? Why did the President say that Britain was fighting our war and that our first line of defense was on the Rhine? Why was Stimson made Secretary of War? Why was Knox made Secretary of the Navy? Why did Ambassador Kennedy resign his post as our Ambassador to Great Britain? Why did Ambassador Bullitt who represented us in France tell the French that if they started the war we would finish it? Why have the American people been urged to aid Britain "short of war"? Why did President Roosevelt promise the American people that our boys would never be sent to fight and die in a foreign war?

All these questions can be answered when we understand that we are to become a part of the British Empire. All news now coming out of Washington is censored, and the people are not told the facts. The truth is known only to the President and those within the inner circle handling and operating the $7,000,000,000 of war materials which we are giving to Britain. When the plan for union with Britain is completed there will be no need for Britain to repay us, since the American people and all subjects of the British Empire in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Ireland, the British Isles, and Africa will be all citizens of one government, the rulers of which will be Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The Senate of the United States will be absorbed in the parliament of the new union. All Members of the American Congress will be deprived of their seats, and new delegates will sit in the parliament of the new union. You will no longer be a citizen of the United States. Your new allegiance will be to this new union, and you will be a fellow citizen of the hordes in India and the tribesmen of Africa. The New Deal has grown into the new union.

Lord Halifax has been sent here to put this deal over. Anthony Eden has proclaimed it. Winston Churchill has said that the movement is flowing steadily onward, and like the great Mississippi River cannot be checked. When Wendell Willkie went to London he carried a note to Winston Churchill stating that the union would sail on. Ambassador Winant has just returned from Britain with a report that all is well.

How near is this new union? American armed vessels are now acting as patrols all over the high seas escorting merchant ships to Britain. The President, proclaiming the freedom of the seas, has issued an order for an unlimited national emergency. He is carrying on an undeclared war with Germany and will never come to the Congress for a declaration of war as provided in our Constitution. Secretary Stimson and Attorney General Jackson have publicly stated that all previous international law has been canceled. Secretary Stimson testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that we are acting under the edicts of a conference of international lawyers held at Budapest, Hungary, in 1934; that President Roosevelt can make war anywhere in the world without any authorization from the Congress.

Plans are now under way to ask the Congress to recess and go home from the middle of July until after Labor Day. The Congress has already appropriated $43,000,000,000, while less than one-third of this sum is all that is needed for American defense. Experts in the Army and Navy have testified that we do not need an Army of over 800,000 for our own defense. On July 1 this Army will already consist of 1,500,000 men. The Congress is appropriating for this year $10,000,000,000 for the Army. Why such gigantic appropriations? All experts in the Army and Navy admit that there is no danger of an invasion of this country by Hitler. Facts and figures have been given to absolutely prove this. Former President Hoover has stated that we can be of more help to Britain if we stay out of the war. Everyone in Washington knows that we are unprepared to carry on successfully a foreign war at this time. Everyone in Washington knows that we cannot have a two-ocean Navy until 1946. Everyone in Washington knows that Japan will attack us if we make war on Germany. Japan is bound by treaty with Germany to come to Germany's aid. We cannot successfully fight a war in both the Atlantic and the Pacific at the same time. You are asking what does all this mean?

Those who advocate the union now with Britain do not mean a union after the war. They mean a union now. If this union be accomplished, then Britain's war is our war, and no matter how it comes out, we will be a part of the British Empire. The fears of the American people are to be played upon until we are forced to accept this union now. The press and radio are flooded with appeals to our sympathy. By day and night we are told the merits and bravery of the British people.

Lord Halifax and Senator PEPPER have toured the Nation calling upon us to espouse the cause of Britain. The will of the people is being broken down by every scheme and device to the point where we will accept an agreement which President Roosevelt will proclaim that he has made with Winston Churchill. The American Navy will be pooled with the British Navy; all private property will be seized by the President; strikes fomented by Communists will furnish the occasion for the use of military force with which to take over manufacturing plants; Mayor LaGuardia is forming the citizens into an army for home defense; Mrs. Roosevelt is about to draft American women into her army; all those who oppose these plans are called Copperheads, Hitlerites, and "fifth columnists." Charles Lindbergh and Senator WHEELER have been smeared. A magazine of wide circulation has carried an article that Americans of foreign stock will be interned and it is even suggested that the rank and file of such organizations as America First Committee and the Keep Us Out of War Committee will be carefully investigated with a view to internment.

In the name of God, whither are we heading? When I say, "We must keep America independent now," you know what I mean. This Nation is full of foreign agents. They are not all Communists. Many are British agents. We shall not tolerate undivided allegiance. We shall condemn all subversive doctrines whether they be Communist, Fascist, Nazi, or British. The minority in Congress which has made the fight for the American people need your help. In my campaign for election as Congressman at Large, I pledged the voters that I would never vote to send the son of an American father or mother to fight and die in any European or Asiatic war. I shall keep that pledge. I also pledged that I would never vote one cent for this purpose. I kept that pledge and voted against the lend-lease bill, against the amendments as they came from the Senate, and I voted against giving Britain the $7,000,000,000. President Roosevelt proclaims a national emergency, unlimited in scope. Since we are not at war, he has no more right to do this than I have. He is usurping the powers of the people. He has no more right to seize all private property than I have. He is acting as a dictator and will continue so to act unless he hears from the American people.

Let us get this straight. Can it be possible that the Congress will sit idly by and watch the President take us into an undeclared war in open defiance of the Constitution of the United States which clearly states that the Congress alone can declare war? Can it be possible that the American people will sit idly by and see their sons shackled into a Union Now with Britain without any authority from them, from the Congress, or from the Constitution? Some will say that it cannot happen here. To all these I make answer How can you explain the fact that just a few days ago the President submitted to the Congress for its approval an agreement to build the St. Lawrence seaway project as a defense measure when at the same time in his message to the Congress he admitted that it cannot be built within 4 years from now? How can you explain this action by the President when all in authority know that such agreement amounts to a treaty and should be submitted to the Senate of the United States, as was done several years ago? Why is it not a treaty today? What has happened to change the status of the project? Conceded to be a treaty heretofore, how has it become a mere agreement now? Can you not see that in the mind of the President the Constitution means nothing. If he can undermine the Constitution in this instance, who can say that he is not ready for Union Now with Britain?

Today we find the Congress of the United States in about the position that the French Council of the Five Hundred was in the early autumn of 1799, just before Bonaparte drove them out of their chamber with his dragoons. Measures are offered for the consideration of the Congress under rules which put a gag on debate. Amendments are offered to bills on the floor of Congress which the Members have not even read. If this condition continues our Republic will pass away and we shall have an endless emergency dictatorship, and only those measures will be submitted to the Congress which Hitler would submit to the Reichstag.

On this day, June 15, the interest is due from Britain for the debts owing to us from the last World War. No interest has been paid; instead, the debtor is seeking to absorb the creditor and thus wipe out the debt. Who could have foretold that anything so monstrous could happen in America? This is Father's Day. I appeal to the fathers of America to weigh well what I have said. I

appeal to you to make known to the President and the Congress that you will not tolerate any further steps in betrayal of our American independence. We all agree that we must do our utmost to defend the United States. But that does not mean that we must accept a Union Now with Britain and that you and your sons for all time to come will be subjects of the British Empire. What have we done that this should come to us? God knows that it is hard enough to give up a son for military training in defense of our common country. It cannot be possible that He will inflict this curse that will deprive us of our American citizenship. I call upon the American people to awake to this danger and write or wire the President and the Members of Congress at once, tonight, that you will not permit the loss of our American independence. We applaud the loyalty of the subject of the British Empire for standing by Great Britain; we expect Frenchmen to be for France; we expect Italians to be for Italy; we expect Hitlerites to be for Hitler. But why, in the name of God, can we not expect Americans to be for America first, last, and always?

The tide is turning in Washington. The Congress is determined to drive the serpent of internationalism from the free soil of America. We have commenced to put the Communists in their place. We must not stop there. With your help, we will check the betrayal of America into a Union Now with Britain. We have a right to cherish our American independence. No man can take this birthright from us. Just as in 1776 the wrath of the American people must be made known and when the American people decide that this mongrel New Union shall not happen here then I am satisfied we shall remain free and independent. Let us hear from you. We need your help. May God bless you all.

Special Committee of the Bar Association of St. Louis After Exhaustive Investigation Recommends Additional United States Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 23 the House passed a bill introduced by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, which provided for an additional United States district judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. During the consideration of that bill the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] read a telegram he had received from Hon. Charles B. Davis, senior United States district judge in the Eastern District of Missouri, in which Judge Davis wired Mr. BENNETT as follows:

Members of the bar have made no study of the condition of the docket. Lawyers have displayed no interest in the bill providing for an additional district judge. No lawyer has had difficulty in getting his case tried. The courts have not been burdened with work for the past year.

I called attention to the situation in the eastern district of Missouri and discussed the matter at length during the debate on the bill. I pointed out that year after year conferences of United States circuit judges had recommended an additional judge for this district, and it was upon that latest recommendation that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] introduced the bill. There are 114 counties and the city of St. Louis in the State of Missouri, and almost one-half of the counties and the city of St. Louis are included in the eastern district of Missouri.

When the bill reached the Senate, Hon. Kimbrough Stone, Chief Justice of the Eighth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, who had submitted the original recommendation, filed an additional statement with the Senate supporting his previous contention that the additional judge was needed.

The bar association of St. Louis, composed of leading lawyers of my city, appointed a special committee to make an impartial investigation of the situation and to file a report as to whether or not this additional judge was required.

I have just received from Judge Fred J. Hoffmeister, president of the Bar Association of St. Louis, as well as the secretary, Russell H. Doerner, a report of this special committee, and under leave granted me by the House, I include in my remarks excerpts from that report, which follow:

To the Executive Committee of the Bar Association of St. Louis.

GENTLEMEN: At a meeting of the bar association held May 5, 1941, a resolution was adopted directing the president of the association to appoint a committee of three members to investigate the necessity for the creation of an additional judgeship for the United States District Court for the Eastern Judicial District of Missouri, as proposed in a bill which has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate.

Pursuant to that resolution, the president appointed a committee consisting of James E. Garstang (chairman), Roscoe Anderson, and Samuel H. Liberman.

The committee in the course of its investigation has conferred with Hon. Charles B. Davis, Hon. George H. Moore, and Hon. J. C. Collett, United States district judges, and with Hon. Harry C. Blanton, United States district attorney.

The committee has also communicated with Hon. Kimbrough Stone, senior circuit judge of the circuit court of appeals for the eighth circuit.

Your committee has read and considered the report of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges held at Washington, D. C., October 1-4, 1940, the report of the administrative director, the report of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, and has studied statistics dealing with the business of the court submitted by the district judges, by the district clerk, and by the district attorney.

The need for additional judges in both the eastern and western districts of Missouri was apparently felt as far back as the year 1929. At that time there were two judges in each district.

At the judicial conference, which is composed of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the senior circuit judges for all of the circuits, in October 1931 the Honorable Kimbrough Stone, senior circuit judge for the eighth circuit, urged that there be created an additional judgeship for each of the two districts. The judicial conference recommended one judge for the western district to act by assignment in the eastern district, upon Judge Stone's statement of his willingness to try this experiment and ascertain whether one or two judges were needed to meet the situation.

On June 22, 1936, an act was passed providing for one judge to serve both districts.

In 1938 the judicial conference reached the conclusion that the appointment of one judge to serve in both the eastern and western districts did not meet the needs of the situation.

It therefore recommended in 1938, 1939, and 1940 at its annual meetings that there should be an additional judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

In 1939, bills for the creation of a new judge for the eastern district were introduced by Mr. COCHRAN and by Mr. SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

In April 1940, Mr. Will Shafroth, Chief of the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics in the Administrative Office for the United States Courts, made an exhaustive personal study of the situation in the eastern district of Missouri, and as a result of his investigation, the Director of the Administrative Office recommended to the Judicial Conference at its meeting in October 1940, the creation of an additional judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

One of the primary functions of the Administrative Office is to study the conditions of the dockets in all the Federal courts and to make recommendations as to such steps, including additional personnel, as are, in the opinion of the Director of the Administrative Office, calculated to improve the prompt and efficient dispatch of the business of the Federal courts.

A bill providing for the creation of such an additional judge has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the need for the creation of an additional judge has been the subject of exhaustive study and consideration by the judicial conference and that the conference has recognized the need for a full-time additional judge in the eastern district of Missouri since 1938.

While your committee has not had the time to make an exhaustive personal study of the relative statistics, it is clear that from the point of view of the cases filed, the cases filed in the eastern District are higher in number than the average prevailing over the United States.

The cases which are now pending and which we are advised by the United States district attorney are to be filed shortly, involving condemnation of lands by the Federal Government, will, in the opinion of your committee constitute such a demand upon the time of the judges that there will be serious danger of clogging the civil docket, to the detriment of private citizens engaged in ordinary litigation.

There are pending at the present time 73 cases involving the Jefferson Memorial project. There have been instituted and are to be instituted other proceedings in connection with the Wappapello Dam, the Clearwater Reservoir, the Weldon Springs TNT plant, and other projects which, in the opinion of the committee based upon information submitted by the United States district attorney from his past experience will require approximately 800 trial days.

It is apparent that the right of a landowner to a speedy determination of his damages is essential to his protection.

We are advised that at the Cape Girardeau division of the court the first case which could be tried between private litigants in 2 years was tried a short time ago, and that this situation was the result of the fact that

the Government had so many condemnation cases pending in that district.

If the judges were required to devote all of their time to the trial of condemnation cases, the civil docket would, in the opinion of your committee, fall about 3 years behind.

We are advised that a substantial increase in the number of criminal cases instituted by the Federal Government can reasonably be anticipated.

There are pending in the eastern district four important railroad reorganizations, and although the end is in sight for one or two, there remains and will remain a large burden of administrative work on the shoulders of the district judges handling these reorganizations. In addition to the railroad reorganizations there are pending other corporate reorganizations under the Bankruptcy Act, which require a substantial part of the time of the district judges.

At the end of the Federal Government's last fiscal year, June 1, 1940, there were pending in the eastern district 200 civil cases which had been on file for 6 months or more, and of these at that time 127 were not at issue. Under the new rules of civil procedure, it is to be expected that issue will be joined in civil cases much earlier than they were under the old procedure, and the effect of such earlier joinder of issue will be to add to the number of cases that are triable at any particular time.

The docket in the northern division (Hannibal) is in current condition, but it is to be noted that there are few, if any, condemnation cases which have been filed or are pending in that division, although it is anticipated that there may be a number of proceedings instituted in the Hannibal division in connection with the Mississippi River development.

The amount of business dispatched by the district judges in the eastern district compares very favorably with the business transacted in all other districts. In the St. Louis division, up to this time, attorneys whose cases are at issue have been able, through the cooperation of the judges, to obtain reasonably prompt settings of their cases.

Notwithstanding the above, the report of the administrative office shows a slight loss of ground in the docket in the eastern district for the year 1940; this loss was shown before the impact on the docket of the condemnation proceedings above referred to could be felt.

The pending bill for the creation of an additional full-time judge was amended in the House so as to provide that the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in the eastern district shall not be filled.

Under the bill as amended, there would be three full-time judges for the eastern district until such time as a vacancy occurred in any of the three judgeships, at which time there would be only two full-time judges.

In view of the existing and immediately prospective volume of litigation, it is the unanimous conclusion of your committee that the additional judge provided for by the pending bill is necessary to the prompt and efficient dispatch of litigation in the eastern district.

Independently of its own conclusions, however, the committee feels that the need for an additional judge who would be available for full-time duty in the eastern district is fully demonstrated by the fact that the creation of an additional judgeship has been unanimously urged and recommended by expert sources which are fully cognizant of the needs of the district and which are responsible for the prompt and efficient dispatch of the business of the courts, and whose motives cannot be questioned, namely, the senior circuit judge of the eighth circuit court of appeals, the judicial conference, and the Office of the Administrative Director.

The committee respectfully recommends that the executive committee promptly take such action as it deems appropriate to urge the passage of the pending bill in the Senate and its enactment into law.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES E. GARSTANG, *Chairman.*
ROSCOE ANDERSON.
SAMUEL H. LIBERMAN.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this report, coupled with the second report of Justice Stone, is a complete answer to those who say an additional judge is not needed in this district.

The Muhlenberg Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

LETTER FROM REV. PAUL H. KRAUSS, FORT WAYNE, IND.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

TRINITY CHURCH,
ENGLISH EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN,
Fort Wayne, Ind., June 11, 1941.

The Honorable GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOC: Here's one letter that hasn't anything to do with war. That must be a relief. (However, to be in the clear, I am now convinced that we should give ourselves to all-out aid for Britain. What other sensible thing is there to do?)

I said this wasn't going to be a letter about war, and it isn't. It is to ask your help in a project undertaken by the United Lutheran Church in America, which will find collateral appreciation from all the Lutherans in this country, including the Missouri Synod. We want to get a special stamp issue celebrating the two-hundredth anniversary of the arrival, in 1742, of the Muhlenberg family in America.

The Muhlenbergs gave dramatic and distinguished service to the laying of the foundations of our Republic—the father and three sons all being notable. The father, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, came to this country in 1742, was prominent in the Colony of Pennsylvania, married the daughter of Conrad Weiser, the influential Indian agent of William Penn. Henry Muhlenberg was the circuit-riding, church-founding patriarch of the Lutheran Church in this country.

One of his sons, General Peter, was aide de camp to General Washington. He received Cornwallis' sword at Yorktown. His statue is one of two representing Pennsylvania's most distinguished sons in Statuary Hall in the Capitol Building. He was the clergyman who preached a stirring sermon in the pulpit in Woodstock, Va., at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, winding up with a climax, "There is a time to pray and a time to fight. Now is the time to fight"—threw back his black Lutheran pulpit gown, disclosing a blue uniform of a colonel in the Continental Army—the drums rolled outside, and men of his congregation enlisted in the first German-Virginia regiment.

The second son, Frederick A., was the first Speaker of the National House of Representatives. The third son, Ernest, was a noted botanist in American colonial history. They all were ordained clergymen of the Lutheran Church.

These men gave leadership to the very large early German migrations into Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia, and swung them solidly to the support of the Revolution, the Constitution, and the founding of the United States. John B. McMaster, the historian, says it was the influence of these Germans in Pennsylvania that swung that colony against the tories to the cause of independence.

So this stamp would be certainly worthy, and an inspiration to patriotism, in these days when patriotism is needed. It would be appreciated, not only by the Lutherans of German extraction, but by all Americans of German extraction, and also by the substantial number of Lutherans of Scandinavian extraction, particularly in the Middle West, who would have a proud interest in such a heritage.

The Honorable John S. Rice, of Gettysburg, Pa., is chairman of the committee of the United Lutheran Church in America, in charge of looking after the matter. President Henry W. A. Hanson, of Gettysburg College, and Rev. William C. J. Weidt, of Mount Vernon, N. Y., are the two other members. They are a subcommittee of the committee on Muhlenberg bicentennial of the executive board of the United Lutheran Church in America, of which committee I happen to be chairman. The offices of the president, Frederick H. Knubel, are at 39 East Thirty-fifth Street, New York City.

Please help us on this. It will be another star in your crown.

Yours sincerely,

PAUL H. KRAUSS.

Flag Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. DEWEY SHORT, OF MISSOURI

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the annual Flag Day exercises, June 14, 1941, Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic, east front, United States Capitol:

Mr. Chairman and my fellow countrymen, on June 14, 1777, a year after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the Continental Congress in Philadelphia decided that the flag of the United States be 13 stripes of red and white, and that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field. In 1912 New Mexico and Arizona entered our Union of States and the stars in the flag reached 48, the number we have today. It was just a quarter of a century ago today that President Wilson proclaimed June 14 as Flag Day, which is annually observed throughout America by appropriate ceremonies. We do well to pause and honor those few surviving members of the Grand Army of the Republic under whose auspices we meet. It is a high honor and a distinct privilege to be invited to stand on the east steps in the front of our National Capitol to address our fellow Americans on Flag Day. Even more than when our Chief Executive takes his inaugural oath we are here today gathered under one flag that knows no partisanship, and where

every man in spite of race, color, or creed may walk the earth his own king, the equal lord of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and woof of the magic days the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on.

Let me say at the beginning that in this New World every man, rich or poor, high or low, Gentile or Jew, Protestant or Catholic, Republican or Democrat, new dealer or old dealer, can rise to any heights that his own capacities, virtues, and energies allow him.

God must have smiled upon this New World because everyone wants to come to it. The poor and distressed peoples in Europe, Africa, Asia, and in the islands of the sea look forward to America as their haven of refuge and hope. We do not claim any particular credit for our fortunate position. Providence has laid its benediction upon us. Though we occupy only 6 percent of the world's surface and have only 7 percent of the world's population, we are fortunately blessed. We have most of the world's railroads, telephones, commercial airplanes, automobiles, radios, refrigerators, carpet sweepers, and all the other physical comforts of life. Moreover, we have the greatest intellectual and religious freedom known to man which is coveted by myriad millions throughout the world. All these blessings were not dropped into our lap but were won through the attention, application, sweat, and toil of men and women who wanted to go forward in this world. No gain was ever made without sacrifice by somebody and we who are the recipients of these benefits should be willing to put forth every effort and sacrifice ourselves in order to pass them on to unborn generations. Shame on any man who would strike to hinder or deter the production of such essential weapons as are necessary to defend his own country.

Tonight we have gathered here to commemorate and celebrate Flag Day. At this hour it is most appropriate that we do this. Symbolism is a natural, normal, and necessary thing. The savage in Africa has his sign; the barbarian in the uncivilized island has his banner; the more advanced man in other lands has his pennant; and in the most civilized nations he has his flag. Whether it be sign, letter, banner, crown, or flag—they all reflect one spirit—the spirit of allegiance, sacrifice, and devotion to the standard that symbolizes the aspirations for which it stands.

Though we are an infant nation, our flag is older than the ensigns of most of the other great nations of the world. For over a century and a half it has waved over a progressive and free people. It is the symbol of a glorious past, of a precious present, and of a hopeful future. It not only guarantees rights but it also imposes duties. It demands as well as gives. It tells of struggle and sacrifice, of honor, loyalty, and devotion to all that is noble in man. The red in it stands for the precious blood shed by our unselfish and valorous forefathers on the gory fields of battle; the white in it signifies the purity of our purposes; the blue in it symbolizes the loyalty of an undivided allegiance of its citizens.

In Great Britain patriotism is centered in the Crown, which means the King. In America patriotism is centered in the flag, which is above and beyond any person or group of persons. Old Glory is America. It is the Constitution. It is the President, Congress, and the Supreme Court all wrapped up into one. It is more than that. It is 130,000,000 Americans who, in spite of individual differences and idiosyncrasies of character, are bound together in an indissoluble union. Beneath the divergences of individual opinion and the differences of individual thought there is a more fundamental unity of the interests and purposes of mankind. Like a big family we may quarrel among ourselves, but when attacked from without we are united and strong, determined and capable of repelling any foreign attack. Blood is thicker than water, and let the whole world understand that while we may differ among ourselves as to policy, there is no disagreement among us on great fundamentals. If America is ever attacked from without, woe be unto the aggressor. There is no division among us when it comes to defending our own country. We are divided only when we begin to police the world or take sides in foreign disputes.

My fellow Americans, we are living in strenuous and uncertain days. Many are the dangers that threaten us from without and from within. As one who loves his country and wants to protect it from all dangers, I do not wish to minimize the threat from without; neither do I want to overlook the dangers from within. While I realize the possibility of attack from abroad, I consider it very remote, and I fear much more our break-down within. Abraham Lincoln once said:

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth—our own excepted—in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years. * * *

"At what point, then, is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

It is also significant to know that years before the present war in Europe broke out, Edwin Markham, that prophetic genius and great poet, wrote:

"I fear the vermin that shall undermine
Senate and school and citadel and shrine;
The worm of fraud, the fatted worm of ease,
And all the crawling progeny of these
I fear the vermin that shall honeycomb the towers
And walls of state in unsuspecting hours."

We had better put our own house in order before we attempt to reform the world. We must make our country financially strong and economically sound within as well as invincible to any military attack from without. National defense depends upon morale as well as upon munitions.

The United States of America are many in one. Our life is made interesting by our variety and is made strong by our unity. Our country is big and broad but it is not spacious enough to hold any subversive elements and we do not want any royal refugees making America over. Liberty is not license. It has obligations to assume and duties to perform as well as rights to enjoy. Every man, woman, and child in this country is free to think, speak, and worship as his conscience dictates but no one is free to undermine either openly or surreptitiously our Constitution or to preach the false and foreign philosophy of overthrowing by force our established form of government.

Without pride of power, without lust of ambition, without desire for imperial dominion the United States wants to remain at peace and live in good will with all nations and to form alliances with none. We want to be honest with all the world but we must first make sure that we are honest with our own people and with ourselves. "This above all else, first to thine own self be true and it must follow as the night the day thou canst not then be false to any man." The greatest need in Washington at this hour is more truth and less trickery, more candor and less chicanery, more statesmanship and less showmanship. America must come not only first but also last and all the time. The pristine power and purity of patriotism must be perenially kept undiluted by rejecting all foreign isms and by constant and wholehearted allegiance to the Stars and Stripes. Our attention, thoughts, and prayers should be centered and riveted on our own flag and never diverted to that of any foreign land.

Fellow Americans, we are building two worlds in America today. One world is material with physical comforts—railroads, automobiles, radios, airplanes, and skyscrapers—a world of physical comforts and of scientific progress; a world in which time is annihilated and space is shattered. It is a marvelous world which has shortened distance, reduced time, and added to our comfort and happiness. We must go forward in it because we have reached only the beginning. The United States has not come to the setting of the sun but only arrived at the approaching dawn. Much more remains to be accomplished.

My friends, there is another world—a world which has been overlooked, shunned, sidestepped, and evaded. It is a spiritual world, a world of ideas and ideals, of hopes and of aspirations; a world of faith and brotherhood and cooperation; a world where men live together helping each other instead of destroying each other; a world of moral principles, ethical ideals, and religious convictions. Unless we build this latter world with the same fervor and stability as we do the former, we shall crash and go to pieces on the rocks of might, materialism, and money. If we are true to America, to the teachings of our fathers and our mothers, and set forth by example rather than by force the great goal to which a free Republic is destined, we shall really inherit the earth.

" 'Tis fine to see the Old World, and travel up and down
Among the famous palaces and cities of renown,
To admire the crumbly castles and the statues of the kings—
But now I think I've had enough of antiquated things.

"So it's home again, and home again, America for me!
My heart is turning home again, and there I long to be,
In the land of youth and freedom beyond the ocean bars,
Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars."

U. S. O.—Means Your Opportunity to Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO CALL-BULLETIN

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, entitled "U. S. O.—Means Your Opportunity to Serve."

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of June 7, 1941]

U. S. O. MEANS YOUR OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE

The American people, including those of us who live in the San Francisco Bay region,

are rapidly becoming familiar with a phase of the defense program which will ultimately affect everybody most intimately.

It is somewhat formally called the United Service Organizations for National Defense just now, but is already on most tongues as the U. S. O., an alphabetical combination which will soon be as common as U. S. A.

The purpose of U. S. O. is to provide recreation and entertainment for both men in uniform and workers in defense industries, and since there are millions of people in these categories the magnitude of the project is obvious.

Nationally, the activities of U. S. O. are going to require some $11,000,000 in public contributions as a starter, and an undetermined measure of public support thereafter as long as the emergency lasts.

Locally they are going to need $135,500 to get going, and proportionate contributions thereafter.

We should get the essential facts about this vital enterprise squarely in our minds at the very beginning.

Considering the uniformed services alone we must remember that we have already taken more than a million young men out of their normal environment and put them into training for defense of the Nation.

At the very least these boys are away from home and family and friends and nothing they find in camp makes up for that.

It is up to the communities in which they are stationed to make up for it as far as possible.

This means the expenditure of something more than money.

It means a systematic and perhaps even a sacrificial taking part in the programs and facilities provided.

This is not a charitable enterprise, to which the citizen can contribute a few dollars and consider the work done and forget about it.

It is a human enterprise, into which interest and sympathy and enthusiasm and neighborliness and friendliness must enter, if it is to mean anything at all.

We would much better leave the boys in uniform to their own devices than to set up so-called hospitality centers which the public shuns.

They want to meet people when they are on leave, the same decent, wholesome, friendly kind of people they knew in their home communities.

They want to be accepted into the life and spirit of the community and treated as if they belonged to it, and not as strangers.

The thing it is most important for us to remember is that if we isolate several million young Americans from our natural and normal community life now they may be permanently estranged from it and make this country pay a more disastrous price for defense than even war itself could exact.

If these millions of lonesome, homesick boys should ever get the idea that they have been shunted out of their ordinary relationships with the kind of people they have been accustomed to associating with they will be easy prey to another kind of people—those who substitute commercialized companionship and sordidness and vice for the decent things a responsible community should provide.

The U. S. O. has been conceived and is being established on the principle that the young men put in uniform are not the only ones with an opportunity and obligation to serve their country, but that certain very real and important patriotic duties are the responsibility and privilege of everybody.

That is why the Federal Government is making the support of U. S. O. a public and a voluntary enterprise. It could very easily put more taxes on the people, and thus provide a professional and artificial brand of entertainment and recreation for uniformed services. But that would build a fence between the services and the people which would shame us all, and might harm us all.

The right view of this matter for the American people to take is that when the boys in uniform are on leave the rest of us are on duty.

And in addition to being a patriotic duty, we will find it to be a very pleasant duty, because when the task of making fine, young Americans feel at home is well done it turns out to be a thoroughly cooperative and reciprocal relationship.

Strikes and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. LELAND M. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on June 12, 1941:

Many of us have noted, with great concern, the defiance of the United States Government, its duly authorized representatives, and its authority, by outlawed strikes carried on by communistic outlawed labor leaders, for it is a fact that in many instances these strikes are fomented and agitated by these communistic leaders. It is needless to draw your attention to the recent happenings, and headlines in the papers, where, out on the west coast, such men as O. M. Orton defied representatives of his own union, the O. P. M., the arbitration committee, the Government, and in fact, all authority. Again the same thing occurred under Freytag, of the C. I. O. union in the North American Aviation Corporation strike. There are other instances, outstanding among them the activities and operations of the notorious Harry Bridges.

Defiance of all authority at this time, by such leaders, in my opinion constitutes nothing short of treason, sabotage, and revolution. This is certainly giving aid and comfort to Hitler and his gang. This certainly means partial destruction, or if some of these men have their way, total destruction of the national-defense program of the United States, and if let to go on, destruction of our form of government.

If we have not been misled by the administration on the necessity for national defense, and I believe we have not, then the matter of the time element in production is one of the greatest considerations in our defense plan, particularly with reference to aviation.

What do we now find? We find open war declared upon the United States by these communistic leaders, for on October 24, 1938, the Dies committee identified this man Orton as a Communist from Aberdeen, Wash. Now, Elmer J. Freytag, who is head of the United Automobile Workers Union at the North American plant, admitted under oath, just a short time ago, here in Washington, that he was a registered Communist.

Many of us, day after day, and for months, have cautioned the administration and the country at large against the socialistic, communistic outlaw leadership that has been present in many of the C. I. O. unions. Our protests have been waved aside, but it has now come about that we are proven correct in our statements and that these subversive groups have openly declared their war on the United States Government and its defense program. As I have repeatedly stated, we might just as well recognize that the first war the United States will have is from within, and against these communistic leaders who are promoting treason, and inciting riot, revolution, and war against our Government. Under the leadership of this communistic Freytag and others, in the city of Inglewood, Calif., sound trucks with radios and banners, parades, etc., were used to whip the honest workmen into a frenzy of riot, treason, and revolution, in an attempt to sabotage the defense program. These workmen connected with this were not told the whole truth, but were being passed only the word that the Communist Party line wanted them to receive.

There is no question in my mind but that the rank and file of the workmen are honest, patriotic men, who will do their duty if permitted to do so, the same as all other good Americans. Many of these men have not been led, but misled, not informed, but misinformed. Many have been forced into their positions against their will through threats of personal injury, beatings, broken bodies, and threats of injury to their families. My heart goes out to the honest workman who has been the victim of such conditions, and who has had to pay "through the nose," the price in money and self-respect, for his job, in order that his family might eat and be cared for.

This was only a beginning because it was scheduled to happen in not only all other airplane plants, but in all other industries in the United States, if these treasonable, communistic leaders had their way.

It is my opinion that this is a "fifth-column" activity, that the word has been passed down through these subversive representatives from foreign countries, that specifically the airplane-defense program of this country must be destroyed. They do not care how it is destroyed, what means are used to destroy it, whether it be undercover war in the form of sabotage and destruction, or open war. The program they wish to accomplish is to destroy it by any means.

When we draft the young manhood of this country, pay them $21 a month, restrict every move in their lives, tell them what to eat, when to eat, what to wear, when to get up, when to go to bed, and don't give them any such protection as N. L. R. B. or Wagner Act regulations, and these same young men patriotically accept these conditions, it is a sad commentary to have to make what these subversive groups in this country, who are so treasonable and unpatriotic in their rackets, refuse to furnish these same patriotic men in the Army the means and material to defend their country. That is a sad commentary, but let me tell you that these men in the Army, and the remainder of the 130,000,000 Americans, who are back of them, are not going to stand for any such program and set of conditions. These conditions must be changed immediately, and I believe the start toward that change has come.

There is no question in my mind but that the first war the United States must win is this war against this subversive, communistic group of outlaw leaders.

No one wants American industry or labor to work for a wage that is not a decent living wage, commensurate and adequate with what is known as a high American standard of living, and this is not the fight. Neither is the fight with the rank and file of men who do the real work. The fight is against the socialistic, communistic, racketeering outlaws, who have moved in from their other businesses; the same group who have never done

any honest labor themselves, but have always lived off the efforts of those whom they could promote, either legally or illegally, and mislead. This type of traitorous, treasonable, communistic outlaw labor leader should immediately be placed in concentration camps or penitentiaries; and they should feel lucky, when they receive only this penalty, that they are not in some foreign country which would give them that which they have so richly earned and deserve, the firing squad.

What are we going to do about all this? You received part of the answer this week, from the United States Government represented by the President, when the Federal Government had to move into the North American Aviation Co. plant at Inglewood, occupy it and furnish protection to those honest workmen who were willing and asking to work, and whom I believe to be in the majority. I believe the great majority of the American workmen are loyal, patriotic, and willing to do their job.

It is not my desire, nor do I believe it to be the desire of either business or labor, that the Federal Government occupy and permanently operate these plants, or any of our industry in this country. We all saw what happened to France under permanent government ownership and operation, the same that has happened in all countries wherever it has been tried. It failed. But I do believe the permanent solution lies in what would be equivalent to martial law, to take possession and occupy, temporarily, such plants, in order to protect the plants themselves and those who wish to work in them and carry out our defense program.

The reason I make this statement is that, to me, permanent Government occupancy and operation would be the nationalizing of business and labor, and this would be a form of socialism or communism that 90 percent of our people, at least, do not want.

I further believe that the answer to this situation is simple and not at all complicated and can be carried out by the President of the United States telling these communistic outlaw labor leaders, who after all, represent a very small minority, that the day of treason, sabotage, and revolution is over; that while it is recognized, under the Constitution of the United States, that this Government will not put these men to forced labor, by that same Constitution they shall not interfere with the rights of other citizens to work if they want to, and complete the defense program of the United States; and that if it takes the combined forces of the Army, Navy, and Marines, and all that we have, to make these plants safe to work in, safe for the owners, and to consummate our defense program and restore order, the President will use them to do these things. These principles under the Constitution of the United States will then become effective and will be enforced.

I believe that if the Government took over permanently the occupation and operation of these plants, the final results would be, of course, socialism or communism, but in addition to this, that part of industry and business, as well as that part of patriotic labor who have cooperated, would be penalized for their cooperation, and a premium would be given to those communistic outlaw leaders who did not cooperate, because the eventual program of these subversive leaders is to cause this very thing, namely, nationalization of business and Government ownership in the accomplishment of their final program—socialism or communism.

In view of all these things, I hope that this Government will clean out of all Government positions those fellow travelers, Communists, and those who have any connection with the preachment of a doctrine that would destroy this country.

I hope, also, that this Government will clean out those officials occupying high position, who have hidden behind the skirts of moral cowardice when they bowed to, and gave in to, these subversive interests, which, in fact, is acquiescence in their program. It should be pointed out to these officials that there is a vast difference between that which constitutes moral cowardice and that which constitutes real diplomacy. It is now time that all officials do their duty by the 130,000,000 people in this country.

The Interior Department Appropriation Bill for 1942, As Amended by the Senate, Affecting Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to explain amendments by the Senate to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill (H. R. 4590) affecting the Bureau of Reclamation's construction program.

The questions which have been suggested are intelligent, sound, and the House is entitled to a frank and unequivocal outline of the proposals. It is also entitled to know what the conditions are that make this program imperative and what results will follow.

In the interest of brevity I shall take up the major proposals by appropriate groupings.

First. Your attention is directed to the amendments 91 and 97 on pages 90 and 91, which will speed power for vital national-defense industries on the Pacific coast. The Central Valley and Grand Coulee projects are looked to to meet deficiencies which threaten to thwart the country's efforts to protect itself. Power shortages, which the Office of Production Management finds place the Nation in a critical position, can be met only by speeding work on such projects as Shasta Dam, Grand Coulee, and other projects named in this bill and its amendments.

I also point to the contribution Boulder Dam is making to national defense in power supplies for the Pacific southwest as an example of the foresight which has made reclamation the backbone of the first line of our bulwarks in the West—power. We have already provided funds to complete Parker Dam, which will begin producing power in December. We now propose to start Bullshead Dam, already approved by the House for construction, on the Colorado River to further supplement our power needs.

It is not only on the West coast that reclamation power is being called to the colors. The Anderson Ranch project in Idaho and the Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado (amendments 92, 93, and 102) have power features it is proposed to expedite in order to meet needs in the intermountain region.

This is an appropriate time to give emphasis to the multiple-purpose of reclamation project construction. Central Valley project, for instance, will provide also supplemental water and other service which will benefit 2,000,000 acres. It will provide flood control, navigation benefits, and protect wildlife. Grand Coulee's vast expanse of waste land will be transformed into individual family-size farms which will relieve the pressure on the population of the West.

Anderson Ranch and Colorado-Big Thompson, like Central Valley, will rescue large areas where crop shortages are depressing purchasing power as a result of water shortages. I cite these as examples of the manifold blessings which flow from the program I am laying before you.

One of the strongest arguments for reclamation is that it serves the Nation in normal times as well as in the preparation for defense. Every dollar on power in connection with irrigation developments is an investment for the conservation of our resources. It will be returned many times over in lower power costs, in enhanced purchasing power, self-sustaining homes, and in other permanent results.

The second group of objectives covered by this bill and the Senate amendments revolve around employment and homes where farm and other families, now on relief, can become self-sustaining. The comprehensive report of the committee on interstate migration headed by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] focused national attention on the needs for irrigation in the Great Plains, the Intermountain, and the Pacific regions.

You are no doubt familiar with the recommendations of this committee, which has made a distinct contribution to the solution of a problem that is both heart-rending and expensive. This committee urgently recommends irrigation projects of the type proposed in this program which will give maximum employment and at the same time anchor families where they can be permanently self-sustaining.

It is true that in a few cities on the Pacific coast and that in a spot here and there elsewhere in the West, defense industries are absorbing most of the unemployed in their immediate areas. But you can count on the fingers of your two hands the points where work has been made available.

The President recently emphasized that there are sections of the country not reached by defense employment. The great expanse lying west of the one hundredth meridian has fewer industries perhaps than any other section of the country.

The problem of unemployment in this area has been greatly aggravated. The great droughts of the thirties uprooted 350,000 families in the Great Plains and drove them from pillar to post in that region until most of them fled westward. They sought irrigated land or employment for a fresh start. Neither was available. Those who remain in the Plains are confronted by conditions almost as severe as those in the last decade.

A large part of the 2,000,000 increase in population in the Mountain and Pacific

States in the decade was due to migrations of farmless and other families from the Great Plains and other sections. The population expansion, by the way, was twice the national rate and the resultant conditions had national repercussions.

The Federal Government in the 8 years ending June 30 next will have spent nearly $3,000,000,000 in a futile but necessary effort to cope with the problem of unemployment in the 17 States of the arid and semiarid area. I do not suggest that reclamation could have saved all of this huge outlay, but I call attention to the fact that the amount is more than 10 times the total cost of all reclamation projects now in operation over a period of 39 years.

The distressing feature of this situation is that the westward surge of migrants from the Great Plains is not ended. Jewell County, Kans., reports a loss of nearly 200 families from 1940 to 1941. Most of these groups moved westward in the vain hope of a chance to return to the soil.

To aid in stemming the exodus of farm families from the Great Plains and similar areas, Senate amendment 102, on page 94, proposes to increase by $1,500,000 the amount of reimbursable funds for irrigation projects of the Wheeler-Case type. You will recall that these projects provide work for W. P. A. and C. C. C. labor on permanent construction.

To the westward, outside of the few spots where there are defense industries, the situation is even more complicated. Reports show there are perhaps 175,000 families with farm background eking out an existence until they can get permanent settlement opportunities.

An equally critical situation confronts many established agricultural areas confronted by shortages of irrigation water. Here it has been estimated there are 85,000 farm families facing desolation.

The Senate proposals, through amendments on pages 83 and 84, and 90, 91, 92, and 93, seek to speed the day when we can provide effective remedies for the conditions I have sketchily described.

For years we have been trying to complete 20 reclamation projects with appropriations from the so-called reclamation revolving fund. Due to our praiseworthy conservation policy, receipts in this fund from the sale of public land have dwindled, until it is wholly inadequate for the purpose for which it was created. At the present rate of appropriations it will take 15 or 20 years to complete some of these projects.

In the meantime, the Government's investment in these projects of more than $120,000,000 is frozen and not working as it should in the local or national interests. One of these projects was started in 1906, and I insist 35 years is entirely too long for an undertaking of this kind to come into its full usefulness.

To meet these conditions, here is what the Senate proposes to do with these projects:

First. Seven projects are transferred for construction from the reclamation to the general fund. In addition to the amounts approved by this House, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to incur contract obligations of $7,450,000, which will be in the interest of economy and economical construction.

Among the projects transferred are Colorado-Big Thompson, in Colorado, and Anderson Ranch, in Idaho, which I have previously mentioned in connection with power and supplemental needs. These two projects, with the Provo River project in Utah, will provide supplemental water for nearly 900,000 acres of land and provide security for 12,000 or 15,000 families. Other projects will offer settlement opportunities for migrant and other families already in the West.

Second. The remaining 13 projects will receive increased appropriations from the reclamation fund. All of them are in areas where the population pressure makes it especially desirable that families now on relief be given opportunities to get back on the land.

Since all of these funds are reimbursable, I submit it is nothing more than good business to complete these projects more rapidly. The sooner this is done, the quicker returns will start; the greater will be the permanent reductions in the drain on the Federal Treasury for relief.

All told, from 25,000 to 30,000 families will be benefited by this move. It has been demonstrated that each irrigated farm supports 2 or more families in nearby cities and towns.

The balanced employment, which will follow these speeded activities, will be geared so as not to interfere with defense priorities. More than 60,000 men on an annual basis will be given work in the program as a whole at the sites of construction, and nearly twice that number will receive work in the extraction of raw materials and in the processing and transportation of supplies and equipment.

By this recital I feel I have shown the need for moving the reclamation program forward with all the speed possible. When all of the projects provided for in this bill are completed, the results achieved can be summarized as follows:

Self-sustaining irrigated farms will be provided for 40,000 to 50,000 families on some 2,500,000 acres of land.

Eighty-five thousand farm families now facing water shortages will be made secure and many established communities will be saved.

Twenty thousand to twenty-five thousand farm families in the Great Plains or similar areas, who otherwise will be forced to migrate, will be anchored in their present localities.

In the cities and towns dependent on irrigation developments, employment opportunities for a quarter of a million families will be heightened.

Purchasing power will be created and maintained which will offset to a large extent the loss of foreign markets.

Federal relief expenditures in the benefited areas will be reduced if not entirely eliminated.

Property and taxpaying values, worth many times the amount of reimbursable funds invested, will be created or maintained.

Low-cost hydroelectric power will not only serve defense industries but will be available for development and expansion of the West under normal conditions.

With the achievement of these objectives advanced by this bill as it passed this House and accelerated by the Senate amendments, we might well rest on our oars if times were normal. But we must look ahead.

Some weeks ago the President called attention to the need when the present emergency is over for a reservoir or shelf of public works projects, which can be quickly launched to absorb ex-workers in defense industries and returning soldiers. The Senate proposes to take time by the forelock and provide the Bureau of Reclamation with an additional million dollars for investigations of feasible reclamation projects.

From the record of this organization, we can be assured that it will present no undertaking that does not meet the high standards the Congress has set in existing legislation and which will contribute to the welfare and stability of the West and the Nation at large.

The conference report on the Interior appropriations bill will shortly be filed in this body for appropriate action. I trust the membership will give serious and thoughtful consideration to it, as your conferees have done, and that it will meet with approval. By adopting the conference report, insofar as it affects reclamation, we will place reclamation on a firm basis, where it can move forward at a rate consistent with the national welfare.

We must ever be mindful of the fact that the western half of our great Nation depends for its successful existence upon reclamation. Reclamation is an activity with definite limits fixed by the available water supply, and we will never be able to irrigate more than perhaps 15,000,000 acres of additional lands. All this new work, as well as that in progress, will reimburse the Federal Treasury for all advances, as it has done in the past, and at the same time, insure this Nation in its present and future greatness.

Clarence Streit, False Front for British-Born "Union Now," Admits There Is Danger Ahead

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

ARTICLE BY LILLIAN SCOTT TROY IN SAN FRANCISCO LEADER

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an article, "Union Now Trembles," by Lillian Scott Troy, published April 5, 1941, in the San Francisco Leader:

[From the San Francisco Leader]

"UNION NOW" TREMBLES

(By Lillian Scott Troy)

In addition to using the dubious services of Maggie-Jiggs social luminaries of dim

intelligence among the fair sex in sponsoring the British-Carnegie-Rhodes transparent intrigue to obtain signatures of American citizens to be presented to Congress to prove that the citizens of the United States are ashamed of their nationality and their flag and desire to come under the cloak of the British Empire in a "union," the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace stands godfather for one item of the opposite sex in the form of Clarence Streit Rhodes scholar and alleged author of the book Union Now.

According to the Carnegie Yearbook of 1940, the organization admits financing this unfortunate man in regard to investing in hundreds of copies of his book and placing them in public libraries of the United States. To quote from the Carnegie publication indicated above, we find page 57:

"In addition to the copies of the book Union Now, by Clarence Streit, sent to the International Relations Clubs, the division placed 400 copies in public libraries and sent over 1,000 copies to carefully selected editors and newspapers and journalists in the United States and Canada, asking that they review the book upon its merits. The response to the distribution was widespread and gave added impetus to public thought on the subject treated by Mr. Streit."

That the list of editors was carefully selected we have no doubt—and how we would appreciate having an opportunity to peruse that list. Alas!

The headquarters of Union Now as, as may have been expected, at Union House, 445 West Twenty-third Street, New York City, if one is not too inquisitive; but to those on the "inside" of the plot, the real headquarters are in London, England.

It was to these headquarters that Mr. Streit sent a radiogram at the request of Federal Union, London, in which he whistled to keep up his own courage—yet displayed his fear in the following words:

DANGER CANNOT HALT US

What danger is anticipated by Mr. Streit? Not from the British, nor from the New Deal, nor from the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace, nor the committee once headed by Mr. William Allen White to defend the United States by giving all aid to the British. Then wherein lies the danger for this Rhodes scholar among the citizens of the United States if he is living and working in loyalty to this land of ours and our citizens? That he anticipates plenty of trouble we may infer from his further words in the radiogram:

"Nothing shall blow out the candle we have lit. The storm shall make its light only brighter."

Storm is the word, Mr. Streit; and you will learn to know just what a storm is when the American people find out what you and your backers have been up to in this treacherous Union Now, or plot. You will run before it, and the wade-out retreat of your friends from Dunkirk will be but a splash in shallow water compared to your leaps and bounds for the nearest border—when the Americans wake up. That you are afraid is evident, and before many moons you may find yourself in competition with those tall and slender aspens which live in the high places—and quake all their lives.

With the usual brass this man assures his colleagues in London that "Already more than 2,000,000 American voters favor Federal Union with you," etc. But with that unescapable display of fear he says, "We enter now a more dangerous year." Yes, it is danger with a vengeance, and we are glad to know that Mr. Streit and his colleagues in London know just what he is doing—and all about the danger.

In London the official organ of this gang is World Review. This publication is a monthly, and the joint editors are Mr. Vernon Bartlett, Member of Parliament, and an expert on foreign affairs, and a close friend of Mr. Clarence Streit; the other editor is Mr. John Sutro.

To those who knew and respected the late William T. Stead, editor of the English Review of Reviews, who was lost in the *Titanic* disaster, it is sorrowful to learn that his publication has been absorbed by World Review of the Union Now adventurers. Mr. Stead broke with Cecil Rhodes' foundation when he learned that the basic idea of Rhodes' scheme was the reconquest of the United States as an "integral part of the British Empire," by treason and intrigue, and betrayal. Mr. Stead often spoke to me of his hope that the United States would "come back" to the British Empire; and invariably I told him this was a distasteful suggestion to an American, and that my people would fight any such suggestion as they would any other kind of treason to their country. Mr. Stead edged away from the conspirators when he learned of the inside of the plan. He broke with Cecil Rhodes; and he counseled of the peril to the British Empire were any such foolhardy "exploration" undertaken seriously by the British Government.

When Mr. Stead found that I had come into possession of the schedule of this plot and intended to publish it in the United States in 1909, he took great trouble and pains to convince me that such publication would ruin my reputation in journalism because the schedule was so "absurd." That was true. Who, reading at that remote time that the power of the President of the United States was to be increased, and Congress abolished, would respect the correspondent who claimed that this absurd statement was factual? And who would give heed to another "point" in the schedule that the Supreme Court of the United States was to be packed?

Or that our naval units, such as the 50 destroyers, were to be placed in British possession? And that professors and educators who were known as loyal Americans and honorable men were to be shunted out of one university and college and school, one after the other, to make way for men who would, under the protection of the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace, write new histories of the United States in which even General Washington would be defamed, and other heroes of our grand and wonderful early history be held up to American students as men to be scorned and despised. All this was truly absurd in 1909; but as many of the points of the schedule of destruction for the United States came to my attention in England, where I lived as a journalist for over 10 years, and I began to see the attention given to the project by members of the British Government, I decided to do my best to have the points of this schedule or plan published in 1912; and it was the San Francisco Leader, for which I am writing this article today, that published the whole plot, and the points, in two articles in February of that year—29 long years ago.

All attempts to have this treachery exposed to view by congressional action has failed. After years of effort the Hearst press made a good start, and followed this up with an illuminating editorial in which pertinent reference was made to the destructive work of the "dead hand" of Andrew Carnegie and his anti-American foundation; but, after a bright beginning, the Hearst papers abandoned the fight and retreated into a silence which has not been broken since that time.

Histories, like that of one Bernhard Knollenberg, published this year in New York, cast unworthy slurs on the Father of Our Country and his generals. Washington's weaknesses and failings are held up to view, and Knollenberg claims that it was a trait of Washington's character to "shift responsibility for his errors to others," etc.

Slander, treason, intimidation of people who have stood fast to beat down these hired slanderers, and the employment of such men as Streit—the timorous specimen who feels the danger so keenly in his rabbit soul that he has to send radiograms about it to his colleagues in London—is the shadow-box display of ways and means which the intriguers have selected to destroy the American Nation. To obtain signatures of innocent old ladies and others devoted to peace for all the world, the Streitists have opened over 700 offices all over the United States and placed them, for the most part, in the hands of women for the purpose of obtaining signatures to a petition to Congress to be presented to that body as an evidence of the desires of our citizens for Union Now, as a member of a supergovernment which would bring about universal peace.

It is not to be assumed that the men who have been spending millions to bring about this degradation for the United States would take all of these women into the secret; and the instructions given the women prove that a goodly number of them have no suspicion of the truth. The menial and servile complexes of some of these enthusiasts may be blamed in some measure for their employment in such a venture. Back of each local center for the distribution of the poison petitions may be found a guiding spirit, generally a man who operates from behind the skirts of ignorant Maggie-Jiggs complexed women; and occasionally the bureau is under the direction of a woman.

If it is true that over 2,000,000 American voters are in favor of Union Now, as Mr. Streit has cabled his London office, then each and every voter has a splendid case for action against Streit and his backers for fraudulent representation; and the old ladies at his Union Now offices, collecting American voters' signatures to sell out the United States to Great Britain, also have a sound case against him for misrepresentation to themselves, and another for the ignominy and shame which their connection with this organization will cast upon their descendants for decades to come. Any other organization, person, or group supporting Mr. Streit's fake peace project, and contributing to the degradation of American voters, or volunteers for the furtherance of Union Now, likewise is legally responsible. If some of the sons of the old ladies who are culling signatures from other old ladies for something which is known to be disloyal to the United States would combine to make a test case of Streit's use of their mothers and maiden aunts, some interesting sprinting for other lands might be witnessed which would place the Norwegian and Dunkirk routs in a most inferior rank for pure speed.

The Carnegie Year Book for 1940, a copy of which is generally to be found in our large public libraries, speaks with glee of their "international alcoves" in each library, and the fact that librarians cooperate to lure the public to patronize the books allocated to the alcoves—most of which are on the subject of how fine it would be for this country to join the British Empire; and publications like Mr. Clarence Streit's "Union Now" disclosure. The life of Washington will be found missing from these alcoves, in its place may be found works on what distinguished British officers and English gentlemen think of the States and the people of the States—as our Nation is called by the Britons.

Among them being the lurid America's Peril by P. A. Vaile, who states, "The carrion-eating vulture would have suited Americans quite as well as an emblem of liberty as the eagle."

And with the Right Honorable Winston Churchill still holding on to his control in Great Britain on the "needling" promise to his people of the Americans coming over to save Britain, it is grim to find that the British author's opinion of American manhood has

been delineated in the following words: "Men in America are effeminate looking. They are a mixture of poodle dog and girl."

Long live the Republic of the United States.

Wooden Merchant Shipbuilding Imperative

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 I addressed the House in favor of an all-out wooden merchant shipbuilding program to meet the needs of Great Britain and our own coastwise shipping. I pointed out the fact that thus far the United States Maritime Commission and the Bureau of Ships, United States Navy, have limited the program almost entirely to steel construction and that we now face a steel shortage according to the latest report of Mr. Gano Dunn, senior consultant in the production division of the O. P. M. Steel is needed for tooling, machinery, armor plate for battleships, heavy armament, and munitions, and, it now appears, for petroleum pipe lines. This is all the more reason why we should utilize wood for our merchant shipbuilding, of which we have a plentiful supply. If we had started a wooden shipbuilding program a year ago, when I first advocated it to officials in charge, we would not now be suffering so acutely from the lack of bottoms which is a serious handicap to Great Britain and ourselves.

A few days ago Secretary of the Navy Knox said that we need to perform a "miracle" in shipbuilding, so critical is the situation caused by the loss of British shipping. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we are capable of performing "miracles"—the record of the past year hardly indicates that—but it is not too late to exercise hard-headed common sense in furthering our shipbuilding program. When I spoke on this subject last week I referred to the achievements in wooden-ship building in the Pacific Northwest in the last World War and drew attention to the fact that our idle wooden-ship yards and ship carpenters and mechanics in that region are ready, able, and willing to do an equally good job to meet the present emergency.

In 1917 President Woodrow Wilson called upon the shipbuilders of the Nation to "span the Atlantic with a bridge of wooden ships." They responded so magnificently to the President's call that historians have declared that the speed and effectiveness with which they acted contributed more than any other single factor to the defeat of Germany in 1918. History can and will repeat itself if our wooden-ship builders are again given the opportunity to serve our country and our democratic allies.

Mr. Speaker, my previous remarks have received wide news and editorial comment throughout the country, and I have also received many interesting and constructive communications. Every expression which has come to my attention has been favorable and I have not seen or heard of any adverse criticism. One of the most illuminating letters which I have received is from my own State and written by an experienced shipbuilder who formerly was located in my own district, Mr. G. F. Matthews, now a resident of Seattle. I quote from Mr. Matthews' air-mail letter to me of June 3:

Representative MARTIN F. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: The local papers have printed several articles in regard to the revival of wood-ship building.

The Seattle Times had an article stating that you had addressed the House June 2, making the prediction that there will be a shortage of steel for shipbuilding, and the Government should construct wood-built vessels, thereby increase ship tonnage.

You remember that I operated a shipyard in your home town, and believe I have an experience that only a few men have; consequently, I will volunteer to explain to you some of my views.

There is no question regarding steel being the most practical and economic material for ship construction, particularly for large vessels. However, the present war has proved that even the greatest type of steel constructed ships are destructible, namely, the *Hood* and *Bismarck*. Any amount of ships, airplanes, and oil will be required to stop this world's greatest menace—war.

Several types of wood-constructed vessels could be designed and built that would give valuable service to both England and the Americas during the gigantic struggle to stop this war.

One type would be a vessel for carrying lumber cargoes, which would be practical and serve a special purpose. For instance, I built a number of steam schooners for the coastwise lumber trade. Many of these vessels were successfully operated during the last war in other trades, South America, east coast, Gulf, and West Indies. Cargoes consisted of lumber, nitrates, sugar, hardwoods, ore, coal, and miscellaneous. A number of this type were sold in Europe.

My idea would be to build a number of that type of vessel, modern and with a capacity of 2,000 M feet of fir lumber equipped with twin-screw 750 horsepower Washington Iron Works Diesel engines, a vessel that would be practical and economical to operate in special trades, thereby relieving the steel ship for more important trade routes.

Lumber, cut in British Columbia, is shipped by rail to the Atlantic Coast, then transported to England by steamers. A shortage of vessels creates a bottleneck for those mills and loggers. The vessel I briefly described could transport the lumber cheaper and allow the steel steamers to carry general cargoes.

Another type of motorship could be built for general cargo, capacity 3,000 tons, and would be a very suitable vessel in numerous trades, such as "feeder ships" to domestic ports and the Western Hemisphere countries.

About 1932 the wooden motorship *North Star* was built here for a supply ship to operate to Alaska, for the Department of the Interior. The Government allowed the vessel to make two trips to the Antarctic for the Byrd expedition, carrying men and supplies. This vessel has been very successful and the Navy is now operating said vessel as a supply ship on the Atlantic Coast. No doubt the Navy could use a number of such vessels if they were available. In the meantime, the Government is compelled to pay existing freight rates to transport supplies to Alaska, also, new bases in both oceans, and will be forced to continue this unless something is done about it.

I, for one, have no desire to see our Government open up on extensive, costly, and wasteful shipbuilding program, like the one established during the other war. However, I believe a conservative program should be started at once, otherwise it may prove to be neglectful.

Every type of vessel is in demand now, and the war demands are increasing beyond all expectations. Less that 2 years ago one of the Government officials visited the west coast and made the remark that we had enough shipyards. His remarks discouraged all possibilities at that time of the establishing of a shipyard then under consideration. His vision was decidedly wrong, little did he realize what the future would bring and the same thing can happen again.

It is not particularly one kind of ship that is so all important now, but the objective is to get the ships, no matter how you get them, and be sure to get enough. That is what is going to count the most before this destructive war is ended.

It is true we have not the number of shipyard mechanics now for building wood ships that we had in 1917 and 1918 and the long timbers are not so plentiful either. However, 8 or 10 modern yards could be established in Washington and Oregon, organizations formed, local sawmills to manufacture the lumber and vessels built. The industry would create an important addition to the defense program now going forward.

In the President's recent address he mentioned the alarm for ships. No doubt the officials responsible for the shipbuilding program will oppose your views in regard to wood-built ships, and may I suggest that your take your plan to President Roosevelt, then you will learn his views.

It is a fact that the enormous amount of wood-ship tonnage constructed in this country during the other war played an important part in the breaking down of the German resistance.

Some of our friends on the harbor have made suggestions to me in regard to establishing a shipyard there. This could be done providing Government work could be awarded. It is impossible to get private capital interested in building vessels for the lumber trade, owing to labor conditions in operating vessels and prevailing uncertainties.

Will be pleased to hear from you when convenient, stating your progress on the wood-ship building program.

With kind personal regards,

Yours very respectfully,

G. F. MATTHEWS.

I will also quote from some of the editorials which have been published in southwest Washington newspapers.

On June 3 the Longview Daily News made this comment:

SMITH SUPPORTED

Here in the timber country we're ready to argue the merits of wood any time, and therefore should back up Congressman SMITH'S assertion that the Government should build some wooden merchant ships, inasmuch as a shortage of steel seems imminent. Wooden-hulled steamers may not be the equal of steel ships in some respects, but they have been sailing the seas for a long time and do a pretty good job. And a steel merchant hull won't stop a torpedo any better than solid planking. Many improvements have been

made in methods of preserving wood and in wood construction, so it ought to be possible to build better wooden ships now than ever before.

On the same date the Kelsonian Tribune, of Kelso, said:

SHOULD BUILD WOODEN SHIPS

With the defense needs for steel exceeding the supply and growing enormously every day, construction of wooden cargo vessels appears a logical solution for the shipping problem, which is rapidly becoming acute not only for Great Britain but for coastal areas of the United States.

Congressman MARTIN SMITH has been urging such a program for months but has received little heed in governmental circles, which apparently failed to see the approaching shortages of steel and a good many other materials as clearly as did our district's Congressman.

Wooden ships can be built with great speed, as was shown in World War days, and material will be used that is not required for other defense programs.

They are also cheaper than steel vessels, and the loss would not be as great when a submarine or bomber sends one to the bottom.

As was true of the wooden vessels that were built in World War days, they would probably prove impractical when normal trade conditions are restored after the war, but so will the slow-speed-type cargo vessels to be built in the largest Portland yard and other yards throughout the Nation.

The following editorial appeared in the Aberdeen Daily World on June 5, 1941:

WOODEN SHIPS

Congressman MARTIN F. SMITH said before the House of Representatives the other day, "There is no reason why merchant ships should be constructed exclusively of steel." He urged construction of wooden ships and the utilization of the idle wooden-ship yards of the Pacific Northwest.

If an emergency means the time element is important there is a very good reason why cargo ships should not be built exclusively of steel. Metal ships are slow in building. Wooden ships can be turned out in a fraction of the time. Steel ships drain our already overtaxed steel supply and capacity to supply. Steel is sorely needed in armaments; wood is not. Steel workers are scarce, but every maritime community in the Northwest has old shipwrights skilled in the building of wooden vessels. There are number of yards already available, but if new yards are needed they can be built in a matter of weeks. Machinery for the fashioning of wooden ships is available in any sawmill town. Raw material is on hand in any log boom. Steel must be mined, smelted, rolled, and cast, and prepared for ships in a long, tedious process.

There may be some argument on the size of wooden ships that can be constructed, perhaps some argument on their fuel capacity in relation to cargo capacity, but there are not insurmountable objections. Wooden ships last a long time; surely they would outlast the present emergency. And they would have this advantage, a German submarine commander would think twice before wasting an expensive torpedo on a small wooden vessel slogging her way to England.

Moreover, wooden-ship building has been resumed on a large scale in New England, where old yards have been renovated and new ones built, and all humming with activity. Even the Navy is turning to these yards and a New Orleans plant is turning out fast motor torpedo boats made of wood plastic and plywood. But nowhere is there a section more suited and more ready for wooden ship construction than Grays Harbor. We built them in the last war and should in this.

Mr. R. H. Calkins, marine editor of the Seattle Times, wrote the following article which was published on June 2:

WOODEN-SHIP REVIVAL URGED

Seattle's wooden-ship building industry, which reached its peak during the World War days, may be revived.

Representative MARTIN SMITH, Democrat of Washington, in an address in the House today, reiterated his prediction of a steel shortage and urged construction of wooden merchant ships in yards of the Pacific Northwest, the Associated Press reported.

During the World War wooden freighters were built in Seattle and other Pacific Northwest ports for General Pershing's bridge of ships.

"There is no reason why merchant ships should be constructed exclusively of steel," SMITH said, adding:

"We should immediately utilize the idle wooden-ship yards of the Pacific Northwest, where the raw materials are plentiful and the idle ship carpenters and mechanics are ready to go to work and assist in turning out the ships which are needed so sorely."

"May be decisive factor"

Merchant shipping is becoming even a more important factor in the present war than in the World War and "it may prove the decisive factor," he said.

A year ago, SMITH said, he told officials of the National Defense Council, the Office of Production Management, and the Maritime Commission, that the supply of steel was not adequate for ship construction.

SMITH said his statements "were clearly discounted and I was given to understand that there was no possibility of a steel shortage and no serious thought was being given to any extensive wooden-ship building program."

"The United States Maritime Committee and the Bureau of Ships, United States Navy, have restricted their shipbuilding activity almost entirely to steel construction, and there has been little or no wooden construction," he continued.

Steel demands mount

"In the meantime, the demands for steel for munitions have been enormous—and we are hardly started—until it is now becoming a recognized fact that we will soon be facing a serious shortage of steel, the very condition which I pointed out last summer and last autumn and this spring was likely to occur."

There is "no method of undoing what has already been done," said Smith, "but we can turn around and get headed in the right direction on this shipbuilding program. There is no reason why merchant ships should be constructed exclusively of steel.

"The logical and most effective method of successfully meeting the U-boat challenge and preparing ourselves for the future, is an all-out shipbuilding program."

Mr. Speaker, our duty in regard to this momentous matter is clearly marked. Every sound consideration impels our Government to undertake and encourage at once an all-out wooden-merchant-ship building program in every section of our country in which the necessary lumber and skilled labor await utilization. In my own congressional district we have the communities of Shelton, Longview, Grays Harbor, Vancouver, Willapa Harbar, and Olympia, in which such a program can and should be carried on speedily and vigorously. The Macedonian call is for "ships, ships, and more ships." We can supply them. To hesitate any longer to do so is to betray the very cause to which we stand committed. To further delay the program is to place in jeopardy the very victory over the enemy which we are all so anxious and eager to achieve in the briefest possible period of time.

MEMORANDUM OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SHIPPING CRISIS

June 3: The German high command reported today that the German Navy and air force destroyed 746,000 tons of British merchant shipping space in May.

By contrast, London Admiralty declared British merchant shipping losses in April totalled 488,124 tons—more than half the German figure.

Since the beginning of the war, German sea and air units have destroyed a total of 11,664,000 tons of British shipping, the Germans claim.

British merchant tonnage at the outset of the war was estimated at about 21,000,000 tons. British figures on Allied shipping losses through April total approximately 6,000,000 tons.

The newspaper Boersen Zietung, commenting on these figures, said Britain thus had lost during 21 months of the war as much shipping as English shipyards were able to construct in 11 years of peace.

Scoffing at the idea Britain's need for ships could be filled by the United States in time to save her from defeat, the paper declared that according to English figures only 27 vessels totaling 221,000 tons were launched in American shipyards during the past 4 months.

The American Bureau of Shipping in New York recently announced figures showing the launching and delivery of 27 vessels of 221,000 tons up to May 1 this year, compared with 16 ships of 107,280 tons in the same period of 1940.

This new construction, it was pointed out, is only one-third of Britain's reported shipping losses for May alone—estimated by the German high command at 746,000 tons. Dienst aus Deutschland, authoritative news commentary, said that since February Britain had lost an average of 730,000 tons monthly.

Adolf Hitler's newspaper, Voelkischer Beobachter, said President Roosevelt failed to state the case when he said in his fireside chat May 27 that "the present rate of Nazi sinkings of merchant ships is more than three times as high as the capacity of British shipyards to replace them." In reality, the paper declared, sinkings during the past few months have been more than 10 times as great as British building capacity.

The records of the United States Maritime Commission show that as of June 1, 88 cargo steel vessels have been delivered under the long range program. Deliveries under the Maritime Commission program are expected to approximate 700,000 tons during the calendar year, which is less than the 746,000 tons of British merchant shipping alleged to have been destroyed in May.

The Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

CORRESPONDENCE OF HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON, OF CALIFORNIA, AND THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the country and the Congress are vitally interested in the progress of our defense program. In this regard I desire to extend in the RECORD the following correspondence between the Secretary of the Navy and myself:

MAY 26, 1941.

Hon. FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has been called to a statement which you made in your recent press conference with reference to the number of Navy planes that have been delivered since the first of January 1941. According to the newspapers you announced that 996 naval planes had been delivered so far this year. As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, I am concerned over the fact that we appear to be falling behind schedule in the acquisition of planes.

According to the testimony of Admiral Towers before the Naval Affairs Committee on January 7, 1941, the total number of naval planes to be delivered by May 1 amounted to 1,230. Admiral Towers stated that we would acquire 334 in January, 263 in February, 299 in March, 334 in April.

It appears therefore that with only 996 planes delivered in the first 4 months of 1941 we are presently 234 planes behind scheduled delivery. I would appreciate having your comments as to the reasons for the delay and would like to know if the deficiency will be made up in the near future.

Thanking you for an early reply and with every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. Z. ANDERSON.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, June 4, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 26, 1941, inquiring as to the reasons for delays of delivery of airplanes on order for the Navy. Specific inquiry was made as to discrepancies in the number of airplanes scheduled for delivery during the months of January, February, March, and April, as testified by Admiral Towers to the Naval Affairs Committee on January 17, 1941, in comparison to the actual deliveries made to the Navy by various contractors during those months.

Testifying before the Naval Affairs Committee on January 17, 1941, Admiral Towers submitted to the committee the total number of airplanes scheduled to be delivered to the Navy, as follows:

January	334
February	263
March	299
April	334
Total	1,230

Actual deliveries during those months were as follows:

January	297
February	185
March	243
April	271
Total	996

The schedules submitted by Admiral Towers were based upon reports submitted by the manufacturers themselves as checked by the inspectors of naval aircraft at the individual plants. Admiral Towers mentioned that deliveries had been falling about 30 percent below schedules and that while it might be expected that deliveries in the early part of the calendar year 1941 would not meet the schedules, based upon British experience, airplane production showed a tendency to exceed schedules during the latter stages of production, and he hoped that the total deliveries for the calendar year 1941 would match the total number of airplanes scheduled for delivery during the year. It is seen that actual deliveries during the first 4 months of calendar year 1941 were approximately 81 percent of the airplanes scheduled for delivery in that period.

Reasons for delay are many. Primarily, manufacturers tend to set schedules which they know are the maximum of their ability to produce. This acts as a goal for their employees, as it is a definite incentive toward maximum production. In many cases manufacturers have been delayed due to shortage of materials, tools, and component parts. Such shortages can be attributed to the fact that the expansion of prime contractors becomes effective prior to the expansion of the subcontractors who supply materials and the component parts.

In order to facilitate the best possible allocation of aircraft material, equipment, and accessories, a scheduling unit has been set up by the Joint Aircraft Committee under the control of the Office of Production Management. This unit is in operation at Wright Field and is utilizing the facilities of the material division of the Army Air Corps. It is hoped that through the supervision of this unit deliveries of aircraft will be expedited and production schedules more closely attained.

The Navy Department, together with all governmental agencies associated with the production of aircraft, is keeping in close touch with airplane deliveries and is exerting every possible effort to expedite those deliveries by relieving bottlenecks, assigning necessary priorities, and in assisting the manufacturers in maintaining production.

Very truly yours,

FRANK KNOX.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Oil Shortage Remedy

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Governor Landon in calling unwarranted any oil shortage or curtailment thereof with respect to gasless Sundays, and so forth, said, in part:

I say a needless loss because first the English companies have not removed their tankers from their private commercial trade to supply their armed forces, yet that is what the American companies are being asked to do.

Governor Landon made a practical suggestion as to how to avoid unnecessary hardships. He goes further and proposes that tank cars not now in use should be used to transport oil to New England. New England will be the hardest hit by this so-called oil shortage.

I also want to bring out the fact, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of the House that if the tank cars are used and there is any curtailment of the use of passenger cars, this will work a great hardship on the traveling public and also a tremendous hardship on the railroad brotherhood unions. Many of them will be put out of employment.

I have a conference arranged with Secretary Ickes tomorrow, and I know the entire membership of the House will aid in seeing that New England does not suffer from any oil shortage.

The article referred to is as follows:

ICKES' THREAT UNWARRANTED, LANDON SAYS—FORMER G. O. P. CANDIDATE OFFERS IDEAS TO CURE SHORTAGE; GIVES OIL MEN'S THOUGHTS

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

TOPEKA, KANS., June 14.—Alf M. Landon, independent oil operator and Republican candidate for President in 1936, today described the threat by Secretary Ickes of gasless Sundays and other restrictions on oil consumption in the East as unwarranted and unnecessary.

Landon, in a statement to International News Service, expressed what many oil men are thinking, although most of them have been reluctant to discuss the Ickes threat in public.

Landon believes the reason for this reluctance is fear that the new oil Administrator might crack down on those who openly oppose his program.

After pointing to the prospective economic loss incidental to the tentative Ickes plan, Landon suggested constructive alternatives.

SEES GREAT LOSS

"The limiting of petroleum products in the populous Eastern States will cause great loss to those communities," the former two-time Governor of Kansas declared. "It will inflict a needless loss on all business connected with farmers. The threat of not enough oil for winter heating purposes is frightening too many people, and threatens to put them to extra and needless expense and to cause loss of employment in the oil industry."

Then, giving a practical oil operator's proposal of how to avoid such unnecessary hardship, Landon added:

"I say a needless loss because, first, the English companies have not removed their tankers from their private commercial trade to supply their armed forces. Yet that is what American companies are being asked to do.

POINTS WAY TO AID

"Second, in considering the practicality of the artificial shortage of petroleum products for the populous Eastern States—a shortage which the administration created by diverting privately owned American tankers to the English supply—I think there are several things that can be done to help the English, which most of us devoutly desire to do, without at the same time upsetting the economic and home life of the Eastern States:

"(A) One thing would involve cooperation among the oil companies not permitted

by the antitrust law. I would imagine that one of the first things Mr. Ickes would have to do is to secure a definite and binding consent from the Department of Justice to this cooperation on the part of the oil companies. This is because the Department of Justice has just finished prosecuting oil companies and oil-company executives for doing what Mr. Ickes asked them to do back in the N. R. A. days. Therefore, obtaining the necessary protection from future prosecution for violating the anti-trust laws, the oil companies, by trading oil and rerouting oil, could do much to increase the delivery of oil through the present pipeline facilities.

"(B) By the use of tank cars not now in use, reversing of the oil stream so that they pump oil eastward instead of westward. Building short pipe-line loops and connecting lines within the already existing system would very considerably increase the delivery of oil immediately."

Is Federal Control of Water-Power Development Incompatible With State Interests?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. JOHN W. SCOTT

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a discussion of the New River case by Hon. John W. Scott, member of the Federal Power Commission, as carried in the George Washington Law Review, April 1941:

Before discussing the problem posed by the title of this article, I am taking the liberty of sketching in brief outline some of the activities of the Federal Power Commission. I do this because it is felt that too few people have even a general knowledge of the functions and program of this growing Federal agency.

It is well to bear in mind that the Federal Power Commission is in no sense merely a water-power commission. It is true that hydroelectric developments were uppermost in mind when the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 created a board consisting of the Secretaries of War, Agriculture, and the Interior for the purpose of supervising water-power projects to be built under license. In 1930, however, the Commission was given the status of an independent agency, consisting of five members appointed by the President.

By title II of the Public Utility Act of 1935, broad regulatory powers over electric utilities which own or operate facilities for the transmission or sale of electric energy in interstate commerce were conferred upon the Commission. The functions of the Commission were further extended by the Natural Gas Act of 1938, under which the Commission exercises broad regulatory powers over natural-gas companies engaged in the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce and in the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale.

In carrying out the many regulatory functions delegated to it by Congress, the Commission has borrowed from the principles of preventive medicine and is trying innovations which have as their purpose a speeding up of the regulatory process. Emphasis is being laid upon preventing abuses rather than in correcting them after they have occurred.

One of the important steps in this direction was the prescribing by our Commission (joined in by 27 State commissions) of a uniform system of accounts, requiring electric utilities to record their properties at the original cost. Moreover, the Commission is attempting to eliminate inflation from utility plant accounts, correct haphazard practices with respect to setting up depreciation reserves, and to forestall the issuance of watered securities which eventually would have an inescapably adverse effect upon consumer rates. Comprehensive reports are required from utilities under our regulation, and worthwhile statistics are being published and made available to the public. Anyone desiring to investigate these data may obtain important information concerning the business operations of utilities under our jurisdiction and determine therefrom, in some degree, the effectiveness of regulation.

This article will not permit an extended discussion of the many interesting activities carried on by the Commission. Suffice it to say that our agency endeavors, in passing upon the problems coming before it, to achieve a solution thereof consistent with the public interest.

Stimulated interest in water-power development is evident as a result of the recent Supreme Court decision in the Appalachian Electric Power Co., New River, case. Immediately following the Court's pronouncement it was charged that "every creek in the country" will be under Federal control and "States' rights have been destroyed." The implication effected by these statements is that the interests of the people will most certainly suffer by reason of Federal control of water-power development in and upon the navigable waters of the United States. Let us examine the problem more closely.

Obviously, the decision defines the constitutional power of the United States over navigable waters and clarifies the claims of riparian owners and the States themselves in connection with streams under Federal jurisdiction. Application of the principles announced by the Court in the New River case effects a theoretical impingement upon claimed States' rights but actually the act determined valid by the Court, by express provisions, protects the people in the enjoyment of substantial rights and benefits heretofore considered a sacred States' rights heritage. To merely make this statement raises the question—

Is Federal control of water-power development incompatible with the best interests of the people of the several States?

An intelligent answer to the question requires an examination of the historical background of the Federal Water Power Act, enacted after many years of agitation on the part of farsighted individuals and groups who advocated conservation of the water resources of our country for the use and benefit of all the people.

Conservation of our natural resources was first born in the hearts and brains of those who placed the public good first. When Theodore Roosevelt called the conference of Governors at the White House in 1908, he stated that the meeting was "called to consider the weightiest problem now before the Nation. * * * The natural resources of our country are in danger of exhaustion if we permit the old wasteful methods of exploiting them longer to continue." It was realized then that our great forests were being rapidly denuded, soils impoverished, and our magnificent streams polluted.

Gifford Pinchot, erstwhile Governor of Pennsylvania and former head of our Forest Service, has stated that the "struggle for control of water power began when the United States Forest Service, first among Government organizations, undertook to control and direct the private development of water power within (its) jurisdiction—that is, on streams in the national forests." The venerable forester made the further significant observation that before that fight began "the electric power interests were all for Federal control—because there wasn't any. Now these same interests are all for State control—because for nearly all practical purposes there isn't any."

It was the early practice to secure special authorization from Congress for the development of power sites on streams under Federal jurisdiction. This, however, was abruptly halted by the conservationists under the leadership of Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt. On January 15, 1909, just before his retirement from office, the latter, in vetoing the James River bill, made this significant statement:

"The great corporations are acting with foresight, singleness of purpose, and vigor to control the water powers of the country. They pay no attention to State boundaries and are not interested in the constitutional law affecting navigable streams except as it affords what has been aptly called a twilight zone from any regulation."

Of the struggle, Kerwin relates:

"It is the old story. When clever legal representatives of rich corporations could fashion their arguments to play upon those prejudices of legislators built upon theories of State sovereignty or of laissez faire, they were all but invincible."

Conservationists never wavered in their support of strong Federal control of the development of the Nation's vast water resources. To them great credit should be given for the passage of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 which is essentially a conservation measure.

This act created the Federal Power Commission and gave it authority to license, for not more than 50 years, water-power developments located on lands of the United States and waters subject to Federal control. It recognized such hydroelectric developments to be essentially a public business that might be entrusted to private enterprise to the extent it served the predominant public interest in the development of the Nation's water resources in an orderly, comprehensive manner.

The Power Act provides for the right of the United States to take over projects at the end of the license period. The Government may exercise this right of recapture only upon the condition that before taking possession it shall pay the net investment of the licensee in the project or projects taken, not to exceed the fair value of the property. Inflation of project costs through valuations placed on goodwill, going value, prospective revenues, or on water rights and lands in excess of the actual reasonable cost of such properties at the time of acquisition is prohibited.

Let us consider the scope of the Commission's licensing jurisdiction. The authority delegated under the act rests ultimately upon the right of Congress (1) to require its consent before anyone may occupy power sites located on lands of the United States, and (2) to require its consent for the use of waters subject to Federal control under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution.

Article 1, section 8, clause 3, of the Constitution provides:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

It is interesting to note that, historically, this power of the Federal Government resulted from the third great compromise of the Constitutional Convention. New England wanted the central government to have control over foreign commerce and over commerce between the States. South Carolina

and Georgia wanted that matter left to the States. New England wanted the slave trade abolished at once and slavery abolished in 1808. The two Carolinas would not enter the Union unless the question of slavery was left to the States, but were willing to consent that the slave trade be abolished at the time named by New England. With reference to this compromise, Young, in his "The American Statesman," gives the following account of how the question of Federal control over interstate commerce was settled:

"Thus, by an understanding or, as Gouverneur Morris called it 'a bargain,' between the commercial representatives of the northern States, and the delegates of South Carolina and Georgia, and in spite of the opposition of Maryland and Virginia, the unrestricted power of Congress to pass navigation laws was conceded to the northern merchants, and to the Carolina rice planters, as an equivalent, twenty years' continuance of the African slave-trade."

What is the nature and extent of the Commission's jurisdiction when no public lands are involved and when constitutional authority must rest solely on the commerce clause?

Undoubtedly, the authors of this clause contemplated that the Federal Government would have authority to prevent the States from interfering with the freedom of commercial intercourse between themselves or with foreign nations. The clause itself, however, contains no such limitation. It contains an express grant of power to Congress to regulate commerce.

Chief Justice Marshall, in the early case of Gibbons against Ogden, decided that commerce under the Constitution comprehended navigation, and that "a power to regulate navigation is as expressly granted as if that term had been added to the word 'commerce.'" It followed therefrom that Congress might regulate the navigable waterways as highways of interstate commerce.

Congress has declared in the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, as amended, that it shall be unlawful to construct and operate a hydroelectric development "across, along, or in any of the navigable waters of the United States" without a license issued by the Commission.

Prior to its decision in the New River case, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Montello case, said that though there had been rapids and falls with carrying places in the Fox River in Wisconsin, the lower court erred in ruling that the stream was not navigable before it was improved, on the ground there were obstructions to unbroken navigation.

In refusing to accept the tests of navigability adopted by the trial court, it further stated:

"for it would exclude many of the great rivers of the country which were so interrupted by rapids as to require artificial means to enable them to be navigated without break. Indeed, there are but few of our fresh-water rivers which did not originally present serious obstructions to an uninterrupted navigation."

And in *Economy Light and Power Company* v. *United States*, the highest court in the land stated:

"Navigability, in the sense of the law, is not destroyed because the watercourse is interrupted by occasional natural obstructions or portages; nor need the navigation be open at all seasons of the year, or at all stages of the water."

Moreover, the Supreme Court, in *United States* v. *Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Company*, in construing the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1890 prohibiting "the creation of any obstruction, not affirmatively authorized by law, to the navigable capacity of any waters, in respect of which the United States has jurisdiction," held that Congress could control the erection of structures in nonnavigable tributaries which might affect the navigability of the waters into which the tributaries flow. In addition, Congress, in the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, as amended, defined for the first time "navigable waters of the United States."

It was with this background of judicial pronouncement and congressional declaration that the Supreme Court considered the contentions made with respect to jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission in the Appalachian Electric Power Co. case. The company (a riparian owner with a State license) had refused to accept a standard license for the construction and operation of its hydroelectric plant on the New River, near Radford, Va., as required by the provisions of the Federal Power Act. It contended, among other things, that the river was not navigable in fact and hence not navigable in law.

It also challenged statutory conditions for a license, among which are included sections 10 (a), requiring that the project be best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing the waterway for the use or benefit of interstate commerce, for the improvement and utilization of water-power development, and for beneficial public uses, including recreational purposes; 10 (c), requiring the licensee to maintain a project adequately for navigation and for efficient power operation and to maintain depreciation reserves adequate for renewals and replacements; 10 (d), requiring that out of surplus earned after the first 20 years above a specified reasonable rate of return licensee must maintain amortization reserves to be applied in the reduction of net investment; 10 (e), requiring the payment to the United States of reasonable annual charges; and 14, giving the United States the right, upon expiration of the license, to take over and operate the project by paying the licensee the "net investment" as defined, not to exceed the fair value of the property taken.

Forty-one States, through their attorneys general, joined the company in denying the authority of the Commission. Notwithstanding the fact that both lower courts had found in favor of the company, Mr. Justice Reed, speaking for a majority of the Court, in sweeping aside respondent's claims and the contention of the States, stated:

"The power of the United States over its waters * * * arises from the commerce clause of the Constitution. * * * The Federal Government has domination over the waterpower inherent in the flowing stream. It is liable to no one for its use or nonuse. The flow of a navigable stream is in no sense private property. * * * Exclusion of riparian owners from its benefits without compensation is entirely within the Government's discretion. * * * It is quite true that the criticized provisions summarized above are not essential to or even concerned with navigation as such. * * * In our view, it cannot properly be said that the constitutional power of the United States over its waters is limited to control for navigation. * * * Flood protection, watershed development, recovery of the cost of improvements through utilization of power are likewise parts of commerce control. * * * That authority is as broad as the needs of commerce. * * * The license conditions to which objection is made have an obvious relationship to the exercise of the commerce power. * * * In our view, this 'is the price which (respondents) must pay to secure the right to maintain their dam.' * * * Such an acquisition or such an option to acquire is not an invasion of the sovereignty of a State. At the formation of the Union, the States delegated to the Federal Government authority to regulate commerce among the States. So long as the things done within the States by the United States are valid under that power, there can be no interference with the sovereignty of the State."

This pronouncement of the Court will serve as a constitutional beacon light in the field of conservation.

Congress has heretofore recognized, and now the Supreme Court places its imprimatur upon the fundamental concept that the water resources of America—the totality of things inherent in and related to proper watershed development, long illusory—belong to, and may be realized and possessed by, the people of America.

Merely to recite the plain implications of the New River decision makes obvious its tremendous importance. It brushes aside many uncertainties of the past and with refreshing courage brings sound legal reasoning to support the almost evangelical program of the early conservationists that the water resources of the Nation should be conserved and utilized in the public interest.

In my opinion, it excludes any further reasonable doubt that—

1. The plenary Federal power over commerce must develop with the needs of commerce and is as broad as those needs.

2. The constitutional power of the United States over its waters is not limited to control for navigation; navigability is but a part of the whole; flood protection, watershed development, recovery of the cost of improvements through the utilization of power are likewise parts of commerce control.

3. Navigable waters are subject to national planning and control and the broad regulation of commerce granted to the Federal Government.

4. If reasonable improvements, though not made or authorized, will make a river available for interstate traffic, the stream is navigable. This includes consideration of the time element whereby a river not reasonably susceptible to navigation improvements in bygone years may subsequently become so in the light of industrial trends, population growth, or engineering advances.

5. The Federal Government has domination over the water power inherent in the flowing streams.

6. The Federal Government has power to condition a license for the construction of a hydroelectric project.

7. The flow of a navigable stream is in no sense private property and exclusion of riparian owners from its benefits without compensation is entirely within the Government's discretion.

8. The exercise by the United States of authority valid under the Federal Constitution results in no interference with State sovereignty.

9. Since the United States might erect structures in these waters itself, even one equipped for the generation of electric energy, it may constitutionally acquire one already built.

An orderly development of our water resources, however, would appear to require exercise of Federal authority over projects located upon nonnavigable reaches or tributaries of streams wherein such construction and operation will affect the downstream navigable capacity of any river. Otherwise, the benefits accruing from developments under license on the lower waters, in many instances, could be destroyed through the construction and operation of upstream projects; the comprehensive development of a river basin for the maximum possible benefit to the public of the water resources of the region, might be thwarted; and navigation in the lower reaches seriously impaired.

In this regard, attention is invited to the authority and responsibility of the Commission under section 4 (r) of the act, as amended:

"To make investigations and to collect and record data concerning the utilization of the water resources of any region to be developed,

the water-power industry and its relation to other industries and to interstate or foreign commerce, and concerning the location, capacity, development costs, and relation to markets of power sites, and whether the power from Government dams can be advantageously used by the United States for its public purposes, and what is a fair value of such power, to the extent the Commission may deem necessary or useful for the purposes of this act" (16 U. S. C. A., sec. 797).

In addition, section 10 (a), as amended, states that all licenses issued under this part will be on the following conditions:

"That the project adopted, including the maps, plans, and specifications, shall be such as in the judgment of the commission will be best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway or waterways for the use or benefit of interstate or foreign commerce, for the improvement and utilization of water-power development, and for other beneficial public uses, including recreational purposes; and if necessary in order to secure such plan the Commission shall have authority to require the modification of any project and of the plans and specifications of the project works before approval." (16 U. S. C. A., sec. 803.)

Thus Congress has, with regard to proposed water-power projects to be licensed and regions to be developed, expressed very broad objectives for attainment. To meet these requires a comprehensive study of the entire river basin. This, obviously, is essential to make certain that a proposed development will not only conserve and utilize to the fullest possible extent the power resources of a particular site, but also will be an integral part of a comprehensive plan to conserve and utilize in the public interest all the water resources of the entire river basin. Licensing authority over merely the developments on "navigable waters," defined as we have noted, would appear insufficient if the objectives expressed by Congress are to be attained.

Congress has not so limited its grant of licensing authority. It has provided in section 23 (b) of the act, as amended:

"Any person, association, corporation, State, or municipality intending to construct a dam or other project works across, along, over, or in any stream or part thereof, other than those defined herein as navigable waters, and over which Congress has jurisdiction under its authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States shall before such construction file declaration of such intention with the Commission, whereupon the Commission shall cause immediate investigation of such proposed construction to be made, and if upon investigation it shall find that the interests of interstate or foreign commerce would be affected by such proposed construction, such person, association, corporation, State, or municipality shall not construct, maintain, or operate such dam or other project works until it shall have applied for and shall have received a license under the provisions of this act. If the Commission shall not so find, and if no public lands or reservations are affected, permission is hereby granted to construct such dam or other project works in such stream upon compliance with State laws" (16 U. S. C. A., sec. 817).

Under this section of the act the Commission performs a function of jurisdictional fact finding. In this regard it is interesting to note that of the 158 declarations of intention filed since its creation in 1920, the Commission has found in approximately half of them that the construction proposed would not affect the interest of interstate or foreign commerce. By reason of Commission action, therefore, a large number of the proposed projects were not required to be placed under Federal license.

Although the Federal Power Act, validated by the New River decision, asserts the dominant jurisdiction of the Federal Government over the navigable waters of the Nation, the act recognizes the substantive rights of the people to enjoy the use of such water resources on a preferential basis through their States and municipalities. Section 7 (a) of the act requires the Commission to give preference to applications by States and municipalities for a license to construct, operate, and maintain dams, powerhouses, or other project works necessary for the development, transmission, and utilization of electric power across or in any of the streams or other bodies of water over which Congress has jurisdiction or upon any part of the public lands and reservations of the United States. The sole conditions imposed upon the granting of such preference to States and municipalities is that the plans proposed be best adapted to develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest the water resources of the region and that the applicant is able to carry out the plans.

Upon the filing of an application for a license or a preliminary permit under section 4 of the act, the Commission is required to give written notice at once of such application to any State or municipality likely to be interested in or affected thereby. Any State or municipality likely to be affected is permitted to object thereto and show cause why the license should not be issued, including, for example, the desire of the State or municipality to apply for a license. The Commission is required to allow to a State or municipality applying for a license a reasonable time to cause its plan to be made equally well adapted to the best development of the water resources as the plans of other applicants.

Moreover, section 9 (b) of the act requires the Commission to obtain satisfactory evidence that the applicant has complied with the requirements of the laws of the State or States within which the proposed project is to be located with respect to bed and banks and to the appropriation, diversion, and use of water for power purposes and with respect to the right to engage in the business of developing, transmitting, and distributing power, and in any other business necessary to effect the purposes of a license under the act.

Licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of electric energy by States or municipalities shall be issued and enjoyed without charge to the extent the power is sold to the public without profit or is used by such State or municipality for State or municipal purposes. Licenses for developments to furnish energy for domestic, mining, or other beneficial use in projects of not more than 100 horsepower installed capacity, shall also be issued without charge unless on tribal lands within Indian reservations in which case the proceeds go to the credit of the Indians of such reservation.

The right of any State or municipality to take over, maintain, and operate any project licensed under the act at any time by condemnation proceedings upon payment of just compensation is expressly reserved under section 14 thereof.

States, likewise, benefit directly from the fees and charges collected annually from licensees for the occupancy and use of national forests and public lands within the boundaries of any State. Of the total receipts from such charges only 12½ percent is retained by the Federal Government. Of the balance, 37½ percent is paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State within which the project is located. The remaining 50 percent of such charges is paid into the reclamation fund, created by the Reclamation Act, approved June 17, 1902, which fund benefits the States through reclamation projects. The total of such receipts has amounted to about $1,500,000.

As a condition of every license, the licensee developing, transmitting, or distributing power for sale or use in public service, "shall abide by such reasonable regulation of the services to be rendered to customers or consumers of power, and of rates and charges of payments therefor, as may from time to time be prescribed by any duly constituted agency of the State in which the service is rendered or the rate charged * * *."

It is expressly provided in section 27 of the act that nothing therein shall be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use or distribution of water used in irrigation or for domestic or municipal uses, or any vested rights acquired therein.

In carefully providing for the right of States and municipalities to use the water resources of the Nation and for Federal control of water-power development, Congress recognized the national character of the problem of utilizing and conserving such resources. Nature has no respect for arbitrary State lines. Its blessings are bestowed—rains fall and snows blanket the slopes of our mountains—without regard for political subdivisions. Streams, river basins, and watersheds, which constitute these great natural resources, are unaware of State boundaries, and obviously their proper development in the public interest cannot be so confined.

But notwithstanding the plenary power of the Federal Government over these water resources, Congress in its wisdom has carefully refrained in the Federal Power Act from exercising its maximum constitutional authority over these resources or to limit the enjoyment of them by the people of the several States. Congress has expressly provided, as we have observed, for the preferential use and enjoyment of these resources by the States and municipalities, as well as for their conservation and development for power and other beneficial purposes.

Obviously, with many provisions of the act protecting States and municipalities, no substantial States' rights have been invaded or usurped.

A sound national economy in the years to come would appear to require progressive stream planning and orderly development of the water resources of the country. This can be substantially accomplished under the provisions of the Federal Power Act without doing violence to the best interests of the people of the several States. The act recognizes the fundamental importance of the development of the watershed systems of the Nation, yet protects the people of the States in their enjoyment of the benefits to be derived therefrom. This character of program will ultimately bring to all of our people maximum benefits from multiple-purpose projects combining, where possible, facilities for navigation, flood control, irrigation, recreation, pollution abatement, and the generation of electric energy.

The answer to the question posed by the title of this article, therefore, is in the negative; Federal control and States' rights in water power resources are compatible. The express provisions of the Federal Power Act impel that conclusion.

A Pledge by College Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, in my home city, Columbia, Mo., is Stephens

College, with an attendance of more than 1,800 young women, representing every State in the Union and, in addition, a number of foreign countries. A few weeks ago, at commencement time, my attention was attracted to a story appearing in many papers and which referred to a pledge as made by the members of the 1941 graduating class. Greatly interested, I wrote President James M. Wood for further information, and now have a reply, as follows:

About a year ago a message came to the president of our student body from Mr. Bruce Gould, editor of the Ladies' Home Journal. In this message he stated, "In a recent public address, Mr. Archibald MacLeish made the statement that unless America regains its sense of values worth fighting for, we had just as well leave our airplanes unbuilt and our battleships on paper. What, in your judgment and that of your fellow students, are the values in a democracy that are worth fighting for?" Her reply, printed in the April issue of the Ladies' Home Journal, was substantially this: "A democracy to me is a form of political organization where every man, woman, and child is an individual personality. As such he is endowed with certain rights that can be taken from him by no majority, nor minority group, and by no institution, whether it be church or state. Among these rights are the right to think, to act, to speak, and to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. I received these as a heritage from my father and my father's fathers. They rest upon my shoulders as a responsibility to pass them on to my children and to my children's childen. If it comes to a choice between passing this heritage on unchanged to them and my own life, my life is a small forfeit to pay."

This question and the reply naturally caused considerable discussion amongst the students on our campus during the past year. About 2 weeks before school closed, the senior class met in a body and appointed a committee of 25 to draw up a statement that would represent the ideals for which they wished to stand. This they had printed in a little booklet, a copy of which I wired my secretary last night to forward you by air mail. This committee also prepared the statement of principles that was placed in your hands. Two days before commencement a committee of the senior class waited upon me and asked that they be given a place on the program on commencement day. They stated neither the objective nor the speaker. On that day they presented to me a scroll signed voluntarily by every member of the class.

The scroll referred to carries pledges and principles as follows:

THIS I WILL DO

1. Fight unwaveringly for the principles of democracy in my town, my State, and my Nation.

2. Fight for the education of women in democratic ideals and democratic realities so that all women, working from the American home, can help to safeguard the spirit of democracy in a world in which democracy is under increasing attack.

3. Fight for the stimulation of increased spiritual faith and spiritual vision without which no democracy can long endure.

4. Fight against all undemocratic forces in American life, whether such forces be foreign-inspired or home-born in the hour of the Nation's stress.

5. Fight those philosophies of government which would reduce men to soulless automatons and women to kitchen slaves and mere incubators for the state.

6. Fight, if war should come, with the same courage and sacrifice with which our American men will fight, so that our lines on the home front, as well as on the battle front, shall prove impregnable.

7. Fight, always and forever, for American justice, tolerance, and freedom so they may stand unhampered and unhindered as the hope and glory of a world.

It is my understanding that it is the hope of those initiating this novel movement of young people that it may find expression in every alumni group of the college, and in fact, throughout the youth of the Nation as a whole.

Radio Program of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AND MISS BETTY JENSEN

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars presented a program over radio station WWDC last night, June 15, 1941. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the proceedings of this meeting inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Theme: Star-Spangled Banner (transcription).

Mr. NORMAN REED. "I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

Announcer GOFF. That was the American's Creed, written by William Tyler Page, which introduces another in the series of programs arranged under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and dedicated to National Civilian Defense.

It is now our pleasure to introduce E. R. Burton, of the publicity committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Virginia, who will take charge of tonight's program. Mr. Burton.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Goff.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. The Cross of Malta is on the air again. We expect to have a man from the National Civilian Defense Committee on the air in a couple of weeks to answer any questions that any of you might want answered about home defense. If you have any questions that you would like to have answered over the air, write them in to V. F. W. in care of station WWDC, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. Write in your comments on this program. We would like to have your comments.

Our first speaker tonight was to have been the Honorable BEN F. JENSEN, United States Congressman from the seventh district of Iowa, one of the best friends the veterans have on Capitol Hill. Last night he received a telegram that one of his World War buddies was dead in Iowa; he took a plane out of Washington to be at the funeral today. His daughter, Miss Betty Jensen, has graciously consented to read her father's message for us tonight. Miss Betty Jensen, now pinch-hitting for her father. Miss Jensen.

Fellow citizens, at the outset of my remarks I wish to pay my respects to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who are sponsoring these programs for civilian defense in this vicinity under the able leadership of my good friend, E. R. Burton. To WWDC, who are so generously contributing the facilities of their station for this worthy cause, we all owe a debt of gratitude.

While I am one of the great majority of Americans who does not feel an invasion of this country can be made by any foreign nation or combination of nations against a strong national defense here, yet I am aware that he who sows safety reaps happiness. Consequently I propose to cooperate to the fullest extent of the civilian-defense program by acting in a cool, deliberate manner and urge every loyal American to do likewise, without fanning the flames of war fear and hysteria in any way.

How simple our civilian defense program would be if we in America could say and know that all the people of this free land really did appreciate to the fullest the many blessings they enjoy under the protecting furls of Old Glory, the symbol of everything that is fine and pure and good.

So I say to you tonight, my fellow citizens, that unless we can instill that love of country and all true devotion to our flag into the hearts and minds of an overwhelming majority of the people in our land, who will guard our portals against the onslaught of every and all subversive doctrine from within as well as from without, then our efforts in this program will surely come to naught. Our flag, the symbol of liberty and tolerance, that banner of freedom and enlightenment, must mean more to the citizen than it has meant at any time since George Washington and Betsy Ross conceived the design of that revered symbol of our country, or when Abraham Lincoln, with his gaunt figure draped in his shawl, paced the corridors of the White House in the still hours of many nights praying for Divine guidance to keep that flag flying over an unbroken Union. I say that in this hour when the Stars and Stripes float as a banner of hope in a world that is dark with the clouds of war, in a world that is aflame with suspicion and hatred, that flag must mean more to us today than it has in many a generation.

If that flag means to us what it has meant to our forefathers—if it means free government, if it means constitutional liberty and rights, if it means enlightenment and progress, if it means equality of opportunity, if it means the inherent right born in each and every one of us of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—then that flag will continue to fly from the masthead of a free and invincible Nation.

If it means merely something to be waved by every pressure group that wants special privileges at the hands of a government, if it means merely so much cloth in which demagogs wrap themselves as they make impossible promises to the people, if it means only that paraphernalia of politicians who are willing to destroy the confidence in a nation and in the flag by broken promises and ruined policies, then I say to you there is

danger that that revered banner and all it stands for may be made to trail in the dust.

It is time, my fellow citizens, for each one of us to search his heart and honestly, courageously, and sincerely settle in his own mind what that flag really means to him and how he can most effectively defend his home in this hour.

What does the flag mean to us? Does it mean something behind which to hide an un-American purpose? Does it mean something to be invoked when we want to acquire some personal gain? Does it mean something to save merely when we are trying to fool the populace, or does it mean to each one of us here the white purity of purpose which motivated our forefathers when they fought to open up for individual men and women the pathway to higher enlightenment, the pathway to education, the pathway to culture. the pathway to spiritual attainments which must inevitably lead in the end to greater purity of purpose, greater purity of citizenship, and a greater purity of humanity?

Do those red bars mean to us the blood spilled on many a battleground by our forefathers who not only fought and bled and died but who sacrificed, those of them who lived, who denied themselves, who held themselves firm to the high purpose of creating for us and those who are to come after us a rich heritage of this great Nation, with its marvelous resources; with its unparalleled religious and educational institutions; with the highest living levels, the greatest opportunities, the finest systems of transportation, the highest wages, and most modern working conditions ever achieved by anybody since the history of man on earth? Whether we realize it or whether we do not, the red which makes the symbol of freedom what it is, is the red of the blood that was shed by our devoted and consecrated forebears who were willing to die, if need be, that their posterity might live more richly, more intelligently, and reach higher spiritual and cultural attainments than even our forefathers themselves could hope to attain in their day.

Does the blue in that field represent to us the fidelity to our ideal of free government, to the Constitution, to the Bill of Rights, that will cause us to stand fast in the face of all arguments, of all persuasions, of all allurement to forget the way of our fathers and the principles of our forebears? Does that field of blue mean an unswerving constancy to the American way of government and the American way of life which our forefathers sacrificed so much to establish for us?

Do those stars floating in the field of blue represent the fidelity to the purpose of the Infinite, who has seen fit to entrust to the hands of 130,000,000 Americans the trusteeship and the guardianship of the freedom of the world?

Oh, my friends, if Old Glory means that to us, then no power on earth, no combination of dictators and slave-driven peoples can ever tear that glorious banner from its masthead and trail it in the dust of defeat.

If this banner means to us the courage to stand up for the ideals of our forefathers, to stand fast for the ideas for which they were willing to fight and die if need be, then truly Old Glory will never be lowered from the masthead to trail in the dust of defeat.

We are now in this hour at the crossroads of decision. Either we are going to maintain the American way of government and of life in this Nation of ours, or we are going to abandon the American way of government and of life—the way of freedom—under the pressure of aggressions by dictators and their driven slaves.

I wish something that was said recently by someone could be read over the radio to the American people every night before they go to sleep and every morning when they wake up. Let me give you the phrase now, because it is a statement of a fundamental fact: "Slaves were never the masters of free men and never will be." It makes no difference, my friends, whether those slaves be the slaves driven by the dictators, or whether they be the slaves of false belief, mistaken ideas, or designing propaganda.

The question we are discussing here today is the home defense. If the flag does not mean to us those ideals which I have outlined, then there will be little need or little use for home defense.

Three thousand miles of stormy seas separate us on the one hand and six or seven thousand miles on the other, from any potential enemies. Yes, God is good, He made that sea, then He blessed us with America where He willed we should be free. With an enlightened unit of purpose and with confidence in our Government, we have in this Nation an unbounded capacity for producing the blessings of peace. Oh, that we might soon be sending bread, the blessing of peace, to all the enslaved peoples across the sea.

It must be true—it is true—that men fighting willingly and voluntarily for their own liberties and their own hearthstones, will fight more valiantly and more intelligently than men who fight because they are driven to fight by the petty tyrants and despots of dictators.

With what, then, shall our home defense be most concerned at this time?

It must be concerned primarily with defending and preserving the Constitution of the United States.

It must be concerned primarily with the defense and preservation of our constitutional form of government, and our American system of government and of life.

It must be concerned primarily with the defense and the perpetuation of the Bill of Rights.

It must be concerned primarily with vigilance and opposition against those alien doctrines which Communists or Fascists or Nazis or any other minions of absolutism in any form have been so busily spreading among our people.

Make no mistake; any man who opposes free enterprise, or free government, or individual liberty in the United States is an enemy of the people. Any individual or group of individuals who propose to submerge the identity of the American Nation, the American people, and the American flag under any other flag or people is an enemy of the American people.

Anyone who advocates the abandonment of our traditional form of political procedure under the Constitution is an enemy of the people.

Home defense means the defense of American ideals, of the American way of government, of the American way of life, of individual freedom, against the most dangerous subversive influences that have ever assailed this country.

Our home defense in this Nation must need be a defense against the danger of our being buried under the débris of our wrecked ideals much, much more than of any débris of wrecked buildings.

Wrecked buildings may in time be rebuilt, but wrecked ideals are a long time being restored.

How clear was Thomas Jefferson's foresight when he exclaimed, "My God, how little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth can enjoy."

"The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us. We ought for so dear a stake sacrifice every attachment and every enmity. * * * Trusted with the destinies of this Republic * * * the monument of human rights * * * and the depository of the sacred fire of freedom and self-government, whence it is to be lighted up in other regions of the earth, if other regions of the earth shall ever become susceptible of its benign influence * * * to what sacrifices of interest or convenience ought not these considerations to animate us? To what compromises of opinion and inclination, to maintain harmony and union among ourselves, and to preserve from all danger this hallowed ark of human hope and happiness?"

Then you who are listening to my voice might well ask this question: What can I do to be most helpful to my country now? My answer is this, simply and honestly:

Thank God you are an American; then be an American—live it. Love your flag; defend it against all enemies from within and from without. Take part in the civilian defense program; back up the boys who are tenting tonight on the old campground. Pray that peace may soon come to a troubled world and that our boys and our flag may be spared. But never be afraid to say and to do that which your good American conscience tells you is the right, regardless of any force on earth. That is your inherent right and duty as an American citizen. Guard it with all your might.

And now in conclusion let me say that to me civilian defense, or home defense, national defense, and Americanism are synonymous. We cannot have one without the other, and by the same token we must have them all or we have none. That we may have them all we must have that patriotic purpose of mind and heart of working in unison for all we hold dear for that safety and preservation of our American ideals, the bulwark of our great Republic.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Miss Betty Jensen, for so ably substiuting for your father.

Ladies and gentlemen, our next speaker is the Honorable JOSEPH RALEIGH BRYSON, United States Congressman from the Fourth District of South Carolina; a veteran and one who has demonstrated by his voting in Congress that he is really a friend of the veterans. Comrade BRYSON.

Mr. BRYSON. Comrade Burton and you, my comrades of the radio audience, it is indeed an honor to have been invited to speak on the program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is sincerely hoped that when the last of your organization has crossed the Great Divide there will be no more veterans of foreign wars. I am to speak to you briefly on the subject of home defense.

HOME DEFENSE

Modern warfare has produced a new type of brutality—brutality on the home front.

The horrors of warfare conducted on the modern scale soon came to the surface in Britain, where the civilian populations of London, Bristol, Coventry, and other cities were made targets of incessant and merciless bombing attacks. In fact, the tactics and strategy of modern warfare as revealed in Europe and Asia consist in a large measure of subjecting civilian populations and cities to attacks aimed at disruption and destruction to break morale and destroy factories.

America cannot afford to ignore the warning sounded by the appalling and tragic events abroad. Somewhat removed, as we are, from the actual scene of today's war, many may look upon the idea of organizing fire-bomb spotters, air-raid-shelter crews, fire fighters, and the like as farfetched and unnecessary. I would ask those who regard such an eventuality as mythical to recall for a moment what a strange and unbelievable phenomena the digging of trench shelters in London's Hyde Park first seemed. While the need for home defense might not be as imperative or immediate as the production of planes and tanks for American defense and British aid, it is nonetheless as vital and important. We must develop a system of home defense capable of standing up to the demands of any eventuality, if we are to be a nation fully prepared. Mayor La

Guardia offered a practical analysis of the situation when he declared that there existed a 95-percent chance that most of the services created under the home-defense program would never be used and then added that "we cannot afford to take the 5-percent chance." We must be fully prepared to meet any attack on America's home front however remote the possibility of such an attack may seem.

For thousands of Americans, eager to do their part in the present emergency, the way is now open to make a substantial contribution to the strength and security of our Nation. Their aid can be added to the Office of Civilian Defense which was organized for mobilization of every volunteer service available in America.

The program of home defense as projected by the O. C. D. is the boldest thrust in the direction of total preparedness this Nation has ever known. It is a program so vast in scope and magnitude as to require the wholehearted support of a united nation. That the American people will not fail to respond with best possible cooperation is the belief in which the Office of Civilian Defense has assumed its great undertaking.

The American people may differ on the question of foreign policy. Honest differences of opinion are necessary in a democracy. The privilege to entertain, express and contend for different policies and principles is highly proper in a true democracy.

On the question of home defense, however, there is hardly room for any difference of opinion. There are those who strenuously oppose the idea of sending our armed forces to fight on foreign soil as a measure of defense. But no citizen, worthy of the name, hesitates on the question of home defense. In performance of duty may there be no wavering or faltering on the part of any citizen. For the defense of our homes and homeland, let there be pledged our lives, our fortune, and our sacred honor.

It does us well to repeat the lines of Sir Walter Scott:

"Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burn'd
As home his footsteps he hath turn'd,
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim;
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The wretch, concentred all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust, from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonor'd, and unsung."

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Comrade BRYSON, for a good talk on Home and National Civilian Defense. Ladies and gentlemen, our speakers next Sunday will be Mr. RAYMOND SPRINGER, Congressman from Indiana, and Congressman GEORGE M. GRANT of Alabama, Past Department Commander of the Department of Alabama, of the American Legion.

Mr. NORMAN REED. This has been a presentation of the public-relations service of station WWDC. The program was another in the series of national-civilian defense programs sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The program was in charge of Mr. E. R. Burton of the publicity committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the department of Virginia, who acted as master of ceremonies. Listen in again next Sunday at the same time for another program in this series.

My Country 'Tis of Thee (transcription).

Sixth Assembly of the Descendants of the Campaign, Siege, and Defense of Vicksburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JULIAN P. ALEXANDER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the address made by Hon. Julian P. Alexander, a member of the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, on the occasion of the sixth assembly of the descendants of the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg, on May 25, 1941. The Blue and Grey Society held its meeting in the Vicksburg National Military Park. The address of Col. William Cattron Rigby, who also spoke on the occasion, may be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A2524.

Judge Alexander's father, the late C. H. Alexander, a leader of the Mississippi bar, lost an eye in fighting the besiegers of the city of Vicksburg, and Mississippians are proud of his record.

Judge Alexander entered into the spirit of the occasion by pleading for the unity of our citizens. The address follows:

It is difficult to translate the spirit of this occasion into words. Its significance inspires sentiment but not speech; it moves the heart but stills the tongue.

I shall not recount to you matters of history with which you are all familiar. Many of these stirring events I learned from one of my own blood, who, as a stripling soldier of 17, fought the besiegers of this beleaguered city in a bitter contest which cost him the sacrifice of an eye. This disfigurement later came to be seen by me as a badge of honor. It is stimulating to one's spirit to recall that there remained to him sufficient sight with which in later years he beheld with pride the glory of a single flag and a heart which beat with pride at its symbolism.

Indeed, the thing which we do here today is in itself a symbol. If this assemblage differs from that which nearly four decades ago occupied these hills, it is only in its outward aspects. The mobilization of minds is not less effective than the regimentation of men. In a gathering such as this the realities of homage and of heroism are made visible.

You are the descendants of an honored people. You sprang from those from whom all earthly wealth had been snatched, yet who left to you a legacy of those eternal and intangible qualities which determine whether there shall be courage or cowardice, loyalty or indifference. Today, we need what they exemplified—courage, patience, and that willingness to sacrifice which is born of a lofty recklessness of devotion which pauses not to count the cost. These your ancestors remind you, as did the chief captain of the host to Paul, "with a great sum obtained I this freedom," to which you were enabled to say with Paul, "I was free born."

Your patriotism has a noble pedigree. You sprang from men who fought not for slavery but for freedom, and in their bequest they sealed their patriotism in the purple testament of bleeding war. It is a sacred trust. You are not only the beneficiaries of the generation which has gone before but trustees for that which is to come. You who are descended from the defenders of Vicksburg have now become the defenders of the faith. The siege laid by apathy and indifference upon the hearts of our people can be just as effective to starve them into the death of patriotism as can beleaguered forces of steel starve bodies into weak attrition.

The time has come when we must accept the truth that no one is a good citizen if he is not a good Mississippian. And no one can be a better Mississippian than he is an American. The character of the Father of our Country has been aptly summarized into a fit and familiar phrase. Washington was first in war because he was first in peace; he was first in the hearts of his countrymen because his country was first in his own heart. It is not a new thought that our development of a scientific progress has given to us modern inventions with which we may speak with a voice heard around the world or travel in a moment to its remotest parts. Washington had none of these things. Today we have them all but do not have Washington. We are reminded that things are not our realities so much as thoughts, and that purposes have more power than people. At a time when public opinion is divided upon the expediency of convoying supplies to a distressed people we should concern ourselves with the necessity for the safe convoy between mind and heart of our thoughts and purposes that they be protected by the armaments of unselfishness and faith. Patriotism is one of our peacetime essentials; it is not to be imported but inspired. Patriotism is one of our undeveloped resources, and without it the industries of peace may not operate and the battles of peace cannot be won. Without it struggle has no purpose, sacrifice no heroism, and victory no glory. If we take from anything everything which makes it something we have nothing.

Wars too often come because men lose the battles of peace. A Chinese philosopher of today has said that if "we should perspire more in peace, we would bleed less in war." The devices of war change with the years. The ingenuity of men's minds and the depravity of their hearts make common cause to devise man's destruction. The paraphernalia of peace remains the same. The reason why swords may be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks is because they are cast of the same metal. The faithful use of either burnishes their surfaces with a brightness akin to glory; and disuse brings to them that rust which possesses all of the destructive oxidation of indifference. A nation which provides beneficent services to protect our lands against soil erosion falls short of its complete service when it fails to guard them against soul erosion. There should be a Monroe Doctrine of the heart which throws about the sources of our loyalty a protecting insulation secure against the invasion of hostile ideas and false idealism.

Even as Nature has cast its healing mantle of green about the scars which, in times

past, have disfigured these noble hills, so have men's hearts become healed from the wounds of those animosities which denied to them the power to think straight and to see clearly. I still believe in the principle of States' rights, but I believe also in national duties. Today, our fight is not for union but for unity. Eighty years ago the stream of liberty and union was beset with storm and vexed with conflicting currents dividing its course. For 4 years these lesser currents fought their meandering way only to converge again into a majestic current which leads its sure course down toward the main of peace and unity, and upon whose proud bosom there ride the golden galleons of greater glory. Today, our concern should be no more with our Bill of Rights than with our bill of duties. Today, there is one flag. There should be one people. Our National Anthem is to be sung as a chorus and not as a solo. It is written in the key of Americanism. It is not a tune so much as a truth. We, who so proudly sing "My Country," should hear the echo thrown back from every mountainside: "My citizen." Is it a mere song which our lips sing that our banner should "long wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave"? Knowing hearts will answer that if it is to wave at all, it must be held aloft in the faithful grasp of a united people. This shall be a land of the free only so long as it is the home of the brave.

We stand amidst the graves of a thousand unknown soldiers bivouacked in the battle abbeys of these templed hills. Their names are to fame unknown, yet we know the hearts of them. They are not silent for their deeds still speak to listening hearts. We honor these who left their homes that they might protect them, who sacrificed their lives that a nation should have life. Not homeless are these who in the twilight of life's glorious day lay down to rest like drowsy children upon the bosom of a kindly mother earth. Mississippi now claims them as her own. She keeps eternal vigil about their sleeping couch. Today, she scatters the blossoms of May about them, and in October, she will draw above them her variegated coverlet in the quilted designs of autumn's leafy patterns, bordered wth forget-me-nots. At evening the old river intones its mournful threnody. Nearby the weeping willow, still disconsolate, mourns its loss, like Rachel weeping for her children, because they are not.

Yet, our heads bow not in tragedy but in triumph, for at the whispered suggestion of the noonday's zephyrs, the reeds and folding grass nod rythmic acquiescence to an ancient truth "except a grain of wheat fall in the ground and die * * *." Fourscore years ago, an overwhelming force took this city but not its spirit. This incident has its lesson. It is that he who ruleth his spirit is greater than he who taketh a city. Loyalty is exhibited by arms and by the devices of destruction, but it springs from about the altars of that shrine we call the hearts of men. Let us therefore keep our hearts with all diligence for out of them are the issues of life. These whom we honor today were not conquered but were more than conquerors, and today we think of Vicksburg in terms of victory.

Through them, their descendants in blood and privilege become each a sovereign. Their hearts shall be their kingdom, unity their power, and liberty shall be their glory forever and forever.

Army Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, OF NEW YORK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered yesterday over the radio:

It is my purpose tonight to discuss H. R. 4944, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on June 3 and which is now before the Committee on Military Affairs. The title of this bill reveals its objective, namely, to increase the monthly base pay of certain enlisted men of the United States Army.

Ever since May 1940, when the President of the United States called the Congress into extraordinary session for the purpose of pointing out to the Nation the vital necessity of embarking upon the most gigantic defense program the world has ever seen, it has been my opportunity to vote for measure after measure designed to carry out this program. Along with the rest of the Congress and the country I felt that it was high time to take these steps necessary to national defense especially because so little had been done before this. While the totalitarian governments of Europe had been steadily strengthening themselves by mass production of weapons of modern warfare, it seemed that the democracies had been enjoying a fateful slumber. Certainly our great Nation, although apparently awake to the dire consequences of a world dominated by Hitler or Stalin, was doing nothing about preventing such a possibility except through lip service. This was the situation in May 1940 when the powerful mechanized German Armies swept most of the remaining free governments from the Continent of Europe. It was a situation which was certainly not encouraging in view of the fact that the United States Government had to start building practically from scratch.

But if the country was slow in realizing its mistake, the Congress was quick to reflect the desires of a revitalized people and as a Member of that Congress I felt it my duty to obey the dictates of my people at home which were substantially to carry out complete national defense with the greatest possible speed.

Probably the most constructive step which was ever taken in the great defense program which is now well under way was the passage of the Selective Service Act of 1940. This measure gradually called to Uncle Sam's protection a million and a half of the finest, most patriotic young men that have ever offered their services to a great cause. I will not attempt to describe my boundless admiration for these boys drawn from every family and from every corner of this broad land. It is sufficient to say that if the development of the fighting forces of the United States continue with the enthusiasm which our boys have already made manifest, you have the right to expect the greatest force for the defense of America that has ever been gathered together under any flag.

But when one praises and acknowledges the splendid patriotism of these young men he must of necessity at the same time take cognizance of the accompanying sacrifices they have made. Need I tell you of the number of farm lads who have left their parents almost without help on their farms in order to make their contribution to this program? Is it necessary to say that thousands of college men and hundreds of thousands of others have given up lucrative positions to join the ranks of this great Army? Or need I tell you of the countless boys who have left their dearly loved homes for the first time in their lives and even at this hour are witnessing the heart-rending pangs of homesickness and nostalgia? Certainly I do not need to point these facts out because they are only too well known by every man and woman who listens to my message tonight. Why are these facts well known about the soldiers of our country, their joys, their sorrows, their sacrifices? The answer is simple enough because their problems are the problems of every family in America. The Selective Service Act has reached into every family of America and has in each case taken, for a time at least, the treasure of that family for the defense of our beloved country. It has brought about all this without a word of audible complaint coming either from the soldier or his people. Certainly this is the apotheosis of the American spirit in our modern crisis.

But let us go back for a moment and describe other phases of this mighty effort to make America invulnerable to attack. I have dwelt at some length, and justly so, upon a description of the unprecedented response of the young manhood of this Nation to a call to patriotic duty. I have extolled them and will continue to extoll them long after their acts have embellished the pages of our noble history. I wish I could praise with equal fervor some of the other forces which are supposedly bent upon the same course of preserving American liberties as our soldiers are. It is not my objective in these remarks to condemn or to castigate any individuals or groups, but I cannot resist calling to their attention the pattern they should follow of devotion to the ideal of the American way that I must confess is best emulated by the young men of the United States.

I listened with rapt interest the other day to some amazing testimony that was borne out by a Member of Congress who had inspected the construction of Army camps and cantonments throughout the country. I was frankly astounded when I heard that two hundred and fifty millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money have been wasted in this construction program alone. These figures were not based on assumption, not based on hearsay, but they were based on cold, hard facts. And if extravagance is so evident in an almost infinitesimal part of the whole program, what figures can be large enough to adequately describe the deliberate waste which is going on in many other parts of this program. I for one deplore this waste, not only because it must be paid by the sweat and the toil of the great rank and file of our American citizenry, but also because it is being countenanced and indulged in by the very men who ought to be above such degrading practices; by men in high places who should be setting the example of distinguished

patriotism to the boys in the training camps. Such a comparison is a shameful commentary upon those whose very right to healthy profits should make them all the more mindful of the necessity to use the revenues pouring in for our defense wisely and carefully.

I want to also take this opportunity to tell those communistic elements hiding behind the broad shoulders of patriotic American labor that if the inarticulate public is ever able to lay a hand on those responsible for the strife which has gone a long way to sabotage our defense industries that they will be sorry they ever raised their ugly heads. Upon those communistic elements do I place the blame for the dearth of equipment and weapons of preservation that our glorious American soldiery is witnessing today. The fathers and mothers of these soldiers can never forget that deliberate attempts to stop the flow of arms and tanks and munitions from our great factories will jeopardize not only the effectiveness but the lives of their sons if they are ever called upon to do battle in defense of America.

Taking into consideration the evidence which I have submitted to you this evening of the deliberate waste in certain phases of construction, of the stubborn selfishness of groups of our body politic in the face of the most serious threat to freedom we have ever known, of the complaints, the dissatisfaction, the hindering that have emanated from unpatriotic elements, I have come to the conclusion that the forgotten man of the whole defensive effort is your son, your son, and your son now in training in the great military camps throughout America. And for these very reasons, because I know that excessive profits are being made out of the billions the Congress has appropriated, because I am aware that American labor is receiving for its services at least 5 and perhaps 10 times the compensation which the Army is getting, and because the soldiers of this country are on duty 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and for at least 1 year, I believe that it is in order at this time to propose that their base pay be raised from $21 a month to $42 a month. Many of these men are sending what money they can scrape together home to their needy families. They are in many cases exhausting this small sum in the very necessities of life at the camps, and at the same time they constitute the very backbone of the protection which Uncle Sam must count upon if and when the far-flung and aggressive forces of the dictators see fit to penetrate the Western Hemisphere. They are deserving of their hire, and it should be the very best that this Nation can possibly provide.

The Inequity of Any Increase in the Federal Gasoline Tax—A Tax Wrong in Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

ARGUMENT RELATIVE TO INCREASE IN FEDERAL TAX ON GASOLINE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following argument with regard to the increase of the Federal tax on gasoline:

There is no compromise with a principle.

Take crime, for example. It is true that a murder is considered a "worse" crime than larceny, and the punishment received by the murderer is considerably more severe than the penalty placed upon thievery. Both the killer and the thief are lawbreakers, and the degree of the crime in no way alters the fact that both are equally guilty of antisocial conduct. A crime is a crime.

Similarly, the rate at which a particular tax is levied may govern the amount of punishment which the tax delivers. But if the tax is inequitable in concept—if it violates fundamental, established principles of sound taxation—the degree of the burden which the tax imposes has nothing whatsoever to do with its undesirability as a violator of principle.

Thus a Federal gasoline tax levied at 2½ cents per gallon would impose a much greater hardship upon those who must consume gasoline in order to earn a living than would a 1½-cent tax. But a Federal gasoline tax levied at any rate- at ½ cent or at 12 cents—imposes an inequitable penalty upon farmers, laborers, truckers, and all other gasoline consumers, because the Federal gasoline tax is wrong in principle.

FEDERAL TAX NOT A ROAD TAX

The Federal gasoline tax is wrong in principle because it is not, and never has been, a tax for roads. The gasoline tax was devised by the States as a special tax paid by motor-vehicle operators for the use of the highways, and it was accepted as an equitable method of raising revenue for road improvement. In contrast, the Federal gasoline tax first was enacted in 1932 as an emergency and temporary tax to provide funds to replace the declining yield from established sources.

No pretense has been made that the Federal gasoline tax is a tax for highways. Farmers who use gasoline in a tractor or stationary engine, for instance, must pay the same amount of tax as the truck driver. Those who use gasoline for other nonhighway purposes pay the Federal tax without exception.

The fact that the Federal gasoline tax has been extended four times, that it was increased 50 percent in 1940, and that it now is being considered as a subject for a further increase, in no way alters the fact that it is a special tax paid by a special class, for costs of general government which should be borne equally by all taxpayers.

FEDERAL INVASION OF STATE TAX FIELD

The Federal gasoline tax is wrong in principle because it constitutes a Federal invasion into a field of taxation which is a keystone of State finances and is a tax which duplicates State gasoline taxes which alone are incomparably burdensome.

States now collect $865,000,000 each year from taxes on gasoline. In the average State this single levy provides more than one-quarter of all the tax revenue collected by the State.

The gasoline tax provides most of the money necessary for the construction and maintenance of our Nation's highway system. Reduce the efficiency of this system by denying roads needed upkeep and improvement and you strike a vital blow at the national-defense effort itself. It is obvious that the gasoline tax must remain an unimpaired source of revenue to the States during the present emergency.

When the Revenue Act of 1932 was in formation, the House Ways and Means Committee considered and rejected the Federal gasoline tax idea. The act, as it passed the House, contained no gasoline tax. The Treasury Department revised upward its estimates of revenue need following this action, however, and the Senate Finance Committee reported out an amendment to the House-approved bill providing for a Federal gasoline tax. In considering the reenactment of the gasoline tax, the Finance Committee's report of May 10, 1933, declared:

"Your committee is of the opinion that the gasoline tax should be reserved to the States. * * * It would be entirely appropriate, therefore, for this committee, which originated the Federal gasoline tax as a temporary expedient, to recommend its repeal."

NOW TAXED AT LUXURY-TAX RATES

The Federal gasoline tax is wrong in principle because it erroneously was considered a nuisance tax on the consumption of a nonessential commodity. It is wrong in principle, furthermore, because it has been imposed at rates so high that they could be justified only upon the grounds that the tax was a tax on a luxury.

Actually, the Federal gasoline tax is a tax on essential transportation. It now is plain that the major proportion of all gasoline is consumed in connection with essential transportation services, and by individuals in pursuit of earning a living. The millions engaged in commercial highway transport, defense workers who must use their private automobiles to get to and from their jobs, traveling salesmen, rural mail carriers, farmers, and the multitude of other highway users, must grin and bear Federal gasoline taxation because no reasonable alternative to the consumption of gasoline is available.

Despite the character of gasoline as an essential, State and Federal tax rates on gasoline during 1940 were equivalent to a sales tax levied at the exorbitant rate of 47 percent on the average retail price. State and Federal retail taxes on gasoline actually were more than 100 percent of the average wholesale price of the product. The 1½-cent Federal levy alone was equal to a 12-percent sales tax.

Compare these rates with the 5-percent levies now being proposed on candy and chewing gum, or with the proposed 10-percent tax on cameras and furs.

BURDEN ON THOSE LEAST ABLE TO PAY

Finally, the Federal gasoline tax is wrong in principle because it bears most heavily upon persons of modest incomes. Truckers, who alone account for more than one-fourth of the Nations gasoline consumption, obviously are persons of modest income. Certainly, it cannot be contended that farmers, who consume another 25 percent of all gasoline, possess any unusual ability to pay taxes. Even the average city-dwelling passenger-car owner, perhaps slightly more prosperous than the farmer, has been found by Federal research to enjoy an income which is between $20 and $30 weekly.

Already, on the average, the motorcar operator must set aside 1 week's wages each year, just to meet his gasoline-tax bill.

Now, to be sure, the amount of an increase in the Federal gasoline tax will make an important difference to the taxpayer, because it will govern the number of additional days' wages which will be required to foot the bill.

But a ½-cent Federal gasoline tax is just as wrong in principle as a 12-cent Federal gasoline tax, and no amount of tax reduction and no amount of compromise, short of actual tax elimination, can change this situation.

Shipment of Oil to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 12, 1941.*

Hon. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: As an American, I view with indignant amazement the reported shipment of 800,000 or more barrels of oil monthly from this country to Japan. My amazement surpasses understanding when I try to reconcile this disquieting fact with the prospect of gasless Sundays and chilled homes in America.

What reason does the administration have for permitting this anomalous situation to exist? Whatever it may be, the people have a right to know.

It has been reported, perhaps as a surmise, that the United States is supplying Japan with oil in order to dissuade her from seizing or attempting to seize the rich oil fields of the Dutch East Indies. Assuming that this report is founded in truth, are we not pursuing a policy of appeasement toward the Nipponese aggressors, a policy we are supposed to have renounced and denounced as worse than futile?

Why have embargoes been impressed on shipments of implements of war and other materials and supplies to Japan and none to speak of on oil? It seems to me—and I am confident I reflect the views of many fellow Americans—that an embargo on oil shipments to Japan would serve three very vital purposes: First, it would materially aid China in her life-and-death struggle with the Nippon invader; second, it would permit conservation in this country of millions of gallons of oil; and, third, it would permit return to the American flag of tankers now being used to transport the oil across the Pacific, which are reported sorely needed to move oil from Texas and Gulf ports to New York and Baltimore, and to Canada and Great Britain.

In view of the foregoing, I am writing you as my Representative in Congress to use your good office to have all oil shipments to Japan halted. I make this request of you because I deem such a step imperative and in the best interest of our beloved country.

Because of the growing interest being manifested by the people of Delaware in the situation above discussed, I am forwarding a copy of this letter to the press.

Respectfully yours,

VICTOR J. COLOMBO.

Two Hundred and Forty Dollars per Year Increase for Selectees and Others Serving During Emergency To Be Paid 2 Years After Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 5063, which provides for an increase of pay to those who serve in the armed forces during the present emergency. If the trainees are permitted to receive as much as the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, passed by Congress, it will be necessary for their present pay to be supplemented by at least $20 per month.

The bill, H. R. 5063, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, introduced June 16, 1941, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, may be cited as the "Service Compensation Act."

It is a bill to increase the compensation of the members of the armed forces; to make intangible property bear its fair share of the cost of national defense; to provide for the proper administration of this act; to provide penalties for the violation of this act; and for other purposes.

Declaration of policy is in section 2 (a) and 2 (b) of the bill, and is as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Congress hereby finds (1) that the greater skill, training, and ability required of the modern soldier together with an increased cost of living entitles him to an increased wage; (2) that wartime inflation and post-war deflation makes it desirable in the public interest and to the advantage of the soldier that payment of some of his compensation be deferred; (3) that property owners often avoid taxes by investing their wealth in intangible property and secreting it in other States; (4) that by reason of its transitory and elusive nature, the several States are unable to tax intangible property at more than a small fraction of the tax on farms, homes, and other property, real and personal; (5) that intangible property can be effectively taxed only by the National Government.

(b) It is hereby declared that the purpose of this act is to increase the compensation of the members of the armed forces and to enable intangible property to bear its fair share of the cost of national defense.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this act—

(a) "Intangible property" means and shall include stocks, bonds, choses in action, unrecorded conveyances, gold and silver coin, Treasury notes, bank notes, and other forms of currency in common use, every claim and demand for money or other valuable thing, every annuity or sum of money, due or to become due, cash surrender or reserve value of all insurance, whichever is the highest, and all claims and demands secured by deed or mortgage.

(b) "Tax" means the excise, tax, or duty imposed on intangible property under this act.

(c) "Taxpayer" means and shall include the person who owns or is entitled to the income of the intangible property on the last day of the taxable year; it shall include all trusts and estates, both the trustee and the beneficiary of the trust being considered separate taxpayers each liable for the full amount of the tax. Trusts established by the same settlor or settlors shall be considered the same trust in taxing the trustee. It shall also include domestic corporations, members of partnerships, insurance companies, nonresident alien individuals, and foreign corporations whose property is within the power of the United States, individual citizens of any possession of the United States who are not otherwise citizens of the United States and who are not residents of the United States, individual citizens of the United States regardless of their place of residence, and China Trade Act corporations. A charitable corporation or charitable trust shall be exempt from taxation of intangibles owned by it. There shall be no other exemptions of any person, individual, trust, corporation, or organization.

(d) "Value" means the true and full value of all intangible property assessed in money. In determining such value the assessor shall not adopt a lower or different standard of value because the same is to serve as a basis of taxation, nor shall he adopt as a criterion of value the price for which the said property would sell at auction or at a forced sale, or in the aggregate with all other property; but he shall value each article or description of property by itself, and at such sum or price as he believes the same to be fairly worth in money which valuation shall not be less than the value on the market thereof Money, whether in possession or on deposit, shall be entered in the statement at the full amount thereof. Every credit for a sum certain, payable either in money, property of any kind, labor, or services, shall be valued at the full price of the sums so payable; if for a specific article, or for a specified number or quantity of any article or property, or for a certain amount of labor, or for services of any kind, it shall be valued at the current price of such property, or for such labor or services, at the place where payable.

(e) The "Secretary of the Treasury" or "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States

(f) The "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

(g) "United States," when used in a geographical sense, means and includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, and all possessions.

SERVICE CERTIFICATES

SEC. 4. Every month each person serving in the armed forces of the United States shall receive a service certificate or bond redeemable by such person for the sum of $20 after 2 years from the date thereof. Said service certificates or bonds shall be nontransferable, shall bear annual interest after maturity at the rate of 3 percent, and must be redeemed within 10 years after the date thereof or they shall be null and void.

SPECIAL FUND

SEC. 5. The revenue collected under the excise tax or duty levied by this act shall be paid into a special fund which shall be designated as the "Service Compensation Fund." This fund shall be used to pay the service certificates or bonds issued under this act. Any surplus in such fund at the end of the fiscal year shall be paid into the general revenue fund and any deficit shall be filed from the general revenue fund.

EXCISE TAX OR DUTY

SEC. 6. There is hereby levied, in addition to all other taxes, an excise tax or duty of 2 mills, or one-fifth of 1 percent, per annum of the value over $50,000 of holdings of intangible property owned legally or equitably by any taxpayer. The tax shall be paid by the taxpayer with his regular income tax to the Commissioner and shall be based on the intangible property of the taxpayer as of the last day of December of each year.

RETURNS

SEC. 7. All returns for the excise, tax, or duty imposed by this act shall be made by the taxpayer with his regular income-tax return. The filing of the return required under this section shall be deemed an assessment, subject to revision, of the tax shown due on the basis of such return and shall be payable forthwith. The Commissioner shall, as soon as practicable after the return is filed, examine the same and make such investigation as he deems necessary for determining the correctness of the return. The tax computed by him on the basis of such examination and investigation shall be the tax to be paid by such taxpayer.

WHO SHALL FILE A RETURN

SEC. 8. Returns shall be necessary only from taxpayers owning over $50,000 in intangible property. Within his discretion the Commissioner may require taxpayers owning over $30,000 in intangibles to file a return.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Section 9 of the bill relates to forms and regulations, and is purely administrative.

Section 10 relates to supplemental reports and is administrative.

Section 11 (a) and (b) relates to penalties for failure to comply with the law and is administrative, as well as subsection (c) and (d) of section 11.

Sections 12, 13, 14, and 15 are administrative and relate to refunds, public records, and conflicting laws.

Section 16, the last, provides "this act shall take effect upon its enactment."

MAIN PROVISIONS

It will be noticed that the main provisions are as follows:

1. To pay those who serve $240 a year, or $20 per month, more than they are now receiving;
2. The payment to be made 2 years after completion of service;
3. The money to be provided by a tax upon intangible property; the tax rate being two-fifths of 1 percent, which means 20 cents on the $100 of property per year;
4. No one will pay a tax on intangible property who owns less than $50,000 worth.

It should not be overlooked that the owners of intangible property are not paying one penny on our preparedness program. If intangible property earns a profit, the owner pays an income tax on the profit only but does not pay anything on the property itself.

There is between $300,000,000,000 and $500,000,000,000 worth of intangible property in this country that goes practically tax-free.

If this bill passes, this intangible property will pay the cost, and it will not be burdensome on anyone, since the tax rate is only 20 cents on the $100 property valuation each year.

If this question is not settled now by treating the trainees fairly and justly, it will come up in the future with increasing difficulties.

Now is the time to settle this problem by paying these trainees a fair amount for their services.

This group—the trainees—is making the greatest sacrifice in our national-defense program, and because they are not organized and therefore do not possess bargaining power, they should not be overlooked, but for that reason alone Congress should make a special effort to see that they are dealt with fairly and equitably.

In Memory of Mike Bottinelli

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

MEMORIAL PREPARED BY ATTORNEY FRANK GRIFFIN, OF IDAHO

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD excerpts from a memorial prepared by Attorney Frank Griffin, of Kellogg, Idaho, for the North Idaho Wildlife Federation on the occasion of the death of Mike Bottinelli, one of its members, who had formerly been fish and game commissioner of the State of Idaho. At the time of his passing, this respected citizen was president of the Shoshone County Sportsmen's Association. He had been a man whose useful service to his community and State will be deeply missed:

IN MEMORIAM, MIKE BOTTINELLI

In the year 1890 there came to Kellogg, a young man, in whose heart burned a brightly lighted adoration for the works of creation, and whose entire being was vibrant with an impelling desire to be of service to mankind. He came from a far country. But the distance that he traveled, the place of his birth, is of small moment now. Important for our purposes are the testamentary remembrances, evidenced principally in the form of inspirational legacies, that he bequeathed to us as a result of a life richly endowed and constructively employed. This young man came to Kellogg not as most young men do, merely for gainful getting; he came to generously and graciously give. His was destined to be a life of useful service to the people of the community in which he chose to live. In the sphere of business he commenced as a chore boy, and rose, by dint of his own efforts, to a position of high station in the electrical department of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining & Concentrating Co., which by the way, is one of the great industrial organizations of America.

In the field of social service he started as an unknown, and proceeded at once to distinguish himself by reason of his untiring devotion to the interests of his fellows, until there had been reposed in him such confidence and conferred upon him such honors, that he was called to occupy the positions and offices of secretary of the Odd Fellows at Kellogg, exalted ruler of the Elks at Wallace, district deputy of the Elks for the State of Idaho. He was also an active and practical Mason, one who looked out upon life with a merry smile and a magnificent heart. He exemplified the teachings of that great fraternal order by meeting his fellowmen on the level and parting with them on the square.

The State of Idaho recognized his abilities and worth by making him an athletic commissioner, and later, and of possibly greater importance to us, a fish and game commissioner. He was President of the Shoshone County Sportsmen's Association at the time that he departed to clasp hands with the great legion of sportsmen who have preceded him "to the happy hunting grounds." At the time of his presidency he, with the assistance of an earnest group of wildlife enthusiasts, erected the Hale Fish Hatchery, near Shosone County Park, just outside the beautiful city of Mullan. This hatchery, a private enterprise established wholly for the public good, represents an investment of approximately $40,000, and stands today as a monument to the labor, industry, faith, vision, and public spiritedness of Mike Bottinelli and his associates. Mike, as all good sportsmen should endeavor to be, was a kind husband, a devoted father, a helpful relative, and a loyal friend. He was beloved by all—the successful and the unsuccessful, the fortunate and the unfortunate. The Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining & Concentrating Co., in dedicating an electric substation to his memory, caused to be inscribed in bronze these words:

"In appreciation of his 37 years of unselfish leadership, loyalty, and service."

We can pay no loftier tribute to our absent friend than was paid to him by one of his fellow fish and game commissioners who, shortly after the passing of Mike, voiced these sentiments: 'God may have made other men as good as Mike Bottinelli, but of this I am certain. He never made one any better."

Hitlerism in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga News-Free Press of June 7, 1941:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press of June 7, 1941]

HITLERISM IN CONGRESS

The most shocking event of the week in the United States was the outbreak of anti-Semitism-Hitlerism on the floor of the House of Representatives which caused the sudden death of Representative Edelstein, of New York. It is alarming to know that, as the United States girds for its struggle with totalitarianism, there exists such a totalitarian spirit within its national legislative halls. It is disconcerting for this section to realize also that the venom came from the lips of a southerner, Representative RANKIN of Mississippi, T. V. A. enthusiast and usually a consistent Rooseveltian. There is no place in a democracy for anti-Semitism or any radical or religious prejudice. Those who give vent to such bigotry lack that much of being good Americans. Especially at this critical period is the planting of this basic Hitler principle a menace to the national unity which is essential to the progress of the Republic.

Save Our Democracy

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully call your attention to what, in my opinion, is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation that has ever been brought before any Congress. I have reference to H. R. 4949, known as the seizure-property bill. I would title it the final step of the goose step.

May I quote you a small part of this bill:

That during any period of national emergency proclaimed by the President the President is authorized, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, (a) to requisition and take over, either temporarily or permanently, property of any kind or character, whether real or personal, tangible or intangible, or any part thereof, or any right or interest therein or with respect thereto, whether by virtue of contract, patent, license, or otherwise.

In my opinion, the dictators whom we have been taught to hate do not have the power which would be granted under this proposal. There is no doubt that some drastic action is needed to shock the public into a realization of the task before the country and to eliminate some of the bottlenecks which are retarding our defense program. However, this bill, H. R. 4949, would give the President the authority to take over the property of any individual or corporation that he, in his judgment, might declare essential for defense purposes, and payment for which would be determined by the Government officials.

It certainly seems to me that it is not necessary, in the name of national defense, to place the property of every individual—his home, his automobile, his personal possessions, including his savings—into the hands of any individual or group. Under this bill the Government could take anything, from a sack of sugar to an airplane or railroad. If it is necessary to adopt such dictatorial measures in order to protect our democracy, we would have no democracy left, and, therefore, nothing left to fight for.

The possession of this power would furnish unscrupulous politicians with the opportunity to wreak vengeance and ruin upon those who are not in accord with their ideas. The President's explanation is that he needs this power in order to take over plants where strikes are stopping the defense effort. The fact is he already possesses this authority under provisions of the Draft Act, and he has demonstrated this authority in the sending of troops to stop a strike at a plant in California.

If there are specific things the President deems necessary to have further authority to achieve, he should say what these things are, and I am sure Congress would immediately remove all obstacles which are hindering our defense program without this all-inclusive measure, which would pave the way for persecution and one-man rule of 132,000,000 free-born Americans.

This bill threatens to destroy with one blow all those liberties which for years we have defended, and I, therefore, call upon Congress to defeat this measure and thus preserve our democracy.

British Propaganda Promoting Union Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of June 17, 1941:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 17, 1941]

BRITISH PROPAGANDA PROMOTING UNION NOW

Miss Cathrine Curtis, chairman of a national committee of women voters, recently issued a statement in Washington.

It appears that her important organization undertook a test poll to discover what proportion of the women voters of the United States favored involvement in the war.

Also what, if any, proportion favored common citizenship with England as proposed by the Union Now movement in the United States and by the eminent British statesman, Hore-Belisha, in the British House of Commons.

It is an amazing fact that some American citizens do approve of joining the United States to the British Empire and making American citizens British subjects in an amalgamation of the two peoples.

It had been previously alleged that those most interested in the Union Now movement are the international financiers and their associates and dependents.

Furthermore, that an almost equally important and influential group favoring the union is the socially prominent elements in the large eastern cities who find the satisfaction of their social ambitions in the high society of London and in the glamor of royal courts.

Whether or not this be the case it is significant that more than three-quarters of the vote cast in favor of common British and American citizenship came from the eastern seaboard States.

Some of these States were Tory in 1776 and labored for continued domination by England during the Revolutionary War.

Apparently they are to a degree Tory still.

To be sure, this Tory vote was not large.

It was only about 5 percent of the total vote.

That is to say, approximately 95 percent of those who answered the questionnaire voted against common British citizenship, while only about 5 percent voted for it.

But to your columnist the surprising fact is that 5 percent of the women of this great country (according to the figures Miss Curtis divulges) want the United States to return to British domination, and want the free citizens of the United States to abandon their independent citizenship and become subjects of the British Empire.

To what is this sycophantic sentiment due?

It cannot be entirely due to the interrelation of the great British and American financial interests.

It cannot be wholly attributable to the socially ambitious elements of the eastern cities.

It must be in part due to a temporary hysteria developed by the flood of shrewd British propaganda which has overwhelmed our country, and to a certain extent drowned out in weaker minds and less loyal hearts the spirit of American patriotism and independence.

Nevertheless, there is some encouragement to be found in the fact that three-fourths of that 5 percent voting for submersion of the United States in and under the British Empire came from the narrow strip which constituted the original English colonies, while less than one-fourth of this snobbish 5 percent voting for common citizenship came from the great territory west of the Allegheny Mountains which constitutes the truer America.

The poll of Miss Curtis' women's national committee seems to have been very comprehensive and thorough.

An enormous number of special polling blanks were sent to women everywhere—to housewives, nurses, college graduates and members of college faculties, school teachers, society women, business and professional women, women doctors, women lawyers, and others in every State of the Union.

The question of whether the recipient of the voting blank would oppose or favor a common citizenship with England was definitely asked.

Miss Curtis declares that her organization did not demand that those voting sign their names on the polling blanks but, nevertheless, made conspicuous provision in specified spaces for signature and address in case those voting wished so to identify themselves.

According to Miss Curtis, it was interesting to note that approximately nine-tenths of those voting against common British citizenship definitely identified themselves by writing in their names and addresses, while less than half of those voting in favor of common citizenship so identified themselves.

Apparently those who voted to make the United States again part of the British Empire were not very proud of their ballot and did not want their names and addresses known.

Possibly, too, not all the votes for common British citizenship were genuine, since in so many cases signatufes and addresses were not appended.

Let us take some consolation in that belief.

And perhaps, too, some of the ballots were cast by women who are in this country taking every advantage of its liberties and opportunities, but who are not American citizens.

There are many English who have been in America for years and still render their allegiance to the land of their birth.

This everlasting loyalty to England is especially characteristic of the British subject, and is admirable enough in those who are British subjects.

Some of these confirmed British may have been among the unsigned ballots which favored common citizenship.

If so, the situation is not so bad, but it is still an astounding circumstance that on the eastern seaboard of the United States nearly 10 percent of the population apparently is in favor of abandoning the independence of the United States and in making our people a part of the citizenry of the British Empire.

The type of British propaganda which incites such disloyalty to America and American institutions is distinctly not admirable.

It is just as dangerous to American unity and American integrity as the Communist propaganda which demands first loyalty of American citizens to Moscow.

All such propaganda to mislead our citizens and abate their loyalty to their own land and their own institutions should be branded as subversive.

Propaganda to lead us into war in the interests of alien lands is bad enough, but the attempt to make us sacrifice not only our welfare but our independence for the benefit of any foreign nation should not be tolerated by a self-respecting people.

Organized Labor and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

LETTER FROM PHILIP MURRAY, PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, AND REPLY BY HON. LELAND M. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., and my reply thereto:

Mr. PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MURRAY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 9, addressed to me and calling my attention to the situation of many millions of Americans who are now unemployed.

I note, in the third paragraph of your letter, you state that your C. I. O. economists estimate that there are nearly 9,000,000 unemployed. I note, also, in the fourth paragraph, you say it would take between two and two and one-half billion dollars to take care of these people; and I note in the last paragraph of your letter you say it seems to you to be the patriotic duty to provide work for our unemployed and to make certain that this Nation prove to its working people that their welfare is a first concern.

To me this is a very peculiar request coming from you, or at least it seems peculiar to me in the light of some of the things that the C. I. O. leaders (not the men) have done in my district and on the west coast. I refer to such leaders at Harry Bridges, Freytag, Orton, and others. It is my opinion that such leadership as I have come in contact with has never had the welfare of either the unemployed at heart or the welfare of the employed at heart. The main objective of these leaders, so far as I believe it to be true, is, first, to instill in the workers the belief in socialistic, communistic party-line doctrine; and, second, to promote them for their own financial welfare. In order to do this they have consistently kept the rank and file so far as they could do so, stirred up by agitation and riot, to cause as many strikes as possible, and thereby create a tremendous loss to both the men and the industry, sabotage the defense program, and create a tremendous amount of unemployment.

In view of all the strikes that the C. I. O. have called, it seems to me that you were not necessarily concerned with getting men back to work so much as you were with creating unemployment. Whether this is your objective or not, your group of leaders have not only done this, but they have seriously injured this country in carrying out its program of national defense, and further than that, many of these leaders have carried on the preachment of a doctrine that would eventually destroy this country.

I have never been opposed to constructive labor when properly led. As one example of this, I would mention Andrew Furuseth. I think this man was a real labor leader. He certainly worked for the interest and welfare of his men along constructive lines, but unfortunately, we have not had this type of leadership from your recent leaders. Whether you are responsible for this I do not know, but in your position, it is your duty to see that this type of leadership does not occur.

Taking a long-range view of this, I do not see how any labor leaders could ever countenance the thought of carrying on such a program as would destroy business or industry, or any part of it, for when this is done, if the results in other nations are any criterion, it will be found that nationalization of industry and business is a form of socialism and was quickly followed by a socialistic regime, a communistic regime, or a fascist regime. In every single instance, every labor union, as well as every business, was wiped out, as well as all rights of laboring men and all rights of ownership.

I am measuring these things not by what men profess at all, but by that which they actually accomplish. When we sum these actions up, these labor leaders will never be able to explain away the deplorable conditions that have existed on the Pacific coast, and particularly, that in the past week, which has just happened at the North American aviation plant at Inglewood, the lumber industry all along the coast, and for years the results accomplished by Harry Bridges in the shipping industry.

Will you tell me why any man who is a fellow traveler, or a Communist, should represent labor in collective bargaining? Will you also tell me why a man, like the alien, Harry Bridges and other alien communistic leaders, should come into this country and tell either business or the workingman who is a citizen, what to do?

I hope you are really serious in your solicitation for the unemployed, but I think one of the biggest helps you could be to this country today would be to cease causing unemployment by strikes, and particularly, in the face of the fact that millions of our young manhood are going to be drafted at $21 a month and are going to accept it, and in view of the further fact that many of the men who patriotically accept this draft are leaving their one-man businesses to serve the country, and are leaving salaries and earnings which are much higher than many of your skilled mechanics get.

Again, you should be cognizant of the fact that for every dollar that this defense program costs this country, it is going to cost the taxpayer a corresponding dollar and that he must replace it, and that a great part of this is going to come out of labor, and if you do not believe this you had better investigate the fact that a pair of shoes now bears 126 different taxes, a bar of soap 154, a pair of overalls 148, a cotton dress 125, a loaf of bread 52, and a bottle of milk 64. Labor had better recognize this, and in that recognition realize that in all these demands that are being made, in the long run it is going to come right back home. Then, also, look back about 2 years and remember that this country was doing its level best, through W. P. A. and otherwise, to keep men from going hungry, and paying $55 a month in my State on many jobs that did not do any particular good but were just created in order that payments could be made to preserve the self-respect by not accepting charity money. Now, when men can get necessary work the C. I. O. leaders on the west coast say they shall not work. Now then, check that up with many of the demands that are now being made and see if it squares out.

Then remember that this country already has a debt of sixty billions, ninety billions is being contemplated, and, if the country goes to war, it is said perhaps one hundred and fifty billions. What is going to be the final result of all this? Where will the employer be? Where will labor be? Where will the general public be if a break-down in the financial structure of this Government occurs? I will answer these questions and say that if history provides any precedent, it will lead to socialism, fascism, or communism, and no workman, no employer, and none of the public at large will benefit thereby, but, as a matter of fact, they will all lose all the benefits of American government and certainly what we have known up to this time as individual liberty.

Then, again, some day, some time, peace will come and war will cease. How do you suppose this country is going to compete with the forced labor conditions and low standard of living in Europe? What is going to happen to the American standard of living? It is high time that your group seriously considered some of these things and attempted to find the answer.

Very truly yours.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1941.

Hon. LELAND M. FORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORD: I want most earnestly to call to your attention the serious situation of many millions of Americans who are as yet unemployed.

According to available Government reports and to reports from our own affiliates, the situation of the unemployed is worse now than it has been at any time since the W. P. A. was started. Within the past year both local relief provisions and Federal Government work programs have fallen off much more rapidly than has unemployment.

Our C. I. O. economists estimate that there are nearly 9,000,000 unemployed. At the very best this number will be reduced by an average of only 2,000,000 during the next year. This will leave an average of 7,000,000 unemployed who are able and willing to work for the coming year. Certainly at least 3,000,000 of these will be very seriously in need.

To take care of this number would take between two and two and one-half billion dollars. Even to maintain the average of the past year would require at least $1,250,000,000.

It is my understanding that Congressman JOSEPH E. CASEY, of Massachusetts, has introduced an amendment providing for such increase to the 1941–42 appropriation. I want to urge in all sincerity your support of this increase. It certainly is a minimum amount.

It seems to me a patriotic duty to provide work for our unemployed and to make certain that this Nation shall prove to its working people that their welfare is a first concern.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP S. MURRAY,
President, C. I. O.

Pensions for Dependent Widows and Children of Deceased World War Veterans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, once more Congress, by a vote that was almost unanimous, has passed a bill providing for pension for the dependent widows and children of deceased World War veterans. I have been supporting measures of this kind for years. I think that the first bill of this kind ever introduced in Congress was a bill which I introduced back about 1926 or 1928. That bill carried provisions very similar to the present bill.

Congress has been making some minor changes in these bills from year to year, and it would seem that the bill that we have just been considering has been drawn in a very good form. I hope the President will not veto this bill. It has been unfortunate in the past that President Roosevelt has been vetoing these bills. I cannot understand why the President would be so liberal even to extravagance in the spending of billions upon billions of dollars while at the same time he has never been able to appreciate the situation of these World War widows who have been struggling to keep their little families together. I know of

many instances in my district, and I am proud to say that I have done the very best I could by them, and have done what I could to provide them with support from every other possible source. Not long ago a World War veteran in my district died and left a wife with eight small children. The oldest of these children had not developed mentally or physically and was a tremendous care and responsibility to the mother. These children ranged in age from 17 years down to 1 year. The veteran died leaving them practically penniless. They lived far out in the country and far away from any opportunity where the older children could work and help their mother. This widow was unable to gain assistance from the provisions of the Social Security law, which provides aid for dependent children because she lived in a poor county that was unable to match the provisions of the Social Security Act. For several years that mother has been struggling along and has been living principally by reason of the charity of the neighbors, many of whom have not been able to divide their scanty hoard with her and her helpless brood.

There are many cases of this kind in the country. There are many other cases where the children have grown up but are still in school and still need many things that can come only as the result of sufficient finances.

This pension would go a long ways toward bringing aid and some degree of comfort to these families which have suffered because of the death of the breadwinner of the family.

The various veterans organizations of the country have for years supported this program. They realize that the finest demonstration of appreciation for military service loyally rendered to the Government would be for the Government to help give relief to the family of a veteran who was ready and willing to give his services and his life for his country.

It is not necessary for me to make a long address on this subject because practically every Congressman agrees with my views and I have spoken on this subject before this House on many occasions.

I am glad the bill is passed, and I am glad that I was in a position to assist with its passage.

The New Justices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial, The New Justices, published June 13, 1941, in the Freeport (Ill.) Journal-Standard:

[From the Freeport (Ill.) Journal-Standard of June 17, 1941]

THE NEW JUSTICES

The missing seats in the Supreme Court are now filled, and the complexion of the tribunal is at last what President Roosevelt long ago wanted it to be. Seven of the nine justices have been appointed by him, and an eighth, Chief Justice Stone, has been elevated from the post of Associate to Chief Justice. In other words, many things come to him who waits, even if he has been impatient about the waiting. To be sure, any President of the United States who succeeds in being elected for a third term has a good deal more chance of getting whatever he wants in the way of a Supreme Court than the average incumbent who serves only 4 or 8 years, and it is not remarkable that Mr. Roosevelt has been able to name seven justices to the Supreme Bench, a record surpassed by none of his predecessors save George Washington.

No longer is it correct to speak of the Supreme Court as "nine old men." The average age is now fifty-something, and the constitutional law which this Court will make will fill more volumes than one likes to think of. American constitutional history is in their hands for a good many years to come, and only a great optimist could feel certain that it is now in the very best of hands. Two of the present Court, Frankfurter and Murphy, have failed to show the Supreme Court stature or temperament that their previous records suggested. None of the other present justices except Stone can be thought to rank with Holmes, Hughes, Brandeis, or Cardozo.

This criticism would appear most unseemly to the retiring Chief Justice Hughes, who deplored any deprecatory attitude toward the high Court of the land. But if one cannot now help thinking of the new justices without thinking also of their political leanings and affiliations, it is not the fault of the public, but of Mr. Roosevelt himself, whose comments before and during the Court-packing fight emphasized those leanings.

The Sheppard Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE WOMEN'S GENERAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a resolution that was unanimously adopted by the General Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church of North America at its convention held in Washington June 6–10, 1941.

It is entitled to the earnest consideration of the membership of this House.

Resolved, That the Women's General Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, in convention assembled in the city of Washington, representing 35,000 women and young women, earnestly petitions the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives in considering legislation regarding the health and morals of the young men in military camps to take favorable action to prohibit the sale of all alcoholic beverages within the camps and in the vicinity of them, as well as commercial vice.

Therefore this organization strongly urges the passage of H. R. 2475, as amended, to include the Sheppard bill.

LILLIAN M. ROBERTSON, *Secretary*.

The Automobile in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

ARTICLE OF NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to again bring to the attention of the House the part the automobile is to play in national defense. The motor transport opens a direct line to food supply, which produce must be brought to the Army, and it is by this means that the farmer moves to market the things which he raises and upon which the centers of population are dependent.

The article follows:

MOTOR TRANSPORT OPENS DIRECT LINE TO FOOD SUPPLY

"The Army moves on its stomach" has been a common military axiom since the time of Hannibal and Alexander the Great. In plain language, it means that an Army must eat to face the hardships of war.

But, first of all, the food must be brought to the Army, and that calls for speedy and efficient transportation, the National Automobile Dealers' Association points out in the seventh of its analyses showing the necessity of the motorcar in national defense and national economy.

Use of motor vehicles by farmers in moving produce to market has been one of the big developments of modern transportation. It has not only opened larger markets to agriculture, but it has raised the standard of living by providing the consuming public with fresh food in large quantities.

The greater expansion of markets has made the farmer wholly dependent on his car and his truck. Surveys which have been made show that more than 40 percent of the motor vehicles now in operation are owned by farmers and residents in rural communities under 2,500 population.

A survey made by the Michigan State Highway Department showed that of cars used by farmers, 92 percent are used in necessary functions of travel. In rural districts, according to the United States Public Roads Administration, 64 percent of the mileage covered by motor vehicles is for business purposes.

The largest concentration of automobiles on farms and in villages under 2,500 population is in the agricultural section known as the north central part of the United States, with approximately 5,000,000 motor vehicles registered in that area. In Iowa, which is one of the North Central States, the highways constitute the only transportation link

between one-fourth of the communities and towns in the State.

A survey made by a private agency covering the States of Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri, brought out the information that slightly above 1 percent of the farmers in that area bought passenger cars for pleasure only. Outside of that exception, all farmers replying to the questionnaire bought their automobiles for use in carrying on farm operations, using their cars for pleasure only as a combined convenience.

American farmers own and operate 1,000,000 trucks. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, 53 percent of the livestock, 27 percent of butter, 65 percent of the live poultry, and 40 percent of fruits and vegetables are moved from farm to market by truck.

Special studies made in 10 States indicate that 65 percent of all rural dwellings are within 1 mile of a surfaced road and 77.5 percent within 2 miles, which means that farmers have linked their operations with the availability of transportation.

Aside from making the business of professional farming more profitable, the development of motorized transportation has stimulated the back-to-the-farm movement and relieved the congestion of large cities. A factor in this movement is the small farms utilized by the factory worker to stabilize his income. With his motorcar this type of workman operates a direct line between factory job and his small farm, making him entirely dependent on personal transportation.

The population trend away from urban centers has also created thousands of completely motorized communities, where an automobile is as essential as a home. It is hardly conceivable that all of the inhabitants make their living in these motorized communities. Rather, they are employed in the industrial centers, and their entire mode of living has been organized on the assurance that they can travel to and from their jobs on schedule.

In national defense, the role of the farmer has become increasingly important, because of the lines of communication between his source of supply and the civilian population and the Army camps.

Defense Doom Comes to Small Manufacturer—Another Case History of the Plight of the Little Fellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1941

LETTER FROM MASTER REFRIGERATED LOCKER SYSTEMS, INC., OF SIOUX CITY, IOWA

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter from Mr. W. W. Wilson, president of the Master Refrigerated Locker Systems, Inc., of Sioux City, Iowa, giving another case history of the plight of the small manufacturer.

Here is a modern, well-equipped small manufacturing plant that has been trying for more than 6 months to obtain a defense contract or subcontract but without success. They sent a man to Washington to try and figure on some of this work. They ask for a chance to bid on Government work but the bid blanks are not furnished until it is too late to submit an offer. This has happened not once but many times to the small manufacturers of my district. They are always excluded from bidding by some technicality or other. Most of the time they cannot even get the bid blanks and specifications.

Having failed to get in on any defense work, these little manufacturers now face the likelihood of being shut off from their sources of raw materials. This will mean closing down the plants and throwing their employees out of work. Thus the defense program will bring doom rather than boom to the small manufacturer, who is entirely overlooked, ignored, rejected, and discriminated against by the present policy of placing defense orders.

Why do we not use our existing machine-tool facilities before spending the money and taking the time to build new plants?

The letter follows:

MASTER REFRIGERATED LOCKER SYSTEMS, INC.,
Sioux City, Iowa, June 5, 1941.

Hon. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VINCE: As you no doubt know, we have sent a list of our equipment to every procurement office of the United States. We have also sent in on several different occasions for bid forms on different articles that we are in a position to manufacture; however, something always comes up every time so it is impossible for us to make the bid. For example, on May 27 I wrote to the Navy Bureau of Supplies and Accounts to receive bid blanks on 8,000 steel dust pans. These bids were to be opened on June 3. The information I requested was received here at the office on June 3, so it was impossible for me to even try and place a bid. This has not only happened once but several times, and in talking it over with Leo Dailey, the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Sioux City, he has asked me to write you explaining the situation.

I realize that I am only 1 small manufacturer out of possibly 10,000 in the United States that is facing the same problem. As you know, we manufacture steel lockers for use in food-storage locker plants, and in the past 4½ years, we have furnished locker equipment for over 1,200 of these plants in the United States. At the present time, there are over 3,500 locker plants operating in the United States with an approximate 700,000 lockers; in other words, there are 700,000 families that are being served out of cold-storage locker plants, which means that there is over 14,000,000 pounds of meat and vegetables stored in locker plants by conservative families who are storing their foodstuffs for the economy that the locker plant presents.

Now we are faced with the problem of trying to get material to manufacture these steel lockers. Owing to the fact that we do not have a priority rating, certain manufacturers are not accepting orders from us for such material as bolts, etc., which means unless we can get some type of war contracts or subcontracts that we will have to close our plant and forget all about the locker business during the duration of the armament program, which also means that we will have 51 men to lay off, and lose our complete distributing organization that we have set up over the United States.

The National Locker Association, which is an association organized by the associations of every State in the Union, feel that they should be entitled to a priority number, owing to the place that the lockers hold in serving the communities in which they are established. The Government is talking conservation, and I know of no better way of conserving food products than through the locker-plant set-up.

Yours very truly,

MASTER REFRIGERATED LOCKER SYSTEMS, INC.,
By W. W. WILSON, *President.*

We Are All Trustees of Our Rich Inheritance of American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. MILO J. WARNER, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues, who may not have heard the message, the address made on the afternoon of May 18, 1941, by Hon. Milo J. Warner, national commander of the American Legion, from San Francisco, Calif., as a part of the National Citizenship Recognition Day ceremonies.

Mr. Warner's address, on that occasion, was directed specifically to thousands who have newly acquired citizenship by naturalization. In listening to his address I was moved to the realization that all of us would benefit by hearing, or reading his remarks, which challenged our realization that we are all trustees of our rich inheritance of American citizenship.

I submit herewith Mr. Warner's inspiring address:

Throughout America today community gatherings are being held to celebrate the coming to political citizenship of some two millions of young Americans. Honored with these young men and women are scores of thousands who have newly acquired citizenship by naturalization. As national commander of the American Legion I am proud to participate in such an occasion.

This beautiful Golden Gate Park in one of America's truly great cities in a State of magnificent splendor and wealth, of great natural resources and strength of American citizenship and character, provides a most fitting setting for this ceremony.

In such a place and on such an occasion one recalls the sturdy, stalwart men and women of America who fought their way to this great place of scenic beauty and virile strength of land and sea. They came through the deserts and mountains, they fought their way through hurricane at sea and storm on land, they came over almost impassable and insurmountable obstacles. As a result of their efforts we are here today.

To both of these groups—the native-born and the naturalized new citizens—I extend the salute of a representative group of mature Americans. We have been told that "a nation is a thing that lives and acts like a man, and men are the particles of which

it is composed." We come then to consider whether this Nation has been generous and kind in making provision for your entry into the privileges and duties of adult citizenship.

I am confident that in this group of new Americans there is general acceptance of the basic concept of citizenship, which is the duty of the individual to give loyal service to the community, the State, and the Nation, in return for which he receives the protection of the whole people.

You are taking your place as citizens of this country at a critical time in the history of the world. Bloody war is raging throughout most of Europe and large parts of Asia and Africa. There is a clarion challenge issued to the democratic nations to prove themselves capable of surviving.

Your new status as political citizens of this country—superimposed on your former status as residents of this Nation—brings you within the orbit of that challenge. The manner of your acceptance of the challenge may determine the issue. I believe fully in your realization of the necessity to do all that must be done to preserve America inviolate, without a long black-out of all the freedoms we have inherited from the past.

This, as never before, is a time to strike bitterness and prejudice from our hearts, and look to the facts with such wisdom as we can muster. You come, fellow citizens, to join with the rest of us in a trying hour. Bring to our councils a mind free of old hates and fears, a mind fresh tuned to the task of this, our land. Coming to us in that way, you will bring strength to this, your country, when this strength is needed.

Following such a course, we will bring added strength to the pool of citizenship in which lies our greatest hope to come through to our ultimate destiny. It is even possible that our responsibilities for citizenship participation may call upon us to make anew the sacrifices that once a generation are called forth in the preservation of the civil, political, and religious liberties on which all our precious freedoms are based.

Remember that America belongs alike to all of us, whether our ancestors were linked to the *Mayflower's* voyage, or came in the later flood of immigration.

All the history of the United States, all the glory of its past, all of the service and sacrifice which gave it birth, are partly yours. We all have our share of it.

We belong to a people sprung from many races and many lands, a people big enough in heart and long enough in head to recognize that liberty and human rights belong to all men, and to welcome all true men to our participation in the blessings we cherish here.

Our new citizens today are of two groups now welded as one with sharing in the responsibilities and privileges of American citizenship.

The one group, the larger, embraces some 2,000,000 young Americans, who, born to the rights of American citizenship, now come into their priceless heritage upon arriving at the established age of full manhood and womanhood.

The other group, the smaller, made up, however, of scores of thousands, has voluntarily chosen to assume the responsibilities and duties of citizenship. Born in other lands and coming to our shores, they have elected to become citizen partners with us.

We are too apt at times to take for granted those things which come to us without voluntary effort on our part, without full recognition of their priceless values.

On the other hand, by toilful effort and painful experience, we have learned and have had branded indelibly on our own minds and consciences, sometimes by actual scars on our bodies, the value of those things reached and accomplished by our own volition and endeavor.

We who live in the United States believe this is the best and happiest country in the world. We must believe that because those who have brought it to its present enviable position in the world came to its shores of their own free will and accord and asked to become a part of it.

What makes it good? What makes it happy? What can keep it that way? We have a rare combination of natural resources and political freedom to insure this as the land of promise—a land where there still are new frontiers to cross.

We are vexed and confused now because the vast miasma of racial and ideological conflicts in the Old World impinges upon our national conscienciousness and issues a challenge to us—as a Nation—to determine whether our form of government can survive the terrific conflict in which world economic and military forces have pitted every element of their strength.

To refer to these world conflicts is to bring home to all of us the necessity for making definite, daily contributions to the support of our American citizenship. We must accommodate ourselves to the thought that we cannot gain something for nothing by being American citizens. We cannot continue to enjoy all of the abundant riches Nature has bestowed upon us; we cannot continue to enjoy all of the inheritance of free citizenship unless all of us are willing to do something as trustees of the rich inheritance of citizenship in the United States.

A good cow is a nice thing to own, but she will dry up if you don't milk her, starve if you don't feed her, get sick if you do not keep her in a clean barn.

A hive of bees is a nice thing to own, but you will not have the bees long if you do not house and care for them and watch out for them when they are ready to swarm.

The United States of America long has been called a land flowing with milk and honey. Compared to many other parts of the world it is all of that. We who are here have an equality before the law to share in the fruits of our citizenship. But there is a correlative need to consider whether we shall long maintain such a privilege if we neglect the duty to care for the cows and bees.

That is a simple way of saying that citizenship carries its duties and responsibilities. It is a statement whose every implication carries meaning to those among us who live in the United States. Here the land is rich in nature's goods. A high share of the potential future development of the United States of America lies here.

We recognize there is such a thing as destiny or fate, or that which bespeaks some invincible force controlling human life in the operations of the universe, and, on the other hand, we recognize the philosophy of self-determination as so bravely expressed by the poet Henley in the lines:

"It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate:
I am the captain of my soul."

We know that there is an all-prevailing power which rises above the individual will or movements of mere man. We also know that there lies within the power of man the privilege and the inherent duty of self-determination in many matters. Where lies the line of demarcation is the problem.

As a Nation we are now at the crossing of the ways. As a Nation we have before us a destiny and a decision. While there are many factors and dimensions directing our destiny over which we have no control, much still rests with our self-determination as individuals and as a Nation.

In one direction there lies an even road which woos the follower of the easy way and is the loiterer's course, but which leads to a morass and wilderness; to the darkness of the jungle and to the slavery of soul and spirit. In the other direction there lies ahead a difficult road—rough and rugged, bestrewn with obstacles and pits over which the travel is hard, and progress is at the price of travail and pain, of blood and sacrifice, but it leads to fertile valleys of prosperity and progress, and to vaulted mountain tops of freedom—freedom of soul and of body.

We, as a Nation, have come to the crossing of those ways. We have a decision to make. We must determine which road to take. The one is smooth—yes; smooth for a way, and then that smoothness levels into the bog of servitude, over which hangs the suffocating lethal gas of fear and oppression. The other way is rough and difficult, but it leads to the heights, while the vitalizing, invigorating air of freedom envelops and sweeps its length.

Down which road do we take the flag of our country? While we must choose which way to go, we cannot choose the smooth road and reach the destiny and goal at the end of the rough road.

Once again the world is faced with a raging conflict between two opposing forces, one endeavoring to drive us back to the Dark Ages, the other striving to preserve our progress and advance toward a fuller, richer, better life; the one representing devouring despotism, the other political forces supporting self-government and individual freedom for all.

As a great Nation and as the only Nation with the reserve power essential to stem the encroaching tide of despotism, we cannot ignore the world conflict now raging, the titanic struggle between despotism and liberty. It is a destiny from which we cannot flinch.

The issue between totalitarianism and Americanism is clearly and sharply defined. It is for us to determine whether Americanism will survive; should totalitarianism prevail over a great portion of the world, there is grave question whether our Government could truly live.

In meeting the problems ahead as individual citizens and as a Nation, it would be well for us to keep foremost fundamental principles—rules which are consistent with our tradition of living and government. May I suggest five basics which I feel all American citizens may well hold fast to in time of world storm.

1. We should at all times consider the interests of the United States, first, last, and always, and do nothing to destroy the national integrity or identity of our own country.

2. In the preparation of our national defenses and in our fight against those things that are threatening our country let us at all times maintain and preserve the fundamental, basic concepts of our form of government, a constitutional democracy so created as not only to express but also to make effective the desires of the majority and at all times preserve the fundamental rights of the minorities.

3. The present-day problems of national defense lie above all questions of partisanship, personal prejudices, or selfish interests. We must shuck off and cast aside all partisan and selfish viewpoints and motives.

4. We should be absolutely loyal to those whom we have placed in public office in our communities, our States, and in our Nation, for upon their shoulders in this time of emergency rests the official responsibility for our national-defense efforts, and we should support them. We have given them the job. Let every one of us assist them in the doing of it.

5. We should face the facts as they are, not as we should like to have them. We must be realistic, even though doing so gives us many a twinge. We must face the facts as they are today, not as they were yesterday, or yesteryear, nor even as we might like to have them tomorrow, or in the future, although we must, of course, plan and look ahead to the future. We must face conditions and facts as they are today, even though

we might not like some of the milestones of the road over which we have traveled in arriving at the place where we are today.

The better things of life—abundance of life in soul and body, the richer existence in spirit and physical being—come through travail and pain, work and struggle. They are reached after trial and tribulation, after pluck and perseverance.

The splendor and beauty, the resources and riches of California, were found and reached, developed, and enjoyed, only after much sacrifice and struggle. And so it is with the privileges and inspiring strength of American citizenship. Its most refreshing waters are found in the deepest wells of service to the community, State, and Nation. Those who give the most get the most.

I like the motto of Kansas, one of our great Middle Western States—ad astra per aspera—"to the stars through hardships," declaring the creed of the courageous pioneer who, while literally hitching his wagon to oxen, however, in daring and driving spirit hitched his wagon to a star.

In terms of the future development of our country we should remember that the United States did not become great solely because Nature had so richly endowed the land in which we live. The flowering of our greatness came because man took the tools of Nature and, shaping them to his own use, developed a citizenry in harmony with all the freedoms we cherish.

Blood and sweat and toil and trouble is a phrase that occurs often to us now, as we see the great-hearted efforts of nations whose concept of citizenship most nearly approaches ours in their fight to beat down the forces of oppression and suppression. But every element of that phrase has been used by man in our own country in winning through to the greatness that is ours as a Nation today.

The back-breaking efforts of the families who crossed the prairies and mountains by covered wagon encompass a journey that is scarcely matched by any people in history in their efforts to realize a dream.

James Truslow Adams ably draws a word picture of that dream in The Epic of America, when he writes: "The American dream—that dream of a land where life may be richer and fuller for everyone according to his ability or achievement. It is not a dream of a land of motorcars and high wages merely, but of a social order where each man and each woman can attain to the fullest stature of which they are innately capable and recognized by others for what they are, regardless of the fortuitous circumstances of birth or position."

Such as that is our goal and endeavor. We in the United States have gone furthest toward it. It is reached by trial and perseverance and by united national integrity. It is reached by depth of purpose and character in performance by each of us as individual American citizens.

That great exponent and advocate of freedom, Thomas Jefferson, said a century and a half ago, "We are not to expect to be translated from despotism to liberty in a feather bed. Freedom is something that men must fight for; otherwise there would have been no need for them to pledge to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. What they regarded as priceless was not peace, but liberty."

He also said, "When we reflect that the eyes of the virtuous all over the earth are turned with anxiety on us, as the only depositories of the sacred fire of liberty, and that our falling into anarchy would decide forever the destinies of mankind, and seal the political heresy that man is incapable of self-government, the only contest between divided friends should be, who will dare farthest into the ranks of the common enemy."

As a Nation we must be willing to fight for our liberty and not to flinch from that fight ere it is too late.

Together as a Nation of courageous men and women, let us go bravely in a solid phalanx along the rugged road to the heights and our great destiny, in a way befitting the words of Dryden:

"Gladness in every face express'd,
Their eyes before their tongues confess'd,
Men meet each other with erected look,
Their steps were higher that they took."

Saboteurs of the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I am making over the radio this evening:

Apparently it has become high treason to suggest the full commercial development of the Nation. To those who want to hide the bright future of this country behind the smoked goggles of selfish interest, to those who are steeped in sectional and antisocial thinking, I suggest you turn your dials to a more pleasant program.

To those who believe in progress, good evening.

The world has been too well populated with "little men." By that I mean those individuals who have acquired little minds, who have lost their inherent foresight, and with it courage. Thank Heaven, these myopic "little people" are in the minority—but shame be it that they make the most noise.

This country did not grow great on milk-toast courage. To borrow the phrase of the Chief Executive, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." What if the buckskin-clad men who scaled the heights of the Appalachians and, after looking into the green forests in the valleys of the Middle West, had said, "The land is a jungle of trees; we cannot live there." What if Lincoln had said, "We cannot hold this Nation united; we are permanently divided by discordant interests." Fine courage, my friends, and unselfishness, but there were "little men" in those times, too.

I would like to turn back the pages of time to show you what the minority of "little people" have accomplished. For recorded ages they have hung a millstone about the neck of progress. It is 1721 and Thomas Steers has proposed the Manchester Ship Canal to bring food and commerce to the interior of England. The selfish interests and their stooges are militantly opposing it—Liverpool is fighting it bitterly.

Year after year, decade after decade, the narrow selfish group of "little men" fought the idea and succeeded in keeping progress at bay for 173 years. Finally after much strife, the courageous and socially minded succeeded in securing the completion of this shipway. But hark, this ridiculous story could now be a tragedy, for the Manchester Ship Canal is keeping a huge share of the English people from starvation this very minute. But the loud little minority had thought only of Liverpool—and not of England. We have a fine parallel in the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway today.

To return to our story, Liverpool did not vanish, her commerce was not destroyed—she became the greater. Thousands of workers built homes in the Manchester area, coming in from the hinterlands. Thousands of new families traded in the Liverpool district. New industries were established all along the canal, and the section became great industrially.

New York and Buffalo are the Liverpools of this Nation. They are opposing the seaway on the same groundless fears, but let them take a lesson from this narrative, for as surely and as inevitably, the seaway as a full-fledged ship canal is certain to be built, and better now than later.

The inspiring thing about history is the lesson it brings—that progress can be halted but never stopped.

In the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the late years of the old century and the first of the new, we find the same clique opposing the Panama Canal that now oppose the seaway. These stooges of the opposition were drooling with pretty flourishes of oratory, motivated by a desire to serve vested interests. When the issue became one of national defense, the transportation groups no longer found their position tenable—they knew they could not sabotage defense efforts and keep face.

Returning to the musty pages yellowed with time, we see in 1902 a Member of the Senate opposing the Canal and insisting that the only reason America wished to undertake the project was to show off to the rest of the world, and more particularly to show up the French, who had failed.

The stated reasons for lobbying against the Canal ran the entire gamut of the human imagination. Waving the flag and piously droning about economy, they pleaded that the hard-headed, sensible, and conscientious people knew there was not, and never could be, an economic justification for digging the ditch. One Member direly prophesied that volcanic action in the Caribbean region would make the maintenance of the Canal unfeasible—if, indeed, it ever could be completed.

This all sounds insane now, but for years these insincere rantings kept the Panama Canal from completion. Had they had their way, we might now be facing a tragedy with the international checker game moving as it is. But the loud little minority thought only of their selfish and sectional interests and not of America.

Old Glory has 48 stars. All the 48 States represented in that beloved blue field are knit together in a common purpose—to make a great, united Nation. When a decision faces this country, it follows that all the States' interests shall be considered. No State, because of the numerical advantage of representation, should attempt to block the economic progress of her sister States. This is more true today than ever, when we are struggling in one mighty effort to keep our place in the sun.

Friends in the East, your economic position is not threatened by the completion of the seaway. Great additional electric-power sources will provide for a new expansion of industry in New York and her sister States of the New England group. In the territory served by the inland ports of this waterway will be built a great empire—the purchasing power of these people will be reflected in orders to industries on the east coast. To the consumers in this region will come great savings in foodstuffs from the grain belts of the Middle West. The coastal cities of the Atlantic will find undreamed of markets within the borders of their own land.

Friends of the South, your surpluses of cotton can be utilized by consumers in the Lake States. They can trade their cars and manufactured goods for your grapefruit, oranges, oil, tobacco, and other products.

We will all find new standards of living by the interchange of commercial goods.

The benefits of the production of wealth in the Mississippi Valley will spread in every direction and enrich every nook and corner of the Nation.

To California we can truthfully say that the principal market for the products of its people—their oranges, grapes, and figs—is now and always will be in the midcontinent of America; to our friends from Georgia we can say that the market for peaches, peanuts, and pecans would soon be doubled if the seaway were built; to the people of Connecticut we can say that their market for dollar watches and nutmegs would increase by leaps and bounds; to the people of Louisiana that they would sell more rice and that the port of New Orleans would do more business if the empire to the north of them were fully developed.

People of all the Nation, we cannot afford great waste—not now. The race for economic supremacy calls for the planned and intelligent use of every part of America. In his recent message to Congress, President Roosevelt said, and I quote, "I know of no single project of this nature more important to this country's future in peace or war. Its authorization will demonstrate to the enemies of democracy that, however long the effort, we intend to outstrip them in the race of production. In the modern world that race determines the rise or fall of nations."

We have all been called upon to subsidize agriculture. The reason for this has been the fact that the farmer could not, because of high transportation costs, deliver to markets profitably. Huge piles of grain lay rotting on the fertile soil of the West, while much of the Nation goes hungry for bread. Some of the States have lost population year after year—because farming was a poor business. With the completion of the seaway we restore farming as a great industry—the Okies can come back to the land. Now most of the farms in the great agricultural region are mortgaged and over half of the farmsteads are operated by tenant farmers. Keep the benefits of the seaway from them much longer and we will have the land abandoned—we will have created a great arid inland desert. The railroads serving them will become streaks of rust.

Much organized opposition has come from the railroad unions. This is motivated by the fear that the seaway will injure the roads. I have constantly maintained that this has no basis in fact.

To support my contention, I offer in evidence the fact that many of the presidents of the railroads of the Nation have openly supported the project. The roll includes Ralph Budd, of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, who is now transportation expert on the defense organization for President Roosevelt; also Hale Holden, who is with the Southern Pacific, and many others. This is an imposing array of names from the most progressive systems, and who favored the seaway 7 years ago. It should serve to lull into security the fears of the employees. If they felt that the seaway would injure their business rather than help it, they would be opposing it with all the resources at their command.

I have always worked in the interests of the railroad employees and the laboring man and, if in my judgment the project would adversely affect their interests, I would oppose it, too.

The opposition has expressed the fear that an influx of cheap foreign goods and foreign labor will be attendant upon the opening of the seaway. To them, I say, foreign goods cannot be shipped into this country via the St. Lawrence any differently than they could enter from our ocean ports, as long as we protect our markets with tariff regulations. Foreign labor cannot stay here to compete with us as long as alien registration and immigration laws are kept in effect.

These statements have about as much foundation in fact as the other claims of the enemies of the shipway—that we will sacrifice the sovereignty of Lake Michigan—that the project bears no relation to national defense.

To those of all political faiths, the seaway was not conceived by, nor has it been fostered by, one political party. President after President, Republican and Democrat alike, have urged the building of the route from Superior to the sea. They have all, conservative and liberal, seen the need, the wisdom, and the economic justification for the project both as a source of power and as a transportation aid. Our President has called for the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway as vital to our present national-defense efforts.

Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, has called for a miracle in shipbuilding. In the shipyards of the Great Lakes, many of them now idle and rusting, lies a part of that miracle, while the shipyards of the rest of the Nation are choked with orders.

Wake up, America! Wake up! This is a task that everyone might well dedicate himself to doing. In the days ahead we will hear the old, old stories that have kept the seaway a paper project for a quarter of a century and more. It is the loud little minority again failing to think of America. I urge every civic-minded person, the far-sighted people, in all the Nation to assist. This is your country, your Government, and the project is your cause. You—everyone listening to my voice—can help build the seaway by building support behind your Senators and Representatives. Let this not be his choice alone; write, wire, send petitions and letters; don't let up until the task is done. A united, determined people can and will tear out the barriers to progress and make a route to one of our greatest assets that we have negligently left undeveloped—America's inland sea.

Farmers Burdened With High Freight Rates Demand St. Lawrence Seaway

REMARKS

OF

HON. R. T. BUCKLER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, having been a wheat farmer in the Red River Valley of Minnesota for 37 years, I was amazed by the argument of my Nebraska colleague [Mr. COPELAND] some days ago against the St. Lawrence seaway. He quotes figures to show that Canadian rail rates from the prairie provinces to Lake Superior are lower than corresponding rates in our Western States, and from these facts makes an awkward and futile effort to show that the seaway would do harm to our agriculture. Just how lower rates from lake ports to our own eastern population and to world markets can by any possibility hurt a prairie wheat farmer is not disclosed.

We, who during a life struggle on western farms for a bare existence have been subjected to arbitrary and burdensome rail rates to deep water, are eager to secure the benefit of low rates from any lake port to the sea. And the rail rates in Canada cannot by any sophistry be made to detract from such benefit.

Red River farmers are not unfamiliar with the economic factors that have entered into the development of the West on both sides of the border. We are fully aware of the arrangements made by the Canadian Government and the Canadian railways a generation ago for cheap, long-haul grain rates in order to lure settlers to the remote areas of their marvelous prairie empire. In return their railways received certain gratuities. Our Government also made vast grants to our western roads, but with no stipulation as to grain rates, and the few privileges stipulated to the Government have been largely surrendered. For a time our grain carriers made rates that were partly but not fully competitive in the border area. These concessions were abandoned in 1935, by permission of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and rates are now higher than ever before since the earliest settlement of the West. We are, therefore, in more need of the seaway now than when the treaty was rejected by the Senate 7 years ago. However, it then received an affirmative vote of 46 to 42, showing that a majority of that body, after extended hearings and long deliberation, favored the project even before the President raised the issue of defense.

My colleague finally turns from the seaway to the inland rivers for farm relief. He says, and I quote his words:

> The hope of the farmer of the Middle West to reach world markets lies, not in a seaway through Canada, but in low barge service to the Gulf and out to the sea upon the Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries.

I am for all possible river improvements and wish these inland waterways Godspeed in bringing relief to the Mississippi Valley farmers. But how a Great Lakes 27-foot seaway with ocean craft can hurt me and the farmers of my area while a 9-foot river channel can help me, is a mystery to me and to all who heard the gentleman from Nebraska address this body. He thinks that 9 feet of water with flatboats, is just right and helpful, but three times that depth with great cargo carriers is destructive. He reminds me of the colored valet who was given a bottle of liquor by his master. A few days later the master inquired how he liked the gift. "Jess right," was the reply. Asked what he meant by "jess right," he said, "If it had been any worse it would have killed me, and if any better you wouldn't give it to me."

Opponents of the seaway try to arouse national prejudice by calling it a canal through Canada. I live too near the border and know the Canadian people too well to entertain such feeling.

Early in this century, nearly 40 years ago, there was a strong movement for a 20-foot channel from Chicago to the Gulf. The State of Illinois espoused the cause, and much time and money were spent in exploration. It was proposed to divert 14,000 cubic second-feet of water from Lake Michigan to float the expected commerce, and there was much enthusiasm throughout the Midwest for the project. All our hopes were for its

consummation. However, the most efficient engineers finally declared the project impracticable, as the cost of maintenance of so deep a channel in such a silt-bearing stream as the Mississippi was forbidding. The 9-foot depth was recommended and has been standardized on the Ohio, the Illinois, and the Father of Waters. I urge all such internal waterway improvements, not only for the farmer but for all lines of industry, and rejoice in the prosperity not only of my fellow farmers, but my fellow citizens of all occupations everywhere. At some future time, I shall take up other features of this groundless, gratuitous, and malignant attack on the only outlet for my people to the sea. Suffice it now to say that whatever may be the sentiment of other States or other areas of our country, the Red River Valley of Minnesota stands for the United States, and will have the support of my vote for any measure that will serve the welfare of the remotest section of our country or the humblest groups of our people.

David Lawrence Proposes Planning for a Peace After the War as an Effective Program of Defeating Hitler and His Axis Partners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, what course of action is best for America? It is this question, sir, which Americans throughout the length and breadth of our great Republic are now searching their souls to answer. Upon the ability of the collective thinking of America to find the right answer to that question depends the future of our way of life in our sphere of influence. This has truly become the most important question ever to face the self-governing people of a free republic.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who feels that in the answering of a question affecting the destiny of every American and which will provide joy or promote sorrow in every home of our land, the defining of the ultimate answer to such a question should be the exclusive right of any man, or group of men, nor should it be confined to citizens of any section of this country, geographically, nor to any segment of our population from the standpoint of their occupation.

The question, What course of action is best for America? is one which probes into the lives of all the people of America and it is manifestly one which the entire cross section of public sentiment should help to answer. In this we differ from the practice of the unfortunate people of Germany, or Italy, or Russia, where a single leader asks and answers all the questions and the rights of the people begin and end with the ancient formula "ours but to do or die." America is great because its people through their collective judgment and energies have made it great. It is not great because a few outstanding men have told its people what to do; it is today the greatest Nation in the world because the joint judgment of its people, through the years, have counseled with their great leaders in formulating public policies which have best served the public weal. The formula of freedom which has built America will protect and preserve America if it is not forsaken for methods made of shoddier stuff.

AMERICA AT THE CROSSROADS

It is therefore both important and inspiring that as America stands at the crossroads today, searching for the correct answer to the question, What is best for America? the people of America both in and out of Government are analyzing their thoughts as never before. This is not a question to be answered by the President. It is not a question to be determined, alone, by Cabinet officers and Executive appointees. Nor is it a question to which Congress alone can assume the princely right to make reply. It is a question for men and women in all walks of life to discuss and consider; it is a question which mothers and fathers, together with their sons in the military services, have a right and a duty to help to decide. It is a question for farmers to argue as much as it is a question for lawyers to discuss. It is a question for men of all parties, all creeds, all colors. It—the most important question of our era—is a question which editors and preachers, housewives and statesmen, store clerks and big business executives, laborers and capitalists, youngsters and oldsters in all walks of life should analyze, study, discuss, consider, and decide. It is thus that our Republic truly functions: it is thus that the formula for freedom operates where men are free and where self-government is a reality. For, in America, the people are the government.

When the people speak, so speaks the Government. Here in America, under God the people rule. Our Constitution provides the specific framework through which the people of America can express their convictions to their representatives in Congress and in the executive departments and through these representatives, in turn, implement the people's desires into established Government policy. And once, such policy is established, by the people through their constitutional means, Americans have always joined ranks to promote their country's interests. So, too, it must always be.

On the gravest question now confronting our beloved Republic—war or peace—the people have not spoken and discussion of the question continues as we search for the formula which will answer the problem, "What is best for America?" We are a united people on many aspects of that formula. We unite in supporting a program of all possible aid short of war to Britain and on this Congress and the people have spoken. We unite in developing an impregnable defense for this country and this hemisphere. On this the Congress and the people have also spoken. We are united in our determination to rid this Republic of subversive agents of the poisonous creeds of the Nazis, Communists, and Fascists, and to protect America against infestation from within or from without by these disciples of totalitarianism. On this, too, the Congress and the people have spoken.

AMERICA SEEKS GUIDE FOR FUTURE ACTION

Only on steps beyond the three foregoing established policies of America today does debate continue and do people still search for the best course of action to best serve America. Beyond this the people and the Congress have not spoken except through unofficial polls registering them some 80 percent against involvement in war, or by their election of candidates pledged not to send American boys to fight across the seas. America still seeks prayerfully for a guiding star to light our course of action beyond the points upon which we already stand united.

Mr. Speaker, I think America is today united on another point but it is an objective rather than a course of action. America is united in a desire to see Hitler defeated in this war and to see nazi-ism, communism, and fascism foiled in any dreams of world conquest which may be cherished by their leaders as a possible result of either military might or subversive tactics. Americans hate tyranny. In a speech on the floor of the House on June 18, 1940, in which I advocated stronger defense collaboration between North and South America I made the following statement which I subscribe to today, with even greater vigor than I did a year ago:

> Mr. Chairman, I have fought Hitlerism, Stalinism, and Mussolini-ism in and out of Congress. I began the fight in my own State nearly 7 years ago in speeches before high-school commencement audiences, service clubs, community groups, and wherever I could find an audience. In 1936 I devoted the better part of a whole political campaign to fighting subversive influences in America and, although defeated and accused of setting up "straw men" at which to shoot, I have never stopped the fight, and I shall never stop it until America is rid of these "peddlers of piffle" who would import alien ideas of government into America to becloud our great ideal of a fair chance for a free people through self-government. I have probably given more speeches against these pagan philosophies of European "isms" by two times over than any other individual in my State, and among my proudest votes in Congress are those which I cast to continue the Dies committee so that sufficient evidence could be unearthed to forever expose and exclude nazi-ism, fascism, and communism from America. Therefore, I venture to insist today that we do more than pass a resolution. I hope we may rededicate ourselves fervently to a crusade against these foreign "isms," both in North and South America.

How then can America best govern its actions to protect its own way of life in its own sphere of influence and to register its mighty will to bring defeat to Hitler and his Axis partners? Some sincere Americans advocate that the best procedure to follow is for this country to enter the war, to send her sons across the tractless oceans once again to fight the legions of Germany, Italy, Japan, and perhaps Russia, and even France, on whatever foreign continent or ocean that we can establish contact with them. Too few of such people, however, go far

enough to point out what they would have follow the fighting. Should America, following such a war, become the policeman of the world, enforcing by our might of arms our policies throughout the world, maintaining the boundary lines we deem appropriate in Africa and Europe and Asia? Should we insist with military might an international code of conduct in conformity with our ideals? If so, at what a cost? And with what chances of success? And with what results to the internal economy and political freedom of our own people here at home? Unless such questions are answered honestly and accurately, and in our American interests, in advance of our joining the fighting, it would seem to be both foolhardy and futile to send our boys across the seas to make the supreme sacrifice again. Such unplanned procedure might do more to contribute to the decay of the America which we have known than to protect and defend the America we cherish.

OTHER CHOICES THAN WAR OPEN TO AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, there are other choices open to America. There are other possible answers to the question, What course of action is best for America? We should consider carefully all these alternatives, too, before permitting haste, hysteria, sentiment, or propaganda to push us beyond the point from which there is no turning back and to plunge us into a war for which we are very sadly unprepared. One such possible answer is to prepare ourselves so well and to fortify our outlying bases so strongly that war cannot come to America unless America goes to the war. Hanson Baldwin, military expert for the New York Times, in his book, United We Stand, has outlined the feasibility and strength of such a course of action. And those who now contend that we are today prepared to go forth to whip the world cannot seriously contend that we are not making mighty progress in the business of protecting ourselves against the world, if need be, here in the Western Hemisphere.

Another possible course of action is to exert the great strength of America in an effort to end this war rather than in expanding it to other countries. This course of action would aim at a defeat of Hitler just as definitely as a course of action requiring the sending of countless numbers of American soldiers, sailors, and airmen to fight and die on foreign fighting fronts. Our strength in peace might count as heavily in the scales of justice as our strength in war. If we can help develop, with the aid of a conference of other nonbelligerent countries or by ourselves, a pattern for the world after the war which will restore the independence of liberty-loving people now under the aggressor's heel, and which will provide economic justice and political privileges to people everywhere, we shall have offered the people of every belligerent country something to hope for which may well overshadow the sordid goals which dictators hold up as something to fight for. If we do this, we accomplish the break-down of home morale in the dictatorial countries, and such a collapse will do more to bring victory for freedom than the winning of dozens of battles or the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children. Woodrow Wilson's 14 points during the World War did more to end that conflict than a whole series of military victories because it helped precipitate mutiny and discontent at home which the whole junker military establishment could not counteract. It might be worth trying again. It can cost America nothing. It might earn humanity much.

NOT AN APPEASER'S PEACE

In all events, such an effort would not be a negotiated peace nor an appeaser's armistice. Far from it. It would be an effort to provide the mighty influence of the United States in promoting a just and equitable peace of a lasting nature. Its terms would of necessity provide the elimination of the sources of unrest and the leaders of tyranny who are now bringing so much heartache to the entire world. If it succeeded, such an effort would revive the hope of all humanity. If it failed, it would at least strike a mighty blow at the home front of the dictatorial countries whose leaders refused to accept principles of justice and equity as the basis for bringing an end to the war. And, if after the effort were made, it finally became necessary for the United States to enter the war and the people and the Congress so decreed, we would at least have the satisfaction defined by Miss Dorothy Thompson in a recent letter to me when she concluded her argument that we should start now to plan for a world after the war by stating:

> Then if we have to fight, we shall at least know what we are fighting for.

We have made some isolated, individual steps in the direction of thinking toward peace, but they are few in number and unsupported as yet by governmental approval. Secretary Hull on May 18 suggested a five-point program. Senator CONNALLY, Congressmen RANKIN, VORYS, and LUDLOW have proposed possible courses of action. Others have offered their answers to the question, What is best for America? Let us hope that the collective intelligence of America may yet develop a course of action which will prevent the necessity of the collective manpower of America being thrown into the cauldron of blood and sweat and tears and toil which is now ravaging so much of the world in the sordid slaughter of war.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I offer the editorial from the June 20 issue of the United States News, from the pen of David Lawrence, who is recognized as anything but an isolationist or an appeaser, but whose zeal for the best interests of America compels him to propose an interesting suggestion for a course of action which this country might pursue while preparing itself to the hilt to defend all that all of us hold most dear:

[From the United States News of June 20, 1941]

A BILLION FOR PEACE

(By David Lawrence)

The talk is of war and more war.

Our national-defense program is a war program.

Our strategy is to help win the war for democracy.

Meanwhile there is no leadership for peace, the very goal we all seek in the end.

It is no answer to say that peace must come by the sword, that nations must be brought to their knees and then there will be peace. For peace does not last when it comes in a spirit of vengeance and passion. It can endure only when it is based on principles of live and let live, of fairness, equity, and human understanding.

We are spending $40,000,000,000 on a war program. We are not spending a cent on a program of peace.

But preparedness for peace is as essential as preparedness for war. We entered the last war and spent billions and then in the 1920's we ignored the causes of the war and the forces of instability which ultimately brought on the second World War. To prepare for peace now is to prevent the wars of the future.

How can it be done? Where there is a will to peace, peace can be achieved. We do not today sufficiently recognize peace itself as a problem of immediate concern. Yet peace must be made eventually and with the very nations against which we are lined up today.

The paramount necessity is communication. We must begin to communicate with the German and Italian peoples. We must start talking to them. We must then begin to listen to them, too. We must draw a distinction between the misguided rulers, who do not believe in human understanding but only in murder, and the 80,000,000 persons who are victims of misrule.

THE WILL TO PEACE NOW IS UNIVERSAL

Nobody, it will be said, will begrudge a billion dollars for peace, if the movement can get anywhere. Who, on the other hand, can assure us that the tanks we are building will get anywhere? The tonnage to transport them overseas must be built. The battle-front where they can be used is yet to be selected. And still we build tanks and contract to build more tanks. The reason is that we have faith that such machine power ultimately will be needed somewhere in our war program. Can we not apply the same spirit of faith to peace? Can we not assume that some day there will have to be a peace conference, and that some day the public opinion of the world will have to be mobilized behind such a conference so as to bring a lasting peace?

In our hearts is a will to peace. In the hearts of Britons is a will to peace. In the hearts of the German and Italian peoples is a will to peace. We need not for a moment doubt it just because we know there exists at the same time a will to defend, a will to perish, if need be, in defense of what each believes is a just cause.

RADIO STATIONS COULD FURTHER PEACE PLANS

There is nothing irreconcilable between a willingness to fight and a willingness to make peace. The object of all war is to compel a peace. The object of a preparedness program for peace is to shorten war and to make a better peace than can come from a mere truce of arms.

We lack today in America an understanding of the needs of a preparedness program for peace. Our leadership is wholly absorbed in defense plans which may at any moment become war plans. It requires, to be sure, a delicate piece of national management which can at one time urge the people on to war and concurrently urge them to prepare their minds for peace. The conflict is considerable, but it is not insurmountable. Conflict is the essence of the human problem in a crowded world. We meet it on every side, in our States and cities, in our neighborhoods. We meet war on the labor front every day. We seek through mediation to find the answers to such conflict. It is hard to handle. The tasks of peace making in industry are beset with passion and pride as well as with

greed and selfishness. But undaunted we seek just the same to solve such conflicts by the processes of reason.

Shall it be said that 130,000,000 Americans are incapable of setting in motion their will to international peace, that 80,000,000 Germans and 48,000,000 Britons will not listen to equitable and fair plans for the making of world peace?

What man can do in making war he can do in making peace. The challenge to human ingenuity is not less in seeking to make the world safe for decent citizens who want to live in peace than it is in making the world safe from the ravages of some dread disease. We can try to isolate the germs of war and treat them by common endeavor. We may make peace, not tomorrow, not next week, but perhaps by Christmas 1941 if we start now. Why wait till 1942 and 1943?

The first prerequisite to a peace program is the establishment of a number of powerful short-wave radio stations both in this country and in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia. The United States can buy or lease stations in British territory. It should be as easy to do as the lending or leasing of a naval destroyer.

Such radio stations should be entirely in the control of the United States so that all the world will know they are disconnected from any other government.

The American Government should appoint a peace commission to be composed of representative American citizens who are as versed in the problems of economic friction and trade in the world as the admirals are in naval strategy. Such a commission should formulate at the earliest possible moment the bases for a new world order—first for discussion and ultimately for the adherence of peoples.

But primarily the German people as well as the British people and the peoples of the subjugated countries must be assured of the good faith and fundamental disinterestedness of the American Government's peace mission. It will not be so received at the outset but it will gradually be apparent as the pronouncements by a disinterested peace body become known.

Once it is made clear that the idea of crushing the German people and making them slaves is furthest from the thoughts of the peoples of the democratic countries, the principal prop beneath the Hitler regime will disappear in central Europe.

GERMAN PEOPLE SHOW APATHY TOWARD WAR

Recently former Ambassador John Cudahy, on returning from Germany where he interviewed Hitler, told reporters in Jersey City that the people of Germany were not elated about the victories of their armies, but seemed strangely apathetic. This is understandable. What enthusiasm can there be among the German people for a war that may not end in a permanent peace? Germans know all too well, if they will but admit it, that the sword never brings a satisfactory peace. They of Germany, just as we of America and the people of Britain are yearning for a peace that somehow never becomes articulate. We want a peace in which the great Christian ideal shall permeate the relations of human beings. We want a peace in which man shall live up to the highest and not the lowest impulses that are within him. We want a peace that makes it possible for us to extend to those who were once against us the hand of fellowship and good will. We want a peace in which, paradoxically enough, we shall share with others what really doesn't belong to us—the property or savings that God permits us to possess for a brief span of years.

WAR MUST END IN A VICTORY FOR REASON

We know what we want. We want mankind to rise to a civilized status—to a recognition of the fact that all men are created equal and that they all have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that there can be no such thing as racial superiority or inferiority, and that there must be no suppression of human freedom by any force inside or outside of government anywhere in the world.

These ideals are not difficult to express. What is difficult is to transmit them. We must begin to speak to those who are alined against us and those who are ranged alongside of us. We must speak of a new world order in terms of hope and a willingness to sacrifice even of our goods and chattels so that the world may become peaceful again. How paltry do tariffs and selfish economic advantages in trade seem today as mandatory priorities upset business and as taxes grow to unbearable heights.

Who now shall say that we cannot bring economic peace when we of the democracies control the raw materials and national resources and the gold of the world? Our weapons of peace are legion. The sinews of peacemaking are all around us. Instrumentalities for expression lie idle. Can we not start making use of them?

It takes a long time to persuade others that we sincerely mean to befriend them. Our initial step must be to show by example that we have a humane spirit within us which wants peace—but peace at a price. That price must be the withdrawal of the yoke of subjugation from all nations and individuals. The German people must sooner or later come to understand that the way to our deliverance from war is the way of their deliverance. This war must end not in victory for brute force but in a victory for reason.

Let the Government of the United States spend a billion dollars now on a crusade of reason. Let our program be based on an honest acceptance by all of us of the principles of human brotherhood. And let us in this world of sorrow and hate speak with a voice of kindliness—a voice that dares to urge the reconstruction of the human spirit itself in the relations of peoples and governments.

The History of the American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

ADDRESS OF SEFTON DARR, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege Sunday evening to address the Flag Day exercises, sponsored in Washington by the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks. There were some 24 participating organizations.

I enjoyed all phases of the program, and was especially impressed by the speech of Sefton Darr, former president of the District of Columbia Bar Association, who told of the history of our flag. As he told of the steps leading to each new design, a flag bearer would carry that specific emblem to the front of Sylvan Theater platform, near the base of Washington Monument, until all flags up to the present pattern were massed before the audience of some 2,000.

I include Mr. Darr's address at this point:

Heraldry is as old as the human race. The carrying of banners has been the habit of barbarian and civilized in all ages. These banners usually contain some concept of the life of government of those who fashion them.

The evolution of the American flag is as interesting as the evolution of the American Government. Its original instability is now matched by a peerless immobility. During the period of its growth and lack of finality it embraced parts of the banners of other countries—sometimes showing even shrubs and serpents and being devoid of originality.

This period of instability of the form and coloring of our flag ceased with the definite fixing of the Government it represented. When nationality became assured, when State independence and State interdependence were exactly measured, when responsibility and international place were no longer open for debate, then, and not until then, the flag became definite.

When John Cabot landed at Labrador in 1497, 5 years after Columbus' discovery of America, he planted on that North American soil the red cross of England, the flag of King Henry VII.

From the landing of the *Mayflower* in 1620 until 1775 the flag of England was our flag. In 1606 the field of the English flag had been changed from white to blue, and the white cross of St. Andrew was placed thereon by order of King James I, and the banner was called the union of the King's Colors.

In 1607 the color of the flag was changed from blue to crimson, and the two crosses on a blue field were placed in the upper corner.

The Colonies recognized this change and placed a pine tree on a white field in lieu of the crosses.

In 1775 the pine-tree flag was adopted for all colonial vessels, and this banner was carried by the Americans in the Battle of Bunker Hill.

The southern colonies from 1776 to 1777 used the snake flag.

In the latter part of 1775 a committee was appointed by the Continental Congress to consider the question of a single flag for the Thirteen Colonies. That committee recommended that the design should be 13 alternate stripes of red and white in the upper corner of which would be an azure field bearing the red cross of St. George and the white cross of St. Andrew. John Paul Jones, the senior lieutenant of the flagship *Alfred*, hoisted this flag to the masthead on December 3, 1775; 1 month later it was raised over the headquarters of Gen. George Washington at Cambridge, Mass., "in compliment," as he wrote, "to the United Colonies."

This flag, which was called the Congress Colors and the Grand Union Flag, was never carried in the field by the Continental land forces, but it was used by the Navy as its exclusive ensign, and was the first American flag to receive a foreign salute of honor. The Fort of Orange, on the island of St. Eustatius, Dutch West Indies, fired a salute of 11 guns in acknowledgment of a similar salute from the *Andrew Doria*, under command of Capt. Isaiah Robinson; an act for which the Governor of the island was recalled by the Republic of the Netherlands, in deference to the protest of the English Government.

There was much dissatisfaction with this flag because it bore, as a part thereof, a design so distinctive of the flag of England; and in response to a general demand for a banner more specifically representative of our own country, on June 14, 1777, the Congress provided:

"That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes of alternating red and white; and that the union be 13 stars, white on a blue field, representing a new constellation."

Whether Betsy Ross, a Philadelphia Quakeress, had the honor of making the first United States flag is a debated question. It is generally believed that in May or June of 1776 a committee consisting of George Washington, Robert Morris, and George Ross called on her and commissioned her to make a flag from a rough design they brought with them. It is said that she suggested that the stars should have five points rather than six.

This banner of starry beauty received its baptism of fire at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., on August 3, 1777, during an attack by British and Indians. The flag was made on the spot. Soldiers' shirts furnished the cloth for the white stars and stripes; the red stripes were made from a red petticoat belonging to the wife of one of the privates; and Capt. Abraham Swartout's blue cloth coat was used for the blue field.

All Americans will recall that the first official salute to the Stars and Stripes was given on February 14, 1778, by France. This occurred in Quiberon Bay, on the French coast, when the *Ranger*, under command of John Paul Jones, was saluted by the French Fleet under Admiral LaMotte Picquet.

The *Ranger's* flag was made by the girls of Portsmouth, N. H., from slices of their best silk gowns. The white stripes were cut from her bridal gown by a bride of only a few months.

Some writers claim that the *Ranger's* flag was the same flag that afterward flew from the *Bon Homme Richard*, in the most thrilling sea fight of history. The conflict was between the frigate *Serapis* and Jones' ship, the *Richard*. The battle by moonlight, which continued until both ships were in a sinking condition and the *Serapis* finally struck her colors, insured the immortality of John Paul Jones, the intrepid defender of the youthful Republic.

The original 13 stars and 13 stripes were intended, of ccurse, to represent the Original Thirteen Colonies. In 1795, 2 additional stars and 2 additional stripes were added to the flag to represent Vermont and Kentucky, which had been admitted to the Union, and the War of 1812 was fought under this banner. It was the flag of 15 stars and 15 stripes, flying over Fort McHenry, on September 14, 1814, which inspired Francis Scott Key to write the Star-Spangled Banner, our national anthem.

Miss Margaret Young, who cut the stars for this particular flag, subsequently became the mother of Henry Sanderson, who was elected Grand Exalted Ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks in 1884.

The admission of additional States into the Union required the enlargement of the flag and an essential altering of its design, and to prevent this, the Congress, on April 14, 1818, adopted a resolution providing that from and after July 4, 1818, the stripes should be 13 and the blue field should carry 1 star for each of the 20 States then in the Union and that a new star should be added for each State thereafter admitted. Today the flag bears 48 stars.

It is at once a history, a declaration, and a prophecy. It represents the American Nation as it was at its birth; it speaks for what it is today; and it holds the opportunity for the future to add other stars to the glorious constellation.

In July 1908, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in Grand Lodge assembled, at Dallas, Tex., provided for the observance of Flag Day on June 14, and the observance of that day has been made mandatory upon each subordinate lodge of the order. Thus, the Order of Elks was the first, and as yet, the only fraternal organization which requires the celebration of this event.

Of all the flags of history the American flag is the oldest. To us it is the most beautiful. Sporting in the breeze, it is a mosaic of ribboned loveliness; dropping in softer airs, the staff is transformed into a maypole of festal delight.

It is an honest flag; a righteous flag.

During the long years of its life our country has engaged in a number of wars, yet its flag has never rippled in support of an unworthy cause, and has never known defeat. It has no taint of scandal—no spot of dishonor.

In the War of 1776 it won our independence as a nation. In 1812 it established the freedom of the seas and the rights of American seamen on those seas. In 1846 it vindicated our national dignity and our sovereignty which had been flouted by arrogant Mexico. In 1861 it preserved the Union. Union—nationality—was necessary to the championing of freedom throughout the world. In 1898 it freed struggling Cuba from tyranny and oppression. Again victorious in the great World War, it flies triumphantly, a beauteous, incomparable emblem of liberty and freedom to all the peoples of the earth.

In Memoriam

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, death has taken a heavy toll in the Halls of Congress—nine House Members and four Senate Members have gone to their eternal rest since we last held memorial services. The Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses are setting a new record for duration of continuous sessions. The Seventy-seventh Congress has now completed 5 months of steady and arduous labor since we convened on January 3. Congress has been in constant session now for 533 days—366 days remaining of the Seventy-sixth Congress last year, the longest continuous session in our history, and 167 days of the Seventy-seventh Congress this year. The physical and mental str. * is proving too much for many of our colleagues, who are dying heroically at their post of duty in the most crucial period of our national history, perhaps the most crucial period in the world's history.

We are living, we are dwelling,
In a grand and awful time,
In an age of ages telling;
To be living is sublime.

Hark, the waking up of nations,
Gog and Magog to the fray;
Hark, what soundeth?
Is creation groaning for its latter day?

Worlds are charging, heaven beholding,
Thou hast but an hour to fight;
Now the blazoned cross unfolding,
On, right onward, for the right.

On, let all the soul within you
For the truth's sake, go abroad;
Strike, let every nerve and sinew
Tell on ages, tell for God.

Eloquent tribute could, and doubtless will, be rendered to every one of our distinguished departed colleagues who died as martyrs to public duty in the truest sense. I shall be able to mention by name only a few of them whom I "loved and lost awhile."

SPEAKER WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD

Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the heavy toll by death in our ranks to which I have already alluded, it is worthy of mention that those of us who became Members of this body at the commencement of the first administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 have already served under four Speakers—Rainey, Byrns, and Bankhead, and yourself, Mr. Speaker, whom we all hope will long continue to serve your country in your present high position. This rate of mortality in our Speakers is very unusual and without precedent in our history. I have on previous occasions expressed my tribute to the memories of Speakers Rainey and Byrns, who were both outstanding Speakers and great Americans, and my personal friends.

Speaker BANKHEAD was one of the most kindly and gracious men whom I have ever known. He was a scholar in politics and his mind was enriched with the treasures of classical literature. He had a deeply religious nature. Our Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery, has told me of the crucifix which Speaker BANKHEAD showed him and which he carried reverently in his pocket. In more than one of his public utterances he expressed the fervent belief that the practical application of the teachings of Jesus Christ was the only solution for the Nation's ills. Speaker BANKHEAD will long be remembered with affection by those who had the privilege of serving with him in the Congress of the United States.

SENATOR ERNEST LUNDEEN

I served with Senator LUNDEEN in the House for several terms before he was elected to the Senate. We were frequently associated together in support of legislation in the interests of the veterans of our wars, whose friend and champion he ever was. We appeared on the same platform at a number of meetings arranged by veterans' organizations and I thereby came to appreciate Senator LUNDEEN's forceful, convincing, and sincere manner of delivery. He was courageous and outspoken at all times and never left any of his auditors in doubt as to his views upon the public questions of the day. I did not always agree with him, particularly in regard to some of the opinions which he espoused in regard to the present crisis facing America, but I respected his high ideals and his character as a man. Such men as he are sorely needed and America is poorer for his leaving.

SAM C. MASSINGALE

SAM MASSINGALE was a sturdy, genuine type who understood the problems of the toiling millions who produce the wealth of the Nation in field and factory. He was a deep student of human nature and very sociable in his relations with his fellows. He possessed a keen sense of humor and was an entertaining companion. He hated sham and pretense and delighted to expose these weaknesses without rancor or spleen.

SAM MASSINGALE was a good lawyer and was more concerned with the equities than the cold letter of the law which is often allowed to defeat the ends of justice. He had served as a county judge and in that position had learned to appraise the warp and woof of life

as it is lived in the average communities of America. Some of the finest men whom I have ever known have served on the nisi prius bench and from there gone fully panoplied to higher but not more important public office. It was from his contacts and experiences as a practicing lawyer on the circuit in the county courts that Abraham Lincoln developed his sterling character and fine intellect. The highest tribute I can pay to our departed colleague is to cite the fact that he possessed some of these homespun qualities.

GEORGE N. SEGER

It was my privilege to serve on the Rivers and Harbors Committee with GEORGE N. SEGER, of New Jersey, and to come in somewhat intimate contact with him. As long as his health permitted, he was punctual and faithful in his attendance upon meetings of the committee and he contributed much to the discussions and deliberations. He was well informed in regard to the waterways of the Nation and a firm believer in the value and importance of navigation and its rich contribution to national progress.

Congressman SEGER was broadminded and not intensely partisan, although steadfast in his loyalty to the principles and tenets of the Republican Party, of which he was one of the most distinguished members in his State and the Nation. He and I frequently rode on the streetcars together on our way to our offices in the morning, and I came more than ever to respect him highly on account of his broad, wholesome outlook on life.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as I think tenderly of these colleagues and how they bravely trod their way on life's pathway to the house of life, often misnamed the house of death, I am reassured in affirming anew the faith and philosophy of the poet:

> Afraid? Of whom am I afraid?
> Not Death; for who is he?
> The porter of my Father's lodge.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD was a member of a family which has given to this country several prominent statesmen. There have been Senators, Representatives, Governors, and other executive legislative officials of the United States from that family, and the history of this country since the Civil War would not be complete without the mention of the members of the Bankhead family, who have been in the forefront of American government in the last six or more decades.

WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, a Speaker of the House, endeared himself to everyone who came in contact with him. He was always patient, attentive, and never too busy to transact the many details which fell to his lot by reason of his official position, and the fact that the many friends he made in the House continually called upon him for advice and assistance. Speaker BANKHEAD was a fountain of learning, a perfect scholar, and a thorough master of parliamentary law. Intricate problems which came to the attention of the Speaker during his term of office and which called for the exercise of extreme skill and thorough learning were a daily pabulum of Speaker BANKHEAD. No problem was too difficult for him, and no problem was too unimportant for him to handle. With his best courtesy and tact he presided over the destinies of this House with dignity, grace and decorum.

He was a sick man when he took the gavel of the last session of Congress and began the final term as a Speaker of this House. Those who knew him dreaded that the ordeal of this office might prove too much for him and that he would not be able to complete his term. The Grim Reaper took him from our midst while the session was still in progress and it was necessary to select a Speaker at almost the conclusion of Speaker BANKHEAD'S term.

We mourn the loss of a true friend, a great American, and one of the greatest Speakers ever to preside over the House of Representatives.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, words are a very small tribute to commemorate the passing of our distinguished colleague and my dear friend of many years, MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, who gave his life, like the Christian martyrs of old, defending the honor of his race and his creed.

MIKE EDELSTEIN was an outstanding member of public life in the city and State of New York, revered and loved by all who had the happy privilege of knowing him. He represented in the Halls of Congress a district peopled by many different races and creeds, to all of whom he gave the same patient consideration and assistance many might give to a member of their own family. He was one of the most able members of the legal profession our city has produced, and this gave him manifold opportunities to render great service to the poor and the unfortunate who had neither funds nor the inclination to seek counsel.

The passing of MIKE EDELSTEIN is a great loss to this House at a time in our national history when crusaders and patriots are sorely needed; it is a still greater loss to the thousands in his district who were so dependent upon his kindly benefaction.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my tribute of love, honor, and respect to our late colleague, Representative SAM MASSINGALE, of Oklahoma. It was my privilege to know SAM MASSINGALE well. Together we served on the Committee on the Judiciary. We did not always agree as to legislative policy, but there was always a common-sense reason and homespun philosophy behind any position taken by Mr. MASSINGALE affecting legislation. No man in these Halls was more devoted to his constituency. He was an inherent friend of the farmer and no important legislation directly affecting agriculture during his service in Congress ever escaped his analysis and vocal approval or disapproval. When SAM MASSINGALE was called away, the farmer of the Nation lost a true and tried friend.

He had a good legal mind developed in the practice of the law in a rural community. With pride he called himself "a country lawyer." By reason of this training and experience he was an especially valuable member of the Committee on the Judiciary. By the same token, the form of many a statute was influenced and changed by this man's knowledge and wisdom. He was not spectacular and did not seek the limelight. He believed in accomplishment rather than publicity. He was gentle and considerate to a fault, yet he was always resolute and firm. He was a man of strong convictions, and with courage and vigor proclaimed those convictions. He was especially interested in what he called the common man. In his going the Seventh District of Oklahoma lost a good Representative in Congress, his State lost a distinguished citizen, and his Nation lost a worth-while statesman.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a man whose political career was cut short at its height, it was my late colleague from New York, Representative M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN. He died at the beginning of his career in this body and at a time when every Member of this House felt that here was a real leader of men and one whose future looked extremely promising.

Just turning 50, EDELSTEIN was elected to this House to fill a vacancy caused by the death of another friend of mine, Representative Sirovich. He came to this House well trained by ability and experience to perform the duties of the important office to which his constituents elected him. He was a lawyer of standing, a political leader, a student of Government, and a scholar in every sense of the word. During the many years of his practice before the bar he always took care of the underprivileged and those who could not afford to pay substantial fees to lawyers. His office was open to all types of people, and he represented a constituency which are among the least privileged in this country.

Men and women of all walks of life would come to MIKE EDELSTEIN for assistance and help, and he was a father confessor to them. They opened their hearts to him and poured out the troubles of their humble daily lives to this sympathetic and attentive person who never turned anyone away who needed his help. MIKE EDELSTEIN was a true man, one who never withheld his assistance, and one whose counsel, help, and aid were ready for anyone who applied for it.

Being the leader of the Democratic Party of his own district, he was, of course, continuously consulted on matters of party politics, and on the welfare of his constituents. In both capacities he rendered yeoman service. The Democratic Party of the city and State of New York owes a great deal of its success to the sane and sage counsel which EDELSTEIN gave it.

The humble constituents of EDELSTEIN'S district have been the recipients of attention and favor in large and profuse measures since their leader, MIKE EDELSTEIN, was their friend and benefactor.

Speaking on the floor of the House on June 4, he was stricken after concluding an address in which he nailed the lie of those who were the detractors of his race and the defamers of his people. It was on this occasion when he rose to the greatest height to which any man can possibly aspire. He became like an ancient prophet of Israel who denounced the enemies of his people for what they were worth. His speech coming at the time it did aroused in all of our colleagues the feeling of resentment against those forces of evil which ever threaten to engulf American democracy, and which our American democracy forever struggles to rid itself from.

MIKE EDELSTEIN'S death was not in vain. His sincerity and devotion have shown their metal in the career of this noble American.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in 1919 the late Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD had already served one term. As I think in retrospect, I visualize a handsome, erect, alert, rather reserved yet at all times a courteous gentleman. The son of an illustrious father, the name Bankhead carried with it prestige even in the far northland from whence I came. When I first met Mr. BANKHEAD, I expected to meet an accomplished southern gentleman exemplifying the traditions of the Old South as we understood them in our part of the country. I was not disappointed. As the years passed, this casual and formal acquaintance ripened into one of the finest friendships I have enjoyed down through the years.

We both entered Congress at a time when it was the custom, if not the rule, for new Members to refrain from active participation in debate on the floor unless the new Member was especially qualified to speak on the particular subject under discussion. Mr. BANKHEAD followed this custom meticulously. The result was that when he did participate in discussion he had the closest attention of the House and always contributed to the information of the House. A born orator, trained in the art, he was one of the most effective speakers with whom I have served in Congress. As time went on, he advanced until, when the final summons came, he had reached the pinnacle of fame and power in this great deliberative body. By a vote of the House, he held the highest office within the gift of the House. In this position he was a worthy successor of a distinguished group of predecessors. He was temperamentally as well as otherwise qualified to be Speaker. A learned parliamentarian, a splendid lawyer, an experienced legislator with a judicial mind, his decisions were in keeping with the legal precedents. He spoke in understandable language.

He was a strong Democrat of the old school. He believed in the two-party system. He has said from the Speaker's chair that he agreed with former Speaker Longworth that the functions and duties of the Speakership divide themselves into two general classes—the one parliamentary, the other political. The first he administered with rigid impartiality. He was in accord with Mr. Longworth's statement that—

> The political side, to my mind, involves a question of party service. I believe it to be the duty of the Speaker, standing squarely on the platform of his party, to assist insofar as he properly can the enactment of legislation in accordance with the declared principles and policies of his party and, by the same token, to resist the enactment of legislation in violation thereof.

That is, he believed in responsible party government and attempted to effectuate such a policy. In these days he found this a most difficult assignment.

In short, his rulings as Speaker were never unfriendly to his party, yet the dignity of the House and the general interests of his country were always paramount. The minority never had occasion to question his sincerity, his honesty, and his integrity as our presiding officer.

For a number of years I served with Mr. BANKHEAD on the Rules Committee. If there is a political committee in the House, the Rules Committee is the one. I served with him on that committee when my party was in power as well as when his party was in power. In such circumstances Members become well acquainted. While we did not always agree as to the procedure to be adopted, yet I feel sure that we were not often far apart on the fundamentals. He was at heart a conservative Jeffersonian Democrat. His political philosophy was deep-rooted. He yielded reluctantly to expediency.

High position and authority did not turn his head. Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD was in all respects the same WILL BANKHEAD who served as a private in the ranks of the Sixty-fifth Congress. He was stricken down in the heyday of his usefulness, but he leaves behind a splendid heritage. This country is a better country because he lived in it. History will record him as one of the great who presided over this body.

Ernest Lundeen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota mourns the passing of ERNEST LUNDEEN, late junior Senator from that

State, and the tragic manner in which the end came makes our grief the more poignant.

Senator LUNDEEN had a long and distinguished record of public service. In whatever capacity he served he gave to the State and Nation loyal, honest, and effective service. A veteran of the Spanish-American War, our departed friend early turned to law, later entering politics as a member of Minnesota's Legislature, where he served several terms. In 1916 he was elected to Congress and entered upon his duties on April 2, 1917. Four days later he voted against America's entrance into the World War, which was an unpopular position to take during a period of hysteria, when our people had been lashed into fury by false tales of cruel atrocities which we later learned had been spread for the purpose of drawing America into the conflict.

Mr. LUNDEEN retired to private life the following year, but in 1932 he was again elected to Congress by a substantial majority, and 2 years later reelected. In 1936 ERNEST LUNDEEN was elected to the Senate of the United States to suceed the late Senator Thomas D. Schall, who also had met a violent end 4 years earlier.

A grateful people mourn Senator LUNDEEN'S passing. An able and fearless legislator, a true and loyal friend, a loving and devoted husband and father, he is sadly missed by former colleagues, friends, and family. His memory is a radiant light that will long be cherished by those who knew him for his many able and sterling qualities. Peace to his ashes.

Kenneth Farrand Simpson

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, to say that our community and our party suffered an irreparable loss in the recent and untimely death of KENNETH F. SIMPSON would be to deny the vigor of the leadership he provided for so many years. The whole aim of his activities was to provide in the community and in the party a force for good Government and progress dependent upon no single individual and beholden to no one man or woman.

And yet his death has left a void which even the most enthusiastic of his followers cannot help but contemplate with dismay. Courage there is amongst us, and willing hearts and minds, and our grief is profound and sincere. But the experience and inspiration and unceasing devotion which he contributed to the welfare of his community cannot be replaced overnight.

His was not only a well-fought fight, it was a long one, with its beginning back in the youthful years, working his way through college, serving his country in war as well as in peace, constantly working for his friends and his neighborhood.

KENNETH F. SIMPSON was born in 1895 in the very district which he served so ably and so long. He went to Hill School and Yale University. During his freshman year at college, his father died and from then on KENNETH SIMPSON was on his own, working his way through the three remaining years as well as through Harvard Law, earning money by such activities as tutoring and editing the Yale News. At Yale he made Phi Beta Kappa, and was the "last man tapped for Bones" and became head of the senior council.

As early as 1916 he became interested in active politics, attending the Progressive Republican Convention at Chicago which nominated Theodore Roosevelt.

That same summer, with war clouds gathering over Mexico, he helped to organize a group of Yale students into a New Haven Field Artillery unit in the Connecticut National Guard. They were not sent to Mexico, but later, when the United States entered the World War, SIMPSON was commissioned a captain of Field Artillery at the Plattsburg Training Camp and was assigned to the Three Hundred and Second Field Artillery, with which regiment he saw active service in France.

After the war, continuing his interest in politics, KENNETH SIMPSON worked actively as an election district captain in the fifteenth assembly district, his home district, where he was married and where his four children were born. From then on, ably aided by his wife, Helen Porter Simpson, he never let up in his fight for good progressive government, serving successively as president of the district club, as assistant United States attorney for the southern district of New York, as leader of the Fifteenth District, as national committeeman, and finally as Congressman from the Seventeenth Congressional District, which includes the fifteenth.

It was KENNETH SIMPSON more than any single individual who finally broke up the forces of misrule which had controlled New York City for so many years. He backed Fusion in 1933 with LaGuardia as candidate for mayor, and 4 years after that successful fight prevailed upon the party again to back LaGuardia and upon LaGuardia to accept a Republican ticket. This second victory brought Tammany Hall permanently to its knees, and brought before the community such outstanding Republicans as Thomas E. Dewey, Newbold Morris, Stanley Isacs, and Bruce Barton.

KENNETH SIMPSON'S fight for the same cause of sound, progressive government in the wider field of national politics is too recent and too well known to require more than passing comment here. His backing of Wendell Willkie and Mr. Willkie's gallant campaign and increasing popularity are evidence enough of KENNETH SIMPSON'S brilliant leadership and vision.

When he was elected to Congress the press of the Nation commented with enthusiasm, and he went to Washington to carry his everlasting fight for good government into this broader field with all the courage and vigor he had always displayed.

His premature death could be a stunning blow to the party and the cause for which he fought. But to those many of us who loved and admired him he has left such a shining example of courage and vision that we would be poor stuff, indeed, if, inspired by that example, we failed to seize the torch and carry on.

That we will do so goes without saying, and no higher tribute could be paid to KENNETH SIMPSON.

Alonzo Dillard Folger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the memorial service held each year in the Chamber of the House of Representatives is a solemn occasion, for it is then that we pay tribute to the memory of our colleagues who have died within the past year.

Death visited the North Carolina delegation within the last few weeks, and we who are Representatives from that State are, like many thousands of North Carolinians, sorely grieved because of the untimely death of Hon. ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, the Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina.

LON FOLGER as he was affectionately known by many thousand North Carolinians, was a descendent of the New England family of Folgers. He was born at Dobson, N. C., on July 9, 1888, and was unfortunately injured in an automobile accident in his home city of Mount Airy, N. C., and died on the 1st day of May 1941. He attended and was graduated from the University of North Carolina, and also completed his law course at the university. Shortly thereafter he was admitted to the bar of the State of North Carolina and was immediately recognized as an able and outstanding lawyer. On account of his legal knowledge and attainments, he was appointed a judge of the superior court by the Governor of the State, and although his tenure of office was short on the bench, his judicial temperament and his legal knowledge caused him to be recognized as a great judge.

During his entire lifetime LON FOLGER was very much interested in government and this brought him actively into the political field. He was county chairman of the executive committee in his county, a member of the State executive committee, and later on he was a member of the Democratic National Committee, and

in these capacities he rendered loyal and unselfish service in his county and the Nation to his party.

As a great American and a great North Carolinian interested in government and the welfare of the people, Judge FOLGER was elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress and was renominated by his party without opposition in the primary in 1940 and reelected to the Seventy-seventh Congress. As a Member of Congress, he rendered valuable service on the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which he became a member upon entering Congress. His ability, high character, integrity, and honesty, as well as his lovable qualities, endeared him to all that he came in contact with. It was my privilege nearly every day that the House was in session to sit with him and discuss the matters of legislation, as well as other matters affecting the State and Nation. This personal contact with him increased my admiration and high regard for him.

His family life was happy, and very often he spoke to me about his wife and two sons.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we in Congress, as well as his family and many friends in North Carolina, are sorely grieved on account of his death; but I realize that his influence will be felt for years to come in his county and in his State, as well as here with us, because his life was a life devoted to the welfare of the American people and was an example of noble courage, a sense of duty, and a great love for his country.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, as we assemble in this Chamber to pay tribute to the memories of our departed colleagues, we become conscious of the value of their associations and services and of the responsibilities and duties left by them to us. We apprise and appreciate the dead, free from the grosser attributes of human nature. In death all are equal—prince and mendicant, sultan and slave, sage and simple—all march to the same music through that grim and ghostly cordon beyond which we may well all meet when the sun goes down.

Death is a true and pure democracy. In the democracy of the dead all men at last are equal. There is neither rank, station, nor prerogative in the republic of the grave. At this fatal threshold the philosopher ceases to be wise, and the song of the poet is silent. The poor man is as rich as the richest, and the rich man is as poor as the pauper. There the proud man surrenders his dignities; the statesman, his honors; the worldling, his pleasures; the invalid, his rack; and the laborer rests from unrequited toil.

It therefore becomes my sad duty today to recall briefly the life, character, and accomplishments of him who, as a Member of this great body, I had the privilege of knowing intimately and well, M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN.

Born in Poland in 1888, he was brought to this country as a small child and continued to live in New York City, where he attended our public schools, Cooper Union, and the Brooklyn Law School. In 1910 he was admitted to the practice of the law.

Throughout that long period of our friendship I greatly admired Michael for his many fine qualities of manhood. He was a kindly person, a devoted son, and a loyal adherent to the ancient faith of Israel.

Alert to opportunity, self-reliant, facile, and warm-hearted, he made his own way, owing his success to his tireless persistence and his unquenchable ardor in living. He belonged to the aristocracy of the plain people of this country.

His passing is a great personal loss to me, and I know I express the sentiments of my delegation when I say that we have lost a true friend, his district a model Representative, and the country a splendid citizen.

His family life was an example and inspiration to those favored with the opportunity to observe it. While our hearts go out in sympathy and sorrow to his mother, sisters, and brothers, we would remind them that he left behind a memory of fidelity and love which as time goes on will become as sweet as the fragrance of a perfumed flower. Truly he has left footprints on the sands of time.

He added to the sum of human joy; and were everyone to whom he did some loving service to bring a blossom to his grave, he would sleep tonight beneath a wilderness of flowers.

William Devereux Byron

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM DEVEREUX BYRON, late a Representative from the State of Maryland

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of our late colleague, WILLIAM D. BYRON, of Maryland, removed from conspicuous public service and from the membership of this House a young, vigorous, able, and popular gentleman. On the morning of February 27, 1941, when the airplane crashed within a short distance of Atlanta, Ga., I was in Macon, Ga., and immediately upon hearing of the collision hastened to the scene. I shall never forget that experience. The first shock was, of course, to find my colleague, BILL BYRON, apparently killed instantly, and the huge plane in which he was riding a mass of debris, including many mangled bodies.

Possibly the best estimate of Congressman BYRON'S strength in the district he represented can be drawn from the fact that normally the Sixth District of Maryland is Republican, possessing a large labor vote. Congressman BYRON, comfortable financially and an employer of men himself, apparently enjoyed the friendly support of labor because it was his privilege and distinction never to be defeated for any office he sought. He served in the State Senate of Maryland in an elective position. A little later, he was appointed by the late Governor Albert C. Ritchie to membership on the State road commission. Finally, he became a Member of Congress.

It is a source of great satisfaction to find his devoted widow succeeding him as a Member of this House. This daily reminder of our friendship for Congressman BYRON will serve to mitigate to some extent the loss his death occasioned, but we shall always remember him as a real gentleman, a devoted father, a man proud of the traditions of the great State he represented, and a public servant who enjoyed life and gave most of it to the service of the country for which he fought as a real soldier, and for the future welfare of which he demanded every preparation against those who would destroy it.

Kenneth Farrand Simpson

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, well may we honor the memory of our departed colleague, KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON, today. But mere words of eulogy are no more needed to illumine the earthly record of such a great and good man than is needed an incandescent light to illumine the sun at high noon.

We who had the rare good fortune to know KENNETH SIMPSON intimately and to work shoulder to shoulder with him in many righteous causes came to regard him as an exemplar of real American manhood and the things that count most in life, as truly he was. As a soldier, as a lawyer, as Republican national committeeman for the State of New York, and as Republican chairman of the county of New York, he carved for himself a permanent niche in the structure of the city and State of New York, and his fame as one of the really great men of our Nation will never be dimmed. A

Divine Providence closed the portals on his life at a time when he was standing on the threshold of what undoubtedly would have been a notable and brilliant career in the Congress of the United States. Although his voice, which always rang out for the right, is now muted, he will live forever in our minds and hearts. With Longfellow, we can truly say, "Dead he is not, but departed"; for the great in spirit never die. The great spirit of KENNETH SIMPSON will ever abide with us and be a guide and inspiration in charting the course of the Nation and the courses of our own lives.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I pay this tribute to the life, character, and memory of our late colleague, Representative GEORGE N. SEGER, of New Jersey. Mr. SEGER was more to me than a colleague and contemporary Member of Congress. He was my friend. In fact, it can be truly said that his friends were limited only by his acquaintances.

He was a retiring man, modest to a degree, but behind his apparent reticence there was a most friendly personality. He was in no sense a showman. He was genuine and real in every way. He abhorred the superficial and judged people for their true worth and not for what they feigned to be. He was mindful of the responsibility which membership in this body carries with it. He took his duties seriously. He was not a hit-and-miss voter. His votes were always based on logic, common sense, and an understanding of what he was doing. He was a man of unimpeachable integrity and rugged courage. He had the confidence of his colleagues, and, I am sure, never betrayed that confidence. His district appreciated the manner of man he was and year after year returned him to the House. Preceding his service in Congress, he had acquitted himself well as mayor of his home city. He climbed the ladder of success one rung at a time and each promotion was the reward for a task well done. Political preferment, such as accorded GEORGE SEGER, does not just happen. It is not accidental. One's constituents are fair critics. Every 2 years, on election day, there is a reappraisement of the record of Members of Congress. GEORGE SEGER met this test time after time, and usually with increasing majority. He possessed in abundance the qualities essential to a real representative of the people in this great deliberative body. The memory of this good man will linger with us long.

Ernest Lundeen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a great pleasure I looked forward to in returning to Congress was serving again with the Honorable ERNEST LUNDEEN. There was a dark shadow over that pleasure when he was not here.

My first meeting with ERNEST LUNDEEN was during my first week in Congress, in 1917, when he came to me and said: "You are a woman; you can vote against war. I have been a soldier. I know what war is." His earnest sincerity and deep emotion over our responsibility made me realize the seriousness of my position. I knew then if men had the courage to fight in war, women should have the courage to prevent war, and the first woman should accept the first opportunity to protest against it. I have always been grateful for his help.

ERNEST LUNDEEN'S habit of seeing the long-distant future gave him the same understanding of military questions that he had of social relationships. He was the first to advocate military bases in the Caribbean that would give the United States adequate protection against any nation or combination of nations. He was suspicious of all foreign intrigues, and he wished the United States to be independent of any foreign power.

He protested our entrance into the Old World hatreds of Europe and saw clearly their effect on the United States. His life was devoted to the building of human liberties at home.

He was untiring in his research and in his contemplation. He was cautious in taking steps to advance his ideals, but when he took a step it was because his deep conviction and clear thinking compelled him to put all his ability behind the program he felt was essential. He was willing to remain in the background and let others have the credit for his ideas if he felt in that way the ideals could be advanced.

Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, in the days of the first war, knew that the greatest permanent protection a nation could have was through the use of democratic processes. He was the first to carry on in his district a poll regarding war, and before his vote against it he had received from those who answered an overwhelming protest against our entry. He spoke and voted and did everything in his power to keep this Nation from making the disastrous mistake of 1917.

War propagandists did all in their power to destroy those who voted against war. Certain things could be used against a woman that could not be used against a man. There were other things they could do against a man that would not be tolerated against a woman. There was nothing low and underhanded and despicable that could be used against a man that was not attempted to destroy ERNEST LUNDEEN. They could not get him down.

He never lacked in fortitude, for he realized that it took more stamina to stand for the right than it did to knuckle to the really subversive interests in the country; he always stood, with valiant courage, for the things he knew were right.

This held true in all his fundamental principles regarding the rights of the people. He knew that as long as there was poverty, misery, and suffering among the people our country could not permanently prosper.

Everyone knew that ERNEST LUNDEEN would take his stand on the side of human liberties. If he were living today, he would understand the war interests that so cowardly attacked him, and he would have less rancor in his heart for the injustices done him than his friends have, for he had the understanding and the good will that protected his soul from hatred.

Senator LUNDEEN'S personal life was already a fulfillment of the highest ideals as a husband and father, and as a friend, but he was just beginning his career as a Senator.

His contribution to his country as a lawmaker foretold his potential worth as a Senator. His death was a tragic loss to his friends and to our country, but his memory is a precious heritage.

Alonzo Dillard Folger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, those who knew LON FOLGER will always remember his fine intellectual gifts, which were so often manifested here and in our State affairs in North Carolina, and his capacity for winning the warm and unshaken friendship of supporters and opponents alike. I shall always think of him as a man in whose life the uprightness of character predominated. My relations with him were exceedingly close and intimate, and I know he never harbored unkind feelings or resentment against anyone. He was sympathetic, tender, and was one of the truest of friends, notwithstanding the time required by public service to his country and State. He was devoted to his family

and his wife. He had a fine home, which is the glory and guardian of American life and civilization. He was my friend.

Willis Benjamin Gibbs

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House, and especially as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, our late friend, Representative W. BEN GIBBS, of Georgia, acquitted himself well. Although his service in the House was of short duration, yet during that period he endeared himself to all who came in contact with him. A splendid conversationalist, a courteous gentleman, as a student of the problems of the day, he faced a promising future in the Halls of Congress. We who knew him best loved him most. His service was of too short a duration to make it possible for all to measure his true value as a legislator. In this respect his committee had the advantage. His sudden death was a shock to all of us. A splendid and a profitable life was cut short all too soon. But who are we to criticize?

We shall all miss him.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, while I only had the pleasure and opportunity of serving in this body for a few short weeks with our departed colleague, SAM MASSINGALE, it was my good fortune to know him quite well for more than 15 years.

I knew him as a citizen; I knew him as a lawyer; I knew him as a public servant of the people of Oklahoma. While he officially represented the Seventh Oklahoma District he served not only that district ably and well, but the people of the whole State and the whole Nation.

He was a modest, unassuming man, simple in his daily life and habits. Loyal and gentle and ever thoughtful for the members of his family, which he cherished with a zeal and pride surpassed by no one.

I can say without modesty of my departed colleague and friend that no man who has served in this great body has, or had, a more burning desire to help the little fellow than did SAM MASSINGALE. He was able to meet and greet the man who felt he was down and out and leave him with a better outlook for the future. The man who had concluded that life held nothing in store for him, that hopes and aspirations were gone, that life was fruitless, and that misery and woe were his only lot would have his heart gladdened and his soul refreshed by the words of friendship and affection, the handclasp and smile of recognition given him by our late friend. With this philosophy of life, which was so actively expressed, by his every thought and action, if I may be permitted to borrow the words of the great commoner, William Jennings Bryan, "I shall not believe that even now his light has been extinguished."

The memory of the life he lived will each day be a living inspiration to all of us who were privileged to know him.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of MICHAEL EDELSTEIN the House of Representatives and the State of New York have lost a respected public official and one who has served his country well. I know of no man who had greater courage and a more earnest enthusiasm for the principles in which he believed than this colleague who literally gave his life in the service of his constituency.

The intensity of his convictions and the spirit with which he gave his best to every cause he championed will long be remembered here. Respected by his neighbors and colleagues and deeply loved by his friends, MICHAEL EDELSTEIN'S memory will live on in these Halls and in the State and Nation which he loved and cherished. His death was a great shock to all of us, since most of us were with him here on the floor just before he was taken. He seldom missed a roll call, and it was his devotion to his duty as he saw it which contributed to his death.

I believe with all my soul that the humane principles for which MICHAEL EDELSTEIN stood will forever be upheld and engraved on the hearts of men. I know of no one who fought harder for the things he championed than this faithful public servant who has now been called to serve in a higher cause. I join with my colleagues in extending deep sympathy to his family and to his constituents. The State of New York will miss him.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the late Speaker, WILL BANKHEAD, the State of Alabama lost one of her most distinguished sons, and the Nation contemporaneously sustained a tragic blow because one of its great statesmen had been called to his eternal repose.

Scion of a long line of distinguished Bankheads—intellectuals, actors, statesmen, lawyers—Will quickly assumed the role of leadership in his native State. When the Almighty called him from his earthly existence, one of the stars which had been "shining on Alabama" winked out.

WILL BANKHEAD was an inspiration to the new Members; he was a tower of dignity; he was a lighthouse sending forth beams of inspiration and stimulation to his fellows amidst the encircling gloom of disillusionment, apathy, and despair in a war-torn age.

As a Speaker, he ranked among the best. A model of dignity, probity, propriety, he set an example for all of the Members of the House to emulate. Always courteous, kindly, and cooperative, he made one proud to be a Member of that body over which WILL BANKHEAD presided as Speaker. Possessed of a delicious and engaging sense of humor, WILL BANKHEAD had the qualities of warmth of heart, understanding, and deep emotion which unconsciously drew others to him more closely in the bonds of friendship.

His histrionic ability was demonstrated on countless occasions when he recited poetry, and under the impact of passionate urgency he would give voice to the stirrings of his heart and mind.

Today we weave a benediction to the yesterdays of accomplishment and beckon to the tomorrows of sought-for perfection. Though today our heads are bowed down with grief aroused by the memories of our departed brothers of the Congress, we must not give way to the point where we are incapable of carrying on the work upon which they were nobly and laudably embarked.

WILL BANKHEAD was an evangel holding aloft the light. He has tossed the torch to us, his successors. We cannot fail him. We are entrusted, figuratively speaking, under the will of our departed

colleague, to insure that the light of liberty shall remain undimmed, in a world beset by troubles, and in an atmosphere beleaguered by threats of war and its horrors. We must carry on sans peur et sans reproche.

Today we "discern the signs of the times when the skies are red and lowering." We must read those signs aright. To be mistaken in our judgment would be fatal. Resting upon our shoulders is the greatest responsibility visited upon any Members of Congress since the inception of our Nation. We must not "let the people down."

WILL BANKHEAD was an inspiring and helpful guide in determining our course of conduct in the past. It is my fervent prayer that, rising among us and coming to us in the months to come, will be others who approach his stature. So I say, farewell, WILL BANKHEAD. We shall try to carry on. You have builded your monument in our hearts and our minds. We will never forget you

Kenneth Farrand Simpson

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate to have a day dedicated to the memory of those of our Members who have preceded us into the Great Beyond. Nothing could be more fitting than to pause for this final hail and farewell.

The untimely passing of Hon. KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON stunned all and makes one realize the uncertainties of life.

On January 3, 1941, you administered the oath of office to us as new Congressmen, and just 22 days later, January 25, he was called to higher responsibilities. While it was not my privilege to know KEN SIMPSON before coming to Washington, nonetheless, from the short association with him in this body, I felt a cordial friendship would develop through our service here.

He came from the great Empire State, located on the Atlantic seaboard, while my home is out in the Golden State, beside the waters of the broad Pacific. The House of Representatives was our meeting place.

The freshmen in the Seventy-seventh Congress feel keenly the severing of the tie which bound us to our comrade. We find consolation in the words of All's Well, as written by Anna Newbegin, of San Francisco:

Whatever comes is best—'tis the true way
That we should meet the hours in faith and say,
"What's mine no one can keep or take away;
I'll give the best in song, in joy or pain,
And leave all else without a thought of gain."
When twilight falls, and rest is mine with care,
My soul can say, "All's well, here, everywhere."

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, my long and somewhat intimate association as a Member of the House of Representatives with our late, distinguished, and beloved Speaker, WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, is sufficient reason for me to express, along with his many friends, my deep affection for him; but the fact that I was privileged to be with him at the time he was stricken and, I expect, be the last Member of Congress to talk with him suggests that I might give the Members of the House and his many friends the benefit of that experience.

Our late Speaker had but shortly before his death passed through a very arduous and grueling experience at the Democratic National Convention, where he delivered, with his characteristic force and emphasis, a great speech, and thus became the outstanding possibility for a place on the national ticket as the candidate for the office of Vice President of the United States. He returned to Washington, apparently shouldering with ease and satisfaction whatever disappointment accompanied the decision of the convention, and appeared with his usual smile and happy disposition, ready to do his best toward the success of his party in the great November battle to follow. It was because of his attitude in this respect that at a meeting presided over by the Governor of Maryland and attended by its United States Senators, Representatives in the House, the mayor of Baltimore, the Democratic national committeemen and committeewomen, looking to the opening of the campaign in Maryland, it was unanimously determined to obtain Speaker BANKHEAD as the guest speaker at a great Democratic rally in Baltimore City, which was actually the opening of the 1940 campaign.

It is easy for me to recall the expression of satisfaction which came over the face of the then Speaker on this occasion and his apparent will and determination to serve the party which had honored him so highly, even to the point of affecting his health. So Speaker BANKHEAD accepted the invitation to address this great meeting in Baltimore, and on the appointed day, September 9, I motored from Washington to Baltimore with the Speaker and Mrs. Bankhead. We had a grand trip together, but as we arrived in the suite at the Emerson Hotel, where he was to rest until shortly before he was to speak over a coast-to-coast broadcast, he complained somewhat of being tired. I left him for a little rest, and when I returned to accompany him from the hotel he was at that minute stricken. I wish I could at this point present that scene—a giant of a man suffering intensely, apparently with but a short time to live, still in possession of his faculties and permitting his great mind to dictate his first hope and desire, that he could carry on with the engagement he had within one-half hour of that time. Having been privileged as I was to have read, the day before, the Speaker's prepared speech, I was asked to substitute for him; but, instead, I forwarded his speech to Governor O'Conor, of Maryland, for delivery by him, while I stayed at the bedside of Speaker BANKHEAD with his devoted and game wife until medical assistance arrived, and after that to meet the avalanche of calls and inquiries which were coming to his suite, because by then a message over the radio had notified the country of his illness.

This was the last I saw of our late Speaker, except the following day for a moment or two while visiting his suite.

My first attachment to Speaker BANKHEAD was when I met him in 1927 upon entering the House of Representatives, at which time he displayed such kindness toward me as a new Member. After that, when he was admittedly the outstanding choice of the majority party for Speaker, and he gave way to his friend and colleague of long standing from his own State, he displayed, as no other man in my time has, evidences of greatness, fair play, and honesty. It is not surprising, therefore, that subsequently, when a vacancy for the leadership was presented, he was the overwhelming choice, and then, after he had, despite terrific illness, led his party through bitter struggles in a way that placed him beside the great leaders of our time, he was elected to the Speakership. Strong in mind and body, one of the greatest orators of our time, a kindly gentleman, a devoted husband and father, a country lawyer and gentleman farmer, and every inch a statesman—this was our late Speaker, WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD.

Ernest Willard Gibson

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ERNEST WILLARD GIBSON, late a Senator from the State of Vermont

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it became my sad duty on June 20, 1940, to announce to the House of Representa-

tives the death of the junior Senator from Vermont, the Honorable ERNEST W. GIBSON, my predecessor in office, a long-time Member of the House.

In his death the people of Vermont lost a true friend of great heart, and the State an eminent son, whose lifetime of distinguished service brought honor to it; the Nation an unusually able but unselfish public servant. For me, his death marked the end of a lifetime friendship that grew stronger with the passage of the years.

His career as lawyer, soldier, and statesman was ever devoted to the welfare of his country. This is evidenced in the brief biographical sketch, taken from official records, telling the story in part of the man he was, and indicates how great the loss his friends, his State, and the country sustained in his passing.

ERNEST W. GIBSON, son of William L. and Saville (Stowell) Gibson, was born in Londonderry, Vt., December 29, 1872. He prepared for college in the schools of his home town and at the Black River Academy at Ludlow, Vt., at the last-named place being a schoolmate of the late President Calvin Coolidge.

September 24, 1891, he entered Norwich University and completed the 4-year course in 3 years, graduating with the degree of bachelor of science in 1894.

While in college, he was corporal and later a second lieutenant of company A of the corps of cadets; editor in chief of the college publication, the Reveille; he won first prize in the Sheldon prize-speaking contest in 1893; was a member of the Theta Chi Fraternity; and in 1896, while principal of the Chester (Vt.) High School, he was given the degree of master of arts in course by the university.

He studied law at the University of Michigan and was admitted to practice in the State of Vermont in October 1899, forming a law partnership with E. L. Waterman and J. L. Martin under the firm name of Waterman & Martin, which later became the firm of Gibson & Waterman, when J. L. Martin was appointed Federal judge.

A Republican in politics, he was a long-time member of the Republican State Committee, register of probate for the district of Windsor, deputy clerk of the United States district court, a member of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Chester, represented Brattleboro in the Vermont House of Representatives 1906–1908, and was State senator from Windham County, 1908–10, and while senator was elected the president pro tempore of the Senate; appointed judge of the Brattleboro Municipal Court in 1908.

In addition, it should be said, as a matter of record, that he was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1912; secretary of civil and military affairs for Vermont; State's attorney of Windham County; a long-time trustee of Norwich University, and for years an active member and junior warden of St. Michaels Episcopal Church in Brattleboro, and trustee of the Diocese of Vermont.

He was always intensely interested in the military side of a citizen's duty to his country, and he exemplified his convictions. In 1899 he enlisted in the Vermont National Guard, rose to the rank of colonel, and retired in 1908. He returned to the service in 1915 as a captain of infantry, and served during the Mexican border trouble, and for 2 years during the World War overseas; was colonel of the One Hundred and Seventy-second Regiment of Infantry from August 5, 1921, to November 1, 1923.

In 1923 he was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress and was subsequently reelected to the Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, and Seventy-third Congresses, resigning to accept an appointment to the United States Senate on November 21, 1933, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Dale.

He was married to Grace Fullerton Hadley, of Chester, Vt., on November 25, 1896. Four children were born to that union, three of whom are living, the eldest, Frank Hadley, and Mrs. Gibson are deceased.

The foregoing is indicative of his busy life as a civilian, though it is by no means a complete or comprehensive statement along that line.

In conclusion, let me say as I did the morning of his death, returning from the Senate Chamber:

Well I know he waits not as of old—
I could not find him in the old time place—
I must pursue him, made by sorrow bold,
Through worlds unknown, in strange celestial race,
Whose mystic round no traveler has told,
From star to star, until I see his face.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in the quarter of a century that it has been my privilege to serve in this body we have had eight Speakers, three of whom passed away while occupying that exalted position. All were men of probity, ability, and honor.

Speaker BANKHEAD, whom we today mourn, ranks among the great Speakers of the House. As presiding officer of this body he was fair and impartial in his decisions and rulings. To the new Members he was always kindly and helpful, to the older Members friendly and wise in counsel.

WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD and I came to Congress in the beginning of the Sixty-fifth Congress and just before America's entrance into the World War. Early in our service we formed a close friendship that became strengthened with the passing of time, and no Member of the House grieved more deeply over our friend's departure.

It was WILL BANKHEAD'S privilege to have served as majority leader and Speaker during a most important period of post-war America. As such it devolved upon him to handle important administration measures that came to the House. The work incident thereto drew heavily upon his strength and we know how generously he gave of that strength. Never robust, Speaker BANKHEAD gradually broke down in health under the great strain under which he labored. In time he became weary, but never did he spare himself. To the end he carried on like the good soldier that he was.

Speaker BANKHEAD came of good American fighting stock. It was my privilege to have known his father, the late John H. Bankhead, for 13 years a Senator from the State of Alabama, a Confederate veteran who, by the way, was an intimate friend of the late Senator Knute Nelson, of Minnesota, a Union veteran, and also a splendid American. The late Speaker died in harness, as he wished. He passed away with all sails set, in all the glory of a well-spent life devoted to the service of his country and countrymen. A fallen oak that is majestic in death as it was beautiful in life.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss to my own conscience were I not to say a few words in tribute to the memory and achievements of the late SAMUEL C. MASSINGALE. His untimely and tragic passing was a blow to all of us who knew and loved him. SAM was one of the most popular Members of the House of Representatives. Not a colleague existed but who warmed to SAM'S engaging personality, chuckled with SAM in his frequent good-humored sallies, thrilled to SAM'S homely and telling philosophic observations.

Though he has physically passed from our midst, his spirit lingers in our daily life and in the sessions of the House. His superb sense of humor was as oil on rasping machinery. His infectious wit soothed and warmed and made one glow. Always there was a pleasant reaction to contact with SAM MASSINGALE, no matter how brief was the visit with that remarkable character.

He was a potent spokesman for his State of Oklahoma. As a member of the powerful Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, he added much to a needed balance between liberals and conservatives within the chambers of that committee.

SAM MASSINGALE knew and understood life in all of its phases. Though risen to high position, SAM at no time scorned the base degrees through which he did ascend. SAM's spirit and personality were racy of the soil of his beloved State of Oklahoma. He thoroughly comprehended the problems beleaguering the hearts and torturing the minds of the farmers of America. Though constantly discouraged by rebuffs and set-backs in his efforts to rehabilitate the American farmer, SAM obstinately continued on his course and worked assiduously to secure powerful support for his own bill designed to guarantee to the farmer the cost of production of his products.

We miss you, SAM MASSINGALE. Though you have gone to your eternal abode and are joined in the democracy of death with many great figures who have left our midst, we are advantaged by the inspiration you have provided for us. We shall emulate your record and be stimulated by the example you have set for all of us to follow.

Willis Benjamin Gibbs

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in this short span of years that we call life there are certain possessions that we from time to time accumulate that can never be lost, stolen, or destroyed. They are the appraisals we have in our own minds made of the character and personal traits of individuals whom chance has escorted along our pathways.

Fate may sooner or later remove these persons from our immediate vision. They themselves may choose to deviate from the route we are wont to pursue; they may reach the goal for which we ourselves are striving, more rapidly than do we; or they may, in their journey through life, stumble, fall, and expire. If our contacts have been more than casual, we are often privileged to retain in our minds incidents in their existence which have contributed to our appraisal of their characters and which, though susceptible of fading with the passing of time, will ever recall pleasant pictures that we can enjoy. A sacred asset this, and one that can never be taken away from us. During BEN GIBBS' congressional career, his office was in close proximity to mine. I found him a good neighbor. We served on the same committee, walked to and from its meetings, and discussed the problems, pro and con, that were before us for determination. He was a sound thinker and possessed a keen, analytical mind. We visited in each other's offices. He was jovial and generous. I never heard an unkind remark pass his lips. In humor, in jest, in serious thought he was always a gentleman.

The picture of BEN GIBBS that indelibly impressed itself on my mind was revealed to me the last time I saw him alive—on the afternoon of the day before he passed away. In seemingly the best of health, he exultantly walked into my office and proudly displayed to me a most precious treasure that he carried in his arms—a baby granddaughter. Pleasure and pride fairly oozed from his features as he fondled the little one. When on the day following I was apprised of his sudden death the picture of that scene seemed to appear before my eyes. It was my last impression of him and was the best. It revealed him as a lover of children, a devoted father, and a happy grandfather. BEN GIBBS is gone, but those who knew him are happier because of the privilege that was theirs to know a noble character.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a keen sense of sadness attending a great personal loss that I rise to add my humble tribute to the life and character of my fine and devoted friend, the late SAMUEL C. MASSINGALE, of Oklahoma. It is a high privilege to have extended to me the opportunity of bearing witness to the very high esteem and the deep and abiding affection with which our colleague of former days was held by the Members of the House of Representatives, and with that treasured memory I speak these few words of my colleague who was a good citizen, a loyal patriot, a constant humanitarian, an outstanding statesman, and a fine and loyal friend.

Representative MASSINGALE was devoted to his State. He loved the entire area of that great Commonwealth. The people of the great Southwest were his friends, and he was the friend of the people. Among them he grew into prominence; he was happy in their association. As a lawyer, he endured the customary hardships incident to his early practice, but he developed as the years passed by until he was respected as a worthy foe in every just and righteous cause. Thus he became deep rooted in his great affection for those about him. The people of his State and of his own congressional district quickly learned that he was a stanch and loyal friend in whom they could repose every confidence. He possessed the choicest ideals in life.

It was my privilege to become acquainted with my colleague in early January 1939 in our association on the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives. In our close contacts thereafter I came to recognize in him those rare qualities which directly appeal to men. His was not a nature which courted the spectacular things in life, but his was a temperament which yielded his affection to the serious and the better elements before us; he loved the common place of things. I knew him in the intimacies of those close contacts which are forever reserved by each one of us for but a few. I knew him as a veteran of the last World War, in which we had a common and kindred sympathy; I knew him in the stress of great turmoil when the ponderous questions of state, fraught with life's heavier burdens, were at hand; I knew him, too, in the meditations of sadness, when the heart bleeds and the somber voice pleads for solace and for rest; I knew him when he voiced his reflections and sound logic respecting the future of his country—the land he loved and the form of government which he professed with unerring devotion. He was as kindly as he was brave. He was both loyal and constant. Thus I knew my friend in the days gone by.

My colleague, whose memory I will long cherish, lived as he died—and he died as he lived—with the heavy weight of livid problems of all the people before him. He was no laggard, but he continued at his post of duty until the summons came; he was unafraid; within the silence of his memories he responded to the Master's call. He silently, yet surely, wrapped the draperies of his couch about him and laid down as if in peaceful, happy dreams.

Thus, his life work was ended. The career of my friend was completed.

SAM MASSINGALE, as we affectionately knew him, needs no encomium. His life and his living of it stand before us in all its beauty and its splendor. My last tribute to him I give in those beautiful words which were spoken of a great hero—in the days gone by:

This was a man!

Pius Louis Schwert

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in a tribute to the memory of the late PIUS L. SCHWERT, Member of Congress from my own district of New York.

It was my privilege to know Mr. SCHWERT personally. It is most difficult to find words adequate to express our

inward feelings on occasions such as this. The good opinion of honest men, friends of freedom, and well-wishers of mankind, wherever they may be born or happen to reside, is the only kind of reputation a wise man would ever desire. PIUS SCHWERT prized the good opinion of his fellow citizens. The citizens of the district I now have the honor to represent will cherish his memory.

Memory is the only friend
That grief can call her own.

Kenneth Farrand Simpson

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I had short acquaintance with the Representative from New York, Hon. KENNETH SIMPSON, whose untimely death occurred at the beginning of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, but had he lived, I am sure that our friendship would have grown and ripened with the passing years. On this memorial day, I desire to pay him tribute as a distinguished Member of the House and a respected citizen of the great State of New York.

KENNETH SIMPSON was an outstanding political figure in New York and acted as a leader in the affairs of his party. His desire to serve and his energy and ability would have made him a national leader as well. It was, indeed, a tragedy that he had to be taken in the very prime of life and at the height of his usefulness and power. During the few weeks he served here he reflected honor and credit upon himself and his constituency. New York and the Nation have lost a valuable public official.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this day when we pause in the midst of our official duties to do homage to those of our colleagues who have left us forever-more I take this opportunity to submit from the pen of Judge Frank E. Herrick, of Wheaton, in my State, an eloquent and fitting tribute to a great Texan and a great American:

THE WHITE TOGA

He wore a white toga in the Halls of State
With dignity and bearing fine and strong,
Clad in his robes chaste and immaculate
He stood and faced the Nation's Supreme Wrong!
With truceless lance and unsheathed sword
And tongue of flame he smote the foe—
Strong Drink and his law-guarded horde,
The Mocker of Mankind and king of Woe,
The brave who die upon the crimson field
Do do not hear the cheering victors shout,
But thrice brave they who will not yield
Howe'er the conflict seems in doubt!
Though his long battle days are done
The fields he fought shall yet be won!

Ernest Lundeen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota

"A loyal son and a real defender."

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to pay tribute to the memory of our deceased colleagues for whom taps have sounded during the past year. They cannot benefit by our praise of their efforts and our expressed respect of their characters, but it is we, the living, that must derive inspiration from their courageous and useful lives.

On this impressive occasion I am privileged to briefly record my feelings regarding the life of my friend the late Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota.

The news of his sorrowful and tragic passing is still fresh in our minds. Air-minded, a student of airplane development, an advocate of a powerful air force for America's defenses, God seemed to have decreed his untimely ending. All who knew him in life may be certain that in one brief instant he faced the inevitable in the same spirit that he lived—courageously and unafraid.

The late Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN was one of the few remaining Members of Congress who voted against America's entrance into the World War in 1917. Whether or not we agreed with him, no real American will deny him the verdict that he followed his convictions and courageously fought for them in the same spirit which really built America.

Yes; in the years preceding his death he vigorously continued the battle to keep America out of Europe's troubles. He spoke with courage, with conviction, with sincerity. His passing not only was a shock to the Nation, but in his demise America lost a loyal son and a real defender.

As I have said many times, we Americans admire men with courage and conviction. The late Senator LUNDEEN was a great American and a good soldier, not only literally but figuratively. He served his country well, both in peace and war. What more can a loyal citizen give to his country? He fought that America might live and prosper.

To those of us who must carry on, although we shall miss him, we have the cherished memory of his valuable contribution to his America and our America. The vivid memory of his willingness to fight for what he thought was right will inspire us to go forward with renewed efforts, with renewed courage in our determined fight to protect the last portals of democracy.

ERNEST LUNDEEN has passed on, but the memory of his outstanding human qualities will long live.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, today, at the conclusion of the memorial services, a bugle will blow Taps in these Halls, the immortal notes which declare that the day is done and that the sun is gone from the earth, from the hills, and from the sky. But the sweet and gentle notes also say: "All is well, sweetly rest, God is nigh."

No man so richly deserves the honor that this day bestows upon his memory than my dearly beloved friend the Honorable SAM MASSINGALE. And it is fitting that the military requiem be a part of his memorial service because he laid down his life on the field of action where he served as an intensely earnest and loyal soldier.

I am glad that the conditions surrounding his departure were as he would wish them. He once said to me that his life had been rich and full, that he could ask no more in a personal way for all the rewards of value had come to him.

Through many years, he had enjoyed the companionship of a wife who was not only an intelligent partner but was beautiful and good to a degree of excellence and who made of their home all that wishes or imagination could conceive as being possible to the capacity of wife and mother. SAM also possessed the riches to be found in devoted children who themselves have at all times been worthy of their fine parentage both in the sense of their life attitudes and the quality of their citizenship.

Life was not niggardly in bestowing upon SAM awards and honors, for many times he was raised amongst his fellow

men to positions of honor and trust which he so richly deserved and so faithfully filled. Then to be counted amongst his treasures is the affection of his friends. It is a matter of intense pride with me that I am certain in the knowledge that there was a full reciprocity of friendship between SAM and me. Very few men have ever lived who had more sincere and devoted friends than SAM MASSINGALE. Not only were men in exceptional numbers his friends, but he was a friend to men and he gave them full measure and with extreme generosity of his friendship.

I know of no finer tribute that can be paid to him and of no more certain gage of the fine character and quality of his work in Congress than to make the simple announcement that no man in Congress has more friends, sincere and devoted friends, than SAM MASSINGALE has amongst us here today. I make that statement in the certain knowledge that everyone in Congress will heartily concur with its truth.

I do not believe in death in its ordinary definition. It is beyond my conception that life could cease to be. I do not believe that life is a blind alley. I believe it to be a thoroughfare that goes on and on. The portal of eternity is simply an open gate. It opens the way to a more perfect high road. I once traveled several hundred miles down a long straight road, and could always look ahead and see some point where the road seemed to run into the sky. Man called that point a horizon. I soon found that the road did not end at the horizon, but the road stretched on beyond. And so I know that my friend who has passed beyond the horizon is continuing on the road on the other side that is as yet curtained from our view. He has walked on ahead of us and walks now with the sainted and the immortal with his presence adding honor and goodness to the total over there, just as he added those qualities in full measure when he was in our company here.

I have not said good-bye. I will not say good-bye. We have just shaken hands and parted as we have done so many times at evening, knowing that we would meet again tomorrow.

Willis Benjamin Gibbs

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1940, my friend, WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, a former Member of this body from my district, the Eighth Georgia, answered the last roll call.

Another hero has fallen asleep—one who enriched the world with an honest life. Again we stand in the shadow of the great mystery—a shadow as deep and dark as when the tears of the first mother fell upon the pallid face of her lifeless babe—a mystery that has never yet been solved.

Another life of love is now a blessed memory, a lingering strain of music. The pure and consecrated husband, the devoted and loving father, the faithful, sincere friend, who with tender faith and loyalty discharged the duties of life, has reached his journey's end. A braver, more serene, a more chivalric spirit never passed from life to enrich the realm of death. His life was gentle and his death sublime. He loved the good and all the good loved him. There is this consolation—he can never suffer more, never feel again the chill of death, never part again from those he loved. His heart can break no more. He has shed his last tear, and upon his stainless brow has been set the wondrous seal of everlasting peace. The river of another life has reached the sea.

In the presence of the great mystery, the great mystery that awaits to enshroud us all, we feel the uselessness of words. But where a fellow traveler has reached his journey's end—where the darkness from which he emerged has received him again, it is but natural for his friends to mingle with their grief, expressions of their love and loss.

Ben, as he was familiarly known to me, was truly a son of the Old South. He was born and reared in Clinch County, Ga., which belongs to a section of the Nation that is and has been through the years inhabited by a people through whose veins flows the purest and truest Anglo-Saxon blood, a people, if you please, with courage of steel and hearts of gold, where man is yet a superior creation of the Supreme Ruler and his word is a bond from which he would accept no release. He was of noble heritage, coming from one of the pioneer families who have helped develop that section of Georgia and whose patriotism to every cause of virtue has been an inspiration to all who have been thrown in the light of their lives. He was a son of Willis B. Gibbs and Lilla Johnson Gibbs, two of that county's truest patriots and noblest citizens, whose memory lingers in the love of all who knew them.

I practiced law in the courts with and against Ben. I knew him as he was, and in his soul was anchored a spirit of honor that was never questioned. My life has been made rich by friends, but I have never had, nor will I, a better or truer one than he who lies in silence now, yet loved. He was as steadfast, as faithful as the stars. This man was as reliable as the attraction of gravitation—he knew no shadow of turning. He was as generous as autumn, as hospitable as summer, and as tender as a perfect day in June. He was a home builder. He believed in the fireside—in the sacredness of the hearth. In every storm of life he was oak and rock, but in the sunshine of the summer of life he was love and flower. He was a believer of the religion of deed and his creed was to do good. No man has ever slept in death who nearer lived his creed. I have known him many years and have yet to hear a word spoken of him except praise.

If ever a husband and father could be called a prince of love and tenderness in his home, surely it was Ben. He served every office of home life as an ambassador of peace and good will and carried in his soul that tender devotion and love for his graceful and charming wife and daughter and manly son, that made each moment sparkle with joy and happiness for them. Every feature occasion in his life, whether business or pleasure, was magnified by his love for and pride in his family.

Ben was a public servant for the last 26 years of his wordly journey. For 24 years he served as prosecuting attorney in his district and the last 2 as Representative in Congress from the Eighth District of Georgia. Even though an alert and effective prosecutor, his every effort was founded upon a solid rock of honor and studded with diamonds of purity of purpose and his noble heart always tempered justice with mercy. I have been made happy since my entry into service in this Congress to learn of his brilliant, even though short, service in this body, and the love in which his memory is held by those who served with him. It has always been a source of joy to me that only a few weeks before his departure I had occasion to advise him by letter that I would not oppose him for his seat. I regret that his untimely death prevented him from enjoying a long tenure of office with the membership of this great body where he would have built a monument of service to his memory unsurpassed by American statesmen. His great ability, his unshakable honor and true sincerity always found its way to mightier and loftier heights.

Let me say again of this noble man. He was frank, candid, and sincere; he practiced what he preached, and looked with the holy eyes of charity upon the failings and mistakes of men. He believed in the power of kindness, and spanned with divine sympathy the hideous gulf that separates the fallen from the pure. He lived, he loved, and he was loved. Wife and children pressed their kisses on his lips. This is enough. The longest life contains no more. This fills the vase of joy. But in the presence of death, how beliefs and dogmas wither and decay. How loving words and deeds burst into blossom. Pluck from the tree of any life these flowers, and there remains but barren thorns of bigotry and creed. This we know: Good deeds are never childless. A noble life is never lost. A virtuous action does not die. BEN GIBBS with generous hands scattered the priceless seeds, and we shall reap the golden grain. His words and acts are ours, and all he nobly did is living still. The good are the noble. His life filled the lives of others with sunshine. He has left a legacy of glory to his children. They can truthfully say that within their veins is right royal blood—the blood of an honest, generous man, of a steadfast friend, of one who was true to the very gates of death.

If there is another world, which we have not the slightest doubt, another life beyond the shore of this, and the great and good who died upon this orb are there, then the noblest and the best with

eager hands have welcomed him—the equal in honor, in generosity, of anyone that ever passed beyond the veil. To me this world is growing poor. New friends can never fill the places of the old.

BEN GIBBS lived for others. He accepted toil and hope deferred. He did not seek to adorn his body, but rather his soul with the jewels of charity, modesty, courage, and above all with love of life and its better portions.

Farewell, O brave and modest man!

Your lips, between which truths burst into blossom, are forever closed. Your loving heart has ceased to beat. Your busy brain is still, and from your hand has dropped the sacred torch.

Your noble, self-denying life has honored us, and we will honor you.

You were my friend, and I was yours. Above your silent clay I pay this tribute to your worth.

Farewell!

Alonzo Dillard Folger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

He was a good man, and a just.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, what we say within these walls today of our late colleague, the late Representative FOLGER, can avail little to mold the judgment of his friends and acquaintances as to his useful life, less assuage the grief of those who so deeply and sincerely mourn his sudden and untimely loss.

The achievements of his life were in the courts, in unselfish civic enterprises, in the legislative hall; but perhaps, after all, they are most deeply engraved, if not as firmly perpetuated, in the minds and the memory of his friends and myriad admirers.

Any man might have a pardonable pride to have stood where Mr. FOLGER stood and to have done what he did. He continually did things from which the timid would shrink, the incompetent would recoil, and the coward would flee. But far from ministering to his vanity, the rarest and most sought honors did not elate him, and were in no sense necessary to his happiness.

In fact, honors and increased experience seemed to fill him with vague feelings of unrest and yearnings for hitherto untraveled fields of usefulness and power. One might have thought that one of his placid and judicial temperament would have remained long upon the superior bench of his State, but he resigned after only 2 months' service there to enter important work of a national character, wherein he distinguished himself.

Our friend was not a table-pounding speaker who depended upon gusts of oratory to convince his auditors; he seldom spoke upon the floor of the House, but his influence and work as a member of the important Committee on Banking and Currency were wide, penetrating, successful, and important. It is unusual for one to attain membership on that important major committee during his first term here.

Incorruptibly honest, he was proof against all temptation of avarice. His life was uniformly distinguished by the purest and most refined morality. Dissipation and vice, even of the mildest order, were unknown to him, unwelcome to him. Still he knew and appreciated the temptations of others, the unworthy motive of others; in short, he was cosmopolitan; he knew all classes of the world as they are.

He sympathized with weaknesses, which he in no way shared, of those who fall.

His was a voice that compelled attention and won the ear and the heart and his logical argumentation conquered doubt.

So fine were his feelings, his sympathies so susceptible, and his heart so tender that he felt and bore the pains of others as if they were his own, especially when he could not afford relief.

The wealth of a state or nation consists not in fertile soil, mineral land, or hoarded gold, but in the manhood of such men as Mr. FOLGER and the womanhood of her women.

Rich, indeed, in priceless jewels is the State that can claim him her son; fortunate, indeed, are we who can claim him a countryman and feel the quickening inspiration of the example to high-minded, noble endeavor.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, dean of New Jersey's delegation in the House of Representatives, whom we lost through death last August, was a close personal friend of mine since 1922 and I miss him deeply.

Mr. SEGER was a builder. That was his vocation in life. He was a builder in the House where he was respected not only for his personal charm, his sterling character, but also for his fund of common sense and his knowledge of the tried and true principles of business.

The gentleman from New Jersey spoke rarely and on such occasions he always found a most attentive House because his contribution was both sincere and constructive.

Opposed to the Federal Government going into business in competition with private industry, he was the first to obtain an amendment to appropriation legislation to halt this trend.

Mr. SEGER was particularly active on the House Rivers and Harbors Committee. He was ranking minority member and for 18 years he assisted mightily in the development of America's harbors and waterways.

This man symbolized human kindness. I never saw him lose his temper. I remember him for his friendly smile, his warm handshake.

He had loved no darkness,
Sophisticated no truth,
Allowed no fear.

The plans he made for his secretary whom he called his partner make up one of the most interesting chapters in the history of the Congress and Capitol Hill.

William Devereux Byron

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. DAVID J. WARD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM DEVEREUX BYRON, late a Representative from the State of Maryland

Mr. WARD Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Hon. WILLIAM DEVEREUX BYRON I have lost a dear friend. My association with him over a period of 4 years in the Maryland State Senate, and subsequently in the United States House of Representatives, will always remain with me a happy memory. He endeared himself to me and to all who had the privilege of knowing him as I knew him.

His passing is not only a deep personal loss but a great loss to the State of Maryland, to the membership of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Military Affairs, to which he had been assigned in the present Congress.

Mr. BYRON had a distinguished war record. His military experience was a factor in his assignment to the Committee on Military Affairs. He was graduated from Phillips Exeter Academy and Pratt Institute, and enlisted as a private in the Aviation Corps at the outbreak of the World War. After training he was commissioned a first lieutenant and assigned as instructor in flying and aerial gunnery.

During his brief service on the committee he manifested his value to the Nation in connection with the national-defense program. He helped form important legislation. With his colleagues on the committee he had covered 14,000 miles on aerial surveys of defense projects in the country, and was on two occasions designated by the chairman to

make inspection trips to the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. BYRON was devoted to his family. Symbolic of his harmonious home life was his family orchestra. Himself musically inclined, he encouraged his five boys to develop musical appreciation. Of this he said:

I have always believed that musical appreciation is not necessarily an accident of birth, but can be acquired, and gives those who have it a deeper pleasure and enjoyment of life.

My sincere sympathy is extended to his family. A kindly, gracious, and courteous gentleman and friend, BILL BYRON will always remain in the memory of those of us who were privileged to know him.

Alonzo Dillard Folger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, the death of our colleague, LON FOLGER, was a great shock to all his friends. We of his own State delegation, who knew him best, held him in the very highest esteem and affection. He was a very companionable man and loyal to his friends always. He liked political life and had the capacity for public service. He was always ready to assist those in need and was approachable by the most humble citizen as well as those of wider influence. He was much beloved by the people of his community, who sought his help and advice, and at the same time he had the confidence and respect of the business and political leaders of his district and State. We will miss him as a true friend, a valuable public servant, and as a loyal and patriotic American citizen. To his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy, and in the hope that it may help them to bear their irreparable loss, I quote from a letter written by Benjamin Franklin to his niece regarding the death of her father:

I condole with you. We have lost a most dear and valuable relation. But it is the will of God and Nature that these mortal bodies be laid aside when the soul is to enter into real life. This is rather an embryo state, a preparation for living.

A man is not completely born until he is dead. Why then grieve that a new child is born among the immortals, a new member added to their happy society? We are spirits. That bodies should be lent us, while they can afford us pleasure, assist in acquiring knowledge, or in doing good to our fellow creatures is a kind and benevolent act of God.

When they become unfit for these purposes, and afford us pain instead of pleasure, instead of an aid become an encumbrance, and answer none of the intentions for which they were given, it is equally kind and benevolent that a way is provided by which we may get rid of them.

Death is that way. We ourselves in some cases prudently choose a partial death. A mangled, painful limb, which cannot be restored, we willingly cut off. He who plucks out a tooth, parts with it freely, since the pain goes with it; and he who quits the whole body parts at once with all pains and possibilities of pains and diseases it was liable to or capable of making him suffer.

Our friend and we were invited abroad on a party of pleasure, which is to last forever. His chair was ready first, and he is gone before us. We could not all conveniently start together; and why should I be grieved at this, since we are soon to follow and know where to find him. Adieu.

William Devereux Byron

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM DEVEREUX BYRON, late a Representative from the State of Maryland

All that lives must die,
Passing through nature to eternity.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the subject of our encomiums, the late WILLIAM DEVEREUX BYRON, is another promising legislator that was taken by death just as he was entering full fruit and flower. Born May 15, 1895, he became a Member of the House January 3, 1939, and passed away tragically February 27, 1941.

Let us gather some solace from the fact that—

That life is long which answers life's great end.

Soon after finishing his schooling Mr. BYRON enlisted as a private in the Air Corps of the Army and was in due course granted a commission as first lieutenant. This experience later caused our late friend to be selected a member of our Committee on Military Affairs, where he rendered valuable service, especially in connection with all aviation problems.

It would be difficult to imagine a better preparation than this good man received for service in the National Legislature. From youth he was trained in operation and management of an important private business. At the age of 31 he was elected mayor of Williamsport, Md., in which office he served 4 years, leaving it to become a member of the Senate of the State of Maryland, where he served 4 years. Following that term he served 2 years, 1934-1935, as a member of the Maryland Roads Commission.

The record does not show our late colleague to have been a noisy, self-advertising personage, but he was of that type that in a silent, forceful way devote themselves unceasingly and intelligently to their onerous and important duties in committees, with little or no thought of reward other than the satisfaction of duty well done.

He was one of those men who recognized that one must take humanity as it is and that the world could not be transformed or reformed in one day or one generation. While he recognized that there were conditions in this country that were bad, and some more abuses in our industrial and economic life should be corrected, yet he had the faith necessary to believe that these things could and should be corrected in due course under the orderly processes provided by our Constitution and form of Government, which he understood so well and respected so scrupulously.

Our good friend has gone, cut down in the high tide of physical and mental virility and usefulness. He has trod the path we shall tread when the summons comes. Let us be as well prepared in all things as he was, for the good he did lives after him. Our struggle here may be longer, yet for whatever time it may be, we will go on as "weary ships to their haven under the hill."

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, we have lost many able Members of this body in the short period of 5 years that I have had the honor of representing in Congress the people of my district. We have lost to the grim reaper a wealth of talent, of honor, and of courage. But I actually had not felt so severe a personal loss until the unexpected passing of my old friend SAM MASSINGALE, of Oklahoma. We were corridor mates in the old House Office Building. We always conferred together on measures of importance. He advised me on agricultural problems. I advised him on questions of national defense. He was most conscientious and hard working.

I have never heard him vote against a humanitarian measure of any kind. His was the homely philosophy of the Golden Rule, and in his speech and in his actions he lived up to that standard.

SAM MASSINGALE spoke softly and was slow to anger. His kindly disposition made him a general favorite among us, and on numerous occasions his commonsense remarks on pending legislation resulted in the enactment of laws for alleviating the suffering of the poor and underprivileged and the bettering of the lot of the farmer and the workingman.

We will miss him here, but the greatest loss will come to those of his countrymen for whom he gave his life in line of duty.

Pius Louis Schwert

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York

Give sorrow words; the grief that does not speak.
Whisper the o'erfraught heart, and bids it break.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the subject of our encomiums, who was born November 22, 1891, and passed away March 11, 1941, was an especially promising legislator, after receiving a good, practical education in commerce, which was followed by successful experience in banking, merchandising, and as clerk of Erie County, N. Y. During his quest for business success in early life our friend was not too busy to answer the call of his country in an emergency, but he served as a commissioned officer in the United States Navy.

Mr. SCHWERT's popularity in his important county was so widespread that he was called to serve on the President's special review for veterans' compensation cases.

The qualifications of our honorable deceased were here instantly appraised and rewarded by election to a major committee—the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads—immediately after he was seated as the successor of Senator JAMES M. MEAD.

Our friend's ambition for success of his service here was high. With strong caution and conservatism in his nature he was in no danger of attempting rash experiments or resorting to the empiricism of statesmanship. But he believed that renewed and closer attention should be given to questions affecting the material interests and commercial prospects of 132,000,000 people. He believed that an essential forerunner to a new era of national progress must be a feeling of contentment in every section of the Union and a generous belief that the benefits and burdens of government should be common to all.

Least of all men did he harbor revenge, rarely did he ever show resentment, and malice was not in his nature. He was congenially employed only in the exchange of good offices and the doing of kindly deeds.

In the transitory struggles of life he had an abiding pride of consistency, but he was always liberal and tolerant. After reaching a conclusion, based upon full knowledge and mature consideration, in connection with his legislative duties, he was always content in his mind, justified in his conscience, and immovable in his determination.

After a too short service here, extending from January 3, 1939, to the date of his passing, our friend left behind a proud, expectant constituency, a great host of sustaining friends, and a proud and unsullied name.

Every acquaintance of this honorable deceased loved him. His kindly nature and lovable traits of character and his amiable consideration for all about him will long endure in the minds and hearts of his constituents and colleagues.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have heard and read many of the glowing tributes which have been paid to the memory of the late senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable MORRIS SHEPPARD. All of these tributes were inadequate. They fell far short of the mark because the character of MORRIS SHEPPARD was indescribably fine. It would, therefore, not become me to try to pay him an adequate tribute. But I cannot refrain, as a Texan who admired the Senator very much, from adding my name to the list of those who seek to pay their respects to the memory of a great Texan and a great American.

Some may remember the Senator as they last saw him on the Senate floor, pleading the cause of national defense. Some will remember having last seen him on the way to a Goverment department on a mission in behalf of a powerful or an humble constituent. Some will remember having last seen the Senator as he spoke at the banquet table with a sparkling brilliance and a fine sense of humor. Some will remember him as he sat in the church, as he regularly did, with a reverence and loyalty which was characteristic of his life to the end. One thing sure—all those who remember him will have cause to be grateful for the example of so fine and wholesome an American as was MORRIS SHEPPARD.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, humbly do I join in this memorial tribute to GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, who represented the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey for almost nine terms. He was my chief, my friend, my mentor, and 1 year ago today he was making plans to "stump" for me to succeed him. His sudden death in August broke up our 18-year-old partnership in service, and I had to forego the happiness of having him at my side when I took the oath of office on January 3, 1941.

Mr. SEGER was a man of sterling character and it gave him great joy in late life to reflect on his more than 30 years of public service—school commissioner, mayor, and Representative—and to realize he had kept the book clean. Every political opponent admitted this and he was properly classified as his district's public citizen No. 1. He was an outstanding exemplar of the philosophy "a man can be honest in public life and go places." And he believed mightily the theory it pays to do well the little things in life—courtesies, humanities, acts of friendship.

When Mr. SEGER and I first teamed up he impressed upon me ours was to be a "We" relationship. Frankly, I doubt that Capitol Hill history can record a closer relationship of Member and secretary. This was emphasized by his frequent reference to me as his "third son."

Because he was the World War mayor of his home city of Passaic, Mr. SEGER always felt close to the veterans of that war. He sent his two sons overseas and he officiated at many send-offs of other boys. Giving those boys the then oft-repeated assurances that all would be well when they came home, he was saddened later at the disappointments and heartaches of those who did return. This was his principal reason for his support of the payment of the soldiers' bonus which in 1936 almost cost him his reelection, close business friends then holding such payment would ruin the financial structure of the country.

Mr. SEGER's sons served in the Navy and he himself loved the water. He made several trips abroad with Mrs. Seger, and when he came to the Congress he was assigned to the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, being ranking minority member at the time of his death. He had a deep affection for the chairman, Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, of Texas, and the two cooperated for years in the development of America's ports and waterways. When the Texan once told him he, Mr. SEGER, was destined to become chairman he replied that they would have to have "the two Joes on hand to help." Besides the chairman he was making reference to Joseph H. McGann, long-time faithful and efficient clerk to the committee.

It pleased Mr. SEGER when Postmaster General James A. Farley came to Paterson in 1933 to dedicate that great industrial city's new Federal Building. Digressing from his prepared manuscript, the Democratic chieftain paid great tribute "to the Congressman from this district for his services to his people and the Nation."

In many of his talks, particularly when he would sight Democrats in the audience, Mr. SEGER would recall that his father was once a Democratic member

of the New York City Board of Aldermen. It was in the days of "Boss" Tweed, and when the elder Seger refused to obey orders from the boss he was purged, serving but one term.

Mr. SEGER'S gracious and charming daughter who had been his campaign manager in his first campaign came to Washington with him in 1923. Here she met and married a truly fine gentleman of the South, one who sat on the other side of the aisle from her father, Representative FREDERICK H. DOMINICK, of Newberry, S. C. Their two lovely daughters, Joan and Doris, were Mr. SEGER'S joy, and after Mrs. Seger's passing in 1934 he spent almost every congressional recess in the Southland.

Mr. SEGER loved the House and its membership. I have often heard him say he would rather serve his district in Congress than have any other post within the gift of the people. Friends had often urged him to consider the governorship of New Jersey, but he would never do so. He was much concerned about the international situation as it grew from bad to worse last summer, and he prayed that he would never have to see a World War No. 2, one engulfing America.

There were no prejudices, no hates, in the make-up of this great American citizen, and people of every race, color, and creed knew him as their friend, their champion. Meticulous about his personal habits, he was so about his daily record of "things done." I have never known a man in public or private life who kept a more accurate diary, that book he kept so clean.

There is no group in American life who can appraise a public man better than the gentlemen of the press. Reporters everywhere saluted this genial, friendly dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, and they did so for the same reason men and women of all stations of life wept when they heard of his passing. They knew he was good and they knew he loved his fellow men.

The world today is better because of GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER. The heritage he left me is immeasurable.

I see a hand you cannot see!
I hear a voice you cannot hear.

Key Pittman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. KEY PITTMAN, late a Senator from the State of Nevada

Like as the waves make towards the pebbled shore,
So do our minutes hasten to their end.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the life and the accomplishments of the late Senator PITTMAN aptly illustrate the possibilities accruing under our democratic form of government and the free institutions of our country.

One from Mississippi may be pardoned if he asserts that it is among the sons of his State that occur very frequently indeed striking illustrations of the rising to place of influence, power, and importance of men born in places which, in theory, preclude such advancement; and among the many such examples of children of Mississippi there stands out the life and enviable record of the late Senator PITTMAN.

The record discloses only one important advantage, except parenthood, that was given to the late Senator in early life, and that was opportunity for a good education. Surely after he left school at the age of 20 he was very much on his own as a pioneer, for we find him on the Pacific coast in 1892 trying to establish himself in the practice of law. Five years later he migrated to Alaska with other adventurers, where he spent 4 years and was the first prosecuting attorney of Nome. Thereafter he returned to the United States and settled in January 1902 in Tonopah, Nev., where he lived the remainder of his life.

As the late Senator grew to maturity he knew instinctively that the closed hand cannot receive; therefore his hand was ever held out in helpfulness to all with whom he came in contact.

I cannot tell those who have served here while our friend was a Member of the Senate anything new concerning his assiduous and intelligent application to duty. Going to the Senate the same day as did the late Senator Sheppard, January 29, 1913, he wrested ceaselessly through many black and purgatorial years, and at too great a sacrifice, as this sad ending indicates.

He gave to every interest his best, and the regard and respect of all his associates came back to him. This deceased was indicative of the man who knew life at first hand and who was able and eager, out of his own experience, to devise ways for smoothing the pathway of those who needed most the help of kindly hands. If it be true that the drying of a single tear "hath more honest fame than shedding seas of gore," then Senator PITTMAN will indeed have an enduring fame. Always he mingled with strong men in crowded places. Always his hand was outstretched to aid his fellow men.

Our friend realized that no man has come to true greatness who has not felt in some degree that his life belongs to his race, and that what God gives him He gives him for mankind. He knew that every noble life leaves the fiber of it interwoven forever in the work of the world.

This honored deceased recognized that the best results in the operation of a government wherein every citizen has a share largely depended upon a limitation of purely partisan zeal and effort and a correct appreciation of the time when the heat of the partisan should be merged in the patriotism of the citizen; that this was still a government of the people, and it should be nonetheless an object of all our solicitude. He felt that after party strife, the bitterness of partisan defeat, and the exultation of partisan triumph, these should be supplanted by an ungrudging acquiesence in the popular will, and a sober, conscious concern for the general weal. He felt that we should in these great national emergencies cheerfully and honestly abandon all partisan prejudice and distrust, and determine, with manly confidence in one another, to work out harmoniously the achievement of our national destiny and security and thereby deserve to realize all the benefits which our great and good form of Government can bestow.

Of this good man's eminent service as President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate I shall not speak, because it will be covered thoroughly by those most intimately associated with him; and I need not point out to scholars around me the necessity for strong leadership in those two exalted positions in mercurial times like these.

May we not learn a lesson from the life of this good man that will aid us in our struggle to so live that it can be said of us, as we now truthfully say of the deceased Senator, that in every walk of life, in every responsibility and trust, it was his creed to honestly and fearlessly do his duty as God gave him the light to see his way. His career has been a wholesome influence in American public life.

The widespread influence that Senator PITTMAN exercised as a statesman and philosopher must long continue to be felt and recognized as a molding and directing force in America's onward progress.

Willis Benjamin Gibbs

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the sorrow we experience in the passing of our friends is a sorrow from which the heart fails to find real surcease. It is a sorrow measured exactly by our love for them, and when we learned, on the evening of August 7, 1940, that the great Master of the Universe had called our brilliant, kind-hearted, generous, distinguished, and beloved colleague, WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, from his unselfish labor among us to his eternal home in that country—

From whose bourne
No traveler e'er returns.

we were so convulsed in an overwhelming grief that time, though a great healer, refuses to palliate.

And all of us were grieved to receive the sad news of BEN GIBBS passing, for all of us loved him, as did everyone who knew

him. He loved us, and he loved everybody. Scion of one of the oldest and best families in the land, peer of statesmen and jurists, he fraternized with men of high and low estate, rich and poor, and saw their best qualities, shared their joys and sorrows. He was a true nobleman, noble in thought, in purpose, and action, and appreciated that quality in others as few men can do. His conception of nobility has been exactly expressed by these words:

Howe'er it be, it seems to me,
'Tis only noble to be good,
Kind hearts are more than coronets
And simple faith than Norman blood.

It had been my privilege to know BEN GIBBS some years before his election to Congress, while he was serving as solicitor general of the Brunswick judicial circuit and as governor of the Georgia district of Kiwanis International, which positions he served with dignity, honor, and distinction; but our intimate friendship began when I was sworn in as a Member of this body on August 1, 1939. He came immediately to me, gave me information and guidance so helpful to a new Member, and seemed to derive a real pleasure from every service rendered. As I was drawn closer to him by friendship's ties, I discovered that all his genuine joy came from service he rendered his country, his State, and those about him. He loved his committee work and gave the most careful thought and consideration to every measure coming before it. He studied every measure before the House, and no Member voted more intelligently nor more conscientiously.

He enjoyed wholesome recreation, baseball games, and fishing. He would sit for hours watching the sandlot teams playing in the parks and spend other hours fishing in the Potomac and Chesapeake Bay, but his chief pleasure was his family. He was born in the little community of Dupont, in Clinch County, Ga., on April 15, 1889, the son of Willis B. Gibbs and Lilla Johnson Gibbs. After finishing the common schools of his native county, he entered Mercer University, from which he was graduated, and admitted to the bar in June 1911. He moved to Jesup, Ga., and began the practice of law there in 1912. In 1914 he was elected solicitor of the city court of Jesup, holding that position for 10 years until his election as solicitor general of the Brunswick judicial circuit in 1924, which latter position he held 15 years until his election to the Seventy-sixth Congress on November 8, 1938.

He was a prosecuting attorney for 25 years, and no other in the State had a more enviable record for convictions, yet he made no enemies. He prosecuted violations of the laws fearlessly, but he prosecuted them fairly, and commanded the respect of all.

He was an official member of the Methodist Church and a leader in religious and civic life of his community.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Florence Reville Gibbs, who succeeded him and served his unexpired term in Congress; and a son, Warner B. Gibbs; and a daughter, Mrs. J. A. Leaphart, all of Jesup.

In the passing of BEN GIBBS, the Eighth District, the State of Georgia, and the country has sustained a great loss. He died in the service of his country, while giving his time and talents to their fullest capacity. BEN GIBBS was one of the—

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking.

And one of those—

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions, and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we gather today not to engage in the regular business of the House, but as Representatives to reverently raise our voices in speaking of our honorable deceased.

Since our last memorial services about nine Representatives and four Senators have passed from earth to another world. Neither the old nor the young have been spared. The oldest and the youngest Representatives, who but a short time ago were occupying their seats here, apparently in full prime and vigor, and carrying in their hearts the eager, rejoicing power to meet all demands, have been taken.

Mr. MASSINGALE came here January 3, 1935, and served continuously till his sudden passing on January 17, 1941; and during that too short time I had many pleasurable and profitable conversations with him.

The RECORD bears witness that our friend was a vigilant, untiring worker. He did not occupy the floor in prolix and pedantic speeches, but reserved his more earnest endeavors for effective committee work, which rested very near his heart. His success in law made it inevitable that he become a member of our Committee on the Judiciary after a proper novitiate.

This good man was endowed with studious tastes and disposition, a rich vocabulary, and an enviable, accurate and retentive memory. Seemingly he never forgot anything he either heard, read, or saw. Consequently his mind was not only stored with useful knowledge, but that knowledge was at all times available. This was verified by his few speeches in the House. It was, though, as I have said, in the freedom of a committee room that his strong powers were exhibited to the highest advantage. He practiced none of the arts of oratory, and made no effort at display of any kind, but spoke straightforwardly, entirely unmindful of the style or manner of his delivery.

Our friend was always as chivalrous and generous as the typical knight of the olden time. He did not think that every man with whom he disagreed was foolish. In addition to many other virtues he constantly exhibited the loftiest patriotism. In all that he did he was scrupulously jealous of his country's honor, good name, and highest interests. All proposed legislation here was by him subjected to the test of every sound and experienced legislator—how would it affect the whole United States of America?

Mr. MASSINGALE, born in the State that gave John Sharp Williams and other notable men to the Congress, was a true gentleman of the old school. In a time like our own, when it is too much the habit to sneer at ideals and regard them as impracticable sentimentalities, when change is too thoughtlessly effected, it is well to remember that these men of ideals who belonged to the past were a hard-fighting, brave, and peculiarly effective generation. It is equally important not to forget that now, as always, it is only the men of ideals who in the long run can move and guide the people, for however vivid may be the admiration for mere success, those whom the people really trust and follow must be men who are not content to minister to their appetites or their prejudices, but who bid them raise their eyes and beckon them forward to the heights beyond. We may, in our wisdom, have changed all this, but the nobler instincts still remain to start into life at the master's touch.

Our friend has gone; our high tribute to his worth and work is that we would not have had him what he was not.

Consecrate for us all the memories of the past, the memory of the faithful man whom we shall not see here again, because he has been lifted up to higher service.

Pius Louis Schwert

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ED. V. IZAC
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, what a fine incentive to the youth of our land to see one of their baseball heroes doff his uniform and substitute for his career of providing recreation and entertainment for the American people a new career of service in more grim and realistic matters affecting the daily lives of every one of us. "PI" SCHWERT left that kind of a legacy to American youth. He rose high in athletic prowess; he was destined to rise equally high in service to his fellow men through the medium of legislation for their good. Too bad he had to be stricken just at the time he attained to a place of influence and prestige in the House.

Although he served but a few short years, he had endeared himself, as perhaps no other Member has done in so short a time, to his colleagues of all political parties. I was especially fond of him because, while thrown with him constantly, I never heard him utter a derogatory word about a single human being. He was the soul of honor and a representative of his people of whom they could well be proud.

"PI" SCHWERT was the kind of a Congressman we all hope we would be like. God rest his soul.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, one by one the old landmarks of our political life are passing away; one by one the links that connect a glorious past with the present are sundered. The deceased Senator in tribute to whose memory this day has in part been set aside did not, unfortunately, live the threescore and ten years spoken of by the Psalmist as the period for man's earthly existence; but he wrought with singular devotion, unexcelled ability, and rare constancy in a wide scope and during an epochal era that held us all against the grindstone of grave and anxious uncertainty.

There is given to few men such a splendid opportunity of service and to have received the measure of appreciation, love, and devotion accorded to the deceased Senator.

I served with him from March 4, 1907, to January 29, 1913, in this honorable body. As I sat with him around the table in a committee room and worked with him in this Chamber about 6 years I learned to know and love him in his daily walk of life; and it is with profound respect and true admiration for the lofty example of a busy, purposeful, and useful life that I am glad on this occasion to pay a simple tribute in a few words to his memory.

Although I did not agree with some of the Senator's views, especially one, nonetheless I always found him to be very broad gaged and liberal minded, a gentleman who knew no distinction between races and religions. From time to time he made many interesting public speeches, always pleading for justice and tolerance.

It is, of course, a great honor to serve as a Senator of the United States, and especially so when one comes from a large and populous State. Senator SHEPPARD'S immediate predecessor, Senator Joseph Weldon Bailey, had established an enviable reputation as an orator and statesman, his last effort in the Senate, as I remember, being in connection with the Illinois United States Senatorship in 1912, when the country witnessed the unusual procedure of a Democratic Senator of transcendent ability defending the right of a Republican Senator to retain his seat. Senator Bailey failed in that great effort, but his expounding of age-long principles of election will long enrich the literature of that important subject, and he failed only when opposed by an array of very able legalists headed by the great Elihu Root. This was the last time the legislature of my State selected a United States Senator. In fact, no doubt it may be said that this celebrated case hastened the States to approve the constitutional amendment that provides for the direct election of United States Senators.

The more than 10 years Senator SHEPPARD served in this body was a splendid training for the new and wider duties imposed by his promotion to the Senate; and his State, which had constantly been represented in the United States Senate by men of unusual ability, did not suffer by his elevation.

Let us, then, as our dead is buried out of our sight, seek for the lessons and admonitions that may be suggested by the life and the death which constitute our theme.

First, they teach the value of study and mental training; but they teach more impressively that the road to usefulness and to the only success worth having will be missed or lost except it is sought and kept by the light of those qualities of heart which it is sometimes supposed may safely be neglected or subordinated. That is a great mistake. The greatest possible accumulation of learning alone will not lead to the heights of usefulness and success.

The Senator was not deficient in education; he had a very good education; but of all you will hear of his grand career, and of his service to his country and his fellow-citizens, you will not hear that either the high place he reached or what he accomplished was due to his education. You will, instead, constantly hear as accounting for his great success that he was obedient and affectionate as a son, patriotic and faithful as a safe and sound legislator, honest and upright as a citizen, tender and devoted as a husband and father, and truthful, generous, unselfish, moral and clean in every relation of life. He never thought any of these things too weak for manliness. Make no mistake. This was a most distinguished man, a great man, a useful man, who became distinguished, great, and useful because he had, and retained unimpaired, the qualities of heart which too many of us, I fear, feel like keeping in the background or abandoning.

Living, he was honored; gone from us, his memory will be fervently cherished as long as intellectual excellence, purity, and singleness of purpose and heart are revered among mankind.

By the memory of our deceased friend, let us resolve to cultivate and preserve the qualities that made him great and useful; let us determine to meet the call of patriotic duty in every time of our country's danger or need.

Willis Benjamin Gibbs

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. PAUL BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Hon. W. BEN GIBBS was serving his first term in Congress at the time of his death on August 7, 1940, but during this short time he had proved himself to be a Congressman of outstanding ability and had endeared himself to the entire membership of the House.

He was brilliant and genial and one of the most prominent lawyers of his beloved State. He served for many years as solicitor of the city court of Jesup, Ga., and as solicitor general of the Brunswick judicial circuit. When he came to Congress he was assigned to the Judiciary Committee, for which he was so eminently qualified by his many years of experience at the bar.

His courage, his sympathetic attitude to all in need, his purity of character, and fidelity to duty, together with a sense of justice and humor, marked his life in every position which he was called upon to fill.

His uppermost thoughts were always of others. Never did he place himself above the level of the common man. He was immediately at home with the farmer in the field or with the statesman in the Chamber. He was never happier than when helping the young people with whom he came in contact in their various problems.

Mr. GIBBS was a faithful public servant, a true and loyal friend, and in his passing the State and the Nation sustained a great loss.

William Devereux Byron

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM DEVEREUX BYRON, late a Representative from the State of Maryland

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, it was my sad duty to announce to the House the sudden and untimely death of our friend and colleague, WILLIAM D. BYRON, of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, on February 27, 1941. To those who knew him and who shared his friendship, his death carries with it

the deepest sense of personal loss. That Mr. BYRON was well loved and deeply respected by his constituents is shown by the fact that he was elected as mayor of Williamsport in 1926, to the Maryland State Senate in 1930, and in 1938 to the United States House of Representatives. What further evidence of their affection and esteem could they have shown?

His personality, his sincerity, and his generosity endeared him to all who knew him and especially to those who had the pleasure and privilege of serving with him, and he well deserved the respect, devotion, and love which they freely gave. Mr. BYRON leaves a host of friends in the House and thousands of devoted admirers in the State. He had qualities of mind and heart which made him an especially valuable Member of Congress and public servant. He departed for the farther shore at a moment when he was on the threshold of a notable and brilliant career in Congress. As his friend, and a Representative from the same State, I am proud to pay tribute to his memory. In his passing the Congress and the Nation have suffered a great loss.

I am sure that his devoted wife and children will derive great consolation in the remembrance, down through the years, of his splendid attributes and in the abiding faith that a Divine Providence has ordered all things well.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, since our last memorial exercises four Senators and nine Representatives have responded to the final summons, which every mortal must obey; and "no man knoweth either the day or the hour."

Death is never so distressing, its chilly hand never so unwelcome, as when it withers one whose brilliancy and rare attainments set him above the ordinary level of mankind, as a character to be emulated and admired. When Nature blesses a man with unusual talents; when it invests him with nobility of mind and soul, his passing leaves a void difficult to bear, because it is hard to fill.

Representative EDELSTEIN, to whose memory we pay tribute today, was such a man. Nature was generous with him in her endowments, which he well repaid by more than 30 years of useful service to Nation, State, and community. As a successful member of the bar and a national legislator our friend devoted his talents and high character to the service of his clients and constituents with an intelligence, energy, and enthusiasm that did honor to himself and the State he represented in part.

He was an assiduous student whose books brought him sound counsel and the broad and penetrating information that made his judgment much respected. He was a citizen and legislator eagerly seeking the best interests of his country and the maintenance of its honor. Scion of a race whose history has been one of persecution, his life has given to the world another proof that this is a land wherein merit knows neither race nor creed—a nation wherein honest achievement will receive its just recognition.

I shall never forget an interesting conversation I had with our deceased colleague on the subject of religious liberty. We know that this principle, the right to worship according to the dictates of one's conscience, free from the restraint of man-made laws, continued to be cherished by him as long as he lived, as, in fact, it has been by the race from which he sprang, whose sufferings from un-Christianlike intolerance have been no less noteworthy than the steadfastness of their adherence to the faith of Abraham.

Death lent a touch of high drama to an utterance by Mr. EDELSTEIN here, which utterance ordinarily might have gone unnoticed in these extraordinarily mercurial times. He spoke for only 1 minute when he was stopped by the gavel of the Speaker and by death's sudden dart. Yet it may be said without fear of contradiction that that was the highest moment of our deceased friend's life and that his brief remarks will go down in the annals of American Jewry as one of the most dramatic as well as most significant utterances ever made by a Jew in the Congress. In an atmosphere surcharged with passion, Mr. EDELSTEIN sounded a clarion call for reason, fair play, and tolerance. That death took him so suddenly after his heart's outpouring only serves to stress the significance of his brave defense of the Jewish people.

It was the erroneous and inaccurate charge of certain Representatives against "international bankers and their Jewish brethren" that stung the deceased to the quick, moving him to an immediate and eloquent reply. I need not repeat the charge and the defense of one group of the accused. Those are green in memory.

I wonder whether these gentlemen realize that by their unfortunate charge they killed something not only in Mr. EDELSTEIN'S heart but in the heart of every Jew in the United States. You all know that to which I refer and I will not name it, because this is not an occasion for debate.

This honorable deceased was a comparatively new Member of the House. The RECORD shows that he abstained from boring this House with prolix and pedantic speeches. He simply bade his time and allowed others to orate about matters of state. He was a simple soul, modest, and without any gift for ballyhoo and the histrionic. He was a quiet worker, dedicated entirely to the cause of whole America and the Jewish people. His name did not ring through the Halls of Congress as often as did those of others, yet his dramatic exit did much to preserve the high prestige of the House of Representatives. He may not have been a martyr, as some maintain, but it can be said without fear of contradiction that his short and brave challenge to the forces of Jew hatred and reaction contributed much toward that which every Member of this House holds dear.

Shrinking and in nervous dread of any sort of contest, none surpassed him in vigor of defense or bravery of attack when the fight began, as was shown by the closing moments of his life. Had the aspersion against his race, which precipitated his death, been an aspersion against himself alone, I doubt that Mr. EDELSTEIN would have dignified it by any comment; but, being a Representative here of many of his own race, he could not let that oft-repeated but erroneous charge go unanswered.

This honorable deceased ever shrank from giving pain to anybody or anything. He was always on the side of mercy, always first to urge forgiveness and charity.

Let us fondly hope, as our dead is buried out of our sight, that the unwarranted, unsupported, erroneous charge which was the immediate cause of this death may not be made again in this Hall; and I rest that hope, in part, upon this statement of the Founder of the Republic:

> May the children of the stock of Abraham who dwell in this land continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants. * * * May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our path and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in His own time and way, everlastingly happy.

Our friend was not much influenced by the pleasures of the world, but early discovered that the only deeds which yield a true, enduring satisfaction are disinterested deeds. He found true pleasure only in laboring for the welfare of humanity, and he knew that Christian charity is the only atmosphere in which the human soul can find complete gratification.

Resting with firm step upon the rock of immutable and self-evident principles, he armed his keen eye with the powerful lense of Faith and swept, eagle-like, the boundless region of truth; viewing the ultimate reasons of things from the loftiest and serenest point. Strong in the power of synthesis, he spurned subtlety, one-sidedness, arid abstractions, vaporous generalizations, and traced the meaning of all actual existence to the ideal.

The aspiration of this good man was not in any form of luxury, and his dignity depended not upon artificial adjuncts. The superficial display and the vanity of the world at large were to him matters of absolute indifference.

Our colleague has gone from this House of Representatives to that realm from which no traveler ever returned. He leaves behind him a good name, a priceless heritage of industry, patriotism, and achievement in the interest of his country and humanity.

Those of us who have been here for many years have seen one eminent Representative after another fall by the way.

The older ones in the House are nearly all gone, and new men take their places; and may we trust and believe that in the future, as in the past, we may not be wanting in good and wise men to guide the destinies of the Nation.

Willis Benjamin Gibbs

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the principal objective in the commemoration of the life of any man is to preserve for posterity a record of whatever about that life may furnish inspiration. Relatives and close friends, as well as thousands of other contemporaries, do not need to be told of the admirable qualities which distinguished the character of our late beloved colleague, WILLIS BEN GIBBS; but if in the archives of the Congress through the medium of this memorial service there may be recorded facts about his career which will quicken the ambitions and steady and strengthen the purposes of young Americans for this day and future days, that indeed is something that is worth while.

Because I feel that is true, I wish to submit these remarks about our departed friend.

During our brief but extremely pleasant association together in Congress he told me much of his early career and of the difficulties he encountered before he was able to plant his feet firmly in the pathway which led to eminence in his profession, honors in public life, and a private and public career which can be measured accurately by only one word—success. With limited financial resources, he nevertheless attained through hard work the educational advantages needed to open to him the door of opportunity—advantages which thousands of other young men have had handed to them on a silver platter and perhaps for that reason did not always appreciate.

BEN GIBBS was accustomed to work for what he wanted. Within 3 years after his admission to the bar the qualities of industry and capability had already so distinguished him that he was called into the public service as solicitor of the city court of Jesup, Ga. Ten years later, in 1924, his people enlarged the field within which he might labor for them by electing him solicitor general of the Brunswick, Ga., judicial circuit, in which position, because of his honesty, ability, and successful performance of duty, he was continued until his election to the Seventy-sixth Congress in November 1938.

He made a wonderful impression upon his colleagues in Washington. Quiet and unassuming, courteous and friendly, he was immediately accepted upon a status of recognized worth which ordinarily is not accorded until after years of service. As an evidence of that fact, he was assigned during his first term to the powerful Judiciary Committee, an assignment which has been rarely in the history of Congress, given to a first-term man.

His service justified the confidence placed in him. He continued on this important assignment the policy to which he had been accustomed throughout his life—hard work and careful attention to every detail of his duties. Before long he was recognized as one of the outstanding men on this committee, which has among its membership some of the ablest members of the American bar.

His untimely death on August 7, 1940, was a tremendous shock to his colleagues. The stress and strain of legislative work during the emergency undoubtedly accelerated the fatal results of a heart condition which under less strenuous circumstances might have been overcome. His death, therefore, may be truly said to have been a sacrifice on the altar of public duty.

BEN GIBBS, country boy, student, lawyer, public servant, citizen, and friend, admirable in every condition and relationship of life. I close, as I began, by saying that the record of his career should, indeed, be an inspiration to American youth and that the good of his unselfish life was not "interred with his bones."

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, it is with a keen appreciation of my inability to do justice to one of the great men of our day that I rise at this time to eulogize his memory. One of the greatest influences in my congressional career has been the advice and example of our late beloved Speaker BANKHEAD. To me no Member of the House of Representatives so epitomized the ideal type of legislator and presiding officer as he. Ever courteous but firm, his demeanor stamped him at once as the dignified yet jovial leader of 435 representatives of the people who loved him because of his fairness, his fine personal qualities, and his unfailing friendliness to all.

I am happy in my recollection of a great opportunity when I could show my appreciation of his great talents and of my belief in his fitness for even a more exalted position by casting my ballot for WILL BANKHEAD as Democratic nominee for Vice President of the United States at the National Convention in Chicago last summer. It proved later that he was more needed in the House of Representatives and we all bowed to the will of the majority.

I cannot help feeling that although spared to us as Speaker for but a few short years his passing from the mortal stage has not been without some compensation for us all; he left us a warmness of heart that comes from contact with a noble character.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, it is with a deep feeling of reverence that I stand before you on this day set aside in memory of those of this body who have passed on to the Great Beyond within the last year. And, in this connection, permit me to say that I know of no Congressman who is more vividly pictured in your minds than my predecessor, my friend, and your friend, the late SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, known by everyone as Sam.

Mr. MASSINGALE had acquired that homespun philosophy and jovial nature from early childhood and training. He was respected and will long be remembered by his kindly nature and his smile. When he spoke there was a listening audience.

Although I made two races against Mr. MASSINGALE, I never knew a man who was any fairer to his opponents. He made a clean campaign and, likewise, I made a clean campaign. We were friends. He won his races easily.

Mr. MASSINGALE served his country as a church worker; he served his country as a faithful soldier, as a counselor for many years; he served his family as a good father and a loyal husband; he served his country as a real Congressman; he left a good wife, three fine daughters, and innumerable friends.

I am 35; Mr. MASSINGALE was 70; and may I say now that if I am privileged to be allotted the threescore and 10 years and if at the end I have rendered as much service; if I have won the esteem and friendship of the people, have maintained the love of my family and fellowman, and have retained my smile, as Mr. MASSINGALE did, I will feel that I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, and friends, I feel that Mr. MASSINGALE's passing was a loss, not only to the Seventh Congressional District and the State of Oklahoma but to the United States of America. It will be a difficult task for me to take his place as a Congressman, but I shall do my best.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. NAT PATTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on the character of the late MORRIS SHEPPARD, Senator from the State of Texas, who, until but a short time ago, was the dean of the Senate and the beloved mentor of all legislators in the Capitol. I cannot, in the short time I shall take, cover the entire life or the entire field of achievements this great man attained. I cannot adequately outline the greatness of this man among men. But from my personal acquaintance with this great and noble man, and from his hope for the future, I should like to discuss with you MORRIS SHEPPARD—discussing one phase of his life in the hope that the great and Christian scheme that he envisioned shall not linger and fade with his death, but shall achieve the immortality of fulfillment.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was a brilliant man. His years in the University of Texas and his undergraduate years at Yale bespeak his keen insight into the halls of knowledge. His public addresses in those formative years show a groping and astute intellect, probing the problems of mankind and brushing aside the set delusions of smaller minds.

I am proud to say that I was a member of the Texas Legislature in 1913 that, twice in the same day, elected MORRIS SHEPPARD to the Senate. I remember him as he was then, a small man in stature made larger by a commanding poise and a confident ability to cope with any situation. I recall with the keenest pleasure his acceptance speech before the legislature in January of 1913. He accepted the duties and the obligations of that office with the purest and most noble intentions. and, I praise God, when he laid down the duties of his office at the peaceful close of his life 28 years later there was not one blemish—there was not one sign that MORRIS SHEPPARD had not fulfilled the duties of his office save in the highest and most honorable way. What more can be said in praise of such a man? What greater praise can mortal man receive than to say that in neither ignorance nor guilty purpose did he soil the mantle of his authority?

If I should seek to outline in full the mighty achievements of MORRIS SHEPPARD, I would take your attention for hour upon hour. I do not intend to do that. I shall merely commend to you, Senators and Representatives alike, a close study of his career. From his life and his ideals shall you gain an insight into the character of a true Democrat and a firm advocate of the right. Some day, perhaps in the dark dim future, if democracy should not withstand the pressure of the dictators, some day when future scholars probe in the past, some day a student or a scholar will bring to light the career of Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD. To that age MORRIS SHEPPARD will glean light, the light that shines to us in the careers of the prophets and the great of Greece and Rome. "Here," they shall say "here was the forerunner of our day." "Here," they shall announce, "here was a man who lived before his time and who predicted the world to come." "Here," they will announce to that future world, "was MORRIS SHEPPARD, living in a world of the blind and greedy proclaiming the world of the day and of Christ."

MORRIS SHEPPARD grew to manhood in the world that saw America rise to manhood. For the first years of the life of the United States of America the Nation west of the Atlantic had gathered itself within its borders—jealous of its rights and desiring no contacts with the Europe across the sea. Europe was a prison that they feared and hated. Europe was the land their forefathers had forsaken, left because it offered them only the doom of a living death.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was still a student when Richard Olney, that great American statesman, declared that the American people could not assume an attitude of indifference toward European politics and that the hegemony of a single continental state would be disastrous to their prosperity, if not to their safety. MORRIS SHEPPARD was a young man practicing law in the days right after Theodore Roosevelt declared:

> We have no choice, we people of the United States, as to whether or not we shall play a great part in the world. That has been determined for us by Fate, by the march of events. We have to play that part. All that we can decide is whether we shall play it well or ill.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was a keen observer of events when Roosevelt sent the American Ambassador to France, Henry White, to the Conference of Algeciras in 1906. He saw the United States, a rising young giant, entering the arena of world affairs and sharing in the duties and responsibilities of a member of the world family of nations. He saw, guided by the powerful hand of Theodore Roosevelt, our Ambassador dominate the conference and determine its actions. With other farsighted young Americans, MORRIS SHEPPARD gloried in the activities of his country. He applauded the spirit in which Theodore Roosevelt endeavored to settle the Russo-Japanese War. America had come of age and had taken its seat at the council tables of the world.

It is singular that MORRIS SHEPPARD, one of the most gentle of men and a firm believer in right over might, should have also interested himself in military affairs. It is singular that while he was a strong advocate of peace MORRIS SHEPPARD favored and spoke for increases in our Military Establishment and in our defenses. As the painful days of the Bosnian crisis passed and the Agadir incident took its place, MORRIS SHEPPARD was speaking in behalf of defense and preparedness. A Congressman alone in the din of a House dedicated to everlasting peace and prosperity had to command much respect to be heard. MORRIS SHEPPARD was heard—and some few heeded his message. Too many, too, too many did not. The Balkan troubles in 1912 and 1913 came into history. MORRIS SHEPPARD pointed his finger at the cancer. Be it said to the credit of Texas that SHEPPARD was heard and his worth was recognized—and he was elevated to the Senate in the midst of that Balkan crisis.

MORRIS SHEPPARD entered the Senate at the time that Germany and Austria were watching with misgiving the defeat of Turkey by the Balkan alliances, when the Balkan drive for independence was set to blow the powder fuse at Sarajevo. When even President Wilson was declaring that this was "a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes cannot touch us" when the great majority of the American legislators were declaring that we had no stake in the war, MORRIS SHEPPARD was warning of the coming crisis—the dawning day of the denouement. MORRIS SHEPPARD was expressing the desire of the people for a strong union of nations to make the violation of the peace impossible. His ideals were later summed up in his speech made in the Senate of the United States in 1921, when he said:

> Thinkers, philosophers, statesmen, teachers, prophets in all periods have expressed the longing of humanity for peace. This longing was embodied in the visions of Isaiah, who pictured peace as the natural state of all mankind, and all mankind one brotherhood under the one and only God. Its application to all the world was foreshadowed in the league of Grecian states, by which they were federated into a workable whole. It was dimly seen in Plato's dream of an ideal republic. It permeated the doctrines of the Stoics, a system of philosophy based on the concept of every man as friend, not foe. It obtained portrayal in the deliverances of that orator of ancient days, Isocrates. It was suggested in the writings of Virgil and Cicero, of Seneca, of Horace, and of Tacitus. It was the theme of the angels as they sang the advent of the Messiah. It prompted the measures with which the church curbed medieval violence and disorder. It inspired the teachings of Erasmus. It found expression in Queen Elizabeth's "great design" for a European federation and in the proposal of Henry IV and his Prime Minister, Sully, for a Christian republic of Christian states. It was illustrated in the treatise of De La Croix, who proposed a world tribunal for the prevention of war. It was reflected in the thought of Locke, who denounced war as inconsistent with the morality. It was exemplified in the plan of William Penn for a sovereign state of Europe. It was mirrored in the preachings of Fenelon, the reasoning of Leibnitz. It was embedded in the celebrated project of the Abbé of Tours, Charles St. Pierre, for a republic of nations. It was defined in the philosophy of Rousseau, the

conceptions of Jeremy Bentham and the mysterious Gondard. It found spiritual realization in the theories of Immanuel Kant.

Such a thorough survey of the history of the world to achieve a lasting and honest peace could not have come but from years of study and thought. Please note that no periods of "armed peace" are mentioned as worthy of the plan. The Pax Roma is not mentioned. Peace at the point of a sword was not MORRIS SHEPPARD's idea of peace. Freedom must be the first requisite of peace—peace without freedom to MORRIS SHEPPARD was far worse than war itself.

The overshadowing object of our entry into the world struggle was the overthrow of war and the gospel of war.

When the war in Europe revealed itself to the American public as a world war and the events at sea brought the United States to the brink of active participation, MORRIS SHEPPARD was interested in seeing that the reason for war was worthy of the sacrifice. His reason for entrance was to overthrow the gospel of war. To him, the defeat of power politics and the downfall of force as a means of policy was worth the sacrifice of war. But he insisted that this sacrifice not be made in vain. MORRIS SHEPPARD asked that before the United States entered the war the nations recognize the purpose of the American entry and guarantee that the peace to follow would be molded on the foundations of permanent and honorable intercourse between nations. A peace of justice must be established to act as a cornerstone for the future. MORRIS SHEPPARD was a powerful influence on the plans and thought of Woodrow Wilson. The famous Fourteen Points were an expression of the ideals SHEPPARD had been preaching in the Senate and through the land. And when the German Government called for an armistice, it was called on in accordance with the Fourteen Points.

Glad were the leaders of the world, for the dawn of a new era seemed about to begin. War had ceased, and peace would be established in justice and in honor.

Yet the United States, the Nation that begat Woodrow Wilson and MORRIS SHEPPARD, did not ratify the League of Nations. A "little band of willful men" destroyed the dream of MORRIS SHEPPARD. MORRIS SHEPPARD fought the surging tide of reaction—but in vain. Disgusted with the heavy price of the war, the American people wanted to forget and turn to other things. Europe had been the burial ground of its young men, and the people wished to forget the hateful words spoken in war. MORRIS SHEPPARD the "Little Sheppard of Kingdom Come," the prophet of peace, was not heard though he spoke wondrously well.

Refusing to bow to the reactions of war, MORRIS SHEPPARD strove in futile grandeur to preserve the progress of world peace. His speech in the Senate on October 5, 1921, is one of the masterpieces of modern statecraft. The address, published by the Government Printer, covers 158 pages and is the best exposition on the workings of the League of Nations yet written. It is the guidebook of all scholars. None have surpassed its insight and its delineation of the League of Nations.

Commenting on this monumental speech, the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette said:

A few days ago Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas, delivered in the United States Senate a speech that may be regarded as one of the best and most timely addresses before that body in years. * * * Senator SHEPPARD has given the people a most thorough and exhaustive review of the work of the League since its inception. * * * We know of no document of recent times that is more likely to increase in historic value as the years go by. * * * We congratulate Senator SHEPPARD on the fruits of his labors. They are refreshing, indeed, in these times of sordid politics and partisan narrowness.

Another newspaper, the Charleston, W. Va., paper, in an editorial of the day, stated:

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas, has taken the time and the trouble to review the work of the League of Nations. His is a brave heart and true, one that does not leave the path of right at the first gl fire of error, nor at the poison gas waves of prejudice. His is a masterful piece of strategy as well as a timely contribution to the literature of a subject now almost entirely surrounded by ignorance, prejudice, and politics. * * * SHEPPARD, like Wilson, can see that while money, power, prejudice, ignorance, and political power can do wonders, it cannot stop people from thinking. * * * Senator SHEPPARD sees the power of truth.

MORRIS SHEPPARD never admitted defeat. Again in 1923 Senator SHEPPARD, at the expense of his health, conducted a filibuster against the Senate actions in an effort to gain strength for a movement to bring the United States into the League of Nations. Suffering from an attack of the grippe, Senator SHEPPARD nevertheless led the filibuster and spoke 7 hours one day, to follow it with a speech of 10 hours the next.

Said the Associated Press:

Fearing the Senator might be taxing his strength too greatly, friends tried during the course of his speech to induce him to stop, but he smilingly replied that he was not tired, and continued. There was not even a roll call to interrupt him and give him momentary rest. Including the 4 hours in which Senator SHEPPARD spoke Monday night, he spoke a total of 11 hours out of a possible 24.

Senator SHEPPARD's speech was commendatory of the League of Nations and its accomplishments and deplored the insistence of the United States in failing to participate with it in combating the principal menaces of humanity which he designated as "one of the overshadowing tragedies of all time."

MORRIS SHEPPARD was fighting to gain the goal that the sacrifices of our American soldiers had made possible. He was seeking to bring the mighty influence of the American Nation into the council rooms of the world and bring about a permanent and a just peace. To him, the denial of that sacrifice and the rejection of that goal was criminal. It meant that thousands of lives had been heedlessly and wantonly slaughtered. It meant that war had been fought in vain; that there was to be no reward for valor.

Never turning, MORRIS SHEPPARD declared:

Believing that the issue of issues before the United States and all mankind is the League of Nations * * * or another earth-wide crash; that this League, slow though may appear its processes and numerous difficulties which surround it, offers to this generation and to this century the only hope of the final establishment of organized right and justice among nations, I cannot vote for any enactment in which, once more asserting our isolation from the League, we emphasize our desertion of humanity.

In 1921 MORRIS SHEPPARD drew the line—either a cooperation of nations and a workable League of Nations or an "earth-wide crash." To MORRIS SHEPPARD the denunciation of our sacrifices in the World War and our rejection of the League was a "desertion of humanity." To do as was planned, said MORRIS SHEPPARD in 1921, would lead to another "earth-wide crash."

Was he right? Certainly he was right. Only 2 years later, in 1923, while Senator SHEPPARD was leading a filibuster and pleading the cause of the League of Nations, in far-off Bavaria a little man with a comic moustache was organizing a league of "gray shirts" into a national socialist party. Hitler was emerging from his shell.

I remember the last months that MORRIS SHEPPARD was alive. Vivid in the eyes of the world was the earth-wide crash he had predicted. Only by his work in preparing this Nation through his chairmanship of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, chiefly through his masterly work in getting the Selective Service Act of 1940 enacted, had saved the United States from being totally unprepared. Despite his efforts, in the face of his speeches dating from 1921, when the League was rejected by the United States, the United States had not heeded his call for greater defense work. MORRIS SHEPPARD was the voice calling in the wilderness. He has been right in all things. God grant that we shall learn our lessons and learn our duties aright from the life of MORRIS SHEPPARD. Gentlemen of the Congress, I plead with you to garner the fruits of MORRIS SHEPPARD's labor and let us prepare against the future. Let us arm this Nation as he wished. Let us raise our eyes to the God of all men above who was the mentor of MORRIS SHEPPARD and determine here and now that we shall listen to the prophetic words of MORRIS SHEPPARD still echoing through the Halls of Congress that in the days to come no heedless sacrifice shall be made and that when this horrible war now raging shall be ended that no little "band of willful men" shall defeat the Christian desire of the peoples of the earth. Let us now resolve to ourselves that the memory of MORRIS SHEPPARD shall be immortal in the foundation of a federation that shall preserve the peace of the world in justice and in God. Let us prepare so well that never again shall there be an earth-wide crash nor shall any nation be guilty of a desertion of humanity.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of placing in the permanent RECORD of this Congress some of the things that I believe the people of this Nation should know about the late Hon. SAM MASSINGALE, who so ably represented the Seventh Congressional District of Oklahoma for many years.

Uncle SAM was the favorite nickname given to Representative MASSINGALE. He earned this fond characterization, for, during his 7 faithful years as a Representative, he was a personification of the best that is the American way of life.

He was able, fearless, energetic, but, above all, he had a sense of humor that was truly traditionally American in its kindliness. It was these qualities—all sterling attributes of statesmanship—that won for him the affection of every Member, regardless of party.

Representative MASSINGALE'S training was an ideal background for his success in Washington. A graduate of the schools of and University of Mississippi, a student of law in Texas, a veteran of the Spanish-American War, a pioneer in the new country of Oklahoma, and a leading member of the bar of that new State—all these tended to build the character that was SAM MASSINGALE.

I first knew Uncle SAM when I came to Congress in 1938. I found him helpful, kind, and always willing to lend a hand to a new Member. No task was too great for him to offer his great help; no question was too unimportant to receive a careful explanation from him.

Soon I found out more about him and his kindness to every living being. I never heard him speak ill of anyone. His zeal to help others kept him long overtime hours at his desk.

On the floor of the House I found him always fighting for the cause he believed was right. He was always willing to assist the underprivileged because he believed that they needed his help. His action in this was a personal love and genuine sympathy for those who had had less of the advantages of America. His action always for them was based on an intimate and affectionate understanding of their trials and difficulties—known by him personally to exist throughout his section. Never was his action based on the politically expedient, but on his sincerity for those less fortunate than he was.

Long hours, late meetings found him working for the farmers of his district—those who tried to eke out a living on submarginal farms in the Dust Bowl country. He understood those people, and their weak, inarticulate voices from drought-stricken farms found an able and effective champion in SAM MASSINGALE.

He was liberal in his thinking on legislation; he was always ready to take a position against powerful pressure organizations without a thought of the consequences to himself or his political future. It was for the unorganized man, the weak, the underprivileged, that MASSINGALE championed.

It was his genial friendship, the cheerful smile, the sincerity of purpose that won Uncle SAM his wide host of close friends in Congress. No day was too full of worries or troubles to erase that quizzical smile. No debate was ever too hot or issues too closely drawn to make him forget his humor or his kindliness. I have seen him many times stride arm in arm from the floor with his bitterest opponent in debate. You simply had to love this kindly, friendly man.

It was my privilege to attend the funeral rites in Cordell, Okla., his home for nearly 40 years. It is on the western plains of Oklahoma, where a 10-year drought has ravaged once prosperous farms. The high wind, too, has stripped the fertility from much of the soil. But the drought or the wind could not break the spirit of those pioneer farmers—they were of the stuff of which MASSINGALE found his strength.

Long before time for the funeral the town was overcrowded, and thousands left their farms, their stores, their homes to drive many miles to mourn the passing of their friend and champion. The large city-hall auditorium was too small to hold the number who loved him, too. Across on the courthouse square more remained outside to mourn as could be accommodated in the auditorium.

Huddled in small groups of 8 or 10, they talked of their genuine loss. There was no pomp, no ostentation, no false show of sympathy or grief. Their loss of MASSINGALE was truly personal, for they had known him so intimately for those 40 years that he served them.

Many had known him as a young lawyer, struggling to make a start in the new country. Others had known him as the kindly and just adviser to those who sought his counsel. Still others remembered the thousands of kindly acts that he had done for his people as a Member of Congress.

It was a real cross section of America that day that came with damp eyes to express its sorrow in the loss of a true friend and a great American. Yet these people in common walks of life had a common love and esteem for Uncle SAM that was shared by all those in the Nation's Capital.

From the Senate and the House, from the newest elevator boy and page, that same feeling of loss of a true friend was felt—as existed there on those Oklahoma plains.

We all feel the loss of SAM MASSINGALE. We know that a truly great American, who lived by the Golden Rule, has been called from us. But the memory of his sincerity and his great character will long leave its imprint on those who knew SAM MASSINGALE.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to serve in this House with the late GEORGE N. SEGER, Representative from the State of New Jersey. I knew Congressman SEGER well and regarded him an able Representative, always conscious of his duties and responsibilities as a legislator. His long service as a Member of this House is proof of his abundant ability and popularity among his fellow Members and constituents as well. No man remains in Congress for more than 16 consecutive years without clearly demonstrating his ability and capacity as a legislator.

I knew Congressman SEGER personally as a gentleman of high quality and one who had the capacity to estimate his fellow men. He was tolerant and sympathetic. His death was a great loss to his constituents and to this House. It is a personal loss to me, and I extend to his bereaved family my heartfelt sympathy.

Ernest Lundeen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the high esteem in which a large majority of the citizens of Minnesota held Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN is in itself a testimonial which will far overshadow my remarks in memory of this good friend and colleague. Twice elected from Minnesota to the House of Representatives and then to the United States Senate reflects the unquestioned confidence of our people in him.

Born and educated in the Middle West, he knew the life of a pioneer people. Senator LUNDEEN was known to be a man of the common people and sought to give expression to their views in his public work. He loved his family, and when not engaged on public problems he could always be found at the family fireside enjoying the companionship of his loved ones. In all of his struggles his talented

and personable wife was his constant adviser and helpmate. We mourn the passing of our friend, ERNEST LUNDEEN, but can little appreciate what this sadness means to his family. Our hearts go out in sympathy to them.

The untimely and tragic death of Senator LUNDEEN came as a shock to the Nation. He was on his way home when the airplane in which he was a passenger crashed to earth. He was a frequent user of air transportation, and was one of the first to cross the Atlantic Ocean of a Clipper ship.

Senator LUNDEEN served his country as a soldier, statesman, and lawyer. While I did not always agree with his political views, I nevertheless respected his opinions and admired his courage. In war or peace he stood for America first.

Today we pay tribute to the memory of ERNEST LUNDEEN and other colleagues who have been called to their reward. They are gone from our midst, but their lives, characters, and work will stand as monuments in our memories and on the pages of American history. They served their country, and their names will be inscribed in the archives of fame as men who helped build a better America.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, we meet today to pay tribute to the memories of our colleagues who have answered the last roll call in the past year.

Among them is listed the beloved dean of the New Jersey Republican delegation, GEORGE N. SEGER, of the eighth district, who died on August 26 last, following a brief illness.

It was not my good fortune to have been intimately acquainted with Mr. SEGER over a long period of years. I knew him casually as one who was prominent throughout the State of New Jersey for a long time and who served faithfully and well his home city of Passaic as its mayor from 1911 to 1919, and as director of finance from 1919 to 1923; and then the Eighth Congressional District from 1923 until his death.

But my close association with him dates to my coming to Congress in January 1939 as a fledgling member of the New Jersey delegation when he helped to make easy my apprenticeship in the Halls of this body. For his kindness and courtesy to me then I shall always remember him affectionately in the years to come.

To my mind Mr. SEGER had all those qualities which typify the real gentleman. Clean, wholesome, courteous, and kind; a family man in the finest sense—a devoted husband, a loving and lovable father. To his friends he was ever loyal and sympathetic and was always ready to help make lighter their burdens.

In him was gathered a constellation of virtuous qualities of mind and character which reflected that splendid personality which made up his soul. And as these exercises today serve to call him to our minds we experience a deep sense of grief for the loss that has come to us in his death. We grieve for him because we loved him; in that respect our grief is ennobling for we could not mourn for someone we did not love.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, SAM MASSINGALE was an able and popular Member of the House. By training, personality, and character he was eminently fitted for the position he held as a Representative from the State of Oklahoma. He was a lawyer of real ability. To him the law was not merely a collection of abstract rules, but was rather the machinery by which the ever-changing problems of government are to be solved. In addition to his work on the Judiciary Committee he was very much interested in the problems of agriculture. Laws for the benefit of farmers everywhere always had his vigorous support. In the death of SAM MASSINGALE those of us who knew him have lost a good friend and the House of Representatives has lost a valuable Member.

Willis Benjamin Gibbs

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HUGH PETERSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago the hand of Providence saw fit to remove from this Hall our colleague, WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, who was so faithfully and efficiently serving as the Member from the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia. His passing was a great loss to this House and to our country. With a strong personality and a natural talent for legal and legislative affairs, he had, even during the brief period he was permitted to serve his district, impressed himself upon the membership of Congress and gained the admiration and friendship of those with whom he served.

Few men entering this body have gained so many personal friends among the Members in so short a time as did BEN GIBBS. He was a man of strong moral character, sound judgment, and temperate manners. He was possessed of modesty and dignity, of poise and self-control, and he had a rare wit as well as a natural gift as a conversationalist and story teller. He was gentle and kind yet mentally and physically courageous. He was loyal and reliable. He had an enormous capacity for friendship, and his love for and devotion to his family merited the admiration of all who knew him.

With a natural gift for making friends, a native personality, fine mental faculties, and a character strengthened and mellowed by long and useful public contacts and public service, BEN GIBBS was a man of rare charm and a public servant of unusual ability.

He had a splendid record as a student in the schools of Clinch County and Mercer University, where he acquired a fine legal education. Upon entering the private practice of law his unusual talents were soon recognized by his fellow citizens, and only 2 years after he opened his law office in Jesup, Ga., in 1912, he was elected solicitor of the city court of Jesup. In 1924 he was elected solicitor general of the Brunswick judicial circuit. After many years of faithful and efficient service in these offices, he was elected Representative in the United States Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia to fill a vacancy in the Seventy-sixth Congress. He was popular among his constituents as well as among his colleagues, and when he offered for reelection to the Seventy-seventh Congress there were none to challenge him. Although assured of reelection without opposition, BEN GIBBS continued without slackening his energetic activities in behalf of his constituents and his country. His constant and energetic devotion to duty no doubt contributed greatly to the attack which so swiftly removed him from our midst.

The congressional district which I have the honor to represent adjoins the district which he represented. Our offices in the House Office Building were near each other. Thus, while at home in Georgia we frequently saw each other and while in Washington there was seldom a day that I did not see him and discuss matters with him. I came to know him intimately, and his passing has been a tremendous personal loss to me.

I never saw a man more devoted to his family, and this loving care won for him much happiness. He lived for others and the happiness that surrounded him truly proved the truth of the assertion that we get out of life what we put into it.

BEN GIBBS lived a full and a useful life—one that was crowned with success. He acted "well his part." And even as he has entered into a rich inheritance in a life beyond likewise has he left a rich inheritance—the memories and example of an honorable life well lived—to his family, his loved ones, and his friends.

Today we who knew WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS cherish his memory and mourn his loss.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is proper and fitting that those of us now serving in Congress should pause to unite in paying tribute to our departed brothers and colleagues. So today it is my privilege to speak a word of tribute to the late SAM C. MASSINGALE, of Oklahoma, whom I knew so well and favorably. I was a great admirer of his fine qualities. He was a valuable Member, a good friend to those for whom he professed friendship. He was not of my political faith, but we were of the same mind on many issues of profound importance and I held in high esteem the judgment and sincerity of SAM MASSINGALE. He was an able Congressman. He served his country honorably during the Spanish-American War. His death removed from this House a faithful servant, a good legislator, and a personal friend who cannot be replaced. His loss is irreparable and cannot be overestimated.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, to know GEORGE N. SEGER was to love him. He was my very dear friend. I could not in a eulogy of considerable length speak of him as I should like or as he deserved. I came to know him in the early days of his congressional life and each year his quiet, gentle manner, his unassumed dignity, and his splendid poise increased my admiration for him.

Mr. SEGER served for many years on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I have been chairman for the past 8 years. He was well informed in the problems with which we had to deal, sound in judgment, patient in consideration, indefatigable in his labors, and wise in counsel. One of the last missions of magnitude on that committee with which he dealt was as a member of the subcommittee studying Alaskan problems and particularly the fisheries of that Territory. It was my good fortune to be with him on that trip of about 6 weeks, and I learned then more than I had ever known before of his patient search for the truth, his tolerance in judgment, his humanity, his kindly sympathy with his fellow man, his desire to help wherever possible, and his zeal for the right. Party partisanship played no part in his deliberation. He wanted to know what was best for his country, what was right in his associations with his fellow man.

GEORGE SEGER'S life was an inspiration and an example. I conclude as I began—to know GEORGE N. SEGER was to love him.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I pay my last sad tribute to my very dear friend of many years. Speaker BANKHEAD is absent from mortal eyes, but never from the hearts of those with whom he served. There are times when words fail. To describe BILL BANKHEAD, to measure his virtues, to appraise his fine qualities of mind and soul needs a far more facile pen than I possess.

When I first qualified in Congress on July 3, 1918, BILL BANKHEAD was there. For many years I served with him on the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. I soon discovered his discerning mind, his keenly analytical study of legislative problems, his wealth of information, his grasp of public affairs, and his patriotic and patient approach to their solution. In those early days I learned to lean upon his wisdom and his judgment, to rely upon his fidelity to truth, and to follow in his fight for justice.

Mr. BANKHEAD had the finest qualities of mind and soul. He did not know how to do wrong. His eyes were ever on the stars. His feet were always on the ground. Where he led, men might always safely follow. As a public man it may be said of him, as Jefferson said of President Monroe, that you could turn his soul inside out and the world would not find a blemish. His public career and the many honors which came to him never disturbed his characteristic modesty. He was always the same—kindly, patient, unselfish, friendly, loving. He was a great Speaker. He was always more than that: He was the kindly, loving man, whose greatest glory was to do good, to advance the right, to relieve the afflicted, to lift up the fallen, to help the blind, to strengthen the weak, to replace darkness with light, sorrow with joy, wrong with right. Men like BANKHEAD never die. The good they have done lives after them and years after their journey has ended, many who knew them still call them blessed and, themselves departing, bequeath to others some of the spiritual glory of those lives that they have known.

When I reflect upon the life and character, the work and worth, of BILL BANKHEAD, I feel more than ever the full force of the admodition of the Prophet Micah:

> What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.

Old friend, hail and farewell; for so it must be now, but soon the mists shall have rolled away, and those who knew you here, may again know you where there are no farewells.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1941, Texas lost her most beloved and most trusted public servant. The United States Senate lost its most industrious and considerate Member. This Nation lost a crusader and a leader of note. The people lost a friend.

No man ever served in the Senate who more completely held the confidence and love of the people he represented. All of my life I have known of MORRIS SHEPPARD. He was known to every Texan as a man of firm convictions and of unyielding moral principles. Yet in all the years I have listened to the comments of the people I have never known a man or a woman who questioned the integrity or the character of this illustrious statesman.

His friends included all who knew him, and it may be truly said that all his friends and constituents loved MORRIS SHEPPARD. They all knew that no man worked harder, longer, or more intelligently and effectively for them, not only collectively but individually, than did he. We who have throughout the years taken our problems to him know that, in truth

and in fact, this noble and kindly character literally worked himself to death in the service of his people and his country. We humbly bow in recognition of his outstanding life of service, cheered with the knowledge that he is even now enjoying the everlasting reward so justly his.

Tribute to the Late Senator Sheppard by Senator Capper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a tribute to the late MORRIS SHEPPARD, Senator from Texas, delivered by me at the MORRIS SHEPPARD memorial service on May 26, 1941, at Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the fifteenth psalm in which David describes a citizen of Zion, I find these words:

"Lord, who shall abide in Thy Tabernacle? Who shall dwell in Thy holy hill?

"He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart.

"He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbor, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor."

Our good friend, MORRIS SHEPPARD, who has gone on before us, by David's definition, is one who will abide in the Tabernacle; who will dwell in the holy hill. For if ever there was a man known to me who lived up to the high and exacting requirements of the Psalmist, it was MORRIS SHEPPARD.

Those of us who were privileged to know MORRIS SHEPPARD know that he walked uprightly, he worked righteousness, he spoke the truth that was in his heart. And through all his crusading against the things he believed evil, he never spoke ill of any man; nor ever did evil to any man, nor did he take up a reproach against any of his fellow men.

I have known few as gentle, as courageous, as kindly, and as unswerving in his fight against evil, as our friend, MORRIS SHEPPARD.

I had unbounded faith in him. I believed in his cause. The people of Kansas who made it possible for me to hold a seat in the Senate where I could aid him in his battles—believed in MORRIS SHEPPARD and they believed in his cause and believe in it now.

MORRIS SHEPPARD at the time of his death held a unique place in the Nation. He had represented the State of Texas in the Halls of Congress for 39 years—11 years in the House of Representatives, 28 years in the Senate of the United States. He was dean, and the well-beloved and highly respected dean, of the Congress of the United States.

At the age of 27 he was elected to the House to complete an unexpired term of his father, who had died in service, even as the son was to die in service 39 years later. In 1913 MORRIS SHEPPARD was elected to the Senate, taking his seat January 29, 1913, 6 years before I came to the Senate. It is not necessary that I recite his many and valuable services in the Senate, on Senate committees, on the floor of the Senate, among the councilors and leaders of the Nation.

But I am very proud to pay this little tribute today to the memory of this man whom I loved so much, and whose example and warm companionship, whose leadership in the cause of the right, whose unflagging devotion to duty, in little things as well as great things, was an inspiration to all of us.

Because MORRIS SHEPPARD meant—and still means, for the lives we live, live on after the spirit has left the dwelling of the body—I say that Senator SHEPPARD means much more than just a long record of service in the Congress of the United States.

He was a mild-mannered, courteous, industrious man of unflinching courage and dogged perseverance, with high ideals and the highest personal integrity. He had the respect of everyone who knew him and, so far as I know, the sincere liking of those who disagreed with his views, as well as those of us who generally were in agreement with him. It is said of MORRIS SHEPPARD, and I think truthfully, that he never was known to have said an unkind word or harbored an unkind thought toward or about any human being.

MORRIS SHEPPARD had convictions, and by those convictions he stood to the end, without regard to whether those convictions were popular or not. He was a gallant and unflinching crusader for the things in which he believed. His beliefs were so sincere, so vital, so earnestly and strongly held that he inspired confidence and respect among his fellow men.

Like myself and some others, Senator SHEPPARD believed in national prohibition. I honored him for sponsoring the eighteenth amendment—the national prohibition amendment. He fought for the amendment; he fought against its repeal; he fought hard, but there was no bitterness, no personal animosity, in either victory or defeat.

On the 16th of January every year since 1920, Senator SHEPPARD made a report to the Nation on the liquor problem. When the amendment was repealed he continued to make his annual report to the Senate and the Nation, though prohibition was not as popular as it once was. He never hauled down his flag nor admitted final defeat in his war on what he considered a wrongful and criminal thing—the liquor traffic.

I wish you could have been a listener in the Senate, as I was, when he made his annual report again this year, only a few short weeks before his death—his last attack on the iniquitous liquor traffic. I remember that speech. I believe the tide is turning again, and some of you may live to see the time when the faith that was in MORRIS SHEPPARD and was responsible for his refusal to accept final defeat, will have been justified.

This man, who refused to quit under fire, who refused to surrender his convictions and disdained to hide them, spoke out in the Senate for national prohibition in these words in his 1941 report to the Nation:

"Today I reaffirm the conviction I have often expressed concerning national prohibition, namely, that national prohibition is the most effective and practical way of protecting the American people, especially American youth, from the losses and tragedies of one of the principal social enemies of the Republic—beverage alcohol.

"While millions of our people struggled against privation, want, and misery," Senator SHEPPARD continued, "while America began to call forth its material resources to prepare against modern aggressors, and while American youth prepared to leave their homes and occupations to enter upon a period of preparation and training in defense of a civilization which they believed to be worth preserving, a golden stream of profits continued to pour into the coffers of the liquor industry as constantly as relegalized liquor poured incessantly out of its vats, its casks, its barrels, and its bottles to undermine and cripple the human resources of this Republic."

I am proud to have known MORRIS SHEPPARD. I am proud of a people and a civilization that has produced a MORRIS SHEPPARD. I am proud that he never faltered, never wavered, never retreated an inch in his support of the cause to which he gave allegiance.

As a Kansan and as a Senator I am glad to say that my State keeps up the fight against the evils of the liquor traffic that MORRIS SHEPPARD condemned so effectually till the day of his death.

Memorial Services for the Late Robert M. La Follette, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. D. WORTH CLARK OF IDAHO

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] at the sixteenth annual memorial services for my father, the late Robert Marion La Follette, Sr., at Madison, Wis., June 15, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Trying times bring out the greatness in great men. Such a time is today, as America stands at the crossroads of her destiny. The world is aflame, and the noblest of all God's creations, the human mind, is so bewildered and confused as to make civilization itself waver on the very edge of destruction. Barbaric forces have been unloosed; and just when we were about to believe that man, after a struggle of countless eons, had reached the very pinnacle of civilization and culture and humanity, we were aghast to find that in many respects he has degenerated into the utmost depths of savagery.

Never, therefore, was there a more propitious moment when we, in the midst of our uncertainty and confusion, might well take pause to examine in grateful contemplation the words and deeds of those who have preceded us in meeting and conquering other crises which have occurred before. It is for that purpose that we are gathered here today, to bring, as it were, into our midst the spirit of one of the finest Americans who ever trod this continent, the soul of a brilliant scholar, the ghost of as gallant a fighter as ever lived on this earth—Robert Marion La Follette, Sr. It will well behoove us now, if we would gain insight into the problems which beset a sick world, to take silent counsel with the spirit of that noble man who so valiantly and well met the onslaught of the forces of evil in his day and generation.

Yes; these are turbulent times, in some respects monstrous times, and the world is "out of joint." So, also, was the year 1916. Then,

too, America stood baffled at the forks of the future. In November of 1916, a momentous national election was held. Europe's perpetual volcano of war was once again roaring with unholy fire, and belching more lavishly than ever the molten lava of hate and destruction and death. The common people of America wanted none of this foreign holocaust, and the representatives of those people in the Congress of the United States and in high executive office knew this in their hearts. And so one and all, almost without regard to party, they went before their people asking election to high office, and pledged their sacred word, that if elected, they would never vote to take their beloved country into Europe's cesspool of war. In fact, the slogan of one great party was that it had "kept us out of war."

Here in the beautiful State of Wisconsin, amidst your lovely lakes and fertile farms, a segment of that fierce political battle was raging, and as a candidate for reelection to the Senate of the United States stood Robert Marion La Follette. Already a brilliant figure among his contemporaries, having served his State eminently and well in the Congress of the United States and in the Governor's chair, he was well known to the Wisconsin electorate. In his many struggles with entrenched greed in Wisconsin he had made bitter and powerful enemies, but, even so, his election by the common folk was assured. Nevertheless, with his characteristic courage and leadership, he, too, promised the voters of Wisconsin that as long as he was in the Senate of the United States he would never vote to feed the young bodies of the sons of American mothers into the hungry belly of Europe's immortal god of war. A great President in that year said likewise. The people of America went to the polling places, election was over, and the mothers and the fathers of our country settled back in peace and happiness, secure in the pledges of those whom they had elected, and which were so sacredly given.

Scarcely, however, had the music of election bands faded into an echo, hardly had the torches of election night burned out, when the war racketeers, the paid propagandists, began to ply their nefarious trade. Unmentionable millions were poured into the river of propaganda. Lecturers, authors, and college professors were bought and paid for at so much a head in order to impregnate the American heart and condition the American mind for war. The phrase makers, the slogan designers, began to tell the people of our Nation that they must send their boys across the sea to die, to die for something they called democracy. They said we must "fight a war to end wars," a war "to make the world safe for democracy." They said that England was "fighting our fight" and that her Navy was our "first line of defense." This, my friends, was in 1916, but, let me ask you, isn't there something strangely familiar about it all?

Well, it didn't take long. Money—deceit—propaganda—and in 5 short months a President who had promised in November to keep us out of war was before the Congress in April coolly asking for war itself. And so the Congress, in solemn assembly, undertook to debate whether or not the United States should declare a foreign war. Where were the election promises then? Where were the pledges of men of honor—statesmen, if you please—so weightily given and so prayerfully received by tearful mothers so short a while before? They were the "campaign oratory" of their generation.

Under the whip and lash of heavily subsidized propaganda, typhoons of emotion, and hurricanes of hysteria roared through the land. Gone was the spine of the Senate. Vanished was the fiber of the House. And the raging winds of intolerance and pressure broke like reeds those who had dared to call themselves men. Ah, not quite all. Through the storm one could discern a few—a very, very few—rugged, mighty oaks, towering among their lesser fellows, beaten by the tempests, shivered by the lightning, but standing gallantly. Among these giants was "Fighting Bob" La Follette. He had been well named "Fighting Bob." So far as he knew, the dictionary did not hold the word "retreat." He hated war. He knew what war was. All of his tumultuous life, as the champion of the common people whom he loved so dearly, he had fought predatory financial interests. He had fought special privilege. He had fought international financiers, all of whom had fastened their ugly tentacles upon the masses of the people.

He knew, perhaps better than anyone else of his day, that those same selfish groups which had exploited his people in time of peace were largely responsible for the generation of all wars, in order that they might coin more wealth out of young human lives. None knew better than he that war is a racket, a merciless, relentless racket, devised by racketeers, sometimes these same representatives of savage wealth whom he hated so much, and sometimes politicians masquerading as statesmen.

Yes, Bob La Follette knew war. He knew its causes. He knew its devastating effects. He saw it in its true light as the great destroyer, a destroyer of material wealth, of spiritual values, of human life, of all of the noble aims for which he had so fiercely fought, the destroyer of civilization itself. No pacifist, no appeaser, no coward he. Throughout his stormy career he knew not the command "Cease firing." His outstanding quality was courage, and when those of smaller stature wavered and cringed before the forces of wealth and greed and exploitation he stood firm. He had always known but one word, "Attack." And when these same forces generated hysteria he attacked hysteria. When these forces were finally able to generate war he attacked war, and attacked it with all of his might. Moreover, he had given his pledged word; that word meant something to Bob La Follette. His people had believed him at election time. His very life he would sacrifice to retain that belief.

And so as a quavering Congress plunged this country into the cataract of War, La Follette said "No," and in a masterly address made on the floor of the United States Senate he told the Senate and his country why. They laughed him to scorn, but his answer still was "No." He wearily went away, and his country went into a conflagration from which it has not recovered unto this day. La Follette was a lonely man.

Some of you who believe that the present European conflict is none of our affair, some of you who feel today that saving and perfecting democracy at home is infinitely more important than fighting a war abroad, some of you who believe that paid propaganda is again rampant, and that America's destiny lies in America, may be distressed when chattering war makers call you "appeasers," "fifth columnists," and other opprobrious things; but let me say to you good folk of Wisconsin, you have an inspiration to see you through your distress far beyond those who live in other States. You have the spirit of Bob La Follette, which electrifies the very atmosphere in which we stand today.

Consider what happened to him. After his vote against war, every elemental force of evil in this land of ours was unloosed against him. The savage dragon of prejudice, into whose slimy scales his own sword had so often been buried deep, raised its ugly head to strike him down. Even the powers of darkness skulked out from their hiding places to be in on the kill. It is almost unbelievable to realize today, even when we are up to our necks in the present wave of propaganda, to just what lengths intolerance went in Bob La Follette's time. Disorderly, howling mass meetings all over the United States demanded that the Senate expel him from its midst. So savage did men become that they danced in glee and exultation as he was hanged in effigy in every corner of our land. The public press was almost as a unit in maligning him. Men in high public places, men presumably of integrity and honor, slandered him unmercifully. It is said that many times streetcars and elevators would empty as he entered and was recognized.

Listen, listen to some of the calumnies. No less a man than Theodore Roosevelt himself labeled him a "cause for shame and humiliation for every worthy American." Such was the sweep of emotion that Gov. James Fox, of Ohio, insisted upon his "deportation to Germany." The Public Safety Committee of your neighboring Commonwealth of Minnesota said he was "disloyal and seditious." At numerous mass meetings he was called a "traitor" amidst great applause. The staid, old, conservative newspaper, the Boston Transcript, said that his name would go down in history "bracketed with that of Benedict Arnold." The New York Times said of him that he had a "German mind," and some bespectacled, cowardly editor in the New York World called him an "envious, pusillanimous wretch." The New York Herald said that he would "go down in history with Benedict Arnold."

All these things were bad enough, but the saddest act in the whole sordid tragedy was the treatment which was accorded him by some of his own people right here at the great University of Wisconsin, for which he had done so much. The public press owed him little except fair treatment. Irate mobs throughout the country were at that time only slightly familiar with his sterling character, but if there was one group in all this world which owed Bob La Follette everything, it was that group which composed the University of Wisconsin. La Follette was probably its most distinguished alumnus. When in school there, he brought national fame to his alma mater by his oratorical prowess throughout the Middle West. While Governor of Wisconsin, he had fostered the growth of the university to the point where it was probably the outstanding institution of learning in the United States. La Follette had defended publicly, and in the face of much opposition the right of its faculty to teach in the manner in which they saw fit, and when the freedom of the university to teach the truth was under attack and in jeopardy, he aided the board of regents to prepare and adopt the following resolution:

"Whatever may be the limitations which trammel inquiry elsewhere, we believe the great State of Wisconsin should ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found."

Such was the service which Bob La Follette had rendered to a great institution; such was the honor he had brought to its glorious name.

And yet as the maelstrom of the war spirit began to whirl ever faster and faster, a majority of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, acting as unreasoning, violent human animals rather than as rational men of intellect, signed a memorial to the public press and filed it with the Senate. In this memorial they charged La Follette with giving "aid and comfort to Germany and her allies." Not content with this, they also filed it as a public document with the Wisconsin State Historical Society. Also, at the same time the State Senate of Wisconsin passed a similar resolution.

What a travesty! What a mockery of all that was noble in mankind! I can picture in my mind's eye "Fighting Bob" as he received the news of what his university had done. Likely, it did not stir up his fighting qualities. Likely, it must have hurt him beyond all measure. It must have reminded him of Caesar when he looked into the faces of those who were about to assassinate him and there

saw the countenance of his old friend for whom he had done so much. All he could say was, "Et tu, Brute!" And I think La Follette said it, too.

Well, for nearly 2 years the fearful persecution continued, and La Follette said many times that he did not hope to live to see the day when his position would be vindicated. He hoped only that his children might see it, but the implacable forces of justice struck swifter than he knew. The war ended, and after 4 years of horrible slaughter, after 4 years of ruthless shells tearing apart young flesh and bone, after 4 years of a civilization gone mad, the war ended. Then a weary and a haggard human race began to take stock of its losses and its gains.

Europe found herself bankrupt and bleeding, with tens of millions of her young lives snuffed out. The American soldiers who had been sent abroad only a little while before by the profiteers, exploiters, and swivel-chair patriots at home, began to return. They left behind them row on row of little white crosses to mingle with the poppies in Flanders Fields. They brought with them hundreds of thousands of their comrades crippled, maimed, and insane to fill new and hungry hospitals, where, as broken wrecks, many stay even unto now. Those same soldiers found upon their return a sick and disconsolate Nation. How La Follette must have brooded as he saw the boys come home. How his great heart must have pined for his people as he contemplated the billions and billions and billions of dollars wrenched from the farmers and the workers and the little businessmen of the country, so carelessly tossed away into Europe's age-old conflict. How he must have wondered how long that staggering burden would overhang the already weary shoulders of the American taxpayer, and unquestionably his prophetic eye saw that it would be for a long, long time to come. And so it has. The burden of 20 years ago still weighs us down heavily.

La Follette saw the peace, or what was called a peace. He saw the vultures of the Old World sit down at the peace table at Versailles. He saw them strip from their faces the bright mask of democracy. He saw them revealed to the world in their true form, a form he always knew existed, namely cruel, cunning politicians. He saw every semblance of "making the world safe for democracy," "fighting a war to end wars," vanish. He looked upon the final grab at the peace table by the victors, not for democracy, but for land, gold, trade, commerce, and unconscionable power for themselves. He watched an idealistic President go to Europe and try to obtain some consideration for his 14 points of peace. He watched this same President laughed at and ridiculed for his naivete by the tyrants of the Old World. He saw this President saddened and disconsolate as he began to realize that tens of thousands of American boys had died, not as he thought on the altar of freedom, not as he had hoped in the name of democracy, but on the bloody chopping block of European power politics. He watched Wilson return from Europe a sad man, and he watched his utter disillusionment break his spirit, ultimately his health, and drive him to his grave. Yes, La Follette saw war after the handiwork of the propagandists had been removed. He saw it when the glitter finally had fallen from its bony body. He saw it as he always knew it was—annihilation.

But that was not all. Gradually, the scales began to fall from the eyes of America. Coffins, graves, crippled, maimed, insane, hospitals, debt, break-down of moral values—these things were ruthless awakeners. Soon many of those who had been La Follette's chiefest critics began to slink and crawl away. Loans were made and not repaid. Honor among nations was held for naught. It was not long until the disillusionment of the American people turned to resentment against those who had cost them so much. It was only a little while until the great heart of America began to well up in admiration for Robert Marion La Follette and the pitifully small band around him who had had the courage to tell the people the truth. He grew again in stature and soon became one of his people's chiefest idols. The press, which had condemned him before, now lavishly showed him the highest praise. The Senate of the State of Wisconsin in hasty repentence expunged from its records the vicious resolution which it had passed condemning La Follette when the Senate did not know what war was, and he did. How a majority of the faculty of the university must have felt then. A resolution was introduced in the Senate to expunge from the records of the State Historical Society the memorial which I have heretofore referred to, wherein the university faculty had denounced him as giving aid to Germany. At this point comes an incident which I think gives a better insight into the true character of La Follette than any other thing that I know. As soon as he found out about the resolution, he wrote the author of it and requested that he withdraw it, and I want you to listen as I read to you a few paragraphs from his letter, and I now quote:

"It has come to my attention through the press that you have introduced a resolution in the Wisconsin State Senate which directs the curator of the historical library to transmit to the superintendent of public property for destruction a certain resolution signed by members of the University of Wisconsin faculty censuring me for my attitude during the recent war.

"I deeply appreciate the spirit which prompted you to introduce this resolution and the desire on your part to rectify, insofar as possible, what has seemed to you to be an unfair and libelous attack upon me.

"The signing and promulgation of that resolution by members of the faculty of the university of which I am an alumnus was a source of deep regret and disappointment. Many of them had been lifelong friends and associates. Before the experience of the war, I would not have believed that they could bring themselves to impugn my loyalty and devotion to the best interests of this country. However, the support and steadfastness of you and many others gave me great compensation, which was a source of strength to me in doing my duty to my State and my country as it was given me to see it.

"Time is the great sifter and winnower of truth. The formal destruction of that document cannot change the fact of its existence. I stated many times from the public platform in Wisconsin during the recent campaign that I would not exchange my record on the war with any man in the United States Senate. History alone can judge impartially. So far as I am personally concerned I am well content that this document shall remain as a physical evidence of the hysteria attendant upon the war.

"It seems to me that our energies should be devoted toward bringing our institutions back to the principles upon which they were founded, and which are the true source of our greatness.

"This applies with special significance to the university, and we can perform no greater service toward all our institutions than to see to it that the great University of Wisconsin ever continues that winnowing and sifting by which alone the truth can be found is made a reality and not a fiction."

A man wrote that. Deeply pained as he was by what his alma mater had done, sadly contemplating the injustice of it all, he would not allow the record to be changed. Even in this hour his passion for truth and accuracy led him to insist that history be recorded as it was written.

Soon the revolution was complete and Bob La Follette was not only the idol of his State, but one of the great figures on the American stage, respected, admired, and beloved by all.

Now, my Wisconsin friends, you may wonder why I have devoted so much time to this particular part of La Follette's life. I have done so because to my mind it is the most important part. I have done it because we face today conditions which constitute almost a deadly parallel with those which confronted him. I have done it because as we stand here near his grave I am sure his spirit would want it so. I have done it because once more the vultures of intolerance and prejudice are circling above us, ever ready to pounce down again with their unclean talons and devouring beaks. I have done it in the hope that we may all profit from it.

Now it would be sheer presumption on my part to attempt even to delineate the complete life of Bob La Follette to the people of Wisconsin. The life of La Follette was the life of Wisconsin until the day of his death, and those of you who knew and loved him, and even those who are too young to have known him are, I am quite sure, familiar with his accomplishments. Those of you in Dane County have oftentimes heard of how, as a graduate just out of the University of Wisconsin, he fought the party bosses, and by direct appeal to the people themselves became the prosecuting attorney of your county. You remember well his matchless record in that office. Almost legendary, I am sure, were his services in the House of Representatives, fighting always the people's battle, a man who would rather be right in the cause of the common people than live.

Some of you may recall him as your Governor, giving to the State of Wisconsin an administration which at that time constituted a model of progressive government toward which the eyes of the whole Nation looked for guidance. Then, when he had served you well there, you refused to release him from public service, but sent him to represent you in the greatest deliberative body on earth, the Senate of the United States. His record there belongs not to Wisconsin alone, but to the United States of America. He served there until he died in 1925.

I shall not attempt to analyze the reforms he brought about either as Congressman, Governor, or Senator. His life was too crowded, his accomplishments too many to do them even elemental justice in the time at my disposal this afternoon. He had only one master—the common people of Wisconsin, and later of the United States. In the service of those people he enlisted when he left the university, and only God released him from that service.

I have often thought, however, of several outstanding things characterizing his governorship. Let me mention them briefly.

First, he abolished the caucus and convention system in Wisconsin, and substituted therefore the direct primary where the people themselves could have expression. La Follette believed in a party system in the United States. He was not a despiser of parties as many would have you think, but he also was deeply convinced that a political party is the servant of the people and not its master. When, therefore, at the turn of the century he discerned that the party machinery in Wisconsin had fallen into the hands of all sorts of special privileges, and was controlled by political bosses, and dictated to by the vested interests of the State, and when he saw the party in Wisconsin no longer representing the people, but on the contrary dictating to them, he decided to hit that system, and hit it hard.

He knew corrupt party bosses usually function at their best in convention where they can sit in smoke-filled rooms, use money freely and back candidates who represent not the people, but only the own selfishness of the bosses themselves. So

when he became Governor he abolished this system, and made the great State of Wisconsin an early leader in giving the people control of the party, and not the party control of the people. The result was the Wisconsin direct primary law, which has been a model for other States ever since.

Second, he abolished free transportation, special fees, rebates given as a bribe by the then all-powerful railroads to shippers. It is hard in this day and generation to realize the extent of the ruthlessness of big business as the twentieth century was being born. The railroads were flinging their mighty lines of steel across the country. Huge land grants had been given them by the Federal Government. They quickly obtained monopolies where with complete freedom from all regulation and supervision they bought and sold State and national officers at will, and in general robbed and pillaged the public in any unbelievably brutal way. They gave free transportation to favored shippers, and secret rebates were also a common practice. Of course, the farmers of Wisconsin and adjoining States paid the bill.

Governor La Follette's task in breaking this corrupt railroad ring was no easy one. Vast sums of money were spent to bring about his downfall. Calumny of all sorts was indulged in. But ultimately, and with the help of the common people of his State, he broke their strangle hold forever. He set up one of the first railroad commissions in the United States to see to it, in a measure at least, that fair practices only were engaged in. He compelled the railroads to pay their just share of the taxes of the State, which was one reason why he kept the treasury in splendidly solvent condition. He forced the railroads to abolish free transportation and secret rebates for shippers, and Wisconsin was a better State for his success.

Again, he had enacted a State civil-service law. He had seen how well the political bosses in the pay of predatory interests could control the employees of the State. He conceived it to be the duty of those who worked for the State to be able to give to the State a full measure of service, untrammeled by crookedness and corruption, and so once and for all, after another difficult fight, he placed those who gave their lives in the public service of the State of Wisconsin, in complete security and freedom from political oppression.

I could go on and relate many more of his accomplishments as Governor. Time, however, will not permit. Nearly all of the laws which were enacted under his administration were denounced as dangerously radical at the time. Today nearly every State in the Union has at last followed the course which he so valiantly then laid out. It is a tremendous tribute to his sagacity and almost prophetic vision that not a single law passed under his administration has ever been held unconstitutional by our highest tribunal, the Supreme Court of the United States. In social and progressive legislation he made Wisconsin a shining pattern for the entire Union. Is it any wonder Wisconsin loved him?

His record in the Senate was, of course, a brilliant one. He sought to do there on behalf of the United States what he had so successfully done in Wisconsin. He was one of the first men in public life to place the value of human beings above that of material wealth. Always he devoted his untiring energy to right the wrongs of oppressed people, and this was so whether the oppression came from the business trusts and monopolies of his day or from corrupt government. There is a well-defined body of progressive Federal legislation sponsored by Senator La Follette designed to remedy the intolerable industrial conditions which he found on entering the Senate in 1906. There was the Hours of Service Act, making it unlawful for any common carrier to permit any employees to remain on duty for a period of more than 16 consecutive hours. The purpose of the act was, of course, to promote safety in the operation of trains, and also to promote better working hours for labor, which was also close to his heart. The railroads again strenuously opposed this measure, but "Fighting Bob" beat them, and his law was upheld by the Supreme Court.

Then there was the Employees' Liability Act, which relieved from employees of railroads who were injured in interstate commerce the necessity of complying with the stringent regulations of proving negligence on the part of the carrier, and also relaxing other rules relative to contributory negligence. Again, there was the Railroad Valuation Act, and finally the famous Seamen's Act. Up to that time seamen were practically slaves. They did not have a single right under the Constitution as were accorded other citizens. The nature of their occupation prevented them from maintaining effective unions. They were a hopeless class of Bob La Follette's common people. I shall not go into the details of this constructive piece of legislation now. Suffice it to say that it made the seamen of our country once again free men.

I could go on further with the legislative reforms, but they are too many. Not only was he constantly pressing for positive progressive legislation, but he was ever ready to take the floor of the Senate in defense of human rights. He, together with Senator Borah, of my own State, Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, and others, formed the nucleus of a liberal bloc in the Senate which was largely responsible for most of the reforms that have occurred in national legislation in the past 25 years. His services in Washington made America a better place for its people.

Now, it may or may not be appropriate here, but I simply cannot let this occasion pass without saying to you, briefly, that the elder La Follette's work did not perish with him. On the contrary, his progressive liberalism, his matchless courage, his love for the common people, his devotion to his State, and his rare discernment have been perpetuated ever since his death in the persons of his two outstanding sons, BOB LA FOLLETTE, JR., and Phil La Follette. Neither of them has read this address, and I am sure that both will censure me for even mentioning their names. Nevertheless, I think that Robert Marion La Follette, Sr., would wish it so, and again as we meet near his grave, it is a magnificent source of satisfaction, not only to the people of Wisconsin, but to the whole of America, to know that the progressive, liberal, courageous program which he so valiantly commenced is now being so nobly carried on. BOB and Phil, may you ever in the future, as you have so brilliantly in the past, be worthy of his great name.

In conclusion, may I again remind you that America faces today a crisis even more fearful than that which confronted her in 1916. Another war, generated by the tyrants of the Old World, is again consuming Europe. The pattern of this war does not differ from that of the previous one. It is the same war in a new dress. The same propagandists which La Follette had to face in 1917 are again fastening their talons upon the throat of America. Once more the slogan-makers are busy and again huge sums of money are being spent to soften the fiber and condition the minds of the common people for war. The phrases "fighting for democracy," and "for the freedom of small peoples" again din our ears. Powerful influences are at work to plunge America into a conflict which may not only fail to save democracy abroad, but will surely destroy it at home. We have gone a long way in that direction now. Only the final, fatal, disastrous step remains to be taken. The same financial interests are at work, interests who have more investments abroad than they do here at home; interests who "where their treasure lies, there their heart is also."

Let us pray to God that the lessons of 20 years ago have not been forgotten so soon. Oh, that the spirit of Robert La Follette could be brought back from the grave. Oh, that it could point once more the accusing finger at those who would destroy our land. Oh, that the majestic statue of him which now graces the Hall of Fame, the gift of the admiring people of Wisconsin to the doubly grateful people of the United States, could come to life and speak to us now in the hour of our need. I was looking at that statue just before I left Washington. All of the power, all of the dynamic energy of La Follette is there. It almost seemed to me that it was about to spring not only into life but into swift action. But it cannot. Each of us will have to fight alone today as Bob La Follette fought alone before. We can, however, take courage from his example, and when their slander and calumny are heaped on us as it was on him, let us gather solace and courage from those lines of Henley's which La Follette quotes in his autobiography, and which he states always inspired him and gave him hope during his severest trials:

"Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods there be
For my unconquerable soul.

"In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Under the bludgeoning of chance,
My head is bloody but unbowed.

"It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishment the scroll,
I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul."

Annual Celebration of Bunker Hill Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most eloquent address made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] in the armory at Boston, Mass., on June 16, 1941, on the occasion of the annual celebration of Bunker Hill Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and my fellow countrymen, I am grateful to you for the invitation which permits me after an absence of 20 years to return to Boston. It is good to be here again where as a youngster in college I pursued courses of study at Harvard University, coached football at the high school in the village of Wellesley, courted at Wellesley and Radcliffe, and followed the usual course and pattern of a young American who had come from the South in search of knowledge in the years immediately following the last World War. I realize that in speaking to you on the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker

Hill I follow in the footsteps of illustrious fellow countrymen of ours who in years past have journeyed to Boston to review with you the exploits of our noble heroes of the past and to keep alive in memory's garden their deeds of valor.

I reaffirm the purposes expressed by Daniel Webster, who first delivered the Bunker Hill oration on the 21st day of June 1825, on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone for the Bunker Hill Monument, and I quote: "We are among the sepulchres of our fathers. We are on ground distinguished by their valor, their constancy, and the shedding of their blood. We are here, not to fix an uncertain date in our annals, nor to draw into notice an obscure and unknown spot." We are here today, as we have been in each succeeding year since the date of this historical battle, June 17, 1775, because we are Americans and because we are anxious to remind ourselves of all the struggles which our forbears have encountered in order that we may be able to pass in peace that portion of our existence which God allows to men on this earth.

I am proud and happy to walk momentarily in the footsteps of these great citizens of the past and to bask temporarily in the sunlight of the glory they reflect. Thousands of people gathered in Charlestown on the 17th day of June 1825. General Lafayette, then on a triumphant tour of the States, was present and assisted in the ceremonies. Fifty years had passed since the Battle of Bunker Hill had been fought, but there was a sense of nearness and reality which that half century had not been able to erase from the minds of even the younger generation of that day. The fathers and grandfathers of most of them had borne arms in the Revolution, and there were present upon the occasion 40 veteran survivors with their marks of battle visible upon them. I subscribe again and again to another declaration made by Webster in that first Bunker Hill speech, and I quote: "We cherish every memorial of these worthy ancestors; we celebrate their patience and fortitude; we admire their daring enterprise; we teach our children to venerate their piety; and we are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of their labors and sufferings can never be without its interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth while the sea continues to wash it." And so tonight, I am privileged to speak for the new generation, mindful of the fact that there flits before you the spirit of Prescott, Putnam, Stark, Brooks, Read, Pomeroy, and Bridge, all of whom live in the grateful memory of their countrymen as a shining example of those who preferred death to slavery.

When John Adams presented his letters of credence as Minister to London in 1786, George III, the then King of England, said he was pleased to receive a Minister who had no prejudices in favor of France. To which Adams replied: "I have no prejudices except those in favor of my native land." I hope sincerely that any judgment that is passed upon the remarks that I make upon this occasion will be judged by that standard, because I am indeed an American first, last, and all the time.

Today, 166 years after the Battle of Bunker Hill, we are in the midst of a world revolution. From Narvik to Japan there is no peaceful life. Life, itself, is threatened and security is not at all certain. Because of one man, millions are homeless and countless thousands are dead. A strange paradox, indeed, that in a civilized world only savages remain content. The natives of Africa, the headhunters of Malaya, and the Australian aborigines appear to be carrying on life as usual. In America alone there remains, precariously balanced on the outcome of battles now in progress, the hope of the world for ultimate security. For more than 2,000 years man has fought to raise himself above his geological heredity. All of the years of struggle seem to have led him back to where he began. The concepts of liberty and of freedom, as we have always known them, since the days of Washington and Webster, are based upon faith and justice. Centuries were required to build up this faith among peoples and nations. Creeds were established, based on Roman Law, English Common Law, and the Code of Napoleon. The scales of justice came from Egypt, the modern concept of right and wrong from the Ten Commandments of Moses, and the rights of man from the Magna Carta.

Today the world is threatened by a single man, bent on subduing it. There is no voice in Europe now except his voice. There are millions of people silenced and enslaved, with their cities and towns destroyed, and their populations threatened with starvation. As my friend Stuart Cloetes has said in his revealing book, Yesterday Is Dead, "It seems the dream of yesterday is dead, today is the awakening." It seems absolutely necessary that this tyrant be stopped if order is to return to the world in our time and generation. Every generation must pay in its own turn its own obligations to its own generation. We must live realistically. We must realize that life is real and earnest. We must remember that life is not merely a heritage to be enjoyed, but that it is in every sense an obligation that must be fulfilled. I wish devoutly, as do all fathers and mothers, that I could pay the obligations of my children to their own generation, suffer their pains, stand their reverses, and save them from much of the misery that they must in reality suffer for themselves. But that would not be best, because that would soften them and their successors might prove useless to the country, indeed. The freedom which we enjoy in such abundance today, was gained for us through the grace of God, by our country's heroes from Bunker Hill to the present hour.

Today we are rearming the country hurriedly to meet possible or threatened attacks from world aggressors. We have voted and are voting large sums of money for these armaments. We need a national solidarity and a national unity of all classes, all religions, and all ages at the cost of comfort and at the cost of sacrifice of possessions and property, and maybe of life itself. There should be no division among us. We should, in my opinion, earnestly support the President of the United States in his efforts to prepare adequately the defenses of this country; make these defenses so strong that they will be able to meet any eventuality. I regret any statement made by public men at any time which seeks to create the impression in the minds of the people that the President desires to take the country into war. This I do not believe. Neither do I approve of those fellow citizens of ours who have undertaken to create in the public mind of the country a war hysteria, as I would be wholly unwilling to carry upon my conscience in the years that are left to me the feeling that I had encouraged the men and women of my country to go to war. If war comes again to our beloved country—and God grant that it will not—we should enter it solemnly with the feeling that it is necessary in order to more adequately protect the lives and security of the people of America. At 18 years of age I am proud to say that I was a private in my country's Army. As a captain in the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States subject to call by the President I speak as one who would not urge one of your sons to sacrifice himself in a war for any purpose except in the defense of his country. History repeats itself. In every crisis in the history of our country we have somehow, under God's providence, been able to raise up men who stood firm in the crisis and who were able with His help and with the energies of other men to work out the salvation of the country.

In March 1916 talk of preparedness in the country vied with pleas of pacifists in an apprehensive Nation. Young men were leaving their homes and labor for training camps. German periscopes were arising in the Atlantic to menace American export trade. Critics of the Wilson administration, just as those of the Roosevelt administration today, were branding their President as a warmonger. A Congressman from Virginia took the floor of the House of Representatives and spoke in defense of the President of the United States. He spoke with caution and courage, with frankness and firmness that commanded not only the respect of the President and the people of his own country, but also the respect of foreign nations. He said the President had for 18 months applied himself to the task of preserving peace without impairing the honor of the Republic. In his summation he delivered one of the most eloquent pleas ever heard in the Congress of the United States, and I quote: "Every one of us in authority here is for peace. The whole Congress is for peace. The President of the United States for many months, by night and day, has kept a vigil for peace. With enduring patience, with amazing skill, oblivious to all things else, he has passionately sought, by every conceivable means, to keep this country out of the maelstrom of war. Neither taunt nor threat has shaken his purpose or diverted him from his course. But there are some things better than life, as there are other things worse than death. The human body, bereft of the soul which reveals the image of God, is but a whitened sepulcher; and so a nation with its righteous spirit quenched is as a tossing derelict of the sea * * *." Finally he lashed out at the propaganda of the pacifists, and I do not express the word "pacifist" in any sense of derision, because our Lord has said "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall inherit the earth," but the Congressman continued: "Like unto the proposal to discredit the Nation is the pathetic, perfervid talk about desolating American homes and distressing American mothers by sacrificing their sons to the god of war. The nearest approach to war which this country has recently made was when Members of Congress sought to impede the President's plans for maintaining an honorable peace. The surest prelude to intolerable affront from one direction is the manifestation of a cowardly submission from the other; and unless it be conceived that no injury, however great, no insult, however grievous, could provoke this Nation to resentment, the course proposed by meddling resolutions is most certain to invite aggression and ultimately to precipitate war. And there are some things worse than war. Virginia has homes which might be desolated and mothers who might be distressed and sons who might be sacrificed. But I pray God that the mothers and sons of Virginia who live appreciate their heritage from those who 'being dead, yet speaketh.' Two of Virginia's boys are my own—stalwart, manly fellows, for either of whom I would die a thousand times—and I would have them hear me say, without a tremor, in the spirit which I hope animates their hearts, that I would rather be pursued through time and eternity by the pitiful apparition of their shattered forms than to see my country dishonored and its flag hauled down in disgrace." These words were spoken by Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, while a Member of the House of Representatives. They are as true today as they were yesterday. What will tomorrow bring? The survival of England keeps actual warfare at least an ocean's width away from our beloved country

The Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate of the United States, of which your distinguished citizen is chairman, recently filed

the following report: "From all the evidence available it appears that the United States can be conquered without military conquest of continental United States. An effective blockade against our foreign commerce can be maintained at points thousands of miles from our coasts and well beyond aircraft range. Our outlying possessions will be captured and used against us as advance bases. There will be nothing to prevent the establishment of bases, by force if necessary, in this hemisphere, from which as well as from aircraft carriers repeated bombing raids can be dispatched against our highly industrialized areas. Under such conditions enemy ships, except in the form of raiders, need not approach anywhere near our shores. With the loss of our outlying possessions, our foreign commerce, and subject to continual raids upon our coastal areas, our ultimate defeat is inevitable. It will be only a question of time, depending on how long our national will to further resist will hold out. Without the power to carry the fight to the enemy, there can be no alternative other than subjugation to his wishes."

America would be subjected, in my opinion, to frequent raids from land, sea, and air, and our country, which has always been free, would become a military Nation.

The burden of armaments in the years ahead might conceivably be heavier than our people can bear. It is a frightful prospect to contemplate that we might become a beseiged fortress, spending our time fighting off bombing raids on the cities and towns and upon the civilized population of our country. We devoutly wish, hope, and pray for peace and for security of our sons and daughters. We must be prepared to make sacrifice. We must be prepared to suffer hardships, to get along with less. We must sacrifice sweat now in the urgent race for thorough and total preparedness. Tomorrow may be too late! It has been too late in so many of the small countries of Europe. We must make every sacrifice in order to avoid the sacrifice of blood and tears which may come later. There are those who urge us to negotiate for peace—negotiate with whom, may I inquire? The German military dictator has broken his word to every country with whom he has dealt. I do not believe that this country can afford to deal with one who does not keep his word. As long as our Republic is free, as long as men and women can assemble together in the schools and churches of the country, and as long as we can produce freemen with integrity, vision, and courage, our Republic is safe. This beloved country of ours is a fairly decent place in which to live. It will be in the years ahead what we are willing to help make it, despite those who seek to destroy it. Thank God there are in America still things worth living for and things worth dying for, if necessary. We are what we are because of the struggles and sacrifices of the loyal men and women of all creeds, races, and colors from all sections of this country.

"Here's to the boys of the windswept North
When they meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of Grant be with them all
As the sons of the North advance.

"Here's to the boys of the sunkissed South
When they meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of Lee be with them all
As the sons of the South advance.

"Here's to the boys of both North and South
When they meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of God be with them all
As the sons of the Flag advance."

I close with a toast to the Flag of the United States, written by my good friend John J. Daly, a well known Washington newspaper man, first published in Boston just after America's entrance into the last World War:

"Here's to the red of it,
There's not a thread of it,
No, not a shred of it,
In all the spread of it,
From foot to head,
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and lead for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing in red.

"Here's to the white of it,
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it,
But feels the might of it,
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it,
Made manhood dare for it;
Purity's prayer for it
Keeps it so white.

"Here's to the blue of it,
Beauteous view of it,
Heavenly hue of it,
Star-spangled dew of it,
Constant and true;
Diadems gleam for it,
States stand supreme for it,
Liberty's beam for it
Brightens the blue.

"Here's to the whole of it,
Stars, stripes, and goal of it,
Body and soul of it,
O' and the roll of it,
Sun shining through;
Hearts in accord for it,
Swear by the sword for it,
Thanking the Lord for it,
Red, White and Blue."

There is a Destiny that holds the lives of all of us in the hollow of His hand. Let us all heartily resolve again on this sacred ground, with the memory of the exploits and the deeds of the hero of Bunker Hill fresh again in our minds, that with God's help we will keep our rendezvous with Destiny and pay fully our own obligations to our own generation.

The Late Representative Pius L. Schwert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me on the life and services of the late Representative Pius L. Schwert. I should like to have this statement called to the attention of the House Committee on Memorials and the Joint Committee on Printing.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The tragic weight of a profound personal sorrow makes it impossible for me to speak appropriately of the late PIUS L. SCHWERT. He was my neighbor, my ally, my colleague, and my true friend. I became associated with him many years ago, and that association developed into a bond of comradeship which can never be completely broken so long as I live.

We played baseball together, we attended social affairs together, we dealt with civic problems together, we conducted political campaigns together, we dwelt together. Those kinds of ties make parting almost unendurable.

PIUS L. SCHWERT succeeded me as Representative in Congress from the Forty-second District of the State of New York. Last November he was reelected to that post of honor and responsibility. Prior to his service as a Member of Congress he made an outstanding record in the important elective office of county clerk of the county of Erie. PI SCHWERT made friends wherever he went, among all classes, races, creeds, and political parties. He despised bigotry, indolence, and selfish partisanship. He possessed a rare and enviable philosophy which enabled him to see only good in his fellow man and which constantly compelled him to greater and greater public service.

PI, sterling athlete as he was, knew the rule of fair play, and the thousands who knew and loved him attest to the fact that he never deviated from that cardinal rule which motivated his every word and action.

He served his country in the naval service, he served his community in numerous responsible official and unofficial capacities, and he served in this Congress with everlasting credit to his name and to his memory.

I cannot recount his tragic death. It came with a suddenness that was merciful to him but unspeakably shocking to his scores of friends who were with him at the time.

But I only know that I have lost one of the most genuine friends that any man could ever have. His devotion to family and to friends, his allegiance to duty, his belief in truth and justice, marked him not only as an exemplary citizen, but as a man wealthy in spiritual qualities.

It is with a profound sense of futility that I endeavor to pay tribute to his memory. I can only join thousands of others, who held for him the highest esteem and regard, in calling him a true American, a great man, and one whose loss it is difficult for his friends, his community, and his Nation to sustain.

Our sympathies go forth to his kindly, genteel, and courageous widow, and to those others who were close and dear to him through family bonds. His was a noble character, a lovable disposition, a just and conscientious mind. He worked too hard, he assumed too many responsibilities, he overtaxed his great reservoir of physical energy. He was youthful in spirit and in years, but the burdens he carried were too heavy. He gave his life for his country and in the service of his friends. No greater tribute can be paid to any man. He served his God and his Republic faithfully. No greater loyalty has any man.

Flag Day Address by Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD an address delivered by me on Flag Day, June 14, 1941, at La Crosse, Wis., under the auspices of the Elks' Lodge.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Brother Norman Schultz, Exalted Ruler of La Crosse Elks, my friends, and brother Elks, it is always an honor to speak on the subject of the Nation's flag. It is a particular honor to speak on that subject under the auspices of a group whose reverence for the flag is so outstanding and whose Flag Day ceremonies are so inspiring.

In every one of the 1,500 Elks lodges throughout the Nation commemorative ceremonies are held in June in honor of the flag. In so honoring the flag you honor Elkdom itself, where every member has sworn allegiance to the flag which drapes your altar.

Your organization, by its research throughout the years, has become so well informed on flag history that it is almost presumptuous for me to attempt to discuss that history here today.

We are interested in that history, however, not as a collection of facts, but because it sheds light on the significance of our flag and what it symbolizes.

We know that late in 1775 there was a committee appointed by the Continental Congress to consider the question of a single flag for the Thirteen Colonies. We know that a flag design known as the "Grand Union Flag" was recommended, and that John Paul Jones hoisted this flag on his masthead early in December of 1775, and we know moreover that it was hoisted over the headquarters of General George Washington at Cambridge, Mass.

Because the flag did not have a completely American identity, there was a general demand for a new design.

On June 14, 1777 the Congress provided: "That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes of alternating red and white, and that the union be 13 stars, white, on a blue field, representing a new constellation."

We do not know whether the Philadelphia Quakeress, Betsy Ross, actually made the first flag at her upholstery shop on Arch Street in Philadelphia, but we do know, however, that there was a home-made flag which flew over Fort Schuyler, N. Y., on August 3, 1777, when the fort was attacked by the British and the Indians.

That was probably the first time that the United States flag—as we first knew it—was fired upon.

That flag was made from strips of white torn from the soldiers' shirts, from a red petticoat belonging to the wife of one of the soldiers, and from a blue cloth coat belonging to one of the officers.

Every school child knows that the original 13 stars and 13 stripes represented the Thirteen Original Colonies. Throughout the years, of course, the flag was enlarged and altered in design.

Today we meet to commemorate the first authorization by Congress on June 14, 1777 of Old Glory. Our flag is the third oldest of all of the national standards of the world, and it has a long and honorable history.

We are today less concerned with the past history than the future, and yet we can interpret the future only in the light of what that flag has symbolized in the past.

As Henry Ward Beecher said, "Accept it, then, in all its fullness of meaning. It is not a painted rag. It is a whole national history. It is the Constitution. It is the Government. It is the free people that stand in the Government on the Constitution. Forget not what it means; and for the sake of its ideals, be true to your country's flag." (Flag story—teacher.)

It was just 164 years ago today that Congress met in Independence Hall in Philadelphia to pass a resolution that Capt. John Paul Jones was to be appointed to command the ship *Ranger*. That was the same day that Congress made provision for a flag of the United States. All of us remember John Paul Jones' famous cry:

"That flag and I are twins, born the same day and the same hour. We cannot be parted in life or in death. So long as we can float, we shall float together; if we must sink, we shall go down as one."

When John Paul Jones raised that flag with his own hands on the staff of the *Ranger* there were 13 States and 3,000,000 people. Today our State of Wisconsin alone has a larger population than the entire country had at that time.

Stretching across the span of 164 years, however, the convictions, the ideals, the hopes of 131,000,000 people are one with those of the little group who met in Philadelphia at Independence Hall on June 14, 1777.

The flag has been altered in design but the convictions, the ideals, and the hopes it represented then are the same today.

This is the same flag that fluttered over the ragged armies of George Washington when they marched into Yorktown. It is the same flag that was carried through the ice floes of the Delaware and on into Trenton.

It is the same flag that flew at Bunker Hill; that flew at Ticonderoga; that Perry carried at Lake Erie; that flew over Lawrence as he died on the deck of the *Chesapeake*.

It is the flag that flew over the Alamo; that was flown at the Little Big Horn with Custer. It is the flag that stormed the heights of Chapultepec.

This is the flag that was with Zachary Taylor at Buena Vista, with Dewey at Manila Bay, with Jackson at New Orleans, with the Rough Riders at San Juan Hill; that marched with our boys at Chateau Thierry and in the battle of the Argonne, when the Nation ventured forth to make the world safe for democracy. It is the flag that Byrd placed at the South Pole and Admiral Perry placed at the North Pole.

For more than a century and a half this flag has represented the highest ideals of a great nation and a great people who want to live at peace with all the world.

When I left Washington a few days ago I saw in my last glimpse of Washington as the train moved out of the city the Nation's flag waving over the Nation's Capitol.

It is the same flag that drapes your altar today. It is the same flag that has flown all over our land. What is impressive about this fact is that wherever our flag is displayed throughout the land it represents one people, one nation, indivisible.

When that flag was adopted by Congress there were 13 distinct Colonies fighting the mother country. They had one objective and that objective was liberty.

This flag was its symbol and it welded those Thirteen Colonies into a unified confederation.

It is my fervent belief that in these grave days our flag symbolizes the unity of our people, a unity which may differ on policies but which is eternally the same on ideals.

Our first task then today is to forge in the American consciousness a realization of what our flag symbolizes. Groups such as this one make a great contribution when they focus the attention of the American people on the deep significance of our flag—yes, the real meaning of that flag. (Fond du Lac incident.)

We are too prone to accept our flag and what it symbolizes as the free birthright of every American. It is such a birthright, but it is imperative for us to realize that it is not ours alone, that it belongs also to generations yet unborn, that it is ours to cherish as trustees and to pass on to future generations unsullied and unmarred, as the symbol of a great, free people. (Freedom is a word to conjure with in this period; we alone of the peoples of the earth possess it.)

That is why it is vital for us to realize what it symbolizes as it flies across the Continent of 48 States and over 131,000,000 people who give it allegiance.

The American flag symbolizes so much that can be found only in the hearts and minds of men that it again seems presumptuous for me to attempt to reduce its ideals to words.

My poor evaluation can add little to the glory of our flag, and my words of explanation are no more eloquent than the simple but unspoken understanding which may throb in the heart of a farm boy or a tenement-bred urchin who may never have read of the history of his flag.

It is with deep humility that I consider the significance of our flag as a symbol.

It is a symbol of our ideals, of our progress, of our liberties, of our happiness, of our free-born American initiative, of our hopes, our ambitions, our history, our prayers, our inspiration, our patriotism, our truth, our heroes.

It is the living emblem of our freedom, of our sacrifices, of our fortitude, of our reverence, of our equality, of our independence, of our sovereignty, of our principles, of our righteousness, our justice, our honor, our sincerity—and certainly of our destiny.

It is a symbol of a new breed of men called The American. We stem from many blood streams, but we are a new race, a peculiar people, free of the prejudices, hatreds, and limitations of other people. Under Heaven we are Americans. There is no hyphen there.

It is not enough for us today to pay homage to that flag. Ours must be, as it has always been, more than a lip service. Ours must be an homage expressed in our every thought, word, and deed. Yes, our job must be, in this hour of the world's travail, a dedication to that flag, a dedication and a consecration of all we are or hope to be.

We do not need to be in the uniform of our country to live the allegiance, the loyalty, the obligations we owe that flag of ours. Part of the story of the American flag has been written by soldiers in blood on the snows of Valley Forge and a thousand battlefields, but another part of the story has been written in the sweat of men who carved a Nation from the forests, and in the tears of women who left their bones to bleach white on the alkaline sands. Still another part of the story of the American flag has been written in the dreams and hopes of every immigrant who came to these shores.

The story of America's flag is written not only in the battles for independence, not only in the battles for the freedom of the seas, not only in the battles to vindicate our sovereignty, not only in the battles against tyranny.

It is written also in the steel rails which span the Nation, in the great forests which fell before the advance of the frontiersman. It is written in factories, in great skyscrapers, and in humble homes, in sweat and tears and struggle, in hope and prayers and living, in joy and laughter, in epic lives and simple lives.

It is written wherever our citizens have had great ideals, wherever they have had great convictions, wherever they have sacrificed for a worthy cause. It is all there in that flag.

The American flag is a symbol of peace. Here in our land we are one people with one government. We do not police our State borders. We do not police men's minds, or men's hearts, or men's thoughts. The freedom of the open spaces, sky and sea is ours. No tyrant soul possesses us.

We who live under the flag believe in inspiring allegiance, not by hatred, fear, and oppression, but by the common bond of tolerance, love, and service.

Today the world is on fire, and we owe an obligation to our Nation, to the flag, to the

family circle, and to our love of God to keep that fire from our shores. Therefore we must prepare for any eventuality.

It is our sacred obligation that our Nation shall not be filled with hatred and intolerance. We must always be unified. It is our obligation that whatever cause we undertake must be undertaken because of the high calling of lofty ideals.

We must not embark upon any course because of lust or hatred or emotion. We must not embark upon any course of tyranny or conquest.

Our land must remain a haven and a refuge for the oppressed. There must never be a period of witch burning in the United States. There must never be oppression in this land.

There must never be an indifference in this country to our problems, whether they be economic, military, or ideological. There must be a consciousness of our problems and a willingness to make sacrifices to meet those problems. Believing we have a great treasure here, we must throw a shield of protection around it so that no saboteur, fifth columnist, or foreign "ism" shall find lodgment here.

There must be a reaffirmation of our spiritual obligation. There must be a continual prayer in our hearts to the Creator for guidance and the continuance of His goodness and mercy. There must be a perpetual desire in our hearts to prove worthy of this goodness and mercy.

In our individual lives and in our Government, we must stand for moral integrity and truth. We must continually strive for domestic tranquillity, for freedom and equal opportunity for every man.

We must continually strive for domestic peace. We must live for the blessings of human liberty and American resourcefulness and initiative.

We must continually bulwark our faith against the snares and delusions of totalitarian systems. We must continually strive for a nation of laws rather than a nation of edicts.

In a drab, disillusioned world (but in a world in which we can live gloriously, as Americans) we must continue an orderly march with all the fervor of our belief toward a dynamic and growing democracy, to live in honor, to keep our aspirations and our ideals high, and to forge toward a high destiny with a prayer in our hearts that the God of our fathers will continue to guide and guard us.

This is no time to hide behind the flag. It's a time to support what it stands for.

Oh, my fellow citizens, ours is a tryst with destiny. Tired, worn humanity is looking to us to keep the torch of reason, of tolerance, of Christianity, of liberty, alive, so that when this holocaust is over, poor benighted mankind can find its way back to the light, such as we possess under this flag. May we, under God and our flag, prove equal and worthy of this great cause.

Has England Taken the United States Without Firing a Shot?

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, a group of businessmen in my district, willing to put up capital to help our national defense, came to Washington to secure priority on steel and power from the Boulder Dam. They were to engage in the business of extracting magnesium from certain deposits in Nevada. They asked for no money from the Government. They were finally turned over to John C. Jones, an Englishman, not a citizen of the United States, employed in the O. P. M. He told these men they could not secure the power or the priority. How do you like that—an alien telling our citizens what they can or cannot do.

Now, this Englishman, Jones, is not a citizen of the United States—therefore he cannot take an oath of office. He is getting his per diem from the United States Government. In due time, Mr. Speaker, I shall demand a thorough investigation. It looks to me as if the British have taken over the United States without firing a shot.

Mr. Speaker, these reputable Cleveland businessmen to whom I refer have a process to extract magnesium, a metal that is rare and vitally necessary to national defense. My information is that because they refused to disclose this formula to the English technical adviser, Mr. Jones, who is employed in the aluminum section of the O. P. M., they were refused a certificate of convenience and necessity to secure power from Boulder Dam to go into production.

Boulder Dam is a project built by the taxpayers of America, and I vigorously object to any alien, no matter who he is, making final decisions on the question of the power that we taxpayers of America helped to create. The suspicion is prevalent among many Members of Congress that British capital and in many cases money furnished by the United States Government to British capital seeks to control the production of aluminum and magnesium in this country.

To me it seems to be dangerous, to say the least, for the Government to permit employment of aliens who however sincere they may be, would be inclined to discriminate in favor of their own nationals against citizens of this country.

The information furnished me on this British subject, Mr. Jones, is that he was employed as a metallurgist in the British Aluminum Co., Ltd., Warrington, England, and also consulting metallurgist, Arthur Seligman and Co., Ltd., New York City.

I make no complaint about the British Purchasing Commission, who are employing hundreds of their nationals here in Washington, so long as they are paid by the British Government, but I strenuously object to any agency of our Government delegating final authority to an alien to dictate to American businessmen. Just as the precious metal of magnesium shines, equally does this disclosure, in my opinion, stink.

How long will the Congress supinely submit to the influence of our British plotters, whom we saved from destruction in the last World War and made possible their continuation as a world power, only to have them subsequently literally thumb their noses at us and term us "Uncle Shylock."

The schemers of Union Now," with the new flag they propose, seem already to have taken shape. The matter needs a complete investigation before it is too late. American labor and American businessmen need not take it on the chin under the guise of national defense, which, interpreted, means defense for the British Empire and not the United States of America. If some Members of Congress want to subscribe to Union Now and make of Congress a British Parliament, where they can be addressed as the Right Honorable Smith or Jones, from Devonshire or Lancashire, well and good; but, thank God, there are some of us left who will insist we operate as we have from the beginning of the Continental Congress down to the present day, and that we will insist that the portrait of George Washington still adorn the Halls of Congress, and that his Farewell Address be read religiously each year on the 22d of February.

If Union Now ever takes hold, perhaps the expatriated American Lady Astor may once more take up citizenship in Virginia and run for Parliament from the hound country, once the home of the immortal Patrick Henry.

Instead of singing God Bless America, let us sing God Save America, after this fashion:

God save America
From British rule.
Stand beside her and guide her
From the schemers who would make of her a fool.
From Lexington to Yorktown,
From blood-stained Valley Forge,
God save America
From a King named George.

Addresses Luncheon of the Pilgrims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR WINANT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by the American Ambassador to Great Britain, Hon. John G. Winant, at the luncheon of the Pilgrims on Tuesday, March 18, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Pilgrims' luncheon gives me the first opportunity to express formally and publicly my deep appreciation of the extraordinary welcome that I have received since my arrival in England. I realize that in honoring me you wish to do honor to my country, but I would like to say that your personal kindness to me in doing it will always be cherished and remembered.

I hope that I may be able to convey to the American people some measure of the warmth and sincerity you have shown their representative. The policies which draw your country and mine more closely together in face of a common peril are policies to

which the American people as a whole have solemnly committed themselves.

I shall, of course, do what little lies within my power to carry out those policies, but it is the great mass of American people, working in the factories and in the shipyards and on the farms, who are building the arsenals and the granaries for democracy's defense. It is they who with their labor and resources will provide the tools—the ships, the planes, the guns, the ammunition and the food—for all those here and everywhere, hic et ubique, as it is written on the Pilgrims' crest, who defend with their lives freedom's frontiers. The American people have now girded themselves to provide these things with the utmost speed, in the greatest volume, and with all the skill at their command.

At different periods of history it has fallen to the lot of one nation or group of nations rather than another to guard and defend the frontiers of freedom and civilization. Each nation or group of nations to which that lot has fallen has gained from it its finest traditions and most enduring heritage. Nations, like individuals, derive greatness from deeds which benefit not themselves alone but all mankind.

It was England's proud privilege to give to the world Magna Carta, the conception of due process and equal protection of the law, a conception cherished today by free men everywhere.

It was America's privilege to give to the world the Declaration of Independence, of which Abraham Lincoln said: "It was not the mere matter of separation of the Colonies from the motherland, but that sentiment in the Declaration which gave liberty not only to the people of this country but hope to all the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all would have an equal chance." Today I believe that the British people are happy to recognize that the ideas embodied in the Declaration of Independence were the ideas of Chatham and Burke as well as of Washington and Jefferson, and that those ideas helped to create not only the American Republic but the British Commonwealth of Free Nations.

It was the privilege of France, notwithstanding the excesses of the Revolution, to give undying meaning to the words, "liberty, fraternity, equality," words which will forever ring in the ears of those who fight in freedom's cause.

But I would not have you believe that I think that the cause of freedom is the cause of any one nation or group of nations. The cause of freedom is the cause of all men everywhere. The history of freedom is the history of civilized man, to which all nations, not excepting the nations now held enthralled by the dictators, have in the past made notable contributions.

Today it is the honor and destiny of the British people to man the bridgehead of humanity's hopes. It is their privilege to stand against ruthless and powerful dictators who would destroy the lessons of 2,000 years of history. It is your destiny to say to them, "Here you shall not pass." You have said so little—you have done so much. It is all part of a soldier's faith to have known great things and to be content with silence.

Never in any struggle between barbarism and civilization has so much been at stake. Nazi-ism has called into question every tenet in the faith of civilized man. It has refused to recognize the dignity of man as a human individual. It has deliberately and ruthlessly denied to man freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and equality before the law.

The world has known tyranny before, but never tyranny more cruel and absolute or as relentlessly organized. For nazi-ism has stolen and run amuck with the great inventions of free and inquiring minds, and has set about using them, not to liberate, but to enslave the human spirit.

Peace-loving peoples are slow to believe that others are plotting their destruction and the obliteration of everything they hold dear. But once aroused to the dangers, once convinced that they cannot live in peace with those bent on their destruction, tolerant and peace-loving peoples have within them latent resourcefulness, energy, and fortitude that tyranny can neither match nor master.

In the struggle against the Nazis, the people of Britain hold the front line but they do not stand isolated and alone. Your dominions and your colonies are mustering their forces to bring you ever-increasing aid. America, as President Roosevelt said last Saturday night, "has gone into action." It is mobilizing with ever-growing speed its tremendous resources to make available to you the sinews of war.

On every continent, in every country, on every island—wherever there are men and women who value freedom and love liberty—you have friends and allies. Your magnificent resistance has not only moved other democracies into action, it has given new hope and new courage to the Czechs, the Poles, the Dutch, the Danes, the Norwegians, the Belgians, and the French. Even today throughout the continent of Europe there are legions who yearn for your victory, which means freedom for them as well as for you.

The great mass of common men the world over are not deceived by the Nazis' talk of a new order. They realize that there is no order or security in tyranny. They want what the British people want. They want what the American people want. They want a friendly civilized world of free peoples in which Christian virtues and moral values are not spurned as decadent and outmoded—a world where honest work is recognized and a man can own himself.

They have not lost their faith in individual liberty and the democratic way of life. They are not content to be deprived of these freedoms which they know to be essential to the welfare of man. They desire freedom of speech and expression. They desire freedom to worship God in accordance with their own conscience. They desire freedom from want, or, if I may borrow the words used by your Prime Minister in a broadcast to America spoken more than 2 years ago, they desire a "world of increasing hope and enjoyment for the common man—the world of honored tradition and expanding science." Lastly, they desire freedom from the fear of armed aggression. They know that those freedoms cannot be had in a world dominated by totalitarian tyranny. They know that those freedoms can be won only by your victory.

The free peoples of the world have come to realize that the enslavement of one nation is a threat to the liberty of all nations. This is the significance of the world situation—clearer today than ever before. The peoples of the world were not, and dare not, destined for subjugation to the will of others. There is no people or race charged with the responsibility or endowed with the ability to dominate the world.

But we must recognize that the well-being of men and of nations has become interwoven with the well-being of other men and other nations in a degree that would have been inconceivable a few short decades ago. A much greater degree of cooperation is required between men and between nations than was necessary before the days when the engine and the dynamo came to influence our lives. That cooperation can give to the great mass of men and women a higher standard of living than our forefathers would have ever dreamed possible.

While we have accepted the machine, we have not always learned to cooperate with one another to make the machine the servant and not the master of mankind.

Never has man been able to live unto himself alone, but never has it been so necessary for man to live and work and cooperate with his fellowmen as it is today.

In an interdependent world men must cooperate, dominate or perish. Fear that their neighbors may seek to dominate them has caused too many men to think that they should dominate their neighbors.

It has been that fear in the past which has too frequently blinded men to their common interests, and has set class against class, and nation against nation.

It is that fear which is the root-cause of the counter-revolution—the effort of the few to impose by force their will upon the many—a fear that has brought so much grief to our generation.

It is that fear of other men and other nations which dictators and demagogues have exploited not to give men their freedom but to enslave them. It is that fear that the cooperation of free men and free nations alone can and will overcome.

The road ahead is hard. The lost years are gone. A new spirit is abroad. Free peoples are again cooperating to win a free world and no tyranny can frustrate their hopes. Those who now suffer and die in this effort do so for the common good of the free peoples of the earth who shall follow after them, and who, with the help of God, shall build from these sacrifices a citadel of freedom so strong that force may never again seek its destruction.

So far as your people and our people are concerned, I hope that we may work together in the spirit of the moving words which your poet laureate, Mr. John Masefield, addressed to me on my coming to England. May I read them to you?

"Two with like laws and language should be friends.
Whatever enmities have marred a past,
A future with good will may make amends
And build a new world happier than the last.

"Your coming and your friendship are a cheer.
If yours and ours will but understand,
Earth's future children will not live in fear,
Nor deed of spirit die by deed of hand."

May we help one another build a new world happier than the last so that earth's future children will not live in fear.

Canadian Prime Minister Addresses Associated Canadian Organizations of New York City

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very inspiring address delivered at New York City on June 17, 1941, by the able Prime Minister of Canada, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your words of introduction, and you, ladies and gentlemen, for the warmth of the welcome you have so generously accorded me.

I speak to you tonight as the head of the government of a country which, for almost 2 years, has been actively and unitedly at war. In accepting your invitation, I have not been unmindful that, though it was extended by Canadian friends, I, nevertheless, would be speaking in a country other than my own and to citizens or residents of a nation which is at peace—or at least, officially at peace. Through the courtesy of the National Broadcasting Co., my words will be heard by many of your fellow citizens of the United States. I believe they will be not less anxious than you are to be told, at first hand, facts concerning Canada's war effort.

You have asked me to tell you something of the causes and ideals which led us to take up arms; something of what Canada is doing, and has been doing, as a nation at war; something, too, of our hopes for the world which will rise when peace comes again to bless mankind.

The Canadian people entered this war of their own free will. As one people, we made the momentous decision by the free vote of a free Parliament. Our declaration of war was signed by the King upon the recommendation of His Majesty's Canadian Ministers. The King's proclamation was in the name of Canada. We, in Canada, were as free to make war or to abstain from making war, as the people of the United States are free to make war or to abstain from making war.

PARLIAMENT ACTED PROMPTLY

The decision of the Canadian Parliament was given as soon after the outbreak of war as Parliament could be called together. It was a prompt and united decision. There was no hesitation. There was no compulsion. We knew humanity's cry was upon us all. We took our stand as a free and independent people who wished to do their utmost to thwart aggression, to maintain freedom, to crush the cursed creed of nazi-ism, to preclude world domination by any power, and to end forever, if that were possible, the substitution of force for reason as an instrument of national policy.

Our people went to war for the sake of Canada, but not for Canada alone. We went to war as well for the sake of Britain, for North American civilization which we are proud to defend, and for the sake of that humanity which is above all nations. We saw clearly that Canadian freedom, that North American freedom, was one with British freedom.

We went to war at Britain's side because we believed hers to be the right side. We committed ourselves to her cause because it was our cause—the righteous cause of the liberty of nations, great and small, and of all men, great and humble, rich and poor. If Britain had not been on what we believed to be the side of righteousness, the cause for which she had taken up arms would not have been our cause. I do not hesitate to say that Britain, or no Britain, Canada would never have entered the war if, at the outset, our country had not seen the issue clearly for itself and believed it to be what all free peoples know it to be today.

MOTIVE IS HUMAN FREEDOM

In our unhesitating decision and our action which followed we were true to ourselves. For if any nation was ever inspired by high ideals, unselfish motives, and a passion for human freedom and social and national justice that land was and is Canada. We have a national history without stain of aggression, exploitation, or territorial greed. We have worked always in patience for peace.

In our dealings with other nations we have been amongst the foremost exponents of conciliation, mediation, and arbitration, and the most consistent advocates of international good will and understanding.

We are nationally minded because as Canadians we are free and independent. But we see no escape, no safety, no refuge in national isolation. We are internationally minded because our people know that a threat to freedom anywhere is a threat to freedom everywhere. We know that there are no longer any geographical defenses strong enough in themselves to prevent the onset of aggression. We know that tyrannical ambition, once it overleaps itself, will overleap every boundary, whether it be mountain or sea

Knowing these things, and realizing the strength of the enemy, we entered the conflict—English-speaking Canadians, French-speaking Canadians—as a united nation.

FRENCH CANADIANS UNITED

Don't let anyone dare to tell you that French-speaking Canada is not on the side of freedom in this war. The union of the children of New France and their English-speaking brothers which fashioned the Canadian nation remains unbroken and will always so remain.

The generosity of our citizenship, into which men of many races have been freely welcomed, has been repaid by unquestioned loyalty to our institutions and our cause.

As soon as the cloud on the horizon, no larger than Hitler's hand, resolved itself into the storm of conflict, we determined that we would not wait until the enemy was at our gates. We went to meet him at sea, in the air, and on land. Against total war, we have brought, and shall continue to bring, total efforts.

For nearly 2 years we have been at war. In the war we have had from the beginning two major tasks. We continue to play two major parts. Like Britain, we are a nation at war with all the power of our resources and all the strength of our will. For nearly 2 years we have gathered our strength as we have taken our allotted place in the conflict. Our soldiers, our sailors, and our airmen are with Britain and her other allies in the front line of battle. Our forces on land, at sea, and in the air have been, and are being, equipped and maintained at our own expense. In addition, like the United States, we are helping Britain by sending to her, to the limit of our capacity, the products of our factories, our farms, our forests, and our mines.

CITES CANADA'S WAR EFFORT

The task of arming and fighting as a nation is our own free contribution to the cause of freedom. The task of aiding Britain with munitions and money is an additional effort which Canada is also making for the common cause.

With the United States, and like the United States, we are helping to provide the tools. With Britain and like Britain, we are doing our utmost to help finish the job.

May I now give you some concrete facts and figures. I make no apology for giving them in almost the same terms I used in our Parliament just before it adjourned last week.

In the nearly 2 years Canada has been at war, our own effort in men and materials has steadily gained in momentum, in volume, and in power. Every month sees more Canadian troops, more Canadian sailors, and more Canadian airmen added to the number of the defenders of Britain, the defenders of freedom.

For a considerable time we have had an Army corps of two divisions in the British Isles. They are in key positions, helping to guard and to garrison the vital citadel, the retention of which may well decide the war. We have made known to all the world that our forces overseas are ready to go, and that we are equally ready to have them go, wherever their services may count for most. We shall, within the present year, dispatch to Britain two additional divisions; one, a third infantry division; the other, an armored division. We are also sending a tank brigade and many reinforcements. Some of these forces are already in Britain, others are on their way. This is apart altogether from the active forces we are retaining in Canada.

SHIPS AND PLANES ACTIVE

Ships of Canada's Navy have been engaged with British ships in the coastal waters of Britain. They are now taking an increasingly important part in the defense of the Atlantic coast, and in the duties of convoying supplies and men on the great passageway of the Atlantic so vital not only to the present of Britain, but also to the future of Canada, and of the United States. You already know that some of our destroyers—like a much larger number in the British fleet—were, only a few months ago, flying the Stars and Stripes.

Canadian airmen and Canadian squadrons have, from the beginning, been taking their part in the Battle of Britain. Every day their number is being increased by graduates from the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan. This plan is in the nature of a partnership under which Canadian, Australian, New Zealand, and British pilots and airmen, and, I am happy to say, hundreds of young Americans as well, are being trained as air fighters in the flying schools of the wide spaces of Canada. At the present time about a hundred establishments are in full operation. From this source is flowing to Britain an evergrowing stream of pilots, observers, and gunners. They have crossed to Britain in thousands, and will continue to cross in ever increasing numbers.

We have recently sent to Britain 1,000 radio technicians.

Let me give you a few figures to show what our nation of 11,500,000 people has contributed in manpower. In order that their significance may be fully appreciated, let me resolve those figures in terms of the 130,000,000 who inhabit the United States.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND IN ARMED FORCES

We have in our active armed forces 300,000 men. In comparable figures the 300,000 men in the Army, Navy, and air forces are equivalent to well over 3,000,000 in the armed forces of the United States.

We have in the Royal Canadian Air Force 55,000 men. That number is equivalent to far more than half a million men in the air services of this country.

Service outside Canada in the Canadian army, navy, and air force is voluntary. Eighty thousand volunteers are already in Britain. For home defense we have compulsory military service. Today every able-bodied young man of 21 is called up for training for service in Canada for the duration of the war, unless he chooses to enlist for service overseas. Some 170,000 men are enrolled in the reserve army and are subject to call for local defense. In the defense of our Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the army, navy, and air force act in close and constant cooperation. Canada's armed forces are sharing, too, in the defense of the island outposts of North America, the West Indies, and Newfoundland. For a year, Canadian troops were also stationed in Iceland.

We have therefore prepared ourselves for a twofold duty. One duty, as we see it, is to meet the aggressor in the front line of aggression. That is our duty to freedom and humanity. Another duty, which is a part of that already mentioned, is to be prepared to resist the aggressor if he reaches the shores of America. That is a duty we share with the people of the United States. I believe I am not overstating the position when I say that each day helps to make it increasingly clear that what we have done, and are doing for ourselves and for Britain, is likewise a contribution to the defense of the whole Western Hemisphere.

WAR PRODUCTION PUSHED

It is commonly said that this is a war of machines. In new factories, in old factories, in converted factories, we are making machines for Britain's armed forces as well as for our own. Canadian motor transport vehicles, machine guns, aircraft, corvettes, minesweepers, as well as shells, explosives, and chemicals are being sent in growing volume across the Atlantic. We are sending and will continue to send to Britain all the food which ships can be found to carry. We have launched a great merchant shipbuilding program. Canada, like the United States, is determined that North America will not only be the arsenal of democracy but also the shipyard of the freedom of the seas.

War production in Canada is a partnership between Canada and Britain. Since last April there has been a partnership in war production between Canada and the United States. That partnership, I am happy to recall, was established during my last visit to this country, as a result of the agreement reached by President Roosevelt and myself at Hyde Park. I am even happier to reflect that the Hyde Park agreement is a logical sequel to the far-reaching agreement arrived at between the President and myself at Ogdensburg in August last. Under the Ogdensburg agreement, as you are aware, matters pertaining to the defense of the northern half of the Western Hemisphere became a subject of special study by the Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defense.

A major result of the Hyde Park declaration is that both countries are now in a position to produce more of the weapons and munitions of war and to produce them more rapidly. This is all-important when time is of the essence of the conflict.

FINANCIAL BURDEN IS HEAVY

The arming of our country and the establishment of a great war industry in less than 2 years have placed upon the people of Canada a tremendous financial burden.

Our own war effort alone has already cost us more than a billion dollars. Unless that figure is stated in terms of the population and income of the United States, it may sound small in American ears. In those terms, it is roughly equivalent to an expenditure of $15,000,000,000. In this current year we expect the cost of our direct war effort to be on a scale equivalent, in United States terms, to between twenty-one and twenty-two billion dollars a year. Every dollar of that is paid by Canada and is raised in Canada, mainly by taxation.

Canada, in addition, is raising huge sums of money to help Britain. The money is needed to pay for the great quantities of food, raw materials, and war equipment we are sending to Britain on her account. The value of Canadian shipments this year, it is estimated, will reach a billion and a half dollars, or the equivalent of nearly $23,000,000,000 worth of goods measured in terms of American population and income.

It is not, perhaps, surprising that there should be, in other countries, some persons who do not fully understand what is happening in Canada, or some who do not wish to understand. For example, it has been asserted that Canada is demanding "cash on the barrel head—for its aid to Britain"; that "Canada still sells to Britain for cash at a profit," while the United States is leasing and lending to Britain. Such a statement ignores entirely Canada's direct participation in the war at her own expense. They take no account whatever of what we are contributing in human lives, as well as in those material things which it is possible to lease or lend.

ENTIRELY A FREE-WILL OFFERING

If our war effort is to be construed as a contribution to Britain, rather than what in reality it is—our contribution to the common cause of freedom, the "cash on the barrel head" statement overlooks the fact that the whole of Canada's direct war effort is a contribution which is neither leased nor lent, but is an out and out free-will offering—a gift to the hard-pressed people of Britain, gladly and proudly made, to assist them in maintaining the world's citadel of freedom, and in fighting freedom's battles in other parts of the world.

The "cash on the barrel head" allegation, the alleged "selling to Britain for cash at a profit," equally misrepresents the nature of Canada's indirect participation through financial aid to Britain—the very part, in fact, which parallels, in kind, though not in amount, the lease and lend contribution of the United States.

Canadian producers must, of course, be paid for the goods sent to Britain, just as American producers must be paid. Out of what we send to Britain, Britain pays for in British goods shipped back to Canada. We have reduced our tariffs to make that easier. What good hard cash the British did pay us—in gold—we have had to pay, along with a great deal of our own gold, to the United States for our war purchases in this country.

But by far the largest part of the Canadian dollars needed to pay Canadian producers of goods for Britain have been raised and must continue to be raised from the Canadian people in taxes or loans. We have told Britain not to worry about her shortage of Canadian money—that with the enemy at her gates and approaching our shores, there will be time enough to reckon costs and credits once we all know whether this world is to be slave or free. Meanwhile, we will do our best to find for Britain's Canadian purchases Canadian dollars out of Canadian pockets.

Apart from British goods sent to Canada, Britain has already needed a billion Canadian dollars to cover her purchases in Canada. About a quarter of this sum Britain paid Canada in gold. It has cost us in the United States more gold than this to enable us to fill our British orders.

The rest of the Canadian dollars Britain needed in Canada, Canada herself has supplied. Some of these dollars were exchanged for Canadian securities held in Britain. The remainder amounts, in effect, to a loan by Canada to Britain.

It is only when we add together the cost to Canada of our own war activities and our financial support for Britain that we reach the total financial burden of war which the Canadian people are shouldering. Translated into comparable American figures on the basis of our relative population and incomes, this total burden would amount within this fiscal year to something like $35,000,000,000. To carry this load has required very heavy increases in taxes, even on those who are not well off. I am proud to say the Canadian people have willingly accepted this taxation as a part of their contribution to the cause of liberty.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have tried to explain to you in these few minutes some of the material things which we Canadians have done, are doing, and will do.

FIGHT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

I have tried to tell you why. We believe that everything which freemen value and cherish on this side of the grave is in peril in this war. The right of men, rich and poor, to be treated as men; the right of men to make the laws by which they shall be governed; the right of men to work where they will, at what they will; the right of womankind to the serenity and sanctity of the home; the right of children to play in safety under peaceful heavens; the right of old men and women to the tranquillity of their sunset; the right to speak the truth in our hearts; the right to worship in our own way the God in whom we believe.

We know that if we lose this fight, all fruits will wither and fall from the tree of liberty. But we shall not lose it. We shall not lose it because the people of Britain stand and will stand in undaunted fortitude and magnificent resistance. We shall not lose it because, although some nations may lie crushed today, their souls can never be destroyed. We shall not lose it because we, on this continent of North America, who have been the pioneers of the frontiers of freedom, have already begun to stamp out the prairie fire of tyranny, anarchy, and barbarism which every day draws close to our homes.

For today, whether we will it or not, we are all roof watchers and fire fighters. As Canadians, we are proud to fight the flames with the people of Britain who have maintained for freemen their faith in freedom, and kept inviolate the majesty of the human spirit.

GRATEFUL TO GOOD NEIGHBOR

As Canadians, we are proud of our great and good neighbor, and grateful to know, as all the world knows, that she is with us heart and soul; that her genius, her skill, and her strength work against time for those who fight for freedom.

Some day peace will crown the sacrifices of all. When that day comes the peoples of the British Commonwealth and the peoples of the United States will be found at each other's side, united more closely than ever in one great endeavor to undo the wrongs that have been done mankind. For it is, I believe, the unshaken and unshakable purpose of both that there shall be established upon this earth, now so rapidly becoming hideous with the blackened ruins of civilization itself, a freedom wider and more deeply founded than ever before in human history.

Surely we have all come to see that the present conflict is something more than a war between Germany and other powers; that it is "a struggle between permanent and irreconcilable claimants for the soul of man." On the one side stands spiritual freedom with its high regard for human values, the dignity of manhood, the worth of honest toil and the sacredness of human personality. On the other side is the spirit of nazi-ism and fascism with their "coarse material standards," their "cult of power as an end in itself," their "subordination of personality to mechanism" and their "worship of an elaborate and soul-destroying organization." This false and evil spirit has, in our own day, in our own and other lands, permeated all too deeply many phases of social and industrial life. It must be the purpose of our high endeavor to destroy it for all time.

While that work is being done, it will be ours, as well, to do all that lies within us to make supreme upon the earth that friendship among men and nations which has ever lain hidden in the heart of mankind.

The Nation's Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a speech by me before the Central Retail Feed Association Convention at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., on June 9, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S JOB

Mr. Chairman, my friends, I am happy to be your guest speaker today. It is well that the public servant render an account of his stewardship.

It is well also for each of us at frequent intervals to calmly and dispassionately attempt to analyze the problems which confront us as a people.

That is why I am particularly gratified to speak on the Nation's job today.

We hear a great deal about the job which confronts the Nation today. Just what is that job?

WHAT IS THE NATION'S JOB?

The Nation's job today is defense. Does that mean defense in the narrow military interpretation of the word? No; it means defense in its broadest aspects.

It means not only a military defense, but an economic defense, a social defense, and an individual defense. It means building not only the steel armor plate of mechanized defense, but also of building the bombproof barriers of mental and spiritual defense. Man does not live by bread alone. In our defense program we must remember that.

IF DEFENSE IS THE NATION'S PROBLEM, WHAT ARE WE TO DEFEND?

Before we consider the nature and extent of the Nation's job—the nature and extent of our defenses—we must first know what we are to defend. To have a good defense, there must be something precious requiring protection and preservation.

In the known history of man, there have been more than eight thousand "eternal" peace pacts, but their average life has been only about two years. Probably the reason has been that too often they have been concerned with territorial disputes rather than the great abiding freedoms.

Our defense is not always a military defense. The things we defend are not always corporeal things, which we can hold aloft in our hands. Battles are not always fought because of territories. Defense is not always limited to the protection of life and property.

Sometimes defense is for a way of life—a way of life which we might not even be able to define. Sometimes defense is for an ideal which we cannot reduce to words.

The Nation's job today is the defense of those things we hold most dear. Our lands, our buildings, and our people are all part of these things we wish to defend.

But they are not the only part. The forces which threaten them are not always military forces.

The Nation's job today, in a world of collapsing values, in a tortured world of force and fear, is to retain and develop for ourselves a way of life which we have cherished ever since that sweltering Fourth of July in 1776.

WHAT IS THIS WAY OF LIFE?

What is this way of life? It is a way of life in which "all men are created equal." That means that there shall be no special privileges for any group or class. It is a way of life where there are certain inalienable rights which government cannot deny to any man. It is a way of life where government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. It is a way of life where there is freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition. It is a way of life where government is the servant and the people are the masters.

It is a way of life which has given to our people the highest standards of living the world has ever known. It is a way of life which has given us more economic opportunities than the people of any land have ever had since the beginning of time.

These are the things we defend today. Their preservation and their continued dynamic growth constitute the Nation's job.

EACH INDIVIDUAL HAS A JOB WHICH IS A PART OF THE NATION'S JOB

You and I are part of 131,000,000 people. Each of us has a great job to perform. It may be a job that is unheralded and unsung. It may be a little job as the world evaluates success. Nevertheless, to the degree that we give it our best efforts and to the degree that it squares with our American concepts it is a great job.

The tenement-house mother who has reared her sons in the love of America; the crossroads country doctor on his lonely circuit; the workman whose grimy hand guides a machine lathe; the farmer; the businessman; the small-town preacher—men and women in every walk of life—each contribute to the Nation's job.

Coming from Washington, the vortex of all the economic and political currents of this country, I say to you that this job of ours divides itself into a number of challenges.

THE FIRST JOB OF THE NATION TODAY IS PREPAREDNESS

The No. 1 job of the Nation today is preparedness—adequate defense of the Nation—and now, a bulwark against war. This calls for the creation of national unity, strengthening our morale.

In my judgment, we have made great strides in our preparedness, but we still have a tremendous task ahead of us.

I think that Government has a job of coordination to do. The Chief Executive has created a collection of defense agencies. The Defense Commission, the Office of Production Management, the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, and a number of other agencies.

I have no quarrel with the objectives of these agencies. I do say, however, that they overlap. I do say that our governmental defense agencies have lacked authority and power to act. It cannot be denied also that after almost a year of defense effort, there is still no directly responsible defense head other than the Chief Executive. There is still no completely coordinated defense staff, though it may be that there will be a better coordination under the present "complete" emergency set-up.

The greatest need in our defense set-up is for some kind of mechanism which will secure responsibility for integrated defense agencies.

We have made great strides in our defense effort, and I feel that our governmental defense agencies have accomplished great progress, but greater progress is possible—indeed, it is vital, and that is why I urge a greater coordination of governmental defense agencies.

SECOND, WE NEED PRODUCTION

Once the governmental mechanism for our defense agencies has been clearly defined, once the machine has been oiled and put into running order, we must produce at top speed. Wars today are machine wars, and if America is to remain safe, we must increase our machine output.

To increase our machine output, we must utilize our machines to a greater extent. That need not mean overtime for the trained men who handle the machines. It should mean instead, that we train more men, from the ranks of our unemployed, so that the machines can be used 24 hours a day without imposing inhuman hours on the American workmen.

The first problem, in increasing production, then, is to utilize all of the existing facilities of production, both machines and men. We must further break down the unhealthy concentration of defense orders in the East.

There are idle machines and idle facilities in the small factories which must be employed. Defense must be decentralized still further so that the machines of the small factory are used and the idle workman of the small town is employed.

Government must do its part, in keeping the wheels of industry turning. Industry must not be compelled to wade knee deep in red tape. There must be a decisive, businesslike policy in our defense agencies.

Now that a complete emergency has been declared there must also be a decisive governmental labor policy, so that labor and industry know where they stand. Our labor policy must be taken off 24-hour notice, if we are to have any stability in our production.

My criticism of the existing defense program is that we have scrapped the industrial mobilization experience of the first World War. At that time, we found out that we needed a centralized, unified, and coordinated program both in industrial mobilization and in procurement.

The coordination of our defense activities is definitely a vital part of the Nation's job.

THIRD, THERE IS NEED FOR INTELLIGENT COORDINATED PLAN

As a part of our coordinated effort, the great crying need for our defense activities today, is a plan. The spectacular success of the totalitarian machine has not been purely accidental.

Since the days when Hitler was an agitator in a Munich jail, and in fact long before Hitler ever launched his beer-hall revolution, the geopolitical experts of Germany were formulating long-range plans.

Hitler was sold on the necessity of long-range planning as far back as the days when he began to dream in the Munich jail of Mein Kampf and conquest of the world.

The geopolitical planning of the Third Reich has been almost unbelievably thorough, and it would be senseless for us to suppose that this planning has not already instituted measures weakening our control of the Western Hemisphere.

We know also that as a part of this plan Hitler has encouraged Russia to look with covetous eyes on Alaska. We know that Hitler has goaded Japan to consider longingly the American and British possessions in the Pacific.

We know also that every one of our Latin-American nations has been listed in Hitler's Strategic Index of the Geopolitical Institute.

We know that there have been recreation camps built around Buenos Aires. We know that the long hand of German planning has been stirring up quarrels between the Americas. We know that South American leaders have been wined and dined by the Nazi leaders.

All of this brings us to one fact: Hitler has a plan of offense. We don't seem to have a plan of defense.

I believe we need a great defense laboratory, involving the Navy Department, the War Department, and the State Department, and embodying a first-class observation system.

It isn't enough for this administration to write our defense plans in the shifting sands of day-to-day expediency.

With reference to our South American relations, I do not believe you can buy South American friendship. South American friendship must result from mutual confidence, trust, and understanding, born of a common need. Economic leaf-raking will not bring us a good South American defense.

FOURTH, WE NEED A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT OUR MILITARY JOB MUST BE

Because our defense plans have never been clearly defined, and because we have never determined accurately what we want to defend, our military plans have been vague and indefinite.

At the time when selective-service legislation was considered, I spoke against the conscription bill. At that time—on September 14, 1940—I spoke against the idea of hysterically attempting to assemble a mass Army. I believe that the assembling of such a mass Army does not answer the problem.

I believe that the assembling of such an Army represents an antiquated idea today. I believe that it represents thinking in terms of 1914 rather than 1940.

Whatever we are going to defend, we may as well realize the fact that defense today is a different matter from 1918. Hitler's forces which broke the French line at Sedan; the forces which cut off the British and the Belgians in Flanders; the forces which conquered France's Army of 3,000,000 men; those fighting forces did not exceed 150,000 men.

I made that statement on the floor of the Senate in September of 1940, and a few days ago I was gratified to see it confirmed by the statement of a Member of the House subcommittee directly in charge of military appropriations.

I believe in the finest possible training for our Regular Army and National Guard. I believe in orderly training for an efficient Army protected by all of the weapons of mechanized forces, but I cannot subscribe to the haphazard idea that merely by assembling a huge semitrained Army we can intimidate smaller but highly efficient mechanized forces.

OUR NEED IS FOR MODERN MECHANIZED EQUIPMENT

Part of America's job today then is for modern mechanized equipment rather than for a tremendous Army of infantry and cavalry and field artillery. We need more motorized divisions. We need more armored divisions. We need more highly trained men to mobilize these motor divisions.

I am not interested merely in learning that we have a tremendous number of men being trained. I ask precisely the same question today that I asked on September 14, 1940, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day:

"Have they modern equipment, tanks, antiaircraft guns, and so forth? The answer is no. Has the Army a supplemental air arm such as the spearhead Hitler had? It will be remembered that he had 150,000 men equipped with super-land dreadnaughts, followed by tanks and mechanized units of men with machine guns, and over and above this land organization he had a synchronized air force of Stukas and bombers. Is our Army prepared in that way? The answer is no. Where is the equipment? Whose business was it to have it for the Army? Whose business was it to tell this country what we should have?"

Last year I said that the greatest job for our Army to accomplish was to make our forces blitzkrieg conscious. I say it again today.

"Let us be equipped and trained accordingly. Then take the National Guard and do likewise. We will then have 750,000 men in the third line of defense and if we get the first line—a Navy, invincible, with a coordinated air arm—and a second line of defense, another air fleet such as is being used now in Europe; and our third arm of defense, an Army of men properly trained, equipped, and mechanized, then nothing in the world will touch these shores."

I have voted against the administration's foreign-policy measures. That does not mean that I am not interested in America's defense. I believe that like many of you here today—we believe fervently in defense of those things we hold dear.

Merely because we do not subscribe to the administration's chest pounding does not mean that we are not realistic.

We are realistic. We can see the possibilities for trouble in South America, but we can also see the fact that a tremendous army alone would not be able to suppress such trouble. We know that the need there would be for a small highly mechanized efficient army like the Hitler panzer divisions.

We know that if the United States were ever invaded—and that may be impossible—we would need a mobile, efficient, mechanized army which could move rapidly. No foreign power could land a large army on our shores if we have a first line of defense—the Navy with coordinating air arms—and second line of defense, an independent air arm, and third line of defense, a sufficient number of mechanized divisions.

The Nation's job is to live today in terms of today and tomorrow rather than in terms of yesterday. A tremendous army of mere marching men is out of date. It is an expensive luxury, and moreover it is dangerous.

It constitutes a perpetual invitation to foolhardy action. It constitutes another danger—a danger to any man who is a part of any army which places its reliance on manpower rather than on mechanized power.

I have the most deep-rooted and wholesome respect for our military leaders. I have a profound regard for their patriotism and their loyalty. But, my friends, while I accept their moral integrity I cannot accept their mental lock step.

I cannot accept the "ruttist" approach of the military brass hats.

Defense today must be written in the mechanized terms of invention and initiative. Defense today is written in the progressive terms of today and tomorrow, not in closed minds, antiquated caste systems, and red tape.

They cashiered Wisconsin's own Billy Mitchell for his foresight. You will remember that some 15 years ago Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell, a good Milwaukeean, blasted the Army and Navy mossbacks with a scorching broadside for their criminal negligence and their bungling incompetency.

General Mitchell, a brilliant soldier and a pioneer flier, rebelled at the criminal blindness of his superiors. He urged the establishment of a separate air branch for national defense.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE AIR BRANCH FOR DEFENSE IMPERATIVE TODAY

I say to you today that the necessity which General Mitchell saw more than 15 years ago for the establishment of a separate air branch is more imperative than ever before.

Mitchell was a farseeing man. He commanded the A. E. F. air forces in France. He was convinced that the airplane would be a decisive factor in all future wars. More than a decade and one-half ago he advocated aerial torpedoes, parachute troops, troop-transport planes, heavy-gun combat planes, and air bases in Alaska.

On October 17, 1918, he urged troop transport and parachute armies, and a greater use of the tanks, and that was expert prevision. Mitchell was a prophet. He was ahead of his time. He never "pulled his punches." In 1920 he literally stunned officials in Washington with the statement that he could sink a battleship with airplane bombs. Rocking-chair admirals and swivel-chair generals scoffed at the idea, but they arranged a demonstration. He sank the dreadnaught which the infamous Von Tirpitz said could not be sunk.

Mitchell issued a bitter blast against the hide-bound officials who held down the development of the air defense of this country, and as a result he was arrested, court martialed, and suspended from the service for 5 years.

He was cashiered by what has been called a packed court. One of the greatest military minds of all time was crucified.

He was pilloried by military martinets. His ideas were stifled and his beliefs entombed. If he were alive today he could say, "I told you so." We know today that "where there is no vision, the people perish."

I fought for the vindication of Billy Mitchell in June of 1940, and I reopened the battle last month. I did so not because Billy Mitchell needs vindication. He stands vindicated at the great bar of public opinion.

I am fighting for his vindication because I don't want to see men like him crucified again in 1940 and 1941.

We must scrap outmoded ideas, red tape, and mossback thinking. We must insist on open minds, receptive to new ideas. We must slough off the dead timber in our military system. We cannot follow our outmoded thinking of yesterday.

If we are to defend America, we must think in terms of today and tomorrow. We need a great experimental laboratory to supplement the activities of our free forces of defense. We need to draw even more upon industry for the research experts who know more about some of our defense mechanisms than the War and Navy Departments themselves.

FIFTH, WE MUST GET OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

We must get it in order not simply for the immediate present, but for the period that is up ahead. We must get it so well buttressed that it will be able to stand the economic jolts of the economic war which will follow the European military conflict.

We are living today in what may be the twilight zone for free enterprise. It is my hope that our traditional system of free enterprise will emerge strengthened and revitalized from this twilight zone, but there is a menacing possibility that in the economic developments up ahead we may slip through the flimsy barriers of the twilight zone into a different period, where there may be no semblance of our traditional system of free enterprise.

We are today living in a "no man's land" somewhere between a free-enterprise past and an unknown future.

I believe that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the American system of free enterprise. I believe that too often we have an idea that the American system produces only an unwarranted concentration of wealth in a limited group of people.

I do believe that today there is too great a concentration of wealth and specifically too great a concentration in limited industries, but I believe we must also recognize the fact that our system has effected the most widespread distribution of the benefits of our type of economy.

AMERICAN WORKER GETTING A LARGER SHARE OF WHAT HE PRODUCES

Recently a great American corporation published its annual statement for 1940. The report recorded the history of this corporation for 39 years. It was organized in 1902, and from 1902 to 1910, inclusive, out of all the money to be divided between owners and workers—the workers got 65 percent. In the decade from 1911 to 1920 the workers got 73.4 percent, and from 1921 to 1930, 80.9 percent.

What is most impressive, however, is the fact that from 1931 to 1940 the workers received 94.6 percent of all the money to be divided between the owners and the workers.

Our system of free enterprise has enabled the American worker in each succeeding

decade to get a larger share of what he produces. That, to me, is an impressive reason for fighting to retain the American system of free enterprise. I feel that that, too, is a great part of America's job.

I might add also that employees of this corporation worked 21 percent less hours to earn 4 percent more wages in 1940 than was necessary during the boom year of 1929.

THERE MUST BE NO SEIZURE OF INDUSTRY BY GOVERNMENT

In the lands where this has been done the seizure of industry by Government has left a lengthening shadow of want, pillage, privation, starvation, terrorism, and stagnation.

We are in that twilight zone—that no-man's land where our future will be determined by the course we take now.

OUR FUTURE COURSE TO BE DIRECTED BY APPROACH TO DEFENSE ECONOMY TODAY

In my judgment, aside from the problems of Government ownership and Government control over business, our future course will be directed largely by our approach to defense economy today.

That approach must be a sane approach, and that also is part of America's job.

In the last World War Congress was never completely successful in preventing war profiteering. In 1916, 1917, and 1918, Congress was not completely successful in stopping inflation.

At the present time Congress will make the decisions on tax policies which will determine whether our fiscal policy is geared to the realities of the situation. At the present time we are making decisions which will determine whether or not we will have another group of war millionaires and whether or not we will have a new, unbridled orgy of inflation.

During the last World War inflation made $1 worth only 50 cents. During the last World War in 4 years we established a war debt of thirty-nine billions, and that debt without inflation would have been only thirteen billions.

We know that during the World War our taxes were never sufficient to meet the cost of the war and never enough to prevent war profiteers or to prevent inflation.

Our problem now is not to repeat the mistakes of the World War. At the present time our tax structure is overbalanced with levies on the consumer. In 1940 we hurriedly passed defense taxes.

MUST FACE TAX PROBLEM REALISTICALLY

I believe in a tax which has some relationship to the ability of taxpayers to pay. I don't believe in levying taxes merely because the line of least resistance says that it is easier and better politics to impose a hidden, indirect tax.

Probably the backbone for a wartime tax program ought to be an airtight excess-profits tax. Along with this tax there ought to be a progressive system of personal and corporation income taxes.

We all know that we have a much better chance of avoiding inflation if we "pay the freight" now. I don't like high taxes, but as long as we spend on a lavish scale we have to tax on a lavish scale. The way to cut down taxes is to cut our nondefense spending.

Our problem now is to do a sane job of social engineering in our fiscal policies, as we consider the tremendous new emergency tax structure.

That is a man-sized part of America's job.

I would like to emphasize one lesson which we should have learned after our experience in the first World War. We must begin thinking today about the conditions which will follow the present European conflict.

We know that the last World War brought inflation. We know that after that inflation there came deflation and depression. We know that they were periods of economic readjustment.

The unstable world economy makes it very probable that there may be a fierce economic war in the international markets. Whether we will be able to meet that economic war will be determined by the course we adopt at the present time.

It stands to reason that we will be in a better position to wage that economic war if we maintain our financial equilibrium today. We must not permit an inflation of prices. We must not permit a tremendous increase in the public debt.

We must continue to do everything we can to produce more at lower costs. We must shun the easy way of borrowing more and more funds.

We must reduce our nonmilitary expenditures. We must try to pay as much of the bill as we go. This is a vital part of America's job.

THE NATION'S JOB IS PREPAREDNESS TO MEET ANY MILITARY THREAT, ANY ECONOMIC WAR, OR ANY IDEOLOGICAL BATTLE

The Nation's job is essentially preparedness to meet any military threat, any economic war, or any ideological battle. Thus far we have discussed for the most part America's job as it confronts the Nation.

Let me emphasize, also, that the job which confronts the Nation must be done by individuals, and our success or failure in accomplishing America's job is bound up with our individual efforts. These efforts may not be military efforts, but they will require sacrifices nevertheless.

Wordsworth said: "Peace hath tests of manhood which battle never knew."

I am certain that in these troubled days we fully realize our responsibility. The obligation each of us owes to this Nation, to our concept of government, to the future of this Nation of which we are trustees, demands that you and I be fit—fit soldiers—to meet whatever emergency may arise.

It calls for vision, judgment—it calls for casting out intolerance and class hatred. It calls for perspective.

THIS IS A TIME WHEN EACH OF US CAN DO OUR PART TO CREATE UNITY THROUGH TOLERANCE

Our part is to create unity through a spirit of tolerance and understanding. This is not a time for wild-eyed intolerance—soap-box ranting.

This is possibly the bitterest social era the world has ever known. The part of the citizens today must not be to add to the world's bitterness, but to create a spirit of tolerant understanding.

It is written in Isaiah: "They helped every one his neighbor; and everyone said to his brother, Be of good courage."

This land of ours was founded in the belief that it was vital to rid ourselves of intolerance, hatred, bigotry, and persecution. We have not always been successful in that ideal. There have been periods of witch-hunting in American history; there have been periods of intolerance, sectionalism, and racial and religious rioting.

Lincoln lived in such a period, and he saw its dangers. It was Lincoln, on February 27, 1860, in his famous Cooper Institute speech, who said:

"Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper."

And, again, on March 5, 1860, at Hartford, Conn., Lincoln said:

"Our portions of this Confederacy should act in harmony and use careful deliberation."

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no greater appeal to the people of the United States in these troubled times than those words of Lincoln's, and so I say to you that the first part which we can play in national defense is a tolerant role—a role which seeks to mend the social fabric rather than tear it asunder by creating class castes.

WE CAN REAFFIRM ALLEGIANCE AND FAITH IN AMERICAN IDEAL

We, as citizens, can play a part in our defense program by reaffirming our allegiance and our faith in the American ideal, possibly in the words of the American Creed:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

In other lands, youth is bludgeoned into a dreary acceptance and finally into a fervently fanatical subservience to totalitarian philosophy. How much more inspiring will our crusade be, to create in every boy and girl of this land an intense loyalty to our way of life.

WE CAN PREPARE TO SACRIFICE

The average citizen can do his part in national defense by being prepared to sacrifice; and, I might add, government also must make sacrifices.

I hold no brief for those political gold-brick salesmen who evade their responsibility by letting the American people believe that we can retain our way of life without sacrifice.

These supersalesmen, these glib-tongued prophets of economic self-indulgence are literally playing politics with American lives and American homes when they refuse to tell the American people that they are facing sacrifices unprecedented in American history. I think this is the time to be prepared for a big jolt.

WE WILL HAVE TO MEET STAGGERING BILLS WITH HIGH TAXATION

All of this means that we are in for a period of sacrifice. We are going to have staggering bills with higher and more painful taxation.

WE CAN AID IN CURBING INFLATION

I believe that we can play a definite part in national defense and aid to Britain by doing everything in our power to curb inflation. If we do everything we can to prevent inflation, we will be making an outstanding contribution on the economic front.

I don't believe that the question of whether or not we have inflation is entirely dependent upon Government policy. I believe we, as individuals, can do a great deal toward maintaining stability. Probably the most obvious way in which we can help maintain stability is by deferring satisfaction of some of the wants which we are now able to gratify.

We can also make a contribution toward stability by saving and by refraining from going into debt. We know that the demands on the market will be heavy enough, without adding any demands based on abnormal borrowing.

In the past we have had booms, because of debt making. We have had depressions intensified by debt paying. The tremendous increase in our Government debt and the possibilities for private debt in our defense program involves very serious dangers. That makes it all the more necessary that the average citizen should resist the temptation to expand the individual debt.

WE CAN AVOID GOING INTO DEBT

That means that we individuals may have to buy out of current income instead of on the deferred-payment system. That means less credit and more cash purchasing. We know that it is easy to borrow at the present time, but if this borrowing is not conservative it may involve dangers to both the borrower and the lender, particularly in times of rising prices. Thrift is still a virtue. Debts still have to be repaid. The Government has not set a good example, but that does not alter the fact that we should.

I believe, also, incidentally that business can join with the citizen in a policy of exercising restraint in inventory accumulation.

OBLIGATIONS OF STATES AND CITIES

That means that cities and States must accumulate projects (not undertake them now) which will absorb the returning soldiers, sailors, and men who come from the defense plants when this war is over. It means that these cities and States must accumulate, during this period, reserves to take care of these projects. In other words, it means that cities and States should inculcate the doctrine of saving into their politics. For them as for individuals, I repeat—thrift is still a virtue.

WE CAN FIGHT SUBVERSIVE FORCES

Daniel Webster once said:

"There are persons who constantly clamor * * * They carry on a mad hostility against established institutions. They would choke up the fountains of industry and dry all its streams. In a country of unbounded liberty they clamor against oppression."

Against these subversive forces we can wage an effective battle. When we join in a spirit of unity with our fellow citizens our combined voice is the voice of public opinion—a force sometimes more potent than government itself.

John Milton once said: "Awake—arise—or be forever fallen."

Gentlemen, are the American people awake to all of the dangers which menace our way of life—the dangers from without and and the dangers from within?

I believe that recognizing these dangers the American people will answer the challenge they present—answer them individually and collectively in the ways we have discussed.

It is my fervent hope that out of the Gethsemane ahead, the United States and our way will emerge strengthened and revitalized, both to a recognition of our opportunities and our obligations.

I believe that our republic democracy is a dynamic living thing. That it may continue to work—and to grow—and to live—each citizen must dedicate his highest efforts.

Let me emphasize that in the ultimate analysis the Nation's job will be accomplished because of the strength and vitality of our American character. In the continued growth of that national character, each of us can play a role.

I do not subscribe to the dirge of defeatism. Regardless of what the immediate future may hold, I feel certain that America will accept the challenges and meet them fully.

It is my hope that in accepting those challenges, we will set a living example for the rest of the world, an example which I hope will be followed by other lands in that day, "When men shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Pensions for Widows and Dependents of Deceased World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my wholehearted support of H. R. 4. There is nothing nearer and dearer to the hearts of those of us who served during the World War than the widows and orphans and other dependents of our deceased comrades. This bill is merely a step toward rendering justice to these dependents, and provides somewhat more adequate compensation for the surviving dependent widows, orphans, and the dependent mothers and fathers of these deceased veterans.

The monthly compensation provided in the measure is as follows:

Widow but no child, $20; widow and one child, $28; widow and two children, $34 (with $4 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $12; no widow but two children, $18 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $24 (equally divided) (with $3 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $20; or both, $15 (each).

This measure has the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on World War Veterans. Some opposition has been voiced on the grounds of the expense. The cost of this measure will be relatively small. The Veterans' Administration has submitted an estimate of cost of the proposed measure for the first year, as follows:

	Number of cases	Estimated cost first year
Widows alone	29,300	$7,032,000
Widows with children	60,000	24,689,000
Children alone	20,800	4,199,000
Total	110,100	35,920,000
One-half cost	55,000	17,960,000
One parent	28,300	6,792,000
Both parents	4,900	1,764,000
Total	33,200	8,556,000
One-half cost	16,000	4,278,000
Estimated cost		22,238,000

This measure deserves to be passed without a dissenting vote.

St. Lawrence River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY BEFORE RIVERS AND HARBORS COMMITTEE ON H. R. 4927, GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT, JUNE 17 AND 18, 1941

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the testimony given before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House on the St. Lawrence River development, by Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, Assistant Secretary Berle, and others.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary of War STIMSON. So far as the benefits to this country at this time of emergency are concerned, as I see them in my Department, they are, first, the increase in our shipbuilding capacity by taking in the shipbuilding capacity on the Great Lakes; second, so far as transportation of munitions to Great Britain is concerned, there is a slight improvement, comparatively, in the distance which such munitions could be transported in a protected route. * * * Third, the great advantage is the fact that this waterway will produce an estimated total horsepower of 2,200,000. Now, that is a very important matter at this time of strain.

This horsepower produced by this proposed project is, I am informed by the engineers, the largest block of undeveloped power at one site in the United States, as well as the cheapest in its operation.

* * * I can only say that in my opinion it is necessary to prepare for a very long emergency. We all hope that it will be briefer, but it is not safe to act on hopes in such a case as confronts us today.

* * * There is a very good chance, a very strong chance, in my opinion, of the emergency lasting long enough to enable this country to reap the benefits of this construction of the seaway.

* * * I think the matter of electric power would certainly be a very large factor in the industrial development necessary to produce the mechanized warfare of the present day.

* * * I think the main bulk of the construction of this waterway is of a different matter and will use different materials than are involved in our present bottlenecks.

My estimate is that a very large part of the construction necessary for this project will not interfere with our defense program. A great deal of it will be excavation work and such as that which would not interfere with the bottlenecks we have at present.

When I saw the estimate of the engineers for the share of the United States cost of this project, which I think was $200,000,000, and when I contrasted that with some of the hundreds of millions that we are paying for various items of national defense, I thought this was quite a cheap project.

I think that, while I am aware of the enormous expenditures that this country faces, I believe that the emergency which it faces is so immensely more vital that we have got to take every possibility that we can to prepare for meeting that emergency successfully, even though we know that it is going to be a tremendous strain and burden on the United States to do so.

Secretary of State HULL (letter to the committee).—I am glad to inform you that I am in full accord with the proposed legislation and I trust that the bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Assistant Secretary of State BERLE. * * * The need, of course, of additional shipbuilding, in view of the losses due to the war, is well known. And, finally, the information in the possession of the Department appears to indicate that, should the Axis Powers be victorious, they would commence a shipbuilding race against the United States with the shipbuilding facilities of the entire European coasts, which are several times larger than our own. In that event, as indeed at the present, we should be faced with a situation in which every shipbuilding facility we might have and all that we could easily construct would be taxed to the limit.

Naturally, no one of us can predict the inscrutable future. All I can say is that there is no information in the Department which would lead to the belief that the present conflict will come to a speedy end. We have no basis which would lead us to

assume that there would be a rapid conclusion. We cannot, of course, say how long it would last.

* * * I should like to state that no responsible person in this Government would undertake to take any chances on its being of short duration. Whatever your possible guess might be the only sane, safe, and prudent course that responsible men could take would be to prepare for a long period of stress. And if a kindly providence lets us off we should be very happy.

In that regard I should think that the Secretary of War made the only answer that could be made, which is that every dictate of prudence, precaution, and foresight would require preparation for a very long period which would seem to be indicated by present circumstance.

* * * If we had had this (the seaway) in 1934 and the construction had now been finished, as it would have been, we should have had the huge resources of power; we should have had a tremendous accretion to our ferro-alloy and aluminum industries, either in existence or readily, very readily possible and, of course, we should have had the navigation resources of the Great Lakes ready at hand. I think every student agrees that it was a mistake from the point of view of the national defense, not to have done it in 1934.

* * * The only men that prophesied a speedy end to the war that I know of were the German high command, and they talk about that, naming a new date every few months or so. But we cannot, and we have to be prepared, then, for a long pull here.

* * * Were the entire continent of Europe to be mobilized against us, there would not be a single resource in the United States that we could afford to overlook. And if you want to have that when you need it, you are going to have to begin now, and not later. You cannot have any interference or handicaps in defense. It is a continuous process, and you have to have your material and your resources ready all the time. If there is a lag in between there, the consequence to the country might be such that I think you and I would not care to share the responsibility of it.

* * * The bulk of the materials that are needed are not materials in which there is any shortage, principally cement. The bulk of the labor is not the labor of which there is a shortage. A large part of it is unskilled. The skilled construction labor much of it will be freed in the coming months and years, as the defense plants which have been under construction cease to be construction jobs and go into operation, freeing those men.

* * * if we try to bear out a little here or have a special interest there, in an industry or a section, each for himself, what we propose quite rationally will be impossible to do, and therefore prevent this country from developing at the time when it needs it. The reference I have is that we would be headed for the same result as another sister republic. I can only say that that kind of reasoning is never permitted to enter into the consideration of a subject like this.

Secretary of Navy KNOX. My recent experience as Secretary of the Navy emphasizes in my mind what a great boon it would have been to national defense now if when this project was first proposed it had been agreed to and put into effect. If that had been done it would not have been only along the 12,000 miles of coast line that we now have scattered our shipyards for building combatant ships, but it would have been along additional thousands of miles of inland waters, completely safe from any dangers from without, where we could be building cruisers, destroyers, submarines right now.

There is an advantage in construction in the interior, not only one of security, one of nearness to raw materials and in a region where there is an abundance of skilled labor, but it would have been of tremendous advantage to me as the Secretary of the Navy, in letting these contracts for these combatant ships which we are now building in such large numbers, had this resource been available, as it might have been had this project been adopted then.

* * * we are going to live in a disturbed world for a long time, no matter what the outcome of the war may be, and in that world which is out of balance and struggling for a new and secure footing the control of the seas is going to be of immense importance.

Along with the development of modern sea power has come a new power—that of the air. To have a region in a time of turmoil and disturbance and of possible threatened war, where we could proceed with reasonable security in maintaining that predominance in sea power, which such a state of the world might require, would be an immensely invaluable national asset. So in your consideration of this whole question I hope you gentlemen will bear in mind the tremendously increased importance of sea power in the world for the next 25 or 50 years at least.

* * * I cannot in my judgment—in my opinion—overexaggerate, overemphasize, the importance to that entire region (the Midwest) of having access to salt water in vessels of sufficient size to carry their cargoes unbroken from the point of loading to the point of unloading.

All of you no doubt have studied Europe and visited Europe and are aware of how that intensified industrial region of middle Europe has developed its river communications. They are of first importance, for instance to Germany.

We are going to be living in a world thoroughly disjointed, pretty well destroyed by the activities of war for years after this war is over. * * *

I don't know how long this war will last. It is pure speculation. But this thing I think I can be fairly confident of: That the need for protection on the high seas will be here for a long time to come, and anything we do which will enable us to build more rapidly and particularly build more securely, and which will enable us to spread the work around the country in a more equitable fashion, I believe takes on the character of good, sound statesmanship.

Governor HERBERT LEHMAN of New York, * * * We have been frankly advised and have been put upon notice by the highest authorities of our Government, charged with responsibility for the national defense, that we are today faced with existing or threatened shortages in such essential materials and facilities as power, aluminum, railroad equipment, steel, and shipping. To every one of these needs the St. Lawrence project will contribute, either directly or indirectly, in a very substantial way.

The question, therefore, of sectional, local, or group advantages sinks into insignificance and is entitled to no consideration whatever at a time when we must utilize every means to contribute to the economic strength and security of our country and to protect our very way of life.

Careful study of the impartial and exhaustive reports of the Department of Commerce and other public agencies which have considered this project convince me that there is no foundation for the claims that the improvement of the St. Lawrence River will have a harmful effect upon our ports or existing transportation facilities. But even if these false and exaggerated fears were in any degree justified, we could not afford to trifle with our country's security by obstruction, on such narrow grounds, of a project which promises to contribute so much to the safety and well-being of the entire Nation.

* * * I think that it is tremendously important that we use every possible means that is available to us in our defense. I think you might say, What is the object of building a two-ocean navy when the Navy will not be ready—these new ships will not be ready—until 1946, 1947, or 1948? What is the use of putting in additional locks in the Panama Canal when they will not be completed for a number of years? But it is assuming now that we are going to require a defense in what Secretary Knox described this morning as a very disordered world. I think that this thing is going to be of very great use * * *. I think I would be willing to say vital.

Admiral GEORGE H. ROCK, Retired, U. S. N. * * * I visited four of the larger lake shipyards, those at Cleveland, Lorain, Detroit, and Toledo * * * the four yards visited have capacity, yard facilities and plant to build the larger ocean-going ships which they could build if there was channel to the sea through the St. Lawrence waterway project * * * they could build destroyers and small craft but I found that, in my judgment, the two larger yards anyway, at the River Rouge and Lorain plants, could build now the 10,000-ton 8-inch gun cruisers and, of course, the smaller cruisers.

There is to this say about the yards which may not have been brought out before, and that is that they are well equipped, well organized, well staffed shipbuilding yards. They are going concerns and they have been going concerns, some of them, for 40 years. * * *

There is a great liability to stress much too strongly the thought that by the time we get the St. Lawrence waterway project finished we will not need this additional shipbuilding capacity that we will have acquired.

I cannot think of anything more shortsighted or more foolish from my viewpoint, than that. I am old enough to have lived through the Spanish-American War, and, of course, our first World War and now we are well into this war that is spreading everywhere, but in our own country. The one dominating demand in our country and by our people has been for ships and more ships—a continuous output of ships, and it seems to me that if with all these experiences so recent, we cannot have the ability to plan a moderate distance ahead and be prepared for what may happen when the next war comes, then I think we are woefully shortsighted.

* * * I consider the waterway a matter of a very great national asset and a project which adds to our national safety and for that reason I consider it of the utmost importance, regardless of whether we finish it before this present war ends or not.

Meeting of the American Business Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. THURMAN W. ARNOLD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, some days ago I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the

RECORD a very able address delivered by Hon. Thurman W. Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, before the meeting of the American Business Congress in New York City on June 13, 1941. The address, which deals with the problem of the practical exclusion of small business enterprise in the program of national-defense production, slightly exceeded the limit of two printed pages. The estimated cost is $112.50. I renew the request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a war between industrial armies, not between military armies. It is a war in which the country which produces the fastest will win. It is a test to see whether an industrial democracy can make itself more efficient than a dictatorship.

The backbone of our industrial democracy is the small businessman. It is in small business that the great bulk of both production and distribution is found. Small business must pay the taxes to keep our war effort going. Indeed, it is for the existence of small business as against economic dictatorship that we will be fighting if we get into this war.

Today the small businessman needs representation in Washington by a governmental agency devoted to his interest as he has never needed it before. If he does not have such representation he is going to be crushed by the forces which always operate when a nation is in such a hurry to expand production that it turns to a few established groups which dominate our industrial structure. When we turn exclusively to such groups we not only destroy our industrial democracy, we also slow up production itself. This is shown by the grand jury investigations of big business cartels which the Antitrust Division is conducting today. Of course, big business is not unpatriotic. I will not say either that its loyalty is divided, but I do say that it instinctively fears expansion. It fears that overproduction will hurt its dividends after the war is over. Expansion may mean that its dominating position will be lost. Letting the little fellow in means future competition and lower prices. Above all, big business thinks that it alone can do the job. Such patterns of thought have resulted in the sluggish tempo of advance that have put the great industrial democracies so far behind Germany in the race for production of basic supplies.

For example, there are very few small independent fabricators of aluminum or magnesium today. Why is this? It is because the Aluminum Co. of America first obtained a monopoly upon the supply of that essential product. It then sold ingots to independent manufacturers at about 100 percent more than its own cost. This margin enabled the Aluminum Co. at any time it desired to go into the manufacturing business itself, continue to make a profit, and squeeze out immediately any independent that it allowed to get started.

Even the collapse of France failed to wake up the aluminum industry to the dangerous shortage which their policy of limiting production had created. Last fall, when the Antitrust Division was attempting to prove a shortage of aluminum for war needs, the Aluminum Co. of America denied it. Wishful thinkers in industry, instinctively fearing overproduction of basic materials, swallowed those statements with relief. The story was broadcas in the press that it was unpatriotic to suggest an impending shortage of aluminum. And thus the pressure to build up competing production was relieved.

Now we know there is a shortage, but we could have saved precious time and precious materials had we not listened to the wishful thinking of the men whose financial interest lay in preventing new production in order to preserve their monopoly control after the war.

But the same patterns of thought, the same fear of competing production, the same antiproductive ideas have made our economy sluggish and slow to respond to the need in other basic materials.

Last year steel was already running from 92 to 97 percent capacity. But those in control of the industry did not like to think of a coming shortage because it meant we should have to build new plants, each of which would be a competitive threat to the orderly control of the industry after the war by those already established in it.

In other words, perhaps we had better not build up the steel production that we so imperatively need today because it might give steel to buyers of automobiles and tin cans and steel construction at too low prices after the war. Steel companies during the war should not be expected to expand plants which might hurt their dividends after the war.

Last February the expected survey of steel appeared. Unconsciously colored by the antiproductive interests of the closely knit group that did not wish their control disturbed, it gave the impression that no more plants were needed. It estimated there would be a surplus for both civilian and defense needs in 1941 and even in 1942. No hurry for new production—no pressure on the dominating group to expand. So only 3½ percent additional plant capacity was planned. But only a month after the report, with the war program still in its early stages, steel operations reached 99 percent of capacity. Now we know there isn't enough steel. Yet the industry is still reluctant to expand.

One of the reasons given for not expanding was that we could turn back to the obsolete Bessemer process and put obsolete equipment into production. This is exactly the same mistake England made in the breathing space before the blitzkreig, when they thought it better to keep obsolete mills in operation rather than to expand modern methods.

Let me give one final example. Gerald Firth, president of the Firth-Stirling Steel Co., stated in 1941:

"The control of the tungsten carbide patents by the General Electric Co. and the Krupp Co. has resulted in keeping the price at exorbitant levels. Now, when the emergency has come, industry has not learned how to use tungsten carbide and has not the machines, the skilled men, or the technique which it would have had if the material had been available at the same low price at which it was available to German industries."

The Antitrust Division indicted the General Electric Co. and the Krupp Co. in New York. Immediately the cost of tungsten carbide dropped from $205 a pound to $48 a pound even in an emergency demand. Tungsten carbide is still in an experimental stage in this country. We have not developed it as Germany has because we have never allowed the competitive small businessman to have a chance at the metal. It will take at least a year to make up the loss because we wouldn't allow the small competitive businessman to get into the picture.

I can give many more illustrations but these are enough to prove my point. We will get no real expansion of production until we free the market so that the competitive force of small business, each anxious to produce and get a share for itself, may operate. New enterprise does not have accumulated capital structures to pay dividends on. It knows that it must be better than its competitors in order to survive. It cannot restrict production even if it wanted to because it lacks the power to dominate the market.

We will fail in our defense program if small business and new enterprise is not allowed to share in defense orders. And not only will we fail but we will destroy the system of independent competitive enterprise which we are trying to defend.

In other words, we must let little business into the picture. I am here to tell you that little business cannot get into the picture without protection. It is not sufficiently organized to get that protection for itself. There is, however, one instrumentality in the Government, backed by 50 years of tradition, which stands ready to free the market for new enterprises. That instrumentality is the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

This is a generalization. Let's get down to concrete cases. What are the practical dangers which confront small business and how can they be guarded against?

First, there is the system of priorities in basic materials which have to be imposed because past neglect has led to present shortages. Today hundreds of small factories are finding themselves in difficulty because last year we hid our heads in the sand and refused to recognize the fact that a disastrous shortage of aluminum was already on us. This is happening in other basic materials.

But if we allow matters to take their course, if small business is not represented by an independent agency of government, each priority will have a tendency to hit the big factory first, each scarcity report on raw materials may forget the hundreds of small businesses that need them. The increases of cost will be felt by the little man in his labor and in his raw materials, and each upward surge in price will squeeze him either against an administrative price ceiling or against the buying habits of his customers. And incidentally, it will be the small businessman whom the consumer will blame for all the price spirals of the war. Unless there is some organized effort to represent the interests of small business, to see that priorities are not used in such a way that they lead to monopoly control, little business may have to go out of business. It is the duty of the Antitrust Division to keep abreast of this problem of small business and to work in cooperation with other defense agencies to see that the man who cannot afford an agency in Washington is not swept out of the picture by the persuasive ability of those already established in the industry combined with the pressure for speed on those directing the defense effort.

The second hazard to small business is the danger that he will not be allowed to share in the production for national defense. This will not be the fault of those in charge of production if they are not furnished guidance and advice from that public defender of the small businessman, the Antitrust Division. They do not have time to consider all problems. In great emergencies with shortages of material and labor only the most vocal, to wit, the largest elements of business, can make themselves heard. Washington corridors are so long that those who are not trained to find their way are lost. What was more natural, for example, than to call on the Aluminum Co. in the early stages of the defense production to supply all new capacity for aluminum. It was almost treason 6 months ago to suggest that the small businessman might be able to produce aluminum if you gave him the chance. The same is true of other essential materials, including zinc, copper, manganese and steel. Where the small businessman is frozen out on his orders, on his supplies, on his labor, on his transportation problems, it is not delivered. It is only the result of the short-time line of least resistance.

Let me give you a case history taken from the syndicated column of that brilliant commentator, Ernest Lindley, published on May 23. I quote:

"Here is a brief case history which illustrates two of the most serious criticisms of the direction of our defense production program. It is the experience of the head of a midwestern manufacturer of brass, aluminum, and zinc castings and stampings.

The firm has 460 employees, including an engineering staff and 16 tool-and-die makers, and about 200 machine tools. Its normal business is making such things as parts for refrigerators. The firm is in excellent financial condition. Until recently it was working around the clock: some departments on three shifts and others on two 10-hour shifts.

Some months ago its president sized up the dimensions of the defense program and decided they would put a dent in his regular business. He saw that there probably would not be enough brass, zinc, and aluminum to meet all civilian needs. He suspected also that considerable amounts of steel would have to be diverted from civilian to military channels. Some of his business friends belittled his fears, but as the days passed and it became harder to get the metals he needed, he set out to try to get some defense business.

Knowing a little about the Government and the defense agencies—which are completely unknown to many small manufacturers—he lost no time in learning what steps he should take.

He was told to offer his services as a subcontractor to the large concerns which had the big defense orders. He was informed that the policy of O. P. M. was to bring these smaller facilities into use by encouraging the big concerns to subcontract parts.

So he wrote to a selected list of prime contractors—500 in all—stating exactly what his plant was set up to do. He did not get even one serious nibble, much less a subcontract.

He filed with the Defense Contract Service Office in Detroit a complete survey of his plant. All he got there was a suggestion that he write to the other regional offices, making sure that he told them he had already been in touch with the Detroit office, since otherwise his letters would be forwarded to Detroit.

Finally the Detroit office invited him to submit bids on two fuses for the British. Neither was of a type that previously had been manufactured in this country. Of the 200 machines in his plant, 8—all automatic screw machines—could be used in making the fuses. He submitted a bid, but with it the statement that he could not produce the fuses unless he also got business to keep the rest of his plant going.

Meanwhile, the real pinch has come in supplies of metals. He can get almost no brass, zinc, and aluminum. His refrigerator-making clients have realized that they are going to have to find substitutes—including substitutes for a large amount of steel—or else suspend production.

Last week our exhibit X had to lay off his night shift. His 18 highly skilled tool and die makers are idle.

He has machines and men of exactly the type and training desperately needed for defense production. But they are not being used. And unless they are put to work quickly, he will have to suspend business entirely and let his organization go to pieces.

Early this week, he arrived in Washington to make the rounds of the defense agencies—the Army, the Navy, and O. P. M. He received sympathetic hearings, but, up to the time this was written, no action.

Billions of dollars' worth of defense orders have been poured forth, largely into big corporations. Huge new plants are being built from the bottom up at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. The machine-tool industry is staggering under a record-breaking load of orders.

Here is a plant ready to go. It has the machines, the trained men, the engineers, and management. It doesn't need a dollar from the Government, either for expansion or working capital. It can make any number of items important to defense without adding even so much as one machine to its equipment, and with a few new machines here and there its scope could be greatly expanded.

It is organized and manned for two and three-shift operation, while many other producers are still working only one shift.

Our exhibit X is confident that there are hundreds, perhaps several thousands, of small manufacturers who are getting caught in this double squeeze. Many are less well equipped than he is to move immediately into defense production. But, for lack of metal for civilian use, they will have to suspend operation and disband their organizations. Whether they would ever come to life again is doubtful.

What was the trouble? Who is to blame for this situation? The O. P. M.? Emphatically not. The agency devoted to production in a hurry cannot find the time to take care of the problems of monopoly control at the same time. The trouble was that this businessman and the public generally did not know that the Antitrust Division is set up to see that the monopoly tendencies illustrated in this case history did not occur. No complaint was sent in. Where complaints have been sent in we have been able to get results. For example, the McKeesport Bulletin of May 10 contains an announcement by Mr. Philip McKenna, president of the McKenna Metals Co., that at the present time his production is 10 times as great as it was a year ago; that he has 182 employees who operate 24 hours a day and 6 days a week, that his rates of pay have advanced. If it had not been for the action taken by the Antitrust Division Mr. McKenna's company would have been unable to survive because of a private N. R. A. code formulated, dominated and policed by the General Electric Co. Mr. McKenna generously gives us credit in the following statement:

"The present test of the productive strength of free enterprise under American principles against the productive strength of dictatorship-controlled people will prove the effectiveness of private initiative and free workers in the present struggle for the future of the world. It may be remembered that the McKenna Metals Co. owes its existence to protection under American law, and that the Department of Justice disclosed the monopolistic practices contrary to American antitrust laws."

The third thing that is going to hit the small businessman is restrictions on the distribution of necessities and artificially fixed prices. At first glance it may appear that the small businessmen are fabricators and distributors, and can pass the increase on to the consumer. Unfortunately for you, however, the consumer has an out—he can tighten his belt and go without, while you whistle. Even where consumers have increased purchasing power to spend on higher prices, yet their old price habits will squeeze you against price ceilings if artificially fixed distribution costs are not eliminated. For example, in the Rocky Mountain region lumber and cement prices were higher than anywhere else in the country, due to the fact that no one who did not belong to the ring and follow its policy could get a foothold in business. Only antitrust prosecutions will clean up situations such as this.

Small business need not fear efficiency of mass production. Where the savings of large organizations are passed on to consumers the increased purchasing power which results from making the consumer's dollar go further will give opportunity to thousands of small businessmen. But where there is an artificial spread or a restriction of production the small businessmen will disappear because they cannot survive in a dominated market.

In the scarcity period ahead little businessmen without protection will become littler unless there is an organization to protect their interests, which also happen to be the interests of consumers.

And, finally, there is another set of organizations restricting production and keeping more efficient methods out of the market against whom small business must have the protection of the Sherman Act. I am referring to the middlemen of labor, the unions that control transportation, installation, and distribution, who have gotten themselves into a position that they may tell consumers what they may buy and businessmen what they may sell; who determine what goes into a house; who determine the cost of distribution of food products in large cities. I am not talking about strikes in the defense area. This is an entirely different problem. It is a problem which affects chiefly the small businessman and consumers.

Labor organizations today—I do not say all labor organizations, but some—are putting protective tariffs around cities. They are restricting skills. They are preventing the use of more efficient methods; they are charging the small businessman for unnecessary labor; they are preventing the use of more efficient materials; they are crushing small businessmen in jurisdictional wars between rival unions; and, finally, by the force of coercion, they are eliminating entirely from the field such new enterprise as they desire to keep out.

For example, in one large city recently a labor leader told some contractors that they could not go into business at all; in another, three manufacturers were forced out of business. One small businessman in a large city attempted to redecorate his display rooms. He was not allowed to use a spray gun to put on paint because it was too fast. The telephone union wouldn't enter the place until the painters got out. The electrician union would not work until the telephone union got out. And, finally, to cap the climax, when he wanted to move in some refrigerators, the teamsters' union delivered them to the curb, and he had to get another union to haul them in. He told me that it took him almost double the time and cost 50 percent more in this time of rising prices.

I quote from the bylaws of a bakers' union, located in a large city, which is typical of what some unions are doing:

"Article 6, section 7:

"Whenever in the judgment of the Bakers Local Union 118 any firm or combination of firms are engaged in unfair or unwarranted competition for trade and in the selling of bakery products and against the best interests of the bakery industry, it shall be authorized and it shall be its duty to have such practices stopped even to the extent of withdrawing our members from employment of such concerns as will persist in such detrimental and ruinous practices.

"WM. WARNER POOLE.
"J. A. SMITH.
"CHAS. N. MILLER."

I quote from testimony given in an investigation of another union verbatim, except I left out the names:

"A prominent labor leader said in the presence of all those at this conference: 'Why don't you fellows get wise and play ball with us. You know that prices for your products in your home State are too low and you ought to do something about it. If you do, we can control the price of these products in your State just as we do in the two adjoining States. We can control them through combinations with the teamsters' union. It

will take time. It may take a year or two, but this can be done by raising the prices 5 or 10 cents at a time.'"

What is the use of talking about protecting small businessmen and consumers against price spirals in the face of a situation where unions are permitted to impose protective tariffs, keep out more efficient methods and materials, to crush small businessmen between the claims of rival unions in which the businessmen have no concern, and to eliminate such small businessmen that they do not happen to like. Under recent Supreme Court decisions, the unions claim that they are completely immune to many prosecutions for restrictive practices of the character I am describing. Thus given their head, these practices are increasing all over the United States. They are not accompanied by strikes because strikes are unnecessary. The unions able to exercise this power are unions like the teamsters, the carpenters, the glaziers, the electricians; unions connected with the distribution and processing of food. Such unions stand between the consumer and the producer. They have the same power that a railroad would have if we allow railroads to tell businessmen and consumers in New York City what could be shipped in.

In the furore which has been created by defense strikes this exploitation of consumers and small businessmen has been forgotten in the public press. But the Antitrust Division has not forgotten them. We are trying to bring it to the attention of business and I am trying to bring it to your attention now, so that necessary amendments to the law can be had to compel powerful labor organizations to confine themselves to the legitimate purposes of those organizations.

We are for the legitimate purposes of those organizations, and we regard such organizations as a part of the competitive system which we are trying to protect. We have no desire to limit the right to strike for wages, hours, health, safety, collective bargaining or any legitimate purpose. We simply are trying to protect the small businessmen from being crushed and the consumer from being exploited to gain objectives which have no connection with any purpose of a reasonable labor movement.

No one defends these practices, not even the labor leaders. They say, however, that they do not trust the courts to decide such simple questions as the difference between compelling the employer to use unnecessary labor on the one hand and enforcing rules of safety, health, and the prevention of speed-up systems on the other hand. I reply, that democracy is in danger when any powerful organization stands before the public and says that it cannot trust the courts.

Congress has recently shown its realization of the importance of the problems dealt with by the Antitrust Division by increasing our appropriation about 60 percent. We must build an organization for greater service to small businessmen and to consumers. We are going to use part of this appropriation to set up a separate section in the Antitrust Division which will contact business organizations so that the Division can become a more efficient public defender and public agent of the small businessmen, who otherwise might be lost in the complexities of the vast organization in Washington.

That organization will have the following functions: First, it will try to be a clearing house of complaints from small businessmen all over the country. It will offer an office to which small businessmen can present their complaints in absolute confidence, it will offer them a skilled service in order to solve their problems where those problems concern monopoly control. It will use all the forces of law at the disposal of the Division in order to get small businessmen into the market and to free them from the restrictions of organized groups

This organization in the Antitrust Division will not be effective without the help of groups like your organization. You must organize and let your members know that a public defender for your interests does exist and that they can come to us for relief.

We have been assured of complete cooperation from the Office of Production Management and from Mr. Leon Henderson's Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply. We will not work in opposition to these defense agencies but we will aid them. They are as interested in getting full production from both large business and small business as we are. They are interested in the assistance which the Antitrust Division can give them to these ends. Large business has always had offices in Washington, small business has not. The Antitrust Division is going to try to fill that gap. We will be successful if small business will organize to help us.

All of us, inside and outside of Government, want to cooperate in the great national-defense effort. Cooperation is not easy. The techniques of cooperation involve the highest kind of statesmanship. If this were a dictatorship each one of us would be told what to do and we would not have any responsibility of our own. But this is not a dictatorship, and our free enterprise democratic system forms the framework for our defense program. This means that each one of us has a responsibility to discover how we can fit into this tremendous program of production. With your help, the Antitrust Division intends to see that the small businessman can play his part.

The So-Called Union Now Movement

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that a well-financed, well-organized but very small minority group, masquerading under the title of "Union Now" is attempting to destroy our independence and our system of government by actively advocating an immediate coalition under a supergovernment with England and her dominion colonies.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress either by separate committee or through the Dies committee should investigate the background of this organization known as Union Now. Let us find out who is furnishing the money and who are the people that are putting in ads in the newspapers all over America demanding that we surrender our Constitution and our form of government. I am glad that the editor of one of the leading newspapers of my district has written a timely editorial on this subject.

His comment is as follows:

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of June 17, 1941]

WE WILL NOT SURRENDER

From an organization of women in the East comes the statement that a recent poll showed that 5 percent of the women who answered a questionnaire, favored a union with the British, carrying us back to the days before separation with the mother country.

So far as the two governments are concerned there is little in common. The United States is a democracy, the outgrowth of a free and independent Nation that rebelled against oppressive acts of the mother country.

In the present crisis some people forget the price we paid to gain our liberty, and it is well to recall history, if no other reason than to renew our pledge to George Washington, the Father of Our Country, and to hold high the torch of liberty which has been a sustaining force in the United States.

The questionnaire was sent to every section of the country, and it is not at all surprising that a sprinkling of our citizens—5 percent voted as they did. This Nation, the melting pot of the world, has within its borders those who still fail to recognize that they can serve but one country. Some still hold with Hitler, others think in terms of England, and so we could name minorities favorable to every nation on the face of the globe. To all of these we would say you have cast your lot here in America, and loyalty demands that you support but one government and one flag—these United States and Old Glory.

The surprising part of the Union Now movement which brought about a vote of 5 percent for merging the two countries—the United States and England came largely from the Eastern and New England States, formerly comprising the colonies. This is all the more surprising, when you consider that American liberty was born as the result of the heroism of the men and women of the Colonies who fought oppression and dethroned it.

In this European war it is natural that people will take sides, for dictatorship has little or no appeal on this side of the water. But to advocate a union of England and the United States, would be suicide for our form of government.

The Declaration of Independence is a live and living document, with certain truths that we cannot, no we must not forget. Let us quote:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government.

* * * "When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present king of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having, in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. * * *

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

If the Declaration of Independence is not a sustaining influence which should guide us in keeping faith let me quote from Daniel Webster:

"My judgment approves this measure and my whole heart is in it. All that I have, and all that I am, and all that I hope, in this life, I am now ready here to stake upon it: And I leave off as I began, that, live or die, sur-

vive or perish, I am for the Declaration of Independence. It is my living sentiment, and by the blessing of God it shall be my dying sentiment, independence now, and independence forever!"

If we forget the words of the Declaration of Independence, our Daniel Webster and the men who made this declaration come true by their heroic action on the field of battle, then we do not deserve to enjoy the fruits of a free democracy. To turn back the pages of history to despotism would be renouncing all that the ages have given us—our Washington and our Lincoln.

We will fuse only with those who come to our shores and are true Americans. In this crisis we will meet every issue and we will fight every effort made to take away the liberty given us by men like Patrick Henry, who said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

This is our answer to the movement for a union with any other country.

We are building our defenses to the end that any threat from anywhere in the world to our liberty will be met and defended. Let us keep our feet on the ground and follow the worthy example set by the founders of the colonies—later the United States of America.

EDITOR PRESS.

Closing of German Consulates

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the people of this country are applauding the President for the action taken in regard to the strike situation and also for closing the German consulates in this country. Both of these acts will have a remarkable effect, but I do not think that the job is nearly done. When the strikes are settled I am afraid that we are going to have a wave of sabotage, and I am not the only one of this belief. Many Members of this House, and also high officials, are of the same opinion. With this in view, I have introduced a bill making sabotage a death penalty upon the recommendation of a jury. We are holding hearings on this bill before the Judiciary Committee tomorrow morning at 10:30 and I will appreciate any support which the Members may offer on this bill. In addition to this I have also sent letters to the President and Secretary of State today suggesting that they inform the German Government that Wilhelm Tannenberg, first secretary in the Germany Embassy in Washington, is persona non grata and that the Government recall him at once. I think that Tannenberg is another Boy-ed and should be gotten out of this country.

The letter to the President follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American people are applauding the action of the State Department and the President in closing the German consulates in this country and tightening the regulations for admission of visitors from Germany or any other countries dominated by the Nazis. At the same time they are looking forward to a general housecleaning.

I suggest that one step in ridding this country of dangerous men would be for the President and the State Department to inform the German Government that Wilhelm Tannenberg, first secretary to the German Embassy in Washington, is persona non grata and request his recall immediately.

I may point out that over a period of years Wilhelm Tannenberg was the representative of the German Government, before the German American Mixed Claims Commission, on the Black Tom and Kingsland, N. J., sabotage cases. In addition to this Wilhelm Tannenberg assisted some years ago in the organizing of German-American bunds or at least similar organizations in this country. He finally withdrew because of pressure.

Wilhelm Tannenberg could take the position that he should not stand convicted because he represented his Government in these sabotage cases or because he was active in assisting in the establishment of German-American bunds, but I may point out that in confidence prominent people in Washington and high officials in Government who are in position to know Wilhelm Tannenberg are convinced that he is a very brilliant man and that he would not hesitate one moment in taking action that would assist his government to the detriment of our national defense, if he were convinced he could not be convicted of his acts.

I would also like to say that while the Government's action in having the Army take over the Inglewood, Calif., aircraft factory and its strong stand concerning further hampering of the defense program will no doubt have a very remarkable effect on subversive activities, it is my opinion and the opinion of many others that when the strikes are settled we will have a wave of sabotage throughout the country, and it would not surprise me at all if Wilhelm Tannenberg were to become the chief agent of the German Government in directing these activities. I therefore firmly suggest that for the best interest of this country the President and the State Department ask the German Government to recall Wilhelm Tannenberg, and at the same time that the actions of the German Embassy in Washington be watched closely.

With kindest regards, I beg to remain.

Respectfully,

JOE HENDRICKS.

Protecting the Women of the District of Columbia

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the mothers of this Nation are shocked and terrified over the unsolved criminal assaults upon and murders of young women in Washington. In the District of Columbia working for their Government are young women from every State and Territory of this Union. We in Congress are determined that their stay in the District shall be safe. We in the Congress have confidence in the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives. I personally hope that our District Committee will put aside everything else and concentrate its efforts upon the solution of these unsolved murders. If additional detectives are needed and if certain streets should be better lighted, let us provide the necessary legislation immediately.

Incidentally the committee should know that eight policemen are detailed every moment of the day and night to protect a little group of picketeers before the home of the President of the United States.

For about 6 weeks now the police have permitted a group of publicity seeking, nonworking morons to parade in front of the home of our President bearing placards denunciatory of our Chief Executive. Residents and visitors here become righteously indignant over the reprehensible tactics of these paraders. They are disturbing the home life of our President. Whether you support or oppose his domestic or foreign policies, you will concede that he is entitled to have his home life respected. Furthermore, the White House is an American shrine. Constituents of mine from Ohio bringing their children here—perhaps upon the only trip they will ever make to the Capital of their country—are distressed and angered to see this ugly, un-American group of parading picketeers the first and last time they look at the White House.

These police officers detailed to afford protection to a publicity seeking, un-American group who are abusing the right to peaceably assemble and petition, which every American enjoys, could be detailed to more important work in preventing crimes of violence and making the streets of Washington safe for women who live and work here.

Each morning as long as this picketing parade lasts, a patrol wagon should gather in the picketeers and their placards and haul them to the police station for investigation. Are they citizens? What are they doing in Washington? Are they suspicious persons? Are they vagrants? Why are they not working? Who pays them to picket? Don't they know if they picketed any embassy they would be thrown into jail immediately? Have they ever been arrested and convicted of crimes? These and other questions should be hurled at them. Then for those against whom there are grounds for further detention, I would suggest that the police place appropriate charges. The others could be released after about 6 hours' detention, preferably in an inside room without any air-conditioning advantages; and a patrol wagon driver and one policeman should continue this process each day until the President's home is respected. Let this un-American group picket the Capitol and the House and Senate Office Buildings if they feel they must undertake picketing exercises. The mothers of this Nation and women who work and live here should have protection ahead of a communistic group of picketeers.

Section 117 of the Code of the District of Columbia forbids, among other things, crowding, obstructing, or incommoding—

The free use of any such street, avenue, alley, road, highway, or any of the foot pavements thereof or the free entrance into any public or private building or enclosure.

Possibility of Increased Federal Gasoline Tax Viewed With Apprehension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the serious practical difficulties which confront the public authorities in the raising of revenues are appreciated fully, because a few years ago I had the good fortune to have been selected as State commissioner of taxation and finance by Gov. Prentice Cooper during his first term of office in Tennessee. Because of this background of practical experience, moreover, there is even a more natural tendency for my attention to be focused more forcefully upon considerations of equity and justice in apportionment of the tax burden than otherwise might be the case.

HIGH STATE LEVIES

Tennessee is one of the three States which collect the highest gasoline tax in the Nation, 7 cents per gallon. The other two are Florida and Louisiana. For this reason alone residents of Tennessee believe that they are qualified eminently to participate actively in any discussion of gasoline taxation.

SIZABLE BONDED DEBT

There may be some wonderment as to the specific reasons why such high rates of taxation are imposed upon gasoline in Tennessee. The answer is mainly the same one which is found in several of the other Southern States; that is, sizable bonded debt for highways. In Tennessee, for example, the State's share of the gasoline tax, which amounts to 5 cents of the 7 cents, specifically is pledged in its entirety for retirement of these bonds. Fortunately for the State and its highway system, in recent years all of the revenue from this portion of the tax has not been required for this particular purpose. As a result it has been possible to utilize the excess in maintenance of the highway system and, through matching of available Federal aid, to carry on a limited program of new construction as well. The remaining 2 cents of the tax is allocated to the counties for their use in improvement of secondary roads.

POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF INCREASED FEDERAL TAXATION

Citizens in Tennessee are inclined to view with disfavor any further increase in the Federal gasoline tax for certain very cogent reasons. They recognize only too clearly that any such action conceivably might affect the revenue producing capacity of their own State tax. If that should happen, then the State and its citizenry would be confronted with either of two eventualities. In the first place, the State's ability to meet payments of interest on its outstanding debt and the prompt retirement of maturities as now scheduled might be made more difficult. Likewise the continued improvement of the county roads also might be affected because of the direct dependence of these local units upon their 2-cent share of the gasoline tax for this purpose. In the one case, the State's position from a fiscal standpoint might be made more difficult; in the other, the counties might be required to forego certain improvements in roads which may be needed badly.

POSSIBLE NULLIFICATION OF BENEFITS OF T. V. A.

It is with mingled feelings that this plea is being presented. Because my constituency is in the heart of the region benefited most directly by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the far-reaching benefits which have been conferred upon the populace through such beneficences of the Federal Government are appreciated thoroughly. This factor in itself, however, prompts even stronger emphasis of the inequity involved in an increased Federal gasoline tax.

Through the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority many of my constituents have begun to enjoy life for the first time. Transportation by truck and the private automobile are relied upon to an unusual degree in this area. Increased Federal taxation of gasoline, therefore, when added to the very high rates which residents of this area even now must pay to the State, therefore, would tend to preclude further extension of the use of these media of transportation and thereby might nullify much of the progress which has been achieved by the Federal Government in this area. It is difficult to understand why the same government which has conferred such marked benefits upon the residents of Tennessee on the one hand now suddenly should forestall full enjoyment of these same benefits with the other hand.

INEVITABLE CONCLUSIONS TO BE DRAWN

Certain inevitable conclusions, therefore, must be drawn from the above discussion. One is that such increased Federal taxation would impose a further burden upon residents of Tennessee in addition to the one which they now must bear in order to provide the State and the counties with required funds for highways. The other is that it is difficult to envisage the logic of the Federal Government's endeavoring to confer benefits upon the people of Tennessee through the T. V. A. on the one hand, and then nullifying many of those benefits through unwise taxation on the other. So far as residents of Tennessee are concerned, therefore, the only possible conclusion which can be drawn is that any increase in the Federal gasoline tax would be most adverse in its effects upon the State and the citizenry.

Denison Dam Decision of United States Supreme Court Points Way to Inevitable Arkansas Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTHWEST AMERICAN, FORT SMITH, ARK.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the United States Supreme Court on June 2 upholding the authority of Congress in its effort to harness the Red River and to build the Denison Dam points the way to the inevitable Arkansas Valley authority—or some other authority, by whatever name it is known.

Herewith, I insert a most excellent editorial from the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark.:

[From the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark.]

DENISON DAM WINS

All the Southwest is vitally concerned with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States Monday holding the Federal Government has the power to construct and operate the Denison Dam on the Red River between Oklahoma and Texas.

By unanimous vote, the Court extended its interpretation of Federal power over navigable streams to include tributaries of navigable streams. The power of the Federal Government to build the Red River dam is based, at least in part, upon the fact that the Red is a tributary of the Mississippi, which is navigable in fact as well as in theory.

Incomplete reports of the court's decision do not clarify the Court's holding upon various questions raised in the attack by Gov. Leon Phillips on the Denison Dam project. Apparently, all the questions were resolved in the Government's favor.

The question which received most attention in the recent oral argument before the Court was whether or not the Federal Government could build a dam higher than is necessary for flood control in order to provide power production at the same time. Apparently, the Court has decided that the Federal Government has that power.

The questions presented in this case were vitally important to the whole program of flood control, power production, and intelligent use of the water resources of the Nation.

The Denison Dam is a dual-purpose project. It is designed to protect from floods all the valley of the Red below the dam, including lands in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is designed, too, to produce a great amount of electric energy which is needed for the industrial development of the Southwest.

It is similar in purpose and effect to the Norfolk Dam in Arkansas, now under construction, the Nimrod Dam in Arkansas, which is further along toward completion, and a number of other dual-purpose dams which the United States engineers have recommended for the valleys of the Arkansas, the Red, the White, and the St. Francis.

If the Supreme Court's decision had gone the other way, great damage would have been done both to existing projects and to those which are yet to be authorized.

Since the court's decision approves the Federal power in this field, the way is open to

a concerted program of flood control, power production, and conservation of water, soil, timber, mineral, and human resources—all embraced in the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority proposal.

The legal right of the Federal Government to construct and operate dams for power production as well as flood control is the foundation of such a project as A. V. A., just as it is of the T. V. A., now in its eighth year.

Governor Phillips of Oklahoma has waged a hard fight to keep the Federal Government from building the Denison dam. He had a right to present the arguments he has presented to determine the extent of the Federal Government's powers. He has lost. A great many people in the Southwest—we believe the majority—do not agree with Governor Phillips' viewpoint. The matter has been tried out in the approved American way and decided. Now let's get together and try to get the full benefit of Federal development and the use of our water resources.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, on page 5244 of the RECORD the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] called attention to the need of the agricultural congressional group appearing before the Committee on Reciprocal Tariff Information to protest against the trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay, protection needed on products of this country.

I want not only to protest against that agreement but against every other trade agreement in the name of agriculture and of industry as well. I am sorry the gentleman from Nebraska did not include industry as well as agriculture, for I have consistently defended both and objected to all trade agreements. It is my opinion that trade agreements do not provide the way to deal with tariff changes.

My only purpose in rising at this time is to say that the same protest should be registered in connection with the reduction of the tariff on any competitive foreign product, whether of the farm or factory. The American farmer and the American wage earner are equally entitled to the benefit of the home market to the full extent of their ability to supply it.

Of course, as the gentleman from Nebraska said, all that a mere Member of Congress can do under the present program is to register his protest, since under the New Deal the tariff- and treaty-making powers of Congress have been transferred to the executive branch. We have no power to stop these reductions, or to overturn them after they have been made.

I just want to remind the Members that while these two treaties were dropped just prior to the time the resolution to extend the trade-treaty program came up for consideration, I predicted that they would again be taken up after the extension was granted. I urged at that time that Congress reserve to itself the power to approve these treaties before they become effective, but that advice was not heeded. Now we have the treaties in the process of negotiation again, and we are powerless to do anything about them except register our protest.

Do not forget that these treaties will be binding for 3 years, and that in the meantime the hands of Congress will be tied against taking any steps to protect domestic producers. If the present emergency throughout the world should end, and the men who are now under arms go back to work, we can expect a tidal wave of competitive foreign imports of all kinds under the thousand-odd reductions in the tariff that have already been made. We should not make matters any worse by entering into any more treaties, but should take appropriate steps to get rid of those which now threaten our home market.

Communism in Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress and the country generally were shocked this week by developments in the defense strikes. With overwhelming evidence that Communists are working through the unions, particularly through the C. I. O. unions, to wreck the national defense, and with the Government having to move troops into the North American Aviation plant at Inglewood, Calif., after the leaders of the striking workers had flagrantly defied the President of the United States and the national security, it was expected that there would be a cleaning out of the subversive influences in the labor unions, and that sabotage by these subversive agents would be brought to an end.

It was, therefore, a great shock to the Congress and to the American people when C. I. O. President Philip Murray, on June 16, vehemently denied press reports which he termed "fantastic," and the work of "labor's enemies," that his organization was embarking on a purge of communistic members. Murray implied that the charge of radical leadership, in the recent strikes, including the Inglewood, Calif., strike, and the woodworkers' strike in the Northwest, was "malicious slander of duly elected officials."

The Congress and the country had a right to expect that Philip Murray, along with President William Green, of the A. F. of L., and other labor leaders, would be among the very first to move to purge the ranks of organized labor of Communists, Fascists, Nazis, saboteurs, and other fifth columnists. The Congress and the people had a right to expect that the country's interest would be placed above the selfish interests of greedy, power-lustful racketeers who have been using the unions to feather their own nests and further their own schemes. The Congress and the country had a right to expect that a man who has been honored, as Philip Murray has been honored, in the country of his adoption, and a man who has been elevated to the responsible position he occupies in the economic side of the national defense would be big enough, and patriotic enough, to lead his union back to patriotic effort in the struggle to arm the Nation for its safety.

The Congress and the country now have a right to expect that, regardless of Mr. Philip Murray or any other labor leaders, the Government will move to see that the defense work now so desperately needed goes forward unhindered.

It is futile, and worse than impudent, for any labor leader to contend that the outbreak of strikes on the Pacific coast, which were declared to be "outlaw" strikes by responsible union officials themselves, was not the result of the machinations of Communists and other subversive elements. It is clear that these strikes were the result of deliberate efforts designed to hamstring, and if possible, to defeat, the national defense

I believe the vast majority in organized labor is just as patriotic as are other citizens of this country, and wish to see us provided with an adequate national defense at the earliest possible date, and it serves the cause of defense ill indeed for a man as important as Philip Murray, a member of the Mediation Board as he is a man who has the confidence of several million wage earners, to take a position now that his organization is not going to purge itself of subversive influences, simply because some contingents or minority groups of the C. I. O. oppose such action.

Any man or woman of any race, color, or nationality, who, in these hours of the Nation's peril, conspires or works to overthrow our American form of government, and our American way of life, not only should be scourged off the Government pay rolls—where there are all too many of this ilk—but should be rendered harmless to the national defense by whatever means necessary. To continue to shield these subversive agents under the cloak of union respectability is to give aid and comfort to the most deadly enemies of this Nation.

Mr. Philip Murray must be as fully aware of these facts as any other citizen, and in his position of trust and responsibility he should not only be more cognizant of these conditions, but he should be the more anxious to eliminate them.

If Mr. Murray continues to oppose the purging of subversive agents from the labor unions of the United States, Mr. Murray should himself be purged from the Mediation Board and from any position under the Government in the national-defense plan.

The Nation's safety demands that only those Americans who are first and foremost concerned with the national defense and the security of the Nation shall be permitted to continue longer in positions of power and influence in the Government.

To follow any other course than this, to allow those who are sympathetic to Communists in the labor unions to remain in positions of power and influence, is nothing short of treason to the Nation.

Need for Great Caution Relative to Permitting Aliens To Enter America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it has been my contention that the time is at hand when the most careful scrutiny should be exercised concerning any person who by any method or under any pretext seeks to enter America.

Frequently we have read that prior to the subjugation of countries by aggressor nations tourists in large numbers have been sent by the aggressor nations to the countries to be subdued and overrun. I am not at all sure America and the Western Hemisphere are not now being subjected in part to the same or a kindred procedure.

I desire to include in the RECORD a memorandum I have recently received from the Visa Division of the State Department:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
VISA DEPARTMENT,
June 5, 1941.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING NUMBER OF VISAS ISSUED FROM JULY 1, 1940, TO JUNE 4, 1941

There have been received in the Department from consular offices throughout the world 209,756 copies of visas issued. Approximately one-third of this number are immigration visas—quota and nonquota. Approximately two-thirds or about 140,000 are nonimmigrant, that is 3 (1) Government officials; 3 (2) temporary visitors; 3 (3) aliens in transit; 3 (4) aliens entering from transit across foreign contiguous territory; 3 (5) alien seamen; and 3 (6) treaty aliens. Of this number the greater majority are 3 (2) temporary visitors.

NUMBER OF PASSPORTS RENEWED AND ISSUED TO AMERICAN CITIZENS

During the entire year of 1940—January 1 to December 31—there were 26,253 American passports renewed and issued. Of this number only 1,576 were for Europe.

It is highly significant that the great majority of those people accorded the privilege of coming to this country are temporary visitors. In this connection it might be pertinent to inquire as to what is the difference in tourists and temporary visitors. As a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, I have observed that many of the temporary visitors who are here now contend they cannot leave America because there is no country to which they can go. Also, a fact worth considering is that whereas we have permitted 209,756 visas to be issued from July 1, 1940, to June 4, 1941, to people seeking to come to America, the authorities of the countries of the world renewed and issued for our citizens only 26,253 passports in the calendar year 1940. Of this number only 1,576 were for Europe.

Thus far I have not been able to obtain statistics indicating the number of people coming to America from each of the foreign countries. However, I did request Mr. George L. Warren, of the President's Advisory Committee on Political Refugees, to give me the statistics pertaining to the first 1,000 people approved by this committee to be given the privilege to enter America.

I herewith quote a telegram I received from Mr. Warren on June 7, 1941.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 7, 1941.*

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Congress of United States:

Information you request has not been compiled. Compilation will require several weeks. Best estimate foreign nationalities represented in order of numerical importance: German, Austrian, Czech, Polish, French, Belgian, stateless. Letter follows

GEORGE L. WARREN.

At this point I wish to quote two paragraphs from the letter written June 16 by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles to the first secretary of the German Embassy:

It has come to the knowledge of this Government that agencies of the German Reich in this country, including German consular establishments, have been engaged in activities wholly outside the scope of their legitimate duties. These activities have been of an improper and unwarranted character. They render the continued presence in the United States of those agencies and consular establishments inimical to the welfare of this country.

I am directed by the President to request that the German Government remove from United States territory all German nationals in anywise connected with the German Library of Information in New York, the German Railway and Tourist Agencies, and the Trans-Ocean News Service, and that each of these organizations and their affiliates shall be promptly closed.

In view of the contents of the paragraphs above, again I desire to emphasize how necessary and imperative it is that every person charged with the responsibility of preventing undesirables from coming into this country be doubly careful in approving requests of aliens to enter America.

Farm Tenancy—Farm Ownership Should Be Encouraged—Small Farms Now Squeezed Out—Large Farms Becoming Larger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had a feeling of triumph when I looked at some of the 1940 census figures the other day and saw the figure for farm tenancy. But that feeling died quickly when I looked a little further. At first sight it seemed as if we had made a good gain in our battle against increasing farm tenancy. The census showed that 38.7 percent of the Nation's farmers were tenants in 1940. In 1930 the census gave the proportion of farm renters as 42.46 percent. That looks like progress, but it is not.

FAMILY-SIZE FARM DISAPPEARING

There is a very revealing table in the census on the size of farms in the United States in 1940 as compared with 1930. It shows that there has been a startling decrease in the number of farms between the size of 20 acres and 500 acres. These are what we commonly regard as family-type farms, depending upon their locality and the sort of crops grown upon them. They are considered family-type farms because they will yield an adequate living for an average rural family and will require no more labor than that family can supply from its own resources, except for the need of an occasional hired hand at harvest time.

To illustrate these reductions in American family farms, I would like to quote to you the census figures on the three sizes of farms showing the most alarming changes. During the past 10 years 219,382 farms of 20 to 49 acres disappeared. Also gone into limbo were 83,917 farms ranging from 50 to 99 acres, and 59,994 farms of 100 to 499 acres.

BIG "FACTORY FARMS"

The table doesn't say, in so many words, what has become of the acreage represented by these farms that have gone away from the hands of families. But the table shows, in its next three lines, where a vast amount of the acreage must now be found. It is in the large, commercial, and often corporation farms, which range in size from 500 acres to 999 acres, from 1,000 acres to 4,999 acres, and from 5,000 acres on upward. These huge holdings showed just as amazing increases in numbers as the smaller farms showed decreases.

Since 1930 there have grown up in this country 3,998 new farms of 500 to 999 acres. There has been an increase of 16,144 in the number of farms of 1,000 to 4,999 acres. And there are now 3,767 more farms of 5,000 acres or more than there were in 1930. These big "factory farms" have swallowed up the acres of the 360,000 little farms which have disappeared.

FEWER PEOPLE OWNING ACREAGE

We have a lot of rural acreage but it is apparently going into the hands of fewer and fewer people. We find our tenancy rate decreasing. But what is becoming of the tenants? Are they becoming owners? I would like to believe so, but I cannot. I know that some of them are. I am aware that the farm-tenant purchase program of the Department of Agriculture has been helping many deserving American families to own their own farms during the past few years. But I have a strong conviction that appallingly few of the people who ceased being tenants since 1930 went

up the agricultural ladder to ownership. The evidence indicates that they have gone the other way. I believe that most of them have slipped down the ladder to the condition of hired hands or day laborers, and a great many—many more than we like to think about—have slipped all the way off the end of the agricultural ladder. They have gone, I am afraid, into the ranks of agricultural migrants—that flood of pitiful Americans who are of the land but not on it, who shuttled back and forth from State to State in an earnest but aimless pursuit of a living as seasonal laborers on the big "factory farms." Below them are even more of the people who once had a foothold on the land, producing their own living, before times got bad and big farms ate up little ones. These folks are on relief now, mostly in the cities. They are farm people who have come to town to try to keep alive. It used to be the other way around. City people went to the country when times got hard for them. Now country people are coming to the cities.

BANKHEAD-JONES ACT HELPING

I have spoken of the 1940 tenancy figure—38.7 percent of our 6,096,799 farmers—as if it were something to be proud of simply because it is lower than the tenancy percentage of 10 years ago. When we understand why this figure is lower, however, we must realize that we still have this tenancy problem with us and another on top of it. One ray of hope is the fact that we have a weapon to use against this flight of tenancy which afflicts more than a third of our farmers. Maybe if we use that weapon—the Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant-loan program—in the right way to relieve tenancy, we will also find ourselves relieving the plight of these unfortunates who have fallen even lower into the ranks of the migrants.

Sixty years ago only about one-fourth of the farmers in America were tenants or sharecroppers, and in that era tenancy was generally regarded as a step toward farm ownership. Today the more than a third who are tenants have little, if any, hope of ever owning their own land.

FARM OWNERSHIP ENCOURAGES GOOD CITIZENSHIP

Most tenants have no real stake in the country; no homes of their own; no roots in any community. More than a third of them move from one farm to another after every harvest. Their children have little opportunity for decent education, and in many tenant and sharecropper families the standard of living is little better than that of a Balkan peasant. The dangers of such a situation in a time of national emergency must be plain to every American.

OWNERSHIP DISCOURAGES WASTE OF SOIL

The system of tenant agriculture is extremely costly. The mere cost of the annual shifting of tenants from farm to farm has been estimated at $50,000,000 a year, without the slightest benefit to anyone. Far more expensive, however, is the waste of soil and property which results inevitably from the tenant system.

OWNERSHIP INCENTIVE TO PROTECT LAND

It is perfectly plain that the average tenant has little incentive to protect the land, keep up fences, or repair farm buildings. He has no assurance that he will be on that piece of property next year. He is likely to mine the soil for the largest possible cash return, no matter how much damage that kind of farming may cause.

SOIL EROSION SERIOUS PROBLEM

In the South this has meant one-crop agriculture, the planting of cotton or tobacco in the same field year after year. As a result, at least 22,000,000 acres of Southern farm land have been worn out and eroded until they are worthless for agriculture; and an additional area the size of Oklahoma and Alabama combined has been seriously damaged by erosion. This spendthrift wastage of our most-precious capital asset—the soil—must be blamed very largely on our system of tenancy.

TENANCY DANGEROUS TO COMMUNITY AND CHURCH LIFE

Almost equally serious is the damage which tenancy is inflicting on our community life. A tenant who pulls up stakes and moves to another part of the country every few months can hardly be a good citizen, or take an active, responsible part in the affairs of his State and neighborhood. Even the churches have been seriously affected by this aimless drifting. Not long ago a study of religious institutions was made in two sections of North Carolina—one which had a high degree of tenancy, and the other which was settled largely by farm owners. In the low-tenancy area, there were found 257 churches with more than 21,000 members. The area where tenancy was widespread had three times as large a population but it was served by only 218 churches. And only some 17,000 persons claimed membership in them. The plain fact is that religion suffers in any community where tenancy is the common way of life.

HEALTH UNDERMINED BY TENANCY

Another evil growing out of this situation is the gradual undermining of the health of many of our citizens. The one-crop farming which ordinarily is associated with tenancy means that most renters and sharecroppers do not raise the vegetables, chickens, and cows necessary to give them a proper diet. Too many of them are living on the fat pork and corn meal they buy over the counter of some store.

MANY TENANTS DO NOT OWN A COW

In one Southern State, where about 65 percent of the farmers are tenants, there are 71,000 farmers who do not own a cow and cannot provide milk for their children; 73,000 farm families in that State do not have a single hog, 18,000 are without gardens, and 30,000 lack even a single chicken. That kind of living is producing too many pellagra-ridden, weakened people—the kind of folks we sometimes unfairly call shiftless and lazy when they're really sick. It is alarming to think what this means to our national manpower in a time of world crisis.

TENANCY NOT JUST A SOUTHERN PROBLEM

Although the tenancy problem has become especially acute in the South, it would be a mistake to assume that it is purely a Southern problem. Even such wealthy Midwestern States as Iowa and Nebraska have tenancy rates of close to 50 percent. The percentage of tenancy in Iowa in 1940 was 47.5 and in Nebraska 52.8. In my own State of Texas the rate was 48.9 percent. Throughout the Nation approximately 2,800,000 families are working somebody else's land.

A distinguished southerner, F. M. Reeves, Cornelia, Ga., not long ago remarked that—

the social, political, and economic problems of Southern cities cannot be solved until the far-reaching problem of Southern agriculture is solved intelligently. Without the solution of this great problem of agriculture, this American democracy is doomed to disastrous failure. No nation in all the annals of history has ever been able to survive the death of its agriculture.

MORAL FOR AMERICA SUGGESTED

The moral for America seems plain: A society of independent farmers, proud in the possesison of their own soil, is one of the strongest defenses against both foreign armies and subversive propaganda.

STEP ALREADY MADE IN RIGHT DIRECTION

Fortunately, the United States has already made a start toward solving its tenant problem. Four years ago the Congress enacted the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which provides for loans to a limited number of competent tenants and sharecroppers each year to enable them to buy land of their own. This program was undertaken on an extremely cautious, conservative basis. By the end of the current fiscal year, some 21,000 families will have been established on their own homesteads under the Bankhead-Jones program. This is obviously only a beginning, but it is a sound beginning which has demonstrated that the program is ready for gradual and steady expansion.

I believe the Farm Tenant Act provides an effective means of combatting the destructive tendency of absentee ownership. With neither the tenant nor the landlord much concerned about preserving the vitality of the soil, all Americans lose, because all the land is vital to the welfare of all the people for as long as they depend on it for their food and their fibers.

WILL ESTABLISH PATTERN OF FARM OWNERSHIP

The operation of this act eventually will establish a pattern of farm ownership throughout the Nation. It is a channel through which farm tenants of character and ability can settle themselves permanently on the land, derive a living from that land, and protect it as a source of future productivity. The program is an investment in the welfare of our farm people and a guaranty of the protection of the soil. It is a true economy.

TECHICAL GUIDANCE PROVIDED

With each loan the borrower and his family receive technical guidance in sound farming methods. The farm wife

plans a program which will result in preservation of an amount of home-grown foods to meet her family needs. The farmer can build up the fertility of his soil through long-time management plans. He can use crop rotations, permanent pasture, diversified cash crops, and soil-conserving tillage practices which are impossible for a tenant who stays on a farm for only a year or two. Tenant purchase owners plan to stay on their farms permanently, and they are not going to risk depleting their own soil.

SOME WORTHY TENANTS GIVEN OPPORTUNITY

Under the Bankhead-Jones Act, the funds provided for tenant loans are allocated among the States on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy. To illustrate, it will be possible for the Farm Security Administration, which handles this program, to make loans totaling about $4,800,000 to 768 worthy tenants in my State, Texas, by the end of the present scal year. The loans are made only to American citizens who have exhibited ability to make a success of a family-type farming enterprise; and preference is given tenants with family and those who can make a down payment or own the livestock and tools necessary to operate a farm.

CAREFULLY SELECTED

These 768 families receiving Texas loans this year were selected from among nearly 20,000 applicants, so that we can be pretty sure they are the cream of the crop. Moreover, they are chosen by committees of local farmers who are thoroughly familiar with the character and capabilities of the applicants in their neighborhood. These same local committees approve the farms to be purchased and the farm valuation is carefully checked by expert Government appraisers.

I believe you would be interested in knowing just a little more about the demand for these tenant purchase loans. Since the program began there have been 26 applications in the State of Texas for each available loan. The ratio in the United States as a whole, I am advised, is 22 applications for each loan made.

NINETY-NINE-PERCENT COLLECTIONS

One result of the careful selection of borrowers is a rather surprising record of repayments. Installments due from Texas tenant borrowers at the end of the program's third year of operation, June 30, 1940, totaled $105,391. Repayments on these maturities totaled $104,341, or 99 percent of the amount due. In addition, because of operation of a variable repayment plan which enables borrowers to pay in advance when they are able, extra payments amounting to $28,017 had been made. In other words, the average Texan who borrowed money under the Bankhead-Jones Act not only has met his installments on schedule, but also has been able to make a small advance repayment.

SELF-LIQUIDATING LOANS

Throughout the country as a whole the repayment record is just as impressive. Regular collections have been 97.4 percent of maturities and prepayments have brought up the total of payments considerably above the amount due. It is apparent that these Bankhead-Jones loans are completely self-liquidating and that the program involves no drain upon the Treasury.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

This program, which is making it possible for many American farmers to lift themselves from difficulty by their own bootstraps, is contributing as greatly as its statutory limits permit to fulfillment of an important pledge of the agricultural plank of the 1940 Democratic platform:

To extend and enlarge the tenant-purchase program until every deserving tenant farmer has a real opportunity to have a farm of his own.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

SAVING DAYLIGHT ON NATIONAL SCALE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, unlike Joshua, Congress has no power to make the sun stand still, but it does have power to fix time. It used this power during the World War and placed the entire Nation on a daylight-saving basis. By an act passed in 1918, it marked the Nation into five zones, namely, Eastern, Central, Mountain, Pacific, and Alaskan. These correspond to the seventy-fifth, ninetieth, one hundred and fifth, one hundred and twentieth, and one hundred and fiftieth degrees of west longitude.

Except for the Alaskan zone, you will note that each zone is separated by 15 degrees of longitude to correspond to 1 hour of clock time. Congress delegated the Interstate Commerce Commission to define the various zones and then placed them all on a daylight-saving basis. Three bills are now pending in Congress to do the same thing. The Federal Power Commission is making a study of the matter to determine how much electricity would be saved by such a move—all of which proves that even Old Man Time may be enlisted in the cause of national defense.

SOME FISCAL COMPARISONS

Pending in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and steadily moving toward consideration on the floor is one of the most gigantice tax bills in world history. It will constitute an effort to produce more than three and one-half billion dollars as partial payment on the enormous defense expenditures which are now being incurred to make this country ready for any eventuality. The existence of the pending bill has stimulated comparison between tax revenues, debts, and income between the United States and Great Britain, and the following figures which are derived from an authentic comparison compiled by the joint committee on Internal Revenue taxation, and issued as a Government publication on May 21, 1941, may be of interest. Net debt of Great Britain, in all forms, national, state, and local is approximately 63.8 billions as compared with sixty-seven billions for the United States. British per capita debt is $1,357, whereas in the United States it is $493. British national income is 122.3 billions as against 95 billions in the United States. British per capita income is $475, compared with $699 for the United States. British internal revenue tax receipts for the fiscal year 1940–41 is 5.6 billions, compared with 5.4 billions for the United States. Income taxes in Great Britain are as follows: On a net income of $800 a single man pays $130, a married man $52; a part of this, however, is to be refunded at the end of the war because it constitutes the so-called purchase tax. On a $900 income a single man pays $159, a married man $81. On a $1,000 income a single man pays $188, a married man $110. On a $1,200 income a single man pays $265, a married man $164. On a $1,600 net income a single man pays $444, a married man $324. On a $2,000 income a single man pays $624, a married man $504. The refund on this tax, because of so-called purchase tax reduction, would be $106 for a single man and $126 for a married man. Truly here is an onerous tax.

THE GEOGRAPHY MAKERS ASSEMBLE

Did you ever hear about the Scotchman who refused to buy an atlas until the war was over? Which reminds us that the map makers are in convention in the Nation's Capital. It includes official government mappers from Canada, Mexico, South America, and the United States, and they will discuss the complex problems of mapping which have been raised by the war. How, for instance, will new maps show Greenland and indicate our interest in view of the treaty signed with the Danish Minister, whose authority to negotiate over Greenland was challenged? What about Greece and Crete? When the present push in Syria terminates what will new maps show concerning these areas in the eastern Mediterranean? It is a fair bet that as the map makers assemble for tea they will wish for the days when the world remained put.

THE BATTLE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE IS ON

Was it Job who said, "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book." Were Job alive today he might amplify that a bit by saying, "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book, issue a statement, make a speech or write an article for a magazine or for the press." What we mean to state is that in connection with the battle now brewing over the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power project, everything that has ever been said or written by any person or group now opposed to this project is being hauled out, dusted off, reprinted, and laid upon the desks of Congressmen and Senators. Statements and speeches made by railroad executives a generation ago are now being reprinted in quantities to show that at that time they were not opposed to the idea. Statements by Harding, Coolidge, Hoover,

and Taft are now being reprinted to indicate their approval of the project. All this is the groundwork for the debate which will take place if the project should be favorably reported and laid before Congress. Not a day goes by but that the mailman brings literature on this subject. Noses are being counted to determine who is for and who is against. The campaign to secure congressional approval and funds for the seaway has all the earmarks of a campaign of military strategy. It will be a billion-dollar fight when the issue is finally joined. Hearings on the bill are now in progress.

MEN PASSING THROUGH TIME

How often we say, "Time flies." Students of relativity say that it is not time but mankind which flies. They say it is not time that passes away, but, rather, that humankind passes through time. A glance at these figures of the last World War, made pertinent by the present conflict, gives substance to that statement. In round numbers, it is estimated that in 1952, 3,460,000 veterans of the World War will be living. In 1962 the number will be reduced to 2,516,000. By 1972 to 1,119,000. By 1982 to 164,392. By 1992 only 563 will still be alive, and by 1996 there will be but 1. Thus after the elapse of 44 years, according to the mortality tables, which are based upon many years of human experience, 3,458,421 men, ranging in ages from 45 to 99, will have marched through time, and the traditions which they kept alive must be fostered and nurtured by those who follow.

Neutrality of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

LETTER OF GEN. FRANK AIKEN, IRISH MINISTER FOR COORDINATION OF DEFENSE MEASURES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted by the House, I append hereto a letter written by Gen. Frank Aiken, Irish Minister for Coordination of Defense Measures, on the subject of Ireland's neutrality and the reasons therefor.

Members interested in this matter are urged to read this illuminating communication.

The following is General Aiken's letter and the reasons therefor:

The following letter signed by General Aiken, the Minister for Coordination of Defensive Measures in the Irish Government, who is in this country on a special mission for Mr. de Valera, has been sent to the New Republic in reply to an open letter to Mr. de Valera by Prof. Francis E. McMahon, and also to the Reader's Digest, which reprinted Professor McMahon's letter:

SIR: In his open letter to Mr. de Valera, published in your issue of May 12, Prof. Francis E. McMahon asks "merely" that three Irish ports be given to England for the prosecution of the war. He bases his appeal upon the grounds that the cause of England "Today is the cause of all humanity"; that she is fighting for justice, human dignity, the Christian religion, true culture, and the freedom of small nations, including Ireland; that her victory depends upon getting possession of three Irish ports.

First of all let me point out that the giving of facilities to one belligerent for an attack upon another is an act of war. Therefore, the professor's proposition is that Ireland should join in the war. The Irish people, in the free portion of Ireland, decided against this policy after weighing fully what both belligerents said, and refrained from saying, about their war aims; and after weighing carefully what both belligerents did, and refrained from doing, to give practical effect where and when they could to the admirable principles for which Professor McMahon says England is fighting.

Our decision to remain neutral was supported by 99.9 percent of our people of all classes and creeds as well as by every Catholic bishop in the State. Professor McMahon may know better where our duty lies than we do ourselves, but as a small and very democratic people we would not peacefully submit to the judgment of three millions of us being overruled by the opinion of one man 3,000 miles away. Even if Mr. de Valera agreed with Professor McMahon's views, he has no moral or constitutional authority to commit our people to war. According to our constitution the right to declare war or to engage the state in war belongs solely to the Dail, and for anyone deliberately without due and proper authority to give our ports to a belligerent or to do anything else which would inevitably bring about a war situation, involving the sacrifices of the lives of our soldiers and of our people, would be nothing short of unjustifiable homicide.

As for the strategic importance of the three ports in free Ireland, I fear Professor McMahon does not realize that the British still occupy six of our northeastern counties—against the will of the Irish people. In these occupied counties are situated ports and air bases covering the only Atlantic route which the British have used to any important extent since the fall of France. If ports and land-based planes can protect shipping, the British are strategically as well off as if they were in occupation of all Ireland.

We do not forget, as Professor McMahon says, "Centuries ago Eire rolled back a tide of barbarism, as her scholars and saints spread over Europe instructing the ignorant in faith and sound philosophy." Perhaps, if with God's help we survive the present European holocaust, our young men and women will once again undertake the noble work of missionaries in Europe. They are at present doing missionary work in many countries. Even if it were desirable, we have not the military strength to enforce Christianity throughout the world by the sword.

The best we can hope to do in the present circumstances of our partitioned country is to protect against aggression the portion for which we secured freedom after such a long and arduous struggle, and in which we are trying to put into practical operation the principles of Christianity, democracy, and social justice which are contained in our constitution.

Yours very truly,

FRANK AIKEN,
Irish Minister for Coordination of Defensive Measures.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 2, 1941.*

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

LETTER FROM RACINE, WIS.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting letter from Racine, Wis. has come to my attention. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include that letter. The man who wrote it has been in the boat-building business for many years, and his remarks are based on practical experience. His feeling on the subject of the necessity for the construction of a St. Lawrence seaway, I believe, is the same as the most of the clear-thinking people of Wisconsin. They realize that the enormous investment in ships and harbors in order to meet the requirements for shipping facilities on such a seaway, would offset any possible slight savings over present transportation costs.

The letter follows:

Tribune article on seaway plan carried in Sunday's Tribune prompts this letter.

I have never had a dollar invested in any railway, steamship, or utility investment. I have owned small boats all my life, and as president of the Racine Boat Corporation, built hundreds of them. For a number of years I flew the pennant A 140 of the United Shipmasters Association of America. I have fought the consummation of the St. Lawrence waterways for years.

Several years ago I wrote a questionnaire and furnished a list of 25 captains, 5 from each bordering State, which was sent out by the Racine Manufacturers' Association. Every one was returned, and there was not a favorable comment made to the subject any many very scratching remarks.

May I add my might by adding to your objections the fact that last year three tramps docked at Milwaukee in 1 week from Oslo, Norway (6,600 miles), with pulp which was reloaded and shipped by train to Green Bay and reloaded on ground which had stored Wisconsin and Michigan pulp for the last 50 years—quite evident what the competition of pulp and labor would be.

There is a section in Lake Huron at present which is very hazardous due to fog. If the seaway were completed and a highway made of this section, it is reasonable to believe that insurance rates would be raised to a prohibitive height, if not refused altogether.

I believe the best reason for not completing this project and the easiest argument to sell its uselessness to the general public is that there is nothing to be gained as far as lower freight rates are concerned. Car loadings leave Racine on Wednesday and are in New York City Saturday morning. A miscellaneous belly full of foreign-bound merchandise from Racine would be worth about $6,000,000, and the best time that could be expected would be around 14 days. The investment on the cargo and the difference in time would offset any savings in freight which might hope to accrue.

When I was a newsboy 40 years ago, William McKinley was promising the same lure, and every Presidential candidate since. In

1928 Hurley, speaking for Hoover at Fond du Lac, promised it, and two nights later Roosevelt, speaking at the Twin Cities in his own behalf, also hung out the bacon as bait for the farmers' vote, which makes it possible to speak before practically anybody without having the opposition shout, "Red herring."

Senator WILEY promised it in his campaign, but I have been advised by one of our industrialists that he has since changed his mind on the matter.

If there is anything I can do in this section to help you and others to kill the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterways, consider my services at your command.

Sincerely yours,

WM. H. ROHAN.

Resolutions of Tennessee Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT JUNE 2 MEETING

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith five resolutions passed by the Tennessee Federation of Labor at its meeting on June 2, at Knoxville, Tenn.:

Resolution No. 15

Be it resolved, That the State Federation of Labor of Tennessee, in convention assembled June 2, 1941, call upon the Congress of the United States to enact laws immediately that will outlaw the Communist Party, Nazi and Fascist organizations or any other organization which owes its allegiance to a foreign government, and to provide severe penalties for all individuals who are members of any or all of these subversive groups; and it is further

Resolved, That our immigration laws be strictly enforced, and to this end we hereby call upon the President of the United States to have these immigration laws strictly enforced, as a measure of national defense, and have deported all enemy aliens whose presence in America is in violation of the law; it is further

Resolved, That the secretary of this State federation of labor be instructed to send copies of this resolution at once to President Franklin D. Roosevelt; to President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; and to the United States Senators and the Congressmen from the State of Tennessee; and now we

Resolve, That our national-defense program can best be served and the security of this Nation best defended and protected by outlawing the above-named groups and by sending from these shores all enemy aliens illegally in America.

Resolution No. 1

Whereas the southeast is now facing a serious power shortage which may jeopardize our entire defense program and prolong the day when peace and democracy may again be restored to the world; and

Whereas the Cumberland River and its tributaries have great power potentialities which could be developed within a short period of time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Tennessee Federation of Labor, duly assembled, in the city of Knoxville, Tenn., on this the 3d day of June 1941, That the Congress of the United States be memoralized to enact legislation at the earliest possible moment to bring the Cumberland River and its tributaries and territory adjacent thereto under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority for immediate development; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Tennessee Federation of Labor transmit to the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and to the Senators, McKellar and Stewart of Tennessee; Senators Barkley and Chandler, of Kentucky; Senator Norris, of Nebraska, and to each of the Congressmen from the State of Tennessee copies of this resolution.

And, further, that a request of concurrence and a copy be sent to our respected native son, Cordell Hull, for his specific notice and action.

Resolution No. 19

Whereas there seems to be a general effort being made by railroads to defeat the purpose of the Wages and Hours Act of 1938. This was first apparent by their refusal to pay time and one-half at the rate made effective under the Wages and Hours Act for work performed in overtime hours; and now they are cutting the time worked each day to less than 8 hours, so the total daily earnings at 36 cents per hour are not more than before this rate became effective March 1941; and

Whereas on March 1 Senator Sheppard introduced a bill in the United States Senate, which is identified as S. 1015, which reads as follows:

"A bill to amend the Wages and Hours Act

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Wage and Hour Act shall not be interpreted in such wise as to require any employer to work any employee any greater amount for any pay period than shall have been agreed between employer and employee: *Provided*, That such agreement shall specify a rate of pay (herein referred to as regular rate of pay), for all hours worked up to the maximum number specified in section 7 (a), which is not less than the minimum prescribed by this act, and shall assure to the employee for all hours worked in excess of the number specified in section 7 (a) (herein referred to as overtime) compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the said regular rate of pay specified in such agreement between employer and employee. Any compensation, bonus, guaranty, benefit, or advantage whatever promised or paid to or conferred upon the employee in addition to the regular rate of pay specified in such agreement between employer and employee shall not be deemed to increase such regular rate of pay for the purpose of calculating the minimum standard of section 7 (a) for overtime"; and

Whereas the introduction of this bill constitutes an admission that the railroads know the practices mentioned above are in violation of the Wages and Hours Act in its present form: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the Tennessee Federation of Labor meeting in Knoxville, Tenn., June 2, 3, and 4, 1941, go on record as opposing the enactment of S. 1015, and the secretary is hereby instructed to write our Congressmen and the Senators from this State, registering vigorous opposition to S. 1015, and also urge the members of our respective organizations to write their Congressmen and Senators for the same purpose.

Resolution No. 22

Whereas the United States is confronted with a grave national emergency caused by the tragic world situation and is now engaged in a vast defense program for the protection of our democratic heritage; and

Whereas we recognize the great importance of carrying forward this defense program with all possible speed and without work stoppages where possible to avoid them; and

Whereas the Tennessee Federation of Labor is aware of the responsibility of organized labor to do all in its power to promote the welfare of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Tennessee Federation of Labor hereby declares its faith and its love for the American system of constitutional democracy; an economy based upon the institution of private property, with equal rights to capital and labor, with the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively and with the opportunity by honest toil and thrift to live decently and acquire a reasonable amount of property for themselves and families; political, civil, and religious liberty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to all measures calculated and designed to impair or destroy labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively, and if need be to strike, and in particular we are unalterably opposed to the so-called Vinson bill now before the United States Congress, which would destroy the democratic rights of labor and would defeat the very purpose for which all Americans are now united; and be it further

Resolved, That we believe wholeheartedly in the principle of mediation, that we deplore unwarranted and unjustifiable disputes between labor and management and particularly stoppage in defense industries, and we hereby pledge ourselves in all defense industries to meet around the conference table with representatives of management and with disinterested representatives of the United States Government in an honest effort to adjust and settle all controversies; be it further

Resolved, That we hereby pledge our allegiance to the United States Government, and express our willingness to make any and all sacrifices that may be necessary to preserve our Nation and protect its honor; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States, to the Governor of Tennessee, to the Members of Congress from the State of Tennessee, and to the press.

Resolution No. 20

Whereas the widespread dissatisfaction among employees of all trades in the navy yard service with the wage award handed down by the Navy Department on November 18, 1940, and the subsequent delay in the pending appeal from the decision, District No. 44, of the I. A. of M., has persuaded Congressman WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington, to introduce H. R. 4214 which, if enacted, will in part at least correct the wage situation and establish a system for retention in and reemployment in the service, to take the place of the present unsatisfactory efficiency system;

Whereas the bill H. R. 4214 proposes to limit to a period of 3 months the time during which an employee may receive the minimum or third-class rate of pay, after which he must, if retained in the service, receive the intermediate or second-class rate of pay, and 6 months after receiving the intermediate or second-class rate of pay he shall, if retained in the service, be promoted to the maximum or first-class rate of pay.

Whereas during the period of the depression the navy-yard wage schedule was used extensively by labor representatives of all trades in collective-bargaining negotiations with private industry; wages in private industry now have far outstripped wages paid in navy yards and arsenals, as we see it; and we are therefore strongly urging the various lodges to help their own possible future cause

by giving us a lift now. The navy-yard scale was helpful to some of the locals formerly. The use of your political influence now in an attempt to secure the enactment of the Magnuson bill will be very timely.

Whereas the principles of the Magnuson bill have been indorsed by conventions of the A. F. of L.; conventions of the Metal Trades Department; conventions of the I. A. of M. at Milwaukee and Cleveland, and by conventions of District No. 44. Your convention is therefore on safe ground in indorsing this bill, without going contrary to the policies laid down by parent organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the Tennessee Federation of Labor, meeting in Knoxville, Tenn., June 2, 3, and 4, 1941, is indirectly and vitally interested and we urge that the following actions be taken:

1. That a letter be written by the secretary to our Congressmen urging them to support the Magnuson bill, H. R. 4714, and request them to communicate our views and their own views to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, Hon. CARL VINSON.

2. That the delegates in attendance at this convention from the central labor unions and local unions be instructed to bring this matter before their local bodies, with a view to have similar action taken by them.

Madam Perkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. FRANCES PERKINS AND REPLY

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 17, 1941.

The Honorable LELAND M. FORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORD: In the extension of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Monday, the 12th of May, you quoted an alleged statement of mine as follows:

"The right of the C. I. O. to strike is paramount to the right of the United States to have a defense program."

I have not made this statement at any time, nor have I at any time said anything which could be construed as having this meaning.

I have emphasized in many speeches, letters, and memoranda the obligation and willingness of labor in the United States to cooperate with employers and with the Government to avoid delays in production and to increase efficiency and production.

I am asking you to make a correction of this misstatement in view of my categorical denial, and I feel sure that, as a matter of justice without regard to what your opinion may be, that you will be alert to make this correction promptly on the RECORD of the Congress.

Very truly yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

JUNE 19, 1941.

Madam FRANCES PERKINS,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter to me of May 17, 1941, with reference to remarks made by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, May 12, 1941, wherein I said that you had said "the right of the C. I. O. to strike is paramount to the right of the United States to have a defense program." No doubt I should have said, "said in substance," together with the balance of the statement, because, in my opinion, you did say it in substance if the report of your press conference on December 27, 1940, as reported by the New York Times, December 28, 1940, on page 13, is correct, which is as follows:

"Secretary Perkins declared today that the right to strike should not be abridged and that the right had not been abused in connection with the national-defense program."

Conditions at that time were these: That strikes were being carried on which were seriously hindering the defense program. Apparently everybody could see it but you. Many of us called your attention and the attention of others to these strikes and to what they were doing to our defense program, not only myself and other Congressmen, but the personnel of the Army and Navy as well. Nobody takes exception to a man's right to cease work if he does not want to work, which is his constitutional right under the Constitution of the United States, but under that same Constitution, these strikers have not the right to say that no one else shall work. A man's right to work is just as important as a man's right not to work.

At that very time, coercion, force, and bodily injury were being practiced by these strikers on those who wished to work. Can you justify that? Can you justify the taking away of the rights of those who wish to work by those who do not, with any part of the Constitution of the United States? Do you think the right to strike is "abridged," using your own language, when a man who wants to work, under the Constitution of the United States, tries to work and is prevented by bodily injury and force? As an example of this, I will quote you from Funk & Wagnalls' new Standard Dictionary, volume 1, which says:

"The law forbids him to murder but that does not abridge his liberty. He never had a right to murder."

The same thing is true with the abridgement of the right to strike, but in striking there is no right to take away another man's constitutional right and say he cannot work.

Now then, when you made the bald statement that the "right to strike should not be abridged," you made it without any qualifications except to say that it had not been abused, but in fact—and this is what we must judge by, particularly in the face of our present defense program—thousands of men were being prevented by force from working on that program and carrying it out, not only denying their right to work, but denying the right of 130,000,000 people to have a defense program within a proper time to be effective and efficient.

Again, under remarks at press conference January 24, 1941, indirectly quoted, from the New York Times, January 25, 1941, page 9, asked whether you believed that an industry-wide meeting of employers in the aircraft plants and all spokesmen for the labor unions might work up a method of peaceable adjustment of disputes, "the Secretary replied that she was not sure that such a proposal was immediately practicable. She expressed the opinion that where an organizational drive was in progress, such as the one in the aircraft industry, and the union demand was for its first contract, an industry-wide agreement was not possible." You certainly should have known what the result of this would be; and if you did not know, the things that happened in the aircraft industry should certainly have shown you the result. Under the conditions then existing, anyone should have foreseen what was coming, and it certainly did not help straighten out matters, nor give this country a defense program, to have the Secretary of Labor make any such statement as that. That, too, is certainly a contributory statement showing how you stood.

After all, there is no use of stalling, quibbling, dilly-dallying, backing, and filling or attempting to stand on technical statements as to what the substance of these statements means. Unfortunately for you, your chickens have come home to roost, and unfortunately for you, the responsibility of causing many of these strikes is placed clearly where it belongs and in your lap.

This is all a result of your coddling and encouragement of the socialistic, communistic outlaw labor leaders, such as Harry Bridges. I believe your handling of this matter is a blot upon the escutcheon of all Cabinets. I believe your one-sided C. I. O. labor-leader policy has brought this all about, because, in my opinion, you have favored these leaders whether they were right or wrong, not only in the administration of N. L. R. B., but all down the line wherever labor relations existed.

You have not helped labor. I believe you have injured labor, I believe you have injured industry, and I believe you have injured the defense program of the United States, because, through your all-out cooperation with this type of labor leader, the rank and file of labor, who have not been to blame, have seen a public sentiment rise against all labor. This public sentiment, after all, is the greatest weapon that labor has and you have helped destroy it by your biased handling of labor matters, namely, your all-out surrender to the subversive leadership of the C. I. O. Now that public sentiment is proven to be against you, it appears to me that you are running for cover. However, it is my further opinion that you will never be able to run to cover and avoid the consequences of your one-sided administration.

Despite all the statements, news items and comment on the communistic agitators and communistic labor leaders, you are quoted in the Los Angeles Examiner of March 28, 1941, section 1, page 12, as follows:

"Our Department doesn't look through microscopes seeking Communist agitators and we have no specific evidence that Communists have been responsible for defense-industry strikes. We concentrate our efforts upon strike settlements."

In the Los Angeles Times of March 27, 1941, page 1, you are quoted: "I do not think the general situation anywhere is too serious."

In the New York City Mirror of March 10, 1941, these are the headlines: "Perkins hid United States report on deporting aliens. She blighted Congress' efforts to rid the country of 'reds.'"

New York City Sun, April 21, 1941, headline "Perkins not moved by strikes." In that same interview, you were asked from the floor, "How can the public be protected against the racketeering type of union?" Your flippant answer was, "How can the public be protected against the racketeering type of businessman?"

In the Cheyenne, Wyo., Tribune, April 2, 1941, headline "'Defense strike not serious,' Perkins tells reporters," and again, in the same paper, "We have had no serious strikes and the progress of national-defense industries has not been held up to a serious degree by strikes." In the same paper, you are asked, "What is the general sentiment of the public in the West coast to current

strikes?" Your flippant reply, "What strikes?"

In the New York City Times of March 27, 1941: "Secretary Perkins told reporters today that she doubted if communism had played a large part in the defense-industry strikes."

In the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., April 9, 1941, under subheading, "Just Bad Behavior," your statement that it "was not alarming, it was just very bad behavior. She said the number of false ballots was not large enough to have been decisive in the strike vote in the Allis-Chalmers strike."

In the same paper, answering question put by J. PARNELL THOMAS, "Miss Perkins minimized the importance of Communist influence in strikes."

Of course, these are just a few of your statements come home to roost. How is it that you have tried to minimize the results of the activities of these communistic outlaws who would destroy the defense program of this country, particularly Harry Bridges' activities? You don't even frown on the use of false ballots, and then you cry for labor's rights. When asked for answers as to how this country can protect itself against racketeer labor leaders you give a flippant answer. Has the businessman or the public at large any right to consideration in your Department? When you were asked about the strikes on the Pacific coast on your return your statement "What strikes?" may appear to you to be very flippant, but if you have not realized it yet, you will find that those on the Pacific coast and throughout the United States know what strikes were meant, and if knowledge of these strikes has not filtered into your brain you should have your head examined.

Well do I believe, and with me many of our 130,000,000 people, that you do not examine with a microscope the communistic activities that are going on under your nose and which you are, either knowingly or unknowingly, helping to promote.

These are sad things to have to say to a Cabinet officer, but I believe the facts to be such as to justify them. Whether you just don't know, whether you are incompetent, whether you have not the courage to carry out the oath of your office makes no difference to the people of the United States. These things are there, the record is there, and the result is there, and, in my opinion, they all point to one thing, the greatest failure that any Cabinet officer has ever made in office, and it is my further opinion that if you do not resign and turn that office over to someone who will handle it like it should be handled, you will be discharged, as you ought to be.

The people in this country are no longer going to put up with your kind of administration, and it is my opinion that that goes for Democrats, Republicans, and the public at large.

Very truly yours.

The English-Speaking Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR JOHN G. WINANT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. John G. Winant, Ambassador of the United States of America to Great Britain, at the English Speaking Union on Wednesday, May 14, 1941, as reprinted from The Daily Telegraph.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The English-Speaking Union was formed in the summer of 1918 just before the last World War came to an end. That was the first war in which all English-speaking peoples united to preserve their common ideals.

It is because of this fact that I am particularly happy to speak to you with Anthony Eden, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. We worked in the pre-war days to preserve the rule of law and social justice among nations. We served in the last war in the allied armies. Many of our friends fell in France. There they died, and many are buried, that we and our children might live in a free and peaceful world. But now across the western front an invader holds sway, and over the free France of Lafayette and Foch waves the swastika.

The common ideals of the English-speaking peoples of this world are not ideals from which other peoples of the world are excluded. They are ideals which are alien in no country that loves liberty and hates tyranny. They are ideals which are common to all men and women of this earth who do justice, who love mercy, and who walk humbly with God.

The English-speaking countries of the world are peopled by men and women of diverse nationalities and different religions. Our strength comes from diversity, and our freedom is born of tolerance—tolerance of other people's origins, other people's religions, and other people's ideas.

And that is true of England no less than the English-speaking countries overseas. It was in this little island that the Angles, the Saxons, and the Normans learned to live together and call themselves Englishmen. Even the English language is a mixture of diverse tongues, and the book—the Bible—which has had a greater influence on English life and literature than any other is a book translated from tongues never spoken in this island.

In past centuries, England like other English-speaking countries, has offered sanctuary to the oppressed, persecuted and rejected of other lands. It is therefore no accident that, in our own century, among her Prime Ministers have been those of Welsh, Scott, and American descent, or that one of the most distinguished members of her War Cabinet during the last war should have been a South African of Dutch descent.

It is probably the crowning virtue of English-speaking countries that they recognize and respect virtue wherever they find it and are not inclined to beguile themselves with the primitive and barbaric idea that they themselves have a monopoly of it. That is the reason that today throughout Europe, and throughout the world, the common people of all races and of all religions are hoping and praying and, wherever given a chance, fighting for victory for Britain and for the English-speaking countries which are rallying to Britain's aid.

For today the English-speaking peoples are again being drawn together in a struggle to preserve not only their common heritage but the common ideals of civilized men everywhere.

Only this week in London, in the early morning hours of the Sabbath Day, enemy bombs destroyed the House of Commons room of the Parliament and smashed the altar of Westminster Abbey. These two hits seemed to me to symbolize the objectives of the dictator and the pagan. Across the street from the wreckage of these two great historic buildings of state and church, Saint Gaudens' statue of Abraham Lincoln was still standing. As I looked at the bowed figure of the Great Emancipator and thought of his life, I could not help but remember that he loved God, that he had defined and represented democratic government, and that he hated slavery.

And as an American I was proud that he was there in all that wreckage as a friend and sentinel of gallant days that have gone by, and a reminder that in this great battle for freedom he waited quietly for support for those things for which he lived and died.

With Machiavellian cunning, totalitarian tyranny has sought to divide and conquer peoples and nations that should stand together. By blackmail and terror, by intrigue and deceit, they have sought to weaken and undermine national unity in those countries whose freedom they would destroy. They have sought to revive and inflame old and discredited class and racial hatreds. They have missed no chance to make bad blood between friendly nations in order to delay and frustrate common action against international banditry and aggression which threaten the freedom of all nations.

But make no mistake! So far the totalitarians have been appallingly successful. Experience has proved that they have a way of keeping their threats and breaking their promises. They have destroyed, one by one, one free nation after another. While a few short years ago these lawless men could have been put down by a few simple police measures, had the then free nations of the world had the will and wisdom to act together, now the forces and resources of all the remaining free nations of the world must be employed if we are to look forward to a world freed from the domination of fear and force.

For men and women of good will there is only one choice. When dictators conspire together, men and women of good will everywhere must act together. This is no time for vain regrets or futile recriminations. We have all slept, while wicked and evil men plotted destruction. We have all thought that we might save ourselves from the holocaust and that what happened to far distant countries could never happen to us.

We have all tried to make ourselves believe that we are not our brother's keeper. But we are now beginning to realize that we need our brothers as much as our brothers need us.

The freedom-loving, peace-loving peoples of this earth are coming to realize that this is not Britain's fight alone. When clever, cunning dictators are striking with lightning speed at any and every free nation that dares to stand in their way, the time has come for democratic nations to prove to the world that, while they are free to debate, they have the power and the will to act.

On the wise use of the navies of the world may hang the destinies of the free peoples of the world. A kindly Providence at this time of stress and danger has placed at the heads of the two great English-speaking peoples two men whose knowledge of the sea is probably greater than that of any statesmen of any time. The problems that are before them in the defense of their countries are not simple problems, but complicated problems. In the controversy that has arisen in regard to sinkings of goods manufactured in the United States, I hope that the people here and at home realize that a mere statement of the sinkings of ships from America does not tell the whole story. It only proves, as does the successful transport of troops to the middle east, the protective power of an adequate convoy.

Such figures do not show the necessity of selection. They do not disclose what food may have to be taken from the children of

Britain to give her soldiers arms. They tell only a small part of the Battle of the Atlantic and of the shipping problem to be faced in the prosecution of this total war. In total war it is total strength that counts.

We are engaged in the greatest struggle in all history to preserve freedom in the modern world. We have made our tasks infinitely more difficult because we failed to do yesterday what we gladly do today. Much that we must do today would not have been necessary had we done enough yesterday.

The longer the delay the more protracted will be the war and the greater the sacrifices which will be required for victory.

Let us stop asking ourselves if it is really necessary to do more today. Let us, all of us, ask ourselves what more we can do today so that we may have less to do and secrifice tomorrow. If we, all of us, will only not put off for tomorrow what can be done today, victory for freedom will come sooner than we dare to hope.

Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, when I was Governor of the State of Oregon a newspaper correspondent of one of the large dailies used to take special delight in calling me the "official crepe hanger." I have no desire to appear in such a role, but if there ever was a darker period since man came out of the caves I have failed to find a record of it in the pages of history.

We have abolished distance in transmission of thought. We have almost abolished distance in transmission of articles of commerce. President Roosevelt recently talked from the White House in Washington, D. C., to the entire world. Think what this means.

We have an abundance and superabundance of things to eat and things to wear, not justly distributed, but available, under a Government which desires and plans social security and justice. We have mechanical devices which are almost human in their accomplishments. The people of the world could live in luxury, peace, and plenty unattainable in any other age. Instead of this, we find there are millions of starving and wretched people on this earth. Modern inventions which should make life more worth living are being used to oppress and enslave millions in a more cruel, inhuman manner than ever used by savages of old.

Never was pledged and plighted word of man or nation so lightly held, so quickly, unceremoniously, and ruthlessly violated as in this day of material plenty. Justice and confidence among nations have disappeared. Force alone is master. Might, indeed, now seems to make right under the cruel system which dominates the earth.

Into this maelstrom we find ourselves plunged, not by our own consent or act but by a series of events over which we have had no control. I do not see how any person can question that Hitler is determined upon world domination. He has said so plainly. I know his word means nothing; still, his acts all point in that direction.

There is an alliance, offensive and defensive, among Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan. This alliance threatens our ideals and our very existence. The Axis Powers teach that freedom is a myth and liberty a misnomer, that the individual means nothing, that the state is everything. Actually, every individual is made a slave for the benefit of the state. Our American ideals of life and government are absolutely opposed to the acts of the Axis Powers.

Under such conditions, there is no compromise possible and there can be no peace. It is either "we or they." No sane person wants war, but for me and my kind war and possible defeat would be preferable to submission and certain slavery.

On the Atlantic seaboard a century and a half ago, there was brought forth and instrumented the finest, best conception of government ever devised by man. Men and women by the thousands have suffered and died that the vision of the fathers might be fully realized. Four score years ago, in great battles between the States, it was decided and determined for all time that we are a Nation "one and indivisible," from ocean to shining ocean.

Our achievements in this century and one-half of national existence have exceeded the accomplishments of any other nation in any time for the welfare of its people. Education, governmental institutions, scientific progress—all have contributed to the well-being and comfort of the average man, of our American citizens.

Apparently the world is on the edge of an abyss and may be just ready to plunge over again, into dark ages. Still, there may be a way around the danger spot by following which we can maintain our existence and our honor. The monster who would destroy the fabric of our Government, and who derides our conceptions of right and wrong, has devised a war machine that has swept over everything from the Arctic to the Mediterranean, and beaten down all opposition with a ruthlessness unparalleled by Hun or Turk. Hitler cannot be appeased nor satisfied, except by abject submission. This would mean extinction of everything we hold dear and sacred. Like our fathers of old, we are called upon to defend our ideals, our rights, and our shores. To this defense we must dedicate our accumulation of wealth, our activities, our minds and hearts, our individual liberties, our place in the sun, our very lives if necessary. We must build, as quickly as possible, a war machine of such strength that it can claim and hold unrivaled superiority in the air as well as on the seas. This is absolutely necessary and of primary and urgent importance. The side which controls the air with bombers has, in military terms, that "superiority of fire" which determines the victor. With a firm hand we must control not for revenge but for our own protection all subversive elements, the "fifth columnists," whether on the air, in the factories, or on the farm. At this stage of the game, it is not for us to reason why; it is for us to do with all our might, or our country may die.

A constituent of mine, in a letter, demands an answer to the specific question, "Will you vote for convoys?" Another asks me, "Will you vote to send our soldiers to foreign lands to die on battlefields?" I honestly do not know what questions may come before us, nor how they will be put. Those who talk about convoys are already out of date, as the President, being Commander in Chief, has the constitutional right to decision, and we now know protection must come from the air rather than from ships at sea. One thing I do know is that in this hour of menace and swiftly moving events I will vote to defend our shores, our institutions, our ideals, our homes, and our sacred honor. The battle for our defense may be fought in the Atlantic or in the Pacific Ocean. It may be fought on the coast of Brazil or in New York Harbor. Choice of place of battle may not be ours.

It is folly to talk of isolation when you can span the ocean in a few hours, when you can eat dinner on the Atlantic border and breakfast within sound of the dashing waves of the Pacific. When we shall strike for home and fireside, is the only question and the important question before us. It is largely a military question. Shall we strike for home and fireside while the thin wavering line of Britain holds or shall we hold our fire? Good citizens often say we are not prepared; we are not ready; we are too weak. In the words of Patrick Henry, "When will we be stronger?"

Our fate probably rests upon our ability to produce light metals, aluminium, and magnesium, with which to construct airplanes in overwhelming numbers. The German boys have been riding airplanes made of magnesium and aluminum, and they have been riding them to victory all over Europe. Light metals at this time seem to be essential to success. Our wonderful Columbia River power resources can make the contribution.

Germany has a production of light metals about equal to our own. The German war machine is now compelling Norway, France, and other conquered territories to supplement its production of magnesium and aluminum. This means Hitler can double his production of light metals. We can match this only by immediate completion and utilization of Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects. Defense calls for construction of other dams on the Columbia River, notably at Umatilla and The Dalles. We have the capacity and natural conditions to exceed any possible construction of light metals by the Axis Powers, if our natural resources are fully developed. But the critics say that it will take too long a time. It will take years, perhaps, but who knows when the need will be over? The war has gone on nearly two years now.

It is folly to talk of a negotiated peace. It would be only an armistice, at best. Full well do we know that the Axis Powers would violate any and every provision of such a treaty. "Fifth columnists"

would blossom in every village and hamlet, just as Hitler describes the plan in Mein Kampf. His demands would come by slow degrees but would be nonetheless effective. None of those demands singly would be worth fighting for. A year ago France asked for an armistice—France, that has contributed so much to civilization and human welfare, is now disgraced and dishonored. She has become today an open ally of the nation which she knows will cut her throat and bleed her to death. France will sink into oblivion, just as Hitler has outlined it in Mein Kampf.

Honest laborers, organized and unorganized, must know that they will lose everything if Hitler dictates terms of peace or the terms of an armistice. Capitalistic industry must know that it will lose everything if Hitler dictates terms of peace or of an armistice. Complete world domination and world rule is what the German machine is driving toward. Hitler worships no god but force. He knows no law but his own will. Once enthroned, his authority cannot be overthrown by revolt within. Revolts, in the past, were possible, but not in this day of mechanized warfare and the Gestapo. Hitler's secret police, when they once enter a conquered land, remove to concentration camps or graves everyone who could lead a revolt.

We lovers of freedom and liberty cannot betray our illustrious ancestry. We must win this struggle against the Hitler machine or lose everything. The choice is not for us. If the gage of battle is thrown at our feet we will have no alternative. No one thinks Hitler will land on our continental shores should England break. No student can doubt that if England succumbs control of the seas will go where the British Navy goes. We have the resources; we have the men; we have the money; and we must have the will to defend our ideals and our way of life as our ancestors defended their ideals of freedom. This is no time to dwell upon the past mistakes of the British Empire. Those who expand on that subject love Hitler more.

Every true American today must hope and pray that the prophecy of Swinburne may prove true:

All our past acclaims our future: Shakespeare's voice and Nelson's hand,
Milton's faith and Wordsworth's trust in this our chosen and chainless land,
Bear us witness: Come the world against her, England yet will stand.

Justice in Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

ARTICLES BY W. C. McGINNIS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by W. C. McGinnis, superintendent of schools of Perth Amboy, N. J.:

[From the Journal of Education for October 1939]

JUSTICE IN OUR TIME

(By W. C. McGinnis, superintendent of schools of Perth Amboy, N. J.)

Freedom, liberty, justice—these are among the most precious words known to man. "* * * with liberty and justice for all" is a phrase familiar to all Americans. But we are not so familiar with the origin of our concept of justice.

It is the irony of fate and a harsh commentary on world civilization that the people who gave to the world our ideal of justice is the one people to whom, more than to any other, justice is denied, for civilization got its ideal of justice from the Jew. And it is more than passing strange that the nation that in these latter years is crucifying justice and with barbaric and murderous ruthlessness has proclaimed to the world that within her borders the Jew has no right or claim to justice, is Germany, for among the contributions of various peoples to the common store of civilization in days of long ago was Germany's burning zeal for liberty.

The Hebrew's conception of justice which he gave to the world is that justice is an attribute of God Himself. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne." A reading of the Old Testament shows that in psalm and prophesy the Hebrew proclaimed to the world the idea that justice is universal and eternal and that regardless of obstacles and reverses justice will prevail.

Contrast the ancient Hebrew's conception of justice with that of any other people. To the Hebrew justice was not a blind goddess weighing unseen things in the balances. Nor did he think of justice as holding the unsheathed sword of vengeance. No; to the Jew justice was not blind and it was not vengeful, because it came from God and "His mercy endureth forever."

Here in America and in other lands where freedom, liberty, and justice have not been abolished by a power-crazed and oppressive dictatorship the ancient Hebrew conception of justice is civilization's ideal of justice.

We all know that the great common store of the good that makes and sustains civilization is made up of the contributions of various peoples. These contributions were the ideals sought for and attained by different nations and handed on to us as a common heritage. They are the foundation of our civilization, and if the foundation is allowed to be undermined civilization itself will fail.

The history of mankind is the history of man's search for an ideal. Sometimes it was the ideal of beauty in art and literature, as with the ancient Greeks; sometimes it was the ideal of religion and justice, as with the ancient Hebrews; sometimes it was the ideal of liberty, as with the old-time Germans; sometimes it was the ideal of constitutional government based on the rights of men, as with the English; sometimes it was the ideal of a representative democracy and equality of opportunity, as with Thomas Jefferson and the American Colonists; sometimes it was the ideal of unity and liberty—"government of the people, by the people, and for the people"; sometimes it was the ideal of "a world safe for democracy" based on equality of opportunity, on the proposition that might does not make right, and on the brotherhood of man, as with Woodrow Wilson and the American people of 1917.

The Jews have made other contributions to the welfare of mankind, as in science, in medicine, and in literature. The influence of the grand and beautiful language of the Old Testament has a predominant place in the literature of all the nations of the world. But the greatest contribution of the Jews to civilization is the Hebrew ideal of justice. The conception of justice that is accepted even if not practiced in the world today is the contribution of the Jew, and it is the greatest contribution any people has ever made to the good in the common store of civilization.

The Jew may be driven up and down on the face of the earth; he may be driven out of his homeland as he has been driven out of Germany; he may be placed upon a ship upon the face of the deep with no port where he is allowed to land; but nothing can ever erase from the pages of history the fact that it is to the Jew that the world owes its ideal of justice. And some day eternal and triumphant justice shall prevail for the Jew.

[From the Journal of Education for April 1939]

AN UNSUNG HERO OF 1776

(By William C. McGinnis, superintendent, Perth Amboy, N. J.)

"Each generation freedom's creed[1]
Must be with harshness taught,
And freemen warned that all they have
And are was dearly bought;
And oft must Lexington be roused
And Concord's fight be fought."

Freedom and liberty were never conferred upon any nation. The freedom and liberty of a nation have always been attained by fighting for them. The freedom and liberty of a people can be maintained only by fighting for them. Americanism, the freedom and liberty of the American people, can be maintained only by combating those forces which are enemies of our form of government and it makes no difference whether those forces are communism, nazi-ism, or fascism.

If American freedom and liberty mean anything, they mean freedom and liberty for all. To know what they mean we need to know our history. That is why freedom's creed must be taught and Lexington be roused in each generation. We take too much for granted. We are too complacent in our freedom and liberty. Of late years it has been the fashion to belittle Concord and Lexington and the process by which Americanism was established.

At the recent meeting of the bund at Madison Square Garden, one of the speakers read a list of names of Jews who he said were enemies past and present of the United States. In the list was the name of Haym Salomon.

Charles Spencer Hart in "General Washington's Son of Israel" (Lippincott) tells the story of Haym Salomon. Charles Spencer Hart tells three episodes in the drama of Haym Salomon and the birth of the United States:

1. In a synagogue in Philadelphia. It is Yom Kippur. The most sacred period in the ceremony is in progress. A rider in the Continental Army uniform rides up to the building and enters. "I am a courier from General Washington. Is Haym Salomon here?"

A small man in a Quaker hat steps forward. He receives a letter from the courier. He reads it. Then he speaks in soft Jewish accents, "Tell General Washington that his appeal shall not be in vain." General Washington asks for $200,000. Haym Salomon pledges all his resources. His companions pledge various sums. The total amount is raised and the Hebrews return to their religious exercises and the worship of God.

2. The second episode is in Paris. King Louis XVI and Benjamin Franklin are in conference with regard to the request of the infant American Republic for financial support from France.

"But who," asks the King, "will guarantee the subsidies you ask?" Franklin replies quietly, "Haym Salomon."

[1] Rhymes of Vermont Rural Life—Daniel L. Cady.

"It is enough," the King rejoins.

3. The third episode. In the obituary column of the Philadelphia Journal and Advertiser of January 8, 1785, is a one-line obituary: "On Thursday died Haym Salomon, a broker."

Haym Salomon's history is a history of generous financial and personal service to his country never excelled in this or any other nation. It is an outstanding example of what the Jewish people have done for this country and for other nations of the world.

It is not my purpose here to tell the story of Haym Salomon. Read it as written by Charles Spencer Hart. The three episodes I have cited are only three incidents in Haym Salomon's life of devotion and service to his country. He paid the salaries of three future Presidents of the United States and he paid the expenses of Lafayette's Army.

In 1925 President Coolidge suggested building a memorial to Haym Salomon, but nothing was done.

In Philadelphia on a hill of old and narrow streets one may come to Plum Street and the little old cemetery of Mikveh Israel. Here Haym Salomon is buried.

Farm Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE HOLSTEIN FRIESIAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Holstein Friesian Association requesting the deferment in classification of workers on dairy farms. The farm labor situation is becoming very acute and it would seem that the production of food is of the utmost necessity to national defense.

RESOLUTION REQUESTING DEFERMENT IN CLASSIFICATION OF WORKERS ON DAIRY FARMS

Whereas it is vitally essential to the defense program of the United States and to the rendering of necessary aid to Great Britain to enable her to carry on the war against the Axis Powers that the production of food supplies and other materials on the farms of this country be maintained not only at their present high level but increased and expanded to the maximum capacity; and

Whereas the President of the United States and other governmental authorities have called upon the farmers of America to put forth their greatest efforts in the production of foodstuffs and particularly dairy products; and

Whereas it is imperative in the accomplishment of this purpose to have an adequate supply of competent workers on the farms of the Nation; and

Whereas the greatly increased industrial activity with its higher wages to industrial workers has caused many who formerly worked on farms to leave them for employment in industrial centers, and the selective service system as heretofore administered has called many farm youths into the military service, all of which has resulted in an acute shortage of workers on the farms, particularly in the field of dairy farming where trained and experienced help is most important, which shortage is having a serious and increasing effect upon the entire farm program and especially on dairy farms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Holstein-Friesian Association of America in its annual convention assembled at Lansing, Mich., this 4th day of June 1941, That recognizing the patriotic duty of the farmers of America to do all within their power to operate their farms at their highest possible capacity and to grow, produce, harvest, and market in sufficient quantities the foodstuffs and other materials so vitally needed, and desiring to aid in the fulfillment of said purpose, that consideration be given to the increasingly acute farm labor shortage now existing and that it be recognized that registrants who are trained workers on dairy farms of America are necessary in their civilian activity and by reason thereof should be given deferment in class 2-A:

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be immediately sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershel, acting director of the selective service system, with the request that the importance of the deferment of these workers be emphasized to the officials of the selective service system throughout the various States.

Shall We Feed Europe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN HERALD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

SHALL WE FEED EUROPE?

(By Herbert Hoover and Dorothy Canfield Fisher)

MR. HOOVER SAYS—

We are struggling today against terrific odds to preserve the value and sanctity of life for the individual man—what happens to the starving among the 80,000,000 people in the occupied democracies of Europe is but one-half of the impending tragedy. The other one-half of this tragedy is what happens in the process to the soul of America faced with the demand for human compassion. If to the helplessness of the weak is to be added now the indifference of the strong, then I say, upon the outcome of this struggle may depend not only the future of certain nationalities but the questionable permanence of a religion that disowns the brotherhood of man. I have faith that if we understand the danger this tragedy will not be permitted.

On a recent evening Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador, addressed the Pilgrims in New York City. In defining the words freedom and democracy he said: "I would state thus what in varying forms is in many minds today: First the religious principle of the absolute value of every human." I heartily agree with that statement. There is no false humanitarianism in those words when applied to all people. And there will be no false humanitarianism in this struggle today if the teachings of the Prince of Peace are followed. For "every" to me means not only "every" British woman and child but "every" Belgian woman and child; "every" Norwegian; "every" Finnish; "every" Danish; "every" Polish; "every" Dutch; "every" French; "every" Spanish; "every" Chinese and indeed, "every" starving helpless person of "every" nation. That which makes a humanitarianism false is not the supposed necessity of some military strategy but the refusal of human compassion and bread to every starving disease-ridden people.

The other day I read with agreement also a statement by Mr. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., an Assistant Secretary of State. After describing a religion that had the power to change the face of the earth, he said, "Foremost was the conception that no individual was forgotten, none left out." That's the purpose of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies. We believe there should be no forgotten Belgian; no forgotten Norwegian; no forgotten Pole, Dane, Dutchman or anyone else. None should be left out if the brotherhood of man is to remain at the heart of true religion. The arguments today against our Christian duty to feed these people I faced in the last war. I say today again what I said then to Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, "It would be an ironic thing for the British soldiers to march into Belgium and find her people all dead, or but a shell left." It is upon a people helped to survive by our intervention that the future of Europe has to be built.

General Smuts, surveying what the war and the blockade and counter-blockade had done to Europe, said: "It is the most awful spectacle in history, and no man with any heart or regard for human destiny can contemplate it without the deepest emotion."

And we have agreed to all-out aid for Britain. We have now a responsibility in the policies of this war. We have a right to speak through our Government in these matters. And in a country of precious freedom of speech we have a right to debate its policies.

So I appeal to the compassion of the Christian churches, to her ministers, to her devoted people to come to the assistance of the starving among these 80,000,000 people. Let us not visit the tragedy of the first World War on civilian populations again.

I believe General Pershing and Admiral Pratt (World War leaders) are right when they say our plan confers no benefit on Germany nor disadvantage on Great Britain.

The compassionate example and teachings of the Prince of Peace bid us to answer the prayer of 80,000,000 who cry, "Give us this day our daily bread."

MRS. FISHER SAYS—

In a periodical dedicated, as the Christian Herald is, to keeping open the channels of spiritual life, there is less need than in other magazines to say and then to repeat that Christianity and humane feeling for our fellow human beings are valid motives for trying to get food to the hungry. In fact, it is not only in magazines directly professing Christian principles that one finds a ready admission that, of course, from the religious and humane point of view, those who have more than they need should try to help and share with those who are suffering because they have less. Dr. Polling's ardent, eloquent editorial in the Christian Herald, Imperative—Now! lays a warm-hearted emphasis on the need to try to help the starving. To the credit of the religious leaders of our country be it said, the same attitude is found in a large majority of the statements made by the notables of other religious bodies.

The words of our Lord are too plain to be distorted, "For I was an hungered and ye gave me meat," is as much a part of the fiber of our collective American mind as Lincoln's "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers

brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

No; nobody needs to think up answers to arguments that it is Christian to refuse food to the hungry. No such arguments can be made, are made. Chapter and verse from Scripture meet with a vague, unwilling assent from practically everyone. The obstacle to be surmounted is just one short, formidable word—"but." How many times do we hear it said, perhaps say ourselves, "Yes; of course, it would be the right thing to do, from the purely moral point of view, to send food to the hungry, but * * *" or "My heart simply aches for the suffering over there, but * * *."

It is with that "but" ringing in my ears that I begin to set down some of the reasons, not the well-recognized, humane, decent reasons for trying to live up to the minimum of decently human principles, but the plain, factual, logical reasons for pushing that "but * * *" to one side and going forward toward the only action of which we won't be heartily ashamed in years to come.

After the "but" what words come next? Perhaps the phrase most often heard is, "but—it would help Hitler." This reason is usually backed up with a statement that the Germans really got most, or a good deal anyhow, of the food distributed by the Commission for Relief in Belgium during the 1914–18 war. Fortunately evidence on this point is available, evidence that would be accepted by any responsible law court in any civilized country. The Belgium Relief Commission was administered by a considerable number of reputable, responsible citizens of the United States, of Belgium, of France. Not one of them—not a single one of them—has ever said that food meant for the starving Belgians was confiscated by the Germans. Seventy-three living members of the Belgian Commission (many of them have become well-known public figures since) who directed the distribution of food from August 1914 to November 1918 have signed a statement absolutely denying the truth of the rumor now darkening our air, that the Germans interfered with their work or took any (but the smallest amounts, and those refunded from German stocks) of the food that was sent in for the starving of the invaded countries. The accounts of the Belgian Relief Commission were published, down to the last detail, in 1925, and never questioned. During the 4 years of the war, the French Government, the British Government, repeatedly and publicly stated that food was reaching the people of the invaded regions only. During the 20 years since the last war, nobody said, anywhere, in any form, that the Belgian Relief Commission had been fooled by the German authorities. Now really * * *.

When somebody gives you as basis for the statement that Germans ate the food distributed by the Belgian Relief workers, a story which was told her by an American soldier who saw—or a report from the friend of a friend who heard that—it is really safe for you to reply with a flat old-fashioned "That just ain't so." There is no evidence to prove such statements, none at all. There is an abundance of undisputed evidence to the contrary. It would clear the air of what is the merest gossip if every one of us would rise up with rather an exasperated snort whenever that "but" is followed by "the Germans got a whole lot of food which was intended for the Belgians in the last war." Here is an argument which really should be ruled out of any ordinarily intelligent discussion.

You will find that, as soon as you have knocked down and dragged out this first absurdity, that the next obstacle is this idea: "Well, maybe the Belgian Relief operated in 1914–18 without interference from German authorities, but the Germans are ever so much more unscrupulous now, ever so much more experienced in lying and falsity of all kinds. They'd soon find a way to get around any sort of precautions which could be invented by our nice, open-minded (rather simple-minded) Americans."

Maybe so. Who knows? Certainly those who oppose the feeding of hungry women and children do not know, for they can't look into the future any more than other people. There's only one way to find out whether the Germans would get around any precautions taken by American relief to get food to the people conquered by the Germans. That's to try. What's the risk in trying? There is a risk, a very small one. It's this—that the Germans might get food for two or three days more. But the carefully made plans of the American Committee on Food provide for a steady flow of small amounts of food, rather than for the piling up of great quantities. If the Germans seized all that is on hand at any one time, and transported it all to feed Germans, they would have just three days' provisions. How much would that influence the outcome of the war? This fact, for it's no theoretical argument, just a plain fact, cannot be too often repeated. It must be repeated over and over, as long as the statement is heard that Germans, not the hungry civilians in the conquered countries, will eat any food sent in from America.

But you will find—there's a regular foretellable progression in the talk about all this—that when you have finally silenced a prophecy advanced as a fact, the next obstacle is a statement phrased about like this, "But the American and neutral people running this attempt won't know—how can they—whether they are getting all the food sent in or not?"

These primitively simple material objections are only the first usually brought out. Just as much to be expected is this argument which might be called political, "Who are we, unbombed in our safe homes, to try to tell England, fighting for her very life, what's the right thing to do? We should do exactly what England wants done." Well, in the first place there isn't the slightest danger of our not doing what England wants. We can't very well do anything else, since England's say-so as to the blockade absolutely decides the matter. So there's no question of doing what the British Government decides it doesn't want done. But not even to talk about what we think is the Christian, decent, and the wisest way to meet a tragic situation! Only totalitarians could wish us to give up our democratic right to think for ourselves about matters involving human welfare, and having thought, to present publicly our reasons.

For, leaving out entirely all the reasons of the heart which come rushing warmly and emotionally to anyone who has been brought up in a civilized country, it seems obvious to large numbers of Americans that as a matter of mere political policy, it would be better for our cause not to leave to their fate those citizens of democracies conquered by dictatorships without making an effort to help them. If we could help them in a military way, how quickly would we act. There is a chance, a possibility that we can help them in a nonmilitary way. If we do, will we furnish them with reason for thinking more or less of democracies? The question answers itself. Some weeks ago—no, it is really some months ago, so completely is this last argument fading and withering in the light of common sense—one heard it said that if the conquered people were starved enough, they would be more inclined to revolt against their German conquerors. But that is seldom said now. The physical weakness and depression which comes from near-starvation is too well-known a fact to overlook. And it has become more and more proved that the conquered peoples of Europe are boiling in resentment and hatred against their conquerors now, ready to revolt at the appearance of the slightest chance of successful rebellion. To enfeeble by lack of food those people more passionately ready than any others to resist Nazi ideas—that is obviously weakening a wing of one's own army. If we could arm them with machine guns and tanks and ammunition to fight their conquerors, what mountains of military supplies would we rush into their hands. To keep up their bodily strength with food, and their spirits by the knowledge that they are not forgotten but cherished by nations still free—why is that not, even from a military standpoint, as useful to the great cause for which we are, all of us, hoping and praying?

United Office and Professional Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to an address made on the floor by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] on June 9, 1941, in which he charged that the white-collar workers of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., of New York, were "reds," seeking to control this important defense industry for the purpose of impeding national defense.

As a matter of fact, it is my honest opinion that what the so-called "red" workers and union officials were and are seeking to do to better the economic position and preserve their union. In substantiation of this there is being held a National Labor Relations Board election to determine whether Local 16, United Office and Professional Workers of America (C. I. O.) shall represent the workers as bargaining agent. In the course of his remarks the distinguished gentleman from Michigan makes a number of what appear to me to be unwarranted charges against Lewis Merrill, national president, and Peter K. Hawley, president of, and Norma Aronson, general organizer of Local 16.

Lewis Merrill, president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, in reply to Representative HOFFMAN'S remarks on the U. O. P. W. A., made the following statement:

I have just read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the vicious attack against myself and my organization by Representative HOFFMAN in the House of Representatives on June 9, 1941. I deny in toto the charges made in that statement. I further state that if Representative HOFFMAN will divest himself of his congressional immunity and make those same statements in a manner which would allow for court action, I will unhesitatingly sue him for libel, as I would any newspaper or anyone else who will take responsibility for these statements.

It is my deliberate judgment that Representative HOFFMAN has accommodated his high office to serve the interest of a union-

hating employer who has already been cited for contempt for flagrant violation of the National Labor Relations Act. This firm, M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., must appear before the United States circuit court of appeals on June 16 to answer an N. L. R. B. citation for contempt because of its refusal to obey a Board order to disband its company union and cease its unfair labor practices. Representative HOFFMAN'S attack upon our organization has served to encourage a lawbreaker in pursuance of its illegal antilabor acts. The day following Representative HOFFMAN'S statement, M. Lowenstein & Sons discharged an employee, who testified before the Labor Board, for wearing a union button. The gentleman from Michigan and those who give currency to his remarks are responsible for the loss of this man's job and for what may follow.

I am not now, and have not been, a member of the Communist Party. I believe in the American system of free enterprise and seek to preserve our democratic political institutions against all those who threaten it, including those employer interests Representative HOFFMAN so loudly represents. Communism is no issue in our union, and will not become so, despite the apparent efforts of Representative HOFFMAN or the Dies committee or anyone else to divert us from our seeking genuine collective-bargaining contracts.

Peter K. Hawley, president of Local 16, U. O. P. W. A., made the following statement:

In a period of grave national problems Representative HOFFMAN, Monday, June 9, 1941, consumed considerable time on the floor of the House of Representatives to launch an attack consisting almost entirely of misstatements concerning the activities of the union and a declaration in support of a company union in the firm of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc. Its purpose was subsequently revealed when, on Monday, June 16 (10 days before the N. L. R. B. election), a copy of the speech was distributed, under the frank of Representative HOFFMAN, addressed to each employee in the firm of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., entitled "Reds Seek Control of Office Workers." The committee of fellow employees in Lowenstein, labeled as a company union by the National Labor Relations Board, has made public admission that the remarks of Representative HOFFMAN were the result of an interview which they had with him in Washington prior to his attack on the union. No effort was made by Representative HOFFMAN to ascertain the facts, either prior to his statement or since. The circumstances under which the speech was made, the manner in which it was mailed, and the time at which it was delivered clearly point to collaboration between a Member of the Congress of the United States and a company union outlawed by the National Labor Relations Board.

On the very day that the letters were distributed among the employees—unjustionably designed to affect the election—leading officers of the company went on trial in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals charged by the National Labor Relations Board with contempt of court, as a result of violating a decree of that court entered into by M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., on October 24, 1938. The seriousness of this charge is indicated by the fact that since the Wagner Act was passed there have been less than a dozen such cases brought before the courts. The complaint was signed by Harry A. Millis, Chairman; Edwin S. Smith, member; and William M. Leiserson, member, of the National Labor Relations Board.

On March 26, 1938, M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., was found guilty by the National Labor Relations Board of establishing a company union and engaging in other acts designed to interfere with the organizational efforts of its employees as a result of a complaint submitted by Local 16, United Office and Professional Workers of America. The company union was ordered dissolved and the employer ordered to cease and desist from interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of their rights to self-organization. M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., opposed the Board order until October 24, 1938, when the circuit court of appeals entered into a decree with the firm, enforcing the order of the Board.

On February 10, 1941, the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 16, requested the firm to engage in collective bargaining. Another company union was established, known as the Committee of Fellow Employees. The National Labor Relations Board, after thoroughly investigating, has found that this act is in violation of the existing court order and the contempt of court trial, which is now on, is the result of these investigations.

M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., was found guilty of a third National Labor Relations Board violation by a decision handed down on February 17, 1941. The National Labor Relations Board found that the employer foisted a company union among the machine printers in its Rockhill, N. C., plant. Yet, in the face of this record, Congressman HOFFMAN has used his office to defend the Lowenstein firm and aid its company union. One of the consequences of Representative HOFFMAN'S remarks has been the discharge of a National Labor Relations Board witness in the contempt proceedings, John Johnsen, for union activities.

The union has gone on record of its own willingness, following certification as the collective bargaining agent of Lowenstein workers, to submit all differences arising from negotiations to mediation and arbitration. There has never, at any time, been any question of strike action, but every effort has been made to settle the union's differences through the legally prescribed channels.

Representative HOFFMAN has referred to testimony of discredited witnesses before the Dies committee as the basis of his charges against the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 16, despite the fact that Lewis Merrill, president of the union, has repeatedly denied any affiliation with the Communist Party and has requested an opportunity to appear before the Dies committee to refute these charges, which has never been granted.

The officers of local 16 and its membership, and specifically Norma Aronson and Peter K. Hawley, named in the Hoffman accusation, are concerned only with exercising the right of white-collar workers to organize and improve their standards. They are opposed to any group which might seek to control or influence the policies of their union in any other direction than that of the program of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Congressman HOFFMAN has charged that a section of the membership has bolted from local 16 because of its policies. The records will show that the only persons "who left our organization" were the employees in the office of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, at the time when the union itself deserted the Congress of Industrial Organizations and returned to the American Federation of Labor. The white-collar workers in private industry are proud of their union. They look upon such actions as Congressman HOFFMAN'S in the light of the record of the firm which he is supporting, as a union-breaking act which has no place in Congressional chambers, and detracts from the dignity of the Congress.

The above statements are inserted in the RECORD for the purpose of enabling the House to hear both sides and exercise individual judgment in the premises.

The Story of Washington State's Old-Age Pension Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. N. P. ATKINSON

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting and provocative article written by the Honorable N. P. Atkinson, president of the Old Age Pension Union of the State of Washington, and the Honorable William J. Pennock, executive secretary of that union, and who is a State representative.

These two gentlemen were recently in the National Capital, where they conferred with the National Social Security Board. They have been among the foremost exponents of a decent State pension act in our State. They promoted the Initiative No. 141, known as the Senior Citizens' Act, which they describe in the following article. But let the article speak for itself.

[From the magazine US week of June 14, 1941]

DESIGN FOR LIVING AT 65

(By Washington State Senator N. P. Atkinson, president of Washington Old Age Pension Union, and State Representative William J. Pennock, union's executive secretary)

There are millions of impoverished old people in the United States, people who have spent their lives in useful work but who are now suffering from lack of proper food and medical attention.

In the State of Washington every person will get a minimum pension of $40 a month, as well as free medical attention, after he has reached the age of 65. And he doesn't have to be a pauper to get it.

He can own his own home. He can have his own car. He can have an insurance policy. But he still needs food and rent money and security, and in the State of Washington he gets these—or at least gets a vital contribution toward these irreducible expenses through a State pension.

BOOST APPROPRIATION

How did we do it? Through organization. We increased State old-age pensions from $22 a month to $40 a month and increased the number of pensioners from 40,000 to 60,000. We boosted the appropriation for old-age pensions from $22,000,000 to $55,000,000 per biennium at one session of the legislature.

This is the victory which the Washington Old Age Pension Union has just wrung from a reluctant Democratic legislature and from the backers of Republican Governor Langlie. Here are five factors which led to this victory:

(1) Our pension plan, known as the Senior Citizens Act (initiative 141). In the State of Washington we do not have to depend upon the legislature entirely. By securing over 100,000 valid signatures of voters we put the Senior Citizens Act on the ballot. Now it cannot be repealed or even changed for at least 2 years.

The act contained no "funny money" clause. It contained no clause at all for raising necessary funds. It simply gave a mandate to the legislature for that body to do its

appropriating duty. Enemies attempted to make a great deal of the fact that we did not place all our eggs in one basket of an exclusive taxing clause. If we had followed the exmple of some other States and done so, these same enemies would have been the first to attack the taxing clause, no matter what method was provided. In fact, they had beaten a previous pension plan in 1935, by praising its general intent, but criticizing its revenue-raising clause.

So we had a good, sound initiative, with strong specific provisions, such as a $40-a-month minimum at 65, free medical and dental care in addition to the pension, a standard of need that would double the number of recipients on the rolls, and exemptions for a homestead, for a person's car, for insurance policies with $500 cash surrender value. In addition, we provided a simplified method of hearing on grievances, and for court appeals for which the State pays the cost.

The minimum of $40 was important, for with a $30 maximum pension during the preceding biennium the State social-security department has simply taken the legislature's appropriation, divided it into 20 equal parts, and spread the resulting poverty over 40,000 pensioners at an average of $22. Under the Senior Citizens Act, the first $40 checks were sent out March 1, 1941, and while some deductions were made that the Pension Union deems unauthorized, the present level shows that at least 60,000 pensioners will receive an average of $34 each.

ALLIES HELP DRIVE

(2) Another factor: We searched for and found allies. If it had not been for the communications we sent to trade-unions and the speeches we made before them, many of them would not have sufficiently realized our victory was also a victory against antiunion forces. They would not have worked and contributed as they did.

Other allies we won included the Townsendites, who wanted to eat while they worked for a national pension, and who knew the Pension Union supported 100 percent their drive for a national pension; the small merchants, who saw the new pension grants would flow into their tills; the education associations, aware that the tax dodgers were as much opposed to education money as to pensions; the farmers and granges, so impoverished they eyed $30 for a married couple with delight; and our political friend and guide with whom we are affiliated, the Washington Commonwealth Federation—broad people's movement.

(3) Another factor was the political education of our members. The Washington Old Age Pension Union encouraged all discussion which broadened the general political and economic outlook of its members, and related the pension to other social gains for which unions and other people's organizations are fighting. Thus our locals discuss taxes, prices, profits, wages, and farm and labor problems. We wanted to be sure after we got $40 for our senior citizens that that $40 would buy more than the previous $22. We have not tolerated red-baiting in our locals.

(4) The fourth factor was pension organization. At no time in the legislative campaign did we let it divert us from getting new members. With the payment of the $40 pensions on March 1, and the filing of tens of thousands of new applications, and the resulting work by grievance committees in every local, we have insisted that the only guaranty of holding our gains and getting new ones is to build the pension locals. This has resulted during the last year in a 60 percent increase in membership, and a growth of active locals to 150.

(5) The final factor was militancy. This is the spirit which refused to be intimidated by the attacks of Tory newspapers and the calamity-howling of the paid propagandists of the power trust, who spend hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to discredit and invalidate Initiative 141, according to direct testimony at the recent investigation held by the Federal Power Commission.

This militancy is what kept the pensioners firm to defend the rights of those off the pension rolls as well as those on, to fight for aid to dependent children and their mothers, for the physically handicapped, for those on general relief, for every category of public assistance.

For instance, the Pension Union doubled the grant to dependent children through a determined fight at this year's session of the legislature, although the Republican governor later vetoed the increase. A picket line kept going on the capitol steps, and packed the corridors so tightly with our members on State Capitol Mobilization Day that legislators almost had to crawl over their heads to get out of the house and senate chambers.

FIGHT FOR INTERPRETATION

The fight will be carried forward for a better interpretation of the senior citizens act. There are still too many and too large deductions, including $6 from each check where pensioners live together, and a deduction of $12 for the estimated rental value of shacks in Hooverville, etc. We are bringing test suits in these cases.

We've made a good start in Washington, and now that we've done it, we can say it was easy. We believe it was only a start. We believe there will be schemes aimed at nullifying our gains. But we're going to be alert. And we know that it's a Nation-wide problem. Wherever there are old people or people who expect to be old, there the pension movement will grow. And that is all over.

Tribute to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY J. A. HILLIARD

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a Tribute to the Flag, by Mr. J. A. Hilliard, published in the Wayne County Press, of Fairfield, Ill., on May 29, 1941:

[From the Wayne County Press, Fairfield, Ill.]

TRIBUTE TO THE FLAG

(By J. A. Hilliard, Spanish-American War veteran and national historian of Veterans of All Wars Association)

That flag presents the most beautiful combination of national colors that was ever unfurled.

It has carried more joy to more humble hearthstones than any insignia of government that ever floated in the sun-kissed breezes of heaven.

The red in that flag is redder than the rising sun when it bursts above the eastern horizon with a face of insufferable splendor; redder than the carnation whose colors are brewed in the workshops of Nature; redder than the flush of joy that mantles the cheek of the young mother when she feels for the first time her first-born's breath.

It typifies the blood that flowed down the slopes of Bunker Hill; stained the snows of Valley Forge; gushed from wounds at Lundys Lane and Buena Vista; the warm heart current that reddened the sod at Gettysburg; consecrated the apple blossoms at Appomattox; freed the oppressed at Santiago and Manila and poured over Flanders Fields.

The White in that flag is as white as the driven snow when it flows uncontaminated from the hand of God; whiter than the calla lily that blossoms beneath the fostering care of the loving housewife; whiter than the sacred veil that envelops the blushing bride; whiter than the silver beam that shoots the evening star.

It typifies the purity of the patriotism that animated American manhood on a thousand blood-bought fields and a hundred crimson seas.

The blue in that flag, is as blue as the arched dome of heaven; bluer than the modest violet that blossoms in the wood glen; bluer than the mellow radiance that flashes in the human eye.

It typifies the sacrifice of the mother who laid her stalwart first-born on the altar of his country, and kneeling at his vacant chair, prays to God, to comfort her lonely and aching heart; then seizes the sword that has fallen from the lifeless hand of the dead hero, buckles it to the waist of her remaining son and bids him go forth to conquer.

Priceless principles go with that flag:

For them, Washington, Taylor, and Grant fought; Webster and Borah plead and Lincoln died.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Kelley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK (N. J.) STAR-LEDGER

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased on Friday of last week upon the rewarding of a well-deserved advancement to a very close friend of mine for services so well rendered in his chosen profession. Monsignor Kelley, though extremely busy, still finds time for many outside activities and has served well as the vice chairman of my selection board for the appointment of candidates to West Point and Annapolis.

The following editorial appearing in the Newark Star-Ledger on June 12, 1941, is a fine tribute to a fine person:

[From the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger]

THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR KELLEY

In every community and among every group of men there are always certain individuals who stand out because they best personify qualities or aspirations common to all. Such personifications of abstract qualities take on distinctness with time and achievement; sometimes they are acknowledged on appropriate formal occasions, but always they are felt with a growing degree of consciousness by the community.

A formal occasion of recognition of a uniquely important personality will occur within the Roman Catholic community of New Jersey tomorrow night when the Most Reverend Thomas J. Walsh officiates at investiture ceremonies for the Right Reverend Monsignor James F. Kelley at the Seton Hall

College Auditorium. On that occasion the president of Seton Hall will be invested with the robes of office to which he was named by Pope Pius XII recently.

A formal occasion is in itself a symbol; those participating represent and typify a far wider community of interest, and the occasion is but a focusing upon time. The man to be honored tomorrow serves within his faith and church, but belongs to a community as broad as the human race and personifies to those who know him and feel his influence the aspiration of all good men to understanding of their fellows.

Good citizenship has never been better exemplified than by the president of Seton Hall in his activities on behalf of his college and many other patriotic, civic, and educational efforts that have commanded his interest. With him civic duty has never been a matter of doing a share in certain conventional civic undertakings; he has never counted, measured, or budgeted his energies except for the purpose of stretching them to conform to his sense of duty.

As a priest he has earned great distinction and recognition; as an educator he has helped to build a growing and growingly progressive institution of higher learning; as a citizen he has preached and practiced an ardent, neighborly, and dynamic Americanism; as a man he has been unsparing of himself and understanding of others.

No community has so many such great citizens that it can remain unaware and unappreciative of any; the people of metropolitan New Jersey, men and women of all races and religions, must feel gratified by the honor being bestowed by the Roman Catholic Church upon a neighbor and civic leader in whose achievements all may take pride and comfort.

B'nai B'rith Aids Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY HENRY MONSKY

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, District No. 3 of B'nai B'rith, considered one of the largest Jewish service organizations in the world, just concluded one of its most successful conventions in Atlantic City, N. J. The highlight of the convention was the principal address delivered by Henry Monsky, president of the supreme Lodge of B'nai B'rith, who is one of the most distinguished Jewish leaders in America, and an outstanding American. Mr. Monsky pleaded for national unity, and offered the facilities of B'nai B'rith to help the President of the United States in our great national-defense program. In discussing civilian defense, he said:

Anticipating that the time would come when all Americans would be given the opportunity to participate in the furtherance of the national-defense program, the recent triennial national convention of B'nai B'rith adopted a resolution placing at the disposal of the President and the people of the United States the entire strength and resources of the 150,000 men and women enrolled under the banner of B'nai B'rith.

That was nearly 2 months ago.

Today the millions of civilians not already engaged in some aspect of national-defense activity have been given the means for contributing their share to the defense program. Last week the President of the United States issued an Executive order creating the Office of Civilian Defense, with New York's Mayor La Guardia as director. This new arm of the Government is the President's answer to those men, women, and children who have been asking: What can we do for national defense?

All of us have been asking that question; the family man who has been deferred from military service wants to help; the housewife would like to pitch in too; the shopkeeper and the professional man would like to find a niche for themselves; even those too young to wear their country's uniform are begging for the opportunity to do their bit in civilian defense.

Civilian defense is a threefold job. It involves the organization of communities throughout the country for the maximum industrial defense; the stimulation of morale among the civilian population; and, most important of all, it calls for setting up skeleton civilian organizations for actual physical defense in the event that should become necessary. It is in this latter phase of the program that the civilian can be most helpful.

Men can learn to act as air-raid wardens, how to guide people into air-raid shelters, how to put out fires, how to quell hysteria, how to administer first aid, how to guard public utilities, and can serve in home-guard units. Women can knit, man feeding stations, serve as emergency telephone operators, conserve the food supply, and guard against profiteering. Our youth can help collect scrap metal and rubber, pinch hit as traffic guardians, help reduce fire hazards, and take over various household duties to relieve adults for more responsible tasks.

All of us, regardless of age or class or sex, can make sacrifices to buy national-defense bonds. All of us can do our share to make things more comfortable for the families of men called into the armed service by cooperating with the home-service division of the American Red Cross. All of us can help by maintaining morale on the home front and contributing toward the welfare of the men in uniform.

To do all these things, and many more, a huge civilian army of volunteers—a part-time army of democracy—is required. Millions of men, women, and children will be asked to give up their time, talents, and treasure for the common good and the common safety.

To enroll such a vast army will require careful planning. These volunteers should be given the opportunity to register on a free will basis, if possible, on a single day throughout the length and breadth of the land, a day which should be made the occasion for a great national civic demonstration. And, if practicable, why couldn't that day be July 4th? Independence Day is already our national holiday of freedom. Today when we are girding all our strength to preserve that freedom, let all who call themselves Americans, who enjoy the rights and privileges born on that July 4, 1776, celebrate Independence Day in this year 1941 by registering for national service.

Such a mighty outpouring of civilian volunteers on Independence Day would show the world that in this democracy we regard service to the nation as the highest form of patriotism in action. A mighty demonstration of national unity in action and purpose on July 4th, through the registration of the world's greatest army of civilian defenders, would be an inspiring thing. It would be an army with no uniform other than the cloak of patriotic devotion. It would be an army with no arms other than the heads, hearts, and hands of a people firm in their conviction that a democracy worth preserving and enjoying is one for which they are prepared to make any and all sacrifices.

Americans have never been found wanting in an emergency. This is an emergency. The times call for sacrifice and more sacrifice. Let us register our faith in the democracy we cherish and want to hand down to our children by a vast human mobilization for civilian defense.

All can serve. All will serve. Let us tell our Government that with a united voice. All we want to know is where and how we can serve. If we answer this call to national service it will be written that the civilian defenders of democracy were its first column.

As for the B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish community, of which it is a cross section, every last man, woman, and child belonging to B'nai B'rith and the Jewish community will be found in the ranks of the civilian defenders, as they have always been found in the ranks of those who served America in times of crisis and emergency.

Gasoline Tax in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on the 28th day of April 1941 I introduced H. R. 4549, which, when passed, will raise the amount of gasoline tax paid by the people in the District of Columbia from 2 cents per gallon, as now, to 4 cents per gallon. Each 1 cent increase in the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia will raise from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000 in revenue for said taxing unit. With the tremendous increase in appropriations for governmental purposes in the District of Columbia this proposed increase in the gasoline tax will be welcomed, I am certain, by the people generally throughout our country.

The pending bill, H. R. 5049, is the present appropriations measure for the District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942. It calls for the total sum of $52,547,081, and it is admitted to be the largest amount which has been sought to be appropriated for the District at any time. This bill contains an appropriating provision of $6,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury to help bear the cost of government in the District. It is a sad situation in which the taxpayers of our country find themselves when it is apparent that they are required to meet and pay their own State, county, and city taxes within their own governmental taxing units at home, and then be called upon to aid in the payment of the taxes in the District of Columbia.

Let us analyze this tax situation very briefly, and let us keep the record straight on this point. If the people within the District were now paying taxes equal to, or nearly equal to, those now paid by our own taxpayers at home, I am confident there would be no complaint from our people on this subject. But that condition does not exist. The people in the

District do not pay taxes equal to, or nearly equal to, the taxes paid by the people in the several States. The tax rate on real estate in the District is but $1.75 on each $100 of value. There is an exemption of $1,000 on personal property. There is no poll tax, no income tax of any kind, and no other tax, except the gasoline tax at the rate of 2 cents per gallon, which is far below that in every State other than Missouri, which has a gasoline tax of 2 cents per gallon. This collection of taxes, which the residents of the District of Columbia pay, is far below the average of taxes paid by the people of the various States.

Respecting the gasoline taxes in the various States, I have made a survey of these items, and while each State pays the Federal tax on gasoline, which is now 1½ cents per gallon, they pay the additional amounts to their State government, which is as follows:

	Cents
Alabama	6
Arizona	5
Arkansas	6½
California	3
Colorado	4
Connecticut	3
Delaware	4
District of Columbia	2
Florida	7
Georgia	6
Idaho	5
Illinois	3
Indiana	4
Iowa	3
Kansas	3
Kentucky	5
Louisiana	7
Maine	4
Maryland	4
Massachusetts	3
Michigan	3
Minnesota	4
Mississippi	6
Missouri	2
Montana	5
Nebraska	5
Nevada	5
New Hampshire	4
New Jersey	3
New Mexico	5
New York	4
North Carolina	6
North Dakota	4
Ohio	4
Oklahoma	4
Oregon	5
Pennsylvania	3
Rhode Island	3
South Carolina	6
South Dakota	4
Tennessee	7
Texas	4
Utah	4
Vermont	4
Virginia	5
Washington	5
West Virginia	5
Wisconsin	4
Wyoming	4

In making an analysis of the various amounts of gasoline tax paid by our people for State government, we find the following:

One State, Missouri, has a gasoline tax of 2 cents per gallon, payable to the State; however, a pending bill will no doubt increase the amount of that tax; then 10 States have a gasoline tax of 3 cents per gallon; 17 States have a State gasoline tax of 4 cents per gallon; 11 States have a State tax of 5 cents per gallon; 5 States have a State gasoline tax of 6 cents; 1 State has a gasoline tax of 6½ cents per gallon; 3 States have a State gasoline tax of 7 cents per gallon.

The average for the States is 4.4 cents per gallon.

Therefore, the present rate in the District of Columbia, of 2 cents per gallon on gasoline is far below that of all contiguous States, and of all States, except Missouri.

May I say that the States of Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia, which are adjacent to the District, each have a much higher gasoline tax than is now in force in such District. Maryland has a 4-cent tax on gasoline, while Virginia and West Virginia each have a 5-cent gasoline tax. This variance in such tax imposes a very great hardship upon those engaged in the sale of that commodity in nearby Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. They are faced with a heavier tax burden, and the selling price of gasoline must be increased to meet it. This gives a distinct advantage to those engaged in the sale of gasoline within the District over those so engaged in the nearby States.

While the District calls upon the taxpayers of our Nation to make an annual contribution of millions of dollars with which to maintain her government, yet the District of Columbia fails to require her own taxpayers to pay an amount of taxes equal to that which is now paid by our own citizens in our respective States. That policy is entirely unfair. It should not be tolerated in the future. If the gasoline tax should be increased an additional 2 cents per gallon in the District, that small increase would raise, annually, from $2,000,000 to $3,000,000, which would be available for use in maintaining her government. This amount of money would not then be required from the Federal Treasury, and our taxpayers within our respective States would be discharged from making this annual contribution to the District for her governmental functions.

I appeal to each Member of the House to aid in the passage of H. R. 4549, which I introduced, to the end that this unjust discrimination against our own taxpayers may be terminated.

Flag Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERRON PEARSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HERRON PEARSON OF TENNESSEE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted I am incorporating in the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered by me under the auspices of the B. P. O. E., Jackson Lodge, No. 192, on June 12, in Jackson, Tenn.:

Mr. Chairman, brothers, and friends, we meet today under the auspices of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks to pay homage to the American flag and all that it means to us, and I feel honored to be permitted to have a part in such a ceremony.

I shall not undertake to outline the history of our flag, but rather to discuss some of the things which it brings to mind, for which it stands and which today mean much to the people of America.

The Order of Elks has pinned its very destiny to this flag. Upon its altar is always to be found the red, white, and blue—such red as never human shed in blood, such blue as exists only in azure skies, and such white as lives only in the purest of hearts. Our flag is the indestructible emblem of freedom, democracy, and happiness, the symbol of liberty and the spirit incarnate of American independence.

I give thanks today that our form of government fosters and encourages the great spirit of fraternalism that interweaves its very life with the preservation and protection of a symbol of a nation's way of life, and that we do not live in a land where fraternities, civic pride, and patriotism have by law been prohibited as undesirable activities.

Within a few short days we will celebrate the one hundred and sixty-fifth year of national sovereignty and independence, and only a week ago we observed the one hundred and forty-fifth anniversay of Tennessee's admission to the Union of States. These anniversaries, as well as Flag Day, have more than ordinary significance this year because of conditions which make us more conscious of what it means to be citizens of a great State and a great Nation—competent parts of the millions who recognize as their first duty the obligation of preserving and perpetuating the cardinal principles of government which bind us together into a union indisoluble and indivisible.

What we may say and do in these critical days as we commemorate the milestones in our history should not be said and done in thoughtlessness and indifference. Rather should we earnestly and prayerfully consider their significance, utilizing the inspiration which they bring to sustain us in our desire and determination to keep forever inviolate the governmental processes which have brought us thus far down the highway of a peaceful and successful national life.

I am not an alarmist, but it is my humble but well-considered judgment that never before in our history have our flag, our independence, our freedom, our form of government, our chosen way of living been faced with such threats as are being made against them at this very hour. Twenty-five years ago we undertook to "save the world for democracy," but now we may be called upon to "save democracy for the world."

We are in the midst of a momentous period of human affairs. Our prophesied appointment with destiny has apparently arrived. The hour of decision is at hand.

The fierce light of history is beating down upon us.

All the conflicts of centuries past and the age-old story of man's search and struggle for liberty and self-rule comes rushing into our memory.

Standing in that light and with those dark pages of history burning and ringing in our conscience, we face another and perhaps more serious crisis in our national history.

Here and now as Tennesseans and Americans we do well to rededicate ourselves to

Americanism. Inspired by the sacrifices of the founding fathers out of which this Nation was born we do well to reaffirm our intention and desire to protect and defend our liberties and our institutions and to say to all the world that nothing shall deter us in our determination to resist and repel any designing aggressor who rears his ugly head or offers his might against us.

"The drama of the world moves on and on
Flowing like an endless river without pause.
And never, never will it turn aside
That we see its face in brief repose
All varieties, all certitudes
Belong to other days, to instants fled:
Each moment we must build anew."

For 18 months the United States has been a sad but wary and suspicious spectator of European civilization crumbling and crushed before the onslaught of a power mad militarist, merciless and ruthless, equipped with instruments of death and destruction the like of which the world has never seen. He has challenged every civilized nation to either submit to a single master or be overrun, conquered, and enslaved.

Some have submitted, others have refused, and today practically all of continental Europe is at the feet of this Gargantua bleeding and torn, helpless and hungry, pitiful slaves to an overlord in whose veins flow the chilled blood of an oppressor who grows more menacing with every victorious conquest.

Boundary lines no longer outline what was once proud Austria. She was the first victim. Czechoslovakia was subdued before she had a chance to defend herself. Poland was left a veritable shambles and blazing inferno. The peace-loving, neighborly countries of Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium were guilty of nothing except owning lands and resources which Hitler wanted, and overnight they exchanged freedom for serfdom.

Bulgaria and Rumania, permeated with disloyal influences, were easy prey for an overwhelming power.

Yugoslavia was taken by blitzkreig.

France, plagued by disloyal leaders, communism, and inadequate defense, saw her vaunted erstwhile impregnable Maginot line crumble like a barnyard fence before the devastating power of mechanized forces, and today all that remains of unoccupied French territory is being forced at a pistol point to join her late conqueror in trying to banish from the earth those who have fought by her side in many life and death struggles. The heart of France is not in such a task, but she has no alternative except that of further subjugation and annihilation. She is the unwilling ally of those who have hated her for generations.

Ancient Greece is no more, and at this moment Great Britain and Great Britain alone stands in the path of the Hessian hordes of Hitler in their mad march to rule the world and force upon unwilling people the social, industrial, and economic ideology of Nazi socialism.

Who knows what will happen if Great Britain fails and who the next victim may be?

In answering this question it is advisable to remember we cannot act upon presumption or promises. The man who has started the fires of world revolution boasts that a broken treaty or promise means nothing if to violate is in the interest of Germany and her aims. Nations which have trusted him know too well how true his boasts. He has destroyed the possibility of negotiated peace and left those who may be his chosen victims the one alternative of preparing for the worst.

The United States tried in the first instance to prevent this war and failing in that we have tried to keep out of it.

Long before it started by the Neutrality Act we virtually withdrew our ships from dangerous seas. Since its enactment we have sacrificed our foreign commerce to save the blood of American youth. No nation in history has made so great a voluntary sacrifice financially to preserve peace. It was America's offering upon the altar of peace.

Despite our desire for peace and our efforts to preserve it, it has become increasingly obvious that the aim and purposes of the dictators of the world are not confined to conquest in Europe alone, but through unholy and dangerous alliance with those to the West of us, through the acquisition of strategic possessions at our very door, through defiant threats in Western waters destroying the freedom of the seas, through superior might in the air, on land and at sea they seek to incorporate the Western World in their new order and with that incorporation to destroy free institutions, free government, and every other freedom which has been ours to enjoy for over a century and a half.

With this knowledge the American people have become convinced that if we are to avoid becoming actually involved in war we must meet existing conditions realistically and two things must be done to keep war from our shores.

Congress has made provisions for these two essentials; first, an adequate defense against any power or powers on earth and secondly all-out aid to Britain while that preparation is going forward.

I share that conviction with the American people and believe with all my heart that such a course is to the ultimate best interests of the Western Hemisphere. With that belief I carry the hope and prayer that in following that course we may avoid the misery, the heartaches, and sorrows of war.

If we fail to do either of these vital things we jeopardize not only the lives of American citizens but everything that makes their lives worth living. If we do both successfully and well we may avoid war and avert the threat which now hangs over us like the sword of Damocles. If we fail it seems to me our participation in war is inevitable.

So far as our national defense is concerned, suffice it to say that we now have a standing Army of nearly one and one-half million men, with a goal of two million by next January. Military and naval bases guarding our entire coast line are now being established. A two-ocean Navy is under way, and we will soon be producing combat planes at the rate of over 1,000 per month. Tanks, guns, cars, ships, planes, bombers, men, equipment, and every other essential in national defense are being made available in a systematic, orderly manner and despite criticisms, impatience, and faultfinding by those who seek to sell America short. I tell you that America is being prepared; and when the time comes, if come it must, the visitor who approaches our gates—either east or west—with aggression or conquest as his mission will be met a thousand miles at sea by forces as fine and as courageous as any on earth.

For aid to Great Britain we have appropriated $7,000,000,000, and already deliveries are being made as fast as possible under very hazardous conditions. If necessaries can be delivered the great fleet of protection can be kept on guard and the fight for the preservation of democracy and free government can be carried on. If not, no man can foretell the future.

If anyone doubts the advisability or soundness of our policy in extending this aid, I only wish he could have listened to that quiet, peace-loving, and courageous Tennessean, Hon. Cordell Hull, as he gravely told Congress what should be done.

Out of his years of experience and study he says:

"Were Britain defeated and were she to lose command of the seas, Germany could easily cross the Atlantic unless we were ready and able to do what Britain is doing now. Were the Atlantic to fall into German control, the Atlantic would offer little or no assurance of security. * * *

"The most serious question for this country today is whether the control of the high seas shall pass into the hands of powers bent on a program of unlimited conquest. For us to withhold aid to the present victims of attack would not result in restoration of peace. It would merely tend to perpetuate the enslavement of nations already invaded and provide an opportunity for the would-be conquerors to gather strength for an attack against us."

Colonel Lindbergh would have us withhold this aid and prepare our defenses in a spirit of defeatism and upon the assumption we are never going to be attacked. America cannot afford to adopt any such philosophy, and under Mr. Hull's leadership she never will.

Today so serious is our situation we are living under a Presidential proclamation of unlimited national emergency requiring that all military and civilian defenses be put in readiness to repel any attack or threat of aggression toward any part of the Western Hemisphere.

All loyal citizens, in every walk of life, are asked to lay aside their differences, to forget self and cooperate each with the other to assure our internal security against foreign-directed subversion—to place the Nation's needs first in mind and in action and have ready for instant defense every material resource of the Nation.

This is the call of the Commander in Chief—it is a command. It means that nothing must stop the wheels of industry engaged in production for national defense. It applies to capital and it applies to labor. It should put a stop to bickerings and disputes between industries and it should stop the many unwarranted and unjustified strikes that are partially paralyzing the manufacture of ships, planes, tools, and other essentials for our defense. Labor has its rights and all fair-minded men will help preserve them but when the very life of this Nation is at stake, when time and speed are the very essence of our national safety, when America's youth are giving their all to the country for a pittance, then it is time for those engaged in defense industries working under the best conditions and most liberal labor laws in history to preserve the high traditions of labor and to maintain their record of devotion and loyalty to the one form of government which protects and fosters every fundamental right of those who labor.

The men I know as leaders of the labor groups are good Americans, and they are not responsible for these conditions. The pitiful aspect of it to me lies in the fact that some of the major labor organizations are being mislead by disloyal leaders who seek to destroy America and care not what they do to thousands of real Americans affiliated with labor. If they are permitted to continue as leaders and spokesmen, they will destroy all of the gains made by labor in recent years, and crucify the honest, loyal workmen who want to do their full duty as Americans.

Yes; under this proclamation we may all expect to make sacrifices.

With it may come rationing, price control, suspension of the 8-hour day, control over banks, business, and industry; curtailment of certain production and such other steps as the President deems necessary to control the activities of every person and every group in the interest of national defense.

Each of us might adopt Edward Everett Hale's patriot's pledge and say:

"I am only one; but I am one. I can't do everything, but I can do something; and what I can do, that I ought to do; and what I ought to do, by the grace of God I will do."

The world knows today America's foreign policy and the course we expect to take in this war. Americans know that course and are prepared to see it through.

The President has reasserted the ancient American doctrine of freedom of the seas.

The solidarity of the American republics and Canada in preserving the independence of the Western Hemisphere.

Our pledge of material aid to Britain and other democracies of the world and our intention to fulfill that pledge.

The President has declared that the Americas will decide for themselves whether and when and where our interests are attacked or our security threatened; that our armed forces are being placed in strategic military positions; and that we will not hesitate to use our armed forces to repel attack or invasion.

Would any American want to do less than these things call for under present world conditions?

In reasserting these age-old rights and our intention to enforce them we have simultaneously reasserted our "abiding faith in the vitality of our constitutional Republic as a perpetual home of freedom, of tolerance, and of devotion to the word of God."

These are the rules which shall govern our conduct henceforth. The enforcement of them does not necessarily mean war. The danger lies in the disregard of them by others. To enforce them we need not commit even the semblance of an overt act. If our right to enforce them goes unchallenged, we remain at peace, and may God grant that in our efforts of self-preservation we be spared the bitter dregs of war and its consequences.

By virtue of this policy we hope to save for all mankind the four major freedoms that constitute the fundamental bedrock of all human happiness—freedom of speech and expression everywhere, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere, freedom from want everywhere and freedom from fear everywhere in the world.

And so, my friends, if the immediate past is prophetic of the future, our tomorrows may be days of bitter trials, acid tests, and heartbreaking sacrifices. These things we have met without faltering in our yesterdays, and America will not falter now.

We have set ourselves to the task of defending the western world from every threat and every danger emanating from the mailed fists of the would-be conquerors of the world, and when the ominous clouds of war have cleared away, the flag we honor today will still float high in the breeze and there will be written upon the silver lining in letters of unquenchable fire this immortal message:

"The government of the people, by the people, for the people has not perished from the earth."

Has the Auto Industry Been Made the "Goat" of National Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY JAY G. HAYDEN

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in an article that appeared in the Detroit News of June 16, 1941, that eminent journalist, Mr. Jay G. Hayden, outlined the various steps that are being taken to curtail the automotive industry. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article in order to draw particular attention to the fallacy of this procedure:

[From the Detroit News of June 16, 1941]

No 1 WHIPPING BOY—AUTO INDUSTRY UNDER ATTACK—NEED FOR DRASTIC CUT QUESTIONED

(By JAY G. HAYDEN)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—The whole administration has focused on the automobile industry as the No. 1 national-defense whipping boy.

First came the O. P. M. with an entirely reasonable 20 percent cut in automobile production, applicable at the beginning of the new-model year, Aug. 1. Then price-fixer Leon Henderson and Federal Reserve chairman Marriner S. Eccles joined in the suggestion that automobile excise taxes be boosted so high as to stop all new-car sales for the period of the emergency.

Last Thursday Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, launched a drive for complete stoppage of automobile production, and a day later Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, chimed in with the declaration that the immediate curtailment should be at least 50 percent.

All this is nothing new. For 30 years the automobile has presented a shining target for the Government tax collectors, State and National. During the World War the industry was curtailed more than any other. The best proof of the vitally essential part the automobile plays in American life is that the industry continues to grow in spite of the burdens heaped upon it.

HOGGING CHARGED

The major contention of Knox and Patterson is that automobiles are hogging steel supply and thus hampering national-defense production.

Our present steel-production capacity is about 91,000,000 tons annually, of which the recent Gano Dunn report estimates 25 percent is sufficient to meet all defense requirements, present or contemplated. Approximately 11,000,000 tons of steel were consumed in automobile production during 1940.

Consumption now is running at a slightly higher annual rate, but if anything like the 20-percent reduction occurs after August 1, total 1941 automobile consumption of steel will be less than last year.

Since the recently passed Priorities Act has given the Government first call on all steel production, and manufacture of war materials has not yet reached the point of consuming anywhere near a quarter of the entire steel output, the drive against the automobile industry now would seem to be principally an alibi for the Government's own organizational inefficiency.

REVENUE A FACTOR

But, it is said, the automobile industry, more than any other, is susceptible of being transformed into production of war materials. This is measurably true. However, it also is true that this transformation cannot be effected in 1 month or 6 months.

It takes at least a year to retool an automobile plant for production of airplanes, tanks, or guns. In the meantime hundreds of thousands of workers either must continue to make automobiles or be thrown out of work.

It also is self-evident that automobile production cannot be stopped and the Government continue to collect the huge revenue now derived from it, at one and the same time. In 1940 the Federal Government collected $137,000,000 in sales taxes on automobiles, and the least that is now proposed is to double this collection. Corporation taxes paid by automobile companies probably amounted to 100,000,000 more, and these also face an increase.

Automobile operation bulks even larger as a source of governmental revenue. In 1940 the Federal Government collected $328,000,000 in taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil, and the States in 1939 (the last year for which complete figures are available) collected $816,000,000 from the same source.

STATES ALSO BENEFIT

In addition, the States derived $412,000,000 in 1939 from automobile license taxes. Any appreciable diminution of automobile tax revenue would quickly throw all State budgets out of joint.

The biggest fallacy of all, perhaps, is the idea, still harbored by the politicians, that the automobile is essentially a luxury. Recent traffic surveys have exploded this theory. They show that, except in cities with more than 500,000 population, 70 percent or more of city transportation is provided by private passenger automobiles. For Saginaw, Mich., the figure is 88.3 percent; Glendale, Calif., 86.7; Lincoln, Nebr., Kenosha, Wis., and Youngstown, Ohio, 81; Houston, Texas, 78.

Even in larger cities, private automobiles are the main factor in transportation. In Los Angeles 56 percent of the residents ride to work in them, as against 44 percent on busses and streetcars. In Detroit the division is 49.2 percent by private automobile, 9.9 percent by busses, 1.7 percent by trucks, and 39.2 percent by other means of transportation.

SOME CUT WELCOMED

The demand for transportation for new or expanded defense industries has fallen almost exclusively on the privately owned automobile. Appearing before a House committee recently, Charles F. Palmer, defense-housing coordinator, cited as an example the Glenn Martin airplane plant at Baltimore, where 42,000 men will be employed by next January.

"Only one main route comes into Baltimore," he said. "The men are now coming in on an average three and eight-tenths per automobile, and even so it takes well over an hour—2 hours at times—to clear the shifts off that particular road."

No automobile manufacturer has complained against a reasonable curtailment in production. To the contrary, the manufacturers welcome it because they believe it will solve the problem of the present supply of used cars and build up a demand that will cushion the economic shock when the war ends.

But they do believe the curtailment should be applied gradually and that the automobile should not be singled out as the one biggest defense goat.

The Aluminum Situation as Seen by the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, as Secretary of the Interior, has demonstrated to the American people that he possesses qualities of high courage, transcendent ability, and unflagging industry. He has shown himself to be conversant with the many and diverse problems arising in

every State of the Union which bear upon the operations of his great Department of the Interior.

I have found him to be cooperative and helpful to me as a Representative, in part, of the State of Washington. Recently, fisheries interests of our State found that Secretary Ickes and his capable staff in the Bureau of Fisheries were most understanding of their complicated problems. These gentlemen modified fisheries regulations in a manner for which the owners and operators and the seamen and employees, engaged in the fishing industry in the Pacific Northwest, are very grateful.

Secretary Ickes possesses that rare talent of being able to fill his speeches with telling and memorable phrases. His piquant words and figures of speech make his forsenic utterances outstanding. His devotion to the Pacific Northwest and the cooperative aid he has rendered its public enterprises are looked upon with pride and profound appreciation by the people of that area.

Particularly do I feel warmly thankful toward Secretary Ickes for the able and comprehensive manner in which he has grasped details in relation to such gigantic enterprises as the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, and to the many and varied public works which came within his jurisdiction during the operation of the Public Works Administration. His handling of the national parks has set an example which will make it hard for his future successors to duplicate or excel. The national parks of America, under his brilliant direction, have expanded and provided innumerable improvements and comforts for the public user which make them a source of pride to all patriotic Americans.

Hon. Harold L. Ickes does not pull his punches. He has the courage of his convictions. No one will accuse him of being a straddler. He does not employ circumlocution. His contentions are candid and are directed straight to the point. Politically, he has been a tower of strength to the New Deal. His liberalism is unalloyed and unassailable. He is undismayed and unafraid, although he has been the target for perhaps more vitriolic attacks than have been directed at any other public man in this generation. He has a sublime sense of humor which enables him to relish a fair fight. He has never been backward about calling a spade a spade. One may not agree with every conviction reached by Secretary Ickes, but all must respect his profound learning and versatility. As Secretary of the Interior, he has been a notable public official.

Mr. Speaker, recently Secretary Harold L. Ickes made an inspiring statement to the special Senate committee designated to investigate the national-defense program. In it, he has discussed most thoroughly the aluminum industry and the dangers of monopoly inherent in its current operations. It contains facts well worthy of careful study by every citizen in these United States. Secretary Ickes clearly and persuasively reveals the dangers of monopoly in aluminum, and makes recommendations as to the remedy. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, HAROLD L. ICKES, BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM, JUNE 16, 1941

It has recently become almost commonplace to point out that the Nation's needs for war materials are still being underestimated. Mr. Batt, of the Office of Production Management, in his testimony before you, reiterated that "our sights are too low." The O. P. M.'s Director of Research and Statistics, Mr. Stacy May, has come to the conclusion that an all-out defense effort means spending on defense as large a proportion of our material income as the British and Germans are doing, which is approximately 40 percent. For us this would mean an expenditure of thirty-three billions this year instead of seventeen billions, and about forty billions next year instead of twenty-three billions, figuring the national income at eighty-two billions this year and at one hundred billions next year. Others, including Mr. Nelson, have pointed out that we must abandon old estimates for new ones.

Probably the one notable exception to this trend was the statement made by the electric power adviser of the O. P. M. at a conference in Buffalo only this month. The impression one received from Mr. Kellogg's remarks on this occasion was that we faced No problem with respect to power supply. His statement was promptly repudiated by the O. P. M.

On the same morning that Mr. Kellogg was making his speech in Buffalo, other representatives of the O. P. M. were engaged in a conference with officials of the Department of the Interior and the Tennessee Valley Authority in an effort to find a solution to the problem of providing sufficient electric power to meet the new estimates of aluminum capacity needed for the national defense. At this conference on June 3 an immediate program for the expansion of aluminum and magnesium capacity requiring more than 1,000,000 kilowatts of electric power was discussed, and the power agencies were asked to formulate a program for making this additional power available.

Following this conference, the Division of Power of the Interior Department supplied to the Office of Production Management tabulations made by its engineers and those of the T. V. A., showing when and where power could be made available in the West and South in amounts sufficient to make feasible the location of electro-metallurgical defense industries. The tables were based on existing and contemplated hydroelectric developments and upon steam plants that would be useful in connection with those developments both in the defense emergency and afterward.

Last Thursday the Federal Power Commission issued a voluminous report on electric power requirements and supply in the United States. Its conclusions were that "unless orders are placed immediately for large amounts of additional capacity for 1943 serious shortages will develop in that year and in subsequent years, if the emergency continues." The program outlined in our suggestions to the Office of Production Management would provide about two and one-half million kilowatts of additional power during 1943. It is my intention to press for action along these lines. I am no advocate of power plants for their own sake. I do, however, believe that we should leave no stone unturned for the sake of a really adequate defense effort. What must be done can be done.

We must not fall behind in providing additional power as we have in aluminum. While it appears that our aluminum and magnesium requirements are now being estimated on a more realistic basis, this has not always been so.

I have been interested in aluminum development for some time, both as a member of an informal committee of the Cabinet on aluminum and magnesium and as the officer responsible for much of the national water-power development. Since the beginning of the defense program I have constantly fought for increases in our plans for aluminum and magnesium production. The failure of the Defense Commission and of O. P. M. to admit this necessity held up some of the necessary development by approximately 1 year. On July 15, 1940, O. P. M. officials told Senator MCNARY and a delegation of Northwest congressional representatives that the Aluminum Co. of America would have ample capacity to take care of the aluminum airplane requirements through 1942. At that time Alcoa's capacity was 875,000,000 pounds per year, with a slight increase in sight. The 1942 requirements for military uses alone are now put at 1,600,000,000 pounds, with nothing allowed for civilian requirements. I believe these estimates will have to be increased again shortly.

About a month after this assurance, Assistant Attorney General Arnold was arguing before the court that the long existence of a monopoly in the aluminum industry had kept down the capacity to produce this metal. This view was later also expressed by Senator O'MAHONEY after studies by the T. N. E. C. In rebuttal, Mr. I. W. Wilson, the production vice president of Alcoa, testified in the trial that Alcoa was in a position to supply the United States Government "with all the aluminum it will require for national defense within the next year." He further insisted that there would be a substantial surplus for the British. He also testified that Alcoa would be able to supply the needs for 1942 as well as for 1941, and that if requirements should increase after 1942 Alcoa would be able to expand relatively simply and easily to take care of such requirements. He added, on cross-examination, that this was over and above civilian requirements.

Alcoa was not disinterested in this matter. It sought to put off the horrible day when the monopoly would have to experience some competition. On November 28, 1940, the famous press release was issued to the effect that sufficient capacity was available to meet all defense requirements and provide some increase for civil requirements. There is evidence before your committee that Alcoa helped the O. P. M. to estimate what these requirements would be. Again, when in December 1940, one of the smaller California aircraft companies indicated that it had to shut down because of a shortage of aluminum, O. P. M. issued certain statements to the effect that there was sufficient aluminum capacity. That was 6 months ago, just about the number of months it would have taken to build an aluminum plant to meet the undoubted shortage.

Early this year some of the reasons for the long delay and the possible responsibility of the monopolistic Alcoa for it were discussed by the informal Cabinet committee on aluminum. On February 11, I suggested to the committee: First, that the O. P. M. be asked to estimate a top figure of aluminum capacity needs by months for the next 3 or more years; secondly, that all competitive processes should be examined at once on a commercial pilot plant basis; thirdly that competitive production of magnesium, as well as the use of this metal by fabricators, should be encouraged; fourthly, that the Government should curb the profits of Alcoa, either by building Government-owned plants or by the purchase of Alcoa's output on a cost-plus basis.

On February 4, in reply to a request from O. P. M. for an additional 65,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power for Alcoa, on top of 162,500 kilowatts already contracted for, I

pointed out that this would amount to four-fifths of Bonneville's then installed capacity, and that therefore the request ran counter to basic policies set up in the Bonneville act. I said that defense needs would govern my actions, and I also brought up the possibility of allocating this power to competitors of Alcoa. The possibility of magnesium development, for magnesium is itself a competitor of aluminum, was suggested. The Bonneville Power Administration thereafter entered into power contracts with the Reynolds Metals Co., equal to that requested for Alcoa, for the production of aluminum.

In March, when we complied with a request by O. P. M. officials that we give Alcoa another 20,000 kilowatts for operating its pots at Vancouver beyond their normally rated capacity, we were told that this would be enough power in that area for Alcoa.

A month later we were again asked to allot 65,000 kilowatts of additional power for the Aluminum Co. of America. This was to be included in a program of 200,000,000 pounds additional. At this time it was obvious that the plans provided for an amount far short of what would be needed, and I replied that we would insist that new requirements be met by plants built by the Government. It was evident that unless this were done we would continue to be at the mercy of the Aluminum Co.'s apparent purpose to continue expansion on a piecemeal basis.

In May of this year the O. P. M. finally raised its sights to 1,600,000,000 pounds, which, I am sure, will be raised to 2 billions within another few months. Yet on May 14 the senior vice president of Alcoa told your committee that there was plenty of aluminum for national defense on the day he was testifying. That is a statement which was as incorrect then as it is incorrect to date. Personally, I think that this statement betrays either incompetence or self-interest, both of which are dangerous to our program of national defense. The Government is assuming almost all of the risk inherent in our rapidly expanding aluminum production. It is guaranteeing the market. It will take everything that anybody can produce. It is putting up, at its own expense, huge generating facilities which it will have on its hands at the end of the emergency unless the Nation continues to expand as I, apparently unlike the Aluminum Co., hope that it will. The Government is putting up the money for the aluminum reduction plants. It is also paying the management for operating them. It could hardly do more. In the Bonneville-Grand Coulee service area the Department of the Interior expects to have generating and transmission facilities costing some $70,000,000, devoted to the production of aluminum by the end of 1942. That will make possible approximately 350,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year in that one area alone.

There is an obligation on the part of the Government not to take a fool's risk with the people's money. I do not believe that we should invest all of this money for national-defense purposes and end up either by treating the Northwest as a colony or by making a Christmas present of all of our expensive facilities to the Aluminum Co.

I have discussed these matters with the various Government officials who will be responsible for arranging leases for the Government-owned plants. I have taken the position that in the matter of price policy the Nation has a great interest in aluminum. I am told that ingot aluminum has cost less than 10 cents per pound to produce at times when it sold for even more than the present price of 17 cents. Its price has been manipulated up and down in the past by the monopoly for its own purposes. This great differential between cost and sales price is a heavy expense to us. If the price of aluminum were reduced even 2 cents a pound, which would still allow the enormous profit of 5 cents a pound, we would save $32,000,000 annually based on the present estimates of demand. Moreover, as a result of the high-price policy aluminum has not come into the general industrial use that it should, and if the price stays high it will not come into such general use. It is to the interest of the Nation to have low-cost aluminum that will assure the continued use of cheap electric power and the operation of fabricating plants.

A second factor to which I have called attention is the necessity for the immediate training of adequate personnel to manage all of the new plants that are being built or contemplated. Unless this is done, the Government is without any real assurance that the defense plants will be run efficiently or that we will be able to expand even further, as will be necessary without any doubt. In our power contracts we insist, of course, that the companies begin building so as to be ready by the time that the power is produced. It would seem essential that the companies which are to manage the reduction plants guarantee also that tried personnel will be available at that time.

It should be pointed out that, although it is both desirable and necessary that aluminum reduction-plants be located in the Northwest near available sources of public power, this location would place a heavy burden upon the Nation unless fabricating plants were also located in that region. At the present time, alumina produced from bauxite is shipped from Mobile and East St. Louis to the Northwest; it is there reduced to pig aluminum; the pig aluminum is then transported to fabricating plants in the East; the fabricated metal is then sent back in huge quantities to the Pacific coast—and even to the Northwest itself—for airplane manufacture. This shuttle system is obviously expensive. More important, it adds a terrific burden to our critically overladen transportation system. The wastefulness tolerated in peacetime cannot now be afforded, either in the conduct of business or of private affairs.

We must economize, and economy is nowhere more necessary or more greatly possible than in the use of our transportation facilities. While we are proceeding to carry out a program to increase our available transportation facilities, a course of action which I recommended more than a year ago but which defense officials then deemed unnecessary, we must also take vigorous action to avoid the necessity of taking metals and materials on joyrides back and forth across the country.

I understand that additional fabricating plants for aluminum are needed, and it seems to me essential that prompt action be taken to locate sufficient of these plants in the Northwest to process the ingots produced in that region, thereby avoiding these long cross hauls.

A concentration of aluminum-manufacturing plants in the Northwest would be disastrous for that region unless there is assurance that the aluminum companies will not consider themselves as transient aliens, but will plan to stay in that area, and locate fabricating plants there. Reduction plants use few men and add little to community wealth. Fabricating plants use more men and would become part of that growing region. For the aluminum companies to use the cheap power now available there, and then close down and move out would be denying to the Northwest the great opportunities it now has to secure other diversified defense industries which would use the power advantageously now, and which, because of their use of native raw materials, would also build up the community by staying there. I know that the people of the Northwest are eager to help in the national-defense effort, but I am sure that neither they nor the Congress would care to see this region receive least-favored-nation treatment. This is not to ask that the Northwest be relieved of all risk, as the aluminum companies are being relieved of it, but only that it not be called upon to take all of the losses.

Finally, I do not think it desirable that we, however unwillingly, should create a situation which would be a further aid to monopoly. As I have pointed out to the Office of Production Management, the power produced by the public money invested in Bonneville was expressly restricted by the Congress to prevent a monopolization of its use. Monopoly may be even more dangerous in dangerous times than it is in normal times. Our whole defense effort becomes dependent upon the skill, resourcefulness, and devotion to the public welfare of a few individuals who own and control the monopoly. These have not been subjected to the spur of competition. Their whole effort has been, not to improve their skills, but to retain and protect the processes which are the key to their industrial control. Further, these few individuals may operate on the theory that their primary duty is as trustees for their stockholders. They may believe that there is a basic conflict between the supposed interests of those stockholders in limiting facilities and production, thus keeping up prices, and the interest of the Government in increasing production.

We will have lost a great deal of ground if our present plans are so devised that the reduction plants that the Government is now building can be bought by only one big and wealthy company. In such an event it may buy them up at junk prices that will result in heavy losses to the Government. It may even do this for the purpose of closing them down, thus keeping them out of competition. Throughout its existence, the Aluminum Co. of America has bought out or hampered by all means in its power, every formidable competitor that ever threatened it.

If the aluminum plants, established and approved by the Office of Production Management and the Defense Plant Corporation, are few, and so of gigantic size, it will be impossible for average men or corporations either to stay in or go into the aluminum business at the end of the emergency. I would regret to see any such policy established by the Defense Plant Corporation; I would be apprehensive of the results of such a policy. Large units might well mean the end of the development of the light metal industry in the Northwest. On the other hand, smaller plants would certainly be a great stimulation to it, if they were competitively employed after the emergency.

At several conferences held regarding the problem of securing the additional aluminum capacity necessary to the defense program, it was pointed out that one of the more serious delays would be caused by the difficulty of securing equipment for the plants. It was suggested that the Defense Plant Corporation should immediately order such of this equipment as is standard and would be necessary in any aluminum enterprise, no matter who operated it or where. I hope that this suggestion is being followed. The same procedure should be adopted with respect to the additional power generators that will be required in connection with this and similar programs.

You may be interested to learn that I have instructed the Bureau of Mines to study raw materials other than bauxite and other processes for making aluminum, with particular emphasis on the use of domestic raw materials. One of these has already been thoroughly investigated by the Bureau, which has reported that it is economically feasible to make aluminum out of it. I refer to alunite, which is found in the States of Utah and Washington. I am told that the process to make aluminum out of

alunite will also be available to make it out of aluminous clays. I have urged that a full-sized commercial operation of this process be financed by the Government. This matter is still pending at O. P. M. On account of the present shipping emergency, prudence would dictate that we make use of local materials whenever possible.

At some later time I should like to discuss the development in the defense program of the whole area west of the Mississippi. I believe that it has been somewhat neglected, not by intent of the responsible agencies, not exactly by oversight, but by the policy of allowing existing companies to concentrate in the East if they so desire. I have heard that, instead of moving plants out West, some eastern companies have bought up heavy machinery in the Middle West and shipped it East. This comes close to looting that part of the country of its sources of possible wealth instead of calling upon it for the share of defense work that would naturally go to it. More important still, if serious curtailments of our imports of minerals from overseas should occur, the rapid mineral and industrial development of the West would become a matter of life and death to us. We would find that the battle of the West was as important to us as the battle of the Atlantic.

Our best information is that for some time Germany has been actively moving not only great factories but whole towns. The Nazis have learned that a wider dissemination of vital sources of war materials minimizes the danger of bombing attacks from the air. It would be heartening if we could anticipate the future in this regard and thus avoid a possible necessary decentralization of our industrial plants later when it may have to be done under abnormal conditions at tremendous expense.

A Troubled American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERRON PEARSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1941

LETTER FROM J. B. TIGRETT, PRESIDENT GULF, MOBILE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me on yesterday, I am submitting a letter received from a student of industrial and labor relations which I think voices the sentiments of many people in America who are deeply concerned about the attitude of some of the so-called labor leaders in industries engaged in manufacturing vital materials for our national defense. The letter is as follows:

GULF, MOBILE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.,
Jackson, Tenn.

Hon. HERRON C. PEARSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HERRON: Like other Americans all over the land, I am troubled. All my life I have taken for granted the patriotic unity and, therefore, power of the United States. It has never occurred to me to fear that this Nation would not, at any time, have a leadership which could, in a crisis, develop our human and material resources into an impregnable defense.

During the past week I have become increasingly frightened for my country. Within the past year or two I have had occasion to be thrilled by the bold declarations of our President as he condemned greed and deceit and inhumanity and religious persecution. His assurances of aid to those helpless and suffering people who have been the blameless victims of the Hitler blight have had my approval and have aroused by pride. But our boastful faith in these assurances is being given a set-back by the transpiring happenings in our homeland.

It is not the Lindberghs about whom we have to be concerned, but it is the indifference of our Government to the spirit of defiance of the Lewises and the Bridgeses and others of that character.

If our own citizenship becomes dismayed when we find that the leadership of this Nation seems to admit its impotency in handling an industrial element whch puts spoils before patriotism, then how can we expect a mghty war machine like that of Germany to be impressed by our warnings?

I am not intending to criticize the laborer. My sympathies lie largely in his direction. But when a so-called labor leader becomes mightier than the Government, it is high time for all of us to tremble. When it becomes necessary for the people of this country to send representatives to New York to consult one man as to whether or not we may have fuel with which to keep our defense industries running, there surely must be something wrong either with us as a people or with our leaders.

When it is possible for a so-called labor leader to announce in public print (C. I. O. News, April 14), "we defeated the combined efforts of the police, the courts, the employers, and Washington to break the strike and we won a real victory," then the day has arrived, not for Hitler to be frightened but for us who have regarded this Nation as the sanctuary for those who are law abiding no matter whether they are rich or poor.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I have no material interest of any kind which would cause me to write a letter like this and I am no better patriot than millions of others but, I repeate again, I am troubled.

Sincerely,

I. B. TIGRETT.

Cardinal Newman's Prophecy of the Downfall of the British Empire—Poem By the Late Cardinal John Henry Newman, Entitled "England" Is the Most Significant Prophecy Ever Presented In Our Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem entitled "England," by the late Cardinal John Henry Newman, written as he sailed the Mediterranean Sea in 1832, 13 years before he became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church:

ENGLAND

Tyre of the West, and glorying in the name
More than in Faith's pure fame!
Oh, trust not crafty fort nor rock renown'd
Earn'd upon hostile ground;
Wielding Trade's master-keys at thy proud will
To lock or loose its waters, England! trust not still.

Dread thine own power! Since haughty Babel's prime,
High towers have been man's crime.
Since her hoar age, when the huge moat lay bare,
Strongholds have been man's snare.
Thy nest is in the crags; ah, refuge frail!
Mad counsel in its hour, or traitors, will prevail.

He who scann'd Sodom for His righteous men
Still spares thee for thy ten;
But, should vain tongues the Bride of Heaven defy,
He will not pass thee by;
For, as earth's kings welcome their spotless guest,
So gives He them by turn, to suffer or be blest.

This singular prophecy, written by an Englishman, predicting the destruction of the British Empire, should prove a warning to the leaders of the totalitarian philosophy that their cruel policy of crushing minority groups and subjecting free nations to their iron will is one that taunts divine justice. The day of reckoning will come for Hitler, for Mussolini, and for Stalin, as it has come to the forces of imperialism who have for over 350 years dominated most of the world's territory and most of her population.

Mr. Speaker, war is a man-made institution. War in the vernacular of today is a "racket." The Government of the United States by its conduct the past few years has helped perpetuate this war "racket." Witness the sale of American scrap iron to Japan to be processed into cannon to fight the Chinese, while at the same time we loaned the Government of China millions of dollars to fight the people of Japan. Witness the conduct of this Government a few months ago in loaning money to the Government of stricken Finland to fight the Soviet Union, and then selling to the Soviet Union oil and gasoline to service their bombers to kill the Finns. Witness the Government consenting to American capital controlling the rich oil fields of Brazil, and selling oil to the Government of Japan, who in turn sell the same product to the Axis Powers now at war. Witness the recent purchase by the Government of the United States of Russian gold at $35 an ounce which is processed in the Soviet Union at less than $4 an ounce.

In the face of these disclosures it is time to take inventory of the war hysteria, and the war mongers who are pressing the President of the United States for a formal declaration of war on the part of Congress, or an undeclared war by the Executive. God forbid that our beloved country should once more be throw into the blood business of Europe. Instead of taking steps to involve us in a foreign war, the United States, in my judgment, should lead in a move for world peace and join with the head of Christendom, His Holiness,

Pope Pius XII, and the other religious leaders of the world who are seeking to establish peace and a permanent social order.

We were told that our participation in the last World War was to make the world safe for democracy. We paid a tremendous price in blood and treasure and are still paying a colossal price for our share in that war. We turned from a creditor Nation to a debtor Nation and inherited the world's worst depression, because of our participation in the last World War.

We witnessed the shattering of President Wilson's idealism, when the treaty makers at Versailles scrapped his 14 points for world peace. It is reported in the autobiography of Lincoln Steffens that President Wilson was actually spat upon by a delegate to that treaty-making conference.

Mr. Speaker, the Versailles Treaty was doomed to failure from the beginning by the delegates to that so-called peace conference who shut the door against Christ and His teachings, and like a lot of brigands proceeded to cut up the spoils of war, the real estate of a large portion of the world.

Clemenceau, after the treaty was signed, said it was good for seven more wars. Under the terms of the Versailles Treaty, hypocritical as it was, Great Britain had a mandate to protect the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and most of the Balkan States. It is now history that Britain not only failed to aid the government of Czechoslovakia but was a partner with Hitler in the appeasement program that destroyed that republic. It is now history that Great Britain failed to go to the rescue of the defenseless people of Poland, when they were brutally attacked by Hitler a few months after Munich. Although but 550 miles away from Berlin, Britain's sole contribution to the stricken people of Poland was the showering of pamphlets from her bombers over the German Capitol. It is also history that after Hitler had seized the western part of Poland and the Soviet Union had concluded the rape of Poland on the eastern front, Chamberlain, then the premier of Great Britain, rose in the House of Commons and blessed the rape of Poland by the communistic hordes of the Soviet government.

Mr. Speaker, it is history that Great Britain did desert Belgium, France, and in later days Greece and Yugoslavia. When these nations were putting forth a feeble effort to drive back the Nazi panzer divisions the world was told of the glorious retreat at Dunkirk. History will disclose what the people of France and Belgium thought of that glorious retreat.

In the United States today through every conceivable method of propaganda which utilizes the radio, press, pulpit, and motion-picture screen, the agents of Great Britain and some misinformed Americans are demanding, not requesting, our boys be sent at once to die in the filth and disease of the war trenches of Europe. Despite the fact we have placed at the disposal of Britain billions of dollars, in addition to the ships we furnished and the implements of war we are building for her, there is clamorous insistence our boys be sent to Martinique, Dakar, and to the Azores, stepping stones to actual warfare, once we become involved.

Mr. Speaker, why, in God's name, must we every 25 years send our boys—the sons and grandsons of Polish, Irish, English, German, Belgian, Greek, Italian, Russian, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, French, Spanish, and other heritage—to fight the eternal wars of Europe that have raged almost incessantly for the past 2,000 years? The immigrant parents and grandparents of these American boys came to the United States to seek asylum and to escape the economic oppression and militarism of Europe. They are all loyal citizens determined their sons will not be sent over 3,000 miles of stormy waters to repeat the mistake we made back in 1917. These people are loyal and their sons are loyal. They will die for the defense of this country. Unanimously they favor a strong defense program for the protection of the United States from any invasion, but they are resolved if they must die in warfare to die on the sacred soil of this free Republic, and not on any foreign battlefield.

Our sympathy goes out to the poor people of Europe and Asia, the victims of these man-made wars—wars that are only beneficial to the world-trade grabbers and the international bankers who furnish the sinews. Our Government has embarked on a policy of extended aid to certain countries involved in war by supplying munitions, battleships, air bombers, poison gas, tanks, and other instruments of destruction. All of this is costly to our taxpayers, but this material aid, no matter what it is, if lost or destroyed, can always be replaced. The thing to keep in mind is that we cannot replace the broken bodies of our American boys who may be called upon to fight in another foreign war.

I sincerely believe President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had this in mind when he solemnly promised the American people that their boys would not be sent into foreign battlefields. May God give him strength to keep that promise. The fulfillment of such a sacred pledge will cause him to go down in history as one of the greatest men who ever lived. The failure to keep that solemn obligation will cause history to record him as an abject failure and a leader who generations yet unborn will look upon with disdain and contempt.

The warning of Cardinal Newman expressed in the poem I include in these remarks should not go unheeded. John Henry Newman is conceded by all students of history to have been one of the most remarkable characters that ever lived. Every reference to his career discerned in his writings and in his poetry clearly indicates he possessed a very unusual and remarkable mind.

We are a young Republic and, save the Swiss Government, the only true democracy, despite our weaknesses existing today. We have no imperialistic designs. We only ask to be left alone. We should not impose our will upon other nations. If the people of the South Sea Islands decide to conduct their parliamentary meetings in tree tops, or swing from limb to limb, that should be their prerogative. Our danger is not from some man-made dictator across the sea; our danger is from the subversive groups within this country who have failed to take appraisal of the greatness of the United States of America. Unpatriotically they are promoting intolerance and discord within our gates. In some instances they assume we are unable to carry on alone, that we should aline ourselves with a new international order called Union Now, to be dominated by the English-speaking people of the world. Every historian knows the English-speaking people of the world are in the minority and cannot, if they so desired, impose their will upon any group of people.

We trust no historian of Cardinal Newman's type in the future will ever be able to prophesy the downfall of the United States of America, because of disregard of the civil liberties of her people, nor her failure to extend at all times the protection and blessing of the Constitution of the United States.

Throughout the world Cardinal Newman is best known as the author of Lead, Kindly Light, the beautiful spiritual poem sung frequently at funerals and memorial services. The "night is dark" for much of the world today. It will not be dark for the United States of America if we keep out of foreign wars.

Lead, Kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
Lead Thou me on!
The night is dark, and I am far from home—
Lead Thou me on!
Keep Thou my feet; I do not ask to see
The distant scene,—one step enough for me.

I was not ever thus, nor pray'd that Thou
Shouldst lead me on.
I loved to choose and see my path; but now
Lead Thou me on!
I loved the garish day, and, spite of fears,
Pride ruled my will; remember not past years.

So long Thy power hath blest me, sure it still
Will lead me on,
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till
The night is gone;
And with the morn those angel faces smile
Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.

Would It Be Fair to Increase the Federal Tax on Gasoline If the Taxes on Nonessential Items Are Not Increased?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, in the minds of some is the conviction that the proposed increases in the Federal tax rates on certain nonessential commodities should not be enacted. If there is basis for such a conviction, then certainly the conclusion that there should be no

further increase in the Federal gasoline tax must also be accepted. If any nonessential item is considered already to be bearing its full burden of taxation, then a necessary commodity such as gasoline, which bears an exceptionally disproportionate tax burden, definitely should not be requested to assume an additional tax weight.

The economics of taxation embrace as part of their fundamental principles a specific distinction between essentials and nonessentials as tax subjects. This distinction generally is used to justify the imposition of heavier tax rates on such nonessentials.

The taxation of the consumption of nonessentials and luxuries for revenue purposes generally is recognized as justifiable, even if it results in the curtailment of such consumption. The curtailment of such consumption can do little harm, and sometimes it actually may do some good as far as the consumer is concerned. If, on the other hand, the taxation of such items did not result in a curtailment of consumption, then the consumer would not be in a position to complain, because the tax may be avoided without great sacrifice.

Consumption of nonessential goods is regarded as evidence of an ability to support government substantially according to the degree to which these commodities are consumed. It is accepted generally that a substantial percentage of what a consumer spends for such commodities should go to the support of government, even though the consumer's income is not sufficient to purchase other articles which are regarded as necessities.

No matter to what extent such commodities are now being consumed, they do not possess the characteristics of necessities and accordingly they are the proper objects of heavy tax rates. The revenue yield from the taxation of these goods is sufficiently high and stable to make them important items in the governmental fiscal structure.

Consequently, if there is a disposition to retain the prevailing tax rates on certain nonessential items to refrain from enacting the proposals to increase these rates which now are being considered by Congress, then certainly there is more reason to take the same stand in regard to the proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

Some years ago, when the automobile was owned primarily by the well-to-do, the motor fuel used to operate vehicles was a luxury and an appropriate subject for taxation at reasonable rates. Today, however, the automobile is owned and operated by millions in the lower-income groups as an essential part of their everyday living habits. Now, in countless instances, the use of motor fuel to operate the farm tractor or the family automobile occupies a place among the everyday necessities of life, ranking close after such things as food, clothing, and shelter.

Surveys conducted under the supervision of the United States Public Roads Administration reveal that 55 percent of the gasoline consumed in passenger-car travel is used strictly for business purposes—family and commercial. Merchants, farmers, and traveling salesmen are but a few of the classes of motor-vehicle operators that depend to a great extent on their vehicles for a livelihood. Moreover, motor trucks account for approximately one-quarter of all the motor fuel consumed in this country to provide the Nation with the superior economies and flexibility of highway transport.

In connection with the national-defense program, the use of gasoline has become wholly indispensable. Probably the best example of the importance of gasoline is evident in the fact that the shortage of housing and labor in centers engaged in the production of vital defense materials has required the assembly of skilled workers from outside areas. Transportation of these workers to their jobs has been facilitated by the private automobile to a degree possible by no other means. Cases are known of workers driving back and forth to work daily on a round trip taking 4 hours.

Expenditures for gasoline long ago shed the characteristics that made them appropriate subjects for taxation as nonessential expenditures. The operation of motor vehicles now is an essential factor in the welfare of the Nation, and the Nation's families, and the gasoline used to operate these vehicles must be distinguished clearly from the consumption of nonessential goods and luxuries for purposes of taxation.

The combined Federal, State, and local taxes on gasoline, averaged for the Nation, represented a sales tax of nearly 50 percent at the start of the current year. Yet the tax burden on this necessity approaches that on practically any nonessential commodity in general use. Furthermore, the various taxes on gasoline in 1940 produced $1,150,000,000 in revenue to the Federal, State, and local governments. This amount exceeded the revenue produced by special sales taxes on any other commodity.

If the Congress considers further increases in the Federal taxes on any nonessential item inadvisable and yet fails to grant the proposed increase in the Federal tax on gasoline the same consideration, then not only would the fundamental principles of sound and equitable taxation be violated, but the common sense of tax justice would be disregarded.

The Oil Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

LETTER OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO GEN. RUSSELL MAXWELL, EXPORT CONTROL ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are aroused over the conflicting stories which are appearing in the papers concerning the oil situation. We have the prospect of rationing of gasoline and the more serious prospect of not having sufficient fuel oil to heat the homes of people in the East next winter. At the same time we are confronted with the picture of oil being shipped to Japan in increasing amounts, and not all this oil goes from the west coast. Just the other day an attempt was made to ship a quarter of a million gallons from the East where the shortage is supposed to exist.

Our Nation aids China in its war with Japan and at the same time supplies Japan with the lifeblood of her war machine.

The people demand to know why. I believe we, as Members of this Congress, have a right to an explanation. The people of the Nation will not make sacrifices unless they know there is to be some tangible result achieved because of those sacrifices. If this help to Japan is by way of appeasement, then it is pursuing a policy which has been proven a failure on many, many occasions. If it is a permit to allow the Oil Trusts to pile up huge profits, then we have no right to ask the ordinary man to make sacrifices which not only deprive him of the pleasure to which he and his family are entitled, but by refusing him adequate fuel for his home endanger his health and the health of his children.

Because I am anxious to learn the answer to this problem I have addressed a letter to Gen. Russell Maxwell, the Export Control Administrator, which reads as follows:

JUNE 18, 1941.

Gen. RUSSELL MAXWELL,
Export Control Administrator,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL MAXWELL: I have become increasingly alarmed over the oil situation, particularly as it affects the consumption of gasoline and fuel oil in the New England States. The prospect of "gasolineless Sundays" this summer and lack of adequate heat in New England homes next winter I find hard to reconcile with the constant flow of oil and gasoline to Japan, an avowed partner of Hitler and an associate of Hitler who has sworn to do all in its power to to further the dictators' cause.

The newspapers have carried the story of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey's agreement to sell additional supplies to Japan. This agreement it was reported, had been "negotiated with the full knowledge" of this Government. It is my understanding that this oil and gasoline is carried to Japan in tankers of Panama registry. They are tankers owned by a Panamanian corporation which is owned solely by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

"Gasless Sundays" mean loss of the great vacation business which is New England's, and, further, mean that the men who work on national defense in our factories and on construction jobs are deprived of their outings with their families on the only day of leisure they have. "Cold homes" mean cold hearts toward those responsible.

We plead for unity and cooperation, and, at the same time, we tell our people they must suffer uncalled-for hardships while the oil companies pile up profits by supplying fuel to a war machine which some day may drown our sons in a sea of blood.

The people whom I represent demand fair treatment. I want to urge strongly upon

you that the way to guarantee that fair play and the unity of spirit which is so necessary now is to use your authority to prevent these shipments of oil to Japan. We can then have these "Panama" tankers available for the delivery of oil to the eastern seaboard.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. FOGARTY, M. C.

Is a Japanese-American War Imminent?—German-Japanese Conflicts of Interest—Points of Harmony Between the United States and Japan—the Philippines an Asset to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF JUDGE JOHN W. HAUSSERMANN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the salient parts of a speech delivered recently by the Honorable John W. Haussermann before the Bar Association of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Judge Haussermann is the leading American citizen in the Philippines, a gold and chrome miner, a lawyer and former Army officer, and well beloved by the Filipino people as a civic leader, an employer of labor, and as an American who has a great faith in their ability and possibilities.

Knowing Judge Haussermann personally, I wish to state on the floor of the House that he is not only a patriotic American, but he is a man of great intellectual ability, a brilliant lawyer, a very eloquent public speaker, and a consistent fighter for right, justice, and square dealing.

Judge Haussermann's able and timely speech follows:

I am grateful for the opportunity of addressing this audience of lawyers and their friends. It is many years ago since I marched forth from the University of Cincinnati Law School. I went West and stopped in Kansas where I hung up my shingle and talked politics for mental diversion. When the Spanish-American War broke out in 1898 I answered President McKinley's call for volunteers and became an officer in the celebrated Twentieth Kansas. My outfit landed in the Philippines about 41 years ago and was mustered out a few years after. Ever since then I have cast my lot in that country and its good people.

FILIPINO LOYALTY AND COOPERATION

I have just returned from the Philippines in my yearly trip to the United States. The first thing I want to report to my countrymen is that in these times of emergency the Filipino people, led by their leaders, are with the United States 100 percent in any eventuality, including war, which we may have to face. President Manuel Quezon in a message to the Philippine National Assembly, said:

"The Government of the United States has embarked upon a program of national defense which, we earnestly hope, includes the Philippines; for the defense of our country remains primarily the responsibility of the United States. This is as it should be, because so long as we are under the American flag it rests exclusively with the United States, and not with us, to determine whether we shall be at peace or at war. The Filipino people, desirous of cooperating with the United States in the execution of this defense program, are ready to bear their full share of that responsibility. To this end, I have assured the Government of the United States in behalf of the Commonwealth, that the entire Philippines—its manpower and material resources—are at the disposal of the United States in the present emergency."

There are 16,000,000 people in the Philippines. They are a positive asset to us. They could be a serious problem to an enemy in the Orient. The Filipino is a good fighter and is never a quitter. We Americans found that out by experience. I cannot overstress his loyalty to the United States. That loyalty is based on his gratitude to our country and on his love for his own country, whose safety and prosperity he knows are bound up with the United States. It is our duty to stand by him and with him. The Philippines are under our flag and are a part of our national domain. We are going to defend them with all our resources. The Federal Government has so declared in so many words, and I am sure the American people are back of our Government in that stand and determination.

DEFENSE PREPARATIONS

Already the American forces in the Philippines are being reinforced and placed on a war footing. The Philippine forces are being coordinated for service under our flag. Preparations are going on in every possible sector. The spirit of good will and cooperation that has existed for a long time between Americans and Filipinos is reaching its climax in the face of a common danger. We all hope that war does not come, but if it does come, the Philippines are fit and ready to do its part shoulder to shoulder with the United States.

The Far East is in a state of extreme uncertainty. I assume you want me to talk of that part of the globe to describe the theater in which our country may have to play. That region comprehends Japan, east Asia, including China, Manchuria, and Korea, the British colonies of Hong Kong and Malaya, in which Singapore is situated, the Philippines, Thailand (Siam), French Indo-China, Borneo, the Netherlands East Indies, and a myriad of isles and atolls that cover the South Pacific Ocean. They have a total population of some 650,000,000, or five times as many as the population of the United States. Often India and Burma are included in the term "Far East," and with them the region would have more than 1,000,000,000 inhabitants, or roughly one-half of the entire population of the earth. We are concerned, therefore, with enormous hordes of peoples when we deal with the Far East.

Is a war between the United States and Japan imminent? Can that war be averted honorably? Is there a sound reason for that war? These are questions that peoples on both sides of the Pacific Ocean are asking with increasing anxiety.

Today we are facing a condition and not a theory. Last September Japan became a member of the Axis alliance. That alliance is directed against the United States. We are not concerned now why that alliance was created. All that matters is that it exists and that it is against our country. Therefore, we have no choice but be prepared to accept the gage of battle when offered.

600,000,000 PEOPLE TO BE WITH AMERICA

In the event of war with Japan we shall be associated with at least 600,000,000 people in the Far East, three-fourths of whom, the Chinese, are already fighting the Japanese. With our expanding Navy conducting a blockade and attacking operations on the east of Japan and a well-equipped Chinese army of 10,000,000 on her western side, and the Philippine, Javanese, British, and other forces on the south, and our air bombers operating from the Aleutian Islands and Alaska on the north, we have good reasons to be optimistic as to the outcome of that struggle. We can localize the fighting in the Far East and keep the war from our mainland. That is one of the reasons why it is strategically wise to have fortified outposts as far removed from the North American Continent as possible.

The myth of Japanese invincibility has been shattered by the Chinese and the Japanese soldier today holds no terrors to any other far eastern soldier. Japan's manpower and material resources have been heavily depleted by 4 years of disastrous war with China, which has proved unconquerable. With no real gains to show for these sacrifices, it is hard to believe that the morale of the Japanese people has not suffered, even admitting that the Japanese are intensely patriotic. After all, the Japanese are people, too, and they are human like the rest of us.

But the weakening of Japan is not the reason for America's determination to meet Japan in war if necessary. The reason is more basic and deep-seated. It is, as I take it, that Japan has been for years being more or less warlike toward the United States in words and deeds. America's reasonableness and considerateness have been interpreted by the Japanese as signs of fear, guilt, or lack of decision. From this mistaken conception has sprung the Japanese readiness to disregard American rights, terrorize American citizens, and hurl challenges on America in season and out of season. Obviously such a course must stop sometime, and we have decided to stop it now.

PEACE PREFERABLE TO WAR, BUT * * *

Ladies and gentlemen, I am not being warlike myself. I am merely saying what needs be said. I am describing the realities of the situation as they exist today. My preference is for peace and friendship with Japan. I know Japan can have the friendship of our country if she chooses that alternative to war. We have not been at war with Japan in all our history, and we would like nothing better than to perpetuate that magnificent record. I say it is not too late to avert a Japanese-American war. Both sides, I venture to believe, would welcome the continuation of peace. Such peace could be maintained with honor to both sides if each side is willing to be reasonable and make adjustments. And such peace would be the cornerstone of a general peace around the rim of the Pacific Ocean.

There are many good people in Japan who desire no war with America and prefer the amity, the trade, and the good opinion of the American people. They are among the most substantial Japanese citizens, the liberals, and the most enlightened. They are patriotic Japanese, loving their country intensely and intelligently and sacrificially. They and their American counterparts understand each other's language and comprehend each other's good intentions. But unfortunately a peculiar situation obtains in Japan where the militarists and martinets exert a dominating influence upon the affairs of government and people. They, backed by the Japanese armed forces and superpatriots, are often the authors of Japan's foreign policies which have brought that country nothing

but woes and wars. Here again we must face a condition and not a theory, and much as we may have to disappoint the peace-loving and liberal-minded people of Japan, we are compelled to meet the challenge of the militarists and the martinets with the same implements with which the challenge is given.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me emphasize the fact that in my opinion there are infinitely more reasons for America and Japan to be at peace with each other than for them to be at war. I wish also to give it as my judgment that there are many points of harmony between America and Japan as there are many points of conflict between Japan and Germany.

GERMAN-JAPANESE CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

Let me set forth a three-sided exposition of the interests of the United States, Japan, and Germany today and prove that a Japanese-American cooperation has more reason to be than a Japanese-German one.

First. In the field of commerce, the United States has much more to offer in the way of markets to Japan than Germany could ever hope to have. This fact is so overwhelmingly clear that it admits of no discussion.

Second. America has investment capital to export which Japan needs and wants, while Germany has none.

Third. Germany is so distantly located that she cannot be of direct military aid to Japan in a war in the Pacific.

Fourth. Germany today wants the American Fleet out of the Atlantic and in the Pacific, while Japan does not want it in the latter ocean bearing down on the Japanese mainland and islands.

Fifth. While the United States does not have plans to expand territorially in the Far East, Germany, if she won in Europe, or prevailed by a stalemate, or by a negotiated peace, would most probably come as a colonial power to the Far East whence Japan drove her out as an enemy in the last World War. German economic planners know that Europe needs tropical raw materials.

Although they would admit the correctness of this exposition, the Japanese would assert at once that America is violating her neutrality and aiding China, Japan's enemy, thus making this country practically an ally of China. The reply to this, it seems to me, is what I have already said, namely, that Japan has affiliated herself in an offensive and defensive alliance with Germany and Italy directed against the United States. So in helping China the United States is really acting in defense of herself against a possible and probable Japanese belligerency. That is an act of anticipation that is encompassed in a rational and reasonable interpretation of the right of self-defense and self-preservation.

JAPAN'S COMPLAINT AGAINST AMERICA

One of the favorite complaints of the Japanese against the United States is that our Government is trying to press her down and prevent her from expanding and developing. Nothing is farther from the truth. As I understand it, all our Government desires Japan to do is to respect American rights, live up to her plighted word, and quit attributing ignoble motives to our government and people. This country is willing at all times to do as much toward Japan and our record on that score would bear inspection.

Our Government, in measured statements given by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, has made it plain that it looks with disfavor in this modern day and age on a country conquering another by force for the purpose of foisting its economic and political dominion. But the United States is not stopping Japan or any other country from peacefully concluding treaties, arrangements, or agreements with any country to promote her own interests. America would violate an inherent right of independent nationhood if she were to do otherwise. Japan has been exercising that right. Recently she signed a comprehensive treaty with Thailand, presumably with Thailand's voluntary consent. She is trying to obtain a trade convention with the Netherlands East Indies, but in this case press reports have it that Japan is high-pressuring those unwilling Holland possessions. She is also out to negotiate treaties or agreements with other countries in the Far East. It seems to me that Japan will suceed or fail in this enterprise as she employs peaceful or warlike means and whether she has plans of proposals advantageous to the other party.

JAPAN'S PLAN OF EXPANSION

Japan's major plan of economic and political expansion is called the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. It will operate in what the Japanese call Oceania which, according to the Japanese Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, includes the entire Far East, Hawaii, and New Zealand. The plan consists in the creation of a gigantic economic unit with Japan at the center of it and the other countries of the Far East furnishing the raw materials and common labor in a colossal program of industrialization. Heavy industries as well as other industries will be established in Japan proper. The management will be Japanese. The better-paid positions will go to Japanese. And naturally the greater slice of returns and profits will go to Japan. The other cooperating countries will get the lowest prices for their raw materials and for their labor and they will return their earnings to Japan in payment for manufactured products. This has always been the case between two countries with similar economic relations.

The acceptance of this Japanese plan of egocentric economy depends, of course, on the countries invited and on the nature of the invitation and how it is extended. A polite invitation handed by an admiral or a general may be hard to refuse.

GREATER EAST ASIA CO-PROSPERITY MEANING

The Japanese co-prosperity program would eliminate world competition in the raw materials produced by the participating countries. By a process of exchange and credit management it is conceivable that Japanese manufactures would be about the only foreign goods that these countries could purchase. The treaty negotiated recently between Japan and Indo-China has many of the earmarks of the system I have just described.

How shall we meet this situation, this coming competition in the international movement of goods? My deliberate answer is for our country and other interested countries to study the problem presented objectively and try to formulate a program designed to give more advantages to other countries than the Japanese offer. The expedient is as simple as that, but, as you see, it is very fundamental and rests on mutual advantage and mutual well-being. The peoples of Asia, like the Japanese and the rest of us, are people too and are ambitious to achieve progress and prosperity. The day of exploitation is gone, and I hope, gone forever.

The world significance of the Japanese Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere is just dawning on a few people. The Japanese formula of production is high technological efficiency and cheap intelligent labor. With the vast and varied mineral, agricultural, labor, and other resources of the Far East, Japan would become the most formidable economic factor in the world. She would be in a position to capture much of the world trade, dominate the ocean lanes, and pull down the standard of living of every workingman anywhere and everywhere who produces something for exportation. Certainly the Japanese have struck upon a grandiose idea of achieving economic and political greatness and naturally she must expect difficulties in the process. It is possible that they are embarking upon a plan that is altogether too big and ambitious for practical accomplishment and it is conceivable that it may contain the seeds of its own destruction.

* * * * *

PHILIPPINES AN ASSET TO AMERICA

Ladies and gentlemen, I shall now revert to the Philippines as the climax of my speech. It is a happier and brighter story. It is the grand epic of a country crossing an ocean and establishing her institutions of liberty, progress, and equal opportunity among an alien people and succeeding in that noble mission in a great way for the glory of America, the upliftment of the Philippines and the emulation of a world that has grown cruel and cynical. That is the American record and it belongs to the unwritten chapter of glory that explains the American dream.

The object lesson of Philippine progress is the most powerful single factor in elevating the standard of living, the outlook, and the hope of the hundreds of millions of peoples in Asia and the Far East.

Today the Filipinos, under our flag, have self-government, self-respect, protection from foreign aggression, and freedom for self-improvement.

They have a constitution written by themselves, a president and legislators elected by themselves, an army and civil service manned by themselves, courts officered by themselves, and policies fashioned and worked out by themselves.

Until 1946 America is sovereign in the Philippines. That is the year when the Philippines will become completely independent. But that event could be postponed by act of our Government agreed to by the Filipino people. There is a rising sentiment among the Filipinos in favor of postponement of independence. International insecurity, economic considerations and the realization that there is already freedom, liberty, and self-government are among the reasons responsible for that sentiment.

PLEA FOR AID TO PHILIPPINES

I am making the plea to our Government and people that they give every aid and support to the Philippines, especially at the present time. The Filipinos are with us and loyal to us. They are cooperating with us in the existing emergency. They are willing and eager to follow us.

I am sure that while America is extending all sorts of assistance to foreign countries the Philippines is privileged to ask and suggest that certain things be done to preserve the economic strength and the national morale of the Filipino people.

Financial aid should be extended; Philippine products should be furnished adequate shipping facilities; Filipinos should be permitted to charter American ships; export taxes on Philippine products sent to the United States should be abolished completely; the relatively small Philippine bonded debt should not be made the basis to restrict Philippine agriculture and commerce; and, lastly, Filipinos should be made to feel that we are with them as they are with us particularly in these anxious and critical times.

Ladies and gentlemen, we don't know what the morrow may bring, but whatever it may be we of America and of the Philippines are prepared to uphold the American flag to the last syllable of our strength, enthusiasm, and love of country.

Propeller Club of United States Opposes St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed recently by the Propeller Club of the United States. This resolution briefly but clearly sets forth 12 of the many reasons why legislation authorizing the St. Lawrence waterway project should not be enacted at this time. The resolution follows:

Whereas the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Project is unnecessary, uneconomic and unsound, in that:

1. It is not necessary for the national defense and will not produce a more profitable trade route between American ports.
2. It will result in annual losses to American labor, transportation and industry of $109,647,000, according to Government estimates.
3. It will not benefit farmers because foreign purchases and owners of foreign vessels will absorb any possible savings.
4. It will open up a great inland American market to foreign tramp steamers, thereby producing disastrous foreign competition with benefits to few and irreparable injury to many.
5. Electric energy can be produced and secured more economically and practically in localized areas when needed.
6. Actual cost of the project, being estimated at $1,120,588,000 will exceed by three times the cost of the Panama Canal.
7. Immediate utilization of such money for the St. Lawrence seaway project will divert the money needed urgently in the production of strategic supplies and equipment for national defense;
8. It will result in the imposition of inordinate tax burdens without corresponding benefits;
9. It will produce a diversion of traffic from railroads, steamship lines, inland waterways and motortrucks, and result in unstable and unbalanced rail, water, and motortruck rates;
10. New dangers will be created in navigating the proposed waterway;
11. It will impair property and rental values as the result of the diminution of tax returns to the Federal Government, States and cities; and
12. It will produce unnecessary unemployment and permanent detrimental effects on banking, industry, and purchasing power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Propeller Club of the United States and the American Merchant Marine Conference in convention assembled, That for the reasons above mentioned, among others, this organization vigorously opposes the St. Lawrence seaway project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and to all other interested individuals and groups.

HAROLD J. HARDING,
National Secretary.

Let's Continue and Expand Our So-Called Shelterbelt Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, very soon there will be an agricultural committee conference report to be considered by this House. Included in the report will be a very important item added by Senator GEORGE NORRIS in the Senate to continue the prairie States forest project, sometimes referred to as the shelterbelt program. It is my sincere hope that the chairman or other member of the agricultural subcommittee on appropriations will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which, if adopted and approved by this Congress, will continue a worth-while tree-planting program that means so much to the several prairie States of the Midwest and South, including my own State of Oklahoma.

This project from its inception back in 1935 has been entirely financed from relief funds as a relief propect. This great tree-planting program has been kicked around from pillar to post since its beginning. Due to the fact that it was once called the shelterbelt program and someone suggested that a solid belt of trees from Canada to the border of Texas be planted, there was much opposition to the program from the beginning. If, however, there was ever any such idea, which the Forest Service assures me was not in fact ever contemplated, the solid belt idea has long since been entirely eliminated, abandoned, and forgotten.

Today the shelterbelt consists of from 5 to 7 rows of various varieties of trees usually planted on the south border of the farmer's land for the purpose of checking the hot winds and decreasing erosion in the several prairie States affected. In Oklahoma the program has proved eminently successful. Millions of young trees have been planted on farms in western and southwestern Oklahoma, where farmers have signed agreements to fence, cultivate, and protect the so-called shelterbelts. Despite 5 years of continuous drought, until the present season, the trees have made a marvelous growth and I am advised that a remarkably small percentage of the trees planted have died. I am sure that the farmers of Oklahoma, and certainly that applies to those of other prairie States affected, are tremendously interested in continuing this worth while program. In a general way, let me say that the prairie States forestry project has proven to be a fully practical and extremely beneficial aid to agriculture in the Plains country. This region is the source of almost half of the agricultural food products consumed by the American people, and is one of the great markets for manufactured goods.

The shelterbelts make definite economic contributions to agriculture. They decrease three types of prevalent damage to farm crops—namely, blowing out of seed and young crops, abrasion by soil particles, and hot winds. They conserve the productive values of the topsoil by decreasing wind erosion; they provide an improved condition for game and insectivorous birds; and they yield supplies of fence posts and fuel wood.

The work has been conducted as a cooperative undertaking with the farmers on whose lands the shelterbelts are planted. Counties and municipalities have also contributed to the work.

The value of all services contributed at present amounts to over 40 percent of the cost to the Government.

Since the project started in 1935 there has been planted about 17,000 miles of shelterbelts on about 27,000 farms in the six States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. Notwithstanding the severe drought which has prevailed up to this year since the work began, there has been, as I stated a moment ago, a high percentage of survival of the trees. In the State of Oklahoma 3,000 miles of shelterbelts have been planted on about 5,000 farms. Over 30,000,000 trees have been planted in Oklahoma. Much of the soil of western Oklahoma where the project operates is of a sandy nature. Farmers and other rural people are enthusiastic as to the benefits obtained from shelterbelts.

The Plains area is the only region in the United States where there is a concentration of counties which have lost 10 percent or more of the population during the past decade. By improving living conditions as well as providing benefits to land and crops, shelterbelts undoubtedly have a definite effect on keeping people on the farms. I sincerely hope that the House will recede and concur in the Senate amendment and not only continue this worth-while program, but that we will take this program off of relief and make it hereafter a definite part of our great agricultural program.

Pensions and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered over the radio on May 23, 1941:

At this time, as war clouds gather, there is grave danger that some of our greatest domestic needs may be obscured by the para-

mount problem of defense. If this happens, a loss in national morale is likely to follow.

SECURITY FROM WANT AS WELL AS FEAR

With this thought in mind, 150 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives have gotten together behind a program for social security which, if enacted into law, would tend to encourage our people to a greater zeal for the maintenance of the democracy we seek to defend; in that defense would be coupled with the abiding knowledge of security from want as well as from fear.

NONPARTISAN STEERING COMMITTEE OF 150 CONGRESSMEN

These 150 Congressmen, from all political parties and from all sections of the Nation, have formed what is known as the General Welfare Act steering committee, which committee I have had the honor to head as chairman for the last 4 years. They have all signed a steering committee resolution endorsing the General Welfare Act (H. R. 1410) as an amendment to the Social Security Act, urging its adoption by the Seventy-seventh Congress and pledging their efforts in its behalf.

GREATEST GENERAL PENSION PROGRESS IN HISTORY

This banding together of 150 Congressmen for a single purpose represents the greatest general pension progress in the history of America. I am sure, therefore, that you who are listening in will welcome a brief explanation of this bill, its provisions, and its purposes.

GENERAL WELFARE ACT EXPLAINED

The General Welfare Act, or General Welfare Act amendments, to the Social Security Act was introduced in Congress on January 6, 1941, by Hon. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE, of Indiana as H. R. 1410. It provides for the extension of the coverage of the Social Security Act to all groups and all classes on the basis of a flat $30 per month without any "means test" or "needs test," such as is now required under title I of the Social Security Act. This $30 may be augmented by earnings of not to exceed $15 per month, and the various States may supplement these amounts on the basis of need, so as to allow those who cannot live on the basic $30 Federal annuity, $50 per month in the State of California, $45 per month in the State of Washington, and lesser amounts in those States not able to carry such a heavy load.

ABOLISH PAUPERS' OATHS AND STATE RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

This arrangement would do away with the degrading paupers' oaths in connection with pensions and would insure fair and equal treatment to our senior citizens, no matter in which State they happen to live. It would enable them to travel about from State to State and not be restrained by some social-security regulation.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO BASIS AS AGAINST PENSIONS ON BORROWED MONEY

It would also put pensions on a pay-as-you-go basis and end our present system of giving pensions to some of our elders at the expense of their grandchildren. The Federal Government now grants $20,000,000 per month, or $240,000,000 per year, to 2,000,000 aged until title I of the Social Security Act, to match State appropriations on a 50-50 basis. Every cent of the Federal money thus paid out is charged to posterity as no satisfactory method of financing the present pensions has been worked out. We simply grant them and ask our children and grandchildren to pay the bill, plus interest, to those who loan the money for every day the loan is unpaid. This is certainly not right, and I doubt that many of my listeners would not want to change this system and put pensions on a pay-as-you-go basis.

EXTEND SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO ALL

By doing so we would merely extend the principles of title II of the Social Security Act to all those who have been left out of our present annuity system built up on a proper basis. Under this system about one-half of our present population is covered by a sound social-security system that will eventually bring to each one, fortunate enough to be covered, a proper retirement annuity of from $10 to $85 per month. This system, of course, is geared to pay rolls and is based upon the proposition that one should get in proportion to what one pays in during one's producing years. There is nothing wrong with title II of the Social Security Act. Nor is there anything wrong with our civil-service retirement system or our railroad retirement system.

FAVORITISM IN SOCIAL-SECURITY FIELD

The only trouble is that these Federal annuity systems are not extensive enough to cover all groups and all classes. Consequently, a system of gross favoritism has grown up in America in the social-security field. About one-half of our people are in the category of "haves" and about one-half are "have nots."

"HAVES"

The "haves" include the following groups: Judges, certain Government workers, railroad workers, teachers, veterans, industrial workers, wives of industrial workers, children of industrial workers, office workers, wives of office workers, children of office workers, aliens (since most of our 4,000,000 aliens fall within the industrial-worker category), wives of aliens, and children of aliens.

"HAVE NOTS"

The "have nots" include the following groups: Farmers, farm laborers, casual laborers, housewives, domestics, nurses, students, church employees, institutional employees, many government employees, businessmen, professional men, the self-employed, and the unemployed.

SOCIAL SECURITY BASED UPON EQUITY

In view of this discrimination in granting annuities to half of our people and leaving the other half out, the question arises as to whether we can consistently approve the social-security program as a whole. I say, "No," that we cannot, and that something must be done to equalize this situation. The only thing that can be done, as I see it, is to extend the provisions in question to all groups and all classes. Then, and then only, will we have real social security in America based upon equity.

DISCRIMINATION INCONSISTENT

The system of discrimination, wherein the Federal and State governments match funds, under which the aged poor in Arkansas get $4 per month from "Uncle Sam" as an average and the aged poor in my State of California get $19 per month as an average from the Federal Government, is inconsistent.

PENALTY ON THRIFT

We should end the system under which the more indolent and shiftless a person is the surer he is of getting a pension geared to pauperism, a system which puts a penalty on thrift and a premium on indolence. If a person is a good citizen and acquires a home we tell him, "You are not eligible for a pension. You have paid taxes, and you have a home. You will have to get along the best way you can."

MORE THAN THREE BILLIONS FOR PENSIONS IMPOSSIBLE NOW

As to a general Federal pension going higher than $30 per month at the present time, this is impossible. It would require $3,000,000,000 more than we are now paying to meet such a pension. I know, and so do the other 13 of my colleagues on the Appropriation Committee of the House who have signed the G. W. A. Steering Committee resolution, that this Congress will not appropriate more than $3,000,000,000 additional for pensions under any circumstances during the present emergency.

NOT A TAX, BUT AN ANNUITY PREMIUM

I feel that there is a chance of going to $30 per month as a flat pension, inasmuch as the tax to raise the money for such a flat pension would not in reality be considered as a tax but would be looked upon rather as an annuity premium which all would be glad to pay, either directly or indirectly, for a retirement annuity maturing at the retirement age.

NOT TAX PURCHASING POWER

Most of our taxes are indirect, and we can, therefore, justify the exemption under the General Welfare Act of the first $80 per month of gross income, or $960 per year, cumulative. We do not want to tax the purchasing power of the small wage earner. They would pay, indirectly, as "passed on" taxes that enter into production costs, their share of the gross profit tax of 2 percent which we propose as a method of financing such a pension system as I have outlined.

GROSS-PROFIT TAX EXPLAINED

By gross profit I mean the total gross income of a person or firm less only the cost of the property or commodity sold or of its component parts. The tax we propose is essentially a value-added tax. We never tax a loss and tax only the mark-up or added value in the case of businesses and the value received in the case of employments, less, of course, the basic exemption of the first $80 per month, or $960 per year. Such a tax base is sound, will not pyramid, and will yield a stable revenue. It has been commended by some of the leading tax experts of the Nation, and I feel that we are on sound ground in recommending it. We may even have to come to it as a means of financing our stupendous defense program as well as financing such a proper general social-security program as I have outlined to you this evening.

SIX FEET OF CONGRESSIONAL SIGNATURES

In the office of the General Welfare Federation of America, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., there is a brief 3-line steering committee resolution 6 feet long bearing the actual signatures of 150 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in support of the legislative proposal I have outlined to you. Additional information as to it may be obtained from the General Welfare Federation or from any of the Congressmen who have signed this resolution, whose names are all listed in the federation's booklet, which gives considerable valuable data as to this matter of social security so vital to all of us.

ALL SHOULD BE INTERESTED

I hope my listeners will interest themselves in it. If they are Government workers who are now assured of economic security in the sunset of life, let them think of the welfare of those they leave behind. If they are railroad workers let them give thought also as to what will become of their dear ones if they should pass away. Let the others who are now covered by Federal social security think of those not covered and do their share to help their fellow men get the same breaks they have secured. Let us all work toward improving the splendid social-security system we now have under title II of the Social Security Act so that its benefits will be extended to all of our people and on a fair and equitable basis.

COOPERATION URGED

Above all, keep in mind that we are confronted with many problems that are most disturbing. We owe each other and our Nation the utmost of cooperation and loyalty.

The Un-American Dirksen Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1941

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say is spoken after due reflection. There is no emotionalism or hysteria in it. It was instilled in me during the impressionable years of my life by a man who possessed as fine courage, physical and moral, as ever filled the heart and soul of man, my father. To me my father, above everything else, was a great American. While he never laid claim to greatness, while he never held some high office of state or church, while his voice never swayed the multitude and caused the blood to curdle or the heart beats to grow faster, while his pen was never engaged in writing some learned treaties, while his mind never gave birth to some great thought that revolutionized society, while he never dreamed through some great invention that played an important part in our economic life, to me he did something greater—he believed in his Americanism, and, day by day, in his humble way, he had the courage to live that Americanism. His Americanism, among other things, included the immortal pronouncements contained in the Declaration of Independence and the philosophy of free government as set forth in the Constitution. He believed in tolerance, which is the foundation stone in the Bill of Rights, and he so lived. He believed in the freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, religious freedom, and he so lived. And he believed the accused was entitled to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury, that he should be informed of the nature and cause of the charge, that he should be confronted with the witnesses against him, and that he should be given the opportunity to prepare and present his defense, and he so lived. I believe in these things, and I have tried to so live as not to belie my beliefs. And I know my colleagues here in the House also believe in these things and try to live them.

But, Mr. Speaker, something happened here in the House last Friday, the day on which we adjourned over the week-end, that really alarmed me, and since then the spirit of my departed father has ever been present counseling me to cry out against that happening.

On last Thursday the gentleman from Illinois offered an amendment to the emergency relief appropriation bill, while the bill was under consideration by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, providing "that no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser," and by a viva voce vote of 131 to 88 the amendment was adopted by this, "the greatest deliberative body on earth." On Friday, when the Committee finished its consideration of the bill and reported it back to the House, a separate vote was demanded on the Dirksen amendment, and again "the greatest deliberative body on earth," by a record vote of 214 to 114, upheld the action of the Committee in voting in the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this ex parte star-chamber proceeding that I cry out against shows that on last Friday we failed to live our Americanism, reflects no credit on the House, and when the bill reaches the Senate I hope that this great travesty upon our Declaration of Independence and Constitution will be wiped out by the elimination of this vicious, un-American amendment.

I hold no brief for Mr. Lasser. I do not know him. I have never laid eyes on him. I would not know him if I met him in the middle of the big road. And from newspaper reports and hearsay I fear that there is little, if anything, in common between us. I do not know whether Mr. Hunter, Acting Commissioner, Work Projects Administration, acted wisely or unwisely in giving him employment, but knowing Mr. Hunter to be an honorable man, I am confident he acted honestly and, until the contrary is shown, I presume wisely. It is not David Lasser the man that I am defending. It is David Lasser, the American citizen who, though perhaps misguided at times—yes, if you please, as I view things, as you view things, perhaps radical at times—is still an American citizen, and by virtue of that citizenship entitled to every right and safeguard that the Constitution of this great Republic throws around her citizenry.

Now, what are the facts as revealed by the record, and upon which the House acted? Ah, Mr. Speaker, they present a sad commentary upon democratic processes and upon the acts of the highest legislative body of our Republic and should bring a blush of shame to the cheek of every American.

The gentleman from Illinois, who offered the amendment, prefacing his remarks by the statement, "I find no particular pride in this kind of procedure," did not even charge that Lasser was a Communist. After stating that Lasser was a man of fine appearance, fluent, extremely able, a graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, an engineer by profession, he charged that some years ago Lasser had made certain base and groundless statements with respect to the membership of this House; that he had been president of the Workers Alliance, a questionable organization, of which one Herbert Benjamin, an admitted Communist, was secretary; that he attended the twentieth anniversary celebration of the Russian Revolution; and that he was now holding a position with the W. P. A. investigating "conditions in private employment in the transition of W. P. A. workers to private industry."

Two other members spoke in favor of the amendment, the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Oklahoma likewise did not accuse Lasser of being a Communist. The burden of his impeachment was that he had been running around with the wrong crowd; that he had been mixed up with the Workers Alliance, a questionable organization, and had been for a time associated with one Herbert Benjamin, an admitted Communist; and that he had interviewed Mr. Howard O. Hunter, Acting Commissioner, Work Projects Administration, and made complaint because Lasser had been given employment and asked him what he was going to do about it, to which Mr. Hunter had replied, "Nothing." The gentleman from Pennsylvania likewise objected to the company Lasser had kept, and charged the Workers Alliance had plotted to kidnap him if he attended the laying of the cornerstone of the post office at Reading, but stated that in connection with the matter Lasser had sent him a telegram stating that if there was anything to the plot it had been engineered by a bunch of "hoodlums or stool pigeons that may have been sent into his organization by reactionaries;" that in connection with the controversy over the State of Pennsylvania failing to take care of those on relief Lasser had led a bunch of relief workers, in protest, to the capitol of Pennsylvania where some of them acted unseemly; and that he had protested to Mr. Hunter over giving Lasser employment and was astonished when informed by Mr. Hunter that Lasser was rendering excellent service.

In opposition to the amendment the gentleman from Massachusetts stated:

> David Lasser was born in Baltimore in 1902. He served in the United States Army at the age of 17, and was gassed while in France fighting for his country. In the Workers Alliance when he found that the Communist influence was getting stronger, he had a fight with David (Herbert) Benjamin, a known Communist. The Dies committee was created by the Congress to investigate and determine the facts with respect to un-American activities. I quote what it said about David Lasser in its report to this Congress in January, about the Workers Alliance. It said—
>
> "The non-Communist element in the Workers Alliance withdrew under the leadership of David Lasser in June of that year and that the Workers Alliance became a shadow of its former self."

Hence it appears that Lasser was given credit in the report of the Dies committee for having broken up the Workers' Alliance. Why did he break it up? Because, as recited in the report, it was communistic. This act on the part of Mr. Lasser cannot be reconciled with the imputation that he is a Communist or entertains, in any way, a sympathetic feeling for the Communists but, on the contrary, clearly shows that he is violently opposed to these gutter rats that are trying to undermine free government in America.

The Democratic floor leader, whom we all love and admire, and who rendered the country a great service some years ago as chairman of the House committee to investigate nazi-ism and communism, and who is the author of the bill under which all those charged with subversive activities are now being prosecuted, in opposition to the resolution, stated:

> Mr. Lasser, to me, is just an individual whom I have met on a few occasions. The

first time I saw the man was when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee when amendments to the Social Security Act were under consideration. I have a copy of the hearings in my hands. I had a very unfavorable impression about him when I heard he was going to appear before the committee, and at that time I gave him a rather searching cross-examination; but, Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the examination I changed the tentative opinion of an adverse nature that I had entertained toward him and which was formed as a result of reading the newspapers and as a result of other information, emotional it is true, that had been called to my attention. I found him to be a constructive witness. I found him to be a reasonable witness. He made one or two proposals that I took occasion to compliment him about, and he made at least one proposal which was incorporated in the bill reported out of the committee because it was a sound, constructive proposal.

I have recited the arguments pro and con, not because I believe they are persuasive or controlling one way or the other on the principles involved—I know they are not—but simply to show the limit patriotic, God-fearing Americans, in periods of hysteria, will go.

Mr. Speaker, the conviction of David Lasser—and, for all practical purposes, that is just what this amendment does—an American citizen born in the city of Baltimore of American parents, whose patriotism was so intense that he volunteered at the tender age of 17 to fight to "make the world safe for democracy," and who bears to this day the scars of that patriotic service, by the House of Representatives in an ex parte, star-chamber proceeding, is not only without warrant of law, but is in plain violation of the spirit and letter of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Every American citizen should view our proceeding with alarm when he contemplates them in connection with the pronouncement made by our predecessors in office, the members of the Second Continental Congress, when, through their Declaration of July 4, 1776, they indicted George III:

> For depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury—for transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses.

Every American should view our proceedings with alarm when he contemplates them in connection with the principles of free government set forth in the first amendment to the Constitution, which is the first article in what is commonly known as the Bill of Rights, which reads:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Every American should view our proceedings with alarm when he contemplates them in connection with the principles of free government set forth in the sixth amendment to the Constitution, which is the sixth article in what is commonly known as the Bill of Rights, which reads:

> In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been prevously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Every American should view our proceedings with alarm when he contemplates them in connection with the principles of free government set forth in the seventh amendment to the Constitution, and which is the seventh article in what is commonly known as the Bill of Rights, which reads:

> In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

And every American should view our proceedings with alarm when he contemplates them in connection with the principles of free government set forth in section 9 of article I of the Constitution, which reads:

> No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.

We boast that ours is a democratic government, a Christian nation, and rightly so. And yet 2,000 years ago un-Christian, imperial Rome showed a greater consideration for her laws and the rights of her citizens than was displayed here in the House last Friday. It is recorded that the Jews, who had been subjugated by the Romans and whose territory at the time was a Roman province, "laid many and grievious complaints" against a certain Roman citizen, Paul by name. As I remember the Roman Judge Festus, anxious to win favor with the Jews, was willing to do their bidding by sending Paul to Jerusalem for trial until Paul made known his Roman citizenship by appealing to Caesar. When this fact became known Judge Festus, no longer swayed by Jewish clamor, ordered Paul back to Rome to be tried under the Roman law. His citizenship stood for something. There is another pronouncement in that record that I desire to call to the attention of the House, Judge Festus in denying the request of the Jews, stated:

> It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him.

While I know the membership of the House is perfectly familiar with Holy Writ, in considering the rights of accused, I hope that they will give careful and prayerful study and meditation to the twenty-fifth chapter of The Acts of the Apostles.

Mr. Speaker, let us for a moment contemplate what we have done by the adoption of this ill-considered, unwise, un-American amendment. In a moment of hysterical emotionalism we have, without the semblance of a trial—without formal complaint, without evidence to support a complaint if it had been filed, without facing the accused by his accusers, without permitting the accused to make defense—convicted an American citizen of being unworthy to serve, in a minor civil position, the land that the grim scars of war upon his body bear mute testimony to that he loves. Think of it. Passing special legislation in the nature, to say the least, of a bill of attainder, which is prohibited by section 9 of article I of the Constitution, to get rid of a minor governmental employee.

Why did we do it? What excuse did we offer for trampling under foot the fundamental laws of this land? Let the record answer. The gentleman from Illinois is speaking:

> There is no other way I know of outside substantive legislation which we have difficulty in getting into and through the Congress, to get at Mr. Lasser except by means of a limitation upon an appropriation bill.

While such an excuse is groundless, even if true it would not justify the means employed. I do not know of a single piece of legislation aimed at getting rid of subversive influences that has not had the support of the leadership of this House. For instance, the majority leader, at one time served as chairman of a House committee to investigate nazi-ism and communism. Without the blare of trumpets and daily newspaper headlines his committee rendered a real outstanding service, and recommended to the House the passage of legislation which was immediately passed, and today those charged with subversive activities are being prosecuted under the law. The Dies committee which succeeded the McCormack committee has never, so far as I know, recommended the passage of a single piece of legislation.

But even if the excuse offered were true, it would not justify the action taken. Behold the picture again. The mighty Congress of the United States, supposed to be the greatest deliberative body on earth, singling out a helpless citizen holding a minor position in a governmental department that employs thousands, and without a hearing or an opportunity to be heard, virtually passing a bill of attainder to get rid of him. That does not look like an American picture to me. The coloring has too much of the symbolical red of a Stalin. My colleagues, honestly, are not you ashamed of that picture? Basing your excuse for getting rid of Lasser on the ground that he is a Communist, or has communistic leanings, and then resorting to communistic means to accomplish your end.

Oh, you say there are others. Now, permit me to disgress long enough to make a few observations with respect to those who entertain subversive views being employed by the Government. There has been a lot of loose talk going around for some time to the effect that the departments are employing many Nazi and Communist sympathizers. I hope that this sordid affair will, at least, bring this matter to a head. If such is the case, the Congress and the American people are entitled to know. And if such is the case, I know that the Congress will act, and

act with dispatch and within the limits of the Constitution to get rid of them, and if we need additional substantive laws to do this, I know that the Congress will immediately pass the laws. And in this connection permit me to call attention to the fact that on April 4, 1941, this House adopted an amendment to H. R. 4276, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and the Judiciary, making available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation $100,000 to be used—

exclusively to investigate the employees of every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Federal Government who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government, and report the findings to Congress.

The RECORD of June 5, 1941, page 4769, reveals that the House again had under consideration H. R. 4276 for the purpose of appointing conferees, and discloses the following startling facts:

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in this connection, may I say that on April 4, 1941, because of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] that was passed by the House, I addressed my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] as follows—and, as I stated, this letter is dated April 4:

HON. MARTIN DIES,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Yesterday the House, while making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the judiciary for the fiscal year 1942, inserted an amendment in the bill the effect of which is to make available $100,000 of the funds appropriated to the Federal Bureau of Investigation "exclusively to investigate the employees of every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Federal Government who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government, and report its findings to Congress.

It has come to my attention that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has not the list of Government employees compiled by your Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities who are members of subversive organizations or who advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government.

May I respectfully request, therefore, in order that the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be properly informed of the findings of your committee in the matter of these individuals, that your committee make available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation the list to which reference is made?

Cordially yours,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary.

Under date of April 7, I received the following reply:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 4, 1941, addressed to Congressman DIES.

Please be advised that Mr. DIES is out of town at the present time. However, I shall be glad to bring your letter to his attention upon his return to the city.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. STRIPLING,
Secretary.

A telephone call today to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, made as late as an hour ago, revealed that up to the present time the F. B. I. has not received the list to which reference was made in the letter.

Let us get this thing cleared up. The time is long past due for a show-down. If the investigation of the Dies committee reveals that "members of subversive organizations or who advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government" are on the Government pay roll, why did not the committee immediately report the matter to Congress and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for action? If the Federal Bureau of Investigation is acquainted with the list, why has it not made the proper investigation and, if there is cause to believe that any or all on the list are guilty as charged, report to the Department of Justice for proper action? If the F. B. I. has made the proper investigation and found that the charges are baseless, why has it not made its findings known so the Congress and the public will be advised? These charges and countercharges—and that is all we have had until we took our vengeance out on an ex-soldier holding a minor position by virtually passing a bill of attainder against him—are disturbing me, and they are disturbing the American people. We are entitled to know the facts; and I am serving notice now—let the chips fall where they may—that I am not going to let up on the matter until we get the facts. If, for political reasons, there are those who are making the charges for the purpose of trying to smear the administration because they do not agree with its policies, let the facts come. If for ill will or hate there are those who are making the charges for the purpose of trying to smear the administration, let the facts come. And, likewise, if the charges are true, let the facts come. What we want are the plain, unvarnished facts.

Now, having got this matter off of my chest, let me get back to Mr. Lasser. What are the consequences of the passage of this vicious, un-American amendment? Let us see. Mr. Speaker, there is something ironical in appropriating $10,000,000,000 one day to preserve free government, and the next day passing an amendment which, if adopted as an American principle, will destroy free government. There is something ominous in appropriating something like $1,000,000,000 to feed the hungry and clothe the naked—to meet the responsibility of a free government to its citizenry—and in the very same bill voting in an amendment, the vicious principle of which would do more to destroy free government than all the millions we can appropriate will do for its preservation.

What, I repeat, are the natural consequences of our act? Let us see. We have, let me repeat, without a hearing, without a trial, in a legislative proceeding, and in violation of the spirit and letter of the fundamental laws of our land, solemnly adjudicated that an American citizen, against whom no complaint of law violation had been lodged, is unworthy to hold a position with his Government. We have cut that citizen off from the means of his livelihood, and, in all probability, made it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for him to hereafter find employment. We have virtually passed a bill of attainder against an American citizen. Remember, my colleagues, you cannot destroy the rights of the other man without putting your own rights in jeopardy.

If this amendment stands then who, I pray thee, is safe from the legislative edict? If the amendment correctly expressed the power of Congress, then what is there to keep a member from listing those in the departments for whom he has a dislike because, perchance, they do not view political, social, or economic questions alike, and then waiting until the appropriation bills covering the respective departments are brought up and offering amendments prohibiting the use of any of the funds appropriated from being used to pay their respective salaries? My Republican friends, let me say that if the amendment correctly expresses the power of Congress, then it is a good thing that the legislative appropriation bill has passed, because I am afraid that some Democrat, given to buffoonery and in a spirit of counterfeiting folly, who does not agree with you on political, social, and economic questions, would offer an amendment cutting off the pay of all Republican Members. Yes, the Democrat offering the amendment would charge you with being reactionaries and radicals and alarmists and extremists and, be not deceived, if required to produce proof, which, of course, is a matter of such small consequence that it is not required under the Dirksen philosophy, could darn nigh prove it—at least he could to the satisfaction of the majority of the House as at present constituted.

Again I repeat, what are the natural consequences of our acts? Why, through our hold on the purse string, we are usurping the powers of the executive and judiciary and setting up a legislative dictatorship. If the Chief Executive or any of the department heads or the employees therein do not suit us, why pass an amendment to the proper appropriation bill, and without a hearing, solemnly declare by legislative edict that they are unworthy to hold public office, and provide that no part of the appropriation shall be used to pay their salaries. If the Supreme Court judges or any of the lesser judges or their employees render decisions or entertain views that do not coincide with ours, why, pass an amendment.

I hope the Senate will undo our ill-considerative action. If it does not, then, if I were President, I would veto the bill. I would never let it be said that the head of this Republic gave his sanction and approval to the provisions of a bill that strips an American citizen of his constitutional rights by an ex parte, star-chamber proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, this is no easy task that I have performed. I dislike to criticize an act of this House. I love its membership; I prize above earthly possessions the privilege to be numbered among its Members; I revere its long and unbroken record of service to our country; but, feeling as I do, I could not live my Americanism and let go unchallenged the vicious and un-American action we took in passing the Dirksen amendment.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. CULLEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to record a personal word to the Members of the House upon the life and services of that splendid and lovable character who came to Congress from the city of New York, and whose untimely death filled our hearts with sadness—the late MICHAEL EDELSTEIN.

I cherish the memory of my friend MICHAEL EDELSTEIN. He was a delightful companion and a warm-hearted and loyal friend. He possessed those human qualities which made others love and admire him.

He was successful in his work in Congress and elsewhere because of his indefatigable industry, and his intimate knowledge of anything he ever undertook to do.

I join with those who have reason to cherish his memory in paying this brief tribute to the personality and character of a man who rose to prominence in the great metropolis of New York City and who in a dignified and effective way rendered valuable services to his city, State, and country.

Alonzo Dillard Folger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, in the tragic and untimely death of our beloved friend and colleague, ALONZO D. FOLGER, the membership of this body has suffered a serious privation. To all of us who knew him and shared his friendship, his death carries with it a profound sense of personal loss. The people of his district, of our entire State and of the Nation have lost a faithful and efficient public servant and a true friend.

No one could know LON FOLGER without recognizing and admiring his outstanding ability, his unselfish devotion to duty, and his love for his fellow man. His many high qualities were universally respected and his gentle consideration for others, his unfailing patience and courtesy endeared him to everyone with whom he came in contact.

As evidence of the esteem and respect with which he was held by the people of his district and of North Carolina, I may cite a few of the many honors and positions of trust and confidence which were bestowed upon him. He served since 1932 as trustee of the University of North Carolina and in 1937 became a judge of the Superior Court of North Carolina. Shortly thereafter he resigned to become our national committeeman and director of finance for the Democratic National Committee. He came to Congress in 1938 and served here with honor and distinction until his untimely death.

In each of these capacities he gave unstintingly of his unusual abilities and energy. No one was more zealous or untiring in his devotion to the public cause. An earnest and able effort to promote the welfare of his fellow man was the single purpose of his entire life.

LON FOLGER'S personality, his sincerity, and sympathetic consideration endeared him to those in every walk of life. His friends were legion, and never was there the slightest indication that their trust and confidence were misplaced. I know that I speak for all of them when I say that he is sorely missed and that his death has brought to a tragic end an extremely useful career.

To his widow and family we extend the heartfelt sympathy of the House of Representatives, and we share with them a profound sorrow in the death of one so universally respected, admired, and loved.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, gone from our midst is that modest, able, and alert gentleman, the late Congressman M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN. Those of us who knew him realize that his talents and qualities will be sorely missed. In these days of uncertainty, when much can happen as the result of an ill-advised word or deed, his experience with human psychology would have been of great assistance. Seldom ruffled, always the perfect gentleman, he contributed greatly to sane, sound procedure.

As a member of the bar he enjoyed an enviable reputation. He was held in an affectionate and respectful regard by judges, lawyers, and court attaches, and he enjoyed their complete confidence. Always scrupulous in his efforts to avoid offense to anyone, he lived his life to the end that he might mix with his fellowmen in harmony and at peace.

To say of him he was an American is to put it mildly. It would be more in accord with the fact to say that with him Americanism was a religion in itself. His concept of the term embodied all that is noble in America and all for which America has stood throughout the years. To him some of these unfortunate present-day practices, which are properly condemned by all right-thinking Americans, were completely foreign to his understanding of the teachings of America.

His life was cut short by the Almighty Providence which determines time and place. The arduous duties of his office, and the sincerity with which he discharged them, unquestionably contributed to his passing. His demise is indeed a sad blow to his dear ones and friends. However, may I venture the thought that few of us can ever hope for as glorious an end as that of our departed colleague and friend. As has been said by a prominent jurist of the State of New York, in commenting upon the death of our colleague:

He died in harness, in the Hall of Congress, fervently pleading for tolerance and justice to all.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD was one of the ablest debaters and ablest parliamentarians that Congress has developed in recent years. He was a man devoted to the interests of his country, his State, and his own home community. It was my privilege to meet and to know him as few men had an opportunity to know him, and the power of his intellect, and the sincerity of his patriotism have left upon me an everlasting memory.

Pius Louis Schwert

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. CULLEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, if the time of departing from this world had been

left to man, the life of PIUS L. SCHWERT would certainly have been greatly prolonged, for his friends and associates would have been reluctant to have dispensed with an association and friendship so pleasing and enjoyable to them.

During my association with him in the House of Representatives I grew to respect and admire him for his wonderful characteristics, his qualities, his principles, his extreme kindness, and all those other attributes which typify a great man.

In this solemn hour devoted to a contemplation of his character and accomplishment it will be comforting to those who loved him in his life to recall that though his distinguished career is closed, he has left behind him the heritage of a great name, respected and honored throughout his city, his State, and the Nation.

Kenneth Farrand Simpson

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have known KENNETH SIMPSON for over 20 years. During all that time he has been active in the public service, but as a man of public service rather than a holder of official position. He was a great success as a practicing lawyer and became the political leader of the largest city in the country. He has left his imprint on the city of New York and its political life in a fine way and in a way that will be a credit to him more and more in the years to come.

He was elected to the House last fall and served just 8 weeks. It was tragic that a man of such ability should die so young. It was a tremendous tribute to his ability that he was able to accomplish so much in a short and busy life.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE SEGER came to Congress when I did in 1923. I have known him closely and intimately ever since then. He has been a devoted and loyal public servant. Few men for so long a period of time have held the absolute confidence of their people as he did, beginning early in life and continuing their service to the very end of a long and useful life. He had an especially fine and pleasant manner, and was a keen student, and was always on the job. It was tragic that he should have passed away when he had contemplated retirement the 1st of January 1941 and not be permitted to complete his term, at the end of which he had announced his retirement. Few men are able to train and name their successor as he was, and we must acknowledge in that he did a fine job, as he did in everything else. GEORGE SEGER will be greatly missed by his family and friends.

A Constitutional Freedom—The Freedom of Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

ADDRESSES OF HON. E. E. COX, OF GEORGIA, AND REV. JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY, CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses delivered by myself and Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, at the dedication of radio station WALB in my district:

ADDRESS OF HON. E. E. COX, OF GEORGIA

My friends, I am greatly pleased to be permitted to take part in these exercises. It enables me to speak directly to those I love best and owe much.

This broadcasting station, now being dedicated to the public service, symbolizes one of America's cherished freedoms—freedom of speech.

When the framers of the Constitution had completed their work at Philadelphia and by resolution had agreed that it should be sent to the States for ratification, in accordance with the provisions of article VII of their completed draft, the First Congress elected under the Constitution proposed, on September 25, 1789, to the legislatures of the several States, a series of amendments.

Among those amendments, which we have come to call the Bill of Rights, the very first provides: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Thus, it should be observed, these fundamental principles—"these * * * essential human freedoms," as they were designated by the President in his message delivered at the opening of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress—were proposed by the elected representatives of the people. They were, moreover, ratified by the people in their several States and made a part of the Constitution, in accordance with prescribed constitutional principles.

Today, more than at any other time in our history perhaps, we cherish these freedoms because today we live in a world in which there is a denial of these freedoms, especially freedom of speech, to millions of people by totalitarian or communistic dictators.

Throughout all the world today, except in our own America, a totalitarian or a Communist censor determines what the people may hear over the radio, what they may read in their daily press, or what they may say. Totalitarian censors determine what the world shall hear, by way of the air, of events and occurrences within their own lands, and they deprive their own people of news from all the world.

Here in America today there are approximately 30,000,000 radio families. Based upon the average estimate of approximately 4 persons per family, this means that in America a radio is accessible to practically every person in the Nation. Here there is no censor. Here there is no suppression of free speech. Here the air lanes are free to carry the news of all the world into the homes of all our people. Great news-gathering agencies, the most efficient in the world, present the news almost every hour around the clock. Instantaneously, our broadcasting systems carry us to all the capitals of the world, where the voice of American broadcasters may be heard bringing us the facts of world events. Here proponent and opponent alike is accorded a fair opportunity to express his views upon any matter of importance of interest to the people, whether it be cultural, political, or economic, for under the canons of broadcasting equitable opportunity is granted to all alike to present their views.

We live in a revolutionary era. There is world-wide upheaval. The institutions of human civilization are being shaken to their very foundations. Some will be destroyed. Some will be preserved. It is for us as free people to decide whether we will preserve our human freedoms or whether we shall permit them to be destroyed by philosophies foreign to our land, inimical to our perpetuity, and destructive of our future existence.

Whether we like it or not we are being precipitated into a new world of thought, of new economic philosophies, of new concepts of government, of changing principles of human relationships. We cannot avert these changes, but we can determine as a resolute people to what extent we shall permit ourselves to be changed by them, if at all; and we can determine by our will and our energy so to mold these changes and the forces which are instrumental in effectuating them that the human values we cherish shall prevail.

The conflict raging about us today is a conflict between two ways of life, between two systems of values. On the one side are ranged the forces of dictatorship, of personal aggrandizement, of government from above, of subservient obedience from below. On the other side are ranged the forces of democracy, of human values, of individual liberty, of personal freedoms—the human freedoms of the American Constitution, of the right to life, liberty, and property as we understand it in America. Of the right, if you please, for those who have established this broadcasting station to operate it as a private enterprise, observing, of course, those limitations and restrictions necessary merely that others, too, may enjoy the use of the air in accordance with their rights under a government the functions of which are to guarantee the rights of all.

Whether or not we like it we are engulfed in a conflict of ideas, or, as they have come

to be called in this latter day, ideologies. This is the real conflict, for behind the lines, behind the attacks by air, behind the parachutists, behind the bombers, is a conflict of ideas—of invisible ideologies.

How can we adapt our democratic way of life, our democratic ideals to our own needs, to the needs of all our people, at a time when these are challenged by totalitarians and Communists from without and Communists and "fifth columnists" from within.

In my opinion we can do this only by rigid and insistent adherence to those human freedoms guaranteed us by the Constitution. We can do this when we determine upon a course of action adapted to our own needs, to the preservation of our own ideals, to the development of our own institutions, to the perpetuation of our own civilization. We shall fail when we neglect our human freedoms, when we no longer insist upon their observance, when we permit foreign philosophies and foreign ideologies to invade our land and pervert our people.

Above all we shall lose our human freedoms when we deny ourselves freedom of speech or permit it to be denied us. We shall lose our human freedoms if the elected representatives of the people should be denied the opportunity to utilize the most modern of scientific instrumentalities for the public presentation of public issues, for this is the most modern of all means for the dissemination of thought through speech.

In an earlier day leaders spoke to the people directly in the public forum. Demosthenes, Cicero, or Caesar could address the assembled multitude directly, for the number of the multitude was small and almost all could assemble within hearing of the spoken word. But as populations increased, as new continents were discovered, as great cities with teeming populations came to be developed, recourse to the written word became necessary, and in America we established a free press. This modern miracle, the radio, has restored once again the power of the spoken word. Today a Presidential message is heard around the world. The voice of a king, a prime minister, or a dictator is carried into the homes of the land. The people's leaders or their elected representatives now may address them directly. This is a very real freedom, indeed. It is one which we may not permit to be challenged by dictators nor denied even by government itself, for our constitutional limitation is imposed upon government, not upon the people.

I would remind you, my friends, that the future of democracy is no less challenged by communism than by nazi-ism, for whatever the apparent agreement between totalitarians and Communists the fact remains that nazi-ism is but the counter-revolution against communism, and ultimately that conflict must be waged. Democracy stands between, threatened on both sides alike. America, with all its human freedoms, against denial of every human right by totalitarian and Communist alike.

I would remind you, my friends, that democracy is concerned with the rights of the individual, whether he be great or small, rich or poor, in high place or lowly. American democracy makes individual rights supreme and institutions subordinate. American democracy assures unlimited possibilities of growth within the individual. Our constitutional human freedoms emphasize the value of the individual.

And in this connection I would remind the people of America that we who now carry on cannot ignore the needs of those who must carry on after us. The heritage we now purpose to preserve is not for ourselves alone but for our sons and daughters for whom we hold it in trust and to whom we must relinquish it when the time for our eternal reward arrives.

It is for us to preserve that which we possess against immediate assault whether it be from within or without. But it is an even greater obligation to assure those who must succeed us that they shall not be denied access to the cherished institutions of America. We must assure them an opportunity to acquire in American schools and American homes the knowledge and the inspiration that alone will enable them to understand our human freedoms as they have been developed in our American way of life.

Armed with that knowledge, inspired by those ideals, they will be able to take up the task where we must lay it down. Let us then dedicate ourselves to the preservation of our human freedoms, let us pass them on to our sons and daughters, and may this most modern instrumentality of science be dedicated to the cause of freemen and freewomen not merely in our own land, where human freedoms prevail by constitutional guaranty, but throughout all the world in order that they may make others free.

ADDRESS OF REV. JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY, D. D.

I am gratified to be with my close personal friend and your most capable and notable Congressman, the Honorable GENE COX, in whom there is neither variableness nor shadow of turning; individualistic, loyal to his constituents and to his conscience with unswerving fidelity. There is no greater patriot who serves under the dome of yonder Capitol.

Democracy is not a right, it is a privilege.

Democracy provides freedom, but what is to provide the safeguards of freedom?

The controls must be such as to be voluntarily accepted. Herein lies the central problem of human government. There is no question as to where the controls must be applied.

One of the first of these is national unity. Just as every particle of matter must obey the law of gravity, so must men and events conform to certain basic laws; certain fundamental principles must be exercised in the depths of the very heart of the citizenry of a democracy. We must decide whither we are going. We declare loudly that we want to preserve the American way of life. Take care lest we drift. There are forces in our own midst with a very determined policy which mean to topple the western world completely off its base. If anyone believes in this fiction that there is no alinement between communism in our country and that of pagan Europe he is blind and soft-headed.

One grave sign of our unawareness is seen in our industrial disharmony. What we need to learn with emphasis is that there is a war going on right in our midst. Individuals are harassed by conflict and fear, labor is pitted against employers, and even against fellow laborers. Heaven knows that discrimination and intolerance are not peace but war, threatening the very foundations of free government.

Our Nation's weakness is irreverence. Unless we correct this disease by a better home life and school life, we are facing a Niagara of destruction. * * * National character, without reverence for our great historic forefathers who made this Republic possible, and without deep and abiding respect for law and authority, is like the air without oxygen. A nation cannot long survive that does not reverence its God, the Bible, and those high standards that make for the highest order of citizenship. Without reverence the whole image of our national life is defaced and impoverished to the point where our whole national fabric of christian ideals is threatened with destruction. We are not Italian Americans, nor French Americans, nor Polish Americans, nor English Americans, nor Scotch Americans, nor even Irish Americans, but Americans.

Let us catch the vision of the future; let every American take reverence and national unity to heart and help clean out the rotten logs of our national houses where the termites burrow and destroy and replace them with sound and enduring foundations, permeated by the spirit that makes men free and happy, inspired by the spirit of Him who spoke as never man spoke.

While these are the days of change, we do not need a new religion, but we need to take Christianity out of the storehouse of creed and formalism and turn it loose among the children of men.

Additional Judge, Eastern District of Missouri

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 16, my colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a report of a special committee of the bar association of St. Louis relative to H. R. 137, a bill to provide for an additional judge in the eastern district of Missouri.

In commenting upon the report of the bar committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] said:

It seems to me that this report coupled with the second report of Justice Stone is a complete answer to those who say an additional judge is not needed in this district.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the gentleman from St. Louis in the conclusion that the bar committee's report is a complete answer to those of us who feel that an additional judge at St. Louis is wholly unnecessary.

It is just too much to expect that the local bar, when offered an additional judge, would say he is not needed. The committee was composed of two Democrats and one Republican. They say—

While your committee has not had the time to make an exhaustive personal study of the relative statistics, it is clear that from the point of view of the cases filed, the cases filed in the eastern district are higher in number than the average prevailing over the United States.

Well, the number of cases filed may be greater than the average number of cases filed over the Nation, but the number of cases filed often has little to do with the amount of work done by the judges. In a letter addressed to me on May 13, 1941, Judge Charles B. Davis, senior judge in the eastern district of Missouri, wrote as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *May 13, 1941.*

Hon. PHIL A. BENNETT,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of April 26 was received. It was perfectly agreeable to me for you to use my telegram as you did.

As a result of your inquiry, a check of our records has been made to ascertain the number of cases that have been tried since the

beginning of the present fiscal year. Omitting dismissals, default and consent judgments, pleas of guilty, and nolo contendere, the following is a complete list of cases tried in the eastern district of Missouri from July 1, 1940, to April 30, 1941, by all three judges, including cases tried in both the Hannibal and Cape Girardeau divisions:

Government and private civil cases:	
Tried by the court	27
Tried by jury	19
Condemnation cases:	
Tried by the court	9
Tried by jury	8
Criminal cases:	
Tried by the court	0
Tried by jury	7
Total trials without and with jury	70

These figures clearly show that the judges have spent so little time in court that they have had ample opportunity to dispatch all their other duties. There is positively no need for an additional judge in this district.

The St. Louis Bar Association has now appointed a committee to investigate the condition of our docket. You will be advised of their report.

To correct an error that crept into the debate in the House, you are advised I became 64 years of age on March 9, 1941.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. DAVIS.

I, too, have a copy of the report of the special committee of the bar association, which was placed in the RECORD by my colleague from Missouri. I call attention of the House to the fact that the committee does not base its report upon the present need for an additional judge, except in the instance of the Cape Girardeau division, but it anticipates that by reason of the condemnation cases recently filed it will need another judge to dispose of them. Condemnation cases are largely administrative in character, and the judges have little to do with them except sign orders presented. This is shown by figures given in the letter from Judge Davis on May 13, and which letter shows that the 3 judges now at St. Louis have tried only 17 cases of this character during the past year. The time that the committee assumes will be necessary to try the cases now being filed is grossly exaggerated.

The committee admits that it has not made exhaustive study and defers in part to the attitude of the senior circuit judge and the administrative office. Evidently Judge Stone still feels that this additional judge is needed. However, since he approved this plan there has been a great decline in the ordinary civil and criminal cases. A recent report shows a decline of 250 cases filed for the June term, 1941, in the State circuit court at St. Louis as compared with the June term, 1940. This decline has been noticed all over the country.

In a letter received from Judge Davis, under date of June 16, 1941, he says:

The present condemnation program is no greater than that handled by the court for the past several years. We have condemned over 50,000 acres of wild lands in south Missouri; 30,000 acres in the Bird's Point—New Madrid floodway; the Swan Lake bird refuge in Chariton County; and thousands of acres of land in connection with the construction of the dams in the Mississippi River between St. Louis and the Iowa line. These undertakings have been substantially completed.

If the Congress sees fit to incur the expense of another judge in this district, and the judge's salary is only a part of that expense, there is no personal reason why I should oppose it, but I do regard it as unnecessary and ill-advised.

Thanking you for your interest in the matter, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. DAVIS,
United States District Judge.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said in the beginning. I cannot agree that the committee's report is an answer to those of us who believe that an additional judge in the eastern district of Missouri is not needed at this time. With a debt already, actual and contracted, of sixty-seven thousand million dollars, and a deficit that is growing greater every day, it is certainly time for the Congress to reduce all nondefense expenditures.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether the oft-repeated charge that this bill is designed to provide a place for the city counselor of the defeated and discredited Dickman machine, is not well-founded.

Efficiency of the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the efficiency of the Coast Guard, I wish to include an editorial which appeared on June 15, 1941, in the Daily Press, a newspaper published in Newport News, Va. The editorial is as follows:

The watchful eye of the United States Coast Guard upon the American shore line has created an enviable record of efficient service. Established in 1790, its functions have been greatly expanded to include many important duties to the country.

Few citizens of the United States actually appreciate the fact that every inch of the American coast line is patrolled. Constant observers are trained to detect law violation, to safeguard life, and to perform numerous duties contingent upon assuring safety and security upon the shores of our land and the waters contingent thereto. Speedy vessels now ply the coast with augmented powers of observation in the radio. But at the same time the patient watching from towers at 5-mile intervals on the coast of the United States goes on endlessly. Nothing comes or goes along the American coast line unobserved by these trained men, unless the conditions of the heavens preclude all possibility of human observation.

The eagle eye of the Coast Guard men ascertains facts completely oblivious to the unaccustomed observer. The romantic tales of their rescue of beleaguered vessels is a saga of their long service.

The Coast Guard has steadily grown, taking on many functions and being provided adequately with materials to carry on. In time of war, or in emergency such as the present, this branch of the military forces of the Nation is a highly important adjunct to the whole defense program.

Since observation is the keynote of their long services, the men of the branch round out adequately a protective function in scanning the skies as well as the waters for unfamiliar signs.

The silent, swift, gray craft which is so familiar a sight upon the lower James attests the service which is at hand. Under these adequate facilities for observation the American people have been accustomed to rely. And the performance of the Coast Guard is one of the most brilliant records of efficiency in American life.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial is accurate in every detail. It is truly said that—

The performance of the Coast Guard is one of the most brilliant records of efficiency in American life.

I wish our people knew more about the efficient record of the Coast Guard, its splendid, devoted, patriotic, unselfish service, fighting the elements, enforcing the law on the sea, policing flooded areas, relieving the sick and distressed wherever in suffering, peril, disaster, or affliction, defending humanity and the Nation at all times in time of war or peace.

"Semper paratus"—always prepared—is its motto, and it lives up to that motto every day in the year and every minute of the 24 hours in each day.

It is true, as the editorial states, that the romantic tales of their rescue of beleaguered vessels is a saga of long service. That record includes the work of the old Life Saving Service and the old Revenue Cutter Service, which were united in 1915 in the creation of the Coast Guard. That record also includes the brilliant and daring record of the old Lighthouse Service, which is a record of heroism unsurpassed, of lonely vigil, and of daring adventure. It has long been my hope that time might permit me to collect and relate those tales of heroism unsurpassed on any battlefield. If I should be unable to do that work, I know that those deeds of daring will not be permitted to be lost to posterity. They must not be forgotten. They are monuments to heroic service that time can never efface. To these men of unsurpassed valor may there be ever all honor and glory.

Report From Putnam County, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 10), 1941

ARTICLE BY CHRISTINE SADLER

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a brief article which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post on Wednesday of this week. The article was written by Miss Christine Sadler,

and reports experiences, and so forth, on a visit made to her home county, Putnam County, Tenn. I think the article will be found to be quite interesting, and I should like to have it placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 18, 1941]

NO SELECTEES — ALL VOLUNTEERS — REPORT FROM PUTNAM COUNTY—POST STAFF WRITER GOES HOME TO TENNESSEE AND WRITES A MEMO

MEMO TO EDITOR.—I went home—Silver Point, Putnam County, Tenn.—for my vacation. Our town is in the Cumberland foothills about 75 miles from Nashville.

Washington was a mad beehive when I left. National defense wasn't going right, it seemed. Some Members of Congress were on the point of apoplexy. Communists were pulling strikes. The boys covering the White House were jittery.

I wonder if you would like to know about Putnam County?

My mother and most of the other women in Putnam County are putting up red cherries right now. The wheat is yellow in the fields. School is out, and the kids are going barefoot.

The men are all busy. My guess is that they don't read the speeches some of our Senators have been making, because every man who can get in the Army has volunteered. There has been no selectee called from our county because the men didn't wait for that.

They say they always have volunteered when the country was in trouble, and it looks like trouble now, so why wait?

FARMERS BUILD CAMPS, POWDER PLANTS

There are about 1,500 people in our neighborhood, and about half of them are Republicans. Everybody says if the President needs more help they will do whatever he asks.

As fast as the farmers get their crops in they and the hands are getting out their hammers to help build Army camps and powder plants. Those with more skills start working on dams and aircraft factories. The new Vultee plant has opened at Nashville, and nearby Camp Forrest is booming.

The biggest piece of news in Silver Point this week was a first baby in the home of Alfred Gill, the postmaster, who is on leave with the National Guard at Camp Forrest. Alf was so excited when he came home for the week end he almost forgot to report he's been made a sergeant.

The boys in camp come home whenever they can, and their mothers bake all day getting ready for them. The neighbors all come in and sit for a while, and the boys who are not quite old enough to volunteer talk about their chances to fool the recruiting officers. Most of them are big enough to do it, because they grow them big down here. The boys are awfully proud of their shooting ability.

I went to the graduation exercises at Tennessee Polytechnic Institute—8 miles away—last Friday. Dr. D. F. Fleming came up from Vanderbilt University to address the 100 graduates. He said the boys had before them "a magnificent chance to complete the job we started in the World War." The parents nodded and applauded. The boys in the engineering group were excited about getting in the Army or in some defense engineering work. The girls were all talking about civil-service examinations and typing and nutrition work. Some of the boys were rushing off to complete work for their pilot's licenses. I came home feeling I wasn't doing as much as I could.

EVERYTHING STOPS FOR NEWS

When the noon news broadcast starts at Silver Point and the newspapers come, everything stops. If anybody's radio is broken he goes to the neighbors. The strikes make our folks mad. They say, "Communist" like they used to say, "Yankee." Silver Point was glad the troops were called out on the west coast.

I went to the schoolhouse Thursday to watch farmers' families make mattresses. They are made under the old surplus cotton plan which allows at least one mattress to each farm family with a cash income under $600 annually. The family pays 72 cents for the ticking. The mattresses are very good.

T. V. A. power lines are being rushed to outlying districts, provided contracts were made before the emergency. No new contracts are being made because of need for power for defense. Another dam is to be built on the Caney Fork River only a few miles away to bring all streams of this area in the T. V. A. power system.

When I read this over it sounds like quite a lot is going on in Silver Point and Putnam County, but no one is excited about anything.

Our folks just feel like the natural place for a young man is in the Army because they always have gone into the Army when the President called. The older men are glad to have work and are buying savings stamps. And the women are tending the kids, cooking for the menfolks and breaking their necks to please their sons when they come home from camp.

I thought you might like to know.

CHRISTINE SADLER.

Is America Arming the Axis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN M. COFFEE, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a speech to be delivered by me over a national hook-up of the National Broadcasting Co. on Friday evening, June 20, in which I discuss shipments of war supplies from the United States to the Axis Powers or their affiliates.

In this address I allude to my House Concurrent Resolution 30 and give a condensed statement of reasons justifying favorable reporting of this bill by the House Committee on Rules.

The address follows:

The President has eloquently proclaimed that these United States are the arsenal of the democracies. The newspapers are full of solemn pronouncements that America has embarked upon a program of all-out aid to Britain. Whether one be an isolationist or interventionist, he generally may be found to be warmly sympathetic to Britain's cause. Congress has voted $7,000,000,000 in the lend-lease bill for aid to democracy. We are a generous nation. We have supplied Great Britain so far with 50 tankers. We have supplied the United Kingdom with more than 60 destroyers and a score of Coast Guard cutters. On public rostrum, in church pulpit, on college campus, in congressional halls, we have detailed in emotional language our affection for China and our fervent prayer that it defeat Japan.

LEAKS TO THE AXIS

But the cornucopia of plenty which we offer without stint to the democracies has sprung many leaks. A hundred gushing rivulets spurt to the aid of the dictators. The American people are becoming aroused at the spectacle of our exportation of war supplies to the Axis Powers and also to those countries subjugated by them, notwithstanding the above-mentioned devotion to democracy.

EMBARGOING MATÉRIEL OF WAR TO JAPAN

Some 3 years ago I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to prohibit the exportation to Japan of munitions and matériel of war. Hearings were held on this measure before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, but the committee declined to report the bill out favorably, notwithstanding the tremendous public support of the measure. I received thousands of messages from earnest citizens residing in every State in the Union passionately praying that my measure be enacted into law, but Congress declined to act. In the interim, bombs have dropped upon helpless Chinese women and children from airplanes propelled by American gasoline. During those sad and tragic years slumbering China has been devastated, her cities burned, her peoples attacked. We, more than any other country, are responsible for that carnage in that we have continued to ship war supplies to Japan and have purchased annually vast quantities of silk from them. Now the American people are aroused. They are determined upon action. They will brook no delay.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 30

There is now pending in the Congress of the United States, House Concurrent Resolution No. 30, which I have introduced and which is designed to reveal the unvarnished facts concerning this hypocritical business of arming the Axis when we are supposed to be the arsenal for democracy. This concurrent resolution was referred to the House Committee on Rules. That committee held three hearings on the measure, part of them behind closed doors, but so far it has declined to send the bill to the House floor for action. Let me cite you a pertinent section of that resolution. I quote: "It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the character of, and the extent to which, the so-called Axis Powers or countries aiding the Axis Powers (a) are obtaining, or have obtained, essential war materials, money, credit, intelligence, or other aid, directly or indirectly, from the United States; and (b) are hindering, or have hindered, the national-defense program of the United States." The resolution provides that such a committee shall report to Congress, and thus to the American people, at the earliest practicable time the results of its investigation, together with its recommendation for remedial legislation. The resolution then sets up the machinery for accomplishing its objective and provides for a modest appropriation to implement its work.

NEWSPAPER EDITORS ARE AROUSED

Senator GUY GILLETTE, of Iowa, has introduced a similar resolution in the Senate, which was reported out favorably by the Senate Committee on Commerce and is now awaiting action before the Senate. This committee will not be organized, however, until the House passes my companion resolution. But two main reasons can be assigned as the excuse for the sale of war supplies to the Axis and their satellites. One is private profit, which I contend is profit at the expense of

America's best interests and welfare; the other reason would be appeasement of the aggressor, a policy of propitiation of the dictatorships which proved futile, disastrous, if not suicidal when practiced by such countries as Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and Holland. Newspapers throughout the country have editorially decried this illogical and inconsistent procedure. Radio commentators have unhesitatingly condemned it. Magazines are replete with articles inveighing against it. Let me quote from a recent editorial appearing in the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune:

"The United States is selling oil and oil products directly to Japan. The Japanese are sending some oil and oil products to Nazi Germany. If it were only a matter of ordinary foreign trade, the American people might think little of it, but the United States has just acquired a national-defense oil dictator, and we are now warned of impending gasolineless Sundays, and reduction in quotas for oil for heating and fuel purposes is now threatened. Is Uncle Sam growing another set of goat horns?" The Cincinnati Times Star, referring to the shortage of gasoline here and the threatened limitations on its use, said:

"The American people will submit willingly to any measures necessary to the national defense. But they will first want to be satisfied that sacrifices on their part are the only reasonable way out of the dilemma. They don't want to be the victims of another ill-planned crusade."

The Galveston News said on June 6:

"Many Americans think it is unwise to sell war materials to countries with which we soon may be at war. Washington and London apparently have agreed, however, that it is better to keep on supplying Japan with oil than to goad that country to further aggression by shutting off supplies. If it is true that an oil embargo is the only thing which would cause Japan to risk war with the United States, this is a profitable form of appeasement. But experience discredits appeasement as a general policy, and there is reason to fear that it will prove to be mistaken in this case."

The Miami (Fla.) Herald, in speaking of limitations on gasoline consumption for the American people, editorializes as follows:

"They just can't believe it, can't understand it, when Japan doesn't find it hard to get the American gasoline she wants."

A CHINESE INTELLECTUAL IS PUZZLED

Dr. Lin YuTang, eminent Chinese, declared that "we Chinese can't understand logic as applied in the United States." He said, "You sent gunboats to shoot Chinese on the shores of the Yangtse-Kiang, then sent missionaries to ease their souls into heaven. You loan us money to stabilize our currency, and help our defense against the Japanese, while you supply the Japs with matériel of war to be used against us."

DEPARTMENTS CEASE DISCLOSING EXPORT ITEMS

The publicity in connection with the pendency of my resolution has caused Government departments to cease making available figures of American export. On May 29 the Department of Commerce decided "to cease publishing detailed statistics concerning the country of destination of our exports." What caused this sudden suspension of statistics? Can it be that these figures were revealing too much of our trade with the Axis? Certainly suspension of such figures hides nothing from the Axis, because these countries know what they receive. Americans alone are thus kept in the dark.

The Maritime Commission decided likewise to place a black-out upon figures concerning its operations. On June 14 it declared that "American-owned or controlled tankers are not carrying oil directly or indirectly to Germany, Italy, or Japan." At the same time the Maritime Commission lists a total of 214 tankers owned or controlled by American companies flying foreign flags. Although it is stated most of these tankers are engaged in Western Hemisphere trade and in commerce to the United Kingdom and the Dutch East Indies, nothing is said about cargoes to third parties on the West African coast and to third parties the world over. The other day the Wall Street Journal pointed out that Great Britain had more than 500 oil tankers in addition to the 50 transferred to it by us.

OUR OIL FLOWS TO JAPAN

Just what have we been shipping to the Axis and their affiliates? The United States has sold to Japan 25,000,000 barrels of oil per year for the past 3 years. On July 31 an Executive order was issued that "in the interests of the national defense, the export of aviation gasoline is being limited to nations of the Western Hemisphere," but we find that, notwithstanding this, licenses were granted in August of 1940 for several hundred thousand gallons of aviation gasoline and in September for 4,832,000 gallons, and in the last 3 months of the year for 800,000 gallons, all of aviation gasoline. We have increased our shipments of petroleum to Japan since the first of the year The total approximates an amazing amount.

On June 9, two tankers, the *San Luis Maru* and the *Kuro Shiro Maru*, took on 175,000 barrels of petroleum at San Francisco with Federal permission. The Japanese steamer, *Tonan Maru*, at the same time, loaded at Los Angeles 8,000,000 gallons for Japan. This latter ship, says the Japan-California Daily News, in its June 5 issue, "Is one of the 91 Japanese ships which was blacklisted by the British for failure to cooperate in their war against the Axis. The vessel will not be given port courtesy in British ports, nor will she be allowed to fuel there." What do you think of this choice item?

OTHER WAR MATERIALS REACH NIPPON

Early in May, it was officially announced that one American and one British oil company entered into an agreement with the Japanese Government for the purchase from the Dutch East Indies fields of 1,800,000 tons of petroleum during the ensuing year which is 350 percent increase over the amount of petroleum sold by the same companies during the preceding year to Japan. Mr. William Farish, of Standard of New Jersey, claims this arrangement was made with full knowledge and consent of our State Department. During 1940 the United States exported to Japan 51,000,000 pounds of rubber scrap; 7,600 trucks; 32,300 pounds of gum rosin; 535,000 bales of cotton; 96,000 tons of wood pulp; 10,700,000 pounds of artificial abrasives; 254,091,000 pounds of steel bars and rods; 367,000,000 pounds of scrap steel, sheets, rods, and tin plate; 241,000,000 pounds of scrap and refined copper; 28,000,000 pounds of zinc; 3,700,000 pounds of nickel and Monel metal; 23,271,000 pounds of borax; 17,663,000 pounds of carbon black. In practically every case I have cited, the figures show an enormous increase in exports of this material of war over preceding years.

FINLAND IMPORTS WAR SUPPLIES FROM UNITED STATES

Finland is just across the Baltic from Germany. We exported to Finland 17,602,000 pounds of lard in 1940 which is more than 20 times the amount of this item, necessary to a war program, which we exported to Finland in 1939 when it was fighting the Soviet Union. Most of this lard goes to Germany, which is notoriously short of fats. We exported 4,254,000 pounds of tin and tin plate to Finland in 1940, over three times the amount we exported in 1939. The same proportion obtains in motortrucks: 3,114 in 1940 as contrasted with 573 in 1939.

PORTUGAL AND SPAIN LIKEWISE

Portugal does a brisk business with Italy and Germany. Besides shipping her 1,000,000 barrels of petroleum in 1940, we exported 700 motortrucks, and 35,000,000 pounds of tin plate. These products readily found their way into the hands of the Axis nations.

Spain enjoyed a nice trade with the United States in 1940, receiving four and one-half million barrels of petroleum products, over 7,000,000 pounds of paper stock, and two and one-half million bales of cotton, which is 15 times the amount we sold Spain in 1939. A significant item is that we sold Spain three and one-half times the amount of tin in 1940 as compared to 1939, the amount being 20,346,000 pounds. In 1940 Uncle Sam shipped to Spain 1,574,000 pounds of toluene, also known as toluol. This is the base of TNT, the dread explosive. Significantly, Spain purchased none of this from our country in 1938 or 1939. Scrap copper was generously provided Spain in 1940 to the tune of over 2,000,000 pounds. Where does it go? I'll give you two guesses, and your answer is correct both times.

OTHER FORMS OF COLLABORATION

It is not only in the field of exports of war materials, a few startling items of which I have just cited to you, by means of which we are aiding the Axis, but in the field of international corporate relationships and patent pools and contracts, we run into a prolific source of revenue for the Axis. Patent royalties provide foreign exchange and dollar credits for the Nazis and the Fascists, if not now directly in our own country, then through the medium of intermediate individuals in other countries.

American companies are parties in partnership with German, Italian, and Japanese companies in insurance and trade cartels, in shipping and financial agreements. In South America, agents for leading American companies are among the most prominent figures in bund and pro-Nazi organizations.

In the purchase of gold, we have been a generous friend to the Axis and its cohorts. During the years 1939 and 1940, our Government purchased more than $280,000,000 worth of gold from Japan alone, not to mention the millions purchased from the Argentine, Brazil, and other countries friendly with the Axis. Argentina has sold us more gold than she actually produces. Where does this gold originate? Old gold can be remelted to appear as freshly mined. Certainly we should know that when a nation sells us more gold than is mined within her territorial confines, this supply is obtained from an outside source.

TANKERS

In recent weeks, the American people have been repeatedly admonished to conserve on their use of gasoline and fuel oil, yet tankers owned by American companies are still transporting petroleum in foreign trade. Only this week, a Japanese tanker was about to load a vast supply of petroleum at Philadelphia, when stopped by Mr. Ickes. It seems ludicrous that there should be a shortage of petroleum in the United States wher we are limiting production at the wells under State proration laws; when we are exporting millions of barrels of oil, monthly; when we have a tariff upon the importation of oil, thus discouraging its coming in. On the Atlantic seaboard, there is in storage 60,000,000 barrels of petroleum. This could be tapped at the rate of 200,000 barrels a day, which is the amount of the shortage created by the transfer of tankers to Great Britain, which tankers formerly transported the oil from Gulf ports to the Atlantic seaboard.

APPEASEMENT OF JAPAN CONDEMNED

We are told that we must propitiate the Japanese aggressor, and we must not offend him lest he engage in war with us forthwith. I make bold to reply that the Japanese respect the American Fleet in the Pacific, and will not move while our ships remain there. This country, through its public officials, has deplored acts of appeasement at-

tributed to our unfortunate friends in Europe who subsequently succumbed to the invader.

It seems to me I recall an affair called Munich, in which Neville Chamberlain sought to quiet Germany by dismembering little Czechoslovakia and gave Sudetenland to Der Fuehrer. That was appeasement, but Mr. Hitler only paused and soon moved on his way. But the worst feature of the whole policy is its inconsistency, its lack of rationality. How can we say we believe in quarantining aggressors in Europe while appeasing the aggressor in the Orient? The American people want to know whether it is profit or foreign policy which dictates this course, or both. They are clamoring for action. If you feel that something should be done now, let your feelings be known in those places where the expression of your convictions will be most effective. Our people want Congress to get at the facts and take courageous steps to eliminate methods by which our beloved country may in a sense be charged with arming the Axis.

After World War I congressional committees investigated such double dealing, racketeering, and sale of munitions to the enemy and similar questionable war practices. But the facts were disclosed too late for any effective good to be accomplished. These committees revealed that certain American companies were guilty of putting profit above patriotism, but the damage had already been done.

LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT

What, then, are we to do? Sit here and permit this double dealing? Or are we to stop it? I for one want to know who these economic traitors are, what they are doing, and how we can stop them. I dare say that the Axis Powers would not be where they are today had this investigation been made a year ago. And I dare say that an investigation now may lead to measures which might shorten this war by several years. Indeed, it might result in changing the entire outcome. On the other hand, an apathetic attitude toward the double-dealing situations which now exist may lead to disaster. By House Concurrent Resolution 30 I propose that we lock the barn before the horse has been stolen. Let your voice be heard. Support me in this effort to save America from further guilt in the nefarious policy of arming the Axis.

Ordeal of American Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

ARTICLE BY MAJ. ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, from the American Mercury for July 1941:

[From the American Mercury of July 1941]

ORDEAL OF AMERICAN AIR POWER

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

The American people, watching the exploits of military aviation in the present war, know instinctively what their generals and admirals have been slow to understand and to acknowledge—that for our country the choice is between genuine air power second to none and the danger of humiliating defeat. They sense that the Army and the Navy, no matter how big and strong they become, will be helpless unless we give them an impregnable roof of air power under which to operate.

Unlike the professional military men at the higher levels of authority, the ordinary American is under no psychological pressure to provide alibis for the older services. Having nothing to unlearn, he observes the course of the struggle with an open mind, from the angle of common sense. He sees the Royal Air Force holding off Germany's might, month after month, in an all-air conflict, while naval and ground forces merely look on. He sees Crete captured by air forces in the face of overwhelming naval superiority; the world's greatest navy unable to approach Europe because it is ringed with aircraft; Britain, despite the heroic efforts of its magnificent fleet, being slowly strangled by long-range aerial attacks on its shipping. These and other facts point, in common sense, the inexorable moral that air power has emerged as the primary instrument of national defense—the precondition for all other means of defense.

The American people, in addition, are realizing more sharply that the world crisis caught us with our aviation defenses down. Not simply as to quantity—that can be explained by the complacent national mood and insufficient appropriations—but as to quality, for which there is no acceptable excuse. If we possessed only one sample of every type of aircraft, it should have been the best of its kind at that stage. Even by merely imitating other nations we could have been farther advanced. The country at large is learning with a shock what aeronautical people have known all along: that the United States has been dismally backward in military aviation. Modern flying was born and nurtured in America, and in the commercial field our aviation is without peer; but the military development of air power has been left to other countries. The American people should ask: Why? Who? What's being done about it?

Those whose military orthodoxy or commitments to business and politics caused our backwardness naturally tend to slur over defects and to resent public questioning. They prefer the self-delusion that existed in the past. In October 1939 a magazine told its millions of readers—clearly on the basis of information from high official quarters—that "our own war birds are best" and that our aviation "offered a reassuring picture." This when we possessed not a single pursuit plane that could match the German or British pursuits, when our most ballyhooed bomber carried less armor and armament than a single-seater Nazi or R. A. F. fighter. Only some weeks ago a high-ranking air corps general, speaking in Washington, demanded a sort of moratorium on criticism of our aviation setup, exclaiming:

"I have no patience with those uninformed and misguided croakers who look with thick-lensed glasses for indications that the Air Corps is helpless, that the Air Corps is not properly trained or equipped—cannot be made ready to fight—and is being furnished with planes inferior to those of England or Germany."

All he overlooked was that the planes are inferior.

The progress of the war made the fact that we were aeronautically behind the eight ball too obvious to be ignored. Whereupon those chiefly responsible pretended to be surprised. They said, in effect, that the war had disclosed shortcomings which they had not suspected and that they were working hard to make up for the lost years. They made statements to confuse the issue; they staged misleading "sham battles" to retrieve the reputation of discredited equipment, and otherwise showed more zeal in saving face than in saving our national security.

Business-as-usual and politics-as-usual prevailed, and still prevail, when the clear need was to seek out the causes of the backwardness, and the culprits responsible for it, and to eliminate them with relentless vigor. This is scarcely to be wondered at, human nature being what it is. Real house cleaning and renovation of our military aviation structure would mean far-reaching changes in personnel at the top. It would mean revolutionary reorganization in terms of independent air power, which would cut cruelly into bureaucratic inertia and privilege. Above all, it would expose lack of vision, incompetence, and conniving.

II

A courageous young newspaperman, J. Reagan "Tex" McCrary, of the New York Mirror, flew to England this April to learn how American airplanes were behaving under stress of actual warfare. He brought back startling news—startling, that is, to laymen, but a thrice-told tale to aviation men. The great majority of American aircraft in the British Isles, he reported, were being held "in reserve," because they were useless for practical operations against the Nazis:

"Most shocking is this fact: the backbone of the United States air force is our Curtiss *P–40*, Allison-powered fighter. America has sent some 570 *P–40's* to Britain, where they have been christened with a good American name, *Tomahawks*. Of these 570 *Tomahawks* only 18 were 'operational' in service when I left. The others were in dead storage 'somewhere in England.' "

Why were these planes being kept on ice despite Britain's life-and-death need for aircraft? The principal reason, Mr. McCrary learned, was that they were "underarmed and underarmored"; they were rated obsolete on arrival.

Mr. McCrary's findings were based on personal observation and off-record data made accessible to him. Perhaps the Britons, obliged by obvious political considerations to keep quiet, did not mind a chance to convey the truth through nonofficial American channels. In any case, the report has not been successfully challenged. In substance, it corroborated earlier information brought back by Ralph Ingersoll, editor of the New York PM. Indicating that American planes were useful to Britain in various secondary capacities, Mr. Ingersoll reported that they were unable to fight alongside the R. A. F. against Hitler's aviation. The American fighters, he showed with chapter and verse, were deficient in armor and fire power; the best American bombers were woefully lacking in the means of self-defense against attacking planes.

The inevitable denials of these facts amount, actually, to left-handed confirmation, since they are always coupled with the promise to catch up at some future time. Thus the general whom I have quoted above wound up his attack on critics by boasting that "we will have an air force in time * * * it's well on its way and will be ready when called upon." A clear admission that we haven't one now. Unfortunately the world will not stand still waiting for him. By the time we catch up others will have gone far ahead; nor shall we be notified in time by the enemy so that we can make ready. Such postponement leaves the American people to infer that the trouble has only now been discovered and is being rapidly remedied. But the alibi does not stand up. American aviation stands accused of failure to supply effective armor, fire power, range, speed. Not a single item in the indictment comes as a surprise—it was all known to the aviation world before the war started.

German and British types of fighting craft had been exhibited, described, discussed, and studied in close-up by American experts. Our official representatives abroad were keeping

Washington apprised of new aerial developments. The many able and brilliant men in our military air services pleaded for action. More than that, American designers and manufacturers had long been begging for the privilege of building equipment as good as any in Europe, or even better. They were unable to break through the solid walls of indifference, prejudiced opposition to the aviation upstart, and too often, also, influences that put business and politics first.

Since I have access only to my own files, I am obliged to draw on those for confirmation. But I have no doubt that other manufacturers and designers of aircraft could tell similar tales. A series of letters at hand as I write attests that I pleaded with the Office of the Chief of Air Corps years ago for heavier armor, greater fire power, longer range, greater speed—in short, the very things in which we are now trying to "catch up."

In April 1938 I submitted two fighter designs that carried up to six guns and one cannon, as well as heavy armor. Two months later I wrote, urging improvement of the Army's Seversky *P–35* fighter:

"The next modification we propose is to equip these airplanes with new outboard panels, each containing one .30 caliber machine gun and an additional gas tank of 75-gallon capacity. The first will double the fire power and the second will provide a range making possible the concentration of the pursuit aviation from coast to coast, without stop."

Earlier, I had given urgent reasons for raising performance of pursuits:

"The present employment of air power in Europe and the Orient has definitely shown the necessity for some sort of convoying protective force for bombardment aviation. Whether such airplanes should be single-place, two-place, or multi-place; whether they should be single- or multi-motored; what their actual range should be, can be determined only through actual test."

Besides reducing such suggestions to writing, I expounded them personally. But always they were brushed aside as "visionary," and—as one communication from the War Department put it—not worth the extra cost. Yet the same general who blocked improvements has just written a book in which he admits the shortcomings of American convoying pursuits. "They have been too slow and not sufficiently maneuverable," he writes, adding: "The aeronautical engineers are now working frantically to remedy these defects." Thus he implies that it was an act of God rather than his department's blindness that caused us to lag in the race. Engineers would not have to work frantically now if there had been more competence and less complacency 3 years ago. Had it not been for such officials, more concerned with the cross-currents of Army politics than with guaranteeing effective air power, American pursuits would not now be rotting unpacked in England.

All insiders know that the inferiority of our pursuit aviation is attributable mainly to the Army's engine policy. For many years the liquid-cooled plane engine had been ignored; but suddenly, when the Air Corps acquired a new chief, it swung to the other extreme. For reasons still obscure the Air Corps became obsessed with that engine, automatically rejecting all others. Regardless of the merits of the engine, even a layman could see that reliance on a single type of engine and a single source of supply was foolhardy. But no pursuit model could cross the Army threshold unless it was built around the particular model of liquid-cooled engine on which all hopes had been mysteriously pinned. On June 24, 1938, I warned the Air Corps of the danger involved:

"The function of a pursuit and interceptor fighter in our scheme of national defense is too important to rely on only one type of equipment, since, should it fail for any reason, the country would be completely deprived of this type of aerial defense. Therefore * * * it is highly desirable to conduct parallel experiments with pursuit airplanes built around air-cooled engines of maximum horsepower available."

And, indeed, the favored engine did not live up to expectations. The Army has now been forced, years too late, to take on also the air-cooled engine. The very company which was deprived of orders because it could not accept an arbitrary decree in this matter is now swamped with orders. The Air Corps now boasts of its new *P–47–B* pursuit, built around a 2,000-horsepower air-cooled engine. The publicity conveys that this is something new, pulled out of a magician's hat in these last months. The truth is that essentially the same design was laid before the Chief of Air Corps in 1938 and was not even considered because it did not have the pet engine. Meanwhile valuable years have been lost. The 1938 pursuit was suppressed until 1941, when emergency and the inadequacy of the liquid-cooled engine forced action. It cannot be delivered in appreciable quantities until the end of 1942, when it could have been fighting for England in 1940.

We could go on detailing the proofs that political considerations, business-as-usual, and ordinary failure to grasp the meaning of real air power are responsible for our current plight. Production continues today on models that will never see combat, because they became obsolete years ago. To stop production would be a public confession of past blindness. It will be less embarrassing to keep things going until the improved "catch-up" designs are produced, after which the outdated models can be explained away as legitimately obsolete, instead of admitting official blunders.

Right down the line the temptation to conceal past mistakes acts as a brake on air power equipment. Private arrangements, compromises to placate some "brass hats," indifference to aviation progress because of lack of understanding—all these and more are skeletons in the closet. As long as the men and the system responsible for the skeletons are unchanged, there can be no real hope of world leadership in the air.

III

In the higher reaches of our military service the idea of an independent air force has never been regarded as a matter for discussion. It has simply been treated as insubordination and squelched by main force. The martyrdom of Gen. William Mitchell was accomplished publicly and demonstratively in order to warn other "rebels." The intimidation has in large measure been successful. Nevertheless there are other "General Mitchells" today, kept down, "exiled" to distant posts, or forced out because they demand the emancipation of air power. The American people should understand that the heat on both sides of the controversy is not artificial. This is not a dispute over division of authority but a basic question of organization that goes straight to the heart of our defense program.

It is no accident that complacent or short-sighted men, aeronautically speaking, have tended to reach the top. The set-up makes it almost inevitable. The officer, convinced of the paramount role of air power, who defends his views, steps on tender political toes. There are too many old-fashioned admirals and generals in the path, whose distrust of the aviation intruder must be placated. Only an officer with a happy talent for handshaking and backslapping normally rises to high authority; and that sort of political-minded personality rarely goes with military and aviation genius. Nor is his job to be envied; he is caught between the realities of air power and the pressure of aviation personnel for better equipment, on one side, and the orthodoxies of the older services on the other.

Under independent air power, autonomous in its field and not obliged to play politics or take dictation from other services, men of audacious vision and creative understanding of the problems would have come to the top. Blunders and compromises to meet outmoded military ideas, such as we have sampled above, would not have occurred. The immense amount of talent and skill represented by our flying officers would have had an opportunity for unimpeded service.

True air power must function in its own element—the air ocean that envelops the globe. It is a single and continuous element, calling for a single and continuous air command. Before we can hope to achieve freedom of the seas, under the new conditions, we must achieve freedom of the skies; and for that we need a single agency vested with the full job.

To divide aviation into two artificial portions, Army aviation and Navy aviation, as we are now doing, is to court disaster. It violates the first principle of military science. Just suppose we had two navies, as we now have two aviations—a navy under the command of the Army and another under the command of the marines. Arbitrarily splitting the skies into two segments is no less ludicrous. (Under any arrangement, coordination of the air force with the Army and the Navy through a supreme command must be taken for granted, just as we now have coordination between Army and Navy.) Each of the segments, in turn, is limited in its growth by the needs of the particular service to which it is indentured. No matter how efficient it becomes, it cannot escape the limitations of the special mentality and strategy of that service. Aircraft employed in common tactical action with the Army or the Navy should, of course, be under their direct command, like their other weapons. But that has nothing to do with true air power, whose job is to maintain freedom of the skies beyond the reach of the older services.

The aviation personnel at large, in both segments, is aware of these restraints on air power and chafes under them. No finer body of men has ever been assembled anywhere in the world. These are the men who have to fly and to die in our aircraft, whether over land or over sea. Anything that limits the full expansion of those aircraft, and of air-power strategy, is a direct blow at their morale. The most stimulating thing that the President could do to lift that morale sky-high would be to follow the example of England and clean house at once at the top, not in our tactical units but among those who were responsible for procurement before the present emergency. Our aviation personnel will always remain suspicious of the men and the conditions responsible for the backward state of their air services.

The establishment of a separate air department would fire the enthusiasm and the creative vision of our air-minded youth, our designers, our builders. By guaranteeing a roof of true air power for their operations, it would also imbue the Army and the Navy with new confidence and vitality. And the time to do it is now. To say that it is necessary but "too late" is nonsensical. The change is inevitable—the longer we delay the more costly and disturbing it will be. Existent aerial equipment is being outlived so swiftly that, insofar as our ultimate air power second to none is concerned, we are starting at scratch with all potential enemies. But their air power starts without the impediment of outside control, while ours is split in two and harnessed to other and slower services.

The only question is whether we shall put our aviation house in order now or wait until we are forced to do so by looming disasters.

Those of us who see the handwriting in the skies know that what we ask for cuts across the bureaucratic habits and comforts of a generation. But we know, also, that the change must be made if we are to survive in this aviation age. America has the brains, the men, the materials to take first place in the air. It cannot do so until air power is recognized as a primary service rather than an auxiliary and adjunct of older weapons, and divorced from the Army and Navy commands.

There can be no genuine solution, but only a vicious circle of correcting blunders in the light of other nations' superiority, like a dog chasing its tail, until aviation is cleansed of those who share responsibility for its backwardness and those laboring under past commitments to business or politics; until it is freed from Army and Navy overlordship, so that true aviation leaders can come to the fore and work unhampered to give America mastery of the skies.

Keep Out the Undesirables—Put America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ALEXANDRIA (LA.) DAILY TOWN TALK

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H. R. 4861, to promote the national defense by detaining undesirable aliens and by preventing other such undesirables from coming here during the present emergency I insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Daily Town Talk, Alexandria, La., under date of June 12, 1941:

[From the Alexandria (La.) Daily Town Talk of June 12, 1941]

CONGRESSMAN ALLEN COMMENDED

Representative A. LEONARD ALLEN demonstrated his pure patriotism and his genuine love for the country of his birth when he introduced and supported H. R. 4861 in the National Congress

The bill provides that the Secretary of State be compelled to refuse admission to this country of Nazis, Fascists, Communists, or those who advocate similar principles. It provides that all foreigners who visit the United States must guarantee their departure within certain limits. It provides for the cancelation of citizenship of any naturalized citizen who obtained his citizenship through fraud.

The bill limits the quotas of immigration from each country to one-third of the existing quotas, with the provision that during the next 5 years only quota immigrants having fathers, mothers, or minor children in this country may be admitted, and the measure provides for the detention and deportation of certain aliens in this country.

The bill should become a law just as quickly as it can be passed. For too long a time have the gates of the United States been open to what might be called the riff-raff and the half-crazed theorists of other nations. There are men in this Nation today who have been here for years devoting their entire energy to promoting strikes and advocating communism and socialism—they have no citizenship standing of any sort, yet they are permitted to remain upon one excuse or another.

Thousands of aliens enter this country through Mexico, and on the Pacific coast, slipping in at night. It is alleged that there are men who make a living by aiding these imposters to enter. The price for getting the aliens safely in the United States is said to run from $50 to $100 per person.

This Nation has reached the stage where it should be for Americans only, and immigration of all sorts should be restricted. There should be assurance that anyone admitted for possible citizenship should become a good American. Restricting immigration to those who already have near relatives here is an excellent feature.

Yesterday the police jury of Rapides Parish passed a resolution favoring the Allen bill. It is endorsed by the American Legion and other patriotic organizations, and a person who does not favor it cannot possibly bear true Americanism in his heart.

Let us hope that the bill becomes a law in the very shortest space of time possible and that it be enforced to the limit of the law.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. HAROLD CLUETT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, for more than 30 years the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been under consideration by the Governments of Canada and the United States. Investigations by commissions, planning boards, reports by Army engineers, and endless technical reports have filled volumes and the throats of proponents and opponents until it is about time to appoint another commission to weed out the facts and untruths in this voluminous dictionary of propaganda and speculation; and now at one of the most critical periods in our history another political white rabbit is pulled out of the administration hat and wrapped up in H. R. 4927 for an overworked and overheated Congress to dissect and digest. It is not my purpose today to even attempt to unfold all the mysteries and intricacies contained in this legislation. I am certain it would take weeks of the time of every Member of this House to judge accurately of the merits and demerits of this scheme; but under political pressure, and under the guise of national defense, and as an agreement, and not a treaty, a few days may be all that is necessary to see to it that this Congress yields to the magic wand of the White House.

I beg to recommend to each Member of this House the careful reading of a booklet entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway Project," published by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board, 1940; also Executive Report No. 1, of the second session of the Seventy-second Congress, 1932–33. The majority and minority views concerning this project are thoroughly discussed. I am today, 7 years after this report was published, thoroughly in accord with the minority statement very ably presented by the then junior Senator from New York. It may be well to remember also that he was and is a Democrat, and rather inclined to follow most New Deal principles, and is also author of a labor act which I am as heartily opposed to as I am in favor of his able findings as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate opposing this St. Lawrence project. In case my appeal to you to read his entire report may go unheeded, may I quote a few very interesting and impressive paragraphs, admitting that these statements were not made during a national emergency, but with firm belief that such an emergency would not now change his conclusions. Senator WAGNER will soon have an opportunity to decide the correctness of this statement. Here are some of his pertinent expressions:

The single issue that everyone wants to face is: Will the cost of the St. Lawrence project to the people of the United States as a whole be more than the foreseeable return to these people? I am convinced that the project is demonstrably unsound and solicit a careful reconsideration of the treaty and its surrounding problems.

Again I quote:

Interest charges during the contemplated 8 years of construction have been neglected.

Please note his 8-year period of construction, with the 4-year period or less of the President.

I believe the true element as well as the cost has been grossly underestimated. As to the latter, please note, of the five largest canal projects in history that the actual cost exceeded the estimated cost by over $400,000,000. Does anyone seriously believe that this St. Lawrence seaway can be completed for a billion and a quarter or even two billions, more than half of which will be borne by the United States, and an annual fixed charge to our taxpayers forever? Eight years ago the cost of this proposal for the State of New York was $89,726,000. In section 2 of the present bill this cost has risen to $93,375,000, or an increase of over three and one-half million dollars. I admit just a trifle, but an indication of what may be expected from the entire project. I believe the Power Authority of the State of New York will wish to scrutinize rather carefully this item, especially when the proposed power can hardly be transmitted economically from its source more than 150 miles.

It was a strange coincidence that on the very day, June 6, when the President recommended authorization of construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, the House appropriation group made a plea for $92,000,000 for coastal guns. Which appropriation do you prefer, or do you wish both? Or, is one more important now in the interest of national defense? If any benefit is to be derived from the electric energy generated at the International Rapids, certainly New York State should be interested.

All indications point to the fact that New York State as a whole is opposed to this measure. Even though its benefits are vague and uncertain I doubt if she would oppose it if all the country could join with her and be convinced of its national benefits. In this connection may I refer you to a very able statement entitled, "What the seaway means to New York and the United States," which will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2837. This article shows conclusively that not only would the New York area be adversely affected in transportation costs, but the entire country, if this seaway project were approved. To this strong opposition may be added that of the New York Power Authority, who by resolution on June 5, last, stated:

> The cost of this seaway is not justified by any national benefit to commerce or defense, and it is potentially dangerous to commerce, industry, and employment in New York.

The Governor of New York, in his usual New Dealian style promptly vetoed this resolution.

It is not very surprising that this fantastic scheme has had a stormy career all through these years. We are not yet convinced that Canadian statesmen and the Canadian people themselves wish to see this agreement ratified. Has all the push and pull come from the administration itself to carry out some campaign pledge to the people of the Great Lakes region? Who wants this plan put into effect? Just who are behind it and for what real purpose? To read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one would believe it had few proponents, or are they lining up with their artillery to blast away at the final assault. When the final vote was taken in the Senate, March 14, 1934, just what States joined with New York in opposition?—Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, and 22 other States. Certainly the four large Midwestern grain producing States did not seem to worry about getting their grain cheaply to foreign ports, nor were they intensely interested in paying for electric energy they never would receive. I cannot believe they would be fooled today by the cry of national emergency.

The administration has hardly forgotten this rebuke to their supposedly well-laid plans, and now an agreement instead of a treaty has been smuggled into the scheme of things. Is this constitutional, or does fear of the Supreme Court no longer exist? At any rate public opinion does not take kindly to this sort of legerdemain, and resents it. The American people are not easily fooled all the time.

As we enter this debate it will be interesting and important to know Canada's attitude. Certainly they are not interested in our political pledges, or, indeed, in all the many advantages which will supposedly accrue to the United States of America. They are engaged, as we are, in a vast military operation calling upon all their manpower and resources in defense of the British Empire. Can they or we step aside for one moment to undertake a vast enterprise which will call directly and indirectly for the services of an army of laborers, technicians, engineers needed so desperately on both sides of the international border, not to speak of the tons of material of every description which must be employed?

Let me quote from a New York Times editorial of June 7 last:

> In his special message to Congress the President again insists that the St. Lawrence project must be carried out as an urgent defense measure. Even if he is right in his highly doubtful assumption that the work can be done in 4 years or less, we are confronted with the prospect of a vast diversion of manpower and materials needed in carrying out the defense program. In the International Rapids section alone about 92,000,000 tons of dirt and rock must be excavated; over 7,000,000 tons of concrete must be made and poured; enormous amounts of earth-fill, steel, and other material will be required, not to mention machinery difficult to find. Engineers have estimated that if 7 years were allowed for the work a force of 43,000 men would be steadily engaged and that about 17,000 more would be needed during the peak period. This army would have to be doubled if the project is actually to be completed in 4 years or less. Canada must help in this effort, and Canada, even less than we, can ill afford to sidetrack labor now employed in producing munitions and other products for which Great Britain is crying.
>
> The President again stresses our need of power. But it has been pointed out time and time again that we can build highly efficient steam plants at strategic points far more rapidly and cheaply than we can develop St. Lawrence power. Much is also made in the message of the advisability of transferring a large portion of the long-term naval program to Great Lakes shipyards. But this in turn implies an adequate depth of water at the yards. Harbors on the Great Lakes would have to be deepened. And considering the financial state of most municipalities the Federal Government would have to undertake this work, divert more labor and material and raise the estimated cost of the St. Lawrence project by a probable $200,000,000.
>
> The more this St. Lawrence project is studied, the more it is to be hoped that Congress will not be stampeded into giving the President his way. There should be a careful weighing of the engineering, financial, military, and industrial facts before action is taken.

And, again, let me quote from an editorial of the Baltimore Sun of June 7, last:

> Congress will also have to look into the possibilities of steam generation of electrical energy. This country expects to get 1,100,000 horsepower as its share of the St. Lawrence project. The President himself admits that the project will take 4 years at most, with the possibility of shortening the time a little under forced draft. But steam plants to supply the same amount of energy can be built in about 18 months. They can be built where the industrial need develops, which will obviate the need of carrying the industrial load to the point where hydroelectric power has to be developed. And they can be built at just about half the cost of the St. Lawrence power project.

Before we cast our votes for or against this proposal, let us consider a few of the more pertinent facts, and in view of my opposition to this measure I shall state only those which I consider fundamentally sound and tending to discourage the enactment of this legislation:

First. Probable cost, United States share about 65 percent, borne by taxpayers not benefited by project.

Second. Speculative value for present and immediate future of national defense.

Third. No such gigantic expenditure can be sound when benefits from navigation are nil half a year. Real difficulties of ice, shoals, and fogs.

Fourth. Competition from merchandise carried in by foreign vessels.

Fifth. Annual loss by reason of diversion from our present rail and waterway facilities, and public and private property values.

Sixth. Doubt as to large amounts of grain for export via St. Lawrence.

Seventh. United States to pay major cost of work for labor and materials used on Canadian side.

Eighth. Serious doubt as question of further withdrawal of waters from Lake Michigan.

Ninth. Sufficient power now available in that region, both on Canadian and United States sides.

Tenth. Project opposed in 1940 by more than a 3-to-1 vote of New York State Legislature, and yet New York State has been singled out as chief beneficiary.

Eleventh. Last of all, let us consider every alternative which will conserve our financial structure, and meet our immediate national-defense needs.

Even if we admit that there is merit in this plan can we possibly agree that now is the proper time for its execution? The Committee on Rivers and Harbors may well be congratulated that they have not included this legislation in an omnibus bill. It is certainly easier and less odorous to handle one bad egg at a time. If for no other reason than the deplorable state of the Federal Treasury, we should not consider favorably this bill.

Comment is repeatedly heard that this plan cannot be classed as a war measure. Recently the chairman of the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Canada made this statement. I quote:

> It is quite evident that this development cannot be classed as a war measure, for even if undertaken tomorrow it would be 6 or 7 years before it could become of use. Yet the project is persistently misrepresented as a war measure, which far from helping could actually handicap war work.

Coming from such a high authority, might this not be the opinion of many other expert Canadian engineers?

We must not delude ourselves into thinking that this plan as briefly stated in H. R. 4927 may end our further considerations. It may well be only a beginning of untold appropriations for the defense and maintenance of this enormous 1,200-mile outlay. Complete defense bases must be built at dozens of places from the Straits of Belle Isle to the entrance to Lake Ontario. Shall we undertake these and neglect our defenses so badly needed along our entire Atlantic seaboard? Let us not forget that even with Canada our closest friend and an ally if war comes to us, every lock in this canal would be vulnerable to air attack and thus close for an indefinite period exit from the Great Lakes to the sea. Our solicitude for the Panama Canal could

again be in evidence on the St. Lawrence. What then can be our gain after all this expense and care and responsibility? We know that for navigation purposes the canal can be used only for half the year and the principal benefits would go to foreign shippers. Under such conditions the savings to farmers are very difficult to determine, and at the best do not appear to warrant the investment. Perhaps in this discussion some accurate figures may be obtained as well as savings on electric power, and once and for all it must be shown that steam plants cannot be built in sufficient number and at less cost and more quickly and economically operated than any power generated from the St. Lawrence power project which may not be available for several years.

The cry has been raised that propaganda is running wild in opposition to this bill. Perhaps no propaganda is necessary in behalf of the proponents and that the vote in favor is already in the bag. Certainly it is a matter of public knowledge that very large groups of national organizations are opposed to the project, Chambers of Commerce of Akron, Ohio, Boston, Mass., State of Illinois, Providence, R. I.; New Orleans National Association of Shippers; Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, and so forth, showing that opposition is not confined to the State of New York but is country-wide. No doubt arguments will be advanced that Presidents of the United States, as well as scores of Army engineers, have approved of this development. Let us analyze these statements, as they might reasonably bear considerable weight.

Theodore Roosevelt said in 1922:

> The feasibility of the project is unquestioned, and its cost compared with some other great emergency works would be small.

The latter part of this statement is amusing. Would his idea of a small cost hold good today? Did he have in mind the cost of the Chicago Drainage Canal estimated at $16,000,000 and costing $53,000,000? Did he have in mind the Suez Canal estimated at $30,000,000 and costing $80,000,000? He had reason to recall the estimated cost of the Panama Canal of $160,000,000 and the resulting cost of $375,000,000. Would he hesitate after glancing for a moment at today's Treasury statement and admit that a mere billion outlay at this time should be laughed off and of no moment?

Let us hear what Calvin Coolidge said in December 1923:

> The time has come to resume in a moderate way the opening of our intracoastal waterways.

Among these was the St. Lawrence River development, and then he states:

> This is not incompatible with economy.

Would he not today shudder at sight of our financial condition and reverse such an opinion?

What did Herbert Hoover state in 1932? While stating his approval of the project, he used these words:

> The waterway will probably require 10 years for completion.

What a wide divergence of opinion between President Hoover and President Roosevelt.

The latter recently stated in his message to Congress:

> I am advised that we can build the St. Lawrence project in 4 years. Under emergency pressure it may be completed in less time.

Where did the President obtain these estimates? From the Army engineers, who endorsed the Passamaquoddy and Florida ship canal fiascos or pulled them out of the gathering clouds over the White House?

If the figures can be gathered—and I presume they can—showing the amount expended by the administration in the last 8 years in surveys, in wasted time and effort by boards and commissions, in labor expended on projects thrown aside as worthless or impractical, in visionary schemes originating from heaven knows where, the figures would be startling. And now one more political promise must be liquidated at the expense of the American people.

As usual, the cry will be raised that this is not a partisan measure; but watch the vote on the floor of this House. No one can accuse me of wishing to defeat this bill because of party affiliation. I voted among the first for the lease-lend bill. I have supported every bill for national defense. I have upheld the President in his views on national defense and his international program of all-out aid to the democracies. I have declared for the delivery of war materials to Great Britain at any cost, and for ever-increasing speed in production of essential war material for our own use and for those nations who believe in the liberty and freedom we enjoy. I would support this bill if I believed in what it proposes and what it offers of benefit to all the people. These promises and benefits I am confident cannot be performed. A day may come when such a plan might be feasible, but that time is not now. It may come when our whole economic structure needs just this sort of an undertaking to stimulate and encourage our return to normal life. Above all, and of the utmost importance, is the fact that all our thoughts and skill and enterprise should be devoted to the one all-absorbing task of immediate national defense and the pressing problems incident thereto. And I mean by these, strikes against our Government, the outlawing of communistic activities, the growing unrest and disloyalty of un-American labor leaders and racketeers, who have sown the seed of discord and disobedience, and theories foreign to our own way of life, among hundreds of thousands of our citizens who are being deprived of their very right of citizenship. Such problems must transcend those of seaways and canals and flood control and the countless political baits always dangled before our eyes and stamped "Urgent," "Must," "Bite." Whatever arguments are presented here, let us decide them honestly and fearlessly and at this session of the Congress, that our judgment may be that of all the people whose interests we are pledged to serve.

Strikes in National-Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS DELIVERED OVER THE MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM BY HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith opening statement made by me over station WOL, Washington, D. C., on the evening of June 15, 1941, on the program of American Forum of the Air, the subject being the Connally bill, relating to strikes in national-defense industries:

Strikes in national-defense industries have for many months constituted one of the most serious problems confronting our Government. With billions of dollars having been appropriated by Congress for defense and our military and naval experts warning us that speed was of the essence and that every day and every hour counted in the preparation for our defense, yet by reason of a large number of strikes in various defense industries, the defense program has been retarded and slowed down, and our production of planes, munitions, and other defense articles has been greatly reduced as a direct result of these strikes.

In April a statement from the Labor Division of the Defense Commission to the Naval Affairs Committee of the House estimated the number of man-days lost in strikes in defense industries amounted to 2,583,441 man-days. Today, only about 2 months since that estimate was given, this has been increased to approximately 4,000,000 man-days of idleness, according to a report which I received yesterday from the Office of Production Management. This means that since the defense program began about a year ago, by reason of strikes in defense industries, there have been 4,000,000 man-days of idleness. Comparing the April statement with the statement of yesterday, there has been an increase in man-days idleness in 2 months of a million and a half caused by strikes in defense industries.

The gravity of this situation is apparent to everyone, and I think that the American people are aroused and are all agreed that something must be done to prevent the slowing down of the program which we are carrying on for the defense and the preservation of America. There has been much talk about it, but the time for talk has passed and the time for action is at hand.

The right to strike in normal times no one will deny, and collective bargaining must be and will be preserved; and the Government, in order to protect the rights of labor and industry, has set up the National Defense Mediation Board to determine the merits of those controversies without causing a stoppage of work; but in some instances the action of the Mediation Board and the orders of the leaders of the labor unions to proceed with work have been disregarded, evidencing a flagrant and reckless disregard for the Nation's welfare.

The laborers in America as a whole are patriotic and are anxious to do their bit in preparing for our defense, and I am convinced that it is not the fault of the masses

of those who labor that these strikes have taken place. Some have been wage disputes, some have been jurisdictional strikes between labor unions, some have doubtless been caused by the unreasonable attitude of industry, and others have been inspired by a small communistic group acting on orders from foreign governments, but the American people for the moment are not so much interested in the cause of this dilemma as its prevention.

The Connally bill, which passed the Senate last Thursday by a vote of 67 to 7, and an identical bill introduced by me in the House authorizing the President of the United States, whenever he finds, after investigation, that the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production, as result of strikes or threatened strikes in defense industries, to take possession of such plant or plants and use and operate them for the United States in the production of defense articles, is not a cure-all for the problem, but it will certainly be effective when other means have failed to guarantee the continued operation of these plants.

Some plan must be devised, some method must be employed to stop these strikes, when all other means have failed, and that is what the Connally bill is designed to do and will do. It is a gun behind the door to be used by the President only when all other means have failed.

The taking over of the North American aviation plant in California by the President a few days ago illustrates the efficacy of the plan. He did this under his inherent authority under the Constitution as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, but it is desirable that he have the specific authority for such action. This bill would eliminate any question of his right, and furthermore give approval thereto by the Congress of the United States, thereby evidencing the approval of the people of the United States by their chosen legislative representatives.

With this specific authority vested in the President by the Congress, it would serve as a deterrent in the prevention of further strikes, and doubtless would not have to be exercised often, once it was known that he possessed the authority, and that the American people approved of its exercise when necessary.

The administration favors this bill, Under Secretary of War Patterson having appeared before the House Committee on Military Affairs a few days ago in support of it.

It is the only effective plan that has been offered, and its passage in the Senate by an almost unanimous vote indicates the crystallization of sentiment for it and I hope that it may soon pass the House.

Business as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM JACKSON (MICH.) CITIZEN-PATRIOT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot, which is as follows:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot]

"BUSINESS AS USUAL"

Administration spokesmen from Washington tell us that they want no talk of "business as usual." They want the people to realize that we are in an emergency. They want us to sense the need for all-out effort.

And the administration is right in such a program.

But the trouble is that the plan should start in Washington.

If the automobile manufacturers are going to be forced to curtail production, if rationing gasoline in some areas and electric power in others is to become a necessity, there will be no complaint from patriots.

The American people will abandon the nonessentials and the luxuries of life, if necessary; but why doesn't the Government set the pace?

The C. C. C., for example, was a great enterprise in depression days. It salvaged many a boy and young man, and it did many a worth-while job. But in the present emergency we don't need the C. C. C. at all.

The Government is finding it not easy to raise enough money by taxation and the sale of bonds to finance our defense effort, yet the Government continues to pour money into the C. C. C. and the C. C. C. continues to doll up State parks. Why? Because the C. C. C., like every other bureau or commission ever created by the National Government, is unwilling to go out of existence, even though the situation which created it has ceased to exist. The men at the head of the C. C. C. don't want to lose their jobs. Every time a Member of Congress suggests that any present bureau, division, or commission of the Government be abolished a plague of tax-paid lobbyists descends on Congress like a flight of 17-year locusts and demands that the agency be continued.

If we are going to trim down to defense weight, then the place to begin trimming is in Washington. Mark Foote reports that many bureaus and commissions are going to be moved out of the Capital to other cities to make room for defense workers. Instead of moving them, why not do away with them altogether?

There are jobs in the defense program for all of the boys in the C. C. C., and there are other places for the bureaucrats in Washington. Let Government set the pace, and the people will begin to take this defense program seriously.

If American women are expected to do without aluminum dishpans and to get along with last year's automobiles, then Uncle Sam should get along without the C. C. C. and the multitude of other nonessential agencies which continue to live off the fat of the land.

Anglo-American Entente

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of June 18, 1941:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 18, 1941]

COMMONS HOOTS AT OPPONENT OF UNION WITH UNITED STATES—LIBERAL PARTY DRAFTS PROPOSAL FOR ENTENTE

LONDON, June 18.—Cries of "Nonsense" and "Shame" resounded in the House of Commons when Rupert de la Bere, Conservative, insisted in an exchange with Prime Minister Winston Churchill that the British people did not desire federal union with the United States, now or in the future.

Bere asked Churchill if he could give assurance that, as distinct from the idea of an Anglo-American entente, that the Government would not formulate a plan for federal union without a mandate from the British people.

MERGER PLAN DRAFTED

"So great a change could not be brought about without the fullest public and parliamentary discussion beforehand," Churchill said.

"Does not the Prime Minister understand that whilst the country extends tireless goodwill and appreciation to the American people it does not amount to a desire to have Federal union now or at any future date?" Berle then asked.

It was understood that an Anglo-American entente, as part of Britain's peace aims, will be proposed by the executive committee of the Liberal Party at its assembly on July 18.

NO PEACE WITHOUT SECURITY

"This assembly believes that victory will be barren unless it is used by the American and British democracies, working in continuous and close collaboration with other free democratic nations, to realize the liberal principles of international life," a proposed resolution will say. "The post-war settlement must establish the rule of law among nations and it must set up effective machinery for the determination of disputes and provides for maintenance of a system of mutual defense of all peaceful states against aggression.

Closing of the German Consulates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON (MASS.) POST

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent and timely editorial from a newspaper which has consistently pursued a real American editorial policy, the Boston Post:

[From the Boston Post of June 17, 1941]

FULLY JUSTIFIABLE

The Berlin government has proceded along the road to world domination through realistic means and drastic action.

It has not been dissuaded from its objectives by the provisions or the niceties of international law, nor by any human element in administration which endangers the Nazi con-

ception of the supremacy of the state in all matters.

Therefore, there should be little complaint in Berlin this morning at the news that the United States has ordered the German consulates in this country closed and their staffs returned to Germany.

There was little pretense since 1939 that these consulates were operated for other than war purposes.

The trade with Germany has ceased. Because of this, and if international law was complied with, most of the consulates should have closed at that time.

They were held open, with able attachés in charge, to assist the Berlin government as far as possible in the successful prosecution of the war. No other excuse exists for their maintenance.

Because of the strained relations between this country and Germany, and the obvious internal danger which exists in permitting active spies and subversive agents to work unchecked, it was intelligent action which now closes the official offices of the Reich.

This, most Americans agree, should only be the beginning of intelligent action.

The mere act of closing a consulate or a group of consulates does not halt spying or the employment of saboteurs.

Espionage operates in depths which few official Government offices plumb. The spies will not be driven out by closing consulates. Neither will the propagandists depart.

It is up to us and our National Government to proceed directly against the underground organizations and, in addition, not to confine our efforts solely to Germany.

The master espionage system of all time, one which is battling Americanism in our factories and mills, and has done so for a generation, is that supported by the Moscow Government and the Soviet Union.

The Nazis are positively naive compared to the Russians. The latter do not operate through such obvious devices as consulates.

They enter the blood stream of the Nation through the most intricate system of intrigue ever devised, and the poison that this virus has engendered reaches into the lives of millions of Americans, is festering in our Government, and is present in hundreds of official and private organizations.

It seeks to divide and rule, to raise class against class, race against race, religion against religion.

The people of this country will find the action of the President in closing the Nazi consulates fully justifiable.

The people will urge continued action against the hidden organizations of both Germany and Russia.

Consumption of Cheese

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture addressed an appeal to the people of the United States to reduce their consumption of cheese by eating substitutes in order that more of that food might be shipped to the people of England and other nations resisting Nazi aggression.

In this appeal the Secretary seeks to destroy the efforts that have been made for years to induce the people of America to eat more cheese.

I can assure the Secretary of Agriculture that with proper price protection the farmers of Wisconsin and other sections of the Nation can produce all the cheese that may be required to not only maintain domestic consumption but to take care of the demands of foreign governments. We must not destroy our own domestic market.

The attitude of the people of Wisconsin on this subject is clearly expressed in a resolution adopted by the directors of the Association of Commerce of Fond du Lac, Wis., on Tuesday, June 17, 1941, and a statement of Mr. William F. Hubert, president of the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange, reported in the Sheboygan Press, of Sheboygan, Wis., under date of June 18, 1941:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY DIRECTORS OF ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, FOND DU LAC, WIS., TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1941

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has made public pronouncement to the Nation requesting that it reduce the consumption of cheese for the purpose of creating a surplus to be used for export to one of the nations engaged in the European war; and

Whereas the dairy farmers of Fond du Lac County have been contributing to a fund used by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture for the purpose of advertising and increasing the per capita consumption of cheese in the United States; and

Whereas Fond du Lac County ranks eleventh in cheese production among the 71 counties of Wisconsin, and the income from dairy products, especially cheese, vitally affects the economic life of the county of Fond du Lac, as expressed by a production during 1940 of 13,123,000 pounds of cheese, using approximately 135,000,000 pounds of milk; and a reduction in consumption would vitally affect the earning capacity of 61,000 milk cows and large investments in modern farm and dairy equipment, involving the highest sanitary standards in the Nation, and in addition would affect the income of a large number of people who are active in businesses kindred to the dairy-products industry, especially that of cheese, the revenue from which is accurately estimated to represent more than one-third of the total income from all dairy products of the county; and

Whereas the present level of national consumption of cheese will be necessary to avoid a precarious condition after the present foreign emergency is over: Be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Fond du Lac Association of Commerce, representing the industrial, retail, wholesale, and professional men of the city, hereby enter their protest to Secretary Wickard's agricultural program asking for reduction of the consumption of cheese, and resolve that the Secretary be respectfully requested to retract his request and as soon as possible consult with the dairy leaders of Wisconsin to the end that our present national per capita consumption may be preserved for the future and that the cheese required to meet the European emergency be obtained by some program of increased production of cheese; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Secretary Claude Wickard, Senators Alexander Wiley and Robert M. La Follette, and Congressman Frank B. Keefe.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of June 18, 1941]

REMEDY IS SUGGESTED BY HUBERT—DIVERT PERCENTAGE OF MILK FROM BUTTER RATHER THAN HURT CHEESE INDUSTRY

By taking 3 percent of the Nation's milk from butter or other dairy products and diverting it into cheese, the United States could increase cheese production 50 percent and make more than enough for both American and English consumption, William F. Hubert, Sheboygan, president, Wisconsin Cheese Exchange, declared today.

Mr. Hubert, in making the statement, voiced strong objection to United States Secretary of Agriculture Claude F. Wickard's recent argument that Americans should eat less cheese so English demands for that product could be met.

"I feel that we should produce and eat more cheese, not less," Mr. Hubert stated. "According to the United States Department of Agriculture figures, about 32 percent of the Nation's milk goes into creamery butter, about 9 percent into butter made on the farm, and about 6 percent into cheese.

SMALL DIVERSION

"If 3 percent of the Nation's milk would be taken out of butter and other dairy products and converted into cheese, it would produce considerable more cheese than the amount asked for by England. The present estimated cheese production of the United States will be about 840,000,000 pounds during 1941. With so small a diversion from other dairy products, it would then be about 1,250,000,000 pounds of cheese."

President Hubert said that at a recent meeting the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the president and the board of directors of the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange be, and they are hereby, authorized to offer the facilities of this exchange to the Government for the purchase and sale of cheese."

The exchange is willing and anxious to help the Federal Government solve the cheese production and consumption problem, Mr. Hubert said, but he felt that Secretary Wickard's suggestion would be detrimental to the Wisconsin cheese industry, since the State produces 50 percent of the Nation's cheese.

For the past dozen years the State has spent a great deal of money building up cheese consumption through expensive advertising campaigns. If the public is asked to eat less cheese now, during the emergency, then it will be difficult to get people back into cheese-eating habits once the war is over, Mr. Hubert contended.

SURPLUS OF BUTTER

"Figures released by the United States Department of Agriculture as of June 1, 1941," Mr. Hubert continued, "of cheese in storage, being 102,768,000 pounds, show holdings of about 30,000,000 pounds greater than a year ago on June 1.

"It is estimated that included in this 102,000,000 pounds there are about 20,000,000 pounds purchased by the Government. These are in storage awaiting shipment to England. This would leave only about 82,000,000 pounds actually owned in the United States, and this is only about 12 percent greater than that of a year ago. On the other hand, the storage holdings of butter, as of June 1, 1941, are 56,359,000 pounds, compared with a year ago holdings of 25,463,000 pounds, or about 225 percent greater.

"Every effort should be made," the president of the exchange added, "to divert into cheese some of the milk which is now going into other dairy products, namely, butter and ice cream. These latter products are not being asked for by England.

"During the past few years the United States Government has lent its support to butter on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. If this same kind of support was forthcoming to the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange, it would be a material help in the present situation.

"Further, immediate steps should be taken by the Wisconsin College of Agriculture to issue a weekly bulletin to the producers of Wisconsin, giving figures as to the parity between butter and cheese. This could easily

be accomplished by determining the average weekly price of butter on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and compare same with the price of cheese on the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange, and add to each one the price of its own byproducts. It must be taken into consideration that butter is sold free on board track, Chicago, while cheese is sold free on board factory in Wisconsin."

Mr. Hubert explained that free on board track, Chicago, means that all butter prices are quoted on butter standing on the tracks, while in Wisconsin cheese buyers must go to the factory and haul their cheese away.

MAKERS PATRIOTIC

"It would be very inconsistent," Mr. Hubert went on, "to cut down on our cheese consumption after the cheese industry, together with the State of Wisconsin, have through extensive advertising stressed the food value of cheese and nearly doubled its consumption in the past 12 years.

"For this reason, I feel it would be a better policy, during this present emergency, to convert milk from other dairy products rather than to ask the American public to cut down on their consumption of cheese. Everyone connected with the cheese industry knows that the latter would be disastrous, not only to the cheese industry, but to all other dairy industries as well."

"Wisconsin cheese-factory operators and manufacturers are patriotic men," Mr. Hubert said, "and are more than willing to do their part toward making the Nation strong. But when there is an obvious way out of the difficulty, by which no present or future dislocation in the cheese industry will take place," Mr. Hubert said he felt that way out should be taken.

He explained that diversion of fluid milk from butter production into cheesemaking would not in any way injure the butter industry. There is at present a great surplus of butter and this condition of abundance would not be reduced for some time to come, he said.

Breaking down the usages for the United States milk supply, 1937-39 averages, Mr. Hubert quoted the following percentages: Creamery butter, 31.6; fluid milk used in cities and villages, 29.9; used on farms where produced, 11.7; farm butter, 9.2; cheese, 6.3; canned milk, 4.5; ice cream, 3.1; fed to calves on farms, 2.6; dry and powdered, 0.2; and miscellaneous uses, 0.9.

In the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1941

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most interesting comment on the St. Lawrence seaway hearings, printed in the New York Times, Wednesday, June 18, 1941:

[From the New York Times of June 18, 1941]

IN THE NATION—HEAVY POLITICAL GUNS BOOM ON THE ST. LAWRENCE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—Can a long-range defense program be executed at the same time an immediate one—all aid to Great Britain—is taxing all the resources of the United States? Is it wise, from the standpoints of the British aid effort, our own rearmament, and the importance of the time factor in the all-out program, to divert men, money, and materials for a project which will not be functioning for several years? These are the issues in the dispute over the President's proposal that work begin at once to complete the St. Lawrence deep waterway and power plan.

Since the war may conceivably be over before the new power becomes available, and any present diversion of the possible measure of aid to Great Britain may adversely affect that nation's prospect of victory, the argument of the opposition to the St. Lawrence project is as visible as it is impressive. But the administration is determined to override the argument and the opposition, and the President is using his familiar technique of marshaling all the political and personal force under his influence to achieve that on which he has set his mind.

Recent history demonstrates that when the President has come to such a determination he never quits. He abandoned his device to change the viewpoint of the Supreme Court majority by enlarging the court. But time and human fate accomplished for him soon thereafter what Congress would not do and the public would not sanction.

A HEAVY BOMBARDMENT

The administration's big guns are in position now and thundering for the St. Lawrence plan. The Cabinet is coming forward with all possible explanations why what the President wants is a component necessity of national defense and essential to the British cause as well as to our own. Although the ranks of the O. P. M. are by no means solid in favor of the long-distance project, its obliging chiefs were induced to throw the weight of the office behind the President. This gave him a show of expert as well as political support.

Today Secretary Stimson added his voice to the effort, and Secretary Hull instructed Assistant Secretary Berle to voice that Secretary's approval to the House committee. It is an imposing turnout, of the kind the President can muster when he is so disposed. And whenever anything is sought by the administration these days under the phrase "national defense" the effect on Congress is the greater.

Mr. Berle advanced an ingenious reason for abandoning the treaty plan in favor of presenting the project to both branches of Congress as a contract. Twice before, when it was offered in treaty form, the Senate did not furnish the two-thirds necessary for the ratification of a treaty, but a majority was registered in favor. It is generally believed that this is the practical reason why the St. Lawrence agreement is now offered in the form of a contract.

But Mr. Berle had a more virtuous explanation. He said the domestic interest of the United States is so plainly paramount that the administration decided it was only proper to seek the approval of both branches; that the House of Representatives, the popular body, must assuredly be consulted in matters of domestic interest. Yet the material fact remains that by this means the administration needs only a simple majority to get the authority the President is determined to obtain.

THE OPPOSING VIEW

To the opposition it seems incredible that a government which, by the confession of the President's first report on lease-lend shipments, has hardly begun to furnish essential aid to Great Britain in its time of growing exigency should insist on diverting any effort or resources to a long-range project. Already there is a labor shortage for work in hand, and the strikes have delayed important armament construction. There are present and approaching shortages in arms materials. While the requested initial sum of $200,000,000 is mentioned almost contemptuously by the spenders of the tens of defense billions, it would build many airplanes and ships—the prime requisites of the British.

These points are being waived aside. The administration is confident it will win the approval of Congress on the plea of national defense, supported by important officials and the spokesmen of O. P. M. Canada has a direct national stake in the enterprise, which assured the backing of Prime Minister King. And although the British would exchange five future St. Lawrence power developments for immediate ships and planes, their situation is such they can probably be induced to add their official support to the project if it seems to be needed and the pressure from Washington is applied.

When Norway fell Great Britain was forced to turn to Canada for its supplies of woodpulp, ferro alloys, and chemicals. That put a load on the Dominion's industries. Power there went to a premium, and Ontario withdrew its objections to the St. Lawrence scheme. The emergency could be met by building more steam plants on the border and stepping up the power output at Niagara Falls until the war is over. But the administration brushes away such suggestions.

Additional Judge Needed in Eastern District of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT], in his brief speech this morning, again takes the position that an additional Federal judge for the eastern district of Missouri is not needed. I have always felt that when one finds himself in error that he should not hesitate to admit it.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] takes it upon himself to contradict the views not only of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals but the Attorney General, the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States district judge, George Moore, and United States District Attorney Harry C. Blanton, as well as the St. Louis Bar Association. He rests his case solely upon a telegram received from United States Judge Charles Davis which I have quoted on numerous occasions and which, in effect, stated that the members of the bar of the eastern district of Missouri had not taken an interest in this question nor made an investigation. The report of the special committee appointed by the St. Louis Bar Association, which I placed in the RECORD a few days ago, not only contradicts the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] but also United States District Judge Davis.

There came to my desk this morning editorials published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] knows is a Republican newspaper, and the St. Louis Post Dispatch, and I insert them as part of my remarks. The editorial from the Globe-Democrat follows:

A NEW FEDERAL JUDGESHIP

The St. Louis Bar Association has added its endorsement to the bill pending in Congress to provide an additional Federal judge for the eastern Missouri district. The action of the association is particularly significant in view of the charge of politics which has been raised by Congressman WALTER C. PLOESER in the House debate on the measure.

The bar association is not a partisan organization. Its members, who by virtue of their profession are qualified to decide on the need for an additional judge, represent a cross-section of both major political parties.

The association's endorsement is based on a study made by a special committee of three of its former presidents, which found that independently of its own conclusions the need is fully demonstrated by the fact that expert sources "whose motives cannot be questioned," have recommended the bill.

The committee referred specifically to Presiding Judge Kimbrough Stone of the Eighth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, the administrative office for United States courts, and the judicial conference.

The increasing volume of condemnation suits, the substantial increase in the number of criminal cases instituted by the Federal Government and the numerous corporation reorganization proceedings pending in this district, including four important railroad reorganizations are cited by the report in support of the bill. United States District Attorney Blanton, in a recent letter to Senator BENNETT C. CLARK, pointed out that pending condemnation cases would occupy all the working time of one judge for 2½ years.

There are now two full-time judges in this district, while the third judge, John Caskie Collet, divides his time between this district and the western Missouri (Kansas City) district. Passage of the act creating another full-time judge would permit Judge Collet to devote all, or nearly all of his attention to the western Missouri district, and expedite the work of the court in both districts.

The Post Dispatch editorial follows:

AN ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIP IS NEEDED

The report of the executive committee of the St. Louis Bar Association removes all question as to the need for an additional judgeship in the United States court district for eastern Missouri. It does so without violence to the statement some weeks ago of senior District Judge Charles B. Davis that no lawyer had had difficulty in getting a case tried and that the courts of the district had not been burdened with work for the last year.

The need is in the future, but that future is a very near one. Condemnation cases pending or in prospect in the river-front memorial, Weldon Spring TNT plant, Wappapello Dam, and Clearwater Reservoir promise to clog the civil docket of the district to such an extent that ordinary litigants will be injured. The bar association committee reports that these cases alone will require some 800 trial days, a burden which will throw the court 3 years behind.

That would be an intolerable situation, and Congress is wise to meet it in advance, as urged by judicial authorities both in the circuit and nationally.

I hope this will convince the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] that there is no politics in this question and that the bill which recently passed the House should be passed by the Senate without delay.

Diversion of Oil Tankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

LETTER FROM JOHN P. McBRIDE, DIRECTOR MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES, DIVISION ON THE NECESSARIES OF LIFE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
AND INDUSTRIES,
DIVISION OF THE NECESSARIES OF LIFE,
June 16, 1941.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: Anent the situation in relation to suggested curtailment of gasoline, heating oils, and industrial bunker C oil, Massachusetts requirements, based on 1940 demands, are as follows:

Gasoline: 744,262,714 gallons or 17,625,302 barrels.

Heating oils for home use: 906,000,000 gallons or 21,571,428 barrels.

Industrial or bunker C oil: 540,000,000 gallons or 13,000,000 barrels.

It is anticipated that the 1941 demand will be 10 percent larger due to increased consumption and that at least the same increase will prevail in 1942 because of defense work which will be reflected in all these items.

As you doubtless know, there is sufficient of this commodity, but we happen to be in a bottleneck so far as transportation is concerned. This condition is generally so in the east coast. The east coast demand for 1940 was 199,037,000 barrels of gasoline and 267,268,000 barrels of light fuel, kerosene, and heating oils. This east coast includes New England, the eastern half of New York State, and Pennsylvania and the Atlantic States from there to Florida. In relation to this area we consume slightly less than 10 percent of petroleum products.

This area depends almost entirely on tankers for transportation, this being by far the cheaper mode. Other methods of transportation available here are railroad tank cars and a few pipe lines. I understand that some effort is to be made to better correlate the general methods of transportation in tankers, barges, pipe lines, railroad tank cars, etc., so as to relieve this situation, but it appears from all available records that the tanker diversion has been greater than these alternatives can absorb. This has caused considerable concern here with householders, industrial centers, both manufacturing and recreational, and utility companies, also including our State department of public health, which has the responsibility of water supply, sewage disposal, and the protection of public health.

Pipe-line relief will not become noticeable for at least 8 or 9 months, which leaves us in somewhat of a quandary as to next winter's needs. Diversion of tankers is under the control of the United States Maritime Commission, and further diversion will aggravate this situation.

Mr. Harold L. Ickes is the coordinator of petroleum activities between the O. P. M. and the O. P. A. C. S. bureaus. This authority is presently functioning to relieve the existing situation.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN P. McBRIDE,
Director.

Tribute to West Virginia On Its Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to report to the House that today marks the birthday anniversary of West Virginia as a State. We who live in the mountain Commonwealth are justly proud of the history, heritage, and resources of our section. Those visitors who come to West Virginia this year will find a busy people and a hospitable atmosphere.

Only a few hours ago I received a letter from a constituent, John L. Teets, of Morgantown, in which he says:

West Virginia is certainly doing its part in national defense; regiments in the field in training; airports training pilots for active training and service; coal mines turning out millions of tons for national-defense industries in countless cities; chemical extraction of coal for explosives; textile mills humming on Army shirts, blankets, etc.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in these trying times West Virginia, born in strife, takes its place among the other States as a territory in which loyal citizenry unites in behalf of our common country. It was George Washington who was said to have spoken in the darkest hours of the Revolution the following words:

Leave me but a banner to plant upon the mountains of West Augusta and I will rally around me men who will lift our bleeding Nation from the dust and set her free.

In these days our patriotic men and women stand ready to meet any emergency, just as they did even before we actually formed into a State on June 20, 1863.

At this point I include a toast to West Virginia by Harry E. Leeper, of Fairmont:

Nature has richly endowed West Virginia with natural resources, beautiful mountain scenery, and a sturdy, forward-looking people of pure Anglo-Saxon origin.

Noble rivers, wooded hills, fertile valleys, smiling farms, and bustling industries greet us on every side.

In West Virginia history comes to life. Tales of deeds of daring by West Virginians and historic shrines enrich our State and National life.

Man's conquest of nature is nowhere more evident than in West Virginia, with its miles

of engineered highways, its rail- and water-transportation systems, its airports built and building, affording ingress and egress of raw materials, finished products, and linking surface transportation with the boundless air lines up above.

Education and culture are part of our everyday life in West Virginia, and daily scientific research leads to new and greater uses of our vast natural resources for the benefit of mankind.

Foremost in bringing these things to American life and American ways and cooperating with other national research groups is our own West Virginia University, created, built, and building by West Virginia mountaineers.

The greatest asset of West Virginia is its people. Of virile Anglo-Saxon stock, it is they who have made West Virginia great, and it is they who will bring her to greater fame and usefulness through coming years among the sisterhood of sovereign States.

West Virginians have faith in the democratic way of life and will maintain that way of life as did their forbears when they helped wrest from Black King John the Magna Carta on the bloody field of Runnymede; when they strove mightily with King George III so that we in America might "live by no man's leave underneath the law"; when they mingled fraternal blood in '65 and '67 to assure freedom to all, regardless of race, creed, or color; and they upheld the principles of democracy again in 1898 and again in 1918.

West Virginia, endowed with the culture and chivalry of the South, the progressive spirit of the North, the aggressiveness of the West, and the acumen of the East, is indeed, a State of opportunity.

In this State of opportunity we can build a mighty economic and industrial empire for this Nation that will be a monument to the coordination of men, materials, money, and machinery for all time, if we will "but to ourselves be true." We must build so that mountaineers will always be free in our great State of opportunity. The hills of West Augusta must always be a symbol of progressive men and liberty.

My friends—
To West Virginia.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, one of the first men I learned to know on the Republican side of the aisle upon coming to Washington in 1925 was the Honorable GEORGE N. SEGER, of New Jersey, I soon observed that he was not to be known or "heard for his much speaking," but what he said carried with it such sincerity and honesty of purpose his statements were convincing and always exacted profound respect from those who heard him. There was no particular reason why there should develop a strong personal friendship between us further than that he was magnetic in his manner and readily commanded the friendship of all who came in contact with him. With increased associations I developed increasing fondness for his many amiable and outstanding virtues. Although we came from sections of the country where our constituents maintain an entirely different view on many political questions I consider it a distinct compliment to myself to know that our views on the philosophy of life, apart from its political aspects, were quite similar. He was a party man but never selfishly partisan. He was always sincere, honest, frank, courteous, and thoughtful in his deliberations with his colleagues regardless of political affiliations. He was a man of unusual good judgment and demonstrated a sincere interest in promoting legislation designed for the benefit of the public.

It was my privilege to spend some time with him at the same hotel for a year prior to his death and it was there that our association developed into a very warm friendship and where I learned to recognize and properly evaluate his ability and the outstanding virtues of his life.

His long service in the Congress is conclusive evidence that he merited the confidence reposed in him by the people of his State, and is sufficient justification for the high esteem held for him by his colleagues and many admiring friends.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my brief, but sincere, tribute to the memory of our departed friend and colleague, the late SAM MASSINGALE, one of the most beloved Members of the House.

He was a man with many sterling qualities; a man of the highest integrity; one in whom full confidence could be placed. Modest and unassuming, without a trace of pretension, but rugged and inflexible, his service here reflects to the honor and credit of the State of Oklahoma. The respect and esteem which he deserved and enjoyed from his colleagues might well be the envy of any Member of the House.

With his keen and engaging sense of humor, his courteous disposition, his friendly approach, he endeared himself to his colleagues. He maintained at all times due consideration for the rights and opinions of others.

Since the beginning of his service in the House of Representatives until his death, we were very close friends. We often conferred with each other on various matters, especially on matters relating to the welfare of our State. On every occasion of our meeting, I found him willing, agreeable, and anxious to render what assistance he could for the people he so ably represented.

But SAM MASSINGALE did more than merely to represent the Seventh Oklahoma District in Congress. It can be said without exaggeration that he actually personified that district's hopes and aspirations and needs; he was in truth and in fact the seventh district.

SAM was not born in Oklahoma. There was no Oklahoma when he first saw the light of day in Mississippi in 1870. He was not educated in Oklahoma. He had taken a law course in Fort Worth and had served in the Spanish-American War, when, a young man, he hung out his shingle as an attorney in Cordell, Washita County.

There, in that new, raw country, from 1900 on, SAM lived his life. He had reached Cordell only a few years after the country had been opened to settlement. Seven years later the territory became a State. The crudeness of the early days gave way to settled living. Railways came, then highways. Cordell came nearer, in distance, to the big cities.

But the call of those cities, that lured so many much less able lawyers than SAM, had no attraction for him. He preferred to remain among the people whom he knew so well, and who, as the years passed, relied more and more upon his advice.

The depression came. Droughts came. Cordell suffered cruelly, as did all that southwestern country, dependent, as it was, upon wheat and cotton. SAM did what he could for his friends and neighbors. But the stark realities of drought and depression called for more than mere sympathy or for chamber of commerce appeals for diversified crops.

More and more it became the burden of SAM'S talks with his home folk that drastic action by the Federal Government was needed. Only national action could adequately meet the problems raised by the drought; only Uncle Sam could guarantee living prices for cotton and wheat; only the Federal Government could provide aid for those needy aged who had grown old and poor under SAM'S eyes, and through no fault of their own, as he firmly believed.

Feeling as he did, it was inevitable that SAM should at last heed the call from his people to represent them in Washington. In 1936 he was elected to Congress; it was only his second public office.

Coming from a farming district, he had from many years of previous contact and association with the farmers gained a thorough knowledge and keen understanding of their problems. As a Member, he viewed their wants and needs with a sympathetic understanding. He devoted much of his time and efforts for the enactment of legislation which he sincerely believed would lighten their burdens and raise their standards. He was carrying forward this work with rare courage and ability at the time of his death.

How consistently and persistently SAM fought for his farmers and for the needy

aged of his district everyone in the House knows. Yet everyone knows also that, despite what seemed to some the radicalism of his views, he was never the cold zealot. No Member of Congress was possessed of a more genial humor. No one better loved his friends, nor appreciated more a good story.

Relief for farmers and the aged—those were his two great aims in Congress. He lived to see much of his dream come true. But, to the end, he was insisting on full parity for farmers; he was demanding more adequate pensions for the aged, freed from all taint of charity or largess.

Notable is the fact that SAM entered Congress after he had passed the age of 64, an age when men with less ambition are thinking of retiring from the active struggles of life and are content to look at deeds performed rather than those to be performed. After his many years of honest effort in the practice of law, he was justly entitled to choose that course, yet he aspired for greater accomplishments. This ceaseless spirit for greater accomplishments by honest efforts found in its people, as so well exemplified in the life of SAM MASSINGALE, has played no small part in bringing the State of Oklahoma in a few short years to a place of prominence among the Commonwealths of the Nation.

He passed out fighting. He has gone home to the prairies he loved so well. His death caused profound and widespread sorrow among the old friends he cherished, and for whom he did so much. All that southwestern country is the better for his having lived, and the State of Oklahoma has lost a loyal son, the Nation a patriotic servant, and the House of Representatives a beloved Member in the passing of SAM MASSINGALE.

The poet of the masses, Walt Whitman, had in mind the wholesomeness of citizens like SAM when he wrote:

The greatest city is that which has the greatest men and women.
If it be a few ragged huts it is still the greatest city in the whole world.
The place where the greatest city stands is not the place of stretched wharves, docks, manufactures, deposits of produce,
Nor the place of ceaseless salutes of newcomers, or the anchor-lifters of the departing,
Nor the place of the tallest and costliest buildings, or shops selling goods from the rest of the earth,
Nor the place of the best libraries and schools—nor the place where money is plentiest,
Nor the place of the most numerous population.
* * * Where thrift is in its place, and prudence is in its place,
Where behavior is the finest of the fine arts,
* * * Where the populace rise at once against the never-ending audacity of elected persons,
Where fierce men and women pour forth, as the sea to the whistle of death pours its sweeping and unript waves,
* * * There the greatest city stands.

If man begins at material birth and ends at death, then this vale of tears through which mortal man wends his way is of little consequence. But the Holy Writ declares that God created man in His own image and likeness. If man is thus the reflection of the eternal Maker, his being must be as spiritual and as eternal as God Himself. Obviously, the material body could not be the image of God, Spirit.

The only definition I know of the great mystery of death is that of Paul, in his epistle of Romans, when he said, "To be carnally minded is death." Evidently he meant to imply that death, like birth, is a mortal, mental process.

So these precedents I may properly argue that our friend MASSINGALE is still with us in the eternal spirit.

MASSINGALE was sentimental; most persons with a keen sense of humor are. I think he enjoys another passage from Whitman, which typifies this impression of MASSINGALE, as follows:

Must I leave thee, lilac with heart-shaped leaves?
Must I leave thee there in the dooryard, blooming, returning with spring?
Must I pass from my song for thee;
From my gaze on thee in the west, fronting the west, communing with thee,
O comrade lustrous, with silver face in the night?

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Churchill was a "Tommie" when the Boers were crushed.

Daddy, why do we celebrate the Fourth of July? Hush, child.

It is difficult for some to keep their shirts on for peace—possibly it's the weather.

The new War Department slogan, "Keep em Flying," should have added, "Over the U. S. A."

One of the horrors of war is the thought that we may have little dictators like "Ants in the Pants" Ickes.

Leon Henderson, price-fixer, seems more concerned about sitting on the loaf of bread than anything else.

This week it's a tooth-for-a-tooth: We freeze the Axis' dough, they freeze ours; we chase their consuls, they chase ours.

The headline, "The Low-Bracket Income Taxes Tripled in Bill," should speed up enrollment in the America First Committee.

There are those in State Department and executive offices who are mad because the English picked up the survivors of the *Robin Moor*.

The throat trouble of the President dates back to that rainy day he went out into the middle of Chesapeake Bay to welcome Lord Halifax.

Walter Winchell Lipshitz is about to break a hame string and Dorothy Thompson a corset string in their frenzied efforts to drag us into the war.

Frozen trees and flooded fields are the unavoidable and still remain the unexpected. Through catastrophes year after year our people rise again and again.

Nelson Rockefeller and Charles Taft head set-ups under the O. P. M. They are the grandsons of the famous. Charlie's deals chiefly with health and beauty in defense—"Strength through joy."

What shall we do about the statue of Von Steuben in Lafayette Square in front of the White House? After all, what are we going to do about Lafayette Square and the Washington Monument?

Why I Love America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF DR. F. F. BROWN, PASTOR OF THE KNOXVILLE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, AND STATEMENTS BY OTHER PROMINENT CITIZENS OF KNOXVILLE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD I include the following address, Why I Love America, delivered over the radio by Dr. F. F. Brown, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Knoxville, Tenn., on Sunday, June 1, 1941.

Dr. Brown is one of the most eminent Baptist ministers of the Nation, and a great American.

Included in his address are statements from the following able and distinguished citizens of Knoxville: Dr. James D. Hoskins, president of the University of Tennessee; Rabbi Jerome Mark; Dr. Harry Clark, superintendent of Knoxville city schools; Gen. James A. Fowler, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States; Dean F. C. Smith, of the University of Tennessee; John T. O'Connor, former mayor, now director of public welfare of Knoxville; Dr. Clifford E. Barbour, pastor Second Presbyterian Church; and John W. Green, long a leader of the Knoxville bar and the illustrious son of a Confederate colonel killed in action.

This address and the statements it carries, should at this fateful hour be a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night to guide the steps and strengthen the souls of the American people in devotion to our common country:

DR. F. F. BROWN, PASTOR, FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

The very logic of the critical days through which we are passing now is leading sincere, loyal, thoughtful American citizens to face with fresh appreciation the great centralities of our American life and Government.

We are not blind to the faults and evils in our land. We do not ostrich like, bury our heads in the sand, and refuse to see the many manifest imperfections and glaring abuses which American citizenship must deal with courageously and intelligently. But in this

hour when our American way of life and form of government are superficially criticized at home, and openly ridiculed and flaunted abroad, we need to be reminded of the significant foundations upon which our way of life and form of government are built.

With this purpose in mind, I have asked a group of our esteemed citizens for a brief, definite, personal statement on the theme of Why I Love America.

Here are their responses:

DR. JAMES D. HOSKINS, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

I have taught history and political science for 40 years. I have taught the history of Europe and of the United States, and have taught political science and comparative governments. Through all of this study and experience I have never discovered a country or a government which through its history and governmental administration has changed my belief that the Republic of the United States of America is the best government in the world.

RABBI JEROME MARK

Where love is concerned there must be a spirit and a vision, and herein lies the answer to my query Why I love America? The spirit of human consecration and veneration of the worth of the individual, as taught in scripture, invests our land as it does no other political unit on the globe.

In addition, the vision of a future that will count citizens and not dollars or shillings, a future that will boast of institutions dedicated to service and not bleak skyscrapers, is the rightful heritage of American civilization. It is a vision which enthralls me and makes me love America.

DR. HARRY CLARK, SUPERINTENDENT OF KNOXVILLE CITY SCHOOLS

I love America because our American way of life protects every individual against exploitation by those who have special privileges or power, and because the American way of life respects the personality of every individual, whatever his origin, or his present condition.

GEN. JAMES A. FOWLER

When the world was without form and void the brooding spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters; and there was laid in its mountains and plains and hills and valleys a foundation unexcelled elsewhere for the support of a civilized society. These resources remained hidden and untouched until man, groping through the night, saw a glimmer of light and began to struggle for freedom of thought and advancement in knowledge. It then became a haven for those among the downtrodden and oppressed who willed to struggle for liberty in thought and action. Through and from them arose a civilization and form of government theretofore unknown and far surpassing even the plutocratic democracies of the Greeks. This civilization has produced George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and a galaxy of statesmen unequaled by those of any nation, ancient or modern, that has ever existed. This civilization has demonstrated that a government of all the people, by all the people, and for all the people, regardless of race or color, whether the people be few or many, or the land be sparsely or densely populated, can exist and be perpetuated on the face of the earth.

Why not love America? And what American would not sacrifice, yea, if need be, die, for the principles which it represents and which have made it great?

DEAN F. C. SMITH, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

We love America because we still have faith in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. One can worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience with impunity. He can think and act as he pleases within the bounds of other people's rights and still keep his freedom.

America is the land of equal opportunity where ability, industry, and character largely determine one's place in the economic and social order. Every man and woman can and is expected to do his own thinking without interference or fear that he will be penalized if he does not conform to a pattern predetermined by an unscrupulous dictator in control of the state. Here the state is subservient to the people and not the people to the state. We are the masters of our fate, and with the proper balance among culture, industry, and national defense we can, with the help of God, remain true to our objective—a free people in a free land.

JOHN O'CONNOR, FORMER MAYOR, NOW DIRECTOR, PUBLIC WELFARE OF KNOXVILLE

To be able to say, "I am an American," is a precious privilege.

There is no earthly possession of greater value than being a citizen of the United States of America.

I love America because it stands for absolute equality of all men before law and before God.

I love America because it is a land of freedom and opportunity where the citizen has the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and where the humblest among us can rise to the highest station within the gift of his fellow citizen.

DR. CLIFFORD E. BARBOUR, PASTOR SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

I love America because of its equality of opportunity for everyone. According to one's capacity, there is no denial of achievement to its limit. I love America because of its freedom. There is no Gestapo nor Ogpu to snoop into the private lives of honest citizens. There is no dictator to demand unswerving and unquestioned allegiance. I love America because of its liberty, its liberty of conscience as the only guide to every man's faith. I love America because of its ideals. While it has been called a materialistic civilization, fundamentally it is spiritual. Life and labor and happiness are its goals. I love America because of its emphasis upon the value of the individual. Other governments use the individual for the winning of its own policies whatever price the individual may have to pay. America is organized to satisfy the needs of the individual. This seems to me to be God's plan. I love America.

JUDGE JOHN W. GREEN

For 2,000 years millions have loved Christ and the kingdom He established, because He died to make men free. I love America because of the price in blood, sweat, and tears our forefathers paid to make America free, and because if America goes down all is lost that makes a free man's life worth living.

Dr. BROWN. These pungent, vital, thoughtful statements are from Jew and gentile, Catholic and Protestant, Republican and Democrat. But as we listen to the measured words of this golden symposium welling from the hearts and brains of our honored fellow citizens we detect no note of race, or creed, or political faith. We hear only the deliberate, well-expressed convictions of American citizens. That very fact in itself constitutes one mighty reason why many of us love America.

In conclusion, I would say that I love America because she offers the most congenial home for freedom of the soul to be found anywhere on this earth. And soul freedom is the nurturing mother of all freedoms.

It may be necessary for all true Americans to give all that they have and are for the preservation and perpetuation of the great enduring ideals which are the foundation stones of our Republic. When as sincere Americans, we make an honest appraisal of our blessed country, we find ourselves recalling the prayer of Irving Berlin:

"While the store clouds gather
Far across the sea,
Let us swear allegiance
To a land that's free;
Let us all be grateful
For a land so fair,
As we raise our voices
In a solemn prayer."

"God bless America,
Land that I love,
Stand beside her and guide her
Through the night, with the light from above;
From the mountains, to the prairies,
To the ocean, white with foam,
God bless America, my home sweet home."

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is not possible on this occasion for me to recount individually those of our colleagues that we have lost during the past year, but I cannot let this occasion pass without referring to the loss of our beloved colleague, the late Speaker.

Patience and kind consideration shown by Speaker BANKHEAD to new Members will always be remembered by me. Somehow he seemed to appreciate the fact that he, too, was once a new Member in the halls of Congress.

Speaker BANKHEAD came of a family long noted for leadership in public affairs. The Speaker himself began his career in Congress as Representative from the Seventh Alabama District in 1917. He held the rare distinction of holding three high positions in the House, chairman of the Rules Committee in the Seventy-third Congress, majority leader in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and then, by unanimous election, the Speakership.

While Speaker BANKHEAD played a major part in molding important legislation, very little bore his authorship. His individual efforts were cast aside in cooperation with others to secure much beneficial legislation. His last great effort was for the enactment of the compulsory military training bill.

WILLIAM BANKHEAD accepted defeat without complaint. He went to Baltimore to open the Presidential campaign in the State of Maryland. He was not able to make the trip but he felt that he had a duty to perform. He loved his country more than himself. Upon his deathbed, not knowing that his Baltimore speech had been read for him by someone else, he insisted that he must make the speech.

The last sad rites typify the spirit of this great man. The day before the funeral a mechanic from New Orleans sat in the church at Jasper, Ala. He stated

that he would be unable to attend the funeral the next day as he must return to his work. He asked where the casket would be placed so that he might sit near there. Upon being shown to a seat he silently sat there with bowed head for almost an hour. The next day during the funeral services, the person who sat in this same seat was the President of the United States.

During the services our beloved Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery, stated that upon one occasion while talking to the Speaker he said:

I like to see you wearing your cross around your neck like that.

Then the Speaker reached into his pocket and showed him a beautiful golden cross.

It would not look proper or fitting for me to wear mine like that, so this is where I wear mine.

WILLIAM BANKHEAD was a good man as well as a great man. He truly walked with his God. That is the reason why a laborer and the President of this great Republic sat in the same seat to pay their respects to his memory. His body has been returned to the dust of his native State. He was a man who loved his own people and one whom his own people loved.

A great man once said, "The dead take into the next world clasped in their still, cold hands only what they gave away in this world." BILL BANKHEAD gave freely of his services for the relief of his fellow man. His character has become indelibly stamped upon the history of this Nation.

A poet has said:

I wrote my name upon the sand
And trusted it would stand for aye.
But soon, alas, the refluent sea
Had washed my feeble lines away.

I carved my name upon the wood
And after years returned again.
I missed the shadow of the tree
That stretched of old upon the plain.

The solid marble next my name
I gave as a perpetual trust.
An earthquake rent it to its base,
And now it lies o'erlaid with dust.

All those had failed; I was perplexed,
I turned and asked myself, what then?
If I would have my name endure,
I'll write it on the hearts of men.

Truly, Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD has written his name on the hearts of his fellow men.

Expel Alien Agitators and Keep America Out of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1941

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the war between Hitler and Stalin does not change the situation in America, except to strengthen the determination of over 80 percent of our people to stay out of European and Asiatic wars.

I do not believe that American mothers will care to send their sons to Soviet Russia to fight and die for communism or any foreign dictatorship.

I am sure that the noninterventionists will shed no tears in having the Daily Worker and the Communists in this country change their tune to Onward Christian Soldiers in defense of communism, atheism, and Joseph Stalin under the guise of democracy.

I urge the Congress to provide free transportation to Vladivostok for all American Communists who want to fight for Soviet Russia and the "red" flag. Why not give all American Communists who want to fight for world revolution a one-way ticket to Soviet Russia on the steamship *West Point?*

I would suggest that we do the same for the Nazis, Fascists, and all alien agitators. There is no room in free America for any foreign form of dictatorships or despotisms. Let us send back all these un-American elements to their native lands where they can fight to their heart's content. We have as much to fear from our enemies from within as from without.

Our Patriotic Duty to American Veterans and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1941

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a patriotic duty for me to add my support to H. R. 4, the Rankin bill, which provides more adequate compensation for the widows, orphans, and dependent parents of World War veterans.

In the midst of a new call for a united and invigorated national defense, it is entirely in order for this Congress to protect the families of those who made such heavy sacrifices in time of conflict.

By adopting this measure we demonstrate America's appreciation of the personal sacrifices made in its defense. Let us pledge support, protection, and encouragement to the loved ones of those who left the more lucrative and comparatively safer pursuits of peacetime endeavor to respond to the patriotic appeals of our Nation.

We must not be placed in the embarrassing and unpatriotic position of calling upon our youth to rally to the defense of America, without properly providing for the survivors and dependents of those who responded to the Nation's call in other prelious days.

At the same time let this be a solemn reminder that when America is plunged into war the cost of preparedness and defense is just a small part of our financial responsibility. There will be untold millions to be paid in future years to the survivors of our fallen heroes and to those who are left maimed and sick.

Testimony in Favor of Creation of a Commission to Prevent Unemployment and Depression at Close of Defense Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, AND TESTIMONY OF W. L. BATT, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PRODUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I have already explained to the House heretofore, it is my earnest belief that we must now give careful thought and attention to safeguarding our Nation against the situation that will be faced when this period of great defense spending is over. A subcommittee of the Labor Committee, headed by our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], is holding hearings on two resolutions introduced by myself to create an outstanding commission to do this job.

I wish to include herewith first a letter from the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, author of this measure in the Senate, and second, the challenging testimony given this morning by Mr. W. L. Batt, Deputy Director of the Production Division of the Office of Production Management.

I call particular attention to Senator WAGNER'S statement that—

To postpone intelligent consideration is to write half-hearted measures hastily contrived to meet the immediate post-war need. In all probability, however, that need will be so great as to overwhelm any mere stopgap program unless that need is realistically and effectively met; it may even overwhelm our form of government.

And I also call special attention to Mr. Batt's statement that—

The body of thought created by the work of such a commission as these resolutions envisage, could conceivably be the Dutch boy's finger in the dike that will stem the flood of post-war maladjustments.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 21, 1941.*

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am advised that the House Committee on Labor has scheduled public hearings on your House Joint Resolution 76, companion to Senate Joint Resolution 16, which I have introduced in the Senate. The resolution would establish the Post-Emergency Economic Advisory Commission, which is empowered "to study the economic problems likely to confront

the Nation upon the termination of the present defense emergency, and to formulate a comprehensive program for the full utilization of America's resources of men and machines in maintaining and improving the economic well-being of all the people."

I am writing to express the hope that this resolution, together with the similar proposal in your House Joint Resolution 59, may have early and favorable consideration, in appropriate form, by the Committee and the House.

Our democracy faces two major problems growing out of the present world crisis: The first is to defend our land and our free institutions—social, economic, and political—against attack by hostile forces from without. The second is to maintain and improve these institutions in the post-war world, after democratic victory is won by the sword.

To meet the primary problem of military defense we are carrying forward a vast program of industrial production and training of manpower. To meet the secondary but no less vital problem of post-war survival and recovery, we have not even undertaken the essential first steps of consultation and planning. We have already organized vast new agencies of government to tool up for defensive armament. The resolutions under consideration, if adopted in some form, would represent the first national effort looking toward the time when we can tool up for the days and ways of peace.

It is obvious we cannot know now when peace may come or precisely what the state of the world will be. But it is equally obvious that we cannot wait until the emergency is passed to plan for meeting staggering economic problems which can reasonably be foreseen—a sharp decline in national income, an expanded but largely unused industrial capacity, millions of unemployed, vast migrations of workers in search of jobs, and economic chaos in our normal world markets. Expansion of temporary relief and public-works programs will, of course, be necessary. But it must be recognized that the post-emergency problems will be upon us at the very time when we will want to reduce our present burden of public expenditures. To postpone intelligent consideration is to invite half-hearted measures hastily contrived to meet the immediate post-war need. In all probability, however, that need will be so great as to overwhelm any mere stopgap program. Unless that need is realistically and effectively met, it may even overwhelm our form of government.

If we face these post-defense problems with intelligence and courage, the fears of overcapacity retarding our defense program will disappear. Even with the vast appropriations already made, we are far from having taken up the full slack in our unemployed men and machines. We are only now learning the full value of our idle labor and idle industrial capacity. Necessary defense expansion must and will be carried out now, with full confidence in the peacetime future of our system of free enterprise. To help buttress that future will be the objective and the task of the post-emergency planning agency contemplated by the pending resolutions.

In our defense effort the urgency of our requirement is directing the fullest use of all available resources of men and machines. When peace comes we must develop the same urgency, the same sense of national duty and sacrifice, in combating the self-same blight of unemployment, with its shameful waste of resources and its insistent drain on public funds. Submerging political and special interests, and utilizing the national unity born of the all-out defense effort, let us advance now toward planning for that peacetime goal.

If convenient, I would appreciate having this letter inserted in the record of the hearings, together with my statement on introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 16.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER.

TESTIMONY OF W. L. BATT, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PRODUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1941

When Mr. VOORHIS invited me to come before you and present my views on the necessity for immediate consideration of House Joint Resolutions 59 and 76, I was glad to accept, for I believe that the problem which these resolutions are designed to meet is one which merits the most serious attention of all thinking people. It merits consideration now—today—else we shall one day find ourselves at the doorstep of a post-war economic crisis with no previous thought or plan for its solution.

I want to say as strongly as I can that in my opinion it is almost as important to plan effectively—today—for the peace which must come after this war is over, as it is to plan effectively—today—for our national defense.

What I have to say this morning bears not so much on the particular provisions of the two resolutions before you as on their timeliness. The text of resolutions such as these is best perfected by thoughtful discussion between Members of Congress itself, familiar with legislative procedure.

In regard to the provisions of the resolutions I only want to say that I feel the establishment of one commission is better than the creation of two; and that such a commission should be of relatively small size. I have found in my own experience that a large group too easily becomes unwieldy and often falls of its own weight. Then, too, I would not personally favor the creation of an economic commission which, in its individual membership, represents special groups of society, as such, whether they be government, farmer, labor, business, or consumer. Our economic thinking today should not be in terms of special-interest groups.

The problems of business are the problems of labor, and the problems of government are the problems of the consumer and the farmer. I should rather see a commission composed of members picked not because they are representatives of groups but because they are free and intelligent thinkers, men of imagination, initiative, and daring, men whose experience and background have made them familiar with the problems of particular groups, but whose vision enables them to think in terms of the whole economy of the United States not just one phase of it. They should represent the people as a whole, for that is the way this problem must be considered.

In a large sense the only lasting solution to the problems this country will face when the war is over must come through the voluntary decisions and policies of all those engaged in individual enterprise. This battle must finally be won by what I have termed "management's secret weapon"; and by that I mean the much more extensive and planned use of facts and figures about its own business, its own industry, and the whole economy in which it operates. While I do not believe that total economic planning tied up with political control can ever be successful in a democratic country, I do believe that in the future—to a far greater extent than in the past—we must have a more intelligently planned utilization of the productive machinery of our Nation. The body of thought created by the work of such a commission as these resolutions envisage could conceivably be the Dutch boy's finger in the dike that will stem the flood of post-war maladjustments.

To some these maladjustments may not seem so real as they do to me. But I have been saying for some time that as a result of the colossal world revolution now going on and of which we are a part, we face the perfectly plain, inescapable, and inevitable fact that when this war is over, no matter who wins, the world will not resemble the old world of 1939. I need not elaborate on the differences if the Nazis and their satellites come out on top. But what if Britain wins, will it be the same old story of the World War all over again, with the same old British Empire under the same leadership restored to a position of world dominance? We need only look to recent developments for a clear enough indication that the answer to that question is, "No."

But some say, "Britain is at war, and war breeds fundamental changes, but we are not at war; we are only building up our country's defenses." Stated simply, that is true. But in building up our defense high enough and fast enough to be as safe as we can in a dangerous world, we are already doing many things that will affect our economy almost as much as active participation. Let us remember that the most violent disturbance to our own national economy during the World War took place not while we were participants, but before. It was during 1915 and 1916, when our export trade was twisted and distorted and our eventual Allies were placing huge munitions orders in our industrial plants, that we whirled down the road to inflation; that commodity prices increased by 100 percent and more, and that wages and the cost of living doubled. It was then that we began to change from a debtor to a creditor nation. I need not remind you that we had not yet fully adapted ourselves to the economic changes generated during the last war before the present war broke out. Certainly those adjustments would have been more readily made had we planned for them during the war period.

Are we not now engaged in a program which will have still more profound effects on our Nation and its relationships to a world whose make-up we cannot even clearly imagine? I think so.

Once again our export picture has undergone a complete change as a result of the war to date. Our normal peacetime sales abroad of agricultural and consumer goods have been almost entirely replaced by war matériel. Cotton and tobacco and typewriters and apples are not being sold abroad now, but in their place airplanes, machine tools, and army trucks and materials like iron and steel and copper needed by British war industries.

While this is going on our own defense program is tending to make us more than ever self-sufficient, reducing our dependence upon purchases abroad. When this emergency is over and we are trying to convert our defense factories into producers of consumer goods for sale abroad, we shall find that we require fewer products and materials from abroad than ever before. And you know that foreign trade must work both ways. We cannot sell to other countries unless we, in turn, buy from them.

Specifically, the more manganese and tungsten and chrome we produce domestically, the less we buy from foreign producers, and the fewer dollars they have with which to buy our cotton and apples and electrical appliances. Out of sheer necessity we acquired a chemical industry during the World War, and we are likely to acquire new industries and new sources of materials out of this emergency. Once it is over, will we repeat the old formula of subsidies of one kind or another to maintain war-stimulated domestic production? Will we put up another Smoot-Hawley tariff to close our markets to foreign goods, and thereby close foreign markets to our goods?

This is only one of an array of vital problems that this war and our national-defense program are creating for us.

Industrial problems: What to do with the new manufacturing capacity we are creating?

Labor problems: Where to find jobs for the men we are training for the production of wartime materials?

Political problems: Who is to own and operate the plants that the Government is building or paying for in one form or another?

Financial problems: What to do about the Federal debt incurred by necessarily huge spending for defense?

Monetary problems: What about the gold base when we own most of the gold in the world?

All these and many more will present staggering difficulties.

Distinguished from these future problems are the day-to-day overwhelming difficulties which present themselves to the men now working on the defense program. How and where to manufacture sufficient aluminum and magnesium; how and where to obtain adequate supplies of power; how to allot shipping space and priorities for all materials and products? Such problems alone are enough to tax the men who are engaged in the immediate and urgent task of arming the Nation. The others—more complex and long range—are those for which these men have little time. Moreover, the men who are working directly with the defense program have one and only one supreme task—to get the required equipment produced in the least possible time. We should not ask them to be concerned about the long-term implications of how they get it. What then must we do? Let me repeat to you what I said in a speech last December.

"It seems to me essential that we immediately create a small group of the ablest men in the country who would be charged with studying these long-range problems and working out solutions in advance. They ought to be set off in a corner by themselves, instructed to forget all about the immediate problems of procuring war matériel, except as it affects the future national economy. They should set to work now on the preparation of an industrial demobilization plan. Nations have spent decades preparing plans for the conversion of a peacetime economy to a wartime economy. So far as I know, nobody has seriously undertaken the preparation of plans for the opposite process—converting a wartime economy back to a peacetime economy. That might involve the discovery and development of new processes and new products for civilian consumption that could be manufactured on the same machines that now are turning out or preparing to turn out products that are useless in times of peace; plans for the absorption of our newly trained labor in peaceful pursuits; the fundamental policies of foreign trade in a world that will be vastly different from that with which we have ever dealt before.

"This group would need to employ inventors and research scientists, trade experts, and fiscal experts, men of practical knowledge and great vision. They should devote their entire time to the formulation of the best plans that could be evolved for the utilization of our entire resources for the improvement of our standard of living, for the protection of our national economy from the repercussions not of war but of peace, for the conversion of the processes of economic waste to the processes of economic usefulness.

"It is immensely important that we try * * * to make out at least the type and possible shape of the problems we shall meet face to face in the future. And when we discover that these problems will be many and varied and of tremendous significance to our future well-being, then we must meet the next challenge of duty, which is to undertake immediately the formulation of plans for their solution. This was entirely ignored during the World War, and we have not yet rid ourselves of some of the problems that might have been solved before the war was over, if we had had the foresight to do it. In the meantime a new war has come along that will create changes of far greater importance. The men who are devoting their time and efforts to the solution of our armament problem have no time for worrying about the disarmament problem. If we wait until the end of the war, it will be too late.

"There is, in Washington and elsewhere, a general recognition of the importance of planning for post-war adjustments. But as far as I am aware, there is no coordinated thinking along these lines, no organized group with this specific directive. I think that there should be, and I hope to see it accomplished in the near future, for there is no time to waste."

I am of the same mind now as I was then. Since I spoke last December some groups have been studying the problem. The Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, the National Planning Association, and the National Resources Planning Board have all, among others, been at work on initial discussions. But more than that must be done. I sincerely believe that if we tackle this problem of post-war demobilization of industry and manpower with an energy comparable to that which we are now devoting to the opposite process, we can build an economy and a standard of living the like of which the world has never dreamed. We can, in that process, lay the ground-work for an industrial system that will have as its only limits the limits of available manpower for production. This system would be based on a price structure designed to reach a vast reservoir of potential consumers that have in the past only been able to afford the basic necessities of life.

I do not want to bore you with my own philosophy, but it is because of certain beliefs that I hold that I am so strongly in favor of the sort of thing the two resolutions before you propose to do. I have a great and abiding faith in the rightness and the potential good inherent in democracy and in private enterprise. I also have a strong conviction that the dynamics of this system must be consciously planned, directed, and harnessed so that it grows, progresses, and improves. It can neither remain motionless nor be permitted to drift aimlessly. If either of these things happens, our system will be supplanted by something else—something more violent, more restrictive, more suppressive than any of us would like to see.

In other words, I think we should not only be making plans for the demobilization of a wartime economy but also planning for the mobilization of all our resources—human and material—for better living in a world at peace. If I may borrow a phrase from Henri Bergson, it is time "to think as men of action and to act as men of thought."

Keep the Flag of Freedom Flying at the Masthead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. KARL STEFAN, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my distinguished and able colleague, Mr. STEFAN, of Nebraska. No Member of Congress has been more outspoken and consistent in his efforts to keep America out of European and Asiatic wars.

Fellow citizens, we are almost midway between Flag Day, which is past, and the Fourth of July, which is to come. We are in the midst of this marvelous shelterbelt of trees. Someone has so well said: "Only God can make a tree."

I want to talk to you today about what these trees mean to all of us here in our own State of Nebraska, and in every section which will be touched or influenced by this great project. Before I talk to you about these trees, however, I want to talk to you about the question of war, which I know keeps you awake nights as it has kept me awake nights, pondering, wondering, yearning, praying to know what to do. This is a time, my fellow citizens, when we all are torn between our emotional impulses on the one hand, and our logical conclusions on the other. This is a time that rends society if we are not careful. This is a time that divides the sentiments of men; that ruptures friendships between men; that may even divide families. That must not happen in the United States of America.

You know—many, if not most of you here today know—what it meant for you or your forefathers to pull up by the very roots of their heartstrings their love and associations in their native land and come to what, to them, was far away America, their land of opportunity.

Let us be frank with one another here today. Your forebears and my forebears wrenched loose from all they loved on their native soil and came to the shores of the North American Continent and trekked their way across hill, dale, and plain because they wanted to get away from the hatreds and the jealousies and the conflicts and the fears of Europe.

Because I want to talk to you heart to heart, man to man, let me clarify our feelings in this matter at once. We want to stay as free as possible—and when I say "we," I mean you folks and me and all American citizens—we want to stay as free as possible from any foreign entanglement of any kind. We want to stay as far as possible away from the aggressions or the effects of agressions by dictators. We want to maintain and perpetuate free constitutional government in these United States of America. We have a stake in that free constitutional government. We have a stake—not only a material stake of soil and homes but a cultural and spiritual stake—in the Bill of Rights. We have a stake in the biparty system of government, which guarantees that you and your views, be you majority or minority, will be treated with respect and consideration by your Government, by your Congress.

We have a stake in the protection and perpetuation of personal liberty in this Nation because every one of you here today knows that only in personal liberty, only in economic as well as religious freedom, only in equality of opportunity, can there be found those things which make of human life and experience something beautiful and worth while instead of an insane nightmare of horror and suffering.

You and I have a stake, my fellow citizens, in the protection and perpetuation of our system of government, of our system of enterprise, of our system of education, of our system of religious instruction that in a hundred and fifty years have given to America not only the richest, most powerful Nation in the world, but has given to us as a people the highest living levels, the best working conditions, the highest wages, the greatest amount of creature comforts and luxuries, the greatest opportunity for education and spiritual and cultural advancement ever achieved by any people since the

history of man emerged from the dim mists of tradition and dawned into written chronicles.

We need, we must have, and we will have a national defense that will be invincible against the assaults of any nation or group of nations which might at any time in the future consider assaults against us—a national defense so invincible that no groups of nations would even consider trying to come across 3,000 miles or 7,000 miles of stormy seas to disturb us in our peaceful way of life.

I want here, today, to say to you that I refute and deny with every ounce of energy in my being the assertion that dictator-driven slaves are the masters of freemen or ever will be the masters of freemen. I want to say to you here today that with our unequaled capacity for mass production, America, given that unity of purpose, given the spiritual unity which necessarily must be behind unity of effort, can outbuild the world in the luxuries of peacetime or the armaments of war.

I want to remind you and to cheer your hearts today by saying to you that our geographical location on the globe is, of itself, almost as great protection to us as armies and navies. Given an adequate army and a two-ocean navy, in addition, our position will be impregnable.

My fellow citizens, America has been the beneficent and hospitable haven of people from every country in the world. Men and women of every race have found sanctuary and opportunity in this great, wonderful, free Nation of ours. America has been the great melting pot. What do we mean by that term "melting pot"? We mean, my friends, that under the benign influences of a free government, of a free economy, of free enterprise, free speech, free press, free religion, and free politics, men of different races and different tongues have learned to modulate and to adjust their suspicions, their hatreds and even their desires, so that here in this great free land, each man, each woman, each child, can have equality of opportunity.

In God's name, let us respond to those benign influences now. Let those of us of different races and different tongues remember that first and foremost we are Americans of America. Let us remember that first and foremost, while we want to see freedom from oppression reestablished everywhere in the world, we want to make certain that it will not disappear here at home. While we want to help every other country in the world in whatever way we may, to have freedom from want, let us be certain that we eliminate want here at home. There is no tenet of religion or of charity or of generosity that says that we must deny our own to provide for others. Share? Yes; but not to pauperize our own to enrich others. Not to starve our own to feed others.

Our national defense, my friends, must be built as quickly and as efficiently and as economically as an unequaled American ingenuity and capacity to produce can build. We must practice the most rigid self-denial. We must save every possible penny in every department and operation of the Government, because at best the burden of taxation that will be made necessary by the national defense will bear with galling heaviness upon our backs as we work in our Nebraska fields. Many an acre of corn, many a thousand head of hogs, must be produced out of the labor and out of the sweat and the sacrifices of all of us in order that we do not pass on to our posterity, to your children and mine, a burden of debt so great that they will be overwhelmed by a sense of futility and despair.

The countries of Europe must be free again. They will be free again. But we must never lose sight of the fact that our first duty is to keep America free. We must recall what Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and so many others have told us over and over again—that if ever the torch of liberty and free government flickers out on the continent of North America the hope of the world is gone for a thousand years.

We are all grieved by this madness of war. We are all grieved and worried by the stresses and the strains and the unspoken embarrassments which come to us as we meet and talk with our fellow Americans of races different than our own. Let me urge you, today, to forget everything else but that you are Americans, soldiers of the common good here in a great country of riches and opportunity, soldiers under the torch of liberty and the cross of Christianity, soldiers of the lost horizon to maintain in this world, enshrouded as it is in the ruddy clouds of war, Shangri La, the last repository of the highest ideals of man to be kept inviolate and unimpaired and passed on to those who are to come after us.

Oh, if I had a thousand tongues that I might make you realize the more, that you, the landowners, the soil-loving Americans, are the last great hope of a free America.

We have seen groups led astray by leaders who were self-seeking and greedy for power and profit. We have all been alarmed and made anxious by the interferences in the national defense which have been allowed to go to inexcusable lengths. We have all been worried by the constant encroachment of demands for more wages for work in which there was less pride of accomplishment and integrity of effort. All of these internal problems, not the least of which are those which constitute what we commonly term the farm problem, must be solved. These problems have, for the time being, been obscured by the hysteria of war and the haste of national defense. They have been aggravated rather than relieved by the war.

I am not making any appeal to either sectional or group consciousness when I say that as in times past so again will the American farmers prove the salvation of the Nation. Whatever may be the results of the wars in Europe and the Orient; whatever may be the reactions upon our social and economic structure, the foundations of free enterprise, the foundations of the very Bill of Rights itself, will still be rooted in the soil. Regardless of how misguided man may desecrate the world and disrupt human society, we still can and we must go back to the generous breast of Mother Nature for our sustenance and our hope.

That is why, today, this shelterbelt of trees seems to mean so much more to me than it ever has before. We planted this shelterbelt not so much for ourselves as for our posterity. Everything that pertains to farming in America today is being pointed toward a faithful stewardship by us, the faithful discharge by us as trustee of that which is rightfully ours for our lifetime and which must be passed on, not exhausted, not depleted, to our children and our children's children.

As I said a moment ago, we are conserving the soil. We are planting these trees for posterity as well as for ourselves. We all hope and pray that wars may cease; that just peace may be established; that subjugated peoples may be freed again; that leaders so lustful for power that they are willing to wreck civilization may be curbed or reformed. And so, too, do we all pray that the sons of America shall never again have to cross the seas to shed their blood in foreign lands.

If an unhappy turn of events should result in our beloved country becoming involved in armed conflict, then, of course, as American citizens, it would be both our duty and our impulse to render to our Nation every help within our power to come out of such a conflict victorious. Pray God that we may not be involved in armed conflict. Pray God that we may have the opportunity to work out our future in peace. But, should we become involved in a conflict of arms, I know that the love of America will, without hesitation, impel every one of us to perform our patriotic duty.

It is so refreshing to be back home again. Each time I come back to Nebraska, I realize more clearly that in the crowded marts of the eastern cities, that in the smoke-filled atmosphere of the factories, dangerous philosophies of collectivism, of absolutism, of totalitarianism, take root and infect the Washington atmosphere. But when I get back home to Nebraska and look into the clear eyes and honest faces of my own people and feel the firm, honest grip of hands that till the soil, I realize anew that no philosophy of despotism or absolutism, or totalitarianism, or collectivism, will ever eat out the vitals of this free people because the people of the soil and those who breathe the free air of our plains simply can't be fooled that way.

Now, my good friends, I hope I have crystallized in the last few minutes all of our hopes, all of our yearnings to stay out of war, to help the rest of the world in a peaceful way.

Before I pass on to the subject of these marvelous trees, let me say one thing to you and that is, we must ever be vigilant that under the pretense of war, under the pretense of carrying freedom to other peoples throughout the world, we do not give up our free way of life and government at home.

Always, when I return home, I cannot help but think of how fortunate it was, even though partly a matter of chance, that this whole Great Plains region was included in the Louisiana Purchase. It was a matter of chance, at least in part, because the United States intended to purchase only a port at New Orleans, and because Napoleon had his hands full with the English and was in no position to fight for this vast French territory in the New World, and because he needed money badly, this great, rich area was included in the deal. In fact, he would sell the port only if the United States also took the rest of the French possessions. It is idle to speculate what the destiny of this country would have been had we not acquired this rich agricultural land. Certainly it has been, with its tremendous productiveness and its millions of virile people, a vital factor in the making of this Nation, the most powerful nation on this earth.

This great region, one of the finest parts of which is right here in northeastern Nebraska, has become one of the great food-producing regions of our country. It is generally known as the bread basket of the Nation. Its settlement gave impetus to the development of great industries affecting the economic life of the whole Nation. Its products supplied the railroads with the business, for which they stretched into the Plains and on westward; the building of homes for our people provided great markets for lumber and other necessities; the barbed-wire and windmill business developed because people in the Plains needed wire and windmills. Its large farms and great grain fields created the necessity for and resulted in the development of a vast industry producing farm machinery of all kinds. Its corn provided feed for fattening its own livestock and those from ranges farther west.

I could recall more to you, but that is sufficient to illustrate how important these Plains, which we all love as our homeland, are, not only in production of food but in our whole national economy. Just as they were so important in the building of a strong national economy, so are they important in retaining it.

I am glad with you that this year you are receiving again an abundant rainfall. Those who know these plains and know of the drought which prevailed for the past 10 years must think deeply of the courage and the fortitude of you people who have had to contend with such great hardships. There are many who, through no fault of their own, were unable to stay here, and they

moved out. In fact, this is the only region in the United States in w ich county after county lost 10 percent or more of its population during the past decade. This is unfortunate. To many of these people it was tragedy.

I have studied this situation, and I have worried about it. So long as we use these lands, so long as we keep our homes here, we will have to contend with drought, dry winds and blizzards, hail and other things, all of which directly affect our livelihood and our security and happiness. I do not believe that this region is growing steadily drier and more droughty. Those who have studied this question scientifically tell me that there is nothing to show that such is true. The best information I can get shows that we will continue to have wet years and wet periods and dry years and dry periods. If this is true, we must think of this country in those terms and prepare to manage our land and our business in such a way as to minimize the effects of the droughts and enable us to stay on the land and in the towns during times of drought. After all, we have farmed these plains for a comparatively short time, measured by the age of European farming countries.

The first of all homestead patents was issued in Nebraska in 1869. That was only 72 years ago. But much has happened in that short time. Drought and wind and water have taken their toll in fertility of the land. Many of our farms are not capable of producing as they have in the past. Farmers and rural people need many things. They need adequate credit at reasonable cost, they need equitable taxation, good rural roads, good schools, and other public facilities. But as a bedrock support for all these things, there is the necessity to perpetuate a profitable agricultural industry based upon a good sound system of land management that will keep the soil productive for all time to come.

The lessons learned during the past period of drought and wind should not be forgotten when better rainfall years are here. Rather than that we should all be working hard during the good years to put our management of the land on such a sound basis that the periods of drought may not have such disastrous effects.

It is a wonderful inspiration to me, that in spite of the hardships and difficulties you people have undergone in the past few years, in spite of a world torn by war, in spite of all the uncertainties of the future the people of 21 towns in northeastern Nebraska can come together to celebrate and stimulate the planting of trees.

Tree planting both for beautification and for conservation is something very close to my heart. I traveled, as you know, in Europe in 1939 to see and learn what they were doing over there that might be of benefit to us out here. I was struck by the way they have used trees. Wherever I went in those lands which have been farmed for centuries I found trees. And how those trees are cherished, protected, and used. Permission must be obtained to cut a tree, and when one is cut it is used down to the smallest twig. I want to see this tree planting in this country go on and on until our fields, our homes and buildings, our schools and playgrounds, our roads, churches, and cemeteries are beautified and protected by trees and shelterbelts.

Some people think it is strange that we want to plant trees in Nebraska. Some people probably think that I am queer some way because I have worked so hard to keep this tree-planting work going. They don't understand us and they do not understand our need for trees for the spiritual and the material benefits trees bestow in a plains country. And when I think of trees I think of those grand men who had the faith in tree planting that has made Nebraska known as the Tree Planters' State: J. Sterling Morton, who gave us Arbor Day; Dr. Bessey, who envisaged and who initiated the Nebraska National Forest in the sand hills; and I think of Dr. George E. Condra, who has encouraged and aided tree planting in all its aspects in this great State.

I think of the vision of that great forester, Dr. B. E. Fernow, who, away back in 1890—and that, my friends, is 52 years ago—said, "I believe that forest planting is one of the necessary requisites to reclaiming this vast domain. I believe that afforesting this large area deforested by fire and buffaloes and consequent desiccation, is not impossible, but I also believe that success can be attained only by cooperation, by strong hands working together upon a comprehensive plan on a large scale systematically but methodically carried out by commanding knowledge, means, and power such as government only, be it State or general, can command." And, too, I think with reverence of those intrepid pioneers who brought to this State in their covered wagons the first seedlings planted here, and who amidst hardship and danger still found time to dig and plant the wilding cottonwoods and cedars found along the stream courses, and who under the Timber Culture Act left many of the fine groves we have today.

These people, ancestors of many of you who are gathered here today, came from timbered regions. They knew the value of trees; they worked hard to put them here. Much of their effort resulted in failure because they did not know what trees to plant and how to plant and care for them.

A great deal of study has been given to tree planting out here since those early days. The State experiment stations, State forestry agencies, the Bureau of Plant Industry, and the Forest Service have developed a lot of sound scientific knowledge and have gained much experience in tree planting, which is resulting in much more successful work. The old idea that a tree would last forever is being rapidly replaced by the knowledge that trees have a definite span of life just as does a human being. The length of the life span varies according to the conditions under which the trees live. Eventually, however, trees grow old, become diseased, and die. We must all recognize that if we are going to have trees we must plant some new ones each year not only to replace the ones that die but to increase the trees we have now. The planting of new trees must go on year after year.

In my judgment this tree-planting work is one of the essential things that must be done to obtain the full development of our agriculture and the general improvement of living conditions. We need the trees which protect our homes, our land, our crops, and our livestock. We need the shelter which trees afford to our game birds and other wildlife. We need these trees which give us cooling shade in summer, fuel and warmth in winter, and which beautify our landscape. Trees which in their own and no other way will help us to do the thing which I have spoken of before; that is, to make of these plains a permanent and prosperous homeland.

I like to think of what Lydich has done with trees on his farm. As a young man stricken with asthma, the doctor tcld him he would have to move to the mountains among the pines and spruces and mountain breezes. But he didn't move there. He liked Nebraska and his farm and his neighbors too well to do that. Instead he brought the pines and the spruces to his farm. They are a beautiful sight, and many of you have seen them. Would he give them up? I think not.

Many of you here have seen the Earl Lewis, the Duhacek, and the Martischang farms, and how these good farmers have protected the land from blowing by planting shelterbelts; there are many others who have done the same thing. These trees have cost many hours of real effort; they have caused a lot of sweat, but I believe these good men would say they have been worth every bit of it in the protection they have given, and I think their good wives would say the same.

I commend the efforts of the State extension service and the Forest Service in the distribution and planting of millions of trees and fine shelterbelts in this area during the past several years, and I want to commend the farmers who have cooperated so willingly in this great work. After all, the big job of cultivating and caring for the trees after they are planted is the biggest and most important job. No work of this kind could be successful without the unstinting help of you farmers.

The Union Now Movement

REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned over the Union Now movement, reliably reported to be gaining support in governmental circles here and the British Isles.

I am strongly opposed to this country ever becoming a part of the British Empire.

I am certain the plan is unsound, for it is based on force.

There are strong indications when World War No. 2 ends an effort will be made to form what might be called a United States of Europe.

This merger of interests and resources would tend to increase trade between the have and have-not nations and produce prosperous conditions throughout continental Europe. Standards of living would rise and greatly reduce the possibilities of future wars for commercial advantages.

Certain international trade interests in this country and the British Isles foresee this eventuality and they do not like it. Therefore they propose to create a bigger and stronger merger of nations—the United States and Great Britain—for continued domination of world trade.

However, I am in complete sympathy with the idea of close and friendly relations among all English-speaking peoples. I likewise want to see this country enjoy the same good-will relations with all other peoples.

Hitler sold the war to his people on lavish promises of regaining lost trade advantages, and unless steps are taken now to remedy a basic condition, a more equitable division of international trade, the end of this war will settle nothing. It will only sow the seeds for future wars.

And I do not want to see this country voluntarily go into a deal whereby we shall become a party to the suppression of trade possibilities for small nations, and that is what the Union Now advocates contemplate.

I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial from the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of June 4, 1941:

[From the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of June 4, 1941]

EVENTUALLY—WHY NOT NOW?

Some evening when you are wondering how wars can be prevented and how mankind

can be taught to live not only in peace but in a spirit of friendship, you might ponder what would happen if the people living immediately north of the Mediterranean were to organize what might be called a United States of Europe.

Europe, together with Europe's colonial possessions, forms a very good economic entity. As a country, Europe has access to remarkable reserves of cultivable land and minerals. It has access to products of both the frozen north and the Tropics. It has oil, coal, iron, and gold in abundance. If the people of Europe, from the Balkans to Normandy and from Spain to Finland, were to set about to create among themselves the standards of living known in the United States, such a work would take them a century of time and leave none of them the desire for aggression.

If you consider any one country of Europe separately you will see that it cannot survive properly alone. Austria, for instance, lacks a seaport if we think of Austria as separate from Germany. It is not self-contained. Switzerland has beautiful scenery but must import bread. Germany alone has coal but not enough iron or oil. Ninety percent of the people of Russia must find subsistence on 10 percent of the land. Holland is a great dairy country but must import fodder for her livestock lacking enough fields. Poland has been notoriously poor, the peasants of that country trying to survive on an average cash income of only $7 a year—and that was before the recent invasion.

But if Germany lacked iron she had coal. If Austria had iron she lacked coal. If Italy had agricultural lands she lacked oil, coal, and gold. A United States of Europe, with the people free to move about as they please, and to ship as they please and buy what they want without payment of penalizing duties, would give the people a chance to mix and understand one another.

It has been suggested that a United States of Europe might become too strong and want to go to war with the United States of America. But if Europe had plenty why would Europe risk a war to obtain more? Certainly Europe has nothing that we want and we have nothing that Europe could get even if tempted.

Eventually there will be a United States of Europe. It will be organized because that is the sensible way out of Europe's difficulties.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the San Francisco Examiner, commending Congress and our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative JOSHUA L. JOHNS, for officially designating I Am An American Day:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of June 17, 1941]

"I AM AN AMERICAN"

The interest and patriotic enthusiasm of the American people for the I Am An American ceremonies held May 18 throughout the country have been satisfying to all who took part in the observance.

The Congress of the United States certainly made no mistake in giving official status to I Am An American Day, which it did by joint resolution finally approved on May 3, 1940.

It should interest the American people that the author of this resolution was Representative JOSHUA L. JOHNS, of Wisconsin, whose name should thus be permanently associated with future observances of the day.

It is particularly fitting that a Representative of Wisconsin should have contributed so importantly toward giving national character to I Am An American Day.

A Wisconsin community first successfully conducted the patriotic ceremonies which inspired the Hearst newspapers to urge Nation-wide emulation.

On June 4, 1939, the Hearst papers said editorially:

"A patriotic idea worthy of emulation throughout the Nation is that of Manitowoc County and the city of Wauwatosa in Wisconsin in observing Citizenship Day (I Am An American Day).

"All the young people of the country who have attained the age of 21 during the year are formally welcomed as new citizens by the community, each receiving a certificate attesting his citizenship, and each swearing his allegiance to his country and its constitution.

"Months of instruction in Americanism precede the ceremonies, with the result that young Americans reach the estate of citizenship with full knowledge of its rights and privileges as well as its duties and responsibilities.

"In Manitowoc County this year 350 young men and women, born in the World War year of 1918, assembled for this impressive ceremony, before a thrilled crowd of thousands representing the entire State of iWsconsin. This patriotic spectacle reflects great credit upon the people of Wisconsin.

"In administering the constitutional oath to the young citizens of Manitowoc County, Chief Justice Marvin B. Rosenberry of the Wisconsin Supreme Court, said:

" 'The principal purpose and object of this preparation for Citizenship Day is to enable you to exercise this great power wisely and to prepare you to participate as citizens and, if chosen, as officers, to participate in the government of your country.'

"Further emphasis upon the patriotic significance of the occasion was made by President C. A. Dykstra of the University of Wisconsin who, in reminding the newly made citizens that they had set their feet on the road of American democracy, said:

" 'Your fathers have traveled it for centuries. Continue on it and keep it open. Millions yet have the right to be born free.

" 'Let freedom ring. But also let freedom live and work.'

"District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, sent a telegram to the class, which said, in part:

" 'This program is not a mere ceremony. It marks the completion of a formal course of citizenship. Citizenship is in truth a commencement. It is the beginning of a long journey, upon the success of which the future of our country depends.'

"The full measure of the occasion, however, was in the significant response of the young people themselves, as voiced by their spokesman, Jerome A. Mahlberg.

" 'Had it not been for these ceremonies,' he declared, 'many of us might have been content to take our citizenship responsibilities lightly and unthinkingly. But this program, climaxed by the inspiration of this day, challenges us to take our place.

" 'We accept the challenge to put our best thought and our best effort into the serving of our country, our State, and our Nation.'

"It has long been the custom in many American communities to make the induction of new citizens, who have come here from foreign lands, the occasion for formal recognition and observance.

"Native-born Americans, crossing the threshold of citizenship and taking up the burdens, duties, and privileges of citizenship, should be equally recognized and honored.

"It is one of the most important days of a young American's life when he reaches the age of active citizenship.

"He achieves on that day a vote and a voice in his country's affairs.

"Nothing can deprive him of those rights thereafter except his own criminal misconduct.

"He can vote or speak for or against the majority party in government, without risk of life, property, or standing in his community.

"He is an American in full standing, regardless of private wealth or position, regardless of creed or opinion, and regardless of the legitimate minorities or majorities with which he may affiliate.

"Few other countries put such responsibilities upon new citizens or confer such rights upon them.

"Having made the day of such importance, the United States should not let it pass unnoticed.

"The welcome ought to be in keeping with the occasion.

"Americans ought to be more impressed by and demonstrative of their heritage of freedom and their American principles and institutions.

"Certainly young Americans, newly arrived at the estate of citizenship, ought to be received and welcomed with pride and adulation.

"The Wisconsin idea deserves to spread and be Nation-wide, with annual citizenship ceremonies in every State."

Mr. Johns first offered his joint resolution, providing for a day of citizenship recognition, on January 23, 1940, and his earnest advocacy of the matter was properly recognized and rewarded.

The Hearst newspapers, as their readers know, have a deep and intimate interest in "I Am An American Day." They not only discerned the great patriotic merits of the early observances, but foresaw the eagerness and unanimity with which the whole American people would participate in similar observances.

Hence, when the ceremonies of Sunday, May 18, 1941, proved to be the greatest mass demonstration of patriotic enthusiasm and loyalty in our history they brought both satisfaction and credit to all who foresaw that consequence of their enterprise.

The Tanker Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

LETTER FROM ADMIRAL LAND, A RELEASE BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AND A LETTER FROM THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Admiral Land, a release

by the Secretary of the Interior, and also a letter from the Association of American Railroads, with regard to tankers and tank cars, and the shortage of oil and gas:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, June 20, 1941.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: With reference to our discussion today with regard to the tanker situation, you are advised that the Maritime Commission has made a current check of its records which show that American owned or controlled tankers are not carrying oil directly or indirectly to Germany, Italy, or Japan.

No owned or controlled tankers under American registry have engaged in trade to these countries since the outbreak of the war. A check of American owned or controlled tankers under foreign registry shows that none is currently engaged in such a way or has been for the last 6 months, with the exception noted below.

This record excepts the activities of five tankers registered under the German flag and five registered under the Italian flag. Owners of these tankers have been unable to exercise control over their movements during the last year and one-half and have no authentic reports on their activities. A solitary ship under another foreign registry is completing a voyage to Japan under a contract arranged some time ago. Upon completion of this voyage the vessel will be required for other trades.

American-owned or controlled tankers under all foreign registries have been and are now engaged in Western Hemisphere trades, trades to the United Kingdom and to the Dutch East Indies. This particularly applies to tankers which were at one time under American registry and were transferred to Panamanian registry. As will be seen from the table attached the largest single group of such tankers are under British registry and are chiefly engaged in United Kingdom services.

The Commission is cooperating closely with Coordinator of Petroleum for National Defense Harold L. Ickes, and the Commission's control over transportation will be exerted in the interests of inter-American trade, national defense, and aid to the democracies.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

[Enclosure.]

Foreign-flag tankers owned or controlled by American companies as of May 1, 1941

	Number of vessels	Gross tonnage
Argentine	5	11,362
Belgium	1	5,322
Great Britain	88	547,513
Cuban	1	1,983
Danish	1	1,099
French	6	37,816
German	5	49,591
Honduran	1	7,623
Italian	5	35,835
Netherlands	7	39,539
Norwegian	12	96,414
Panamanian	60	498,398
Venezuelan	22	62,617
Total	214	1,395,112

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
INFORMATION SERVICE.

OFFICE OF THE PETROLEUM COORDINATOR FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

(For release Wednesday, June 18, 1941)

Action was taken today by Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense, to increase the prospective supply of petroleum products for the east coast by 5,000,000 barrels annually.

Conferences between the Coordinator and officials of the Sun Oil Co. and the Standard Oil Co. of California resulted in a recommendation by the Coordinator whereby tankers now engaged on routes between California and east coast ports will be switched to runs between Gulf ports and the east coast.

On the intercoastal route the tankers involved carried approximately 4,000,000 barrels of gasoline a year; in the Gulf to east coast trade their annual carrying capacity, due to the shorter haul, will be raised to approximately 9,000,000 barrels annually. (A barrel of gasoline is computed at 42 gallons.)

The Coordinator, in announcing the prospective increase in east coast supply, said:

"The diversion of these tankers to the Gulf to east coast routes involves a sacrifice by the two companies concerned, and will also cause them considerable inconvenience and financial loss. However, they have agreed to the arrangement as a temporary measure in the interests of national defense, and, as Petroleum Coordinator, I wish to express my appreciation of their cooperation in lessening, to some extent, the prospective east coast shortage."

The oil-company officials who participated in the conferences were J. Howard Pew, president, and Arthur E. Pew, Jr., vice president, of the Sun Oil Co., and J. L. Hanna, vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

The tankers have heretofore been engaged in supplying the Sun Oil Co. with special grades of California gasoline under a contractual arrangement between the two companies of more than 10 years standing.

The Coordinator emphasized, however, that this increase in the east coast's supply did not greatly lessen the dangers of a prospective shortage in that area.

"Many additional steps must be taken," he said, "if a serious east coast shortage is to be averted."

The Coordinator's telegram to the two companies follows:

"With reference further to the movement of petroleum products by tanker from California to the Atlantic coast under the contractual arrangement existing between the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Sun Oil Co., the facts submitted and the discussions had with representatives of your company pursuant to my telegram of June 6, have had the careful consideration of this office. It is apparent that the problem is a complex one involving several important considerations which would not appear upon the surface, and I appreciate the enlightenment which your representations have added. That the discontinuance of this movement will considerably inconvenience the two companies involved and call for some sacrifice, I fully appreciate. At the same time we face a critical tanker shortage, with the prospect of a distressing stock situation on the east coast. The temporary diversion of these Pacific coast shipments to Gulf sources will, by reason of the shorter haul, make possible the movement annually to the Atlantic seaboard of some 5,000,000 barrels of petroleum products more than can now be supplied with the same number of tankers from the more distant California points. In the circumstances, even in the face of the facts and points of view which you have presented, I must recommend that the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Sun Oil Co., by mutual agreement, temporarily discontinue these intercoastal tanker movements of petroleum products and so make available for the shorter Gulf haul all of the tankers now engaged in such intercoastal movement. This for such period as a tanker shortage exists or until there is some change in the situation warranting renewed consideration by me and a different conclusion. The cooperation of your company in the development of this subject with my office is much appreciated and augurs well for the future success of our mutual efforts in the interest of national defense.

"HAROLD L. ICKES,
"Petroleum Coordinator."

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1941.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Referring to your conversation with this office this morning concerning the question of tank cars available for the handling of petroleum and its products:

A very recent report of the American Petroleum Institute to the O. P. M. showed that the oil companies and the private car-leasing companies owned together approximately 125,000 tank cars of various kinds and capacities, divided as to ownership about one-third and two-thirds, respectively. The study indicated a present surplus of approximately 20,000 tank cars of various capacities now distributed all over the United States. Direct railroad ownership of tank cars over and above those listed above is somewhat less than 10,000. Approximately 7,000 are used for handling petroleum products. Of the approximate 20,000 surplus tank cars owned by the oil companies and private car-leasing companies, these are capable of handling 200,000 barrels of petroleum and products per day from the southwestern fields to the eastern seaboard.

If there is any further information you desire, will be glad to have you telephone me.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. J. PELLEY, *President.*

Address to the Graduating Class of Howard University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered at Howard University on June 13, 1941, on the occasion of their commencement:

Mr. President, trustees, members of the faculty, distinguished visitors, members of the graduating class, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great honor to appear as the principal speaker on this occasion; an honor to be cherished and remembered throughout a lifetime. Ordinarily, on such an occasion, my remarks would be addressed almost wholly to the graduating class representing the various departments of the university, and to the students of the university. I am deeply conscious of the fact that at this time there rests upon the shoulders of the speaker a responsibility which demands that this address must reach out and touch not only the graduating class and members of the faculty and the visitors who are present, but must include a message dealing with the great world emergency and the contribution

that America's largest minority group is called upon to make in the struggle to safeguard the principles and the life of democracy. In keeping with this thought, I shall divide my speech into two parts. In part 1, I shall endeavor to deal in a brief way with the world situation to which I have already referred. In part 2, I shall address my remarks to the members of the graduating class.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States, it has been my privilege to observe conditions in the world as perhaps no other member of the race has had an opportunity to do. It is an accepted fact that not since this Government was founded has there been such a serious threat to the opportunities and blessings provided in the Government which we refer to as a democracy. At this moment there are powerful forces at work not only in foreign countries but in our own country, which, if successful, will destroy every vestige of liberty and freedom which we have enjoyed under the Government of this country. Indeed, the very Government itself is threatened, and if these forces to which I referred are not arrested, it is only a question of time before all that we hold to be dear and precious in our country and in our Government will be wiped out.

This Government, under the leadership of those charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of government, is putting forth its greatest effort to defend itself and to guarantee the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. To do this, tremendous burdens are being placed upon the backs of every American citizen in one form or another. Hundreds of thousands have been called from their homes and businesses to take up the life of soldiers. Every city and hamlet has sent thousands of youths to the training camps where they are now learning the art and science of war. The Negro youth, in this war as in all previous wars in which this country has engaged, is sharing this responsibility. Tax burdens such as we have not known in our lifetime are about to be imposed upon the jobs and the industrial activities of the country. We are just now having introduced in the Congress a tax bill which we are told will make the heaviest demand upon wage earners and salaried people ever known to us. In addition to this we are called upon to purchase war bonds and war stamps in larger amounts than has ever been true before. On all occasions where I have discussed these war burdens, I have said without hesitation that the Negro will be no slacker. He has always responded to the requests and demands of his Government and his country, and this will be no exception.

Please permit me to say that I am not at all unmindful of the fact that this Government and this country, which the Negro has so generously defended with his means, his blood, and his life, have not looked upon this group of citizens with the same degree of consideration and favor as that accorded all other groups. Maybe it might be that there are those among you now who would like to propound this question to me, namely, "Do you say to us that we should go forward meeting every request and every demand of this emergency without regard to the injustices and discrimination and handicaps which our Government has placed upon this group of citizens?" My answer to this is an unequivocal "Yes."

There is one fact in connection with our situation in America that we should recognize from the beginning. Without due recognition of this fact it is absolutely impossible to reach the right and proper conclusions in the consideration of all the other facts surrounding our case as American citizens. We are a minority group, still carrying upon our shoulders the stigma of slavery and servitude; a condition which cannot be explained away but must be fought and lived down, and when I say "fought and lived down," I mean we must fight to achieve all that any other race has achieved, and at the same time make due allowance for years to pass over our heads before we can receive at the hands of the majority group full consideration and justice, however much this fact might pain us.

I know how easy it is for us to think of our lot in this country and become impatient and thereby lose our balance. I resent with all of my soul and strength every racial discrimination practiced in this country, whether outside of our Government or inside the activities of the Government. I contend that no such discrimination can exist within a genuine democracy. At the same time, I have sense enough to know these things did not grow up overnight. Nor can they be wiped out during one or two short generations. General Armstrong well said that "it takes as long to right a wrong as it takes to commit the same wrong."

I know we are making substantial headway in this country. We have already come a long distance. This progress has been made through patience, tolerance, struggle, prayer, and extreme effort. I plead for a continuance of the exercise of patience and the other virtues which we and our fathers practiced.

In the Congress I have spoken time and again, urging justice for our group, but I have at the same time urged absolute loyalty on the part of our people. Here are extracts from two such speeches:

"THE LOYALTY OF THE NEGRO TO AMERICA IS PLEDGED"

(Speech of Hon. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, May 1, 1940)

"Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, during the nearly 6 years I have served as a Member of this House I have heard much said about different forms of government, dictatorships, etc. At times there have been statements to the effect that certain legislation which we had under consideration pointed toward the setting up of a dictatorship in our country. There is no doubt in my mind but there are subversive influences at work in America and that they are seeking to undermine our Government. They are making their appeal to all supposedly disgruntled groups. I am firmly of the opinion that such an appeal is being made to the Negroes, the largest minority group in this country.

"I have implicit faith in the loyalty of the Negro, but at the present time there are evidences of small groups here and there giving an attentive ear to doctrines which are subversive in their nature. I regard such teachings as being not only detrimental to our Government but most destructive and detrimental to the best interests of my group. I do not wish to go on record as being in sympathy with the injustices from which my people suffer. I have denounced them on the floor of this House time and again. I have pleaded for absolute justice, and I have asked the Nation to wipe out discriminations against the largest minority group; but I look with disapproval upon any activity which smacks of disloyalty to this Government.

"I believe that communism as taught and practiced in Russia is seeking through its agents to disrupt the good feelings between the two races in this country. I deplore this and disapprove it as does the great majority of Negroes. I have no confidence in these so-called revolutionary organizations springing up here and there among certain of our citizens, white and colored. It is my opinion that there are designing white men and women in the United States today who are deliberately seeking to take advantage of whatever dissatisfaction exists among the Negroes and are seeking to use the Negro as a tool against this Government. This I condemn with all of my heart.

"I wish to go on record as condemning the activities of the so-called National Negro Congress as expressed in a resolution which I understand was passed by the organization while in session here last week which resolution purported to set forth a statement that should this country become involved in war with Soviet Russia, Negroes would refuse to fight on the side of our Government. This I brand as a deliberate misstatement of fact. Negroes have always been loyal to this Government. In this time of unrest there might be a traitor found here and there, but I wish to assure this Congress and the Nation at large that the Negro is a lover of this country—it is his home; he knows no other, and while his country might withhold from him, and does withhold from him, many of the privileges of American citizens, the well-thinking Negro does not wish to and will not raise his hand against this Government, it matters not with whom we become engaged in war.

"It is my hope that the American people will never again have the occasion to engage in bloody conflict with any nation, but I say to you that should that day come when we must engage in such a conflict, the Negro will be found loyal to this Government, fighting for it just as he did in the Revolutionary War, just as he did in the Civil War, and just as he did in the War of 1812, and just as he did in the Spanish-American War and in the World War. These persons who resolve otherwise do not represent the feelings, thoughts, and intentions of the millions of well-thinking Negroes to be found in all parts of the country.

"I wish to go on record as thoroughly disapproving the appeal made to the Negro at this National Negro Congress by the labor leader, John L. Lewis. It is my opinion that John L. Lewis is the most dangerous, outstanding leader in America today, and it is his desire to change our form of government and to establish a dictatorship in America. I also believe that he wishes to be the American dictator. God forbid that any such day should come. My final word is this: The Negro stands loyally by the American flag and will give his blood and his life to protect it against any foe, whether German, English, French, Russian, or what not. We are Americans, all of us." [Applause.]

"THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE NEGRO IN THE UNITED STATES

"(Extension of remarks of Hon. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, of Illinois, in the House of Repreeptatives, Tuesday, May 14, 1940)

"Statement by A. Philip Randolph

"Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when there is rumor of much subversive influence at work in the United States, it is only natural for attention to be turned toward the American Negro, who constitutes our largest minority group and who, because of his economic status and political weakness, furnishes the most fertile field for subversive activities in this country. There is no doubt but that there is being made a very serious effort on the part of the agents of subversive propaganda to enlist and organize the Negro against this Government. I am therefore calling attention to a statement made recently by A. Philip Randolph, the former president of the National Negro Congress, an organization which is thought to be dominated by communistic influences and partially financed by Russian Communists.

"'WHY I WOULD NOT STAND FOR REELECTION FOR PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS

"'(By A. Philip Randolph)

"'Notwithstanding the fact that these are serious and grave moments for the present and future of all democracies, I am firmly of the opinion that the Negro, because of his unfaltering trust in God, and his love for peace, transquillity, and justice, and because of his spirit of long forbearance and tolerance, will be the last of American minority groups to yield in any degree to these ap-

proaches and appeals from the agents of subversive propaganda. In this connection I should like to call the attention of white America to the fact that the Negro should be treated with fairness and justice in all matters. How long will white America disregard the rights of this group and expect it to withstand the teachings of those who are unfriendly to our country?

" 'If there should ever come a day when the Negro yields to these influences it will be because of the activities of such white organizations as the Ku Klux Klan and other similar organizations founded and sustained on racial prejudice. I think white America should take due notice and immediately modify its attitude in government and in economic opportunity toward the Negro; give him the same chance and the same consideration that is given all other racial groups. If this is done, there need never be any fear of the Negro going astray.' "

In closing a speech delivered by me in the Well of the House April 22, 1936, I used these words which I wish to have you consider:

"I do not lose patience because we are not doing this thing as rapidly as we would like to do it. I am a student of history. I know how long the white women of this country begged you to let them vote. Quite a change has come over this country. As I look into the Senate I see women there who, 30 years ago, could not even vote. I look at the President's Cabinet, and I see a woman sitting in the President's Cabinet. They tell me it took a century for these women to achieve the success they have achieved in that respect. If it takes a century to do what we would like to do, I still believe that that time will come, and I believe I will live to see the day when we will have the same rights in all of these States that are given all of the other citizens because we are loyal.

"Mr. Speaker, let me close these remarks by using this quotation from Laurence Hope:

" 'Men should be judged not by their tint of skin,
The gods they serve, the vintage that they drink,
Nor by the way they fight, or love, or sin,
But by the quality of thoughts they think.' "

Now, to the young people who are being honored on this occasion by having awarded to you degrees from the various departments of this great university. Let me first extend to you heartiest congratulations. You have made a noble fight—every one of you. I am familiar with the hardships, the difficulties that you have overcome, the struggles and sacrifices through which you have passed. I know this is a glorious moment in your lives. Thousands of persons here and elsewhere share with you that unspeakable joy which this occasion brings.

I shall now speak to you, emphasizing two things: the opportunity and the responsibility which you now assume as new leaders coming into power at this crucial moment. You are charged, every one of you, with the sacred responsibility of going out into the world and succeeding either as teachers, ministers, lawyers, doctors, scientists, engineers, or what not. It is a great thing to start out in active life with the resolution that you will not be a mere cipher in your community, but a real constructive force; that you will stand for something more than a real living-getter or a dollar-getter; that you will not be merely one more citizen, but a strong, robust, vigorous force—a power respected. A force that moves things; will be known as a progressive individual who stands for everything that is for the betterment of your community. You should be ambitious to be something as a citizen besides a specialist in your vocation or profession.

If you would succeed you will not wait around for chance or luck to aid you. You will not think that you must have a complete outfit of the finest tools before you can attempt to do anything. The men who accomplished great things in the past did not wait for fine tools, well-equipped offices, and other people to help them. Men who are doing things today did not wait for somebody or something to smooth the way and remove difficulties before they began their work. They did the thing they set out to do with whatever tools and equipment they could get hold of.

No; it is not fine tools and the best equipment or splendid opportunities, or influential friends, or access to money that make great men. The greatness is in the individual or nowhere. The golden opportunity you are seeking is neither in your environment nor in luck It is not in chance, nor in the help of others. It is in your self alone. You must forge your own key and unlock the door and enter each for himself.

More than a half century ago, Henry Ward Beecher, in addressing a group of young people, had this to say; I quote:

"There is no open door to the temple of success. Every man who enters forges or makes his own key. No one can succeed for another. The key that will unlock your great opportunity to you must be forged by yourself."

There is no happiness like that which comes from doing our level best every day, always, everywhere; no satisfaction like that which comes from stamping superiority, putting the royal trade-mark of excellence upon everything which goes through our hands. Rely on yourselves. This develops strength. Crutches were intended for cripples, not able-bodied young people; and whoever attempts to go through life on mental crutches will not go very far and will never be very successful. No matter where you go, young man or young woman, no matter who your ancestors were, what school or college you attend, or who helps you, your best opportunity is in yourself. The help you get from others is something outside of you, while it is what you are, what you do yourself, that really counts.

Today every word spoken comes from well-wishers. No one does other than commend and encourage you. Tomorrow the story will be different. You will find many who cheer you today will oppose you tomorrow. What now appears to be sympathy and love may prove to be jealousy and hatred, and in moments such as these the real test of your worthiness and your ability will be made. How will you meet difficulties? If you would succeed in any marked way, you must not only be bold, self-reliant, inventive, and original, but you must be determined and uncompromising in your effort to continue the fight through the bitterest kind of opposition, remembering that only a live fish can swim upstream. The force that will maintain you during such trying moments is coiled up inside of you. The reward for which you work is promised to the one who holds out, endures to the end, "to him that overcometh." This is the proof of greatness—when a man can stick to his aim, can deliver his message to mankind, accomplish his mission, in spite of all sorts of embarrassments, irritations, and disheartening conditions.

The Greek philosopher, Epictetus, in his story of how we should struggle with circumstances, says:

"It is circumstances (difficulties) which show what men are. Therefore when a difficulty falls upon you, remember that God, like a trainer of wrestlers, has matched you with a rough young man. For what purpose? you may say. Why, that you may become an Olympic conqueror; but it is not accomplished without sweat. In my opinion, no man has had a more profitable difficulty than you have had if you choose to make use of it as an athlete would deal with a young antagonist."

Epictetus, in writing on the subject How We Should Struggle Against Appearances, had this to say—I quote:

"Every habit and faculty is maintained and increased by the corresponding actions—the habit of walking by walking, the habit of running by running. If you would be a good reader, read; if a writer, write. But when you shall not have read for 30 days in succession, but have done something else, you will know the consequence. In the same way, if you shall have lain down 10 days, get up and attempt to make a long walk, and you will see how your legs are weakened. Generally, then, if you would make anything a habit, do it; if you would not make it a habit, do not do it, but accustom yourself to do something else in place of it."

You must subdue in a large measure self-interest and work for the good of your fellow man.

A few days ago I read from Dale Carnegie to this effect: That the one word which is used more than any other in the English language is the personal pronoun "I." When you look at a group of pictures made on this occasion, whose picture will you look for first? Will it be that of yourself or that of one of your many teachers and benefactors? If you are selfish you will look first for your own picture. We find that this spirit manifests itself in thousands of young lives. It is the spirit of selfishness, and in this connection permit me to say that I am told—and I think truthfully so—that the smallest package in the world capable of being wrapped up is an individual who is wrapped up in himself.

You must not go from these halls feeling that you have reached the goal of your life. You must remember that these degrees which you are receiving mark the commencement of a career which is to be lived out in each life. In this connection let me tell you the story of a cartoon I saw in a Chicago paper many years ago, depicting the graduation of a young man from the University of Chicago.

On the front page of one of Chicago's great metropolitan dailies was this young college graduate, dressed in cap and gown, holding in his hand the diploma. In the same picture stood the world. The conversation that took place between them was something like this: The young college man said to the world, I quote: "I am an A. B. from the University of Chicago." The world in turn said to the young man, I quote: "You have learned 2 alphabets and there are 26 in the language. If you will come over and grapple with me for a few years, I will teach you the other 24 alphabets." This is more than a mere story. It has in it a great lesson for the thousands of young people throughout this country who are today receiving their diplomas.

One writer has well said that the success of young graduates depends solely upon their efficiency. I think this is true, if taken in the broadest sense. My definition for efficiency is simply this: The ability and the willingness of one to do the right things in the right way at the right time without having to be told or helped.

In conclusion, let me say that you have been favored and blessed immeasurably through and by the unusual opportunities provided for you at this great institution—an institution which is semigovernmental in its existence, but thoroughly democratic in its operations. I regard this institution as being the most thoroughly democratic university in this country. You have been served here. Now with the choicest blessing of this institution and your Government upon your heads, you are sent forth to serve.

Will you go forward from this almost sacred spot to render every possible service to your fellowman, your community, your church, your race, your country, and your God, remembering as you go:

"The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flights;
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night?"

Proposed Trade-Treaty Agreement With Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK CARLSON, OF KANSAS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Washington, D. C., June 23, 1941, on the proposed trade-treaty agreement between Argentina, Uruguay, and the United States:

Mr. Chairman, I regard it not only a duty but a privilege to appear before this body and express my views on the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between Argentina, Uruguay, and the United States. I appear here this morning as a representative of one of the great agricultural districts of Kansas, which, I believe, is typical of the other agricultural sections of the United States.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I believe I am familiar with the trade-treaty program. During the past few years much stress has been placed on the good-neighbor policy. The term we now hear used is "hemisphere solidarity." The present is a very opportune time to use these phrases, especially in dealing with pan-American countries.

Everyone realizes the seriousness of the present international situation, but even at that our Nation must think clearly and sanely on matters dealing with international trade. We must not be carried away by an idealistic approach to our problem. We must be realistic. The present world conflict, as well as every other international conflict in the past, is an economic one. In simple language it is a struggle for future trade. It is an easy matter to negotiate trade treaties on an idealistic basis. However, this method of negotiation can be very destructive to our national economy. The present proposals are no exception. It is my contention that the home market must be protected and preserved for our producers. This is particularly true as far as agriculture is concerned. The chief surplus product of Argentina and Uruguay is beef. What those countries desire and insist on having in trade treaties with the United States are tariff concessions that will make this country a permanent market for that surplus. As a concession on their part, Argentina and Uruguay would lower the tariff on motor cars, refrigerators, and products that are not produced in those countries.

Geographically, Argentina is so located from a climatic standpoint that it produces practically every farm commodity that we raise in this country. It is easily the leading agricultural nation of the world. With a population of only 13,000,000 people she leads the world in total agricultural exports, being first in the export of beef, linseed, and corn and second in wheat, wool, and mutton. With a population of only one-tenth of the population of the United States she has exported annually an amount approximating $400,000,000 to $650,000,000. She must export her beef, wheat, wool, etc., or become an industrial nation. The latter will not be easy as Argentina has no iron, coal, petroleum, gas, rubber, copper, tin, lead, zinc, or aluminum which are so necessary for an industrial nation. Under these circumstances she feels it is absolutely necessary to find a market for her beef and other farm products in the United States. The principal markets for surplus farm commodities for both the United States and Argentina are in Great Britain and continental Europe. The world conditions are such that neither the United States nor Argentina have been able to dispose of much of their surplus farm crops in this great market. It is true that the United States is at the present time shipping some surplus farm commodities to Great Britain through the lease-lend program. Everyone realizes that the farm commodities which are now moving on this basis will eventually be a direct gift to that nation. Few people realize that it is 6,500 miles from New York to Buenos Aires while it is less than 3,000 miles to important markets in Europe. The distance from Argentina to Europe is more than twice that from New York to the same points in Europe. This is a further reason why Argentina and Uruguay are so insistent on negotiating a trade treaty at the present time that will move their agricultural products into the United States. Argentina can produce food so cheaply on her new fertile soils that the United States cannot compete without shrinking the income of the United States farmer. The proposed trade treaties are considering concessions to Argentina on prepared or preserved meats, meat extracts, corn-beef hash, wool, hides, skins, tallow, grass seeds, alfalfa, broom corn, flax, and many other items that indirectly affect agriculture.

A glance at the list of proposed items shows that this country will undoubtedly receive many livestock and other agricultural products and commodities, either in the original or processed form, which we do not need, some of which we have surpluses so large that they are actually depressing prices on American markets.

American producers are not unreasonable in asking that the domestic market be reserved for their products in accordance with their ability to supply it profitably. The American farmer's economic position has become such that they now realize their own future welfare necessitates vigorous opposition to the admission of certain competitive farm products from other lands which they are in a position to supply. They know that the defenses and the welfare of their families depend upon what they and others employed by them do about the matter.

The total imports of agricultural products for 1940 represented a total paid value of $2,370,200,148. All American products displaced by these imports is estimated at 118,510,007 acres, or, stating it another way, 581,092 farms of average size (174 acres) were displaced.

Some folks are inclined to excuse or apologize for bringing in these imports on the ground that they represent only a small percentage of all our total production and requirement. In answer, it is important to emphasize the fact that with certain of these products the quantity brought in may represent the difference between profit and loss for the American producer.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to a wire I recently received from several of the livestock commission agencies at Kansas City, Mo., and ask permission to make it a part of the record. There is a prevailing impression that cattle producers and cattle feeders are all making money and the wire which I am placing in the RECORD gives some information on this. It states that since January of this year market prices for choice heavy beeves have declined until today we find the beef costing buyers in many instances within 1 cent per pound dressed of low-grade cow beef. The wire further states that "It is our opinion that the present semidemorialized condition of the market for thick, fat, heavy steers weighing 1,250 to 1,500 pounds could be alleviated and materially helped by purchases for Army and Navy use of this choice product." Quoting further from the wire: "We must not fail to remember the importance of beef cattle to our agriculture and the fact they constitute the largest money investment of all livestock, moreover that it takes 8 to 12 months at a cost per pound of gain of approximately 12½ cents to produce a choice mature steer which now sells on the hoof from $9.75 to $10.50. We earnestly request your support and assistance toward the end of helping maintain prices for beef cattle at a cost-of-production figure."

For the past few years the beef-cattle industry has been in a more favorable position than any other farm enterprise. We must remember that it was just 7 years ago that the farmers and stockmen of our Nation were forced to sacrifice nearly 15,000,000 head of cattle and sheep because of the severe drought and feed shortage. These cattle were disposed of at a price of from $15 to $20 per head. Many of these cattle represented investments of $40 to $100 each. It will take many more favorable years to repay the losses sustained in sacrificing these herds that it had taken a half century to build. We have not only the best cattle industry in the world but we have the best markets of any consequence in the world. If we reduce the tariff duties on meat and other livestock products so that this Nation becomes the dumping ground for competitive products and commodities produced with cheap labor we will revert to conditions existing in this country nearly a hundred years ago. For example, the producers of cattle that goes into South American canned beef on the average receive $3.43 per hundred, which is about a third the price to American beef producers. The laborer who processes this meat, the transportation company that moves it, the merchant who disposes of it, receives wages from one-fifth to one-tenth of what we pay in the United States. We do not believe anyone in this country wishes to place the farmers and laborers of this Nation in competition with this low wage scale and the economic conditions that surround it.

In conclusion I wish to state that the American stockman and farmer does not need to prove that he is a good neighbor and patriot. For centuries our ancestors have always extended a helping hand to the needy and oppressed. We have always been foremost in patriotism. We have always been in the front ranks of every patriotic move to protect our Nation and defend our principles. Agriculture is inclined to view a reduction of tariff rates to appease neighboring countries and certain groups at home with great misgivings. The American farmer and stockman has already suffered considerably in the past and present indications are that great readjustments will have to be made following the conclusion of the great struggle in the world today. No doubt at that time the farmer will be called upon to make even greater sacrifices in the form of taxes and the loss of markets. He has always met these conditions with great fortitude. However, he is now insisting that nothing be done in the way of tariff reductions that will place him in further competition with foreign producers. Let us give him the benefit of the American market, which is rightfully his. Thank you.

The telegram referred to follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 19, 1941.*

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Corn Belt and Midwestern States farmers and cattle feeders have on hand and are now offering on the public livestock markets of the country the finest selection of mature beef steers that has been presented in many years. They represent the product of long hours of careful and painstaking care and handling on the part of the feeder as well as

a very substantial investment in money and feed. Since January of this year market prices for these choice heavy beeves have declined until today we find the beef costing buyers in many instances within 1 cent per pound dressed of low-grade cow beef. Conditions which permit of such an unheard of and deplorable situation in the beef trade should challenge and arouse to action all factors in the industry as well as people generally. The prosperity of America lies very near the soil; the products of 75 percent of all our cultivable acres finds its market through livestock. The successful defense of America will be closely bound up with our farmers. Ability to provide the storehouses with an abundance of health- and strength-giving meats. They cannot be expected to do this at a loss, however; prices presently prevailing for choice mature beeves are below the cost of production. This will result, if continued, in discouraging the feeding of beef cattle; in fact it has already done so. It is our opinion that the present semidemoralized condition of the market for thick, fat, heavy steers weighing 1,250 to 1,500 pounds could be alleviated and materially helped by purchases for Army and Navy use of this choice product. Meat to have quality must be rich in fat, yet we understand to come within Army specifications it cannot be too well-fatted. For the next 60 days an oversupply of this grade of beef will burden the trade and the feeders of such cattle will suffer tremendous losses unless something is done to provide an additional outlet for the meat. Our boys in the Army camps are entitled to the best. Giving them the top in beef at but slightly increased costs over inferior grades and thereby helping the men who produce it seems consistent with sound business practices. In the efforts now being made to make hog raising and grain production profitable, we must not fail to remember the importance of beef cattle to our agriculture and the fact they constitute the largest money investment of all livestock. Moreover that it takes 8 to 12 months at a cost per pound of gain of approximately 12½ cents to produce a choice mature steer which now sells on the hoof from 9.75 to 10.50. We earnestly request your support and assistance toward the end of helping maintain prices for beef cattle at a cost-of-production figure.

Farmers Union; Live Stock Commission Co., W. G. Bernhardt, Manager; Texas Live Stock Market Association, Dick Arnett, Jr., Manager; Producers Commission Association, Lester H. Ryon, Joe R. Hoover, representing customers with 1,200 heavy cattle ready to market; Fred H. Olander, chairman, Missouri River Markets Group.

Farm-Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

LETTER OF HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE, OF INDIANA, TO INDIANA FARMER'S GUIDE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter concerning the shortage of farm labor which I have written to the Indiana Farmer's Guide, an agricultural magazine published at Huntington, Ind.:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1941.

Mr. C. E. HUGHES,
Indiana Farmer's Guide, Huntington, Ind.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: Glancing through the June 14 issue of the Farmer's Guide, I came across an article dealing with the agricultural labor shortage which interested me very much.

Although outside of farm publications this problem has been given very little publicity, there is no denying the fact that this is a serious bottleneck in our defense program—one which should be dealt with promptly and effectively if the Government program calling for increased production of farm commodities is to be successful.

What is the answer? Your article suggests a partial solution through the utilization of C. C. C. and W. P. A. labor. I believe you are on the right track, and that a practical plan along these lines could be developed.

Supplementing this, however, should be the general deferment by local draft boards of all young men engaged in agricultural pursuits. Brig. Gen. Lewis B Hershey, Selective Service Director, is aware of this problem and has recommended a more liberal interpretation of the draft law as it affects registrants employed on farms.

As a further suggestion I have in mind the possible establishment of farm employment agencies in rural counties, through which farmers could fill their part-time and seasonal employment requirements. A plan similar to this has operated successfully for generations in my native Scotland.

These agencies could operate in cooperation with representatives of local branches of the W. P. A., the C. C. C., and township relief organizations. Relief recipients and other able-bodied, unemployed men could be registered to provide a reservoir of farm labor for the busy seasons. Registration should be compulsory and relief should be withheld from those unwilling to accept farm employment at a reasonable wage.

I feel confident that with the full cooperation of the Government, and of the above-named agencies, such a plan could be made to work.

Certainly something must be done to meet this problem if national-defense food requirements are to be met. We cannot afford to drift along as we have been, with conditions growing more critical by the day.

You may count on my full support of any constructive program for the solution of this very serious problem.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. GILLIE.

Committee of Americans Presents Unique Radio Program — The Congressional Mail Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, both because of the unique character of the broadcast and the timely importance of the subject with which it deals, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the script of a radio program sponsored by the Committee of Americans and participated in by four Members of this House.

This program, called the Congressional Mail Bag, and released over the facilities of the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. on June 20 last, is the second in a series of broadcasts which are designed to emphasize and impress the people who compose a Congressman's constituency with the importance of the legislative branch of the Government; to highlight and dramatize the relationship of the people back home to their chosen Representatives in Washington.

This unusual and highly interesting radio presentation is but one phase of the splendid educational program which the Committee of Americans has been carrying on ever since its inception in 1935. The committee, through full page advertising, posters, news stories, and booklets, valiently defends and extolls at every opportunity the American way of life and, by constructive criticism and helpful suggestions, has had much to do with shaping national thought in respect to the necessity of sanity in governmental affairs.

In the light of its various activities in the public interest, I know of no organization with the name of which we have in recent years become familiar, which is rendering a more valuable service during these days of successive national emergencies when crisis upon crisis follows so closely upon those which have gone before.

The chairman of the committee is the venerable Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus of the Harvard Law School. Its vice chairman is Prof. Edwin W. Kemmerer, of Princeton University, an internationally known authority in fiscal affairs. Its president is the able Berkley A. Thomas, of New York City, whose public service commands the respect and admiration of all of those who are familiar with his works.

During the course of the broadcast to which I am now making reference, Mr. W. Royce Powell, of Washington and New York, a publicist of wide reputation, acted as master of ceremonies.

The text of the sponsored radio program, the Congressional Mail Bag, follows:

Speakers: The Honorable Charles S. Dewey, Member of Congress, Illinois; the Honorable Thomas H. Eliot, Member of Congress, Massachusetts; the Honorable Bertrand Gearhart, Member of Congress, California; the Honorable Lansdale Sasscer, Member of Congress, Maryland, and W. Royce Powell, for Committee of Americans.

ANNOUNCER. In these times of world-wide stress and pressing domestic problems, what are Mr. and Mrs. America thinking? What better way to find out than to see what they are writing their elected Representatives in Congress. The National Broadcasting Co. brings you a second program presented by the Committee of Americans in which the legislative branch of our Government discloses what is the tenor and temper of its daily mail. Tonight a member of the Committee of Americans interviews four Members of the House of Representatives in the Nation's Capital who will speak to you from Capitol Hill. Presiding over the letter opening will be Mr. Royce Powell of the Committee of Americans.

Mr. POWELL. This is Royce Powell in Washington about to open the Congressional Mail Bag. Tonight we are extremely fortunate in having as guests on the Mail Bag program four Members of the House—a Democrat from New England, a Democrat from the South, a Republican from the Middle West, and a Republican from the west coast.

It is one of the purposes of the Committee of Americans to reemphasize the importance of the legislative branch of the Government, and with so much important legislation being initiated in the House, we feel that the speakers on this program represent about as broad a constituency as it is possible to obtain. With us tonight on Capitol Hill are Republican Congressman CHARLES S. DEWEY, of Illinois, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee; Democratic Congressman THOMAS H. ELIOT, of Massachusetts, a member of the Judiciary Committee; Republican Congressman BERTRAND GEARHART, of California, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and Democratic Congressman LANSDALE SASSCER, of Maryland, a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. I don't know just exactly what they are going to talk about, but suppose I ask them? Mr. DEWEY, in the light of the mail which you have been receiving with what subjects will you deal tonight? Congressman DEWEY, of Illinois:

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Powell, when I say that my mail has a tax to grind, I mean that the bulk of it shows a thoughtful interest in the public debt and how it shall be met. I, therefore, will confine myself largely to the subject of taxes.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Mr. Dewey. And Congressman ELIOT of Massachusetts will give us a general index of what your mail contains?

Mr. ELIOT. Well, let's look at my mail. The first letter is from a young fellow who wants another physical examination because he is sure his blood pressure is not so high as the Navy medical examiner said it was. This lady wants a job, any kind of a job. Here's a letter protesting against gasless Sundays. Here's one wishing me a happy birthday. Here's a man who wants to work in Trinidad and here's someone who wants a passport in a hurry—there is a much greater variety than you would think.

Mr. POWELL. Very good, Congressman ELIOT, and I hope you had a happy birthday. And now, Congressman GEARHART, what are your good Californians talking about aside from the weather?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Powell, the weather is so good at home it has ceased to be a topic of conversation. What my people are deeply interested in is what they may expect in way of a tax bill from the House Ways and Means Committee. So, like my colleague [Mr. DEWEY], I will grind a few taxes, too.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Mr. GEARHART. And now to hear from the Free State of Maryland. Congressman SASSCER, what say your constituents about the passing scene?

Mr. SASSCER. To be sure my people are very much like Mr. ELIOT's in New England. They are also plenty tax-conscious being so close to Washington, but they are equally interested in a project which, though seemingly remote from us, will have a vital effect upon the great port of Baltimore. I mean the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. So I will take this opportunity to catch up on some of my mail by dealing with both subjects.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, gentlemen of the House. And now to open the Congressional Mail Bag. I am first going to call on Republican Congressman CHARLES S. DEWEY, of Chicago, who represents a large and varied constituency. I call on him with particular interest, because he is an authority on that subject on which we will soon be authorities or semiauthorities—taxes. To refresh everyone's memory, Mr. DEWEY was formerly Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and was one-time financial adviser to the Polish Government. Congressman DEWEY, will you be good enough to tell us in a general way how the billions will affect the millions?

Mr. DEWEY. I'll do my best, Mr. Powell. What you ask is a bigger order than I can fulfill without becoming statistical at an hour of night when America would prefer to be soothed by a lullaby. And yet, and yet, it is perfectly clear that the citizens of this country must prepare themselves now or wait until next March to support an unprecedented tax burden. That the people are becoming aware of this fact is shown by the mail I have been receiving from home.

Mr. POWELL. You mean, Congressman DEWEY, that the rank and file are now ready to recognize that this defense program is every man's program and not something which will hit only "the other fellow"?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes, Mr. Powell; the mail from back home reflects an amazingly intelligent interest in the subject of who's doing what to whom and how much will it cost. For the last several years the Federal Government has been engaging in all kinds of extravagances. No one seemed to give much thought to how the money would be raised. But the people are beginning to appreciate now that the day of the tax collector is close at hand.

Mr. POWELL. Excuse me, Mr. DEWEY, but would you tell us just how this widespread interest manifests itself in the mail you receive?

Mr. DEWEY. The mail I receive on this subject seems to fall into two general categories. First, I have received a great many letters objecting to some specific tax that has been proposed, such as the excise tax on fuel oil, on soft drinks, on theater-admission tickets.

Mr. POWELL. What is the other category in which you state your mail can be classified?

Mr. DEWEY. Secondly, I have received a number of letters from owners of industries in our smaller communities expressing concern over the proposed estates-tax increase. These small businesses are, to my way of thinking, the backbone of American business. They employ 44 percent of all factory workers and produce almost half of our manufactured products.

Mr. POWELL. How would these little businesses be affected by the new estates tax, Mr. DEWEY?

Mr. DEWEY. These little businesses are generally owned by the persons who originated them. When such a person dies his estate will be hard pressed to pay the stiff tax. It may, in many cases, necessitate a complete liquidation of the company or its sale to some outside speculating interest. That would be disrupting to employment in the community where the factory exists.

Mr. POWELL. If the new estates tax is adopted, is there any way to avoid this adverse effect?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes; I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee with a plan for prepayment to the Treasury of the estimated tax during the life of the factory owner. By this method the factory owner could arrange to protect the future of his little company. Moreover, the Treasury would benefit by having the use of the prepaid tax funds, which would bear no interest. The plan protects not only capital but also labor's possibility of continuing employment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. DEWEY, may I inject a question at this point?

Mr. DEWEY. Certainly, Mr. Powell.

Mr. POWELL. I'm sure both ourselves and the radio audience would like to know—aside from these special protests—what does your general mail reflect, Mr. DEWEY, with respect to public opinion on the general matter of footing the defense bill?

Mr. DEWEY. The other communications I receive from home on the subject are of a somewhat different nature. The writers do not protest against some specific tax but protest against the large expenditures for nondefense matters. In other words, my people are asking, and they have a right to ask, why must we pay these new taxes when the Government does nothing about reducing the cost of Government. The writers express a willingness to pay whatever taxes may be necessary to defray the cost of the defense program, but they contend—and I think rightly—that expenditures on items not essential to our national defense should be substantially reduced.

Mr. POWELL. In connection with these so-called nondefense items, to what do the protests from back home refer, Mr. Dewey?

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Powell, they refer to a billion-dollar proposed expenditure for agricultural parity payments and the St. Lawrence waterway project.

Mr. POWELL. In other words, your people feel it is time to call a halt to spending of this type which is neither necessary to alleviating crop depression or national defense?

Mr. DEWEY. Exactly, Mr. Powell. And I should like to point out——

Mr. POWELL. Please go ahead, Congressman DEWEY——

Mr. DEWEY. I should like to point out, in connection with our increasing debt, that the present $19,000,000,000 expenditure called for in the current Budget does not include the $450,000,000 item for agricultural parity payments which the Senate inserted in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, now in conference. Nor does it include the St. Lawrence waterway project which the President recommended to Congress and has just revived. It has been estimated that the total cost of the St. Lawrence waterway project would be $1,220,588,000, of which the United States Government would pay $533,221,000.

Neither of these items, amounting to $1,000,000,000 above the Budget estimates, can be said to be essential to our national defense. The St. Lawrence waterway project cannot be completed until 1947, even if authorized. In my judgment it would be a serious mistake to make this expenditure when our absolutely essential defense requirements are so great and we are asking the people to pay taxes which, although the heaviest in our history, do not bring the revenue into balance with expenditures.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. DEWEY, what in general is your reply to these various communications you receive from home on the subject of taxes?

Mr. DEWEY. That is not an easy question to answer. No two letters may be exactly alike. Each may emphasize a different point.

Mr. POWELL. We can appreciate that. But perhaps you can give us just a general idea, the general nature of your reply.

Mr. DEWEY. For one thing I try to make it clear that there is going to be a substantial increase in taxes. It will be a heavy burden and we will be required to make an adjustment in our living. I strongly recommend that the people prepare now to meet the tax collector, who will make his appearance on March 15 next, demanding prompt payment.

Mr. POWELL. Do you mean you recommend that the people begin now to save for this tax-collecting day?

Mr. DEWEY. Precisely. I think the Government should put on a campaign along this line. And I also recommend to my correspondents that they insist that their Government eliminate and reduce all expenditures not essential at this time for defense.

Mr. POWELL. I wish to thank you, Mr. DEWEY, for this splendid contribution to the Congressional Mailbag program and especially for your constructive suggestion with respect to how America's small businesses may be protected and preserved.

Mr. POWELL. You've just heard Congressman CHARLES S. DEWEY of Illinois. The Congressional Mailbag now takes pleasure in introducing a Representative of the Free State of Maryland, Mr. LANSDALE SASSCER, a Member of the House Naval Affairs Committee. Mr.

SASSCER, is your mail also crowded with comments on taxes?

Mr. SASSCER. Yes, Mr. Powell. The subject of taxes is arousing a lively interest from all walks of life which is a healthy sign. Some of my constituents are fairly well versed on the subject but others are not. The main criticism with the present tax set-up seems to be that it is complicated, penalizes certain commodities at the expense of others, etc.

Mr. POWELL. Congressman SASSCER, would you be good enough to give us your general opinion on the whole subject?

Mr. SASSCER. I'll be glad to, and I think they represent a fair crosscut of the views of my constituents back home.

Mr. POWELL. Good. Please proceed. Mr. SASSCER.

Mr. SASSCER. It is most important that we coordinate our tax sources with a view of having each source carry a more just proportion of the expenses of our Government.

For many years our tax system has been constructed like a crazy quilt, a patch here and a patch there, without any regard for coordination. This probably is due to changing membership in State and Federal legislative bodies and on the committees which formulate the tax policy of the legislative bodies. This wrong approach is also intensified because it is easier to spank a child twice who is across your knee than it is to catch another one.

Unless the problem of taxation is approached and applied in a comprehensive program which coordinates the various tax sources with the view of having each carry only its just share of Government expense and defense requirements, and if the tendency to pyramid taxes on existing sources is continued without regard to existing inequities, our taxes could easily, in some instances, become punitive and sufficiently destructive to dry up the sources of revenue on which the pyramiding continues. This is particularly true as to cigarettes, automobiles, automobile accessories and, to some extent, as to income tax.

The important element is that taxes be sufficient in this emergency to permit us to carry on the essentials of strong government, to permit us to build the greatest navy, and to provide an over-all national defense as rapidly as possible. And I think that's what this Congress will do with respect to levying taxes.

Mr. POWELL. May I ask a question, Mr. SASSCER?

Mr. SASSCER. Certainly, Mr. Powell.

Mr. POWELL. While the people back home have not actually received the new supertax bill yet, how do you find they feel about the burden which they will ultimately bear?

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Powell, I find that our people in Maryland at least—and I believe this attitude generally true—will pay fair and needed taxes more willingly than ever before and without a whimper. With the tremendous cost of national defense confronting us, and with this willingness and cooperation prevailing among our people, this Government should cooperate in an effort to keep nondefense items at a minimum and to discontinue, or at least defer, nonessential items.

Mr. POWELL. In that connection, Congressman SASSCER, what do you and your constituents consider under the classification of "nonessentials"?

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Powell, I consider—and I believe I reflect the viewpoint of my State—that super, high-costing projects, such as the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project, which has just been revived, is nonessential. The project is not essential to defense. I have taken from my files two very typical letters. One is from D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in Cleveland, Ohio, and the other is from an everyday citizen of Elkridge, Md. First, the Elkridge letter, and I quote:

"Referring to the St. Lawrence project, I hope you will use your influence against this at this time. It will be 2 or 3 years before this could be used, and, in spite of all the proponents say, it is going to use a tremendous amount of money, energy, material, and labor now at a time when they are all desperately needed for our present emergency. The project may be a good one, but I think it very poor policy to put through pet projects under the guise of national defense."

Do I have time to read you excerpts from the union letter, Mr. Powell?

Mr. POWELL. Most certainly, Congressman SASSCER. Please proceed.

Mr. SASSCER. This letter does not attack the St. Lawrence project on the grounds of nondefense but on the grounds that it will in the long run tend to create unemployment among railroad workers:

"The development and operation of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway transportation facilities will result in diversion of business from existing transportation agencies and in thousands of railroad employees losing their jobs. Mining, shipping, and all forms of transportation will be adversely affected, and employees engaged in such industries, like those on the railroads, will find themselves among the ranks of the unemployed."

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Mr. SASSCER. Over and above these objections, I presume the people of Maryland, particularly of Baltimore, have a very definite sectional reason for opposing the St. Lawrence water proposal.

Mr. SASSCER. They do, indeed, Mr. Powell. Baltimore commercial and maritime interests are vigorously opposing the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence navigation and power agreement. It is regarded as unsound on a national basis and as menacing to the port and city of Baltimore. The project, which has lacked economic justification through the years and is now urged as a defense measure, is believed to be contrary to the immediate needs of national defense.

Baltimoreans look upon the port employment factor as of great consequence. Approximately 15,000 port workers in many classifications gain their livelihood from harbor activity and the needs of interior traffic movement and many more are indirectly dependent on the port and its steady operation. A large number of port jobs are at stake in the St. Lawrence proposal.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Congressman SASSCER, of Maryland. Congressman ELIOT, we all got a warm, human chuckle about your summation of the mail which you receive, for we know it is typical that the people who elect you Congressmen to office continuously look to you for everything. I'm sure we all agree that that is the way it should be, because the last remaining and truly greatest people's forum left in the world today is the Congress of the United States of America. But will you tell us what Massachusetts——

Mr. ELIOT. Yes; I will, Mr. Powell. And I think the whole eastern seaboard is as equally concerned as is my home State.

Mr. POWELL. You mean oil, Mr. ELIOT?

Mr. ELIOT. I do, indeed, or rather of the threatened lack of it. Right now, I suppose the biggest question about which people are writing me is the threatened oil shortage in New England. This talk about gasolineless Sundays certainly started something and it is right that it should. If we are going to have to have a shortage, gasless Sundays would be about the most unfair way to deal with it.

The first question is what kind of a shortage will it be, and is it necessary? We have voted to help England as part of our own defense effort and presumably we are ready to make some sacrifices as part of that effort, but the question about this oil shortage is whether it is a necessary sacrifice to strengthen the British in their fight against Hitler.

In the first place there is not an oil shortage. There is plenty of oil in America. The shortage is threatened because 50 tankers which normally transport oil to the northeastern ports of this country have been taken off the Atlantic seaboard, presumably in order to help England. It is a transportation shortage.

That is supposed to leave the eastern seaboard and particularly New England with an oil supply next year about 20 percent below present requirements.

But there are a number of very serious questions which we in New England want answered. First, what about the rumor that there is really no shortage of oil in the East at all but that millions of gallons are now stored in the East as a supposed reserve. Reserve for what? Second, is all oil now in the East being kept in the East or is some of it being shipped West or to foreign countries? We are all glad to hear that Secretary Ickes has stopped the shipment of oil from Philadelphia to Japan. Will all shipments away from the East be stopped?

Third. We want to know more about these 50 tankers which will no longer supply the eastern coast with oil. If they are carrying oil and gasoline to Great Britain, to fill the fighting requirements of Great Britain, that is one thing. Is that how they are being used? We have not got enough facts on this situation. The people of New England want to know the facts, and I think they are entitled to know them. They are entitled to know if it is true that these 50 tankers have merely released some British tankers from the Atlantic, so that the British tankers can transport oil from the East Indies to Japan. The charge has been made that after we gave these tankers to Great Britain, British tankers began carrying oil from the Dutch East Indies up to Japan, at a profit for the oil companies which were selling the oil to Japan.

People are also entitled to know whether or not it is true that British tankers which our ships have released are now carrying oil from the West Indies and South America right up to Canada. In other words, people in New England want to know whether the sacrifices they will be called upon to make are sacrifices made necessary by British resistance to Hitler or sacrifices which merely make possible bigger profits.

Those are some of the points which have been coming up in my mail these last few days. They are questions which the people are asking and they are questions which a good many Congressmen are asking, and certainly we all have a right to ask them. Personally, I am encouraged by the action which Secretary Ickes took earlier this week in connection with the oil in Philadelphia. I am encouraged, too, by the very understanding attitude toward New England's problems, which has been shown by the Oil Division of the Office of Price Administration.

If there is any shortage it is going to affect the northeastern part of the United States, and New England is the northeast corner of the northeastern United States. Some of the people who have written me have rightly urged that New England be adequately represented in whatever administrative set-up is finally created to settle this oil problem. I have been glad to make that request myself on the floor of the House and in communication with Government administrators. It is important, too, and I think the Government administration realize it, that the interests of the domestic fuel oil users be taken into account if any real shortage necessarily occurs.

I think we will all face that shortage cheerfully and will arrange for a fair division of the actual supply—without any gasless Sundays, which would so obviously bear heaviest on the workingman whose only day off is Sunday—I think we will face all this with good cheer if we are convinced that there really is a shortage and that it is a necessary shortage. But we do need facts to show us that the lack of transportation

facilities is caused by the effort to defeat Hitler and not by somebody's desire to sell more oil and gasoline to Canada or, far worse, to Japan.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you Congressman ELIOT of Massachusetts for pouring some cool water on the troubled oil situation. And now let's jump from New England to the San Joaquin Valley of California and hear from Republican Congressman GEARHART, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee—the committee which through you, and you, and you, is trying to find a way to the means of raising $3,500,000,000 in new revenue.

Mr. GEARHART. It really taxes a person's mind, doesn't it?

Mr. POWELL. Yes; and that isn't all, Congressman. But bye-the-bye, Mr. GEARHART, and while we all want to hear about what the Ways and Means Committee is planning in the way of taxes, could we change the subject for a moment?

Mr. GEARHART. Certainly; what is it?

Mr. POWELL. Well, thus far no one has reported on the labor situation. I mean do you, for instance, get much mail on this subject?

Mr. GEARHART. Most certainly, Mr. Powell. Though it is quite apparent that my correspondents are warmly sympathetic with the legitimate objectives of labor unionism, it is also equally apparent that they are unanimously and emphatically opposed to strikes in our national-defense plants, whatever the cause may be. The universal condemnation of these strikes which runs through all of the letters I have received on this subject is based largely, if not entirely, upon the conviction that the loss of work-hours which has recently occurred is due to a traitorous leadership of Communists and racketeers whose objectives have nothing to do with the welfare of the workingman.

Mr. POWELL. What would you suggest, Congressman GEARHART, in order to curb or control this subversive element which threatens our industrial unity? Would it be a law making it mandatory for all unions to become incorporated and under the regulation of antitrust laws?

Mr. GEARHART. I would prefer not to express myself offhand in respect to so controversial a subject; but whether incorporation of labor unions is the way or not, it would seem to me that labor unions should be made as responsible before the law as union leaders insist that the employers be. That would promote mutual respect and confidence, contribute much to labor peace, I am quite sure.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Congressman GEARHART, for letting me interrupt the subject on which you are so equally well qualified to talk, namely, taxes. Would you say this subject is as uppermost in the minds of your constituents as it is in yours?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; I would. If there is any phase of the emergency which has taken on unusual importance with my correspondents, it would be, undoubtedly, the one which has to do with taxation and kindred subjects. Because of my membership on the Ways and Means Committee, which is the committee in the counsels of which tax legislation must originate, the committee in which the anticipated war revenue bill is now being formulated, many, many letters are reaching my office every day, each one offering suggestions or voicing protests for or against some specific tax proposal discussion of which has found its way into the public prints.

Because many a helpful suggestion is called to my attention in the letters which I receive, letters are very, very welcome at my office on Capitol Hill. To my correspondents generally, I feel a very deep sense of gratitude.

The Ways and Means Committee has been engaged in the preparation of a war taxation bill ever since the 24th day of April. Public hearings, during the course of which everyone who desired to be heard was listened to, continued through all of the intervening week days until May 28. Since that time, the entire committee of 25 members have been meeting constantly in executive session and the end is not yet. Though no one can say precisely when our work will be concluded no bill can possibly be formulated and presented to the House of Representatives for its favorable consideration much before the first of July.

The job is a particularly complicated one, one with many ramifications, one presenting many varied and most difficult problems. Because of the highly technical nature of the subject and the long hours of painstaking study to which the members of the committee are devoting themselves, I have every confidence that a bill will ultimately be produced which will be as nearly satisfactory to all parties concerned as could be produced under the necessities of the moment.

The bill which will ultimately be offered to the Congress for its consideration will deal specifically with practically the entire field of taxation, except the tariff. In the rewriting of the tax laws which are now in effect, it will be necessary to completely reexamine and refix the rate schedules of normal income taxes on individuals, surtaxes, corporation income taxes, excess-profits levies, gift and estate and inheritance taxes, and, finally, excise-tax levies, all of which, when taken together, will represent a most imposing and a thoroughly comprehensive readjustment of the entire tax structure of our country.

The Secretary of the Treasury has requested the Ways and Means Committee to readjust the tax levies so as to increase the revenues of the Government over that which they were in 1940 by not less than $3,500,000,000.

I do not believe that I am violating the confidence of my colleagues when I point out that it is the hope of the committee to raise almost all of this vast and unprecedented sum from income, gift, and estate taxes as these taxes are, generally speaking, levied in harmony with the guiding principle of ability to pay. For this reason no consideration will be given to the subject of excise taxes upon commodities until it is known to the members of the committee just how much can be raised in the other brackets.

It will only be when the estimates of that which can be derived from the various income, gift, and estate taxes are before the committee, that the amount which must be raised from excise taxes will be revealed.

While it is quite impossible to say at this time just what the sum total of the taxes to be collected under the various title heads will be, there can be no doubt but that the amount which our taxpayers will be compelled to yield unto their country for its defense in these days of emergency will be very, very large.

The proper carrying into execution of our two great policies of the day, that is, the rearmament of our country in the interest of an invincible national defense and the carrying forward of the program of all-out aid to the embattled democracies is going to require billions upon billions of dollars.

Great as is the sum of $3,500,000,000 which the Secretary of the Treasury has requested us to make provision for, it will constitute, when collected, but a small part of the vast expenditures which the administration will be called upon to make these next few months. The rest must go to bonds.

That those who compose our tax-paying public are willing to make this sacrifice is manifested beyond the peradventure of doubt in nearly ever, letter that reaches my desk. From that which I read in these communications I am thoroughly convinced that the American people are prepared to sacrifice as never before in order that the ends to which we are, as a nation, devoting ourselves may be achieved, the American way of life maintained.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Congressman GEARHART, of California. And thank you, Congressmen DEWEY, of Illinois; SASSCER, of Maryland; and ELIOT, of Massachusetts, for making possible this second presentation of the Congressional Mail Bag. The Committee of Americans, on behalf of its chairman, Dean Emeritus Roscoe Pound, of Harvard; Prof. Edwin Kemmerer, of Princeton; and Berkley Thomas, the president of the committee, are highly indebted to you.

Mr. GEARHART. Since there is but a few seconds left, I think I can safely speak for my colleagues in saying that we have enjoyed this opportunity of speaking to our constituents back home and that we highly commend, as I am sure they do, too, the Committee of Americans for its patriotic effort in bringing the people and their Congress closer together by this unique method.

Mr. POWELL. That's very nice, Congressman. And to all of you from the House who participated in this program on this warm night, I want to say I am personally grateful for your cooperation. Royce Powell saying good night.

Professed Friends of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the House Labor Committee to report out necessary amendments to the N. L. R. A. and suitable defense strike legislation is undoubtedly responsible for the attitude toward that committee taken by the majority party and its leadership.

It is responsible, too, for the editorial of June 17 from the Washington Daily News, which is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 17, 1941]

A VERY UNHAPPY POSITION

By reason of long service in Congress, Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, is chairman of the House Labor Committee. She has found it necessary, as she says, to plead with the membership of the House to deal with her committee as it does with other committees.

That many Members of the House have no confidence in the Labor Committee is certainly true. And it is unfortunate. But it is something for which the committee can blame only itself. For years its attitude has been to obstruct labor legislation, excepting only such legislation as organized labor wanted. And, with organized labor split into two factions which often have disagreed violently as to what they wanted, Mrs. NORTON'S group has found itself in what she describes as "a very unhappy position."

Three years ago demands began to rise from the country and in Congress for a sensible revision of the Wagner Act to correct the lopsided administration of that law by bigots on the National Labor Relations Board. There was a job that should have been undertaken by the Labor Committees of House and Senate. But neither committee would tackle it.

The House created a special committee to investigate enforcement of the Wagner Act. This special committee, after long study, proposed certain amendments—and the Labor Committee did its utmost to prevent them

from being voted on by the House. Finally they were routed around the Labor Committee and a year ago the House passed them by a 2-to-1 vote. Then the Senate Labor Committee succeeded where Mrs. NORTON'S committee had failed, and killed the amendments via pigeonhole.

In this matter, and in others, the Labor Committees have thwarted the will of a majority in Congress. These committees, of course, reflected the policy of the administration. That policy, under which organized labor was given almost unlimited power and practically no responsibility for proper use of its power, led inevitably to abuses which culminated in the unjustified strikes that have delayed the national-defense program.

There have been insistent demands that Congress deal with the defense strike situation—and again, Mrs. NORTON'S committee has done nothing. "We could not and would not rush legislation to the floor of the House at a time when emotion might rule over common sense," she says.

And so legislation has reached the floor of the House by detouring the Labor Committee. And if some of it is too drastic, and at the same time too superficial, that is largely because the committee which should have handled it with common sense couldn't be depended upon to handle it at all.

Mrs. NORTON and many other professed friends of labor, in their eagerness to please organized labor's leaders, have done disservice to rank-and-file workers and to the country. If they had sponsored or permitted moderate remedies as abuses appeared, there would not now be danger of unwise measures. And if now they wish to play an effective part in shaping the legislation which certainly is needed, they'll have to do more than plead for confidence in their leadership. They'll have to prove that they have changed their attitude so completely that they deserve confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made on the floor by the chairman of that committee, the Member from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and, as a member of the committee, I, too, regret that the leadership of the House has not seen fit to refer bills to the committee; but, until the committee shows some sign of bringing in constructive legislation, the practice will undoubtedly continue.

I have introduced not a few bills, the purpose and the principles of which would in my judgment do much to lessen industrial strife, aid employees. But so far the Labor Committee has failed to act upon them.

Immigration Restriction Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SCHENECTADY (N. Y.) GAZETTE AND A RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL, JUNIOR ORDER OF UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill, H. R. 4861, which I recently introduced to further protect the United States from the dangers of enemies coming here, I insert in the RECORD the following approving editorial from the Schenectady (N. Y.) Gazette under date of June 20, 1941, and also the following approving resolution of the National Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, on June 18:

[From the Schenectady (N. Y.) Gazette of June 20, 1941]

THE ALLEN BILL

One would think that by this time Congress would have adopted the necessary drastic legislation to combat every member of all subversive groups and make clear the position of dangerous aliens, but the legislators are still dallying.

The Allen bill would go far toward achieving the right purpose. It provides for the exclusion and deportation of members of all subversive groups and enumerates the worst of them by name. It would suspend all immigration for 5 years and ultimately reduce quota immigration to one-third of the existing figures. If, in years to come, it were deemed advisable either to reduce quotas still further, or to increase them, it could be done.

The Allen bill would make possible the complete elimination of alien habitual criminals. It clarifies the policy regarding aliens who must be detained for the protection of the Nation during this emergency, and their deportation thereafter.

Other bills ostensibly designed to obtain the same results have been introduced or are in preparation. But some of them would do the opposite of what is desired by all those concerned with real defense, and some of the measures are so confusing and vague as to make them worse than no bill at all.

The situation calls for action. As Ambassador Bullitt said last year, "The agents of the dictators are already here, preparing the way for their armies. They are preparing the way in the same manner in which they prepared the way in France. * * * More than one-half the spies captured doing actual military spy work against the French Army were refugees from Germany."

NATIONAL COUNCIL, JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Resolution 26

(H. R. 4861, deporting subversive aliens)

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States a bill known as H. R. 4861 by Congressman A. L. ALLEN of Louisiana, which has as its object the deportation of alien members of all subversive groups, the suspension of all immigration for 5 years, and the ultimate reduction of quota immigration to one-third of existing figures; and

Whereas the agents of the dictators are already in our midst and are working along the same insidious lines that undermined the nations of Poland, Norway, France, and others now under Nazi-Fascist occupation or domination; and

Whereas these agents, if permitted to remain here and foster well-laid plans, can, as has been proven in other countries, at a critical time stop transportation, disrupt communication, and otherwise hinder and obstruct the orderly processes of the national-defense effort; and

Whereas many so-called refugees who are in this country are actively identified with subversive groups, and these would be deported upon apprehension under the enactment of the Allen bill into law; and

Whereas representatives of the national board of officers have conferred personally with Congressman ALLEN, and are convinced that the adoption of H. R. 4861 would make possible the complete elimination of alien habitual criminals, and that the bill definitely clarifies the policy regarding aliens who must be detained for the protection of the Nation during the national emergency; and

Whereas the terms of H. R. 4861 were worked out by Congressman ALLEN, in full collaboration with Congressman DIES, of Texas, and Congressman STARNES of Alabama, with whose work the Junior order has long been acquainted and which the order approves wholeheartedly; and

Whereas it is the understanding of the board of officers that this bill will come up for an early hearing, at which time the order will be represented as a witness in favor thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc., in session assembled in the city of Washington, D. C., this the 18th day of June 1941, That we unreservedly support H. R. 4861 as a measure that must be enacted into law as quickly as possible in order to safeguard the country during this period of national emergency and for the future; and be it further

Resolved, That the national secretary be instructed to communicate this resolution to the chairman and members of the House Immigration and Naturalization Committee, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Vice President of the United States.

Submitted by:

WILLIAM H. MURPHEY, *Virginia.*
R. L. MCCLANNAN, *Virginia.*
O. B. HOPKINS, *Virginia.*

Approved by:

W. A. CLARK, *Ohio,*
E. L. ALGER, *Virginia,*
EDW. GOTTSCHALK, *Kentucky,*
O. LEROY MORRIS, *Pennsylvania,*
W. B. SIMMONS, *West Virginia,*
Good of the Order Committee.

Adoption moved by Harry E. Dailey, of Ohio; seconded by M. D. Collins, of Georgia. Unanimously carried.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 26 adopted by the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics in regular session assembled in the city of Washington, D. C., on June 18, 1941.

JAMES L. WILMETH,
National Secretary.

One Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BERGEN EVENING RECORD, HACKENSACK, N. J.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, of Hackensack, N. J.:

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J.]

ONE AIR FORCE

Representative OSMERS is energetically sponsoring establishment of an air force separate from the Army and Navy and addition of a Secretary for Air to the President's Cabinet. He appears to be making little progress. Neither Army nor Navy officials have committed themselves. In fact, with typical

stodginess they seem unfriendly to change as a matter of principle, ignoring foreign demonstration of the value of an integrated air force. And President Roosevelt has offered no opinion on the prospect of an additional Cabinet member.

Mr. OSMERS' arguments are apparently valid. He points to the unified air forces of Germany and Britain. The Battle of Crete was conducted almost entirely by the Axis air arms. Modern warfare is prosecuted by three forces: Land, sea, and air. If we split one, why not all three? Or, more reasonably, if we integrate two, why not the third?

The teachings and preachings of the martyred Gen. Billy Mitchell are just now being heeded, long after his death. The military leaders of the United States are admitting that to be prepared means essentially to be on the same war basis as a hypothetical enemy.

It therefore is reasonable to suppose that they have seriously considered the plan which Mr. OSMERS advocates and have decided on the basis of either evidence or tradition that separate Army and Navy air forces are practical and efficient. No doubt they have so coordinated and correlated them that under combat conditions they would act as a unit. But it would be rather startling, if and when Army and Navy leaders finally reveal their fundamental air policy, to find that we must still depend on two separate air forces acting independently of each other.

Our Home Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

RADIO PROGRAM OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars presented a program over radio station WWDC on last Sunday night, June 22, 1941, on the subject of our home defense. Under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the program rendered at that meeting:

Theme: The Star-Spangled Banner (transcription).

Mr. NORMAN REED. "I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

Announcer GOFF. That was the American Creed, written by William Tyler Page, which introduces another in the series of programs arranged and sponsored under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and dedicated to national civilian defense.

It is now our privilege and pleasure to present E. R. Burton, of the publicity committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Virginia, who will have charge of tonight's program. Mr. Burton.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Goff.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, the Cross of Malta is on the air again. I wish to open this evening's program by extending my greetings to my comrades and delegates at the nineteenth annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Virginia, which opened this morning at 9 o'clock, in Staunton, Va.

Our first speaker this evening is a veteran from the Hoosier State, Comrade RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, Representative in Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana. Our Comrade SPRINGER was a captain of Infantry during the last World War; he is now a lieutenant colonel of Infantry in the Reserve Corps of the United States. He is a member of the V. F. W. He was the first State commander of the American Legion in the State of Indiana and he served 2 years as a member of the National Executive Committee of that great ex-service men's organization. He is the veterans' friend and he will now speak on Our Home Defense. Comrade SPRINGER.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, my comrades of the last World War, Americans all, I am tremendously honored to have the high privilege of speaking to you, tonight, on this program sponsored by my comrades, the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This great organization is engaged in a splendid peacetime service. May their splendid courage and their undimmed loyalty to our flag and to our country carry them forward to greater heights in these hours of anguish and uncertainly. Our people applaud your devotion to every patriotic duty at this hour. May I compliment you, and may I assure you of my unqualified endorsement of your sound and unalterable stand for our home defense.

Yours is a sentimental subject which has been assigned for this program—home defense. The defense of our country, our people, and our institutions—within the boundaries of our Nation—is the predominating subject today. Men and women—even little children—from the four corners of our great Nation are calling for our defense—our home defense—to be made so sound and so strong that we may repel the attack of any foe. This is not the appeal of any class or group of our people—it is the unanimous demand of all of our people. Whatever may intervene and which develops into a discord in these critical hours may be only passive—yet, there is no discord in the demand of our people that we continue our preparations for the defense of our country, our flag, and our institutions, even to the last man. That is the spirit of every American.

Our home defense is a subject which I love, because it symbolizes the perpetuation of the new life of the world. The dust of the ancient day has been removed. The treasure of the olden days, where crumbling shrines and ancient art once thrived, has become a forgotten lore and our people in this new world have developed that philosophy in life of completely discarding that which is outgrown and outworn; this is the new life of the world.

At the moment we face ominous days in our country. We pause and reflect upon the past, but the past is secure. We are inspired by it. With that inspiration every American stands as a guardian of our future. Our country, with her ideals and traditions, has traveled far. We must not stop, nor even pause, within the shadow of today. Since the days of Lord Cornwallis and Yorktown we have faced toward the front. The future is our goal. Whatever may intervene which may tend to obstruct our course—we will face it—we will meet it as Americans. We will not deviate from our unalterable course—we will march forward toward the goal of our ultimate attainment.

We are constrained to reflect upon our traditions, tonight, because we seek to perpetuate them. These must remain inviolate. Our Constitution and the Bill of Rights, which stand supreme, grant to every American the right of a free man—the right to worship God as he or she may choose—the right to work and the opportunity of progress—the liberty and freedom which we enjoy in this Nation. These are the inalienable rights of every man, woman, and child within our country. Every citizen of every foreign country who comes here, no matter where his home may be, is entitled to equal protection under our laws. This is, truly, the land of equal opportunity to all. These rights must never be surrendered. We must forever guard those fine traditions which have come down to us from our forefathers.

Our Home Defense—that is our theme tonight. We have the most profound sympathy for every democracy in the Old World and their allies that can emanate from the hearts of men. We hope that every nation now defending the liberty and freedom of a free people may completely conquer those who seek to dominate and to force upon them a new and unsolvable philosophy of government. The curse of mastery, the unalterable desire of acquisition, and the sordid purpose of satisfying a selfish desire—all of these elements, spurred on by the lash of desire for personal domination and individual dictation, cause the war lords to continue their conquest for power and dominion. Their philosophy of life and of government must not prevail here. Ours is the American way of life. Our liberty and freedom, as we have known it, must never yield to the individual domination of any dictator. Our Constitution, which is sacred to every American, and our representative form of government established thereunder, must not perish from the earth.

When we reflect upon our home defense, we think of the defense of our flag. There is no combination of the dictators of the world, who rule and dominate their subjects as serfs, who direct the way of life of their people as slaves, who would crush and destroy both religion and education, that can take our flag from the masthead of victory and trail it in the dust of disaster and defeat. Our flag symbolizes the ideals of our forefathers. They fought for those ideals. In their day, that man or woman who lived in our country, who enjoyed our liberty and freedom, who benefited from our unparalleled institutions, who earned his sustenance from our soil, who would have indulged in subversive activities or conduct to the detriment of our Nation would have been looked upon as a spy and a traitor to his country. Our forefathers believed in our American ideals. Many of them died on the battlefields that we might inherit the benediction of a free America. To those who scorn when we plead for the preservation of those ideals which are wholly sacred, we must question their Americanism, and we must question their sincerity as patriotic American citizens. I hope that day may soon come when we may truly say, "All for one, one for all—America."

Thus we face the future. The patriotism of every American is exalted commensurate with our ideals. There must be no laggard within our boundaries when our country calls. We must respond, and that response must be universal; it must be voluntary. The quickened heartbeats of an aroused people cause all Americans to stand at attention. In the dim and dark unknown, in the remote realm of an indistinct future, the glittering stars of liberty and freedom still shine; their luster has not yet been dimmed; they will continue to shine throughout the future years.

Every American reflects upon our theme tonight—home defense. When we speak of it we naturally ask the question, "What is my duty to my country?" Our duty is de-

fined. The responsibility is ours. Yes; we will defend it; we will defend it and all that it implies, even to the last man. I am convinced that every American will do his full duty in the development of our home defense. We will not fail in this responsibility as Americans. Thus we will assure the perpetuation of our heritage, the sacred traditions bequeathed to us by the sturdy pioneers, and we will make our worthy contribution, to the end that our Nation and our flag will be secure. We will go forward as united Americans in our home defense, not marching forward to our fate but marching to a most glorious destiny.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Comrade Springer, for that fine address. We will now hear from another veteran of the last World War, Comrade GEORGE MCINVALE GRANT, Representative in Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Alabama. Comrade GRANT is a past department commander of the American Legion, of the State of Alabama. He, too, is the loyal friend of the veterans. Comrade GRANT:

Mr. GRANT. It is a pleasure and a privilege to join with the Virginia depar nent of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in this evening's program. The department is to be congratulated in presenting this timely program on the subject, Home Defense.

The district's newest station, WWDC, has shown by its sponsoring of this program each week that it is truly alive to the civic and patriotic needs of the territory which it serves. Certainly at the present time there is a need of keeping the matter of home defense before the public, and in doing so the V. F. W. continues to carry out the worthy and patriotic ideals which have down through the years made it an organization of vast good not only to its members but to the public and the Nation at large. Certainly, no radio station could carry out the objects for which it was licensed in any greater manner than is being done by this station in staging such a program.

While not eligible for active membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I hope that I may, upon this occasion, by reason of a small service in the World War, greet you as buddies, in that by our service we have dedicated ourselves to a common cause.

The subject of home defense is one in which we all should be greatly interested. Why, some may ask, is the Veterans of Foreign Wars interested in this subject? It is because these men know something about war, of its horrors and suffering. They know, too, that present-day warfare is far different from what it was during the last war. Then it was that while those at home in many cases bore great suffering, it was through the loss or injury of a loved one at the front. As far as physical pain and injury was concerned, the man in the field received the suffering. Today it is a far different story. War is no respecter of persons. With the increased air warfare and blitzkrieg movements, children and old people are in constant danger from attack, although they may be hundreds and hundreds of miles away from any actual battle front. Knowing the value of home preparedness, the V. F. W., many who would now be too old for actual front-line combat, have volunteered their services as members of the home guard and home defense organizations.

What measures may we as civilians take in order that we may contribute our greatest ability toward home defense? To me the first and greatest thing that any nation may have is morale. Unless the citizens have this morale and unless it exists in the fighting forces, that nation must eventually sink. How long do you think the present war would have lasted had the English been able to pound away night after night at Berlin, like the Germans have done in London and other English towns? I do not believe history will record a people displaying a greater morale than has been shown by the English people. In speaking of morale, I do not mean that we should build up a morale against any nation that would demand our declaring war or fighting them. I mean a morale that we are prepared to resist any and all nations that might attack our security; that we will maintain our institutions of democracy at all costs and at all hazards.

I do not believe, in planning our system of home defense, that we should become hysterical; that we should believe that we are in danger of immediate attack and that bombs will be dropped upon us from the skies within the next few weeks. But on the other hand we cannot close our eyes as to what is going on around us in other parts of the world. Insofar as communications are concerned we are as near Europe as we were to many parts of the United States several years ago. Planes that formerly made 75 miles an hour and only had a short cruising area now fly over 300 miles an hour and have a much greater cruising area. Certainly no one can say what tomorrow will bring forth. We are busy preparing our Army and Navy for defense purposes. Certainly no one can say that we are doing this to get ready to attack anyone. So it is with civilian home defense. Our taking every precaution does not mean that we are getting ready to go to war or that we are in immediate danger of being attacked, but it does mean that we realize the danger now in the world and that we want to be prepared both by our armed forces and as civilians to meet any eventuality.

I would not upon this occasion and in the limited time available attempt to tell you just what each individual should do. Even if the time were available I would hesitate because of the fact that Mayor LaGuardia has set up a national organization for this specific duty. Recently here in Washington registrations were accepted from those who cared to register for civilian defense. I am informed that the number registering was very gratifying to those in charge of the work and that while registration centers in various parts of the city have been closed, that those who have not registered and desire to do so may still register at headquarters. It will necessarily take many weeks to classify all of those who registered but in time this will be completed so that each man and woman who registered may know his or her duties.

It is my information that nine regional offices will be set up corresponding to the nine Army Corps areas. These will establish direct contact between local and State governments. The public will be instructed in arrangements for receiving and giving air-raid warnings, collecting and recording information of air-raid damage, care of casualties, including first aid and ambulance service, clearance of debris, repairs of utilities, demolition of unsafe buildings, detection of chemical gas, and decontamination of gassed areas.

Civilians will be trained to serve as volunteers in vital State and municipal activities, to plan air-raid shelters, to evacuate and control traffic in event of any bombing or other method of attack, and many other jobs, including the spotting and extinguishing of incendiary bombs.

The United States conference of mayors has issued a booklet which can be obtained by any city interested in this work.

You as an individual can do your part in this work, whether you are old or young. If you are not listed as an actual worker in the home-defense organization, you can keep your eyes and ears open for subversive activities and sabotage. This is especially true in sections where defense industries are located. Regardless of how we may individually feel as to the lend-lease bill and this Nation's declared policy of aid to England, we as good Americans can all agree upon one thing, and that is preparedness at home. It makes no difference whether we be Democrats, Republicans, or Progressives. In the appropriations in Congress for our national defense all Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives joined together as good Americans. As I recall, there was only one dissenting vote in the House of Representatives to our vast defense program, and this vote was not cast by any member of any of the parties which I have just mentioned.

You may ask what change will there be in this country now that Russia and Germany are at war. Will many of those who are Communists and who are against our preparedness program still be against it? What will be the cooperation that formerly existed between the Communist agents and German agents? This I cannot answer. We are at war with neither Germany nor Russia. We do know that the program of the Communist Party is world revolution. If the war spreads with Russia, then, naturally, Russia will be an ally of England, which is a nation that we have definitely committed the resources of this Nation to aid. Our commitment of aid is that we are the arsenal of democracy, and as a democratic nation we will not see England fail. On the other hand, we have Germany saying that she is coming to the aid of Finland, and everyone knows where this Nation stood as between Russia and Finland, that brave little nation which we have classed as a democracy and one that we have aided.

Regardless of the situation in Europe, regardless of whoever may become involved, it should convince this Nation that we must speed our defense; that we must become the greatest armed nation in the world. It has been said just recently that Russia and Germany would not fight, that they both stole Poland, and that a mutual agreement existed between Hitler and Stalin as to just who should have what. Evidently their spheres of influence and operations have conflicted, as is always the case between nations who prey upon others.

America wants none of that mess. Let's resolve that we will stay out—not as appeasers, but stay out because we will become so strong that no nation or combination of nations will dare attack us. Let's not be blind to history—certainly not to recent history. England was slow in setting up a home-defense organization. Bombing was considered a joke; but when the raids began, it was realized that air-raid wardens, fire fighters, and members of the home defense were in truth as well as in fact front-line fighters.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Comrade Grant, for that fine address.

We will have a special program next Sunday evening. The Assistant Attorney General will be on the air from 8 until 8:30 p. m. At 8:30 p. m. the Honorable William Tyler Page, author of America's Creed, will speak on the subject Independence and the Republican Form of Government. Let us have your comments and questions on the subject of Our Home Defense. These will be answered at our next program. Thank you, and good night.

America (transcription).

Senator Harrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, when the Social Security Act was being drawn, I had the

duty of working for many weeks with the Senate Finance Committee. I had more especially the happy privilege of working for long days and evenings, on a personal basis, with the chairman of that committee. For a youngster, to work with Senator Pat Harrison was a wonderful education in the legislative process. For anyone, it was the greatest possible good fortune informally to study with him far-reaching legislation, to be delighted by his wit and his warm human simplicity. I rise today simply to say how sad I feel because Pat Harrison is gone.

The American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our national policy, both foreign and domestic, is becoming more clearly defined each day as first, foremost, and altogether an American policy, designed to secure peace and freedom for America. That was the note sounded by the President in his radio speech of May 27. That is the note which should sound still more clearly now that Russia is in the war. That is the policy behind which our people can and will unite.

Such a policy means opposing both war and Hitlerism. There are some who say we must choose one or the other of these two evils. That is like the old argument that democracy is doomed and we must choose between communism and fascism. The supposed alternatives turn out to be very much alike, and both of them bad.

Instead of going to war, we are building a strong defense which may include the "aggressive defense" implied in the President's speech and described in Hanson Baldwin's important book, United We Stand. Instead of acquiescing in Hitlerism, we are aiding England in its stout resistance, and here at home are preserving our own fundamental liberties.

To enter the war means death, devastation, and sorrow, with the danger that at its conclusion neither the world nor America would be either peaceful or free. To let Hitler dominate the greater part of the world means a severe trial for democracy here, with the danger that America might not remain either peaceful or free.

Our course has been steered between these unhappy alternatives. The President has guided the ship of state safely through a difficult and dangerous channel. He has given the freedom-loving people of the world hope and faith. He has launched us on a tremendous productive enterprise, strengthening ourselves and helping the British resist the great aggressor. He has sought and obtained congressional approval of his course.

Our Constitution provides that Congress, elected to represent the people, should have the war-making power. I know that people say that declarations of war are out of fashion. Certainly they are out of fashion—if Hitler sets the fashion. But in September 1939 England declared war. France declared war. And the United States as a democracy should go to war only if the representatives of the people so decide.

Hitler has not amended our Constitution.

I hate Hitlerism. So do most of us. We feel that it represents the utmost degradation of the human spirit. By entering the war now, we would give more active expression to our feelings, and for many that would be a great emotional relief.

But we must be guided by calm reason, not emotion. There is always some risk of war, no matter what course we take. Uniting behind the President's warning to the Axis that we will resist acts designed to facilitate aggression against us necessarily involves some risk of war. But that is a very different thing from plunging, of our own volition, into a general foreign war that is being fought in Europe and Africa and Asia.

To enter this war now, half prepared, would not be common sense. It would even be a most dubious way of aiding Britain, for we have no two-ocean navy and we might well have to fight in the Pacific. We would be embarking on a desperate life-or-death venture while millions of loyal Americans, who believe in defending America, are convinced that this foreign struggle is not our war—convinced today more than ever, for Communist Russia would be, to say the least, an unnatural ally.

There are other millions who feel it is our war, and who demand that we choose now, either to enter the war or to draw back entirely and presumably let England fall.

The impulse to choose is a compelling one, but in resisting it lies the greatest hope for our country and the world. We might survive as a free people even if we went to war. We might survive as a free people even if Britain fell. But the best chance for the survival of democracy lies in our staying out of war and at the same time helping in the resistance to Hitler. "Aid to England short of war" makes sense. As long as such a course is humanly possible, it is the wisest course.

It is a difficult course. It does not satisfy any emotional craving. It requires great effort without stirring battle cries, great patience in the midst of tumult. But think of it as what it is—our own American policy, to keep the light of freedom shining somewhere in the world—and we can see that in our ability to steer this course lies the last, best hope of earth.

All Americans can and will unite in the determination to preserve American liberty. There must be no black-out of peace and justice and tolerance and freedom in America. There must be no faint hearts, no foolish praise of any foreign tyrant, no surrender to the forces of inhuman brutality and evil.

The ideas of human liberty, of family affection, of even-handed justice, have survived through the centuries. They will continue to survive. It is for us to make them flourish.

Proposed Trade Agreements With Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY B. COFFEE, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION, JUNE 23, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which had under consideration the proposed trade agreements with Uruguay and Argentina vitally affecting the livestock industry:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to protest any reduction in the tariff or excise taxes on any of the competitive agricultural products listed for consideration in either the Argentine or Uruguay trade agreements. I shall confine my remarks primarily to the proposed tariff reduction on canned meats under paragraph 706.

Agriculture is the biggest business in the United States in volume and in number of people employed. The livestock industry is the most important phase of agriculture. In my own State of Nebraska 71 percent of the total cash farm income is derived from livestock or livestock products. I represent one of the most important cattle-producing districts in the United States and am also personally engaged in the cattle business. I know something about the problems the cattlemen have had to face in the past and will have to face in the future.

The present 6-cent tariff on canned beef is not too high; it is too low. This 6-cent tariff is not enough to permit the domestic growers to compete with the low-priced product from South American countries. The canned-beef market in the United States is now practically monopolized by South American countries. Our imports of canned beef during the last 5 years have averaged nearly 80,000,000 pounds a year. This is the equivalent of 200,000,000 pounds of beef, dressed-weight basis, which in turn is the equivalent of approximately 400,000 steers, weighing 1,000 pounds each.

Let us follow some of these 400,000 steers from Argentina and Uruguay to the consumers in the United States. I have been in Argentina and I know they have a fine quality of cattle comparable to our own. They sell at about half the price of similar cattle in the United States. The 1,000-pound steer that sells for 10 cents a pound in the United States can be purchased for 5 cents a pound in Argentina. The packing-house workers that process cattle in Argentina receive about 16 cents an hour as compared with the wages which range from 67 cents to $1.25 an hour paid in the packing industry in the United States.

After a 1,000-pound Argentine steer is slaughtered and dressed, the carcass will weigh approximately 500 pounds. When it is boned, cooked, and canned, the meat will weigh approximately 40 percent of the dressed weight basis, or about 200 pounds. In other words, that 1,000-pound steer has now been concentrated to a weight of 200 pounds in the can as it is shipped to New York.

The ocean freight rate before the present war from Argentina and Uruguay to New York City was only 35 cents per hundredweight. Therefore, this 1,000-pound steer was delivered in New York City for a total freight cost of only 70 cents. The freight rate on canned beef from Scottsbluff, Nebr., to Omaha, Nebr., is 41 cents per hundredweight. To move canned beef merely across the State of Nebraska costs more freight than from Uruguay or Argentina to New York City. Of course, it is recognized that Nebraska beef must not only be shipped across the State of Nebraska but across many States to reach New York City and the other consuming centers of the East.

At 6 cents a pound tariff, this 1,000-pound Argentine steer, concentrated into 200 pounds of canned beef, pays only $12 duty. This is about the equivalent of 1.2 cents a pound live weight or 2.4 cents a pound dressed-weight basis. To consider lowering this tariff to me seems preposterous.

The Federal Government needs the tariff revenue and our livestock producers need the protection. The 6 cents a pound duty brings in more than $4,500,000 a year revenue to the Federal Government. Why should the tax on foreign products be reduced at a time when taxes on all domestic producers must of necessity be greatly increased to meet our national-defense expenditures? Instead of reducing this tax on canned beef, it should be increased because as we increase our domestic taxes to meet the present emergency, the price of domestic products must increase in order to carry the additional tax burden.

Since the people of the United States are being called upon to pay increased taxes for the purpose of protecting the Western Hemisphere, isn't it logical to increase rather than decrease the tax on the products of these countries we are endeavoring to protect? Is it logical at this time to decrease the revenue to the Federal Government by reducing the tariff on these agricultural items and at the same time reduce the taxpaying ability of the American producers?

With the whole world on the verge of war and foreign markets so uncertain, now is no time to open our gates to foreign dumping. These tariffs and excise taxes on these competitive agricultural commodities should not be reduced. Quotas should be established to prevent any flood of competitive foreign products coming in and demoralizing our domestic market.

To reduce this tariff is to encourage increased imports of beef at a time when cattle numbers in this country are again approaching the peak. On the 1st of January we had 71,000,000 head of cattle in the United States. The highest number ever recorded was 74,000,000 in 1934. A 5-percent increase in cattle production will result in the greatest number of cattle ever enumerated in the United States and will place the industry in the danger zone of overproduction.

All meats are competitive. Hog production is being encouraged and greatly increased. Sheep production is being increased. Unless the American livestock producer is protected in this market against foreign imports, he will soon be forced to sell his products again below cost of production because of a price-depressing surplus.

It should be understood that the United States is an exporter of meat products and between 1925 and 1930 was exporting a billion pounds of pork and lard a year. Argentina normally exports a billion pounds of beef a year. Beef and pork are competitive. Canned beef competes with canned ham just as much as it competes with other meat products. Last year hogs were selling for half the parity price and only reached parity this year due to increased shipments to the British Isles. Cattle prices have been below parity from 1930 until 1939. The industry faced bankruptcy until 8,000,000 head of cattle were eliminated through the Government purchase program following the drought of 1934.

The livestock industry is the backbone of agriculture and unless it can be protected and encouraged to supply the American market there can be no sound expansion of that industry.

Cotton and wheat farmers, who are piling up huge surpluses because of the lack of foreign markets, are being encouraged to go into livestock production. In the Corn Belt we have millions of bushels of surplus corn that must eventually be converted into meat. The Government is spending millions of dollars in controlling the production of corn and in maintaining the price level through loans. Yet here is another agency of the Government that is proposing to encourage increased importation of these competitive agricultural commodities which must replace the product of the American producer. How can you restore the purchasing power of agriculture if you are going to force the American producer to compete with cheap peon labor? Why should American agriculture and particularly the American livestock producer be sacrificed for the benefit of foreign producers? In carrying out the good-neighbor policy, I would suggest that we first minister to the needs of our neighbors at home.

To make further concessions on agricultural commodities in the proposed Uruguay and Argentine trade agreements would further accentuate the trend of industrializing this country at the expense of agriculture. Importation of competitive agricultural commodities must be curbed, not encouraged, if we are to provide our farmers and livestock producers in this country their fair share of the national income. Eliminating recent statistics which have been distorted because of the war, I find that competitive agricultural imports have been increasing and our total agricultural exports have been decreasing.

In 1939 our imports of competitive agricultural products amounted to $526,000,000 as compared with $476,000,000 in 1938. In 1939 our total exports of agricultural products amounted to only $655,000,000 as compared with $827,000,000 in 1938, a decrease of $172,000,000. This shows that our competitive agricultural imports amounted to more than 80 percent of our total agricultural exports.

Twenty years ago agricultural exports accounted for approximately 50 percent of our total exports. That percentage has been gradually dropping until in 1939 agricultural products accounted for only 21 percent of our total exports. In 1938 our total imports from foreign countries amounted to $1,950,000,000. Agricultural commodities accounted for 46.4 percent of this total, more than half of which were competitive.

The livestock industry bore the brunt of the concessions made in the Canadian trade agreements and it is likewise asked to carry the burden of the concessions in the proposed Argentine and Uruguay agreements.

Since the first World War the livestock industry has had more years of losses than of profits. It is entitled to more consideration and protection.

The 1940 census shows the total value of all farm lands and buildings in the United States to be $1,000,000,000 less than it was in 1910. This reflects the plight of agriculture. There can be no justification for asking American agriculture to make any further sacrifices for the benefit of foreign producers. Hemispheric solidarity cannot be accomplished by engendering discord among our own producers.

St. Lawrence Waterway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LOUISVILLE (KY.) COURIER-JOURNAL

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to note what happens when newspapermen adopt different viewpoints. Some time ago one of our eastern writers, representing a geographical section which believes that it exists entirely for itself, commented at some length about the disadvantages of the St. Lawrence seaway project. I find a very able reply in an editorial in the Louisville Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., for June 19, 1941. It reads as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of June 19, 1941]

FOUR YEARS IS NOT FAR IN THE FUTURE

If our neighbor, Frank R. Kent, has briefed the case against the St. Lawrence project competently, no reason exists for longer suspension of judgment on the enterprise. The sooner work begins the sooner will the shortage of electric power in the Buffalo industrial district be relieved. And the sooner will we be prepared for whatever the future holds.

History tells us how the canal interests foug't railroad extension. We know how railroads fight truck lines and internal waterway improvement, how utility and coal interests fight waterpower development.

We might have expected a disinterested columnist to present the opposition fairly; but Mr. Kent's thesis, emphasizing the imperative importance of the time element in defense preparations, skips the most salient point, which is the possibility of producing power at the St. Lawrence Rapids by the latter part of 1943, a little more than 2 years hence. It is this which may have enlisted the support of William Knudsen and Sydney Hillman, O. P. M. heads, in charge of speeding defense production.

Mr. Kent dwells upon the fact that the seaway will not, perhaps, be completed inside 4 years. But even that span of time happens also to be the minimum period necessary to build a two-ocean navy, so why doesn't Mr. Kent argue against a two-ocean navy, too?

He does not do so because he knows that any such argument would be absurd and unpopular with a people who realize they must have the mightiest Navy on earth, but he ought to be consistent. He ought, at least, to face the fact that Great Lakes shipyards, impractical until they get an adequate outlet to deep water, would immensely increase American ocean tonnage at a moment when ocean tonnage is all-important.

There will be no slowing down of defense industries, as he infers, to furnish labor for the canal and dams. Knudsen and Hillman,

the President, and Secretaries Knox and Stimson are just as feverishly eager to promote preparations as Mr. Kent professes to be. But they are responsible and must look ahead, whether their critics choose to look ahead or not. The expansion of our shipbuilding facilities, the development of 2,200,000 horsepower of electric energy in the northeastern industrial section are important for the war's aftermath as well as the immediate future.

Our competitors in the impending economic struggle are developing all their resources to cheapen production and transportation for world commerce. We need all the waterpower we can develop, and we also need to reflect upon the fact that America's wonderful midcontinent granary is incomparably rich as an agricultural area and also incomparably remote from ocean-borne transportation. We wonder if Mr. Kent has thought about this. We wonder, too, if he knows that no other nation on earth would have neglected the St. Lawrence seaway for this long, simply because of its colossal economic importance.

Aside from economic factors we don't know at what near or distant future date we shall have to take measures of total defense against the most vicious sort of aerial warfare. How could we better protect ourselves from the destruction of all our docks and shipyards than to provide reserve facilities 1,000 miles inland, where providence has made us so secure?

Mr. Kent's sole argument seems to hinge on his personal reluctance to looking ahead a brief 4 years; he seems to forget utterly that this unpredictable war may last that long, or longer. Surely, the bottlenecks we have encountered since defense preparations began and which we have not yet eliminated, have taught America the dangerous folly of shortsighted policies.

House Joint Resolution 193 Will Increase Unemployment—W. P. A. Appropriation Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has considered and passed House Joint Resolution 193, which is a resolution making appropriations for work relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942. I pointed out that the appropriations for this purpose as set forth in this bill were entirely inadequate. The House should have adopted the Casey amendment, which had for its purpose an increase in the money appropriated for W. P. A. projects.

My attention has just been called to an item in the Duluth (Minn.) newspapers which reads as follows:

A cut in the Duluth district W. P. A. quota to 5,690 by July 6 was ordered yesterday in St. Paul following announcement in Washington the previous day of a general cut throughout the country.

The July quota for Minnesota is 25,500, compared with 37,193 on June 11. The reduction necessitates stopping of full projects in some parts of the State and entire operations in some counties, S. L. Stolte, State administrator, was quoted as saying by the Associated Press.

A. T. Gilbertson, district manager for Duluth, was in St. Paul yesterday attending a session of W. P. A. officials and is expected back today.

This is a drastic cut and means that a great many people now working on W. P. A. projects in Minnesota, and especially in the territory I represent, will be forced back on relief rolls.

Apparently the same situation prevails in the District of Columbia, because in an item in yesterday's Times-Herald, I note that the Board of Public Welfare here will be required to discharge about 4,000 W. P. A. workers on July 1. This newspaper item reads as follows:

DISTRICT SEEKS $300,000 TO AID W. P. A. JOBLESS

The District Commissioners late yesterday asked the Board of Public Welfare "what to do" about the 4,000 W. P. A. workers who, on July 1, will be dropped from the rolls.

Commissioner John Russell Young said he had asked Acting Welfare Director Conrad Van Hyning for suggestions as to how the District might aid the W. P. A. workers who will be thrown out of jobs when the Federal edict becomes effective.

"There will be several thousand jobless on our hands who face starvation," said Young, "and we must do something to see that they don't go hungry."

He estimated that between $300,000 and $400,000 would be necessary annually to take care of those dropped because of the Federal demand for a 50-percent cut in local W. P. A. personnel.

At the instigation of Senator OVERTON (Democrat), of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate subcommittee on District Appropriations, Young said he had asked all local agencies affected by the Federal W. P. A. cut to file reports as to the effect on both services and personnel.

"I have asked Acting Welfare Director Van Hyning to give us an idea as to what might be necessary to care for these persons who will lose their jobs," said Young.

Senator Overton, Commissioner Young said, has asked for a complete analysis of the local situation.

Mr. Speaker, I call this situation to the attention of the House because it is my hope that the Senate will see fit to increase the W. P. A. appropriations. The House bill was a drastic one, and I think a very serious mistake was made when the House leaders took the attitude that the relief program should not be continued. This Government is spending plenty of money in aid to countries across the water. That is proper. But we have a duty and an obligation to our own citizens, and this should not be overlooked at this time.

Abuse of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MOUNT VERNON (N. Y.) INDEPENDENT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Mount Vernon Independent, Mount Vernon, N. Y., on Friday, June 20, 1941, entitled "Abuse of Democracy."

[From the Mount Vernon Independent of June 20, 1941]

ABUSE OF DEMOCRACY

Much to our regret we learned that recently the President of our country, at the mention of his name, at a rally of the America First Committee, in White Plains, was booed.

With reports such as these being circulated throughout the county and country, we wonder just how far democracy should go in order to protect the welfare of our country. Either those who participated in booing our President were ignorant of the responsibilities and trust placed in the high office of the Presidency, or they were deliberately abusing the rights given them under our system of government. These are critical times. Our country is being attacked from without by millions of people who believe in other forms of governments than our own. The high office of the Presidency of the United States is being smeared by outside propagandists, and every time these attacks are made they are attacks upon every American citizen.

It is therefore doubly important that we prevent any further smears upon the Presidency of the United States by people from within our country. Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President of the United States for a third term by the majority of the people. Our system of government demands that the minority abide by the will of the majority. It further demands that the President be the leader of all these citizens of the country, and that the seat of the high office of President of the United States be respected by all citizens, regardless of party affiliations. We hope that we do not see a repetition of what occurred in White Plains again, but if it does, we trust that, in the interests of our country, proper steps be taken to stop such demonstrations. Within the comprehension and extension of the word "democracy" should not be read the meaning that a citizen has a license to boo its President.

A Former Member Favors the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

STATEMENT OF W. W. CHALMERS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement from Mr. W. W. Chalmers, of Ohio, on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Mr. Chalmers served in this House for many years and was a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee for 8 years and introduced the first bill on this seaway December 5, 1931.

Mr. Chalmers has been a deep student of this interior development, and his statements are very important at this time, when there is so much confusion

and misrepresentation regarding it. His remarks follow:

The Great Lakes are the most efficient transportation system in the world today. I stood in the Toledo harbor recently and saw the Hocking Valley derrick load into one of the lake freighters 4 carloads of coal every 3 minutes, or every 24 hours more than 100,000 tons of coal were transferred from the rails and put into lake freighters. In 1927 when making a round-the-world trip we were held up at Singapore 5 days so that they could load 12 tons of cargo on our ship, *The President Garfield*. This freight was carried on board by Singapore Tamils. With all our handicaps we have been handling freight on the Great Lakes for the past 50 years, loading over 125,000,000 tons a year for a little less than 1 mill a ton mile. Imagine a pile of coal of 10 tons on the asphalt pavement between the Capitol Building and the Congressional Library. What would it cost to have that coal loaded and hauled down Pennsylvania Avenue a mile to the White House? We have been doing that job on the Great Lakes for more than a half century for a little less than 1 cent. Give us the American seaway and see what it will do for the prosperity of the country.

That great Midwestern continent lying between the Allegheny and Rocky Mountains is the most productive region of the world, a modern Garden of Eden. When the St. Lawrence River project is completed and the 34 miles of rapids in this river are canalized and a 27-foot channel is opened from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean, the American Merchant Marine will help this great continent to take its place as a world leader.

That is why I favor the bill. I favor it because I want to save it for future generations. I want to see the waters of this country developed so that one-half of the freight load of the United States will be handled by the rivers and harbors and inland and coastal waters of the country. If you save 13 mills per ton-mile on the freight load, you will save approximately six and one-half billions of dollars annually to the shippers and consumers of this country.

It has been said that the region of the valley of the Great Lakes is the cream jug and breadbasket of the world. That country is most prosperous that makes the sea the first unit of its transportation scheme. Don't blame us for a longing for an ocean port. It has been the desire of men and nations since the dawn of civilization to have an outlet to the sea.

The most extravagant thing this country can do at this time is to neglect its waterways. The successful peoples of the earth have been masters of the deep. During all time the prosperous nations of the world have been those who have made the ocean their first transportation unit. If we could only clear away the barriers made by the rapids of the St. Lawrence and let our ships into the Great Lakes and the Mississippi Valley territory they would pick up more business than they could handle.

Following the recommendation of the American and Canadian engineers, the International Joint Commission has divided the 182 miles from Montreal to Lake Ontario into 5 divisions. The first division is from Montreal to Lake St. Louis, 25 miles, 13 miles of canal and 12 miles of river, with an elevation of 45 feet. In the canal section they make use of 2 locks and a guard lock. The second division is from Lake St. Louis to Lake St. Francis, 16 miles, with an elevation of 83 feet, 13½ miles of canal and 2½ miles of river. In this section they place 2 locks and 1 guard lock. The third section is from Lake St. Francis to St. Regis Island, a distance of 28 miles, all open sailing, with a change in elevation of 3 feet. The fourth division is from St. Regis Island to Chimney Point, a distance of 48 miles, 7½ miles of canal and 40½ miles of river. The elevation is 92 feet, and they use 3 locks in the canal. The fifth section is from Chimney Point to Lake Ontario, with wide river sailing the whole distance of 65 miles, with a change of elevation of only 1 foot. The power works are recommended to be placed in the fourth section, on the international boundary line, and provide for the development of 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric current.

The St. Lawrence canal will cost $275,000,000 for a 27-foot channel, with the permanent works built so that it can be later deepened to 35 feet. These costs were figured between July 1, 1920, and July 1, 1921, when materials and labor were 20 percent higher than now. The added value to the grain crop will more than equal the entire cost of construction each year after its completion. The price of a commodity is fixed where the surplus of that article comes in competition with similar commodities from other parts of the world. Hence the price of grain is made in Liverpool. Whenever you can cut the cost of sending a bushel of wheat from Kansas to Liverpool, or a bushel of corn from Illinois, you add that saving to the wealth of the farmers of those States. This does not apply to the surplus only, but the price of the whole crop is fixed by the price of the part of it that is thrown upon the market.

Canada rebuilt the Welland Canal. It is now completed. When the St. Lawrence is completed, as recommended by the International Joint Commission, the Great Lakes will be turned into a Baltic or Mediterranean Sea. With a 27-foot channel from tidewater to the Great Lakes, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Duluth, Superior, Milwaukee, and Chicago will have the same freight rates from Liverpool and other foreign ports as those in force from the same ports to New York City. Do you realize what that would do to business? Do the farmers and manufacturers realize what it would do to them to have the cost of the railroad haul eliminated from Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, and Buffalo to New York City? It costs 22⅘ cents to ship a bushel of wheat from Chicago to New York by rail. Save it and give it to the farmers. It costs $40.65 to ship an automobile weighing 3,000 pounds from Toledo or Detroit to New York. Save it and divide it among those who make the automobiles. It affects equally all the territory between the Alleghenies and the Rockies. When this seaway is completed, the freight rates will be revised radically downward.

You ask me what proof I can submit to substantiate the above surprising statement? It is 160 miles farther from Liverpool to Cleveland by the St. Lawrence River than it is from Liverpool to New York. It is 275 miles farther to Toledo, 325 miles farther to Detroit, 860 miles farther to Chicago, and 950 miles farther to Superior and Duluth. What difference does even 1,000 miles make on a seaway? All the Atlantic seaports now, although some of them are 1,000 miles apart, have the same Liverpool rate. Let me quote from the report of the International Joint Commission:

"The Commission is inclined to agree with the statement that where there is a productive interior, ships will proceed as far inland as physically practicable, and that the farther inland they can penetrate the greater will be the resulting economy and the more extensive the area benefited." Notable examples of rivers on which considerable traffic has been developed by oceangoing ships are the Amazon, the Yangtze Kiang, the Rhine, the Danube, the Columbia, the Willamette, the Delaware, the lower Mississippi, and the St. Lawrence itself. It appears in evidence that the same rate of freight was paid from New York to Bombay as from New York to Calcutta, although the latter port was 2,000 miles farther and involved 90 miles of a tortuous river channel much more difficult than the St. Lawrence. It may be noted that ocean shipping has to an increasing extent made Montreal its destination, although railroads extend down both banks from Montreal to Quebec.

Two thousand miles farther and a tortuous channel of 90 miles make no difference in the rates. The total restricted channel of our seaway, including both the St. Lawrence and the Welland Canal, is only 59 miles. The equal rates from the lake ports are not visionary but are a corollary of the present practice.

Forty-seven percent of all the tonnage shipped over sea originates in the territory west of Pittsburgh, east of Denver, and north of the Arkansas and Tennessee Rivers. Ninety percent of all produce shipped abroad is grown in this territory. The value added to the grain of this region each year would more than pay for the cost of this project.

Now I come to the part of this project that the East is vitally interested in. I refer to the hydroelectric possibilities. The value of the hydroelectric energy derived from the power works will add to the business of the East more than 10 times the possible loss from navigation. You are interested in this project by the possibilities from its hydroelectric development. The St. Lawrence drains one-fourth of the American Continent north of the Mexican border, and in its course falls 224 feet and is capable of delivering more than 5,500,000 continuous horsepower. This is equal to the energy created by the burning of 60,000,000 tons of coal in the most modern steam plant. I call your attention to Professional Paper No. 123, issued by the Interior Department, W. S. Murray, chief engineer, recommending a superpower circuit, including Boston, New York, Baltimore, Washington, and adjacent territory.

Senator Leonard W. H. Gibbs, who was chairman of the New York State Commission, opposed to the St. Lawrence ship canal, said 5,400,000 potential horsepower of electric energy available on the St. Lawrence at $25 a horsepower, and you may be sure it will never be sold so low, amounts to an annual income of $135,000,000.

I recommend that when this project is built that the sills of the seven locks be put down to a depth of 35 feet so that when the time comes, as it will, for a deeper channel, it will not be necessary to tear apart the permanent works and rebuild the locks, but simply do a little dredging at small cost. When my bill was up for consideration the office of the Chief of Engineers figured this for me, and the cost would be only $4,000,000, and is covered by the $275,000,000 at that time.

I secured the adoption of my bill the fourth reach from Lake Ontario to Ogdensburg. (See Public, No. 520, 71st Cong., H. R. 11781, p. 15.)

It is an international crime that this energy has not been used for the service of man in the past. It has been going to waste since the early morning of creation, and will not stop until darkness closes the last day of eternity.

The St. Lawrence waterway will make millions each year from coastwise navigation. It will make tens of millions from its hydroelectric works. It will light homes, stores, streets, factories, and cities. It will do the work, run the streetcars and railroads at less than half the cost of today. We are just in the morning of the electric day. The greatest progress of science and inventions in this age will be made in the electric field.

The United States is not as it was 150 years ago—a narrow strip of coast lying between the Allegheny Mountains and the Atlantic Ocean. Beyond those mountains today is a vast domain whose people are interested in this seaway. Its success goes much beyond merely passing interest. It means their life or death commercially.

This project is more than a mere business proposition. Its potential possibilities are limitless. It contains romance, comedy,

tragedy, life, and death, not only to this generation but to countless generations yet unborn. Let us be pioneers and promoters of this, the greatest and most beneficent enterprise of the age.

Over beyond the Berkshire Hills and the Adirondacks, between Buffalo and the Rockies, there are forty-two and one-half millions of people who are being commercially smothered by a lack of transportation facilities. They are gasping for breath under the weight of high freight rates. The grain is rotting in the fields. Their automobiles are reaching the world markets a year out of date. They will be bled white by high freight rates unless relief comes—and the only relief is in the development of the national seaway—obstructed by only 34 miles of rapids—provided by God at the creation. Those rapids are watched over and guarded by New York as Leonidas guarded the Pass of Thermopylae. You would imagine by this opposition that if this seaway goes through grass would grow in Broadway and cows would be herded in Fifth Avenue and the sheep and the lambs would go unmolested, even in Wall Street.

I am appealing to the Members of Congress, where right and justice have always been given first consideration. No; the West will find its way to the sea. The 34 miles shall not stop them, even though guarded by selfishness and avarice and those who would exact a toll as our commerce passes through.

It is right, and, if so, you cannot kill it off by fighting it. You will remember that a certain doctor of the law gave the Sadducees some pretty sound advice many years ago in the following words:

"And now I say unto you, refrain from these men and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God."

Mazzini Society Opposed to Fascism and Nazi-ism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE MAZZINI SOCIETY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to use the following statement, reaffirming the intense devotion of Italian citizens to our democratic system and giving voice to their hatred for facsim and all that it implies.

A copy of this splendid declaration was supplied me by Mr. Amerigo Bozzani, whose high patriotism and deep love of his adopted country has been an inspiration to his fellow countrymen in this trying period in our national history.

The Southern California Branch of the Mazzini Society, at a meeting held June 9, 1941, placed itself on record once more as denouncing Fascist Italy's entrance into the war on the side of Germany and against Britain a year ago today, and sent a telegram to the President, F. D. Roosevelt, reaffirming that conviction and faith in the ultimate triumph of democracy.

The Mazzini Society, which is composed of American citizens of Italian origin and of Italians residing in this country, condemned such war against Britain, who during the fight for Italian national independence has been sympathetic to our struggle and highly honored Garibaldi and Mazzini, who found in England free hospitality. The events of the past year, the society declared, have brought added humiliation to the Italian people; the fascistic dictatorship imposed by force 20 years ago has utterly destroyed the current of sympathies for Italy in all foreign lands where free democratic institutions prosper, and after continued military reverses Mussolini has turned Italy over to its traditional enemy and reduced the nation to a German colony, completely subjected to Hitler.

DICTATORS DENOUNCED

Thus the Italian Dictator has destroyed the noble work of Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Cavour and nullified the ideals of our Italian generations who through unending sacrifices devoted themselves to the liberation of Italy from the German yoke.

The society repeated its firm conviction, based on first-hand knowledge, that fascism does not represent the spirit of the Italian people; it reaffirmed its unalterable opposition to fascism and nazi-ism; it denounced the Italian press and radio in this country as agents of totalitarian propaganda, and it renewed its allegiance to the principle of democracy and to the Constitution of the United States.

THE MAZZINI SOCIETY,
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BRANCH,
By AMERIGO BOZZANI.

Ouster of the German Consuls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HOME NEWS, BRONX COUNTY, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to revise and extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared June 17, in the Home News, a newspaper published in Bronx County, New York City.

To my mind the importance of this editorial is not the fact that it expresses the policy of this newspaper, but, rather, because it is in reality a reflection of the opinion of the community which it serves and which I have the honor to represent.

The editorial follows:

[From the Home News, Bronx County, New York City, of June 17, 1941]

OUSTER OF THE GERMAN CONSULS

Since it is implicit in the Nazi dogma that every agent abroad must lend himself unquestioningly to Hitlerian schemes and ambitions, regardless of what international amenities are violated thereby, the United States will have less reason to worry about propaganda and espionage and worse now that the whole German consular corps and associated servants of the Reich are under orders to depart.

President Roosevelt's decision to expel the consuls and their German employees and to close up their 24 offices, as well as the German Library of Information in New York and similar agencies, brings the United States almost to a complete rupture of diplomatic relations with Berlin. The break is not entire, however, for the German embassy itself, at Washington, is not affected. Though minus an Ambassador, just as the American Embassy in Berlin long has been conducted not by an Ambassador but by an envoy of lower rank, the Reich Embassy remains the last direct link in our territory between our Government and the Wilhelmstrasse.

There is no use shuddering about the implications of this latest stroke, which came close in the wake of the freezing of German and Italian credits, and which is due to be followed by a strong protest over the U-boat sinking of the *Robin Moor*—a protest that undoubtedly will be emphatic, despite yesterday's good news of the rescue of the missing 35 passengers and crew.

America's course of all-out aid to Britain and all-out defense being what it is, and Nazi intrigue being what it is, there is instead plenty of reason for satisfaction in the expulsion of these untrustworthy guests. By July 10 they must be gone—and with them they will carry the knowledge that the United States is determined to take every measure to insure freedom from such subversion and disunity as was fanned in pre-war France by Hitler emissaries; and exemption from such a profound study and disruption of Norwegian and Yugoslavian and Dutch and Belgian defense arrangements as was carried on by Hitler tools in those lands.

The State Department charges the Nazi representatives with improprieties "inimical to the welfare of this country." Americans who have watched the careers in our midst of Consul-General Fritz Weidemann in San Francisco and Baron Edgar Von Spiegel, to mention only two conspicuous examples, will have little doubt of the validity of the accusation that the consuls and the "librarians" and attachés of the German Railway and Tourist Agency and the Trans-Ocean News Service "have engaged in activities wholly outside the scope of their legitimate duties." A consul is supposed only to look out for commercial interests and for the persons and property of fellow countrymen abroad; newsmen and other disseminators of information are supposed to stay strictly within their fields.

The charges do not give specifications. Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles referred to the Justice Department inquiries about the investigations that preceded the ouster and about the possibility that any of the German officials had been directly linked with sabotage. Details may be forthcoming, but even without them enough has transpired in the recent past to indicate that where these individuals belong is back in the homeland.

Germany now is sure to expel our consuls, just as we ourselves earlier this year requested Italy to close its establishments in Newark and Detroit, in retaliation for the closing of two American consulates in that country, and just as Premier Mussolini has sequestered our assets in Italy, in reprisal for the corresponding American action.

All that cannot be helped. We cannot permit bundsmen funds to attack us here at home, and we cannot allow official German agents to tamper with our security. Whatever the consequences are, they must be faced, if the United States is to remain safe and make itself strong.

Additional Judge for Eastern District of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I again desire to refer to the bill which has passed the House providing for an additional United States judge for the eastern district of Missouri. It will be recalled, when this bill was under consideration charges were made that it was the purpose of the legislation to take care of some political friend and there was opposition to the bill, especially from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT], who read a telegram from the senior district judge of the eastern district of Missouri, in which he indicated that an additional judge was not needed. I yielded during my speech for information as to who the "political friend" was, but no one could advise me.

After the bill passed the House a further investigation was made by the Chief Justice of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, Hon. Kimbrough Stone, and he filed an additional statement with the Senate committee to justify the recommendation that the conference of circuit judges had made, not once but on numerous occasions, for an additional judge for this district.

As I stated last week, the Bar Association of St. Louis appointed a special committee, composed of Republicans and Democrats, to make an investigation and they unanimously reported, after a thorough study, that there was need of an additional judge in this district.

I have inserted in the RECORD editorials from outstanding newspapers in the district and now, Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I insert an editorial taken from the St. Louis Star-Times of Saturday, June 21, which is self-explanatory. The editorial follows:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of June 21, 1941]

ANOTHER FEDERAL JUDGE

A report by a special committee of the St. Louis Bar Association clarifies the question of whether eastern Missouri needs a new Federal district judge. The committee, in a statement endorsed by the bar association's executive body, points out that the docket will be seriously crowded by pending and expected condemnation cases, and urges that the new judgeship is necessary if ordinary civil cases are not to fall "about 3 years behind."

Add this report to the fact that the Federal Judicial Conference, composed of Chief Justice Hughes and senior circuit judges, repeatedly has recommended an additional district judge in eastern Missouri, and the issue seems settled. The courts, as Judge Charles B. Davis recently pointed out, are handling their current cases promptly, but it would be a serious mistake to ignore the imminent danger of future crowding and delays. In Missouri, as elsewhere, "justice delayed" can all too easily become "justice denied."

A bill creating an additional judgeship has passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Its enactment is proper and thoroughly desirable.

Mr. Speaker, every metropolitan newspaper in this district, regardless of their political views, have now urged the appointment of this additional district judge, and I hope that this will be sufficient to convince the House that no mistake was made in passing this bill.

Trade Agreement With Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD H. REES, OF KANSAS, TO THE COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY AND INFORMATION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement submitted by me to the Committee on Reciprocity and Information on the proposed trade agreement with Argentina and Uruguay:

Members of the committee, I want to join with others who have appeared before your committee, in support especially of the stockmen and farmers and the farm organizations, to oppose reduction in duties on meat products, cheese, wool, hides, flaxseed, and other commodities that are brought into direct competition with the American producers. It appears the only important proposal in the agreement is to permit the increase of farm products into the United States.

In this brief statement, my discussion shall particularly deal with the livestock industry. I should like to call your attention here to the fact that the livestock business is a $4,000,000,000 industry and directly affects one-third of our population. I believe the American farmer has a right to be protected so long as he can supply the American market with the things he produces. The producers of livestock are in position to amply supply the needs of this Nation with meat and meat products. The livestock population in the United States today closely approaches the high peak of 1934.

It is my contention that any agreement entered into at this time that will provide for further importation of farm products will certainly not be in the interests of American agriculture. Heretofore, as I understand it, trade agreements have been entered into for the mutual benefits of the contracting parties. We are now told that these particular agreements are required at this time as a part of the good-neighbor policy and to provide for hemispheric solidarity. It just seems to me that there are many other methods that should be more satisfactory, and far more durable at this moment, in order to have hemispheric solidarity.

I just don't believe, either, that we can get very far in providing hemispheric solidarity by a piecemeal method. It also seems to me, if the question of hemispheric defense is important—and I grant that it is most important at this time—that we will get further by instilling in the hearts and minds of these peoples the fact that it is just as important to them as it is to us that we join in a program of defense and protection against the aggressor nations. It seems to me that the South American countries should realize that the threat of aggression in the world today is just as vital to them as to the United States. We can't secure hemispheric solidarity by attempting to buy it in this fashion. I don't believe it is necessary for us to import more beef and beef products, flaxseed or dog food, in order to impress these countries with our friendship.

Can it be said, in order to provide economic solidarity that the economic sufficiency of certain nations in South America should be secured at the expense of our western United States? If that is the point in question, it would be just as well for us to buy their surplus meat products and give it to the undernourished and underfed people in their own countries.

Our Government is expending billions of dollars in an effort to support the price of farm products. We have provided billions of dollars in loans and subsidies. We have created acreage restrictions, and we have export subsidies, in an attempt to provide the producers with incomes with which to purchase the things they need to buy. In view of this situation, it seems incredible that your committee at this time would consider further complicating the situation. We have always protected industry by tariffs. Now, when the farmers and stockmen are having the struggle of their lives, you propose by this method to make that problem even greater.

Since it is the policy of the Government to raise production costs on articles of manufacture of every kind—how are you going to reconcile such policy with one of this kind?

A number of witnesses who appeared before your committee have given you facts and figures with reference to the value of exports and imports as they deal with this country. I shall not add to such figures except to point out that 83 percent of our exports to Argentina are industrial, and 90 percent of our imports from that country are agricultural.

It is my opinion that we have gone far enough in permitting meat and meat products to enter this country in competition with our own. This is no time to go further. Suppose, for example, we should turn this problem around. Do you think there would be a demand for this program if these countries had a surplus of industrial products and wanted to dispose of them in the United States? Do you believe, in order to be friendly with these particular countries, that we would be very keen in our desire to make such a deal for those particular products?

The President has said that he did not consider tariff duties on farm products as being high, and that to lower them would be inconsistent with his farm program. This proposal does not seem to agree with that view.

There is another thing which seems important to me, and I firmly believe that in view of conditions as they are in the world today—it is not the proper time to enter into agreements of this kind. Furthermore, it is not the time to stir the producers of our country by causing them to become fearful of injury they might sustain on account of these proposals. The very least you can do is to postpone this matter until world conditions become more settled and stable.

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD H. REES,
Member of Congress.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who has consistently opposed our entry into the war, I have become convinced that we should not merely in a negative way be against participation in the war but should advocate an affirmative and constructive course for our country to follow.

Even though we have step by step come to the brink of war we can still avoid participation in it if we are united in a constructive policy that has for its goal the welfare of the United States. Keeping in mind solely the best interests of our own country could we not agree on the following course for us to follow:

First. Let us all unite behind the program to make this country impregnable from attack. It is not sufficient that we have appropriated billions for this purpose. Our first duty is to ourselves, and we must see that our own defense requirements are filled before we attempt to help others. We should not ask our young men to sacrifice a year in the Army without giving them the necessary equipment for training purposes.

It is a known fact that this country has practically stripped her defenses of much-needed equipment. We should fill our own needs first. Only then should we give all possible aid to England short of war. This is not selfish. It is only common sense. With the fortunes of war rapidly shifting, no one knows how soon we will need everything possible for our own defense.

Second. We must keep this country on a sound financial basis. One of the first lines of defense is our financial stability. If this country becomes bankrupt or inflation comes, not only our whole defense program but our entire economic system would collapse. With the necessity of spending billions for defense, our national indebtedness will probably go from $65,000,000,000 to $90,000,000,000. This dangerous situation must be squarely faced. We must have increased revenue for these ever-increasing costs. That means more and more taxes so we can, as far as possible, pay as we go. We must cut down to the bone all expenditures other than for defense purposes. We should retain only those services of the Government which are absolutely necessary during this emergency.

Third. We must protect this country not only from dangers from without but from within. We should pass any additional legislation necessary to protect our country from "fifth columnists" and all subversive activities. We must have cooperation between labor and industry, so we can have an all-out effort for national defense. We should most carefully preserve our representative form of government as guaranteed under the Constitution, with its three coequal branches of the Government. Let us not wake up some day and find we have a dictatorship at home just as bad as those we abhor abroad.

Fourth. We should be definitely against any plan for Union Now with Great Britain. Are we suddenly to transfer our patriotism for our own country to the British Empire? That such a suggestion is not mere idle words but is being seriously considered I quote from the Washington Times-Herald of June 19, 1941, as follows:

LONDON, June 19.—Prime Minister Churchill, who recently promised the House of Commons he would make no transfer of Empire territory without giving the members a full opportunity to discuss the advisability beforehand yesterday assured the House that the government would not formulate a plan for Federal union between this country and the United States without a mandate from the British Parliament. So great a change, Churchill said, could not be brought about without the fullest public and parliamentary discussion beforehand.

I suppose we should consider it fortunate that Churchill has decided to have a full discussion in Parliament before taking us into the Empire. I wonder what our early patriots and those who fought to make this country great would think of such a course of action?

Fifth. We should engage in a peace offensive before we try a war offensive. Everyone in their right senses desires peace but with all Europe and part of Asia aflame and the biggest offensive the world has even known, reaching from the Baltic to the Black Sea, about to be launched, who can bring about that peace so universally desired? Certainly not the belligerents themselves. It would be a sign of weakness on their part. No matter which side wins, they will attempt to dictate a peace that will revenge the wrongs inflicted upon them which would result in another Versailles.

Then is it absurd to talk about a just peace? I do not think so. Perhaps momentarily but not as a definite policy of this Government. We, the greatest Nation on earth, are not at war and can use our tremendous influence for peace. Perhaps not at the moment, and I am perfectly willing to leave the proper time to the discretion of Secretary of State Hull, but I am convinced when he deems the time is right that he should vigorously urge and insist that a just peace be arrived at between tne belligerent nations. He has already hinted his willingness to fulfill this great humanitarian roll in his speech of May 18, 1941, when he set forth five principles for permanent peace that could be adopted by any reasonable nation.

Sixth. We must vigorously and aggressively defend not only the United States but all her vital rights and interests in the Western Hemisphere.

Germany is now attacking Russia and I believe it is the consensus of expert military leaders that Germany will be victorious. If she is able to conquer Russia she will have control of all the vast resources of that country and will virtually nullify the English blockade.

We might as well squarely face the fact that it would be a very grave undertaking, under those circumstances, to attempt to send an expeditionary force into continental Europe. All military experts are agreed that it takes four times as powerful a force to invade a country as to defend it. Why should we take on those overwhelming odds? Why should we not force Germany to assume such odds if she tries to invade this hemisphere? I do not mean for one moment we should fight purely a defensive war if we should get into it. We should be as aggressive as necessary in defending our rights if attacked.

Seventh. If Germany defeats Russia we should help feed the starving peoples in the conquered countries, under certain guaranties, as such a victory for Germany would nullify the blockade and would remove the chief objection to furnishing food to the starving civilians in these countries. Starvation is driving them into the arms of the Axis. Take France for example. If food was furnished these countries it would strengthen their determination to remain at least in passive resistance against these aggressors. Of course, proper safeguards should be established that these supplies in no way be permitted to reach the military forces of the Axis Powers.

I have tried to outline several principles which should make our Nation strong. An impregnable defense; a sound financial and economic policy; a country united under the principles enunciated by our Constitution and dedicated to carrying on our own destiny—that destiny to defend America and to preserve inviolate her institutions; we should be definitely against any plan for Union Now; we should attempt to bring about a just peace before entering the war; if it is necessary to go to war we should take all necessary steps to defend our rights in the Western Hemisphere, but we should not attempt an expeditionary force to Europe; we should try to help the starving people of Europe wherever possible. The thought I have in mind in all of these suggestions has been simply that we should think of America first and what is best for her before we engage in the age-old European quarrels.

Shall the United States Sever Diplomatic Relations With the Axis Powers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. HAMILTON FISH OVER THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, SUNDAY EVENING, JUNE 22, 1941

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio

speech delivered by me over the American Radio Forum, broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System's network, Sunday evening, June 22, 1941:

The recalling of our chargé d'affaires and the embassy staff from Berlin and severing all diplomatic relations with Germany is only important as a final step to war. Being opposed to war, except in defense of America, I am naturally against any such action.

The closing down of German and Italian consulates should not be confused with breaking off all diplomatic relations. The administration, if it had proof of German and Italian propaganda against us or of inciting strikes, industrial unrest, or sabotage, or of military or naval spying, was right in ordering the consulates closed. Moreover, there is very little trade between the United States and Germany or Italy and, therefore, there is not much need for these consulates.

I believe, however, to sever all diplomatic relations with Germany and Italy would be a serious blunder and against our own interests. If we recall our diplomatic representatives from Berlin and Rome, and they do likewise, we will have no channel left to exercise any influence throughout continental Europe now or at the end of the war or to promote peace whenever that time comes.

The war between Hitler and Stalin does not change the situation in America, except more than ever we should determine to stay out. I do not believe the American mothers want to send their sons to Soviet Russia to fight and die for communism or any foreign dictatorship.

I am sure the noninterventionists in America will shed no tears in having the Communists in this country lined up with the war makers.

It would be the height of hypocrisy for free Americans to think of defending Communism and the "red" flag in Soviet Russia or at home. Far better to provide free transportation to all American Communists who want to fight for Joseph Stalin and world revolution and send them back to Soviet Russia with no return ticket. I would do the same for the Nazis and the Fascists. There is no room in free America for any of these foreign forms of dictatorships and despotisms. Let's send them all back to their native land.

I take this opportunity to state that the preliminary result of a poll of 106,000 registered or enrolled voters in my district on the clear-cut issue, "Shall the United States enter the war or stay out?" shows that the sentiment against our involvement is overwhelming—approximately 86 percent, according to the first returns.

The poll had nothing to do with hatred of warfare, but simply whether we should participate or stay out. To my surprise, as I expected the vote would be 2 or 3 to 1 against our going into the war, it is running 7 to 1. Everyone in America knows that we are on the verge of war and the object of the poll was to ascertain public sentiment now, not 6 months from now under unpredictable conditions and circumstances.

The poll shows that over 85 percent of the people of my district have not been deceived by the eastern interventionist press, radio propagandists, and war-making columnists.

It is evident that only a small minority of the American people are for war now, but apparently they are vociferous, aggressive, wealthy, and with powerful connections in the press and over the radio.

However, as long as 85 percent of the people insist on their right to be heard against involvement in European, communistic, and Asiatic wars, the Congress will never vote for war except in case of attack.

Before it is too late the American people must consider the price of entering European and Asiatic wars in lives, money, and as it affects the destiny of America. There is only one yardstick to reach a right decision, and that is what is best for America.

H. R. 3318—Hospital Care for World War Veterans of United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress now has before it H. R. 3318, introduced by the Honorable ARTHUR D. HEALEY, of Massachusetts. When enacted, this bill will authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish domiciliary and hospital care and medical treatment to World War veterans of the United States merchant marine.

Let me bring you back to 1917, when the Sixty-fifth Congress authorized the recruiting and training of men for the United States merchant marine and appropriated $6,250,000 for such expenses. These boys were trained and then served in the all-important and vital service of the United States merchant marine, which was a medium of contact for the fighting forces of the A. E. F., which was at least 3,000 miles from their base. The cry in 1917 was to build a bridge of ships to France, so that the much-needed troops and tonnage and other supplies across the mine-filled and U-boat infested Atlantic Ocean would reach the shores of France and other Allied countries. In manning these ships many of these boys were sent to Davey Jones' locker. Some of the ships did not even have a gun for protection.

It was President Woodrow Wilson who issued the call to the young men of 1917–18 to enlist in the United States merchant marine. He said:

It is the patriotic duty of young men to join this important service.

The enlisted men of the United States merchant marine in carrying out their precarious duties on the high seas were at all times subjected to the same hardships, suffering and dangers as those enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard and the United States Navy. But, while the latter great services of the United States have been fully recognized since the World War, the men of the United States merchant marine have suffered through the failure of Congress to take proper action in their behalf. That the Congress should have done so is shown by the significant fact that it was a prerequisite to enlistment in the United States merchant marine that as protection against sabotage the applicant be a full American citizen. This regulation, as is well known, was not in force in either the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard. Thousands of aliens were permitted to enlist in these branches of the service and are today receiving benefits which are denied American citizens who served in the United States merchant marine. They were picked men. All had to be bona fide American citizens between the ages of 21 and 35.

The record, showing 156 American merchant vessels sunk by the enemy, as against 19 naval vessels, testifies as to the hazards they suffered. No harder or more hazardous work was performed by any of the men engaged in the regular military and naval services.

I have here statements by President Woodrow Wilson; Secretary of War Newton D. Baker; Edward N. Hurley, Chairman of the United States Shipping Board during 1917–18; Admiral Sir John Jellicoe, of the British Navy; Rear Admiral William S. Sims, of the United States Navy, and many other outstanding personalities who guided our destinies during the World War. These statements are proof of the great value of the United States merchant marine to the well-being of our country during the last war.

The men of the United States merchant marine of the World War of 1917–18 are appreciative of these commendatory statements; but words, no matter how kind or praising, are of but little value to the maimed and the sick who have received their disabilities in the service of their country.

Now, after 25 years of neglect, these middle-aged and elderly veterans of the United States merchant marine of 1917–18 are merely asking for hospital and medical care already accorded the military veterans. Also, they ask for the burial of their dead and the use of United States flags to drape their caskets.

Surely, in view of the all-important service they have rendered their country at the risk of life and health, these requests are not excessive.

It is plain that a grave injustice has been done these veterans who served so splendidly during the World War of 1917–18. The Congress has failed during all these years to properly and adequately recognize them.

The Healey bill, let me emphasize, does not in any way seek pensions, bonus, or compensation benefits of any kind. It simply calls for a just recognition of the valiant service of the men of the United States merchant marine of the World War of 1917–18 by granting domiciliary and hospital care. Let us recitify the injustice done to the veterans of the United States merchant marine by enacting H. R. 3318 into law.

[From the Boston Post of December 12, 1930]

MERCHANT SHIP CREWS AMAZE NAVY—MESSAGES SENT BY GERMAN SUBS KNOWN, SIMS SAYS

Praise for the officers and crews of American merchant ships who transported supplies across the Atlantic during the war was given by Rear Admiral William S. Sims in his Lowell Institute lecture series last night. The skill and seamanship of these sailors was something that amazed naval officers, the admiral said, and they proved themselves to be seamen "in a sense that naval officers never have the opportunity to become."

GOT EVERY SUB MESSAGE

Courage, initiative, and a sense of responsibility, skill in handling ships of all types, and noteworthy seamanship characterized the merchantmen, he asserted. "I'd like to see a bunch of 30 naval officers trying to handle 30 heterogeneous ships as the merchantmen did," he said. "I don't think they would like it. Without the merchantman's skill, courage, and loyalty, the war could not have been won."

[From the Boston Post of March 6, 1941]

MERCHANT-MARINE HEROES

Senator WALSH in the Senate and Congressman HEALEY in the House have introduced bills seeking to give belated recognition for the services of our merchant-ship crews of the first World War.

When we entered that war in 1917 and faced the tremendous task of transporting millions of men and billions in supplies and equipment over 3,000 miles of ocean, our merchant marine for foreign service was almost extinct.

President Wilson and Secretary of War Baker issued calls for volunteers, and immediately thousands of adventurous young men, largely from New England and New York, responded. No harder or more hazardous work was performed by any of the men engaged in the regular military and naval services.

Sailing in poorly armed, slow, and clumsy vessels through the mine fields and submarine zones, these men were more exposed to danger than those on the warships. The German submarines, equipped with heavier caliber guns, could and did stand off and batter them to pieces without risk.

The record, showing 156 merchant vessels sunk by the enemy, as against 19 naval vessels, tells what hazards they suffered.

For this they received plenty of tribute, but little else. Rear Admiral Sims said: "Without the merchantman's skill, courage, and loyalty the war could not have been won." The British Admiral Jellico said: "The officers and men of the American merchant marine have founded, during the war, a new and glorious tradition in the teeth of undreamed of peril."

Now, after 25 years of neglect, these middle-aged and elderly veterans of the merchant marine are merely asking for the hospital and medical care accorded the military veterans, half of whom—through no fault of theirs—never had to leave the United States. Also, they ask for the burial of their dead and the use of United States flags to drape their caskets.

Surely, in view of the all-important service they rendered their country at the risk of life and health, these requests are not excessive.

Resolution Against Participation of American Boys in Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

RESOLUTION BY CITIZENS OF KEWAUNEE COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition in the form of a resolution requesting the President of the United States and each Wisconsin Member of the Congress of the United States to do all things in their power consistent with the actual defense of the United States and the protection of the lives and property of its people in America to prevent sending American boys abroad to take part in a foreign war on land or sea or in the air:

Whereas the slaughter of tens of thousands of young Americans on European battlefields during the last World War and the economic and social disorder which followed indelibly impressed in the hearts and minds of all clear-thinking Americans a determination that never again by inducement of foreign propaganda or otherwise shall the youth of this country be taken abroad for wholesale killing and maiming; and

Whereas now again the United States is being drawn nearer and nearer to participation in the present European conflict, but the American people have not wavered in their determination that American youths shall not be sent abroad to fight in a foreign war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by citizens of the United States and residents of Kewaunee County, Wis., That the President of the United States and each Wisconsin Member of the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby requested to do all in their power, consistent with the actual defense of the United States and the protection of the lives and property of its people in America, to prevent sending American boys abroad to take part in a foreign war on land or sea or in the air; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this petition, duly certified by the first signer thereof as a true copy of the original, be sent to his Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member of the Congress of the United States.

Opposition to Socialism and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE J. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HAVERHILL (MASS.) EVENING GAZETTE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Reader Editorial of the Day, from the Haverhill Evening Gazette of June 16, 1941:

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Evening Gazette of June 16, 1941]

MIGHTY OPPOSITION — CHURCH AND LABOR DOOM EFFORTS OF SOCIALISTS AND COMMUNISTS

READER EDITORIAL OF THE DAY

Norman Thomas, Socialist Party candidate for President in 1940, and two or three times before, is out with an article in the Call, official organ of the Socialist Party, in which he mentions the fact that a recent poll of union members in this Nation shows only 11 percent in favor of any radical third party, and especially the Socialist or Communist brand.

For 30 years the late Samuel Gompers fought socialism. In one of his speeches he said:

"There's no such thing as an American Socialist Party; it's just an annex of the German Social Democratic Party."

President William Green, of the A. F. of L., who has been at the head since Mr. Gompers died, has exactly the same opposition that Mr. Gompers had. Mr. Gompers once said to me:

"I stand exactly where you do. Government can't run any business. It has all and more than it can do effectively to run itself."

The executive board of the A. F. of L. is divided between the two old parties, but not one of them has been, or will be, for socialism.

The most powerful opponent of socialism is undoubtedly the powerful Catholic Church, with its more than 21,000,000 followers in the Nation. Some Catholics may, and often do, vote for a slice of state or municipal socialism, but this doesn't mean that any considerable number of them will ever vote for real socialism.

The recent address of Pope Pius XII denounced the "too extensive interference of the state." And he once again commended the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, the Rerum Novarum, as the "Magna Carta" of Christian social "endeavor." He highly endorsed Pope Leo and what he said on labor and private ownership. While the Pope didn't mention socialism or communism, he did endorse private ownership and the "right to riches," meaning the right to accummulate wealth and to "use it justly."

Socialists almost everywhere bitterly denounced the encyclical of Pope Leo, and the present Pope will probably receive the same bitter opposition. That the Catholic Church as a whole is 100 percent against socialism cannot be disputed.

All this being true, when do the Socialist leaders think they'll be able to perform the "revolution?"

Socialists and Communists alike are fighting a "lost cause," though they are not wise enough to know it.

F. G. R. GORDON.

Another New Deal Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

ARTICLE FROM SOCIAL JUSTICE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the publication, Social Justice, of June 23, 1941, showing that although millions of unfortunate American citizens who, after 8½ years of this so-called "more abundant life," are still unable to afford pork, the New Deal administration is not only giving hogs to Great Britain but is purchasing these same hogs from a British dominion for cash:

[From Social Justice of June 23, 1941]

HOGS FOR BRITAIN

These millions of slum-dwelling Americans who live on a few cents a day, and seldom

if ever can indulge in a hearty breakfast of ham and eggs or a Sunday pork roast, might find it difficult to see the logic of some of the Government's aid-to-Britain measures.

Particularly those millions of indigents, characterized by President Roosevelt as the ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed one-third of the Nation, might shake their heads in puzzlement over America's shipment of pork to England.

According to Columnist Paul Mallon, the Agriculture Department is buying hogs from Canada at relatively high prices and "lending or leasing"—which means giving—them to Great Britain. Canada meanwhile is selling for cash her hogs to England at prices lower than the United States is paying.

Mallon asserts that in the first 4 months of 1941 the United States bought 10,450 hogs from Canada, compared with 18 in the corresponding period of 1940.

The same day Mallon reported this in his syndicated column a Cleveland Plain Dealer market story revealed that "hogs yesterday lost 15 cents of their recent advance."

So goes aid to Britain.

A Communistic International Cabal—Members: President Roosevelt, Justice Frankfurter, Ambassador Winant, Harold Laski, Ernest Bevin, Harry L. Hopkins, and Benjamin Cohen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY AMOS PINCHOT

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Amos Pinchot:

DOES DANGEROUS INTERNATIONAL TIE-UP MENACE AMERICA?—ARE THE PRESIDENT AND HIS MORE INTIMATE ADVISERS BENT ON SETTING UP A SOCIALIST-LABOR GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES?

(By Amos Pinchot)

Are President Roosevelt and his more intimate advisers, in cooperation with the British Labor Party, bent on delivering the United States to socialism? Are they trying to turn our Government into a labor government, paralleling the effort of Bevin, Laski, and the English radicals, and our economic system into a collectivist system controlled, as in the European dictatorships, by one strong leader and his aides?

Have they seized upon the present defense crisis as an opportunity to discredit, then liquidate private enterprise? Is the administration taming a half puppet Congress with patronage and breaking its prestige, in order to forestall opposition to a socialist organization of society? Is it subordinating defense to politics, and politics, in the ordinary sense, to class war?

Has the President been taking a weak stand against strikes and violence in defense industries, for fear of losing the voting strength of organized labor? Is the New Deal, as Arthur Krock charges in the New York Times, preparing to stay in power "permanently"? And, if so, what are the influences surrounding Mr. Roosevelt and guiding him on this unconstitutional and un-American path?

These and similar questions are being asked by literally millions of intelligent, patriotic men and women—many of them new dealers or former new dealers—who have kept their faith in American institutions, and believe that a shift into collectivism and dictatorship would prove as disastrous here as it has abroad.

SEIZE-SEND BILL WAS THE TIP-OFF

The introduction of the so-called seizure bill S. 1579, authorizing the President to take over private property of "any kind or character," and keep it permanently, war or no war, emergency or no emergency, is an event of national and, I believe, international importance. It marks the latest advance in the administration's quickening drive toward socialism and dictatorship. And though, under pressure, Mr. Roosevelt has consented to modification of its terms, this does not change its original intention and significance.

Two circumstances make this bill especially important. One is that, though it has been in gestation for some time, it came to light soon after Prof. Harold Laski, intellectual center of the British Labor Party's executive committee, and confidential adviser of Mr. Roosevelt, Ambassador Winant, and Justice Frankfurter, announced that the purpose of British labor is to build "the first democratic socialist state in the modern world."

AMBASSADOR WINANT AND COHEN RETURN

The other is that when Ambassador Winant, whom Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, describes as "something of a dreamer on a brave new world," returned to this country on May 30, he brought with him Mr. Benjamin Cohen, who had accompanied the Ambassador to London in the capacity of "mentor." And Mr. Cohen is credited with being the author and draftsman of many of Mr. Roosevelt's radical bills.

The World-Telegram editorial of June 5, queries whether Mr. Cohen is the author of this bill, and says:

"There would be less apprehension if this sort of thing didn't fit so perfectly into a background established in peacetimes. We as a nation are willing to stand for almost anything in a war situation like the one we now face. But we cannot help viewing this seize-send bill, as a press-gallery wag dubbed it, as part of a pattern-for-power.

"Long before Hitler moved on Poland there was alarm in this country about concentration of authority in the Executive. Many were more inclined to blame a group around the President for needling him into this trend than they were to blame the President himself; the group of appointees who never had run for office but who 'had a program'."

From time to time not merely Mr. Clapper and Mr. Krock, but various well-informed Washington correspondents, have referred to a remarkable international tie-up, which is playing a delicate but increasingly revealed hand in Anglo-American politics.

IDENTITY OF "KEY" MEN IN TIE-UP REVEALED

This tie-up, described as being based on the friendship and identity of "ideological aims," existing between certain key men in the United States and Britain, is said to include the President, Justice Frankfurter, Mr. Ernest Bevin, British Minister of Labor, who led the general strike in 1926, and, it is predicted, will lead the drive to carry England into socialism at the war's end, and Prof. Harold Laski of the University of London.

Also there are Harry L. Hopkins—lately returned from a London mission, and now living in the White House as administrator of the lend-lease bill—Ambassador John G. Winant, former head of the International Labor Office at Geneva, who, according to Clapper, "is not so much an Ambassador to the Court of St. James's as an Ambassador to the Court of Mr. Bevin," and Mr. Benjamin Cohen, general utility man and bill drafter extraordinary to the White House.

What is the meaning of this small, close corporation of internationally minded and exceedingly powerful men, friends of each other and, with the exception of Bevin, of President Roosevelt? And, in particular, who is Harold Laski, their intellectual switchboard, regarded by many people familiar with Washington affairs as having, directly or indirectly, more influence on the President than any one individual, with the exception of Justice Frankfurter?

Professor Laski is a small, ageless, rather inconspicuous man, who rarely raises his voice. While in this country he is often a guest and sometimes a house guest at the White House, but he has not been in America since 1939. The President, says the New York Times, has known him since the old days when Laski was at Harvard, more than 20 years ago. He is possessed of a bitter hatred of private enterprise and the profit motive and a bear-trap memory which, together with his wide reading and talent for apt, if overprofuse quotation, gives the impression of profound culture, an impression that is probably deserved.

LASKI MADE EMPHATIC DEMANDS

Undoubtedly Laski's place in British affairs is a considerable one. At the recent annual conference of the British Labor Party it was he who announced that if the Government did not accord his party more representation in certain matters it would cease to cooperate, war or no war. A dispatch in the New York Herald Tribune on June 3 reads, in part:

"Harold Laski, a member of the Labor Party executive committee, declared that unless Labor is given representation in the Ministry of Information's direction and in the B. B. C., 'the possibility of our continuing to cooperate will no longer exist as far as this party is concerned.'"

This, however, is not the first time Professor Laski has taken a stand of this kind. For in April 1939, he appeared at a peace convocation at the University of Wisconsin, and addressed the student body as follows:

"Should war be forced upon us and we see the old, ugly, imperialistic aims dominating the rules of the democracies, we of the Labor Party and the working class everywhere see it as our duty to turn those wars into civil wars and remake those governments which disregard the working classes which are their foundations."

In other words, with the fanaticism so common to left-wing philosophers and reformers, Laski is not averse to dragging his own and other countries through the hell of civil war in order to reach his socialist Utopia. It might be asked which war he is most concerned about—the war with Germany or the class struggle? And a similar inquiry might be addressed to President Roosevelt. Has he been more interested in not offending the leaders of organized labor, who have been his political allies, than in building our defenses and helping Britain?

ACTIVE AS LECTURER IN THE UNITED STATES

Professor Laski is almost as well known in this country as in England, having served as guest lecturer in many American universities, including Yale, Harvard, Columbia, Amherst, Williams, University of Washington, George Washington University, University of North Carolina, University of Pennsylvania, et cetera. Recently he was retained as lecturer by the Cutting and the Carnegie foundations, the latter being especially interested in promoting Union Now, that is to say an immediate British-American offensive and defensive alliance.

He is an indefatigable writer of books and magazine articles. In the June 3 issue of the New Masses, Mr. A. B. Magil says that Laski, a contributor to that paper in 1939, is the author of 20-odd books. Magil regards Laski "in recent years known as a Left Socialist, an advocate of the United Front with the Communists," as a backslider fallen from grace, presumably because he did not support the Russian experiment after the Russo-German pact. Nevertheless, he has probably done more than any other man to teach our younger generation disbelief in our economic and political systems and distrust of the Constitution and the way of life it sustains.

Like Mr. Roosevelt, Professor Laski has regarded the Supreme Court as "a problem." According to an Associated Press dispatch of January 5, 1939, he "let out a shout of joy today when he learned Felix Frankfurter had been named to the Supreme Court," and said he had previously discussed the matter with Mr. Roosevelt.

FOLLOWS LINE OF PROFESSOR RUGG

As to the Constitution, Professor Laski follows the line of our own Professor Harold Rugg. In his 1940 book, The American Presidency, he sees its makers as selfish, greedy men, whose interest in freedom was illusory.

"They feared the masses. They were adamant about the 'rights' of property. Liberty to them predominantly meant protection of vested interests from the invasions of the multitude."

This is his appraisal of Washington, and James Madison of Virginia, Roger Sherman of Connecticut, Benjamin Franklin of Pennsylvania, Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, et cetera.

For a long time adviser of the President, lately Professor Laski has performed important services for him. For example, last summer, in the strategic month of August, when the third-term campaign was getting under way, he brought out The American Presidency, an eloquent, ably argued defense of the third-term proposition and a plea for clothing the Chief Executive with enormous powers at the expense of Congress and the several States. In passing, it may be said it also was a gushing eulogy of President Roosevelt.

"As things are, leadership can come from the President alone; for reasons that I shall discuss later, there is no other source of direction which can secure the attention of the whole nation."

"But when all possible deductions have been made, there is no problem of which it cannot be said that it may be material upon which the President, and no one but the President, must make up his mind."

And again:

"A President limited by the will of Congress is always like a sailor on an uncharted sea; he cannot proceed with certainty upon his course."

Almost simultaneously, another book appeared, Democracy and the Third Term, by Prof. Fred Rodell, of Yale, a pupil and disciple of Laski's at the University of London. This volume, like The American Presidency, is a defense of the third term.

ROOSEVELT PROGRAM INSPIRED BY LASKI

Many young Socialists declare that what is generally called the Roosevelt program is, in reality, the Laski program, imposed on New Deal thinkers, and finally on the President, by the London professor of economics and his friends. The idol of our squab intellectuals, and some of the older ones, Laski has for years not merely denounced capitalism, and especially free enterprise and the profit motive, for which he finds no place in civilized society, but advocated public ownership, not merely of essential industries but of all the land. This proposition is embodied in the seizure bill.

Laski has preached the doctrine sustained by Lenin and all good Communists—which was incorporated in the President's message of January 6—that the great, messianic reform that is to free the people of the world must take place simultaneously everywhere in the world. In all probability, when Mr. Roosevelt wrote this concept into his January message, he was unaware of its Marxian genealogy.

WRITES WEEKLY LETTER TO FRANKFURTER

According to a reliable informant, Professor Laski carries on a correspondence with the President, and writes a weekly letter to Justice Frankfurter, who transmits it to the White House for discussion. Whether the letter is weekly or not, it is certain that he keeps in close touch with the inner circle of the New Deal.

Obviously, there is no reason why the President should not have as many left-wing friends and correspondents as he pleases. But, as Chief Executive of a nation whose Constitution guarantees security for private property, private enterprise, and the profit motive, it does not behoove him to surround himself with men like Laski, Hopkins, Frankfurter, Cohen, and Winant, all sales agents of the brave new world in which the American tradition, that has served this country so well, and made it the promised land for so many people, would be discarded and forgotten.

DOESN'T RECOIL AT REVOLUTION

That Mr. Laski's mind does not recoil at the thought of violent revolution is evidenced in his article in Harper's Magazine of April 1941, apparently written as a favor to the Roosevelt administration, in order to blast Ambassador Kennedy, who refused to go along with the President's foreign policy, and was superseded by Laski's friend, John Winant. Here he says that he doubts that the necessary job of socialist reform "can be accomplished by consent." Elsewhere he points out that there are two things either of which will bring about revolutionary reform. One is bankruptcy, the other war. Seemingly our idealistic "dreamers on a brave new world" are not unwilling to try both at once, with class struggle thrown in for good measure.

One of my few contacts with Professor Laski was at Yale University, at a time when he was sojourning as resident professor. After a dinner given by a mutual friend, I spent the evening with him at his rooms, where he expressed the opinion that communism was the only real answer to the world's difficulties. I do not hesitate to quote this since he has expressed the same view publicly in his writings.

Some of Professor Laski's books have received favorable attention from Mrs. Roosevelt. His most recent book, Where Do We Go From Here, Viking Press, 1940, was recommended by her, and also by Ralph Bates. British propagandist for communism until the Hitler-Stalin pact, who described it as "The best statement on the issues of the war yet to come out of Britain."

Laski's main thesis in "Where Do We Go From Here?" seems to be that what the world needs most is wiping out the individual sovereignties of nations and building, in their stead, an "international organization" under a Socialist-Labor government. Only thus, he says, can we achieve the "more abundant life" which capitalism makes impossible.

Endowed with a subtler and, I think, more powerful mind than his friend, Justice Frankfurter, whom he introduced in England as a college lecturer, Professor Laski, when at his best, argues his case with a more thorough build-up, superimposed on a broader, better-documented foundation. Nevertheless, Frankfurter has lately shown a remarkable degree of dialectic subtlety in his opinion in the Phelps-Dodge case.

In this remarkable document, by an imaginative extension of the Wagner Act, which prescribes a penalty for employers who refuse to reinstate employees discharged because of union affiliations, he puts into the law a doctrine which Congress obviously did not intend, to wit, that an employer must not only hire, but give back pay to applicants for jobs who were refused employment because of union affiliations.

As Mr. Raymond Moley points out in Newsweek, this decision puts the employer in a strange position, where he invites penalties every time he declines to employ a man belonging to a union. And it also establishes a new and unconstitutional process of lawmaking, by which the Supreme Court can read into a statute almost anything it may deem socially desirable.

Professor Laski is not by any means all out in his advocacy of communism. He does not hesitate to criticize some of Marx' theories. And he deprecates the mistakes of the Russians, but does not deprecate them very hard. So far as I know, throughout his writings, he does not object, except in vague, indirect terms, to the blood-soaked regimes of Lenin, Stalin, or of Leon Trotsky, who, though considered less addicted to frightfulness than Stalin, nevertheless will go down to history as having invented the plan of making hostages of the families of political officeholders, in order to insure their loyalty to the party.

COMMUNISM A "NOBLE EXPERIMENT"

Laski pictures communism as a great and noble experiment that has brought "exaltation to the common man." Lenin is his "ideal leader." And he compares communism to early Christianity, whose doctrines, he says, seemed as foolish to the adherents of the Roman system as communism to the believers in capitalism.

One of Professor Laski's friends is Mr. Maynard Keynes, of the British treasury. Mr. Keynes lately arrived in America, thus joining the band of distinguished Britishers whose function is to shape the President's policies and instruct him and Congress in running the affairs of our country. Mr. Keynes, it will be remembered, was the economist who won the President to the disastrous pump-priming and big-spending program, which had been rejected by Mr. Keynes' own government.

At present, Mr. Keynes is advocating, for the United States, a capital levy of such huge proportions that it would necessitate an immense quick sale of privately held securities. As it is inconceivable that anyone could buy these securities en masse, except some Government agency like the R. F. C., this step would constitute a long and effective stride into government ownership of industry. Mr. Laski is an admirer of Mr. Keynes, and Mr. Keynes, like Mr. Laski, an admirer of collectivism. In his book, Communism, Laski quotes Keynes as praising communism on the ground that it reduces the importance of the profit motive.

Among Professor Laski's outstanding traits are the consistency with which he expresses distaste for capitalism and the profit motive, and the earnestness with which he longs for a revolution, bloody or otherwise, that will bring about what he calls a democratic socialist order. He is willing to have the British Labor Party break with the Government, if that will result in socialism. And he is willing to recommend civil war, as he did in Wisconsin, if the socialist order cannot be had in any other way.

Like President Roosevelt, he is hostile to the Churchill-Beaverbrook group in the British Government, whom he regards as dangerous Tories, to be tolerated only for purposes of waging war. And no doubt, like the President, he was chagrined at the appointment of Lord Halifax as Ambassador to the United States, and would have vastly preferred a laborite. He sees in Churchill a great fighting spirit, but outside of that a thoroughly undesirable influence on England.

LASKI TOOK CHURCHILL TO TASK

On April 12 the Washington Post published an article by Laski scolding Churchill, and stating that, after the victory, he would not remain in office long unless he approached "the peace in the spirit of President Roosevelt's address to Congress last January." That was the message in which Mr. Roosevelt dedicated America to bringing democracy and the four freedoms to every people "everywhere in the world" and performing this modest task within our generation. One sometimes wonders whether Mr. Laski was not coauthor of that stupendous utterance.

As one reads the Laski books and articles one finds little recognition of America's accomplishments in attaining the highest standard of living, and the widest spread of material welfare that have been known at any time in history. This fact does not seem to impress him. It does not impress him because as a follower of the Communist theory, it would never do to admit that a nation that pursues another theory has performed a service to itself or mankind.

For the same reason, if one called his attention to the fact that the United States has become the country to which people from all over the world have flocked, this would fail to modify his low opinion of our system. As is the rule with so many radicals, if a fact is inconsistent with a theory, it is the theory, not the fact, that has the right-of-way.

In a very able and too little-read book, The Revolt of the Masses, Ortega y Gasset states that, from the time European history began in the sixth century up to 1800, "Europe did not succeed in reaching a total population greater than 180,000,000 inhabitants." But from 1800 to 1914, the era in which capitalism and its fecund economic system was developing, the rise in living standards brought an increase in the European population of from 180 to 460 millions. And the same capitalism has resulted in a similar but faster upsurge in this country.

But nothing must be allowed to refute the glorious creed of communism which, according to Laski, "builds its temple upon spiritual heights." And to give substance and authority to this creed, which is being discredited all over the world for the simple reason that it builds its temple, not on spiritual heights, but on spiritual coercion and degradation, Laski, with the packrat mind so typical of radicalism, borrows here, there, and everywhere, fragmentary bits of evidence to sustain an argument that finally shows up, even under casual analysis, as a patchwork of unrelated parts.

Coupled with this, and perhaps related to it, is another tendency, the tendency to obscurantism, that is to say, to surround one's statements with a haze of mystery as well as authority, in order to make the reader believe that the writer is a deep and learned individual, accustomed to dealing with matters beyond the common range of understanding. Scattered through Professor Laski's works one encounters passages like the following, from "Communism":

"With Bossuet, and, in a sense, with Vico, that lesson is the dominion of Providence over the effort of mankind; with Fichte, it is the victory of reason, of free inquiry, over the blind demands of faith; with Bonald and de Maistre it is the necessity of religion as the one power able to compel that subordination without which men are the necessary victims of anarchic disorder.

No wonder American intellectuals, whose chronic failing is that the one thing they cannot do is think, are wont to throw up their hands and cry "Kamerad" before the professor's blitzkrieg of literary allusion and ornamental, if confusing, words.

SHOWS HATRED OF CAPITALISM

In the same book, Communism, we find the author back on his favorite theme, to wit, that greedy capitalism is responsible for most of the world's ills. He has just quoted his friend Keynes to the effect that capitalism, in order to survive, must be successful. Certainly this is not a very complicated or abstruse idea. Nevertheless, he embellishes it with the following cryptic sentence calculated to reduce even the most skeptical to surrender:

"It is no longer either optimistic or self-confident as it was in the days of Nassau Senior and McCulloch."

He does not pause to explain who Nassau Senior and McCulloch may be. That is unnecessary. For on the previous page he has already weakened his readers for the coup de grace by hurling Savonarola, St. Francis of Assisi, and George Fox into the fray.

Coming back to his The American Presidency, we find Laski giving reasons for his admiration for President Roosevelt, whom he considers, in some respects, the superior of both Lincoln and Wilson. He says that, while Lincoln was rarely able to select the right human instruments for his purposes, Roosevelt proved his ability by putting Harold Ickes in his Cabinet.

"Franklin Roosevelt has possessed it [the ability], as he showed when he chose, in remarkable circumstances, Mr. Ickes to be his Secretary of the Interior."

Why single out Harold Ickes, of all people? For Ickes' chief claims to fame seem to be the attacks he has made on the press, his talent for unbridled and often silly invective, and the fact that one of his official functions is to say the things which the dignity of the Presidency forbids Mr. Roosevelt to say for himself. To this may be added the fact that, over a national network, Mr. Ickes advised the American public to read Lords of the Press, an untruthful and violent assault on American newspapers and capitalism, written by a feature writer for the Daily Worker.

I have written at length and somewhat critically about Professor Laski—not doubting, however, that he sincerely believes in the doctrines he has been preaching for so many years—because he is an important factor, and perhaps the integrator, of an international group consisting, as I have said, of Felix Frankfurter, Harry Hopkins, Benjamin Cohen, John Winant, the President, and probably Ernest Bevin and others.

For the evidence shows that these men, guiding our national policy, are working to deliver the United States to socialism, including a labor or class government. And I am deeply convinced that socialism, with its intensive political control of the activities of the people, cannot be put over without resort to class hatred and violence, or practised without coercion and cruelty. And I also believe the American people will have the common sense to reject it, especially as a reaction against radicalism is already in evidence.

DICTATORIAL CONTROL OF OUR LIVES

What, after all, is this thing, variously called Hitlerism, communism, fascism, which is running its course through Europe? It is simply dictatorial government control of the economic, political, and personal lives of the people, enforced by militarism, and inspired by a vision of far-flung foreign domination.

In the last 4½ years we have seen our country, led by the President and his advisers, proceeding, all too rapidly, along this dark road. The judiciary bill to pack and control the Federal courts; the executive reorganization bill to move the powers of Congress into the President's hands; the Black-Connery so-called wage and hour, which, in its original version, was a bill to create a price-fixing and wage-fixing dictatorship over capital and labor; the May bill of 1938, aimed at arming the President with full censorship of the means of communication, and also, like the seizure bill, enabling him to rewrite, at his discretion, every contract entered into in the United States, whether between private persons and corporations, or between them and the Government; the bills providing for agricultural regimentation and price fixing; the President's efforts to place under political control medicine, insurance, railroads, and other enterprises and professions that should be private, competitive, and free.

And now comes the seizure bill to give the President authority to take over all private property, newspapers, and the radio included, forever. This is only the natural outcome of the New Deal's course.

WE TOLERATE HATEFUL FOREIGN PHILOSOPHY

America is a great country, even though it has drifted somewhat from its moorings in the last few years. But, with its clear and strong tradition of political life, brightened by the names of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, its decent, generous personal life, its fruitful industry, fertile land and the spirit of peace and progress that has made us really strong and great—why should we permit a foreign philosophy, hateful and unsuited to our people, to gain foothold in our midst? Why should we let little men, crusaders for a new toryism that calls itself liberalism, undermine our country and poison our national character?

Surely it is time for the believers in the real America to assert themselves.

Pertinent Questions and Answers Concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, HIS REPLY, AND STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following letters and statement:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1941.

Hon. JESSE JONES,
Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Certain questions regarding the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project have arisen in my mind, and I believe are likewise present in the minds of many others in and out of Congress.

Feeling that great good may be served by seeking out the facts that may furnish the answers to these questions, I am submitting them to you with a request that you answer them seriatim based upon the official information of the Department of Commerce.

Your assistance will be appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS C. RABAUT, M. C.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, June 20, 1941.

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of June 13, requesting information and reply to certain questions relating to the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project, has been received.

By direction of the President, this Department has been for more than a year engaged in an exhaustive study of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project. I am asking the director of the survey to supply you with the answers to the questions which you have presented.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Question. What is the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project?

Answer. The project is a joint effort by the United States and Canada to develop the boundless natural resources of the Great Lakes Basin, to provide the Middle West with a deep-water outlet to the Atlantic Ocean, and to harness the torrential flow of the St. Lawrence River to produce waterpower.

To build the seaway it is necessary only to build a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to deepen the channels and canals linking Lakes Huron, Erie, and Ontario, and to improve the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Quebec. Engineering plans call for reconstruction of the canals and locks already built by Canada to the St. Lawrence River and for construction of a main navigation and power dam across the river at Barnhart Island, between Massena, N. Y., and Cornwall, Ontario, and a small control dam farther up the river. With these improvements, a deep waterway extending 2,400 miles from Duluth, Minn., to the Atlantic would be provided.

The electricity developed at the International Rapids section would be shared equally by the United States and Canada. It is proposed also to redevelop existing hydroelectric power facilities on the Niagara River in order to expand power production in that area.

The entire cost of the project to the United States would be about $285,000,000—less than the cost of three battleships. Of the total cost, some $93,000,000 would be paid by New York State, and New York would be given control of the generation and distribution of electric power. The Federal Government's share will therefore be, roughly, $195,000,000.

Question. Would the seaway-power project impede or aid our defense program?

Answer. 1. By increasing the country's supply of transportation and electric power, the project would greatly strengthen our productive machine and thus strengthen our whole defense effort. As the situation now stands, we face shortages both in transportation and in power production. The St. Lawrence project offers the cheapest and most efficient means of averting shortages of this type in the tributary area of the Great Lakes.

2. Construction of the seaway would make possible full use of Great Lakes shipyards to expand and speed up our national shipbuilding program. Great Lakes yards are now operating far below capacity. The improved canals in the St. Lawrence River would be large enough to accommodate all types of naval vessels except battleships and aircraft carriers and all except the largest ocean freighters. If we began building cruisers on the Great Lakes now, the seaway would be ready for use by the time the cruisers were completed. Shifting cruiser construction from salt-water to fresh-water yards would speed up the Navy Department's building schedule by many months and would permit seacoast yards to devote a larger proportion of their facilities to the construction of urgently needed cargo ships. Nine to twelve freighters can be built in the time it takes to build one cruiser.

As President Roosevelt has said:

"Shipyards on the Great Lakes, with access to the ocean, yet close to the sources of supply of labor, raw and finished materials, further removed from possible attack, may be a vital factor in successful defense of this continent. They will help to build the ships which will bring back commerce to the harbors of the Atlantic coast ports."

3. The St. Lawrence project would strengthen our defenses in the Northeastern corner of the North American continent by giving us a protected inland-water route to our new military base at Newfoundland. At present, because there are no rail connections east of Quebec, all supplies and equipment for our Newfoundland base must be sent through the Atlantic sea lanes. In time of war this route might be hazardous, but with completion of the seaway defense materials could be sent down the St. Lawrence River to Newfoundland without fear of interference from enemy naval units.

Opponents assert that the St. Lawrence project would impede our defense effort (1) because 4 years would be required for its completion, and (2) because the project would divert men and materials needed for building planes, guns, and tanks.[1] How do these assertions square with the facts?

1. President Roosevelt has answered this criticism in the following terms:

"Opponents of the project have pointed out that it takes 4 years to build this seaway. They know, but fail to mention, that it takes at least that long to build a battleship. * * *

"We hope that the world situation may soon improve. But we are bound to be prepared for a long period of possible danger. * * * Only one who can say that we do not need the battleships that we are now building will dare to say that we do not need the essential Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway."

2. The St. Lawrence project would provide one of the largest single blocs of electric power on this continent. At a time when serious thought is being given to curtailment of civilian consumption of electricity to conserve power, it is the worst kind of folly to say that the St. Lawrence project would cause the diversion of men and materials from more useful purposes. The planes, guns, and tanks we need cannot be built without tremendous expansion of our facilities for producing electric power. As we need the power and must obtain it from some source, from any source, the St. Lawrence power project is an economy measure of the first magnitude. It is the cheapest source of power in America, and it will absorb less skilled labor than an equivalent steam plant.

Question. How would construction of the seaway affect the cost of shipping American wheat abroad?

Answer. Wheat is a bulk commodity carrying traditionally low shipping charges by water. With construction of the seaway, the savings in shipping charges from Duluth to Liverpool, as compared with the best possible alternative route, would amount to 5.2 cents a bushel, or $1.74 a ton.[2]

Question. Would savings in the cost of shipping wheat abroad mean savings to American wheat farmers?

Answer. Yes.

It has been asserted that reductions in the cost of exporting wheat over the seaway would merely reduce the price of wheat in the world market, and that potential savings to American farmers would thus be canceled out.[3] This assertion is false. The price of wheat reflects all the influences at work in all the wheat-producing areas of the world. Basically, the price is determined by supply and demand, not by cost of production. Lowering the production costs of wheat farmers in the Great Lakes tributary area by lowering their transportation costs would by no means lower the world wheat price by an equivalent amount. The reduction in transportation costs would amount to a bonus for American farmers.

Question. Would construction of the seaway result in the dumping of foreign wheat in our domestic markets, as is claimed by opponents of the St. Lawrence project?[4]

Answer. No.

Great Lakes ports have now, and after the construction of the seaway would continue to have, the same protection against dumping of cheap foreign products that Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports enjoy. The present import tariff rate on wheat is 42 cents a bushel. This tariff would be imposed at the ports of Buffalo, Chicago, or Duluth, on the Lakes, just as it is imposed now at the ports of New York, New Orleans, or Los Angeles. And the same factors which prevent the dumping of foreign wheat into our markets would prevent the dumping of other foreign goods and commodities.

Question. Are opponents of the seaway correct in asserting that navigation conditions on the St. Lawrence River would be so hazardous that shipping lines would not take the risk of sending their vessels over this route?

Answer. No.

Construction of the seaway would vastly improve present navigation conditions in the 183-mile section of the St. Lawrence River between the lower end of Lake Ontario and Montreal. Existing channels and canals would be enlarged and deepened, and the 22 small locks now in operation would be replaced by 8 larger ones. These and other improvements would greatly reduce hazards to shipping.

But even now, with the projected improvements still in the blueprint stage, navigation conditions on the St. Lawrence are good.[5] The heavy volume of traffic which already passes through the shallow canals in the International Section is the best proof of that. More than 8,000,000 tons of freight moved through these canals in 1938. Some 5,900 vessel trips were needed to carry this freight. About 115,000 tons of freight moved

---

[1] Both of these assertions are made, for example, by the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, in its pamphlet For National Defense? The conference states that: "The United States is engaged in the tremendous task of rearming—now—for eventualities which, if they are ever to happen, will happen soon. * * * To divert from that pressing task the men, machines, materials, and money which so stupendous a project as the St. Lawrence scheme would require would be a handicap, not a help, to national defense."

[2] The rate for wheat shipments from Duluth or Chicago to Liverpool via the seaway is conservatively estimated at 9.6 cents a bushel. During the 15-year period 1924–38 the lowest average rate for wheat exported from Duluth to Liverpool over any of the various existing routes was 14.8 cents a bushel. This was the average rate over the all-water route through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River via Buffalo and Montreal.

[3] For example, it has been stated that: "In normal times the price of grain was invariably determined at Liverpool, so that reduction in transportation costs inured not to the benefit of the American producer but to the benefit of grain factors in foreign ports."—Expense Without Recompense (National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 1941), page 6.

[4] In its pamphlet Two Ways for Farmers to Lose Money, the National St. Lawrence Project Conference asks: "Why should the American taxpayers be called upon to spend hundreds of millions of dollars * * * to make it easier for foreign grain to be brought into the markets of the United States?"

[5] During the 5-year period 1935–39, there were 116 accidents to vessels in the International Section of the river. With only about half as much traffic, the Panama Canal had 156 accidents during the same period. The record indicates that there is considerably less foggy weather in the St. Lawrence than there is in New York Harbor. Over a period of years, Montreal averaged 4 days of fog annually; New York Harbor averaged 44 days.

directly between Great Lakes and European ports in shallow draft ocean freighters.

As to the assertion that ocean shipping lines would be unwilling to risk sending their vessels through the proposed seaway, the testimony of the late Robert Dollar, founder of the Dollar Steamship Lines, should be revealing. In a letter read to a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the 1933 hearings on the St. Lawrence Treaty, Mr. Dollar said:

"Ships will certainly go to the Lakes for cargo; in fact, ships will go anywhere and everywhere to get cargoes. We have big ocean-going steamers running 1,000 miles to the Yangtze River, where the current is very swift and navigation quite difficult, far more difficult than it would be going to Lake Superior from Montreal.

"When the canal is finished there is no more reason for doubting that ships will go from the ocean to the Great Lakes than there is that ships will go to any port on the Atlantic seaboard."

Question. What proportion of United States and world shipping could make use of the proposed seaway?

Answer. The world's freighter fleet, excluding combination passenger-cargo ships, consisted of 6,400 vessels on December 31, 1939. Of this number, 4,540—7 out of every 10 freighters—would find safe and convenient navigation in the 27-foot canals on the St. Lawrence River. The United States freighter fleet consisted of 800 ships, of which more than 500—5 out of every 8—could easily navigate the seaway. A still higher proportion of United States and world shipping could make use of the seaway under certain conditions—if larger vessels carried less than full load, or if their cargoes consisted of commodities having light density, such as cotton, jute, or burlap.[6]

Although the seaway would safely accommodate a large proportion of the ships now in service, it should be borne in mind that shipping lines make a practice of designing their new vessels to fit the type of service for which these vessels are to be used. With completion of the seaway, therefore, many new ships specially adapted to conditions on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence route would be built.

Question. What effect would the seaway have on ocean ports like New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore?

Answer. 1. As the eastern export center of the United States, New York stands to lose a small proportion of the foreign trade which now passes through its harbor. Some of the goods and commodities which now move through New York would undoubtedly be shipped by direct water route between Great Lakes ports and foreign countries. But the St. Lawrence survey estimates that total diversion of foreign traffic from the port of New York would amount at most to 1,800,000 tons a year. This would represent only 1.6 percent of the 109,000,000 tons of water-borne commerce which moves through New York Harbor in an average year.

Coastal and intercoastal shipping traffic in New York Harbor would actually be increased by completion of the proposed seaway. The St. Lawrence survey estimates that about 1,000,000 tons of existing traffic of this type—3 percent of average annual coastal and intercoastal traffic in New York—would be diverted to Great Lakes ports but that this loss would be more than made up by new water-borne traffic between New York and the Middle West. With completion of the seaway, grain, cereal products, meats, dairy products, and automobiles would be shipped from the Middle West into New York Harbor, while iron and steel products, refined copper and zinc, brass, sugar, and other commodities would move from New York Harbor through the seaway into the Great Lakes region.

2. Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other ocean ports can expect substantial gains in shipping traffic if the St. Lawrence project is constructed. Boston Harbor, in fact, would be one of the chief beneficiaries of the seaway. With little danger of existing traffic being diverted, Boston stands to gain a large volume of new commerce. New England imports large amounts of raw materials and foodstuffs from the Middle West, and with completion of the seaway project these would be shipped by water from the Great Lakes into Boston Harbor. At the same time, New England shoes, machinery, fish, and other products would move from Boston Harbor to Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, and other ports on the lakes. A similar increase in water-borne commerce with the Middle West could be anticipated by other port cities along our seaboard.

Question. How would the seaway affect the economic life of Buffalo?

Answer. The St. Lawrence Survey has made an exhaustive study of the effect of the project on Buffalo's economic life. Its conclusions may be summarized as follows:

1. Buffalo will lose some of its grain transshipment traffic, but this loss will not amount to more than 700,000 tons a season—about one-fifth of the city's average annual lakewise grain receipts. Loss of grain traffic would involve the loss of the jobs of 200 workers in grain elevators and other waterfront occupations, or about one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total number of employed persons in the Buffalo area. At the same time, the loss in revenue to grain elevators is estimated at not more than $220,000 a year.

2. The possibility that Buffalo might lose its preeminent position in flour milling is remote. Flour mills will not lose their business when Buffalo becomes a deep-water port. Buffalo is an important milling center largely because it is accessible to the sources of grain supplies and because it is close to the markets for flour along the eastern seaboard. Its advantages in these respects will be enhanced by construction of the seaway. Moreover, flour exports from Buffalo, estimated at an average of 180,000 tons during the open season, would save as much as $525,000 a year in freight charges.

3. The iron and steel, machinery, and other major manufacturing industries of Buffalo would find increased foreign and intercoastal markets for their products. Iron and steel manufactures constitute by far the largest item in shipments from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts. Yet Buffalo accounts for only a very small proportion of this commerce. In 1937, the intercoastal trade westward in iron and steel manufactures amounted to 1,370,000 tons, of which over 1,000,000 tons originated in Middle Atlantic ports. Buffalo, however, sent only 25,000 tons to the Pacific coast. It cannot compete in west-coast markets because it suffers from a transportation disadvantage relative to steel mills located along the Atlantic coast. The situation in regard to overseas exports of iron and steel products is similar.

In the light of these facts, it is obvious that construction of a deep-water outlet to the Atlantic will have an important bearing on Buffalo's steel industry, as well as on such other industries as machinery, chemicals, abrasives, aluminum, and metal alloys. Existing transportation disadvantages in reaching overseas and west-coast markets will be eliminated, and an expansion of sales in these markets can be expected. Since these industries are among the largest employers in the Buffalo area, even a small increase in sales would involve a large number of jobs. Moreover, increased shipments of iron and steel products, machinery, and other articles would stimulate increased receipts of ore, coal, limestone, and other raw materials, thus further increasing harbor traffic.

Question. What would be the effect of the seaway on Great Lakes carriers? Lake shipping companies fear that if the seaway is constructed they would lose their business to foreign vessels, built and manned by cheap labor, with the result that the wages of Lake seamen—now the highest in the world—would have to be reduced. What are the facts?

Answer. Foreign vessels would not be able to carry freight between American ports on the Great Lakes because of Federal laws prohibiting freight movements of this type except in ships of American construction and registry.[7]

In 1937 more than 87 percent of the United States water-borne commerce on the Great Lakes consisted of traffic in coal, iron ore, limestone, and unmanufactured steel—practically all destined for consumption within the tributary area. Traffic in these commodities would be largely unaffected by construction of the seaway. About 10 percent of total water-borne commerce consisted of miscellaneous products, most of which would likewise be unaffected by construction of the seaway. Less than 3 percent of the total consisted of grain and grain products, and a good part of this traffic represented domestic shipments.[8]

In view of the nature of traffic on the Great Lakes, it is doubtful that shipping companies would have to meet foreign competition on as much as 3 or 4 percent of their present business.

Question. What would be the effect of the seaway upon the railroads?

Answer. The seaway would increase the freight transport capacity of the United States by not more than 10,000,000 tons annually. In a good year, the railroads carry 1,000,000,000 tons of freight. If every ton of freight carried over the seaway consisted of products that otherwise would have been carried by the railroads, the diversion would amount to 1 percent of total rail freight traffic.

Actually the diversion of traffic from the railroads to the seaway shipping services would never amount to as much as 1 percent of the total rail traffic. There are two reasons for this.

1. The establishment of cheap water transportation would stimulate the shipment of some products which, because of high rail rates, are not now shipped at all, and which therefore would represent a net addition to existing traffic. That is what happened after the Panama Canal was built, and that is what would happen after construction of the seaway.

2. The growth of the population of the United States and the increases in its productivity require constant expansion of

[6] The following statement by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board (in the St. Lawrence Seaway Project, 1940) has been widely quoted by opponents of the St. Lawrence project: "American-owned vessels of sufficiently shallow draft to ply the proposed waterway comprise only 5 percent of the world's merchant ship tonnage."

This is a statistical trick. The obvious purpose is to convey the impression that only 5 percent of American shipping could use the seaway. The number of United States vessels of all types, as of the end of 1939, amounted to only 14 percent of the world fleet. Therefore, even if every United States vessel were able to navigate the proposed seaway, it would still be possible to say that "American-owned vessels of sufficiently shallow draft to ply the proposed waterway comprise only 14 percent of the world's merchant ship tonnage."

[7] The prohibition against foreign ships carrying freight between American ports was recently lifted—as to Canadian vessels—in view of the war emergency.

[8] The Effect of the St. Lawrence Seaway Upon Existing Harbors (St. Lawrence Survey, United States Department of Commerce, 1941, p. 55).

transportation facilities to handle the increasing volume of traffic. Hence, a large proportion of the water-borne commerce moving through the seaway would represent not freight diverted from the railroads but new traffic arising out of the needs of a growing population with rising standards of living. In building the seaway we would not be harming the railroads; we would be making it possible to handle freight traffic for which carrying capacity now in existence will not be adequate.

Competition of water carriers using the seaway might force the railroads to reduce their freight rates. In this case, freight traffic carried by the railroads would increase and it would be beneficial to the American people.

Certainly there is nothing in this situation that would hurt railroad labor.

Question. It is asserted that the proposed seaway would be "uneconomic" because it would be closed to shipping for nearly 5 months every winter due to ice in the Great Lakes. What are the facts?

Answer. The seven months during which the seaway would be open—from the first of May to the first of December—are the months when farmers ship their crops to market and when demands for rail and other transport facilities are greatest. Thus the seaway would dovetail into our national transportation pattern, relieving the strain on the railroads during the peak period.

The St. Mary's Canal at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., is also ice-bound for 5 months every winter. It can hardly be said, however, that this canal is "uneconomic." The tonnage moving through it during the 7-month season exceeds the combined tonnage of the Panama and Suez Canals during a 12-month season.[9]

Question. How much power would the St. Lawrence power project produce?

Answer. The St. Lawrence development would be the second largest single-dam power source in the world—both in terms of installed capacity and in terms of average annual production of electric energy—being exceeded in size only by Grand Coulee.

The comparative size of the St. Lawrence power project is indicated by the following table:

	Grand Coulee	St. Lawrence	Boulder
Ultimate installed capacity (kilowatts)	1,944,000	1,650,000	687,500
Annual average production (1,000 kilowatt-hours)	14,225,000	11,563,200 [1]	4,380,000

[1] Assuming full development at 80 percent load factor.

The St. Lawrence would have a generating capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower, half of which would be made available to the United States and half to Canada. At some future date existing hydroelectric power facilities at Niagara Falls would be redeveloped to provide an additional 787,500 horsepower of capacity.

Question. Where would the power generated on the St. Lawrence River be distributed?

Answer. The power actually generated on the St. Lawrence would be distributed throughout an area within a 300-mile radius of Massena, N. Y., thus making it possible to supply New York City, the Buffalo industrial area, and a part of New England.[10]

[9] An average of 63,069,722 tons of freight passed through the locks at Sault Ste. Marie every year during the period 1935–39. During the same period the annual average freight tonnage through the Panama Canal was 30,687,985, while the comparable figure for the Suez Canal was 29,899,000.

[10] The Niagara Frontier Planning Board (in the St. Lawrence Seaway Project, 1940) asserts that: "Neither New York City nor western New York is a practical market for St. Lawrence power: Under existing delivery conditions, power from nearer sources is more practical and economical for these areas."

This assertion is contradicted by the engineering studies of the New York State Power Authority. The more economical generation of hydroelectric power more than compensates for transmission charges within a 300-mile radius of the dam site. The cost of St. Lawrence power delivered to downstate domestic consumers, according to the Power Authority's estimates, would be 1.8 cents per kilowatt-hour in New York City. Power generated by steam at present costs domestic consumers in New York City 6.03 cents per kilowatt-hour.

However, by shifting loads over existing and contemplated transmission lines, St. Lawrence power could be made available, in an emergency, throughout an area bounded by Chicago on the west, Washington, D. C., on the south, and Boston on the north.

Question. Would steam power be cheaper than St. Lawrence hydro power? Opponents of the seaway-power project contend that it would be more economical to produce the electric energy we need by building steam-power plants than by harnessing the flow of the St. Lawrence River.[11] Is this true?

Answer. In spite of the very great reduction in operating costs of coal-burning power plants in recent years, waterpower developed by publicly owned, multiple-use hydroelectric projects—such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville, and Boulder Dam—is still the cheapest power in the United States.

According to the New York State Power Authority, the cost of power generated at the proposed dam on the St. Lawrence River will be less than 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, including all fixed charges and operating costs. The delivered cost, including all transmission expenses, will be approximately 2.55 mills. Equivalent power from steam-electric plants in New York State would cost 5.11 mills, not including any transmission expenses.[12] Thus St. Lawrence waterpower would cost only a little more than half as much as steam-generated power.

Question. How would the development of St. Lawrence power affect the electric-light bills of homes, farms, and factories?

Answer. The project would substantially reduce the rates of electricity to all classes of users in the area to be served. The St. Lawrence survey estimates that the average cost of power to farm and residential consumers would be reduced 64 percent below 1937 rates and the cost to commercial and industrial consumers 25 percent.[13] According to the figures of the New York State Power Authority, St. Lawrence power would mean savings amounting to $26,000,000 a year to all types of consumers.[14]

Question. How would the seaway-power project affect coal producers? The National Coal Association, representing bituminous-coal producers, fears that the seaway would (1) permit British and Nova Scotian producers to invade the present Canadian market for United States coal and (2) reduce railway coal consumption in the United States. At the same time, the association fears that (3) if power is developed in upper New York State by harnessing the flow of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers, instead of by building steam-generating plants, a potential market for coal will be lost. How do these fears square with the facts?

Answer. 1. The United States produces about 450,000,000 tons of coal a year. It exports an average of 11,000,000 tons of anthracite and bituminous coal to Ontario and Quebec annually (not 19,000,000 tons, as claimed by the coal association). The bulk of our exports to Canada—an average of 8,700,000 tons—consists of bituminous coal shipped to the Province of Ontario. That British producers would not be able to invade this market after construction of the seaway is shown by the fact that we already sell nearly four times as much bituminous coal to the Province of Quebec, east of the International Rapids, as Britain does—during 1935–39 an average of 753,000 tons, as against 193,000 tons—and Quebec is a seaport province. If Britain cannot outsell us in Quebec now, she certainly cannot outsell us in Ontario after the seaway is built.

The only other possible source of competition for the Ontario bituminous market would be Nova Scotia. United States coal has nothing to fear from the small Nova Scotian mines, however, because the present output of these mines could not be increased more than 2,300,000 tons a year—and this probably at an increased cost.

Construction of the seaway would increase the freight capacity of the St. Lawrence canal system by 16,000,000 tons a year. About 10,000,000 tons of this capacity would be available for United States traffic so that only 6,000,000 tons would be left for Canadian traffic. Obviously, therefore, it would be a physical impossibility for British and Nova Scotian producers to ship 19,000,000 tons of coal a year through the seaway into Ontario markets, as the coal association asserts they would do if the seaway were completed. There is no such market to invade, and American coal is cheaper in Ontario than either British or Nova Scotian coal.

2. Construction of the seaway would not reduce the amount of coal now consumed by the railroads. If the seaway is built, however, a smaller amount of new railroad facilities will be needed to provide for future transport needs. Hence, the amount of additional coal which the railroads would otherwise use might be slightly reduced. It is a reduction from an increase.

If, 25 years ago, producers of oats had opposed the manufacture of automobiles on the theory that the new gasoline buggies would displace horses and thereby reduce the market for oats, their position would have been no more absurd than the present position of the coal producers on the St. Lawrence issue. Deep-water transportation is relatively less expensive than rail transportation. Yet the Coal Association opposes the seaway and advocates the expansion of high-cost rail facilities on the ground that this would increase the market for coal. Most people will be inclined to reject this kind of reasoning. They realize that economic betterment comes from lowering prices, not from raising them.

[11] In a press statement issued January 7, 1941, John D. Battle, secretary of the National Coal Association, said: "The St. Lawrence hydroelectric power facilities upon which the President is so insistent, will cost twice as much * * * as coal-burning electric generating plants of equivalent capacity." This statement may or may not be true, but in any event it refers only to the capital cost of generating equipment, not to the cost of the power actually produced.

After steam generating equipment was installed in New York State, coal would have to be brought in from other States to provide fuel. The fuel for the proposed power dam, on the other hand, would be the flow of the St. Lawrence River. That is why it would be cheaper, in the long run, to produce hydro power than it would be to produce steam power—even though the cost of installing steam-generating equipment might be somewhat less than the cost of installing hydro equipment.

[12] Annual Report, 1937, New York State Power Authority, pp. 126–27.

[13] Economic Effects of the St. Lawrence Power Project (St. Lawrence Survey, U. S. Department of Commerce, 1941), p. 82.

[14] Annual Report, 1939, New York State Power Authority, p. A–9.

3. The Coal Association contends that the hydroelectric power development contemplated on the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers would reduce the future coal market by "between 30,000,000 and 35,000,000 tons of coal annually." The association's arithmetic is bad. According to the best engineering estimates, 5,550,000 tons of coal would be required annually to generate steam power in an amount equal to proposed hydropower production on the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers. [15]

It by no means follows, however, that the St. Lawrence-Niagara hydro development would destroy a potential market for some 5,000,000 additional tons of coal at some future time. Experience in the southeastern States since the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority strongly supports the conclusion that the development of cheap waterpower under public auspices has the effect of increasing the total demand for electrical energy, thus increasing the market for privately developed steam power.

Between 1934, when T. V. A. began operations, and 1940, the amount of coal used in the generation of electric energy in the southeastern States increased about 250 percent, whereas the increase in the United States as a whole was only 59 percent. The Coal Association charged in 1934 that T. V. A. was a "menace to the coal industry," but whereas only 540,000 tons of coal was used in the generation of electricity in the T. V. A. area in 1934, 1,891,000 tons was so used in 1940. There is no reason to doubt that the coal industry would be similarly affected by the St. Lawrence-Niagara development.

Far from reducing coal consumption, the St. Lawrence project would increase it. The cheap transportation and the cheap power made available in the Great Lakes Basin would stimulate industrial expansion. Growing industrial activity would mean growing markets for coal. For these reasons, it is clear that in opposing the seaway-power project the National Coal Association is opposing its own best interests.

Question. Would it be possible to meet the expanding power needs of defense industries more quickly by building steam plants than by going ahead with the St. Lawrence hydroelectric power development? [16]

Answer. Only a few areas in the country have abundant water resources that can be utilized for the development of cheap hydroelectric power. In most regions, power shortages resulting from expanding defense production can be averted only by building steam power plants. Manufacturers of steam turbines are now working overtime to produce generating equipment for steam-power stations, as well as propulsion units for hundreds of naval and merchant ships.

Although a lifelong opponent of public-power development, Gano Dunn, president of the J. G. White Engineering Corporation, last year urged Congress to authorize construction of a dam to produce additional hydroelectic power in the Tennessee Valley, in preference to steam plants, because of the necessity for speed in making power available to defense industries. Testifying before a Senate committee on July 10, 1940, Dunn explained his stand by pointing out that factories building steam turbines were "clogged up" with defense orders, whereas manufacturers of water wheels for hydroelectric power plants "are not busy, because everybody is building steam plants nowadays." Since this testimony, the situation has been further aggravated. Our two-ocean navy program alone will require over 10,000,000 kilowatts of turbine capacity.

Under present circumstances, therefore, it would take as long, or longer, to build steam-generating equipment capable of producing the huge amount of power to be made available under the St. Lawrence project than it would be to build the proposed dam at Massena, N. Y.

However, the whole question of whether steam or hydroelectric power can be made available more rapidly has become meaningless within the last few months. The reason: Power needs of expanding defense industries have increased so enormously that it is now clear that we must build all the generating equipment—both steam and hydro we are capable of producing—and even then we may not be able to meet future demands for electric energy.

[15] In arriving at an estimate of 30,000,000 to 35,000,000 tons as the annual loss to the coal market resulting from the St. Lawrence-Niagara hydro development, the coal association made three basic errors: (1) It assumed that the capacity of the project would be "6,000,000 to 7,000,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity," whereas the correct capacity figure is 2,987,000 horsepower, and of this only 1,887,000 horsepower would be available to the United States. (2) It assumed that all the turbines installed would be kept in operation 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, whereas the proposed installation could operate at capacity only 87.5 percent of the time. (3) It assumed that 1.41 pounds of coal would be required to produce 1 kilowatt-hour of electric energy, whereas all recent installations of large steam electric plants have an efficiency of 1 pound or less of coal per kilowatt-hour, the best plants having an efficiency of 0.9 pound.

Engineering estimates forecast an average annual production on the United States side of 11,100,000,000 kilowatt-hours for the combined St. Lawrence-Niagara project. On this basis, using an efficiency rate of 1 pound of coal per kilowatt-hour, the total amount of coal necessary to replace 1 year's production of hydro power on the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers would be 5,550,000 tons. Since all of this power would be sold to new customers, or to consumers who use more electricity because of lower rates, there would be no reduction or displacement of an existing market for coal.

[16] John D. Battle, secretary of the National Coal Association, asserted in a press statement of January 7, 1941, that: "The St. Lawrence hydroelectric power facilities * * * will * * * take three times as long to get ready as coal-burning electric generating plants of equivalent capacity."

William Devereux Byron

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM DEVEREUX BYRON, late a Representative from the State of Maryland

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden and untimely passing of BILL BYRON of Maryland I have lost a friend. I rise to pay my respects to a genial and happy personality, whose warm friendship meant a great deal to me. A good father, loving husband, and able public servant has crashed to his death at the prime of his life. The manner of his passing, through some human fault, makes his death the harder to bear.

At the threshold of a great career in Congress, and with an outstanding record of public service to his city and State behind him, BILL BYRON, during his brief stay in this House endeared himself to all of us, and was an able Representative. His friendliness was a great contribution. His human qualities enriched this membership.

I admired also his fondness for his family and his devotion to his home. Yes, he was a good public servant, but the responsibilities of office, great as they were, never dimmed the human qualities that we loved.

Ernest Lundeen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we are met today to pay tribute to our colleagues who have passed to the Great Beyond since our memorial exercises of last year.

All of our colleagues who have now passed away were men with whom it was our pleasure and privilege to serve in the Congress of the United States. This is a day for pleasant memories. We think of them as we knew them and admire their fine services in the House and Senate of the United States.

To live in hearts,
We leave behind
Is not to die.

Among those we honor and respect on this occasion is Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota. I served with him in the House of Representatives and as our acquaintance ripened into friendship, I began to appreciate and value his fine record of public service and devotion to his country.

He was a militant man and had the courage of his convictions. He fought to make the world a better place in which the ordinary man and woman might live and enjoy the blessings of constitutional government.

His life was an inspiration and an example for those who hold high ideals on the political stage.

May I say of him as he said of a former colleague some years ago in memorial proceedings conducted in this House:

In the Valley of Decision,
Down the Road of Things-that-are,
You gave to us a vision,
You appointed us a star,

And through cities of Derision
We followed you from far.
On the Hills beyond Tomorrow,
On the Road of Things-to-do,
With what strength of hand we borrow,
As we borrow soul from you,
We know not sloth nor sorrow,
And we build your vision true.

Senator LUNDEEN was an able antagonist. He fought for every cause which he thought was right. Nothing could deter him from his course of conduct, and the following verse is most appropriate:

Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.
In the fell clutch of circumstance,
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Beneath the bludgeoning of chance,
My head is bloody but unbowed.
It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul.

Our friend and colleague is no more. He has gone to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns. But our Christian faith teaches us that there is a life beyond the grave, and that the soul of man never dies. In a beautiful land of somewhere, beyond the Great Divide, he lives to take up the higher and eternal tasks prepared for those who have left us.

And so we pay tribute to his memory and I close with the following fine sentiment:

IF LIFE WERE ALL

If life were all,
Where were the recompense
For all our tears?
The troubled toil
Of all the long-drawn years,
The struggle to survive
The passing show,
Were scarce worth while
If life were all.

If life were all,
What were it worth to live?
To build in pain,
So soon to learn
Our building were but vain,
And then to pass to some vain nothingness,
Were scarce worth while,
If life were all.

If life were all,
How might we bear
Our poor heart's grief,
Our partings frequent,
And our pleasures brief?
The cup pressed to the lips,
Then snatched away,
Were scarce worth looking on,
If life were all.

Life is not all,
We build eternally,
And what is ours today
To make existence such
Is ours always,
We stand on solid ground,
That lasts from aye to aye,
And makes earth's sojourn worth the while,
Life is not all, I say.

Life is not all,
I do not understand the plans;
I only know that God is good,
And that his strength sustains,
I only know that God is just;
So in the starless, songless night,
I lift my heart to Him and trust,
And God my spirit witness gives,
Life is not all.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. WILL ROGERS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, once each year we meet in memory of our departed comrades. It is fitting that we thus honor them. During the last 12 months four Members of the Senate and nine Members of the House of Representatives have started on that long journey from which no traveler returns. They are gone, but fond memories of them remain.

One of these Members, the Honorable SAM MASSINGALE, represented my native State of Oklahoma. I probably knew him longer than any other man who has ever been a Member of Congress. He came to Oklahoma as a young man. I met him nearly 40 years ago. We lived in the same county. As a barefoot boy, I walked the streets of Cordell, Okla., where SAM MASSINGALE, even as a young man, was becoming one of the outstanding lawyers in western Oklahoma. His reputation for industry, honesty, and fair dealing spread to the surrounding counties and enabled him in 1934 to be elected to represent the Seventh Congressional District of Oklahoma. He was an able Representative. His constituents had confidence in him and would undoubtedly have continued to send him to Congress for many years had death not taken him from us. No man in Congress had more friends than did SAM MASSINGALE. His colleagues loved him. Will Rogers once said, "I never met a man I did not like." I know that SAM MASSINGALE could have made that same statement, and I am confident that no one ever learned to know SAM MASSINGALE that did not like him. We miss him, but we are consoled by the knowledge that he lived a useful life. Even though SAM MASSINGALE has gone, he will live long in the hearts and minds of men.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following eulogy delivered by Rabbi Bernard Bergman, spiritual leader of the Home of the Sons and Daughters of Israel, 232 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y., at the funeral services of Congressman M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN on June 6, 1941, at the Gramercy Park Memorial Chapel in New York City, N. Y.:

This afternoon is a sad and mournful one for us. It is overflowing with grief, for we are gathered here to pay our last respects to our dearly beloved leader of this community and great humanitarian, Congressman M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, who was near and dear to us.

In the literal sense there exists no need for me to extoll his manifold virtues, for they are common knowledge. He holds a warm spot in every one of our hearts, and he has earned that fondness and admiration through long years of unstinted readiness to help anyone who came to him. No special appointment was necessary to see our Congressman. There were no formalities needed to speak to our Congressman. His door, as well as his heart, was always open to all. He was an altruist, a philanthropist, a lover of mankind, always fair and just in his activities.

Congressman EDELSTEIN truly exemplifies the passage in the Talmud, "The loss of a righteous person is equal to the loss of a sanctuary." In the death of Congressman EDELSTEIN not only the Jews but all Americans mourn the loss of a true sanctuary, a human sanctuary, in which dwelt the spirit of God.

I care not how intelligent or accomplished one may be, I care not how successful or well-to-do one may be, if he does not lead a religious life, his life is without content. Congressman EDELSTEIN was a religious Jew, and thereby a religious American.

In addition thereto, he was a kind, generous and understanding soul, ever sympathetic, tolerant, and veritably the embodiment of the finest of man's virtues. In thinking of him I am reminded of a quotation of Shakespeare, "Even nature might stand up and say to the world, 'That was a true man!' "

Congressman EDELSTEIN did not use his office as a stepping stone to personal gain, nor as a means of self-praise and self-glorification, but rather as an instrument to help others, and serve humanity. He actually lived the words spoken by God in connection with the high official of ancient days, "And it shall be upon Aaron, the priest, to minister, to serve." It was not for mastery nor for fame, that the office of the priesthood was to be used. Congressman EDELSTEIN was a servant of the people, catering to their interests, ministering to their social and political needs.

It is most unfortunate that he was taken from us in the prime of his life, when his great usefulness to the Nation was becoming more and more apparent, especially during these critical hours, when our dear country is being assailed from within and without by enemies of our American way of living.

Congressman EDELSTEIN was truly a model American. His deep-rooted patriotism was well expressed in his last words in Congress, "We are living in a democracy. All men are created equal, regardless of race, creed, or color; and whether a man be a Jew or a gentile, he may think as he deems fit."

For these ideals Congressman EDELSTEIN was ready to sacrifice his life. He really overworked himself that democracy might live, and it may truly be said he was a martyr to democracy.

Only a few days ago, when he attended the holiday services at the synogogue I officiate, did I learn how deeply he was concerned over the wave of antidemocracy and un-American-

ism. He was a true interpreter of the ideals of democracy—a true interpreter of the soul of America. All he aimed and battled for in Congress was to bring all the blessings of American liberty to all the people in America. Yes; he lived for his people—and died for his people. May his soul enjoy eternal life. Amen.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, mine was a long and pleasant acquaintance with the Honorable GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER. His district and mine adjoined. Mr. SEGER possessed a warm, congenial personality. His kindliness endeared him to his acquaintances, and this was evidenced by the spirit of respect and friendship which the people showed him. These qualities, together with his high character and his devotion to his duty, made him an impressive figure in his home city of Passaic and in his district.

I was one of the committee of Members who attended his funeral, and I have seldom witnessed a similar occasion where I saw stronger evidences of love and respect for the dead than was shown by the great concourse of his fellow citizens who gathered to pay a last tribute to their friend. In this tribute paid him by the people who knew him best, it was plain that they felt they had lost even more than a friend.

As a public official Mr. SEGER was unselfish and public spirited to a high degree; as a citizen and businessman, he was progressive, energetic, broad-minded; as a friend to thousands, regardless of race, religion, or politics, he was loyal, sympathetic, thoughtful, always possessing a rare capacity for consideration for the man or woman who needed his assistance.

Those who were privileged to know him intimately—and that number was legion—knew Mr. SEGER to be a Christian gentleman, a faithful and honorable public servant, and a man who valued his personal friendships as his greatest asset in life. And no better eulogy can be paid to any man than that.

To the friends and relatives of Mr. SEGER comfort and solace may be had in this sad hour by reflection upon the life he lived and the friends he made. In their hearts he still lives in loving memory.

Pius Louis Schwert

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York

In the long vista of years to roll
With me his memory nor his honor fade;
And though other land retain his soul,
He lives also here
In the results of his deeds and friendships made.

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I have heard and read many of the glowing tributes which have been paid to the memory of the late Representative PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, from New York, and I feel with them that any attempt to express our deep feelings over his untimely passing seems inadequate.

I feel a deep sense of personal loss at the passing of my friend. He was affable, lovable, a student of human nature endowed with a God-given understanding of the problems of the underprivileged. He was an able and astute student of political economy, and he represented his people well. His ambition at all times was to better living conditions for his people.

PIUS SCHWERT was elected as United States Representative to the Seventy-sixth Congress and reelected to the Seventy-seventh Congress. I learned to admire his fine qualities from an intimate and practically daily contact with him and knew him to be an outspoken and courageous representative of his people.

Mr. SCHWERT was a partisan because the history of his country convinced him both theories were American, but he chose the Democratic theory. He served his country during the World War as an officer of the United States Navy. One of his chief interests was for the veterans of the World War, and because of his keen sense of understanding, justice, and genuine ability he was appointed by President Roosevelt to serve on the President's Special Review Board for Veterans' Compensation Cases.

He had a deep affection for youth and worked unceasingly to develop their athletic leanings. Early in youth and later he played professional baseball. During the years of 1914, 1915, 1916, and again in 1921 he played with Jersey City, Newark, Buffalo, and with the New York Yankees.

PIUS SCHWERT had the happy faculty of making enduring friendships wherever he went. The Nation has lost a great servant and statesman and the Congress has lost a diligent student of political economy, so sorely needed at the present critical moment in our history. His constituents have lost a truly worthy Representative and his family have lost their inspiration. In his passing I have lost a friend.

George Nicholas Seger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, GEORGE N. SEGER, who, after nine terms of consecutive service in this body has passed to his greater reward. Respected, and much loved by his colleagues and by the people he served, he has earned an honored place among those who served State and Nation.

GEORGE SEGER is remembered for his kindliness, for his conscientious service in this House, and for the personal and understanding manner in which he helped the people of his constituency. His service was beyond partisanship, beyond what many would consider the responsibility of a Member.

This venerable gentleman from across the aisle was my friend, and was a friend to every Member in the House. He radiated geniality, and in his full life of three score and fifteen years was never known to bear enmity toward anyone.

Revered, loved, and respected, GEORGE SEGER carved a niche for himself in the hearts of all who knew him.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, Texas lost her most distinguished son, the Nation an outstanding leader, and thousands of individuals like me, a very dear friend.

The Senator was a most unusual man. I say unusual, because I realize that this great Nation has legions of capable and patriotic men; but those characteristics

alone do not reflect the true greatness of MORRIS SHEPPARD. His gentleness, his deep-seated love for even-handed justice and fair play, his unyielding devotion to duty; and his eagerness to be of service to all, indelibly stamped him as a leader that the Nation could ill afford to lose even in normal times, much less during this world-wide upheaval.

As chairman of the important Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, his intimate and thorough understanding of the human problems of war, of our Army with its hundreds of thousands of men, of the dislocations attendant with the rearming of the Nation—gave the United States, before his untimely passing, a program that will protect and save our Nation and its institutions; and will enshrine his name in the hearts of the living and of men yet to be born.

His lovely family has suffered an irreparable loss, and so has the Nation. His admirable examples in the art of living and in being a real man will keep him with us.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of the gentleman from New York, Mr. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, in the place to which he was elected by the the people of the Fourteenth Congressional District of New York, lost to the Nation a Representative known for his humanity, for his earnest endeavor on behalf of everyday people who turned to him in the extremity of their need.

MICHAEL EDELSTEIN understood people. He knew that every man needs a friend, and he was a friend to anyone in need.

His last appeal on the floor of the House of Representatives was in behalf of tolerance, a plea for justice to all men in the spirit of our great democracy. He could not tolerate discrimination, for he was the champion of men who suffered, in one way or another, from the discriminations of those who have against those less fortunate people who have not.

An able lawyer, a conscientious Representative, a loyal friend who never spared himsef in the service of others, MICHAEL EDELSTEIN has earned a place of honor and respect in the hearts of democratic people. We mourn his passing; we must strive to emulate his example.

Pius Louis Schwert

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to my late colleague, the gentleman from New York, PIUS L. SCHWERT. There is no one who knew him who will not feel a deep sense of personal loss in his passing. His philosophy of life was service to others. In everything that he did he was actuated by a spirit to serve his country and his constituency.

One of the most earnest Members of this body, Mr. SCHWERT was one who gave leadership to this Nation in these difficult times. He held before the young people of America the highest ideals of manhood and of clean sportsmanship.

We all can testify to his genial disposition, his fine character, his willingness to serve, and his worth to the Nation at large. As one who came up through the ranks, PI SCHWERT retained his sympathetic understanding of his fellow man. He was particularly interested in the disabled veterans of our wars, in the problems of the youth who need a hand up to get started on the ladder of life, and generally in the underprivileged.

Such men are few enough and never can be spared. Let the life of willing service that was PI SCHWERT be ours to emulate. His passing places on each of us an added duty to the underprivileged in all walks of life.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I humbly rise to pay my last respects to the late Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, whose service to his country was indeed so great that I feel ill-qualified to speak of him, lest my words fall short as descriptive of his great qualities.

Speaker BANKHEAD, accorded great honors in this House by its membership, won the love and deep respect of all of us. His fairness, his great discretion, his wisdom, his leadership, were unsurpassed by any Speaker in my time. I valued greatly his friendship and his help.

We recall his humor, his oratory, his kindliness, his fair and impartial rulings, his wise counsel. As majority leader and then as Speaker he led the House, giving untiringly of his time and ability in the service of his country.

Truly may it be said that today we mourn his passing because he gave all that he had to give. After an arduous session of Congress, when the Speaker needed rest, he instead led the Democratic convention to which was entrusted the great obligation of selecting a President and Vice President to lead the Nation in a period of great stress. He completed this service ably in the dignified and distinguished manner we would expect of one so well qualified.

Any man has only so much heart to give, even in the service of others, and so it was that BILL BANKHEAD left us. We love and honor his memory. The Nation is better for his having lived.

Service Program of the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY COMMANDER VINCENT E. SCHOECK, OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from Vincent E. Schoeck, national commander, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, the announcement of the appointment of Millard W. Rice as national service director.

In this announcement Commander Schoeck gives a detailed account of Mr. Rice's background as a legislative representative, together with interesting facts pertaining to the Disabled American Veterans.

Commander Schoeck's article is as follows:

Most Members of Congress know that Mr. Rice was the able national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars during the 5 years preceding his appointment as national service director for the Disabled American Veterans. Mr. Rice resigned his position as national legislative representative with the Veterans of Foreign Wars with the assurance that he

would do his utmost in his new capacity to try to continue to develop a closer cooperation among the several veteran organizations, particularly as to objectives and services which may beneficially affect veterans suffering with service-connected and service-connectible disabilities and their dependents.

Mr. Rice brings with him to his new position a broad background of experience in veterans' affairs. He has been a member of the Disabled American Veterans, as well as of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, continuously since shortly after his return from World War service. Wounded in action in Belleau Wood while serving with the United States Marine Corps, after his return to the United States Mr. Rice moved with his family from South Dakota to Minneapolis, Minn., where he was granted vocational training by the old Federal Board of Vocational Education, and secured his bachelor of arts degree from the University of Minnesota in 1920 and his doctor of laws degree in 1921, after which he started the practice of law.

Step by step Mr. Rice was drafted away from his law practice by an increasing volume of activities in behalf of disabled veterans, becoming commander of the Minneapolis chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, during which time it became and has since been the largest single unit of disabled veterans in the United States, conducting its first forget-me-not drive, organizing the Minnesota Department of the Disabled American Veterans, and being its department adjutant for several years, as well as the national Disabled American Veterans liaison service officer for Minnesota and the tenth district. In 1928 he was elected national commander of the Disabled American Veterans. From 1930 to 1935 he was its assistant national adjutant, helping to coordinate its many administrative, membership, forget-me-not, educational, publicity, and service activities. He resigned from this position in 1935 in order to take a similar position with the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, shortly after which he became its national legislative representative.

During his 5 years as national legislative representative for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Rice established a reputation for being conscientious, versatile, and effective in his activities and contacts. Recently he resigned from that position, again to be employed by the Disabled American Veterans, with which he had received his first experience in rendering service to disabled veterans. I have confidence that, in charge of its legislative, rehabilitation service, and employment activities, Mr. Rice will help to develop the Disabled American Veterans into an ever bigger and better service-giving organization.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

I think it would be appropriate to take advantage of this occasion to tell Members of Congress something about the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, commonly referred to as the D. A. V.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by Congress in 1932, to render service to, for, and by disabled veterans, the Disabled American Veterans has, since its inception, been one of the spokesmen for disabled World War veterans in Congress and before its various committees, as well as before the Veterans' Administration and its regional offices and facilities.

As implied by its name, the Disabled American Veterans of the World War is composed exclusively of honorably discharged World War veterans who were wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled in or by reason of their World War service. Its membership is, therefore, composed of a very exclusive class.

Active membership in the D. A. V. can only be secured by those whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of disease or disability, incurred by reason of their World War service. Less than 10 percent of those World War veterans who are now living are therefore eligible for membership in this rather selective organization.

Wearing the emblem of the Disabled American Veterans which, by the way, is a replica of the Accolade of Chivalry, portrayed on the wound certificates issued by President Woodrow Wilson, is therefore to wear a badge of honor, indicating that the wearer has sacrificed part of his blood, part of his body, or a part of his health in the Nation's most hazardous employment, serving in its armed forces during time of war.

The wearer of a Disabled American Veterans' emblem button can be proud of such proof of his patriotism—a real badge of honor.

No one, certainly, can justly question the true Americanism and patriotism of those who have paid such a high price as proof of their patriotism.

Disabled American Veterans membership is restricted to those American citizens who have earned it by sacrificing their youth and a part of their bodies, or a part of the health of their minds or bodies, in service for our beloved country. There are no other limitations as to membership eligibility. Its membership, therefore, includes men who are Protestants, Jews, and Catholics, of many different racial origins, engaged in various types of employment, if any, receiving incomes from the lowest up to the higher brackets, including both the humble and the prominent; the poor and the rich; the former buck privates, corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, captains, majors, colonels, and generals; the unemployables and the unemployed employables; the uninformed and the well informed; the helpless and the helpful—a typical cross section of American citizenry.

During its existence the Disabled American Veterans has elected former privates, corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and a general to the office of national commander. Its leaders have had service in Uncle Sam's Infantry, Artillery, Air Corps, Marine Corps, and Navy. It has been led by Jew, Catholic, and Protestant. All of these men, with divergent backgrounds, have found a common ground in the Disabled American Veterans—the union of America's disabled defenders—to help to render service to those who need service.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

I think it will be interesting to Members of Congress to be reminded of the fact that the Disabled American Veterans has had its national headquarters almost since its inception, at 2840 Melrose Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. National Adjutant Vivian D. Corbly has been secretary-manager of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his assistant.

An excellent newspaper is published by the national headquarters, the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to the developments concerning all legislation—proposed and already a part of our Federal statutes, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, Attorney General's opinions, Comptroller General's opinions, and Veterans' Administration regulations, service letters, and much other material of value and of interest to disabled veterans or their dependents. No disabled veteran is doing right by himself, and those dear to him, if he deprives himself of the valuable news and information in the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During the 21 years of its history, the Disabled American Veterans has initiated much liberalizing legislation on behalf of various groups of disabled veterans and their dependents, and has also been largely responsible for the issuance of many liberalizing regulations by the Veterans' Administration from time to time—too numerous and too technical for me to set forth to you in detail at this time.

Many World War veterans, and their wives, widows, and children are not informed as to the various types of benefits, rights, and privileges which are available to them, from various governmental agencies, under certain circumstances, as secured by the legislative and rehabilitation efforts of the Disabled American Veterans in cooperation with other veteran organizations. Following is a thumbnail résumé of benefits available, under certain conditions, to World War veterans and their dependents, in case of need for more specific information as to how to proceed to secure certain desired benefits, contact should be made with a service officer of the Disabled American Veterans, or of some other veteran organization, the American Red Cross, or the Veterans' Administration.

Compensation for World War veterans with service-connected disabilities, ranging from $8 to $285 per month, depending upon nature and degree of disability, including statutory awards, ranging from $25 to $250 per month for certain disabilities.

Disability retirement benefits for certain emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary World War officers as to permanent disabilities of 30 percent or more in degree, acquired in service in line of duty.

Pension of $30 per month (only $6 for single men without dependents while maintained in a governmental institution) for those war veterans who had 90 days or more of honorable service, or, if less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, and who are permanently and totally disabled, not legally proven to be service-connected.

All Medal of Honor men, age 65 or more, eligible for $10 per month statutory award.

All payments of benefits received from Veterans' Administration exempted from taxation, attachment, or claims of creditors.

Adjusted compensation provided as to active World War service, exceeding 60 days, computed at rate of $1 per day of domestic service and $1.25 per day of overseas service, with certain limitations.

Government insurance policies in multiples of $500, up to $10,000, for insurable World War veterans.

Hospitalization to any World War veteran for treatment of a service-connected disability, and to any needy World War veteran, honorably discharged, for needed treatment of a non-service-connected disability, with certain prosthetic appliances, clothing, and tobacco allowances, when beds are available in Government facilities.

Domiciliary care in a Veterans' Administration home facility, with certain needed clothing and tobacco allowances, for any needy veteran unable to follow any gainful occupation.

Transportation to, and back from, Veterans' Administration facilities, when authorized in advance, for examination, medical treatment, hospitalization, or domiciliary care, of any veteran.

Guardians are required as to incompetent veterans and minor children, who are beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration; their accountings are regularly inspected by regional attorneys.

Certain preferences as to Federal civil-service examinations, ratings, appointments, reinstatements and retention of Federal employment.

Certain preferences for W. P. A. employment for those in need.

Extensive United States Employment Service and Veterans' Placement Service in every State.

Credit for all active military or naval service for civil-service retirement or railroad-retirement purposes, with certain exceptions.

Burial allowance in the amount of $100 for any honorably discharged war veteran.

United States flag to drape casket of deceased war veteran, honorably discharged, subsequently turned over to next of kin.

Headstones or markers—stone, marble, or bronze—for graves of deceased war veterans.

Pensions for certain widows and orphans (and helpless children) and dependent parents of those deceased World War veterans who have died by reason of their service-connected disabilities, and at lesser rates for the dependent widows and orphans of those who, at time of death, had some service-connected disability.

State laws provide various benefits, rights, and privileges to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations, under certain conditions, as per résumé published in the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly.

In spite of the enactment of many Federal and State laws, there are still many inadequacies, inequities, and inequalities of the privileges, preferences, and benefits as to and among various classifications of service-connected and service-connectible disabled veterans, and their dependents, which the Disabled American Veterans is striving to have corrected by proposed legislation, which as legislative director, Millard W. Rice, will vigorously push forward in hearings before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, as well as before other committees of the United States House of Representatives and of the United States Senate.

The Disabled American Veterans—the recognized voice of the Nation's World War disabled—concentrates its collective strength to protect and to advance the best interests of its members and eligibles, and of their dependents, thus helping them, their respective local communities, and our country. Its constitution forbids it to take part, officially, in any partisan, political, industrial, or religious disputes. Its national policies, as well as its national officers, are decided upon at national conventions, to which delegates are sent directly by local chapters—thus democratically providing for finding out and abiding by the expressed wishes of the majority.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The Disabled American Veterans has had the offices of its national service bureau, also almost from its inception, in the Munsey Building in Washington, D. C., where it now has nine service experts to advise and to assist deserving veterans in the technical and legal prosecution of their equitable claims for compensation, pension, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, and in securing suitable gainful employment—private or public.

The national service director has supervision of the office of the national service bureau in Washington, D. C., and also exercises supervision over the services of the organization's 38 nationally paid national service officers—who, incidentally, receive very inadequate salaries, ranging from only $20 to $200 per month, depending upon the number of Disabled American Veterans members in their respective States—as well as over its 56 unpaid national service officers and its 807 voluntary chapter service officers.

All of these unselfish, self-sacrificing service officers are themselves disabled veterans. All of them have had the experience of prosecuting their own claims for service connection and compensation. All of them know, by reason of personal experience of the difficulties and handicaps with which disabled veterans are confronted in their efforts to obtain and retain suitable gainful employment. These Disabled American Veterans service officers know, by reason of personal experience, the complications and technicalities that disabled veterans must overcome legally to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of the claims and rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration. They understand, of course, that officials of the Veterans' Administration must adhere to the laws as enacted by Congress, with their limitations and restrictions as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Disabled American Veterans service officers well know that being equitably entitled to service connection and compensation for a disability, by reason of the handicap of such disability, is not the same as being legally entitled thereto.

Because of their understanding of these various problems with which disabled veterans are baffled, these service officers of the Disabled American Veterans are naturally sympathetic to disabled claimants in their efforts to overcome such difficulties. I think it is safe to say that a person who himself has experienced some of the complexities incident to proving himself entitled to certain benefits because of a disability which he is convinced was caused by his World War service, and who himself has had the experience of trying to overcome the handicap caused by such disability is in a better position to advise and to assist other disabled veterans in the solution of their various problems understandingly, sympathetically, and effectively.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS SERVICE ACTIVITIES

The services and accomplishments of these national Disabled American Veterans' service officers during the past 12 years is indicated by the following brief résumé:

Claims handled	672,695
Hospitalizations and medical examinations obtained	73,004
Appearances before rating agencies	164,608
Favorable decisions	90,787
Total monetary benefits	$51,433,774.58

It is, of course, impossible for a brief statistical résumé to indicate the many different types of services extended by service officers. Moreover, it must be recalled that many liberalizing precedents have been established on the basis of cases handled by Disabled American Veterans' service officers, which subsequently have proven of value to hundreds or thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot appear in the reports of the national service officers who have helped to establish such favorable decisions.

The original and increased compensation payments for more than 90,787 disabled veterans and their dependents have converted such individual disabled veterans from local liabilities into local community assets, bringing increased compensation payments into every community and thus increasing the distribution of purchasing power by that much in such communities, with consequent individual benefits to each community and its citizens, as well as to each State.

The service activities of this comparatively small organization of Disabled American Veterans have rendered needed advice and assistance to thousands of disabled veterans each year, helping to secure compensation for their disabilities, finally rated as service connected, medical treatment, and hospitalization where needed, pensions for dependents, insurance benefits, etc.

In passing, it is interesting to note that a considerable number of those disabled veterans who gained experience originally as chapter and as national service officers for the Disabled American Veterans thereafter have become national service officers, national service directors, national legislative representatives, national adjutants, and other types of service-giving officers of other national veteran organizations. The school of experience which they attended in various capacities in the Disabled American Veterans has graduated a considerable number of these former Disabled American Veterans' service officers into other capacities with other organizations, where they can hope to extend the benefit of their knowledge and experience to wider fields in various types of humanitarian service for fellow veterans for their respective communities and for our country.

FINANCING THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

The principal source of income for the Disabled American Veterans, by which it has been enabled to maintain this extensive service program, has been through the support of individual disabled veterans themselves, by their payment of membership dues in the Disabled American Veterans, through its 37 departments and 807 chapters throughout the country.

A national per capita tax of $3 per member per year is paid by each local chapter to national headquarters.

Those disabled veterans who have supported the Disabled American Veterans, representing the united collective voice of, by, and for disabled veterans—have so earnestly believed in its past accomplishments, in its current service program, and in its objectives for the future, as to be willing to make the necessary sacrifices for payments of annual membership dues which, by the way, average about $4 in most of the local chapters.

During the last 3 years, the Disabled American Veterans has extended to its membership the opportunity to acquire life membership, upon payment of $50, generally by a cash payment of $4 or more, plus $1 or more per month until paid. An increasingly larger number of eligible disabled veterans—now more than 43 percent of all Disabled American Veterans members have been becoming life members of the Disabled American Veterans.

Disabled veterans who are members of the Disabled American Veterans realize that it does not have any mysterious source of income. They realize that its strength, prestige, and ability to accomplish constructive services on behalf of individual disabled veterans, and their dependents, rests entirely upon the collective force of all of those who are prompted to become and to remain paid-up members of their own outfit.

Local chapters of the Disabled American Veterans finance their own social-service and relief activities out of the portion of annual membership dues which they retain after having sent the national per-capita tax of $3 to national headquarters, by annual forget-me-not drives, and by such small finance-raising projects as dances, etc.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS SERVICE FOUNDATION

Some donations, but not nearly enough, are made each year to the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio, and regarded as the Disabled American Veterans' incorporated trusteeship. Five trustees, all of them now past national commanders, are elected by each national convention for a 5-year term, the term of one of them expiring each year, whereas two additional trustees (generally the current national commander and the current national judge advocate) are elected each year for 1-year terms. This method of electing the trustees was designed to give assurance of real continuity as to the policies of the Disabled

American Veterans Service Foundation, as to the conservation and administration of its funds, and as to the appropriations therefrom once each year to the National Disabled American Veterans itself, exclusively for the maintenance of its national service bureau and of the national Disabled American Veterans service officers in the various States.

Some of the disabled veterans who have received benefits by reason of the assistance of the national service bureau, or of some National Disabled American Veterans' service officer, and other disabled veterans who know of its deserving purposes make donations to the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation each year in sums which have ranged from $1 to $200—generally totaling only about $1,000 each year.

The Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation has also been the beneficiary of bequests made in the wills of several disabled veterans who have died, and will probably be remembered in the bequests of other disabled veterans whose deaths will occur in the future. Some contributions, moreover, have also been received from time to time from other social-service-minded citizens.

NEED FOR DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Disabled American Veterans' members are aware of the fact that the Disabled American Veterans has, in whole or in part, been responsible for much legislation which has directly benefited thousands of disabled veterans who have never become associated as members of the Disabled American Veterans—some because they know nothing about the organization, others because they are indifferent to the need for collective action, still others because they are too unthinking or too selfish, and many who have persuaded themselves that they cannot financially afford it.

It is a strange commentary upon human nature that this comparatively small organization of disabled veterans has continued to render very valuable service to thousands of individual disabled veterans in helping them to prove up service connections, secure increased compensation, hospitalization, insurance benefits, or the continuance of insurance benefits, etc., apparently without their feeling any gratitude for such valuable service, apparently without the realization that they have been freewheeling, and that the service which they have secured has been paid for by other disabled veterans no better off financially, if as well, to contribute to the helping-hand effort, through membership in the Disabled American Veterans, to provide for its Nation-wide service set-up.

Every social-minded disabled veteran who is anxious to protect the benefits which may have been awarded to him, and at the same time to help to secure needed benefits for other veterans who are even less fortunate, ought to be a paid-up member, if not also an active member, of the Disabled American Veterans—generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's World War disabled.

Helping disabled veterans to help themselves and getting the help of the Nation for those who need help, which we earnestly believe to be a big dividend-paying investment, is the self-appointed task of the Disabled American Veterans.

Fellow citizens frequently need to be reminded by an organization such as the Disabled American Veterans, composed exclusively of, by, and for disabled veterans, that an important factor in providing security for America is for America to provide security for its own citizens, and particularly for its disabled defenders of the past, as well as of the future. America can always feel assured that it will be enthusiastically protected and defended so long as America remembers to protect and defend its protectors and defenders.

Shipment of High-Grade Gasoline and Scrap Iron to Japan

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, many of us living on the west coast wonder why it is necessary to continue to ship quantities of high-grade gasoline, scrap iron, and lubricating oil to Japan. This has been going on for months. It was announced a few months ago that there would be no more high-grade gasoline sent to Japan, but the fact is that this gasoline is still going there, to be used for the purpose of raining bombs on our friends in China and possibly to be shipped on to Europe to be used against our own Allies or those that are friendly to us.

We wonder why. The feeling of the people of the Pacific Northwest in regard to this serious matter is accurately expressed in a recent leading editorial in the Oregonian, a newspaper published in Portland, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent to include that editorial as part of these remarks.

The editorial follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of June 7, 1941]

GAS FOR JAPAN'S WAR PLANES

During the first 3 months of 1940 there were no restrictions on export of gasoline to Japan and other countries outside the Western Hemisphere. The embargo on export of aviation gasoline, the commodity presumed to be essential to effective operation of war planes, was ordered on July 31. Yet a dispatch from Washington tells us that in the first 3 months of this year Japan imported from this country five times as much gasoline as it imported in the corresponding 3 months of a year ago, when there were no restrictions.

The gasoline thus going in much greater quantity to Japan may be assumed not to be aviation gasoline. It includes, however, much high-grade gasoline, which, by the addition of antiknock ingredients, can be converted into aviation gasoline. And the concurrent export from this country of $110,000 worth of antiknock preparations to Japan reveals that conversion of the fuel into aviation fuel is its true destination.

Our sympathies are strongly with China in the war now going on in the Orient. Our material interests also lie in the success of Chinese resistance to the Japanese "new order." We give practical aid to China in the form of loans, and sell Japan the fuel necessary to bomb the Chinese armies from the air. Moreover, our own relations with Japan are precarious, and the thought that persists among us on the Pacific coast is that these delicate relations may be broken and that the airplane fuel that we sold to Japan may propel planes which will bomb our cities.

The same dispatch tells us that the administration is fully cognizant of the situation and is permitting export to Japan of strategic materials for the time being for very good reasons. Two reasons are cited. They are not very good reasons. One is appeasement. The other, that it is America's policy to lull Japan into a sense of false security, and corresponding neglect of reserve stock building, so that when and if we do stop shipments the embargo will be an effective one. The spokesman for these two doctrines was no doubt dissembling. And it may well be that officially to set forth the true reasons would be ill-advised.

It is a fair supposition that the watchful-waiting strategists are for the time being in the ascendancy in Washington with respect to policies in the Orient. Word has hitherto come forth that there are two schools of opinion on this branch of foreign policy. One is that Japan understands only direct action or force, is in no position to make reprisal, and if it took the headlong chance would be made short work of. The other argument, the one that seemingly predominates, is that Japan is poised in the south China Sea for attempted seizure of Malaya and the East Indies, and if we embargo essential war materials would strike recklessly and effectively enough to cut off for a long time our access to strategic materials obtainable only in the Far East in quantities sufficient for our own defense program.

The United States is dependent in whole or major part on the Asiatic southeast for 5 of the 14 commodities listed by the Army and Navy as strategic materials. The 5 are rubber, tin, tungsten, Manila fiber, and quinine. We have been depending on that region for 98 percent of our rubber and 80 percent of our tin. Moves have been taken to build up stocks in these materials and develop new sources of supplies and substitutes.

The situation resolves itself into a question of whether our own vulnerability with respect to strategic materials has been overcome, and whether Japan's vulnerability as a naval power is correctly estimated. That a showdown approaches is implied by Japan's new pressure on the Netherland East Indies for release to Japan of quantities of petroleum, rubber, and tin. Japan fears a drying up of the imports from America. The three commodities are essentials to successful warfare or defense, but so are automobiles and automobile parts, and machinery, and scrap metals, these last not to be obtained by Japan anywhere in the world at present unless it be from the United States.

The squeeze of a complete embargo on export of war materials to Japan would seemingly strangle Japan in short order notwithstanding statistical comparisons of Japan's naval strength with that part of ours which could be spared for operations in the Pacific. The Government may know what it is doing when gasoline is permitted to go to Japan in growing volume, but the people do not think so. Last fall a Gallup poll showed 90 percent of those participating to be in favor of a complete embargo.

Pacific Coast Pulp Industry Goes 7 Years Without Time Lost in Labor Disputes

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the recent signing of another

amicable contract between the operators and the workers in the pulp industry on the Pacific coast draws attention to the fact that for 7 years not a day has been lost in this industry because of labor disputes; 7 years of unbroken contracts between operators and labor, as this new agreement is virtually a continuation of the original one made in 1934 between companies and unions.

The agreement provides for a wage increase of 10 cents an hour and brings the basic wage per hour up to 75 cents for men and 62½ cents for women. It affects 15,000 workers, members of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers. One clause of the new contract provides that all employees of 2 years' standing are to receive a week's vacation with pay.

The agreement affects workers in pulp and paper at Longview, Camas, Vancouver, Shelton, and Grays Harbor, all in my congressional district in the State of Washington; and from Port Angeles on the Straits of Juan de Fuca through Anacortes and Bellingham; through Portland and Coos Bay, Oreg., and down as far as Los Angeles, Calif.

According to a public statement by Mr. John Sherman, fifth vice president of the Pulp and Sulphite Workers, and Mr. E. B. Lambton, vice president of the Paper Makers, the Pulp and Sulphite Union workers favored the new contract by a vote of 5,482 to 385, while the Paper Makers Union workers voiced their approval 2,197 to 181.

The method of arriving at agreement is by way of the conference table, known among industrialists as the goldfish method in which profits of the owners and needs of the workers are weighed and become the basis of agreement. Announcement by Mr. J. H. Smith, president of the Pacific Coast Pulp and Paper Manufacturers Association, said the pay increase will total more than $3,000,000 annually, of which $2,000,000 will go to workers in 20 mills in the State of Washington, $500,000 to workers in 8 California mills, and $650,000 to workers in 5 Oregon mills. Union officials have said the pay scale is the highest in the United States for similar work. The agreement brings the annual pay roll in the 33 Pacific coast mills to $33,000,000.

The pulp industry has been one of the industries of the Nation favorably affected by the war in Europe. Before the war much of the American pulp supply was imported from Scandinavian countries where cheaper labor and lower shipping costs made it possible for them to sell their product cheaper than the west coast. Today pulp mills of the coast provide not only a major part of the North American pulp supply but are exporting heavily to South America.

What Necessitates Use of Old World War Submarines?

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, newspapers of Monday, June 23, reported that Mrs. Minnie Schneider, of 408 East Seventy-first Street, New York, mother of Frederick Schneider, one of the seamen lost in the submarine *O–9*, remarked, upon being advised of the tragedy:

With all the millions that they are spending, I cannot understand why the Government should have sent my boy into a trash basket like that.

The boy's father, Peter Schneider, is reported to have said:

They had trouble with that old sub. * * * Is it not the Government's duty, with all the money it is taking from the people, with all the money it has to spend—is it not the Government's duty to provide my boy with at least a good ship, a safe ship, a sound ship?

Sol Gerson, 906 Union Avenue, the Bronx, a brother of Nathan Gerson, another seaman lost with the *O–9*, had this to say to reporters, according to the newspapers:

My brother was home a week ago. He told me that on June 9 they went out from New London in the *O–9* for a trial run; that the *O–9*, he said, developed three leaks. He told me they put back to the submarine base and the leaks were repaired and they went out again, and on the second trial the sub's condition, so my brother said, was good. "The way it is," he commented, "no one knows what happened. * * * Let the Navy Department do its own telling."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the parents and relatives of the seamen who were lost with the *O–9* are not the only ones in America who are asking for details regarding this tragedy. I agree with Sol Gerson that the Secretary of the Navy should furnish these details to the Nation, in spite of the rigid censorship he has imposed in his Department. I am, therefore, today introducing the following privileged resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to inform the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date—

1. The original date of the commissioning of submarine *O–9* and the cost thereof.
2. The date of the reconditioning of the said submarine *O–9* and the cost thereof.
3. What service was performed by the said submarine *O–9* during World War I, and subsequently.
4. Such information as may be on file in the Navy Department showing condition of said submarine *O–9* as to require its repair and reconditioning for efficient service as an undersea vessel.

In preparing this resolution, I have sought to conform to the rules of the House of Representatives which prevent demands for other information which I believe should be furnished the public, including whether inferior materials were used in the reconditioning of the *O–9*, and whether its reconditioning was necessitated by the aid in American vessels the United States is giving to Great Britain under the lend-lease program.

I trust the Secretary of the Navy will furnish this information to the Congress.

We have been told repeatedly that we have a navy second to none. The Secretary of the Navy, in my opinion, should inform the Congress if the *O–9* is a correct example of our sea-fighting equipment. The Navy Department has succeeded quite well in its efforts to hush up the *O–9* incident for which someone was responsible. That responsibility should be fixed and the Nation should know whether recurring tragedies can be expected. It should be told whether our Navy is second to none or really next to nothing.

As Sol Gerson so aptly said:

Let the Navy Department do its own telling.

A Warning and a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ARCHIBALD McLEISH

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, in the Philadelphia Municipal Auditorium, the Honorable Archibald McLeish, Librarian of the Library of Congress, delivered an address to the graduating class of the University of Pennsylvania.

This address is a complete departure from the usual graduating speech. It is an address that will be a classic in the years to come. It can be read and reread by all Americans everywhere with the assurance that it will make of them better. Americans. I feel privileged to make it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

It is the custom of this country to offer up a certain quantity of words on the graduation from college of each annual generation of young men and young women. It was the custom of other countries to offer up on such occasions a certain quantity of sheep's blood. In both cases, it was the sacrificial act and

not the thing sacrificed which counted. With the ancients the blood itself was not valued. The earth took it. The practice is the same with us. We prefer, perhaps unwisely, the gullets of men to the gullets of cattle and—unwisely perhaps again—we do not cut them. But with us, as with those others, it is the full luxurious flow which is counted as auspicious. No one intends to gather up the words and preserve them for the future guidance of his life.

I mention this not to complain of it but to indicate that I understand my role and accept it. I accept, that is to say, the unexpressed stipulation that I am not to communicate a message of meaning and significance, or deliver to you in useful and memorable form the truths my generation knows which your generation does not know. It is not difficult to accept. What a man knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 is, for the most part, incommunicable, which is, perhaps, why no adequate system of education has ever yet been devised. The "laws," the aphorisms, the generalizations, the universal truths, the parables and the old saws—all the observations about life which can be communicated readily in handy verbal packages—are as well known to a man at 20 as at 50; he has been told them all, he has read them all, and he has probably repeated them all before he graduates from college.

What he knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 is little more than this: That the things he was told were true at 20 and the things he said were true at 20 are, for the most part, really true—but true with a brutal and inescapable truthfulness and consequence and meaning which would have shocked him had he guessed at it 30 years before. This knowledge is of all forms of knowledge the least communicable because it is a knowledge not of formulas or forms of words, but of people, places, actions—a knowledge never gained by words but by touch, sight, delays, victories, sleeplessness, shame, love—briefly, by experience of this earth and of one's self and other men.

How difficult it is to communicate you may see for yourselves by observing carefully the efforts of the greatest poets to communicate it, for this labor is the last and most difficult of all the labors of poetry. Between a poem of Yeats which says, in the twentieth year of his life, that women are beautiful, and a poem of Yeats which speaks 30 years afterward of the beauty of women, there is a difference which, to a young man and to any woman, is no difference at all, but to a man in middle life immeasurable.

So that it is not a hindrance, but, on the contrary, a considerable help to accept the custom of these ceremonies. I willingly agree to burden you with no secrets and to charge you with no knowledge private to your elders. But though I am not myself to communicate messages from beyond your fortieth year or to bring you words in a sealed bottle from voyages which preceded your voyage—stuffed birds from remote islands or photographs of the customs of the inhabitants—there is, nevertheless, one thing I am at liberty to do; one thing which, perhaps, I have an obligation to do. I am at liberty to warn you against certain members of my generation who do not accept for themselves the restrictions you impose upon me here, but openly undertake, not only in rooms privately but in public addresses and even in books, to communicate what cannot be communicated and to convey what has no conveyance.

That there are such members of my generation is not unknown to you. The social historians whose duty it is to record interesting phenomena have thus far failed to record the fact that my generation has produced prophets, but you have not failed to notice it. Too many of the prophesies have been aimed at you. You have had occasion to observe that there are members of my generation who are familiar with the shape of the future and who are willing to share their familiarity with others.

You have heard voices which declare that the violence and brutality and obscurantism which you see sweeping over the world are the present shape of the future and should be accepted for that reason. You have heard still other voices divulging the news that there is nothing to do with this violence and this obscurantism but let it sweep over you; that if you attempt to defend your kind of world against it you will inevitably lose your kind of world. You have had other advisers also—those who speak in the role of the old soldiers, plucking your sleeves and telling you they were tricked into the last war by talk of democracy, telling you the talk of democracy is always talk to trick a man; telling you, you also, if you listen, if you weigh the democratic risk, will be tricked and made fools of. You have heard the professors prophesying that the violence of this time will take its course as the violence of the French Revolution took its course, and that nothing you can do or fail to do will change the outcome; the military strategists prophesying that those who oppose this violence will inevitably fail regardless of any aid of ours and that we ourselves will inevitably suffer humiliation and defeat if we attempt to lift a hand to help them.

But though you are aware of the presence and of the prophecies of these people, you have not, I believe, considered with attention what they are or why they speak as they do, and it is for this reason that I feel compelled to warn you.

Briefly, there are three observations to be made about these prophecies. Each relates to the others, and all three to the credibility of the prophetic words. They are not observations which are frequently brought to mind, at least in public discussions of these matters.

The first is this; that these prophecies are prophecies. Prophets have been infrequent in recent centuries, and the sudden appearance of numbers of them in the time in which we live, foretelling the future to the young and informing them of the disasters which will inevitably follow certain actions, is a curious phenomenon.

The second observation is the observation that all these prophecies are prophecies of defeat, prophecies of negation, prophecies not of the things which men can do but of the things which men cannot do. This, too, is unusual. Prophets have prophesied disaster before this but rarely as consistently or in such numbers, and rarely in terms of impotence and failure so complete.

The third observation is less dramatic but no less interesting for that. It is the observation that these prophetic voices are not, as was the case in antiquity, the voices of old men, but of men and women in middle life—men and women of the generation which knew in its childhood or its youth the other war and which came to consciousness of the world and of itself in the years between. It was not common among any ancient people that men and women in the full strength of their middle years prophesied publicly and always of disaster and defeat.

These three observations have significance because they bear upon the question any curious listener will wish to ask himself: Why do these men and women prophesy, and why, if they must foretell the future to us, do they tell it in these terms? Is it because they possess a knowledge of the future not possessed by other men? Or is there a different reason? And if there is a different reason, is it a reason which has to do with the curious fact that the speakers are men all of one generation—the generation of men now in middle life—the generation, specifically, to which I belong?

The answer, I think, is not too difficult. Prophets appear only among those who know or who think they know that the pattern of life is determined beforehand, and who know or who think they know that they are privy to its determination. The generation to which I belong believes, as you who have read its books are aware, in a predetermined pattern of life. It is our conviction, explicitly stated in our histories, our political commentaries, and our studies in economics, implicitly stated in our novels and our poetry, that the pattern of life is determined by economic law or historical necessity or psychological compulsion, and that we are, or by taking thought can make ourselves, privy to these laws and these necessities. My generation not only believes in a predetermined pattern of life, which is to say, in fate: we believe in it to a degree unknown in Western civilization for centuries. It is probable, therefore, that it is not because they have been touched by a god's breath or because they have beheld visions at night, but for a simpler reason that these prophets prophesy: they prophesy because they belong to a generation which, whether it so admits or not, believes, and has believed for years, in fate, and because, therefore, prophecy is natural to them.

Why these prophets prophesy in the language of impotence and defeat is, however, a more complicated question, and one which requires for its understanding a more extended discussion of the relation between my generation and the notion of fate. The fact that men of a given time believe in a predetermined pattern of life does not necessarily mean that they are fatalists or that their prophecies must take fatalistic form. The Greeks, for example, were believers in fate and producers of prophecies, but not of prophecies like these. For the Greeks conceived of fate, not as a predetermined pattern controlling the whole of life, and controlling therefore the will and acts of men, but as a divine intervention capable of cutting across the acts of men at unexpected moments.

Fate to the Greeks was a force to be reckoned with, a force to be respected, even a force to be feared. But fate was never an inevitable pattern to which history and all men's hopes must be resigned. Odysseus, most Greek of all Greek heroes, outwitted the implacable will where he could, and it is the chorus of Sophocles in the Antigone which says, "Many wonders there are but nothing more wonderful than man." A man among the Greeks was not relieved of the necessity of choice or of the responsibility for choosing, because an unalterable will had already chosen in his stead. Nor was it either honorable or admirable for a man among the Greeks to accept and to admit that he accepted the domination of his world by forces beyond his power to control, fitting his life to their patterns and living at their will.

The fates were not an inevitable force but a three-named god, and with a god, with God's help, a man could struggle, surrendering only when he had no choice but to surrender. To the Greeks, in short, man was capable of the mastery of the greater part of a human and sunlit world and only the shadowy edges, the dark depths of unforeseeable mischance, were left to the inscrutable

amicable contract between the operators and the workers in the pulp industry on the Pacific coast draws attention to the fact that for 7 years not a day has been lost in this industry because of labor disputes; 7 years of unbroken contracts between operators and labor, as this new agreement is virtually a continuation of the original one made in 1934 between companies and unions.

The agreement provides for a wage increase of 10 cents an hour and brings the basic wage per hour up to 75 cents for men and 62½ cents for women. It affects 15,000 workers, members of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers. One clause of the new contract provides that all employees of 2 years' standing are to receive a week's vacation with pay.

The agreement affects workers in pulp and paper at Longview, Camas, Vancouver, Shelton, and Grays Harbor, all in my congressional district in the State of Washington; and from Port Angeles on the Straits of Juan de Fuca through Anacortes and Bellingham; through Portland and Coos Bay, Oreg., and down as far as Los Angeles, Calif.

According to a public statement by Mr. John Sherman, fifth vice president of the Pulp and Sulphite Workers, and Mr. E. B. Lambton, vice president of the Paper Makers, the Pulp and Sulphite Union workers favored the new contract by a vote of 5,482 to 385, while the Paper Makers Union workers voiced their approval 2,197 to 181.

The method of arriving at agreement is by way of the conference table, known among industrialists as the goldfish method in which profits of the owners and needs of the workers are weighed and become the basis of agreement. Announcement by Mr. J. H. Smith, president of the Pacific Coast Pulp and Paper Manufacturers Association, said the pay increase will total more than $3,000,000 annually, of which $2,000,000 will go to workers in 20 mills in the State of Washington, $500,000 to workers in 8 California mills, and $650,000 to workers in 5 Oregon mills. Union officials have said the pay scale is the highest in the United States for similar work. The agreement brings the annual pay roll in the 33 Pacific coast mills to $33,000,000.

The pulp industry has been one of the industries of the Nation favorably affected by the war in Europe. Before the war much of the American pulp supply was imported from Scandinavian countries where cheaper labor and lower shipping costs made it possible for them to sell their product cheaper than the west coast. Today pulp mills of the coast provide not only a major part of the North American pulp supply but are exporting heavily to South America.

What Necessitates Use of Old World War Submarines?

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, newspapers of Monday, June 23, reported that Mrs. Minnie Schneider, of 408 East Seventy-first Street, New York, mother of Frederick Schneider, one of the seamen lost in the submarine *O–9*, remarked, upon being advised of the tragedy:

With all the millions that they are spending, I cannot understand why the Government should have sent my boy into a trash basket like that.

The boy's father, Peter Schneider, is reported to have said:

They had trouble with that old sub. * * * Is it not the Government's duty, with all the money it is taking from the people, with all the money it has to spend—is it not the Government's duty to provide my boy with at least a good ship, a safe ship, a sound ship?

Sol Gerson, 906 Union Avenue, the Bronx, a brother of Nathan Gerson, another seaman lost with the *O–9*, had this to say to reporters, according to the newspapers:

My brother was home a week ago. He told me that on June 9 they went out from New London in the *O–9* for a trial run; that the *O–9*, he said, developed three leaks. He told me they put back to the submarine base and the leaks were repaired and they went out again, and on the second trial the sub's condition, so my brother said, was good. "The way it is," he commented, "no one knows what happened. * * * Let the Navy Department do its own telling."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the parents and relatives of the seamen who were lost with the *O–9* are not the only ones in America who are asking for details regarding this tragedy. I agree with Sol Gerson that the Secretary of the Navy should furnish these details to the Nation, in spite of the rigid censorship he has imposed in his Department. I am, therefore, today introducing the following privileged resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to inform the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date—

1. The original date of the commissioning of submarine *O–9* and the cost thereof.

2. The date of the reconditioning of the said submarine *O–9* and the cost thereof.

3. What service was performed by the said submarine *O–9* during World War I, and subsequently.

4. Such information as may be on file in the Navy Department showing condition of said submarine *O–9* as to require its repair and reconditioning for efficient service as an undersea vessel.

In preparing this resolution, I have sought to conform to the rules of the House of Representatives which prevent demands for other information which I believe should be furnished the public, including whether inferior materials were used in the reconditioning of the *O–9*, and whether its reconditioning was necessitated by the aid in American vessels the United States is giving to Great Britain under the lend-lease program.

I trust the Secretary of the Navy will furnish this information to the Congress.

We have been told repeatedly that we have a navy second to none. The Secretary of the Navy, in my opinion, should inform the Congress if the *O–9* is a correct example of our sea-fighting equipment. The Navy Department has succeeded quite well in its efforts to hush up the *O–9* incident for which someone was responsible. That responsibility should be fixed and the Nation should know whether recurring tragedies can be expected. It should be told whether our Navy is second to none or really next to nothing.

As Sol Gerson so aptly said:

Let the Navy Department do its own telling.

A Warning and a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ARCHIBALD McLEISH

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, in the Philadelphia Municipal Auditorium, the Honorable Archibald McLeish, Librarian of the Library of Congress, delivered an address to the graduating class of the University of Pennsylvania.

This address is a complete departure from the usual graduating speech. It is an address that will be a classic in the years to come. It can be read and reread by all Americans everywhere with the assurance that it will make of them better Americans. I feel privileged to make it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

It is the custom of this country to offer up a certain quantity of words on the graduation from college of each annual generation of young men and young women. It was the custom of other countries to offer up on such occasions a certain quantity of sheep's blood. In both cases, it was the sacrificial act and

not the thing sacrificed which counted. With the ancients the blood itself was not valued. The earth took it. The practice is the same with us. We prefer, perhaps unwisely, the gullets of men to the gullets of cattle and—unwisely perhaps again—we do not cut them. But with us, as with those others, it is the full luxurious flow which is counted as auspicious. No one intends to gather up the words and preserve them for the future guidance of his life.

I mention this not to complain of it but to indicate that I understand my role and accept it. I accept, that is to say, the unexpressed stipulation that I am not to communicate a message of meaning and significance, or deliver to you in useful and memorable form the truths my generation knows which your generation does not know. It is not difficult to accept. What a man knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 is, for the most part, incommunicable, which is, perhaps, why no adequate system of education has ever yet been devised. The "laws," the aphorisms, the generalizations, the universal truths, the parables and the old saws—all the observations about life which can be communicated readily in handy verbal packages—are as well known to a man at 20 as at 50; he has been told them all, he has read them all, and he has probably repeated them all before he graduates from college.

What he knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 is little more than this: That the things he was told were true at 20 and the things he said were true at 20 are, for the most part, really true—but true with a brutal and inescapable truthfulness and consequence and meaning which would have shocked him had he guessed at it 30 years before. This knowledge is of all forms of knowledge the least communicable because it is a knowledge not of formulas or forms of words, but of people, places, actions—a knowledge never gained by words but by touch, sight, delays, victories, sleeplessness, shame, love—briefly, by experience of this earth and of one's self and other men.

How difficult it is to communicate you may see for yourselves by observing carefully the efforts of the greatest poets to communicate it, for this labor is the last and most difficult of all the labors of poetry. Between a poem of Yeats which says, in the twentieth year of his life, that women are beautiful, and a poem of Yeats which speaks 30 years afterward of the beauty of women, there is a difference which, to a young man and to any woman, is no difference at all, but to a man in middle life immeasurable.

So that it is not a hindrance, but, on the contrary, a considerable help to accept the custom of these ceremonies. I willingly agree to burden you with no secrets and to charge you with no knowledge private to your elders. But though I am not myself to communicate messages from beyond your fortieth year or to bring you words in a sealed bottle from voyages which preceded your voyage—stuffed birds from remote islands or photographs of the customs of the inhabitants—there is, nevertheless, one thing I am at liberty to do; one thing which, perhaps, I have an obligation to do. I am at liberty to warn you against certain members of my generation who do not accept for themselves the restrictions you impose upon me here, but openly undertake, not only in rooms privately but in public addresses and even in books, to communicate what cannot be communicated and to convey what has no conveyance.

That there are such members of my generation is not unknown to you. The social historians whose duty it is to record interesting phenomena have thus far failed to record the fact that my generation has produced prophets, but you have not failed to notice it. Too many of the prophesies have been aimed at you. You have had occasion to observe that there are members of my generation who are familiar with the shape of the future and who are willing to share their familiarity with others.

You have heard voices which declare that the violence and brutality and obscurantism which you see sweeping over the world are the present shape of the future and should be accepted for that reason. You have heard still other voices divulging the news that there is nothing to do with this violence and this obscurantism but let it sweep over you; that if you attempt to defend your kind of world against it you will inevitably lose your kind of world. You have had other advisers also—those who speak in the role of the old soldiers, plucking your sleeves and telling you they were tricked into the last war by talk of democracy, telling you the talk of democracy is always talk to trick a man; telling you, you also, if you listen, if you weigh the democratic risk, will be tricked and made fools of. You have heard the professors prophesying that the violence of this time will take its course as the violence of the French Revolution took its course, and that nothing you can do or fail to do will change the outcome; the military strategists prophesying that those who oppose this violence will inevitably fall regardless of any aid of ours and that we ourselves will inevitably suffer humiliation and defeat if we attempt to lift a hand to help them.

But though you are aware of the presence and of the prophecies of these people, you have not, I believe, considered with attention what they are or why they speak as they do, and it is for this reason that I feel compelled to warn you.

Briefly, there are three observations to be made about these prophecies. Each relates to the others, and all three to the credibility of the prophetic words. They are not observations which are frequently brought to mind, at least in public discussions of these matters.

The first is this; that these prophecies are prophecies. Prophets have been infrequent in recent centuries, and the sudden appearance of numbers of them in the time in which we live, foretelling the future to the young and informing them of the disasters which will inevitably follow certain actions, is a curious phenomenon.

The second observation is the observation that all these prophecies are prophecies of defeat, prophecies of negation, prophecies not of the things which men can do but of the things which men cannot do. This, too, is unusual. Prophets have prophesied disaster before this but rarely as consistently or in such numbers, and rarely in terms of impotence and failure so complete.

The third observation is less dramatic but no less interesting for that. It is the observation that these prophetic voices are not, as was the case in antiquity, the voices of old men, but of men and women in middle life—men and women of the generation which knew in its childhood or its youth the other war and which came to consciousness of the world and of itself in the years between. It was not common among any ancient people that men and women in the full strength of their middle years prophesied publicly and always of disaster and defeat.

These three observations have significance because they bear upon the question any curious listener will wish to ask himself: Why do these men and women prophesy, and why, if they must foretell the future to us, do they tell it in these terms? Is it because they possess a knowledge of the future not possessed by other men? Or is there a different reason? And if there is a different reason, is it a reason which has to do with the curious fact that the speakers are men all of one generation—the generation of men now in middle life—the generation, specifically, to which I belong?

The answer, I think, is not too difficult. Prophets appear only among those who know or who think they know that the pattern of life is determined beforehand, and who know or who think they know that they are privy to its determination. The generation to which I belong believes, as you who have read its books are aware, in a predetermined pattern of life. It is our conviction, explicitly stated in our histories, our political commentaries, and our studies in economics, implicitly stated in our novels and our poetry, that the pattern of life is determined by economic law or historical necessity or psychological compulsion, and that we are, or by taking thought can make ourselves, privy to these laws and these necessities. My generation not only believes in a predetermined pattern of life, which is to say, in fate: we believe in it to a degree unknown in Western civilization for centuries. It is probable, therefore, that it is not because they have been touched by a god's breath or because they have beheld visions at night, but for a simpler reason that these prophets prophesy: they prophesy because they belong to a generation which, whether it so admits or not, believes, and has believed for years, in fate, and because, therefore, prophecy is natural to them.

Why these prophets prophesy in the language of impotence and defeat is, however, a more complicated question, and one which requires for its understanding a more extended discussion of the relation between my generation and the notion of fate. The fact that men of a given time believe in a predetermined pattern of life does not necessarily mean that they are fatalists or that their prophecies must take fatalistic form. The Greeks, for example, were believers in fate and producers of prophecies, but not of prophecies like these. For the Greeks conceived of fate, not as a predetermined pattern controlling the whole of life, and controlling therefore the will and acts of men, but as a divine intervention capable of cutting across the acts of men at unexpected moments.

Fate to the Greeks was a force to be reckoned with, a force to be respected, even a force to be feared. But fate was never an inevitable pattern to which history and all men's hopes must be resigned. Odysseus, most Greek of all Greek heroes, outwitted the implacable will where he could, and it is the chorus of Sophocles in the Antigone which says, "Many wonders there are but nothing more wonderful than man." A man among the Greeks was not relieved of the necessity of choice or of the responsibility for choosing, because an unalterable will had already chosen in his stead. Nor was it either honorable or admirable for a man among the Greeks to accept and to admit that he accepted the domination of his world by forces beyond his power to control, fitting his life to their patterns and living at their will.

The fates were not an inevitable force but a three-named god, and with a god, with God's help, a man could struggle, surrendering only when he had no choice but to surrender. To the Greeks, in short, man was capable of the mastery of the greater part of a human and sunlit world and only the shadowy edges, the dark depths of unforeseeable mischance, were left to the inscrutable

and fatal will. Men could be destroyed and were often destroyed by inconceivable disaster but they were capable also of compelling the human world—and sometimes the nonhuman. They were capable of victories against odds, achievements in the face of improbabilities—Thermopylae and Salamis.

Our view of fate—the view entertained by men of my generation—differs, however, in every sense from the Greek. It differs even in the manner in which it was formed. The Greeks learned the will of fate by opposing to it their own wills, determining for themselves, by their own defeats, by their own experience, what limits are placed upon the freedom of men to act and at what point it is seemly and proper for a man to bend his will to that other will. Our generation ascertained the will of fate not by opposing it, not even by yielding to it when we met it, but by searching it out in order that we might yield to it, and by yielding then our responsibilities and our wills. And the fate which we searched out—the fate of universal economic laws and universal historical necessities—was a fate which accounted not only for the margins of our lives, the twilight of inexplicable event, but for our lives themselves and the entire world in which we lived.

Fate lay across the road by which the Greeks moved to the understanding of this world. We fled to fate—we invented a fate of our own—to escape a world which had grown too large for us, a world too complicated to understand, too huge to know. The innovations of our period—the plane, the radio, the automobile—did not, as clumsy speakers sometimes say, contract our world. On the contrary, they extended our world, or extended at least our experience of our world, until the physical hearing, the physical sight, and almost the physical presence of an individual man were pushed out to cover an area of which previously he could have had no physical and personal knowledge. This physical extension of a single man's experience moreover was accompanied by no increased extension of his competence to deal with his experience. No innovation in the physical sciences and no triumph of education equipped him to deal either with the larger world he saw and heard himself or with the tangled and complicated world of tangled and complicated social and economic relations which lay beyond his personal experience and behind it.

We became, all of us, huge and unreal shadows of ourselves like the shadows a level autumn sun throws out across a meadow and a hill, to stumble and gesticulate and fade. We seemed suddenly huge and we touched the earth more broadly, but we ourselves were still no larger than we ever were. We realized our smallness, our inadequacy. The thought frightened us, and we accepted willingly, and even eagerly, the notion of a world directed by historical necessity and economic law. We accepted it not as the Greeks accepted the existence of the fates—a power to be reckoned with, a force to be taken into account in the accomplishment of our own purposes—but as the creatures of unalterable law accept the ineluctable necessity of obedience, surrendering to the unopposable will.

The capitalist who "knew" that the law of supply and demand was a universal law which must inevitably operate sooner or later, and to which all social as well as all economic problems could be safely left, took refuge from an insoluble puzzle in a fatalistic reliance upon the will of fate. He was happy in the conviction that the capitalist system would overcome all its difficulties, because the law of supply and demand was a universal law which nothing could successfully oppose. The pre-Fascist revolutionaries, with a fatalism even more naive, entrusted to the sacred laws of dialectical materialism the labors of a revolution they could not make themselves. And their successors, the Fascists, have carried the worship of fate to its last and most devout extreme. The Fascists do not even trouble to translate their private destiny to terms of law. To them the sole duty of the individual is to surrender his will to the single will of his leader, who surrenders his will in turn to the mystical pulse of history. And the individual's sole destiny is to accept the inevitable future as the weeds accept the senseless and inevitable surging of a wave.

But it is not only in our political theories and our historical theories and our economics that the men and women of my generation are fatalists surrendering to the will of fate. We have made the same confession again and again in our literature.

The books we have written about ourselves and the world we live in are books which will take their place in the great tradition of such work. The best we have done is work well done indeed, work which will be remembered. But the picture of our world and of ourselves which these books give is nevertheless a picture of a world compelled by forces beyond the control of men—a world in which men at the worst are violated by these forces and at the best are skilled victims. The heroes of the books we write about ourselves are neither heroes nor are they masters of their fate; the very phrase for us has a romantic, a pretentious, even a silly sound. The heroes of the books we write about ourselves are defeated men whom we pick out for notice because of the manner of their defeat or because of their bravery in accepting it. They are defeated men who have been defeated as the martyrs were defeated, or defeated men who have accepted their defeat with the saving salve of irony or defeated men who have secretly escaped not only from their defeat but from the world, or defeated men who have revenged themselves on their defeat as a street boy revenges himself upon the streets and buildings of his city.

It is commonly said of the literature of my generation that it is realistic and for this it is much praised. It deserves the praise, I think, but not the reason. Other generations whose writers could claim on equal honesty have presented a world which was at least as real and altogether different. What is true of the characteristic novels of my generation is not that they are realistic in any absolute or universal sense, but that they are realistic from a particular and special point of view. They are realistic from the point of view of the defeated man—the man conquered by forces beyond his power to resist.

They are not so much realists' novels as they are victims' novels. The world they describe is the world as the victim sees it. The truth they tell is the victims' truth—the truth told behind the hand, the truth discreditable to the teller and the hearer—the low-down, the confession, the exposure. The enemy of these books also is the victims' enemy. The victim's enemy is not the human enemy—another man or even many other men. The victim is the figure crushed by forces with which no man ever fought, unnameable forces often. And so it is with the books we write about ourselves. The enemy with us is something that rises out of the total life of the time like the sour smoke that hangs over a great city or something that rustles and gibbers and mews in the contemporary psyche or something sprawled along the whole of history, its tail and huge hind quarters buried in the dark of long-past years. The enemy is The System, or History, or Life. The truth of these books is the truth of the victims of this enemy: the victims frustrated, thwarted, crippled, and destroyed.

It is a truth our generation has told as it has never perhaps been told before—a truth our generation has told in novels and plays and poems which surpass, as a whole, the work of any other generation in this country. The books in which men of my generation have written of the world and of themselves are books which mean, if they mean anything, that my generation sees the world as the victim sees it, and accepts as unopposable and inescapable the laws which take for us the place of fate.

It is for this reason that the prophecies you have heard are the prophecies of impotence and defeat. They are the words of men who speak as prophets not because they have greater knowledge of the future than you but because they belong to a generation which believes that life is determined by a preexisting pattern. They are words of frustration and defeat because the pattern of life in which their generation believes is a fatalistic pattern: because their generation sees the world as the victims of impersonal and mechanical laws, necessities, and systems see it.

It is for this reason then that you must be warned against these speakers. Those who tell you that you need not make decisions in this desperate time because the laws of history will shape the future in any case, those who tell you that you need not face the fact that Nazism threatens everything you love because Nazism is an agency of the historic process which will determine everything regardless of your acts; those who tell you this are victims speaking consciously as victims in a victim's words.

Those who tell you that the destroying guns, the ruinous bombs, the lies, the murders, the indiscriminate death, and confusion and untruth of the Fascist military action are a new, creative, irresistible historic force which you cannot oppose but only ride with as the rubbish rides the surf, are victims prophesying with the tongues of victims.

Those who tell you that you cannot defend democracy without losing it because the historic forces and the economic laws will turn it into fascism the moment you attempt to defend it; those who tell you that you cannot win a war against fascism because the military laws won't let you and that you will suffer humiliation and disaster if you attempt to defend yourselves while you still can, gaining honor and glory only if you submit; those who tell you this are victims shameless in their impotence as victims.

But it is not only because these speakers speak as victims that you must be warned against them. You must be warned against them for another reason. You must be warned against them because they are speakers who are not disinterested speakers. Neither they nor any others who accept the fatalism of historic necessity, of social and economic determinism—neither they nor any others who doubt the possibility of human action or the freedom of the human will to act—are distinterested speakers. Whether they so realize or not, they have taken sides already in the basic conflict of our time. They are men who would have been obliged to invent a Fascist revolution if they had not found one, and nothing they may say in disapproval of the Fascist method or the Fascist policy will change that fact. They have already made, and willing made, the one surrender which engenders all the rest.

For the real issue is precisely the issue between those, on the one side, who believe that it is possible for men to imagine, and in imagination to act, and by action to create the kind of world they wish to live in—the kind of world in which each man is truly free—and those, on the other side, who believe it is not possible for men to create for themselves the world they wish to live in, but only possible to accept a world predestined, a world ordered and directed by those who know and can interpret the commands of fate. The real issue is the issue between those on the one side who believe in themselves and believe in their capacity to act, and are willing to accept the responsibility for action and those on the other who believe there is no room for men to

act and no possibility that men will govern themselves and control their own lives, and who therefore remit to the fates, to the universal laws, the responsibility for action.

Those who continue to believe, despite the failure of democracy to accomplish its ideal or even nearly to approach it in any country—those who continue to believe despite the failures of democracy and the successes of the Fascist armies—those who continue to believe that man is what the Greeks believed him to be and what the founders of this Republic believed him to be—will not accept the prophecies of defeated men. Neither will they accept the prophecies of those who offer to tell them how they can avoid the necessity of decision and of action. For they know, as they know nothing else on earth, that their first duty is to decide and to decide with individual responsibility, and to decide with full and faithful knowledge of the facts. Only by such decision is government of the people by themselves conceivable.

Members of your generation, troubled by the prophecies, troubled also by the demands made upon your loyalties and your emotions from many sides, have addressed themselves in the last few months to men of my generation demanding of us the answers to certain questions of great difficulty and perplexity—demanding even that we supply you with certain convictions which your education has not supplied: a central faith, a central belief, which you now lack. It is understandable that you should ask but unlikely that your asking will find answers. At least from us. The answers you require are the answers which will enable you to believe in your own lives and to respect your own hopes and to accomplish your own purposes; the answers which will enable you to take the great ambiguous words—democracy, liberty, humanity, freedom—and speak them again as though you first had used them in the world; the answers which will enable you to act and to believe. Our generation has no such answers to supply. Ours is a generation which never learned the answers you have need of; a generation which inherited one set of beliefs and threw them away because the world had altered and took in their place the automatic laws, the mechanical fatalities.

It is not to us but to yourselves that you must look for answers.

And it is in yourselves that you will find the answers. You will remember, some of you, how Odysseus, seeking his way to his own life—his wife, his fruit trees, and his island—beached his ship upon the foreshore of Hell to ask the prophet, Teresias, for answers. You will remember also how he found among the dead there one of his own men, Elpenor, a reckless and self-reliant man who had gone on the roof of Circe's house to drink and had fallen, breaking his neck bone.

You also, seeking your way to your own lives—you also may find upon this shadowy beach of time one of your own years who will answer you as Tiresias could never answer—one who will say as Elpenor would have said:

For myself—if you ask me—
There is no way back over sea water
Nor by earth's oaks or beyond them:
There is only the way on.
You had best—trusting neither to
Charts nor to prophets but seamanship—
You had best—if you ask me—
Sail on by the sun to the seaward
Till you come to a clean place
With the smell of the pine in your faces and
Broom and a bitter turf
And the larks blown over the surf and the
Rocks red to the wave—height:
No sound but the wave's:
No call of a cock from the
Windward shore, nor of oxen—
Gull's shadow for hawk's:
Gull's cry for the hawk's cry—
On by the open sea
To a land with a clean beach
An unplowed country
Pure under cleansing sun
With the dung burned dry on the gravel
And only the sand to have
And begin it again: start over.
You have only to cross this place
And launch ship and get way on her
Working her out with the oars to the
Full wind and go forward and
Bring yourselves to a home:
To a new land: to an ocean
Never sailed: not to Ithaca:
Not to your beds—but the withering
Seaweed under the thorn and the
Gulls and another morning.

Again the Party Line Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of yesterday:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 24, 1941]

AGAIN, THE PARTY LINE CHANGES

For mental gymnastics there is nothing that rivals the corkscrew convolutions of the Communist Party line.

Along about daylight Sunday, Moscow time, when Hitler's bombers and tanks swept across the Soviet borders, the party line turned an abrupt about-face. But our American Bolsheviks didn't hear about it soon enough to prevent the pre-dated Sunday issue of their Daily Worker and the June 24 issue of their weekly New Masses from going to press with articles ridiculing British imperialist rumors of a prospective German-Russian clash.

By the time the American Communists had edited Monday's issue of The Daily Worker, they had oriented themselves to the new direction. In three columns of black-face type down the front page, the Communist Party of America stated its position. Nowhere, in the statement could be found those well-worn phrases, "Wall Street warmongers" and "capitalist butchers." No; Hitler was again in a class by himself as the archenemy of mankind.

Nor, of course, were there repetitions of recent attacks on the program of lend-lease aid to stop the Nazis. To the contrary, there was a clarion call for all Americans who cherish peace and liberty to rally to the cause of the Socialist fatherland.

This latest somersault is no neater than the one the Commies executed in August 1939 when Hitler and Stalin signed their treaty of nonaggression and friendship. Prior thereto the Muscovites in this country had been agitating for "collective security against fascism" and a "united front for democracy." But Stalin and Hitler made their deal and the party-liners were able, without blinking an eye, to hail the pact as "a mighty weapon in the struggle for peace."

Communist policy has been no less inconsistent in the American labor movement. For many years the "line" was to denounce all American trades-unions as tools of the capitalist bosses. But then came orders from Moscow to join up—and they joined, seeking strategic positions of power, using unions to promote discord and advance the cause of the Moscow foreign office.

Another shift in labor policy is now in the cards. Instead of inspiring strikes in defense industries, the Commies probably will start agitating for the speed-up and stretch-out and anything else calculated to increase production—especially if they think there is any chance of cutting Russia in on lend-lease materials.

Our guess is that American workers will not be deceived, but will get on with their duty of rooting out these foreign agents in their midst.

Although the new party line for the moment may happen to coincide with the interests of our friends the British, and may in some instances parallel our own Government's program for national security, there is no assurance that this will long be true.

Let's not forget that in the last World War the Commies made a separate peace with the Kaiser at Brest-Litovsk, leaving their erstwhile allies to stand the whole weight of the German war machine on the western front. The Bolos will do it again if they think they can save their hides that way.

Afraid of the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, either because they are afraid to face the facts or do not want the American people to know the truth, or are just indifferent, some folks have charged that Mr. Lindbergh is a Nazi sympathizer.

Some base this accusation upon his acceptance of a medal given him some years ago by the German Government; some upon his statement that we are not prepared to fight a war on foreign soil.

Most intelligent Americans know that we are not prepared to send an expeditionary force to Europe, and the great majority of our people have no desire to do so.

True, Lindbergh accepted a decoration or medal. He accepted one not only from the German Government, but from the Congress of the United States as well, and both were given because of his distinguished service to aviation.

On June 16, 1938, photographers for the Federal press were present at the White House when a picture was taken of Marvin McIntyre surrounded by five well-identified Communists, namely, William Wiener, Max Bedacht, Peter Shepka, John Middleton, and Joseph Brodsky, who were there for the purpose

of presenting the President with a portrait of himself.

In December of 1938 another scene occurred in the White House. Upon this occasion members of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians, a C. I. O. affiliate represented by Communists—Marcel Sherer, who ran for alderman on the Communist Party ticket in New York City in 1931, Jules Korchien who had been consulting architect to the Moscow Government, and Lewis Allen Berne, were there to present the President of the United States with an honorary membership in the C. I. O. union.

No one, as far as I know, has ever charged the President with being a Communist or a Communist sympathizer just because these two communistic groups happened to visit the White House and extend these tokens of their esteem, which, as far as the record shows, were accepted and have never been disavowed or returned.

Then consider the case of Jimmie Roosevelt. Jimmie has many medals. The distinguished Representative from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has called attention to a few of the decorations which the President's son has accepted. See page 4686 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1941.

We all know that the President's wife, Eleanor Roosevelt, not only entertained Communists at the White House, but that she went before the Dies committee with Communists when she knew, or should have known, that the effect of her acts would be to encourage the Communists and to induce others to overlook their treasonable activities.

Now we find the administration, which has been telling the people that we must fight the battle of democracy throughout the world, rushing to the aid of "red" communistic Russia. The American people now have awakened to find themselves in bed with Joe Stalin and those Russian officials who throughout the years have persecuted, starved, and caused the death of hundreds of thousands of the so-called common men and women.

The Roosevelt diplomacy, the New Deal, has finally gotten us into bed with the enemies of progress, prosperity, and the preservation of liberty. Are the President and his wife and the Communists in the administration—all those foreign-born sympathizers in the administration who wish to remake America—proud of what they have done to America, to our Congress, our courts, including the Supreme Court?

Are they happy, now that they have worked us into a position where men in America no longer have equality of opportunity; where men no longer can exercise the right to work without paying tribute? Where they have us marching not only under the Stars and Stripes but carrying that banner forward in an attempt to place it alongside the red flag of Russia?

Yes; the Roosevelts—and I mean the President and his wife—have done much to "the forgotten man," and they finally have him on the road to complete regimentation and slavery.

Army Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th day of April 1941 when I made my report on the construction of the cantonment at Indiantown Gap, Pa., I discussed the question of Army red tape. Those who heard or read the speech will recall that I commented upon the fact that the Army had spent $15,000 for termite shields on buildings in an area where no termite had ever been heard of. I also pointed out the fact that one wooden building had stood on the reservation where these termite shields were used which had been erected in the year 1690 and had stood there for 250 years and no termite had ever attacked it. I also called attention to the fact that the termite shields were placed on the building despite the fact that the camp construction quartermaster had been to Washington and made a recommendation against their being used. The day after this recommendation was made the Army instructed him to put them on any way. It was easier to affirm the order even though it was costing the taxpayers $15,000 than it was to cut the red tape which had to be cut to change the order. Under the system used in the construction of Army cantonments under the cost-plus-fixed-fee system, the contractor purchases a great deal of the material such as lumber, equipment, and so forth, and is then reimbursed by the Army. I have before me a statement showing the amount of red tape that must be unwound before the contractor can be reimbursed for such invoice payment.

When the officers of the Quartermaster General's Department and the Army budget officials were before our War Department subcommittee of the appropriations committee, I questioned them on this procedure, and they stated that this statement set forth the things that must be done before a contractor could be reimbursed for invoice payment. This statement covers nearly 3 regular letterhead-size pages, single spaced. It took 46 paragraphs and subparagraphs to set forth the things that must be done before such reimbursement can be made. I am placing this statement in the RECORD. You will find that it requires the filing of 43 papers before a check is issued and 11 papers after the check is issued, or a total of 54 papers, including originals, duplicates, triplicates, quadruplicates, quintuplicates, and other "uplicates," until in paragraph 5, 12 copies of a purchase order were distributed. It also included the filling out of 5 different Government forms, including Forms 64, 79, 115, 116, and 1034. Paragraph 3 provides that one of these forms is made out in white, yellow, pink, and blue colors. It does not state whether or not any baby ribbon is used. All this is being done under the cost-plus-fixed-fee system of Army construction. Speaking about delays, I am wondering just how much of the delay in Army construction was caused by the winding and unwinding of this type of red tape. I am wondering just what the additional cost of bookkeeping is in putting through the intricate bookkeeping system such as this—54 papers for each reimbursement order, large or small. It will also be interesting to note how many bookkeeping entries were made on the Army and other Government books, and the cost of bookkeeping and accounting in an intricate system such as this. I want to repeat what I said in my Indiantown Gap report, that the Army wraps itself up in red tape until it becomes as helpless as an Egyptian mummy to act quickly in an emergency.

INVOICE PAYMENT AND REIMBURSEMENT ROUTINE

1. Purchasing agent receives estimate of material to be purchased.

2. Three or more quotations are obtained in duplicate from vendors by purchasing agent

3. Quotations are tabulated on form No. 79 and one set is attached to original (C. Q. M. copy of form No. 79), and one set is attached to duplicate (purchasing agent's copy of form No. 79). Form No. 79 (purchase order requisition and tabulation of bids) is made up in quadruplicate, in four colors (white, yellow, pink, and blue), and distributed as follows:

(a) Original is forwarded to C. Q. M. (attached to purchase order).

(b) Duplicate is kept in Purchasing Office.

(c) Triplicate is sent to contractor's chief material clerk.

(d) Quadruplicate is sent to contractor's receiving station.

4. Twelve copies of a purchase order are typed, checked, two copies signed, and remaining copies signature stamped.

5. Distribution of 12 copies of purchase order.

(a) Five copies are sent to C. Q. M through Government field auditor for approval.

(1) Two copies (duplicate and quadruplicate) are retained by C. Q. M.

(2) Three copies returned to contractor's purchasing agent.

(x) Original is sent to vendor.

(y) Triplicate is sent to contractor's auditor.

(1) When ready for payment, if purchasing agent checks invoices.

(2) When material is received and checked, if contractor's auditor checks invoices (as later suggested for future projects).

(z) Quintuplicate copy retained in purchasing agent's file, to which one copy of quotations, invoices, and receiving record is finally attached.

(b) Seven tissue copies are distributed, as follows:

(1) Two copies are sent to Government field auditor for forwarding to C. Q. M. disbursing officer, to accompany invoice for reimbursement.

(2) One copy is handed to contractor's auditor for his numerical file (cost department).

(3) One copy to purchasing agent's numerical file.

(4) One copy to clerk who prepared order, for follow-up and expediting.

(5) One copy to invoice checking clerk.

(6) One copy to C. Q. M. senior receiving inspector.

6. Purchase order listed on transmittal list of purchase orders to C. Q. M., by purchasing agent and sent to field auditor, C. Q. M.'s

office. Prices, extensions, footings, etc., checked; purchase order approved by Government field auditor and transmitted to C. Q. M., or executive officer who signs triplicate copy and signature-stamps the others.

7. C. Q. M.'s office returns order to contractor's purchasing agent.

8. Original purchase order is sent to vendor.

9. Acknowledgment is received from vendor (by purchasing agent), and is attached to file copy of purchase order.

10. Delivery slips, delivered with merchandise to material clerk. (When shipments are made by rail, express, and parcel post, shipping memo and tally sheets should be received by material clerk through the mail previous to delivery of material as called for on back of purchase order.)

11. Merchandise delivered and checked by contractor's checker and Government checkers (except that in case of lumber, Government checks for quality only, and accepts the quantity check of contractor and architect-engineer).

12. Receiving record, form No. 64 (original and two copies) signed by chief material clerk, attached to delivery slips (original and two copies) are sent to purchasing agent.

13. Invoice (original and five copies) is received from vendor by purchasing agent.

14. Invoice checked by purchasing agent for correct number of copies, presence of governmentally required certifications, etc. If not in order, invoice mailed to vendor with instructions for corrections. If in order (or when returned by vendor, in order) transmitted to contractor's auditor. It is suggested that on future jobs the quantities and unit prices only of invoices be checked by the purchasing agent and that the invoices then be forwarded to the contractor's auditor for checking of extensions, numbers of properly certified copies, etc.

15. Copy of invoice sent to field auditor (C. Q. M.'s office) by contractor's auditor, for approval (on form 115).

16. Invoice checked by field auditor's office, entered in Government records as approved, and returned to contractor's auditor on form 116.

17. Check issued by contractor and mailed to vendor with original invoice and request that latter be receipted and returned.

18. Invoice receipted and returned to contractor.

19. Reimbursement voucher made up in quadruplicate, but with a separate envelope for each copy; Government Form 1034 written up and certifications signed by project manager; entire file sent to Government field auditor's office, where it is rechecked for payment; also original is checked against copy previously sent to Government field auditor, to detect any alterations in former since approval.

20. Original to Government receiving clerk for certification of receipt of material covered by invoice, then to field auditor (C. Q. M.'s office) for signature.

21. To C. Q. M.'s office for entry in his records, any desired rechecking, and his signature (or that of his executive officer) on Form 1034 certification.

22. Envelopes Nos. 1 and 2 sent to finance officer, Chicago, for reimbursement.

If terms (as in case of Government awards) entail payment of freight bill and deduction of freight from the amount of the invoice, the following steps intervene between steps Nos. 14 and 15 of the foregoing:

1. Freight bill is received and cross referenced to invoice to which it applies. (If requisite number of copies are not provided, or if proper certifications are not present, freight bill must be returned for remedying these defects.)

2. The freight bill sent to Government auditor (on Form 115) for approval; checked for rates.

3. Freight bill returned to contractor's auditor, approved, on Form 116.

4. Freight bill paid and receipted original requested.

5. Freight bill returned, receipted, and amount deducted from the invoice (to which receipted freight bill must then be attached.)

It is suggested that on future jobs, in order to eliminate loss of discounts, that invoices be paid prior to payment of freight bills, or even prior to final checking of invoices from vendors who have continuing accounts.

The Road to Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF CLARENCE BUDINGTON KELLAND, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN FOR ARIZONA

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Clarence Budington Kelland, delivered at Clinton, Conn., May 22, 1941:

If our country and its institutions are to survive we must search for and find a path to national unity.

There is such a road, but there is only one road and it is straight and narrow. That is the road that will lead us to complete trust and confidence in the purposes of those who are now administering the Government of the United States.

I believe it would be a calamity for America to enter a foreign war before it establishes peace at home

I believe it would be a calamity for America to go to battle with a foreign enemy until it has conquered the enemies that are within our borders. And those enemies are suspicion, uneasiness, uncertainty, and fear of the future. Suspicion, uneasiness, uncertainty, and distrust of the domestic plans and purposes of those who are now in control of the machinery of our Government.

When we entered the last World War we gave to Woodrow Wilson without reservation and without fear the widest and most complete dictatorial powers. We surrendered our freedoms. We gave up for the duration of the emergency our constitutional rights. We placed the resources and the lives of this Nation in the hands of one man unhesitatingly. Because there was not a man, woman, or child in America who did not sleep confidently in the sure knowledge that when the emergency had passed Woodrow Wilson would return those powers to the people and our Republic would continue.

Today we are asked to give powers as wide, as deep, as dangerous to the present administration. I doubt if there lives a man, woman, or child in the United States who is confident these powers will be returned to us when peace shall come, and this Republic and its institutions be left intact.

The question we are asking ourselves and must continue to ask ourselves is: How shall America profit if she goes to war to destroy a dictator abroad if in the process she creates a dictatorship at home? We are asking, and must continue to ask, why we should sacrifice our wealth, our comfort, our careers, our very lives to abolish a detestible form of government in Europe while we sit tamely by to see a totalitarian government set up on this continent.

This is a question that must be answered and a condition of fear and uncertainty that must be abolished before America dares to throw herself into the most dreadful conflict in history. This is a doubt that must be allayed before we can have unity of purpose such as is necessary to prosecute a war. This is a fear that must be erased completely and forever before indispensible unity can be achieved; before we can march to war without a terror lest there be an enemy in our rear.

In such an hour, in face of such a question, the American people are entitled to guaranties by the present administration that it will return the powers it asks, and that the American Republic, with its institutions and freedoms, shall be restored when peace comes again to the world.

We, the people, are asked to make vast concessions. It is our right and our duty to demand that concessions be made by this administration in return.

What guaranties can be given that will restore confidence?

What concessions can be made that will justify us in surrendering what the administration asks us to surrender?

One guaranty that would be conclusive, convincing, complete, and final would be the removal from high places of authority officials, appointees whom experience has taught us are unworthy of the trust and confidence of this Nation. One guaranty that would convince every American of the good faith and honorable intentions of this administration would be to remove from positions of autocratic power individuals who are incompetent, inefficient, visionary, or corrupt. One great step toward unity and faith and enthusiastic support would be to replace these officials with Americans of known probity and ability and patriotism. With individuals who are known to believe to the depths of their souls in the institutions of this Republic, and who could be relied upon to fight to the death for their preservation.

This is not a demand for a coalition government; it is a demand for an American government. It is a demand that this administration guaranty its good faith by seeking for and appointing to the highest, most crucial offices men who are worthy, tried, capable. Let this administration find them and place them where we can see them with our eyes and know that they are working in our behalf. Where we can know they are working for the Republic and not for that incohate, incoherent mass of unworkable theories known as the New Deal.

Let the administration guarantee its good faith by delegating its vast and dangerous powers to men who will in their turn be living guaranties that they will be used for the public good and for the ultimate preservation of this Republic.

The affairs of this country are so vast, so far-reaching, that no single man, no matter how able, no matter how patriotic, can administer even a fraction of them. Powers must be delegated. They must be delegated to appointees. James Farley once said that the ultimate test of an administration was its appointees.

A major part of the distrust with which we Republicans and millions of Democrats regard this administration has its roots in the appointees of this administration.

You can unite and weld this country into an unbeatable, invincible unit behind men it knows it can trust. You cannot unite America behind a coterie of such appointees as we now see mishandling the affairs of this Nation. You cannot unite America behind Madam Perkins. You cannot unite America behind Tommy the Cork and Cohen. You cannot unite America behind that amiable and ailing man, Harry Hopkins. Most emphatically, you cannot unite America behind Harold Ickes.

It is to such appointees as these, incompetent, inexperienced, visionary, and even vindictive, that this administration is now entrusting our destinies. It is their hands that will have the spending of our billions and the control of our lives and of our life's blood.

Already the country is seething with rumors of inefficiency in our tremendous program of preparedness. Already the country is seething with rumors of things more malignant than inefficiency. A complacent people may tolerate incompetency, or even dishonesty, in the handling of its treasure. It dares not tolerate inefficiency when it comes to the shedding of the blood of our sons.

So, as a first guaranty, let this administration place our affairs in the hands of men who are worthy to handle those affairs. Let it remove and cast into oblivion those individuals whose gross caperings and intolerance and inefficiency and social scheming have brought our domestic affairs to their present dire pass. Give America back to Americans. Take it away from pets and parasites. Take it away from yes-men and bunglers. Take it away from blunderers and incompetents. Take it away from those whose sole desire is a perpetuation of their own political power. Give it back, give back those powers, to men whose sole thought shall be for the welfare of this land we love.

This, and only this, can be the road to complete unity.

A second step, and one of almost equal importance, is the step of concessions.

If we citizens are asked to concede all, this administration must concede something

In return for what we are to be asked to give let this administration give in return. And by this administration I mean that group, that cabal known as the New Deal.

The fallacies, the fumblings, the futilities of the New Deal have brought this country to the perilous condition in which it now suffers.

The New Deal has not been the American way.

At this moment, the most crucial, the most perilous in our history, we are rent and torn by something that is only less malignant than civil war. Our factories are closed, our production of airplanes, of tanks, of ships, of armaments is impeded or brought to a standstill by something that is nothing short of a revolt of labor. The conditions that have caused this revolt were caused by the paltering, the political maneuvering, the miscalled social aims of this administration. It had sowed the wind and is reaping the whirlwind. The condition is evident. The reasons for its existence are evident. It must be cured, and it can be cured only by those whose acts have fomented it.

Very well, then, let this administration make definite and categorical concessions. Let it concede the danger and the failure of those New Deal aims and purposes which do not fit the pattern of American life. Let them disavow those aims which have been demonstrated to be destructive of it. Let this administration state in unmistakable terms that it means to return to the American way of life. Let it state that in the future it means to work for America and not against America.

Then, and only then, can 30,000,000 thinking citizens unite behind the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt and give to him that wholehearted support which we crave to give.

We have heard much talk of bottlenecks. When the history of this era comes to be written there will be but one bottleneck that will be noted by students of our times. That bottleneck is the New Deal. It is the New Deal that is the bottleneck strangling our national unity.

Let these things be done; let these guaranties be given; let these concessions be made. Then, and only then, dares America take the awful step which this administration seems to desire to take—the step of war. Then, if we march to battle we will be carrying our rifles—not in a New Deal war—we will be fighting and dying in an American war.

Bad leadership is better than no leadership. For 8 years we have had leadership of a sort—the leadership of opportunism, the leadership of impulse, the leadership that comes from not knowing what to do in face of the necessity to do something. But it has been leadership.

Today we have no leadership. In Washington we see fear and vacillation. We see the hampering of political expedience. We see that theorists have at last come face to face with reality and do not know what to do about it. We see that they hesitate to step in any direction; that instead of showing the way to the people, they sit hesitant and aghast, waiting for the people to shove in one direction or in another.

Today we have a leadership of trial balloons. The air is daily filled with them. Trial balloons sent aloft by Pepper, by Knox, by Stimson, by Ickes. It shows to us the picture of a leader who is not marching ahead of his army, planning their campaign, issuing orders for their victory, but sitting in the rear until news can come to him of where the army wants to go.

You cannot unite America behind a barrage of trial balloons.

You cannot unite America behind a leadership that is groping for signposts.

You cannot unite America behind a leadership that waits to read the Gallup poll before it makes up its mind.

The only flags behind which you can unite this Nation are the flags of frankness, of truth, of fearlessness, of definite disclosed purpose. The only flags behind which you can unite this Nation are the flags of integrity, of honor, of love of this land and of its institutions. You cannot unite behind the limp flag of vacillation or the flag of partisanship in national emergency.

We are demanding a flag to follow; we are demanding that it be held high in steady hands; we are not demanding a reed shaken by every political wind; what we plead for is a battle flag of the Republic upon which shall be written as was written of old, "Give us liberty or give us death." And a firm, fearless hand to hold it aloft to every wind, even if that wind be the tornado of war.

I have sought reasonably and temperately, without vindictiveness or slander, to show to you what I believe to be the road to national unity and security. I have no more to say, only this:

May God bless and preserve and keep safe and secure for ourselves, for our children, for our children's children, this gracious land of ours.

Trade Agreements With Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. ROSS RIZLEY, OF OKLAHOMA, TO THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made yesterday before the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

To the Committee on Reciprocity Information,
Tariff Commission Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As a Member of Congress representing a great agricultural district, I am opposed to the proposed negotiation of trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay.

In the main, those who have favored the trade-agreement policy have maintained that it would be a great moral force for the promotion of world peace. It must now be apparent to everyone that it has completely failed in that respect.

As far as farm exports are concerned, it is to be remembered that the so-called major purpose of a reciprocal trade agreements program was to increase farm markets for American farm products. In this the policy has likewise been a dismal failure. Even prior to the outbreak of the war agricultural exports for the full fiscal year just preceding were lower than they were in 1932.

My State of Oklahoma is a great livestock State, and a lowering of the tariff will result in a corresponding reduction in the prices of livestock, meat, and meat products which we produce.

We cannot compete with either Uruguay or Argentina in the production of cattle and sheep. Due to the fertility of the soil and climatic conditions in both of those countries, a cow and a calf and a couple of sheep can be carried on from 2 to 3 acres of land the year around. The feeding of hay, cake, silage, etc., is utterly unknown. There they are fattened entirely on pasture crops, the result being that the cost of production is far below anything possible in this country. Again, here in the United States the livestock producer must take into account certain fixed minimum standards, which are necessarily reflected in his production costs, by way of land values, either owned or rented, feed cost, labor cost, shelter, and supplies, and certainly more than ever before, taxes, which by necessity must materially increase. It is eminently unfair to the cattle producers of this country to permit competitive products to come in at reduced rates.

By acreage restrictions, loans, food stamps, and export subsidies, the Government has for 8 years undertaken to raise farm prices and control surpluses.

In view of this, how can a policy logically be defended that will lower duties on competitive agricultural products?

Respectfully submitted.

Farmers and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress must take immediate action to afford farmers relief against the use of force and violence, "quickie" strikes, mob picketing, secondary boycott, and "hot" cargo practices, which are making it impossible for them to pro-

duce and market vital food supplies for our citizens and fighting forces.

On May 12, 1941, Mr. George Meany placed before this body an article from the American Federationist purporting to tell of the labor conditions of farm employees engaged in picking lemons in Ventura County, Calif. This article in many respects was entirely untrue and in other respects told only half truths, and being privileged by the unanimous consent of this House, I desire to set forth the facts as found by me upon investigation.

It is known that the farm laborer employed by Ventura County growers is better housed, receives higher wages than any other comparable employees in the United States, and were misled into leaving their work by promises and representations of labor agitators which were obviously untrue and never could be fulfilled. These agitators have created racial hatred, have caused to be destroyed hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of agricultural products, and have created a relief burden on Ventura County of hundreds of Mexican families who, before this time, were wage earners.

During the 1941 lemon-picking season, a jurisdictional wrangle broke out between C. I. O. and A. F. of L. organizers attempting to organize agricultural workers of Ventura County. With both unions apparently unsuccessful in peaceably recruiting members, the A. F. of L. instituted a series of "quickie" strikes apparently to force unionization.

During the month of January, officials of the Seaboard Lemon Association were negotiating with the Agricultural and Citrus Workers' Union, Local No. 22342, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, as required under the National Labor Relations Act, after the union had been certified by the Board as the bargaining agent for the packing-house employees.

During the negotiations the union presented a contract on behalf of the lemon pickers in addition to the packing-house employees. Informed by the association officials that the association could not consider pickers' contracts simultaneously, making negotiations for the packing-house employees contingent upon negotiations with the picking employees, who are exempt as farm workers from the National Labor Relations Act, without violating the act, the proposed contract for pickers was withdrawn by the union.

Yet on January 30 a picket line was placed at the Seaboard Association headquarters by the Agricultural and Citrus Workers' Union, claiming to be picketing for the pickers alone. Neither the pickers nor the packers would cross the picket line.

No demands had been made on the association other than the one instance referred to.

A picket line was placed at the Oxnard Citrus Association at noon on January 30 without making any demands. On the following morning, January 31, picket lines using Mexican workers from the Seaboard Association crews were thrown around the Saticoy Lemon Association plant—this despite the fact that an election had been held among packing-house workers at the Saticoy Lemon Association the day prior, January 30, by the National Labor Relations Board.

Absolutely no demands of any sort, either verbal or written, were made on the Saticoy Lemon Association or the Oxnard Citrus Association. Naturally there were big headlines in the local papers, but when reporters questioned farmer members of these associations, who hired their picking crews cooperatively in order to even the flow of fruit to the packing houses and to furnish stable long-term employment to their pickers, the farmers were at a loss to know what the strike was about, as no demands had been made upon them.

The American Federation of Labor organizer, Ed Achstetter, of San Francisco, was joined at approximately that time by A. H. Peterson, of Los Angeles, both of whom are industrial- or craft-union organizers. Evidently realizing they had lost public support by stopping the harvests without even making demands, they used a new tactic. On February 4, between 11 and 12 a. m. they sent a messenger to the Briggs Lemon Association, the Santa Paula Citrus Fruit Association, Limoneira Co., Teague-McKevett Association, Culbertson Lemon Association, and the Ventura County Orange & Lemon Association with a contract demanding a one-third increase in wages and recognition of the union as sole bargaining agent for all lemon pickers, giving until 5 o'clock that same afternoon for them to accede to the demands, or a strike would be called. Of these last-named cooperative associations, five market through the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, with the Ventura County Orange & Lemon Association marketing through the Mutual Orange Distributors.

On the same day the first demands were made on the original three associations struck.

On February 10 pickets from other struck houses were thrown around the Rancho Sespe, all of whose operations are on their own ranch and are not subject to the National Labor Relations Act. This ranch did not receive notice or demands from the union until February 17, 7 days after the so-called strike occurred.

On February 10th pickets from other houses were thrown around the Fillmore Lemon Association. No demands were served on the farmers belonging to this association until February 21, 9 days after the so-called strike began. On that same day at noon the same demands were made on the Ventura Citrus Association and the Ventura Coastal Lemon Association, giving them 5 hours to sign the contract as submitted. Picketing began there on February 13. Of these last two associations one markets through the exchange and one through the American Fruit Growers.

In this particular area most of the associations, which include all parts of Ventura County, are members of the district exchanges, affiliated with the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, but their competitors were included as well. The Mutual Orange Distributors, through which the Ventura County Orange and Lemon Association markets, is a competitor, as is the American Fruit Growers, through which the Ventura Coastal Association markets. This point is reiterated because leaders of the union have claimed at various times that they were striking against the California Fruit Growers' Exchange. That this is untrue is evidenced in the fact that the union leaders themselves announced to the public press that they were striking against all Ventura County lemon growers, and that their move was not a strike solely to increase the wages or improve the working conditions of the lemon pickers, but it was a county-wide first step by the American Federation of Labor to unionize all agricultural labor in California.

Mexican workers refused to go through the lines patrolled by the so-called union pickets. The word "so-called" is used advisedly, because the leaders of the strike admitted in testimony before a State legislative committee that they were in effect handling the strike on a contingent-fee basis and no membership cards in the union had been issued to the Mexican workers involved, but that the Mexican workers' signatures had been obtained solely on a power of attorney after the strike was called, and if the strike was successful they would then sign up. The presiding senator asked Mr. Peterson if the union was drawing a racial line by not issuing bona fide membership cards to the Mexicans.

Throughout the establishment of picket lines and barring of Mexican workers from the picking operations there is ample evidence of coercion and intimidation. These Mexicans did not understand this sudden order not to work, or the threats of violence, being told they had to support their race against the white people. When these organizers told them that the Government wanted them to strike, that Uncle Sam was on their side, they didn't know what else to do. Leaders in the strike went so far as to state that if the growers did not accede to their demands, the Government would take over the property and operate the farms, or divide them among the workers.

These Mexicans were told by Achstetter and Peterson that when they marched on the picket line they were marching in Uncle Sam's Army.

A racial hatred was created, and the pickets, particularly the women, were very offensive in heckling workers who went through the lines.

Remember that none of the white workers would believe or follow the leadership of these outside agitators who came into Ventura County, throwing picket lines around farms and cooperative farm association headquarters, attempting to stop everyone from going to work. Thus these white workers going through the picket lines were called all of the vile names in the Mexican vocabulary. There was engendered a racial feeling and hatred among those workers who had worked together harmoniously through all of the past history of lemon production. Now the farmers are faced with the problem that many of these white workers who went through the Mexican picket lines and assisted the

farmers in saving their crops have insisted that they will not work with the Mexicans in the future.

Growers could not accede to the demands of these outside agitators and stay in business. Congress has consistently recognized the fact that industrial unionism, with its complete surrender of job control in seasonal farm operations, could not work in agriculture when they specifically exempted farm workers from the national policy of such legislative acts as the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, and so forth.

With California farmers already paying wages that are highest in the Nation, no farmer could stay in business if his harvest labor costs were further increased as demanded by the union. With a huge surplus crop, the largest in history, depressing prices, they could not pay the wages demanded. As proof of that, a report of the economic condition of the lemon industry and its inability to bear increased costs has been prepared by the University of California in an impersonal, impartial survey.

Even with economic conditions as they are, according to the report of the Fair Labor Standards Act, dated April 29, 1940, California pays 80 percent higher citrus wages than Texas and 28 percent higher than Florida, the two States against whom California competes in the production of citrus products. In addition to that, California must pay a much higher freight rate to get fruit to the eastern and middle western markets.

It is little wonder that the lemon growers fighting to maintain their groves, without knowing which way to turn to pay interest on mortgages or borrowed money, with a huge surplus depressing the market, and facing the problem of feeding and clothing their own families, resisted the organizers of the A. F. of L., who moved in, forcing pickers to strike for a 30 to 35 percent increase in wages—this at a time when the trees were loaded with fruit, the picking long overdue because of rains, so that due to the large crop and the heavy pickings, the pickers could have made 25 percent more at the old scale of wages than they had made the last year.

For an industry to accede to such demands to advance wages and increase losses at a time when the industry was losing money would be suicidal.

Beyond these points, anyone with common sense knows that farmers are not going to turn over job control on their farms to outsiders who have walked into the county and staged such a strike, using force and intimidation, and allow these men to determine their costs and methods of operation. These men offered no proof that they represented even a majority of the Mexicans whom they forced out of the fields.

The farmers did attempt in this emergency to meet with their own employees and discuss the economic situation. They believed in and publicly announced that they had never done anything to prevent their employees from joining the union and did not intend to do anything. They publicly stated that workers were free to join if they wished to, but that they did not have to join a union to work on Ventura County farms. Quoting from their public statement:

> We never have and we will not in the future treat union workers differently from those who do not belong to unions.

Freely recognizing the right of farm workers to join the union if they wished and agreeing to bargain collectively, in good faith, with duly accredited representatives of their employees, the farmers received neither proof of representation nor any chance to work out the situation with their own employees.

The arbitrary action of union leaders in calling strikes, then serving notice, or serving notice with only 5 hours for consideration of demands, accompanied by no proof of proper representation, with force and intimidation and threats of violence used to force workers from the field, no American farmer could consider that a reasonable approach to negotiation.

Ventura County farmers had for years been proud of the record they had set in wages, conditions, and continuity of employment as compared with agricultural wages in other States, particularly those growing citrus fruits. Monthly reports of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States Department of Labor will definitely show as a comparison between competitive agricultural areas our own wage conditions are much the highest. Particularly pertinent to the citrus industry is the recent study of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

Lemon pickers have lived for years on the same ranches, have been furnished housing the year round, with continuity of employment that averaged 9 months per year. When there was no employment either in lemon picking or other work on the particular ranch, workers were free to live in the houses and work in the other crops of the county, for Ventura County farmers had rotated their crops, changed their plantings, and arranged harvests so that they were able to furnish the most stable employment for agricultural workers in any seasonal crop-production area in the United States.

Housing in Ventura County furnished to farm workers is recognized, taking the county as a whole, as the finest in existence. I submit herewith photostatic copies of reports on this housing from the Division of Immigration and Housing of the State of California, made less than 6 weeks prior to the calling of this strike.

These reports submitted are on the very camps which are attacked so viciously by such men as George Meany, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, who came to the county for a short survey after the strike had failed, and is now using his national influence in attempting to heckle the farmers to whom the A. F. of L. lost the strike.

The growers were not angry with these Mexicans who struck. They realized they had been misled and intimidated. For 3 months they allowed them to continue living in their houses, despite the fact that they were not working and were paying no rent, and the farmers were even having to pay the lights and water and gas bills on more than 600 of these houses.

After weeks of refusal to work on the part of the Mexicans, the farmers asked them to come back to work again, stating that if they did not come back, they would have to have the houses for new farm labor employed to replace them. Then they gave them 30 days' notice to vacate. At the end of that 30 days they gave them 3 days' notice. Then they filed suits in the justice courts asking for writs of possession.

As soon as the hearings started in the justice courts, counsel for the occupants of the houses asked the growers to not evict these farm workers all at once. The workers signed stipulations admitting that they were in illegal possession of the houses, that their employment had been lawfully terminated with the farmers. In return for that, the farmers granted a period of 30 days during which the Mexicans who occupied the houses were to leave of their own volition, agreeing to move out without further recourse. The growers waived all claims to rents and charges for gas, and lights, and water.

Immediately thereafter the union leaders instructed the Mexicans to refuse to move until they were forcibly thrown out, and it was necessary for the growers to go back to court and get writs of possession on their judgments and have the law forcibly evict the occupants of the houses. Many of the Mexicans, knowing they were in the wrong, tried to slip out of the houses in the dead of night so the union leaders would not be aware of their leaving, until in desperation the union leaders even had picket patrols in the camps so that the Mexicans could not leave.

After waiting months for these Mexicans to return to work, the farmers had to have workers to pick their lemons before they fell on the ground and were lost completely. White workers, many of them migrants, began applying for lemon-picking jobs, and the farmers naturally hired them. These people, many of whom had been blown out of the Dust Bowl, others who had worked as agricultural workers in other States and other parts of California, were able to make enough money at the existing wages that they readily lived in tents and temporary housing until the farmers could furnish the housing to them after the long eviction proceedings necessary to remove the Mexicans from houses which they had built for their workers out of their own funds.

Mr. Meany, who has attempted to propagandize against the farmers of Ventura County in the Nation's Capital and through the national American Federationist, could scarcely be human and continue his defaming remarks if he had seen the tears of gratitude and heard the faltering words of thanks of the women of the migrant families, such as one who said, "God be praised. In all these years we have been roaming around doing farm work, I never expected to get a roof over our heads again, much less a pretty little home like this with flowers growing in the yard, electric lights, and real plumbing." And they were happy, for they were making an average hourly wage, while still new at lemon picking, of 40.8

cents in an area where the continuity of farm employment ran 9 months a year, where they were furnished housing and did not have constantly to be moving around in search of jobs.

To that was added the promise of the farmer that those persons working for him through this emergency, when he had to save his crop despite picket lines, would not be fired at the demand of the union so that strikers who placed the farmers in this precarious position could return to their jobs. The growers cannot honorably let these workers go after making such promises to make places for Mexicans who now want to return to work.

The farmers know these Mexicans did not quit their jobs of their own volition. Their lot had been improved year by year, better housing had been supplied them, constant efforts on the part of the farmers to increase the continuity of employment had been made, but the Mexicans had been mesmerized by the promises made to them by the strike leaders—promises of Government support, promises of huge increase in wages, promises that they would be taken care of throughout the strike period. They were promised food and clothing and money by the union. These promises have not materialized, and the Mexicans now are being supported solely by the relief agencies, with the exception of a few quarts of milk a day and other small contributions so that the union could try to keep up appearances.

At the present time the peak of employment is past in the lemon picking, and labor demand is on the decline. There is no opportunity to rehire those Mexicans who struck in January and February for Ventura County lemon picking.

Under the leadership of the two men who attempted to use Ventura County lemon picking as the initial step toward unionizing California agricultural labor, these Mexicans who were once gainfully employed so that Ventura County had the lowest relief load of any comparable agricultural county in the United States, are now practically all supported by either State or Federal relief agencies.

The State relief administration certified strikers for relief so rapidly that the State legislature investigated its practices. It can be summed up in the public statement of Senator John Phillips, chairman of the investigating committee, who said:

> If you accept the premise that it is all right for strikers to receive relief, then I would say that the State relief administration has not certified too many of the applicants for relief.

The Farm Security Administration made relief available to all who could not comply with State relief administration requirements.

The eviction of the nonworking Mexicans from houses that the farmers needed to house new workers could have been accomplished with little hurt to those involved. It was for this humanitarian reason that the growers waited so long to start and then staggered the time of the evictions. But the union leaders, Achstetter and Peterson, used this for propaganda purposes. An outstanding example of this was the family which was evicted during the day and early that night it started to rain. The farmer had known that Mexican family for a long time, so he took a truck and went down to where their household goods were located and offered to take them anywhere they wanted to go to get them out of the rain.

Union publicity photographers were present, however, and ordered the family not to accept the farmer's offer. So the family stayed there and the children were put to bed on the ground in the rain, and that became a "horror picture" for union propaganda against the farmers in Ventura County.

The union organizers promised housing to all the workers if they would stay in the houses until evicted. They promised tents and they promised to take care of the strikers in every way. They brought in a few tents and then claimed that no more were available, although local newspapers checked with firms in that business and openly stated that plenty of tents were available. It was not good propaganda for the unions, though, for the strikers all to be in tents. The result was that the county board of supervisors made available a temporary camp ground for the strikers. Then the Farm Security Administration opened a mobile camp. And in these the strikers who haven't worked for more than 4 months are being cared for now by the relief agencies.

These Mexicans on relief now are refusing jobs of every type and at every wage. They openly boast that there is no need of their working so long as the Government—county, State, and Federal—furnishes them a place to stay, food to eat, and cash from the State relief administration.

To the Ventura County farmers who faced this series of "quickie" strikes, secondary boycotts, and propaganda attacks, it seems this has been another attempt to establish a union-labor dictatorship in agriculture—an attempt by agitators to gain control of the Nation's food basket.

It has long been a recognized fact—acknowledged even by the union's legitimate leaders, who sought legislation in Washington, such as the National Labor Relations Act and the Wages and Hours Act—that the principles of industrial unionism cannot apply to agriculture and agricultural workers, particularly in seasonal operations.

A farmer cannot padlock his plant and leave his machinery idle during a strike, or even during negotiation proceedings. He is not in the position of a manufacturer whose loss of production is during the time of the strike only. A farmer's crops are perishable and can be ruined or badly damaged in a few days. He is placed in the "or else" position of acceding to demands of the union quickly or else losing his crop if he can find no other way to harvest it.

Industrial unionism, based upon the methods of operations for employees in an industry, cannot fit agriculture where, in a short period of time, the farmer will lose not only his year's effort and money invested in 1 year's crop, but in many instances will lose his farm and homestead.

Added costs to agriculture, unlike in industry, cannot be added to the selling price of farm commodities. The farmer must pay all increased costs. And in agricultural commodities where there is a surplus the surplus makes the price.

Organized labor has gone far beyond their strikes on the farms in an effort to force industrial unionism down the throats of Ventura County farmers. They instituted a secondary boycott, threw picket lines around an auction market in Los Angeles, and tried to stop the sale of all citrus fruit in southern California through that market.

Union tactics shut down the principal lemon byproducts plant in southern California with a picket line in a secondary boycott and the use of hot-cargo tactics—using these practices which have since been outlawed by the State legislature.

They have attempted to use the secondary boycott against all marketing agencies handling any Ventura County fruit. They make a great hue and cry against the California Fruit Growers' Exchange because that cooperative organization continues to deal with the farmers who are members of the Exchange. They try to threaten the farmers' own organizations and to get them to refuse to deal with the Ventura County farmers and thus enforce the union dictates. In doing this, they propagandize against one marketing agency; in another place they pick another marketing agency, such as the Mutual Orange Distributors, against whom they tried to enforce a secondary boycott in Portland, Oreg., because Ventura County lemons were sold there.

Their strategy in selecting one marketing agency here and another there is simply this: They hope to use the force of competition in the markets by the various farm cooperatives to divide the farmers against themselves and get this group of farmers to fight against the other group so the union can take control. It is one of the oldest tricks of enforcing union demands to use the pressure of competition and the very fact that where they boycott Mutual Orange Distributors markets, they do not attack the California Fruit Growers' Exchange; and where they attack the exchange they do not attack the M. O. D., makes it discernible that they are using this old tactic of competitive pressure.

If they had been honest and attacked all Ventura County growers, whether members of M. O. D. or the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, the American Fruit Growers', and the independents, then it would have been a boycott against the farmers to whom they have lost their strike.

All of this ably demonstrates that farmers with perishable crops cannot bow to the will of industrial unionism for agriculture. And if need be, Congress, who has thus far contended that agriculture does not come under the provision of our national laws which support industrial unionism must take action to remedy such abuses. Farmers must have

immediate relief against this continued heckling by these labor leaders who have misled a race, created dissension, disrupted a community, and are now attempting to blackmail a sound American farm community into industrial unionism through boycotts and attacks against farm programs. Agriculture is a vital arm of national defense and we must immediately give it whatever protection is necessary to prevent any interference with the production, preparation for market, and marketing of farm products.

DIVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND HOUSING,
San Francisco, December 27, 1940.
TEAGUE MCKEVET CO.,
Santa Paula, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: On December 23, Mr. Rugg of this division inspected two of your citrus camps located near Santa Paula, Ventura County.

These inspections developed that the following camps fully comply with the requirements of the labor code (1937 Stat., ch. 90, p. 185):

Mexican Camp, Santa Paula.
American Camp, Santa Paula.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD A. BROWN,
Supervisor of Camp Inspection.

DIVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND HOUSING,
San Francisco, December 26, 1940.
LIMONEIRA RANCH,
Santa Paula, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: On December 20, Mr. Rugg of this division inspected 17 of your citrus camps in Ventura County.

These inspections developed that the following camps fully comply with the requirements of the labor code (1937 Stat., ch. 90, p. 185):

Santa Paula Main Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula Court Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula Japanese Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula Olive Lands, near Santa Paula.
Del Mar, dormitory, near Santa Paula.
Del Mar Mexican Camp, near Santa Paula.
Del Mar, cottages, near Santa Paula.
Del Mar, court, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula 100 Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula 300 Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula 400 Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula 500 Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula 600 Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula 700 Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula 800 Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula 900 Camp, near Santa Paula.
Santa Paula, Section 9 Camp. near Santa Paula.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD A. BROWN,
Supervisor of Camp Inspection.

Dangers and Advantages to the United States From the Russo-German War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, now that Hitler has turned his face and his armies eastward and is blasting away at Stalin's bloody despotism in Russia, the experts, the near-experts, the would-be experts, the columnists, and the "I told you so's" will all be handing out a lot of good, bad, and indifferent guesses—and guesses only, as to what the new war means. This conflict between these two bloodiest, most selfish, ruthless, and brutal ravagers of humanity since Genghis Khan swept like a plague over a great part of the then-known world, may take any kind of a turn. The guess of the citizen, in any American hamlet, is just as good as that of the experts and the near-experts in Washington. We cannot believe half of what comes to us from Russia, from Germany, or from England. We are told merely what each government wants us to know or think—and nothing more than that.

Hitler is, of course, not fighting to make the world—or Europe—safe against communism. Stalin is not fighting to make Europe or the world safe against nazism. Hitler is trying to grab and control by force all the food, oil, manufacturing, and other resources possessed by Russia. Stalin, the greatest double-crosser known in history, has been trying to promote warfare between all the other countries in the world in the hope they would bleed themselves white, exhaust themselves, destroy their industries, and lie prostrate for the Beast of the Kremlin to assume bloody despotism over all of them.

Of course, generally speaking, the more damage the Nazis do to the Russians and the more damage the Russians do to the Nazis, the safer the world of free and honest men and women and children will be.

But it would be a mistake to regard this new warfare between Hitler and Stalin as an unmixed blessing for Great Britain and the United States.

Stalin is hated by his own armies. He damaged himself more than any one else could ever damage him when he killed off all his able generals, his chemists, and other scientists, his efficient industrial engineers and managers, and his brainiest strategists. Stalin's crazy policy has been to shoot every man who showed enough ability to become powerful in any branch of the Soviet Government.

The doughty little Finns made the Russian Army look like a collection of dumb oxen. If the Russians cannot put up any better fight against the Nazis than they did against the Finns, Hitler's air and tank divisions will conquer them in jig time.

There is another possibility which is disquieting for Britain and for us. If the Russian Army leaders should, because of their hatred for Stalin on account of his slaughter of the ablest Army men, destroy him and turn over the Russian Army to Hitler, the civilized world would face a calamity unequalled in the annals of civilization. Such a surrender—or rather such a coalition—would give Hitler oil, foodstuffs, raw materials, industries, and manpower. Under efficient German direction, the Nazis would be equipped to conduct a long and devastating war against the rest of the world. Japan would quickly swing over actively to the Nazis in such a situation. Under these circumstances, it would be the United States and Britain against Axis Powers which would be potentially deadly dangerous to us all.

On the other hand, if the Russians do put up a real battle, which they can do if their experience with little Finland has taught them anything, Hitler may be kept so busily engaged for a time as to give Britain a breathing spell, time to pull herself together. We also would gain a breathing spell—but the good Lord grant that we improve it better than we have the time granted us so far. Even our military and naval officers are alarmed at the mere trickle of aid flowing out to Britain, and the less than trickle of implements and munitions of war flowing out to our own armed forces. It is little short of criminal the way our defense has lagged while strikes have played havoc with the program.

The writer is not the only one by a long shot who sees in this war between Hitler and Stalin startling new potential danger for the United States and Britain, as well as possibilities for benefits and advantages. The developments will have to be watched. Meanwhile, the only safe course for the United States is to turn to and start building our national defense at the speed we have been told by the administration it is being built—but is not.

We had better prepare—and prepare almighty fast—for the worst. If the worst does not happen we will be well off. If the worst does happen we will not be caught unprepared, if we use good sense.

Meanwhile, the administration should act in this whole world situation solely in the best interests of the United States of America. By so doing it will be acting in the best interests of all enlightened humanity.

Washington's Leading Newspaper Warns United States Against Entering a War To Make the World Safe for Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call attention of the House to the following editorial from this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald, the largest and most widely read newspaper published in the Capital City. I do this, in the first place, to belie the contention that all of the big eastern newspapers are owned or controlled by

forces desiring to push this country into the wars now raging in Asia, Africa, and Europe. This is most emphatically not true of the Washington Times-Herald, which continues to wage an aggressive editorial campaign against our entrance in the war and on behalf of tightening our own defenses and those of the entire Western Hemisphere. I am sure that such an assumption is also untrue in the case of several other metropolitan papers of the East. In the second place, I call this editorial to the attention of the House because of the thought-provoking analysis which it makes of the war situation now that communistic Russia has become engaged in the actual fighting.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no responsible and respected American who advocates that the United States send its sons to fight and die in order to help nazi-ism conquer communism and to project its pagan doctrine over all of Europe. By the same token, I believe that very few Americans who lack financial reasons for putting America into a shooting war favor sending American boys to fight and die to help defend the doctrine of communism or to facilitate its spread across the map of Europe. I believe that most Americans are like myself in disliking equally the destructive and pagan philosophies of nazi-ism, communism, and fascism, and President Roosevelt's earlier remark about "a plague on both your houses" seems to be a fitting salute to the plans of Nazis and Communists to spread their doctrines far and wide by invasion or infiltration whenever and wherever domestic governments fail to prepare themselves on the military front and to protect themselves against loss of freedom at home through too much centralization of government and through too long a failure to make free government work to bring justice and happiness to all the people. Retention of national solvency and preservation of the powers of the people and the Congress in our own constitutional framework of government here in the United States are two good ways to safeguard this free Republic against both invasion and infiltration by either nazi-ism or communism. As the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, has so frequently and factually pointed out through the findings of the Dies committee, in their basic destructiveness of the free way of life there is little, if any, distinction between the poisonous doctrines of nazi-ism, communism, and fascism. All of them are repugnant to the ideals of the free functioning of democracy in the United States.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 25, 1941]

RUSH TO RUSSIA?

As we try to extract some truth from conflicting German and Russian communiqués about events on the newly opened eastern front we become more convinced than ever that it would be folly for the United States to go any deeper into this war.

HITLER VICTORY

Hitler appears to have reconciled himself to a long war, and to have determined to line up his wheat and oil supply for such a war by carving the Ukraine out of Russia.

He may be able to do that. Certainly his blitzkriegers have begun their multiple stab into Russia with their customary zip. The Reds report initial successes; and Stalin has the vast distances of Russia on his side.

But Hitler has another weapon which we'd expect him to use; namely, the possibility of organizing a counterrevolution against Moscow among the Ukraine peasants. These people, who for ages have wanted to own their own farms, were promised ownership by Lenin in the early days of the Russian revolution, to make them loyal to the Bolsheviks. Later, their lands were taken away from them and communized by Stalin. An estimated four to five million peasants were starved to death in the process, and a reported 10,000,000 exiled to Siberia.

We should think that a Hitler promise to restore private ownership of the land to the Ukraine peasants would light quite a fire in the Ukraine. It might deliver the whole area to Hitler with crops and oil wells virtually undamaged.

In that case, Hitler would be set for his long war with Britain. If his empire held together, it would take decades to beat him if it could be done at all, either by the British Empire or by a British-American coalition.

STALIN VICTORY

The prospect of a Hitler victory over Russia is dreary enough. But how much brighter for us is the possibility of a Stalin victory?

The local "reds" are already reviving their old-time mahoola about "red" Russia being actually a democracy, and some of our interventionists are falling for it. We're being told that we should rush to Russia's aid with as much energy as we are now putting out to help Britain under the Lease-Lend Act.

Actually, Russia is more of a despotism than Germany. It's nicer to have Russia on our side than it would be to have Russia on Hitler's side. But if Stalin smashes Hitler, will Europe be swept by a wave of democracy, bearing the "four freedoms" on its crest?

Europe will not. If Stalin wins, the structure of Hitler-controlled Europe will crack up, and there will be nothing left to keep communism dammed back in Russia. It will be communism that will sweep Europe, and the Communist wave will come all the way out to Europe's Atlantic coast line. It may even jump the English Channel and the North Sea and take possession of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.

The repercussions in this country of a Europe-wide engulfment by communism would be enormous. It might mean the end of democracy all over the world. We'd better take notice of these possibilities before we rush to the aid of Stalin.

PAIR OF CROOKS

The long and short of it is, as we see it, that neither Hitler nor Stalin is a man with whom a democratic nation can safely do business, except at arm's length, and preferably with a gun or two cocked on the table.

Both Hitler and Stalin have consistently shown the identifying stigmata of European diplomacy—which in shorter words means either of them would double-cross his mother or murder his grandmother if it would profit him to do so.

The thing for the United States to do, we believe, is to go no deeper into this war than at present, to steer clear of entangling alliances with the Soviet and with everybody else, to keep its powder dry, and collect a lot more of it, by expanding its Navy as rapidly as it can, and building a large Army of plentifully equipped and highly trained mechanic-sergeants at top speed * * * and without further delay to unify its air forces under one separate, independent command, with a view to the most efficient cooperation among our fighting forces of land, sea, and air.

If we stick our fingers into this war, we're likely to get a hand chewed off, no matter who wins.

Authorizations for Reservoirs, Levees, and Flood Walls for Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 4911, under consideration by the Committee of the Whole House, is one of the most far-reaching, influential, and beneficial pieces of legislation to this Nation that has been before Congress on flood control and power development. The members of the Flood Control Committee, I personally know, have given unreservedly of their time and study. They have worked hard and endeavored to do the best that is possible for each and every section of this Nation to obtain as much flood control as is possible.

I want to highly commend the chairman, Mr. WHITTINGTON, for the consideration, the courtesy, and patience that he has given all of us in presenting to the committee our problems of flood control, and I also want to commend highly Mr. NORRELL, a member of the committee and my colleague from Arkansas, for the fine, loyal, and diligent work that he has given in this committee in preparing and presenting to this House this most important piece of legislation. Especially, do I want to express the appreciation of all of us who are interested in the agreeable and satisfactory manner in which my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], has worked with the chairman and other interested members of the committee, in settling the problems of our flood control on the lower Mississippi. This has been a controversial issue for the past 12 years, and in arriving at the conclusion as set out in this bill, the people in the eastern part of my district in this Mississippi area will be pleased and tremendously protected from the devastating floods as never before.

The abandonment of the Boeuf and Eudora floodways, as provided by this act, the elimination of the fuseplug and the construction of the levees on our side of the river to a height that will give a 1-foot freeboard over the project flood, which is the highest and anticipated flood in all history, will give that vast area in Arkansas flood-control protection and enhance the agricultural production, the value of real estate, and the standards of

living of our people in that area. The alluvial valley of the Mississippi, which includes a part of Arkansas, and the eastern part of my district, is one of the most fertile and productive regions in the United States. The enactment of this bill certainly solves a problem that has been confusing and controversial for many, many years, and the people of my district will be exceedingly happy to have the benefit of this protection and relief of the continuous threat and discomfort as well as destruction by floods.

Another feature of this bill, in which I am especially interested is the provision for the protection of the town of Calion, Ark., on the Ouachita River. Calion is a small town, with a population of approximately 1,000 people. It has floods from 6 to 10 feet and often reoccurring two or three times a year. The health, lives, and property of the people of Calion and who are residents of my district, are constantly in jeopardy. This problem has existed continuously in the past, and the $50,000 provided in this bill for the construction of a levee around the town of Calion is flood-control money well spent.

The Ouachita River is navigable along there and Calion has become a very important port, because of the strategic location in the agricultural and industrial area and being contiguous to the Arkansas oil field. This territory is under survey by different engineers from the different departments in the establishing of national-defense industries, and this is a very important location, and I have every reason to believe that a part of our national-defense program will ultimately be established in or near this town.

Also, of special interest to the people of my district is the authorization in this bill and provision for what is known as the Little Missouri River project. It authorizes an ultimate expenditure of $6,800,000, with the initial authorization of $3,000,000 for the initiation by the engineers in carrying forward the program as set out in the report. The Little Missouri River runs through my district and flows into the Ouachita River between Camden and Arkadelphia, Ark. The flood-control benefits derived from the authorization of this project will be mostly in my district and the people in that entire area will be greatly benefited by this flood-control measure. It is recommended that flood-control reservoir and power dam be constructed at Narrows, and that the main river channel be improved, as well as the Ozan Creek and the Terre Noire Creek, tributaries of this river. This will increase the opportunties of the people living in the Little Missouri River Basin, giving a greater production of agriculture, as well as other commodities, and will, after all, be another step toward the preservation of our soil and affording to our people opportunities and privileges to which they are entitled. I urge, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be enacted into law and the iniation of this program go forward as fast as it is possible.

Proponents of Seaway Project Base Their Claims on Illusions—Not Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE LABOR RECORD

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to be on the mailing list of the Labor Record, one of the monthly publications of the American Federation of Labor. In a recent issue of this paper I noticed an item which I would like to include under permission to extend my remarks.

Contrary to what the proponents of this seaway would have us believe, the workmen of this Nation, I believe, are aroused to the fact that the construction of this seaway would deprive them of many thousands of dollars in taxes and loss of jobs. These are the men who are in a large majority "the people" of the United States—their welfare is our welfare. They are the Americans who are behind the lines, bending every effort to furnish the ammunition, guns, planes, ships, and other equipment so necessary to national defense. They are not willing, however, to accept the proposal of a seaway in the St. Lawrence River as vital to our defense program; and from all parts of the country I have had letters, telegrams, clippings, and so forth, proclaiming their objection to the expenditure of these millions of dollars on such an unwarranted, colossal construction program as the St. Lawrence seaway. This item from the Labor Record seems to me to be very pertinent at this time:

[From the Labor Record]

PROPONENTS OF SEAWAY PROJECT BASE THEIR CLAIMS ON ILLUSIONS—NOT FACTS

This paper has published many articles in opposition to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Treaty project wherein our readers were presented undeniable facts showing that should the seaway be constructed and operated it would prove one of the biggest adverse economic boomerangs thrust upon the American public.

The Trucking Association of Michigan has dispatched a resolution to the Michigan congressional body, endorsing the seaway project on the grounds that the project will link the Middle West with the Atlantic, and serve as an outlet for the national-defense needs produced in this section. The time needed to deepen the 48-mile bottleneck in the St. Lawrence River will require more than 7 years, at the end of which time World War No. 2 will long be over. Many thousands of skilled and unskilled laborers and thousands of tons of dredging equipment will be necessary to begin and complete the seaway. With the national emergency that now exists the United States cannot spare nor divert a single man from the task on which he is presently engaged.

This country has always been served commendably and well by its various transportation systems. Even in its infancy our country realized the importance of adequate transportation, the trek of the "forty-niners" from east to west forced our forefathers to build for the future. Today our railroads, truck lines, waterways, and air lines give perfect satisfaction to all, costly improvements being made from time to time. These great links of transportation serve the country as a whole, east to west, north to south, bringing employment and prosperity to even the smallest hamlet en route. These well-known facts are being repeated to show that up to now nothing in the way of concentrated industrial activity has ever been contemplated.

The seaway's proponents have not considered the various angles to this venture as the more cautious men that constitute the opposition. Let us dissect and study the chaff from the grain. As the entire population of the Great Lakes section know, the waters of this body are only navigable 7 months of the year, which in turn would make the seaway useless during this period. Supposedly for an instant that the seaway would prove the economic boon as claimed by the proponents, would other transportation means content to lie idle 5 months whilst the seaway reaped the golden harvest? No is the only answer. And, furthermore, transportation facilities other than water would be reduced to a point to cope only with the demands of the 7-month seaway-operation period. What has the American investing public done to deserve the proposed unfair competition which would result from operation of the seaway? Our shore lines would be infested with foreign seamen, lowly paid at best, possessing a far different brand of ethics than that of the contented American worker. With these foreigners would also come foreign propaganda and hatred for our capitalistic form of government.

If and when the seaway project would be started we can visualize the endless stream of migratory workers to the Great Lakes region, hoping upon hope to secure a job at a living wage standard. Thousands on thousands of these men, women, and children would only meet disappointment, no pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, having finally to rely on the benevolence of the great American people for a dole to keep body and soul together.

Yes; it is indeed amazing that even the idea of this nonsensical plan to join the States and Canada was given birth. Our people have known previous happiness and prosperity in our own hemispherical domain, and this condition will be present again before long without spending $1,000,000,000 on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project.

The Young Democrats of New York Favor Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

RESOLUTION OF AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK STATE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, forward looking youth of the Nation are

proving their metal and Americanism by displaying an intense interest in national affairs, and by actively assuming their share of responsibility in directing our Government.

I offer in evidence a resolution of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State declaring their opinion and militant fight for the St. Lawrence development now.

The puppets of the selfish and sectional interests undertake to convince us that New York State is unanimously opposed to the seaway. The open actions of this group, together with the appearance of Governor Lehman and Lieutenant Governor Poletti of New York in favor of the project, serves to discredit their claims.

The resolution follows:

YOUNG DEMOCRATS OPEN FIGHT FOR ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT NOW

On the eve of the public hearings for the authorization of the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development before the House of Representatives Rivers and Harbors Committee (June 16), the Affiliated Young Democrats rallied the entire New York State congressional delegation in support of the measure. Following by just 10 days the powerful special message of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Congress urging the immediate improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, for promoting interstate and foreign commerce, and for generating electrical energy, the Young Democrats launched into the seaway controversy. The Young Democratic endorsement of the proposition actually "put every New York Congressman on the spot." Some New York Congressmen are lukewarm to the project, fearful of the reaction of the Buffalo, Albany, and New York transportation interests. The Young Democratic support was expressed in lengthy memoranda sent by Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the ardent New Deal group. The youth group demanded expeditious congressional approval, and scathingly attacked influential interests which are purportedly spreading false rumors and invalid arguments about the effects of the development.

The memoranda addressed to Senators ROBERT F. WAGNER and JAMES M. MEAD, and the 45 Members New York State congressional bloc, said:

"National defense requires your full and unqualified support of the pending St. Lawrence waterway and power development. In the name of the people of all our Nation and not a restricted self-centered geographical constituency, we are demanding of you and each and every New York Congressman to subvert sectional interests for national preservation. We are asking you to join with us in a last-ditch fight to route unsavory public interests who are purposely spreading malicious rumors in order to block and sidetrack hydroelectric development and greater seaway improvement of the St. Lawrence.

"We need electric power sorely now and later for greater production. We need all available shipbuilding facilities immediately and in the future. To pigeonhole the St. Lawrence project is:

"(1) to play possum with an Axis victory;

"(2) to invite eventual electric-power rationing for home consumers;

"(3) to sabotage the use of all our available hydrogenerated resources;

"(4) to tie our hands in producing defensive equipment, especially aluminum;

"(5) to deny ourselves the right to build 30 American and 50 Canadian battle cruisers to help defend the democracies on the Great Lakes, which would be afloat in 2 years;

"(6) to refuse to free our eastern and southern seaboard for the construction of badly needed cargo ships.

"We refuse to allow the utility gang interests to jeopardize our national integrity for the dollars and cents which motivate their vicious opposition. Don't mistake the supporters of this imperative legislation. This is not a half-hearted effort. The proponents of the St. Lawrence project are in this controversy to the hilt and we want the people of New York State to once and for all break the stranglehold of the octopus utility empire and also free our great Middle West with a navigable outlet to the sea. Progress may not be halted by a possible threat to the personal gain of a few. We did not stifle the production of automobiles because it threatened to hurt the horse and buggy trade. It is tantamount to heresy to delay this project which is so vitally important to this country's future in peace or war.

"To the representatives of the New York City, Buffalo, and Albany areas, we claim the arguments about business loss to these ports are simply home prejudices always apparent to the introduction of something new. The Federal Department of Commerce has demonstrated comprehensively that possible losses will be more than compensated by new diversions. We ask you to look to the benefit for the Nation. The St. Lawrence seaway must be expedited by the Congress of the United States without any further delay."

Father's Letter to Roosevelt Protests Use of Old Subs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 24, 1941]

FATHER'S LETTER TO ROOSEVELT PROTESTS USE OF OLD SUBS

STAUFFER, CALIF., June 24.—A grieving father today made public a letter which he had written to President Roosevelt protesting the use of submarines of the *O–9* type.

The father was Thomas W. Tillery, whose son, Thomas W. Tillery, Jr., perished with 32 other officers and enlisted men trapped on board the ill-fated craft Friday.

The father's letter follows:

STAUFFER, CALIF., *June 24, 1941.*

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My son, Thomas Winslow Tillery, Jr., has been crushed to death in the submarine *O–9*. He died without a chance to resist in an outdated, unseaworthy craft. His mother and I find little comfort in knowing that the modern products of America's defense effort are being given to a foreign power. Our remaining son becomes eligible for draft in July.

Tom was a valuable man to his country. For 7 years he worked loyally to earn his rating of machinist's mate, first class. You, too, have sons who have acquired rank and position in the armed forces. If they are serving on sister ships of the *O–9*, or are dependent upon obsolete equipment, I beg you, as one father to another, transfer them to positions of safety. Then, if we are attacked, they may die honorably in the face of the enemy rather than helplessly at the hands of their own Government.

Respectfully,

THOMAS W. TILLERY.

Posthumous Award of Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. William Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

RESOLUTION OF NORTHWEST AVIATION PLANNING COUNCIL

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Northwest Aviation Planning Council in annual meeting assembled at Billings, Mont., this 20th day of June 1941, that a bill is being introduced in the United States Senate by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, to secure the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor for Gen. William Mitchell, deceased; and

Whereas delegates to the council from the Territory of Alaska and the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana unanimously favor the enactment of such legislation by the Congress of the United States, recognizing befittingly the just debt of gratitude of the United States of America to a renowned former commander of the Air Service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Northwest Aviation Planning Council, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to enact immediately appropriate legislation awarding posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. William Mitchell, deceased: and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Northwest Aviation Planning Council be instructed to send copies of this resolution to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and to each member of the congressional delegations from the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and the Territory of Alaska.

Members of Our Armed Forces Are Entitled to Tax-Free Cigarettes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] recently suggested to the House Ways and Means Committee that in writing the new Federal revenue bill tax-free cigarettes should be made available to all members of our armed forces.

Congressman CANFIELD's suggestion is a very timely one, since many of the enlisted men of today are receiving a mere $21 a month, and after various deductions have little left to purchase such luxuries as cigarettes.

Congressman CANFIELD's idea has been well received throughout the country. As an indication of the reaction to the suggestion, the following article appeared in the June 23 issue of the New York Journal-American:

[From the New York Journal-American of June 23, 1941]

TAXING SOLDIERS—MEN IN DEFENSE SERVICES SHOULD NOT BE MULCTED

Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, has suggested to the House Ways and Means Committee in Congress—which is writing the new Federal revenue bill—that tax-free cigarettes be made available to all the men in the defense forces—in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard.

This is a proposal that ought to be promptly and favorably acted upon, either in the Ways and Means Committee or on the floor of Congress.

The men in the defense forces, especially those who are drafted from civil life, are making great personal sacrifices in their country's service.

Some of them are having their educations interrupted.

Some are having their careers broken, or the time postponed when they may enter upon careers.

Some have been called away from jobs which in many cases contributed substantially to their families' livings.

For the time in which they serve they will receive very small pay, and out of the pay that they do receive, after allotments and other deductions are made by the Government, they must provide for their personal needs.

Such items as they are able to buy they buy generally from their regimental canteens—that is, from the Government.

So it would be simple enough for the Government to provide tax-exempt cigarettes for the men.

The taxes involved would mean almost nothing to the Government, but would mean a good deal to most of the men.

Similarly, why should frugally paid soldiers be required to pay admittance to motion pictures in Government-owned theaters?

An arrangement could easily be made with the film industry for deferred showing of films at army cantonments, which would in no way affect public patronage of the same pictures elsewhere.

These may seem like little things to some people.

But morale is no little thing in the defense services, and little things like these can be a great factor in building morale.

What's Wrong With Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

EDITORIAL OF C. H. RUSSELL, OF THE MANKATO (MINN.) FREE PRESS, AND COMMENTS OF THE FAIRMONT (MINN.) DAILY SENTINEL

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by C. H. Russell, of the Mankato Free Press, in his personal daily column, 'Round Our Town, together with the comments by the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn.

Each of us has asked of ourselves this question, "What is wrong with democracy?" and I wish everyone in this country could read these thought-provoking comments in Mr. Russell's editorial.

Mr. Russell's editorial, together with the comments of the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, follows:

[From the Fairmont (Minn.) Daily Sentinel]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH DEMOCRACY?

(By C. H. Russell, in Mankato Free Press)

C. H. Russell, Mankato Free Press editor, never did a more important piece of writing than the following, which filled his personal daily column, 'Round Our Town, in the issue for June 12.

If you are really concerned and thoughtful of the mess our country and the rest of the world are in, you'll be well repaid to read what follows and make it the subject of your best thought:

"They're at it again. The tub-thumpers and the breast-beaters are shouting their old refrain and John Q. Public appears in a state of mind to join the parade and start another crusade. We're all set to save the world for democracy once more, by which we really mean that we're in a frame of mind to spend billions in treasure and to sacrifice millions of lives attempting to foist our form of government on other peoples.

"Unquestionably we need to spend billions on our own defenses.

"And just possibly we're going to be dragged into this war in order to insure a world order in which a democracy like ours can be insured an opportunity to grow and progress in peace and security.

"But let's stop right there, whatever happens. Let's be honest and say that whatever we do regarding this war will be done for reasons of enlightened selfishness and not with the silly idea of telling other peoples of the world how they shall live and what form of government they are to have.

"When we get in this crusading state of mind we lose our sense of perspective. We did back in 1917–18. We refused to see any of the flaws in our democracy and as a consequence they multiplied and flourished like weeds until we brought on the debacle of the twenties.

"After all, there is just a tremendous amount of improving necessary in our own system of government before we can hold it up to the world as an example for others to follow. A lot of superpatriots do not like to hear that but it's the truth nevertheless. The surest way to 'make the world safe for democracy' is to make democracy work better right here at home. And we haven't done that any too well in over 150 years of trying.

"If we're honest we'll have to admit that our democracy never functions as such, in a crisis.

"During the Civil War we resorted to a dictatorship. So, likewise, did we during World War I. In the recent depression and economic crisis that followed we abandoned democratic processes—no dictator wielded greater powers than the President and some of the chieftains of alphabetical agencies down in Washington. When we condemn dictatorships the peoples of other nations point to these lapses in our democratic processes and ask, Why these?

"Thus far we have not been able to give a satisfactory answer.

"If we could sit back more often and see ourselves as others see us, we might avoid these recurring periods of crusading fervor. Coldly analytical leaders abroad ask these questions:

"Did democracy succeed in the United States because it was 'right' or because we had unlimited resources, wealth, and land to make it succeed? Will it continue to function successfully after these resources are depleted or exhausted?

"And similarly they ask, Has democracy succeeded in Britain because it is 'right' or because the British have supported it liberally through the exploitation of backward peoples? Take away this power of exploitation and will Britain remain a democracy?

"'We're getting in a frame of mind where questions like these may be branded as treasonable, but we should think about them nevertheless.

"What we need is a crusade to save democracy here at home instead of worrying so much about other peoples.

"We believe in it as a form of government. We know that it is the ideal toward which the human family has slowly but painfully progressed throughout the ages. It is the Christian ideal of laws, rules, and regulations by which nations and peoples can live together in a complex world.

"But we must realize that, like Christianity, democracy cannot be promulgated by fire and sword. It must come from the hearts of men—not from the mouths of cannon.

"Our task is to make democracy function so well, so soundly, so satisfactorily here at home that it will stand out as the example and model all thinking peoples will want to follow.

"Occasionally we have flashes of inspiration and try to live up to that ideal, but they are infrequent.

"We cannot have a sound democracy when the most able and representative citizens refuse to serve in responsible public posts that make a democracy function.

"We cannot have a sound democracy when political leaders remain in office by pitting one group, faction, clique, or racial segment against another.

"We cannot have a sound democracy when major groups—capital, labor, Government bureaucrats—plot and scheme only for themselves without thought of the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

"We cannot have a sound democracy when thousands of citizens boast of evading taxes

instead of bearing their fair share of the Government's expenses gladly and proudly.

"We cannot have a sound democracy when less than 30 percent of the registered voters go to the polls in most elections.

"Until we can correct some of these ills and weaknesses—and there are many more of them—we would do well to ponder putting our own house in order before attempting to inflict our form of government on others. A crusade is needed to save democracy, but we must save it here at home—then it will be safe for the rest of the world and very possibly it will be something they want."

Keep 'Em Flying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AND MAJ. GEN. E. S. ADAMS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1941.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: The War Department requests your cooperation and assistance in popularizing the recently adopted slogan, "Keep 'em Flying!" It is the desire of the Department to make "Keep 'em flying" a popular everyday expression used by persons in all walks of life throughout the Nation. It is designed to focus the public mind on unity of purpose and action in our national-defense effort and applies to the wheels of progress in the whole national-defense program as well as to airplanes.

The objective, of course, is to get people everywhere to use the phrase, "Keep 'em flying," as an expression of felicity, high morale, or as a toast, to the point where "Keep 'em flying" will replace such everyday expressions as "So long," "I'll be seeing you," "Down the hatch, "Good-bye," "Good luck," and similar expressions. In short, "Keep 'em flying" is to be our expression comparable to "Thumbs up."

Thanking you, and with kindest regards,
Keep 'em flying,

E. S. ADAMS,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

JUNE 23, 1941.

Maj. Gen. E. S. ADAMS,
The Adjutant General,
The War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL ADAMS: Replying to your interesting letter of June 18, you may be sure I will be happy to cooperate in popularizing the Army's slogan, "Keep 'Em Flying!"

The paramount task we have before us as a nation is to build an air force second to none in the world. I am sure that this phrase on the lips of every citizen will inspire the many in the armed forces, in the Government, and in the industries engaged in this great effort.

This is America's answer to those who would destroy the freedom for which we stand. It will fix in the minds of our people not only the fine and brave ideal which is symbolized by planes in flight but will be a constant reminder of the teamwork under democratic methods whereby the American way will prevail over any destructive system.

As I see it, aviation has two jobs which must go forward together. The first is to win the battle of production—to build tens of thousands of planes and hundreds of air bases, to train pilots, and to organize an air power which no unfriendly nation will dare to attack.

The second is to promote civilian flying to the fullest extent that military needs for men and materials will permit. This is a great training and morale building activity for air preparedness.

After the emergency, when the facilities of wartime production can be turned to civilian uses, I believe that aviation will expand as rapidly as did the automobile industry after the last war, and will be a tremendous influence in maintaining a prosperous economy. Looking ahead to this development, it is of great importance that American communities continue with their air-progress programs which will build the airports, air services, schools, and local interest necessary to the foundation for post-war activities.

Therefore, I feel there cannot be a more forward-looking and patriotic motive for every American than—

"Keep 'Em Flying!"

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Member of Congress.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

AN ANALYSIS WRITTEN BY WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, because of the changed position of the Communist Party both at home and abroad, and in order that we Americans may have a better understanding of what is happening, I am taking the liberty of calling my colleagues' attention to an analysis of communism written by the Honorable Winston Churchill. It can be found on page 168 of his book entitled "Great Contemporaries."

In my opinion every American should memorize his words and heed them.

But communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the Communist faith as the doctrine itself. At first the time-honored principles of liberalism and democracy are invoked to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement toward the left.

The creation of a mild Liberal or Socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions, if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the new government and the working people. Martyrs are to be manufactured. An apologetic attitude in the rulers should be turned to profit. Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men. No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin. Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy, and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterward broken; liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood according to the dogmas it has learnd by rote is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigation progressively forever. All this, set out in prosy textbooks, written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations, is the Communist's faith and purpose. To be forewarned should be to be forearmed.

Americanism and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by my colleague from Massachusetts, Hon. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY:

In these times of national emergency Americanism has come to have a special meaning. When the world was at peace our Americanism consisted chiefly of talking about it and dedicating monuments to the patriots of the past. Nowadays we are backing our speeches and words with action, and the monuments we are producing are dedicated to the purpose of making this Nation impregnable to enemy attack now and in the future. These monuments are guns, ammunitions, planes; they are also national unity and a

strong devotion to the principles of our Government.

Never in the history of our country have the times called for more concerted action and for closer unity. The production records of our defense industries indicate that we are getting action. As for unity, all that we have to do in order to convince ourselves that we are bound to achieve it as we never have before is to visit a national-defense factory. There we will see workers of all creeds and from all corners of the world producing, side by side, sharing the same tasks and the same conviction that the democratic way of life is the only way of life. That is a picture for the dictators to look at—those distorted minds who would have the world believe that this is a world that can only be operated by persons who belong to their particular creed and race. In the United States, we not only dismiss that kind of thinking as sheer nonsense but we also go ahead and prove by our day-by-day actions that here men and women from many countries and of different creeds can work and live together and guide the destiny of this Nation. It is a destiny that we are all proud of. We have fought for it once and we shall always defend it, for it is based on a notion that we have come to regard as one of civilization's main tenets—and that is that human beings are perfectly capable of self-government, regardless of race, creed, or nationality, so long as they can believe in the principles by which they live. Those principles are based on the freedoms guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

Our current peacetime Army, consisting of boys of many different nationality origins and religions, is a striking example of our talent for national unity. There never has been any question about the abilities of our selective-service soldiers to mold themselves into a powerful and well-coordinated army, regardless of their varied backgrounds.

About a month ago we celebrated I Am An American Day, a national holiday dedicated to American citizenship. It was a tremendous demonstration of national unity in which millions of Americans, new and old, participated gladly and freely. In some European countries such an occasion would have necessitated giving orders and commanding citizens to assemble and listen to self-appointed rulers. Here there was no coercion and not the slightest regimentation. No one gave orders. Our American citizens assembled and pledged allegiance to our Government because they wanted to and because they believed implicitly in what our Government stands for. Such spontaneity and patriotism can only be found in a land like ours where freedom is the watchword, and where we judge men by their loyalty and deeds rather than by their religion or origin.

From the start, our Nation has welcomed those who came here from other parts of the world. During the first part of the century they came in great numbers. They came looking for freedom and security. They were daring people, for they were leaving their native land, which is always dear to the individual, and striking out for a new land where they knew they could have economic and spiritual freedom. Like our early pioneers, they had the pioneering instinct that has kept our democracy alive and ready to face any new task with the virility and strength that characterize us as a nation. In some respects, the most recent of our Americans have an advantage over old-stock Americans. For one thing, most of them come from a far older civilization and many of them are able to make cultural contributions which we could never acquire otherwise; for another, they came here imbued with the same marvelous vitality that our pioneer fathers had. Challenged by a new country, a new set of customs, and often a new language, they could not and did not rest on their past achievements. It is not surprising that in transplanting their roots to this new land those roots have prospered and blossomed into, sturdy trees that have borne valuable produce.

There have been a number of definitions of Americanism but, because it means many things to many people, no single definition has been widely accepted. I should like to point out, however, that the only definitions of Americanism that make sense must include an appreciation of the varied make-up of our population. Nowhere else in the world has a more exciting mixture of peoples gathered from all corners of the earth. Thirty-eight million immigrants have come to the United States in the past 100 years. Over 30 percent of our total population is made up of immigrants and children of immigrants, all of whom have contributed to the development and progress of our country.

Americanism is not the possession of any particular race or group. It belongs to all of us, regardless of where we came from. Our immigrant population and their children have as much pride in saying, "I am an American" as those of us whose roots extend deeper in American soil. In the last analysis we are, as has often been said, all immigrants or descendants of immigrants, all Americans. It is interesting to note that even that section of our population which we usually designate as alien is not very alien. A recent sampling of the registration forms compiled in the registration by the Department of Justice last year revealed that 40 percent of those noncitizens who registered had already taken steps to become American citizens. The registration also showed that we now have the smallest percentage of noncitizens we have ever had. They number less than 5,000,000 and represent only 3½ percent of our total population.

All these facts add up to stronger national unity and more powerful American defenses, for regardless of how much we can increase the production of arms and munitions, our chief strength lies in our singleness of purpose. We shall become even stronger as we learn to guard against racial and religious prejudices. Those are the propaganda poisons that have infected some of the European nations and produced internal dissension and havoc. Those poisons are the weapons of the dictators who would weaken our national morale by introducing hysteria and suspicion of our neighbors. We know that strategy too well by this time. We have seen the Nazis conquering nation after nation by the expedient of dividing a nation into various factions and then setting those factions against each other. We can battle that divide-and-conquer strategy in this country because we all firmly believe in the democratic principles of our Constitution and will not be divided.

Complete faith in our Bill of Rights gives us a weapon far superior to anything the dictators can produce. That is a weapon, forged through the centuries by all civilized men, which those self-styled supermen fear for they know its power and its ability to draw the people of a democracy together and cause them to defend their democratic principles, as a mother would defend her young.

Let us not lose sight of those principles, even though the heat of the battle may become more intense. Let us keep our heads and refuse to be swayed by those who would try to break up our unity by spreading racial and religious prejudice. Our task is to build and move forward to even a greater democracy than we have enjoyed, and we can do that if we maintain a constructive attitude toward all our fellow Americans.

Production of Aluminum for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following regarding a statement made by me on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 28, 1941, to the effect that the Reynolds Metals Co. is a corporation which was set up by a gentleman in the Attorney General's Office, which was prosecuting the Aluminum Co. of America. By that I meant the Government was setting up a new industry to compete with private enterprise through the Reynolds Metals Co.

In this connection I will state that I would not take the space in the RECORD to elaborate on this statement in full if it were not for the fact that I received a letter from Walter L. Rice, vice president of the Reynolds Metals Co., who was the lawyer I referred to because of the fact that he was chief counsel for the Government under the Attorney General's Office, who was prosecuting the Aluminum Co. of America. I do not want to injure Mr. Rice, the Reynolds Metals Co., nor any other person. As I understand it, before the suit was settled in full and the verdict rendered by the court, he was offered a position and placed as vice president of the Reynolds Metals Co. With the experience and knowledge gained by him in this suit he will now compete with the Aluminum Co. of America in the manufacture of aluminum, using the knowledge he gained at the expense of the Government certainly to the advantage of the Reynolds Metals Co. and especially since most of the money that has been acquired for the use of the Reynolds Metals Co. has been secured by the R. F. C., as per a letter of June 19, 1941, which I received from Jesse H. Jones, giving the amount of money borrowed from the R. F. C. as $23,000,000, and that authorized by Defense Plant Corporation as $12,721,791.50, making a total of $35,721,791.50 that the Reynolds Metals Co. received for the manufacture of aluminum by moneys loaned to them from Government agencies.

Wishing to be fair in this matter, I would not submit this correspondence if it were not for the fact that in the last paragraph of Mr. Rice's letter to me he states as follows:

> I recognize that Congressmen enjoy a constitutional privilege with respect to all statements made on the floor, no matter how erroneous, and that they cannot be held accountable for such statements.

Certainly I had no idea of trying to do anything detrimental to the gentleman,

Mr. Rice, or to the Reynolds Metals Co., but since the facts must be known I publish this correspondence. At the same time, in order to give the public the benefit of the statements that were made by the Aluminum Co. of America, in reference to its aid and assistance to the defense program, I publish the statement made by its vice president, Mr. I. W. Wilson, in charge of operation of the Aluminum Co. of America, before the Senate committee investigating the national-defense program, wherein it was criticized very much by Secretary Ickes, the chief spokesman for this administration, and I believe it was criticized unduly and unjustly. Now, I have no briefs, nor am I interested in any sense in the Aluminum Co. of America, nor with the Reynolds Metals Co., or anyone connected therewith. So the general public can judge for themselves by reading this correspondence whether the Government is justified in setting up new corporations with Government money to compete with the people who are in private enterprise.

I say again, and I have said it time after time, that this administration is doing everything it possibly can to destroy private capital, to set the Government up in business in competition with private enterprise in one way or another, until eventually you will find that we are fast becoming a communistic Nation. This I am doing everything I can to oppose, and will to the end.

I herewith submit to you, first, the letter I received from Mr. Walter L. Rice, vice president of the Reynolds Metals Co.; second, the letter from Jesse H. Jones, of the Federal Works Agency, Washington, D. C., with the statement of moneys loaned to Reynolds Metals Co.; and third, the statement made by I. W. Wilson, vice president of the Aluminum Co. of America. I am responsible for inserting this and was not requested to place it in the RECORD, but do so on my own initiative with the idea of trying to keep the Government out of business.

The letters and statement follow:

REYNOLDS METALS CO., INC.,
Richmond, Va., June 6, 1941.

HON. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICH: I have read the statement which you made on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 28, 1941, to the effect that the Reynolds Metals Co. is a corporation which "was set up by a gentleman in the Attorney General's office who was prosecuting the Aluminum Co. of America." Inasmuch as I was chief counsel for the Government in its prosecution of the aluminum monopoly suit, I assume that your statement had reference to me.

Your statement is a clear reflection upon the Department of Justice, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Reynolds Metals Co., and, therefore, I am sure that you will want to make an official correction as soon as the true facts are called to your attention.

The Reynolds Metals Co. is a well-established company which was set up not by me, but by Mr. R. S. Reynolds, a courageous and enterprising man, whom I regard as one of the great industrial geniuses of our day. Mr. Reynolds organized the company in the early 1920's, and by 1940 it had grown into a wide-spread manufacturing enterprise with assets conservatively valued at more than $28,000,000. Recognizing the need for a second domestic source of aluminum for the manufacture of airplanes and munitions, it had the courage to pledge all of these assets, including 18 manufacturing plants, to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in return for a loan of $15,800,000, later increased to $20,000,000. The loan was secured not only by the existing assets, but also by the future assets, including all of the new aluminum plants to be built with the proceeds of the loan.

Since you have stated that I went to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to get "twenty or thirty million dollars" for the Reynolds Metals Co., permit me to demonstrate how ridiculous and impossible this statement is. When the Reynolds Metals Co. applied for the R. F. C. loan, I was in New York City devoting all of my time to the trial of the Government's antitrust suit against the Aluminum Co. of America. I did not even know about the application for the loan until after the R. F. C. had tentatively approved the loan in July 1940. The first time I heard of the loan was about the time when the Aluminum Co. of America's counsel brought up the matter in open court some time in the first part of August 1940. I did not even meet Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Jesse Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, or Mr. Emil Schram, Chairman of the R. F. C., until after the loan had been approved.

In the face of these facts, it is amazing to read a public statement to the effect that the Government prosecutor "got so much information from them (the Aluminum Co. of America) that he thought it would be a fine thing to start a small company, set up an organization to compete with the Aluminum Co. of America." If the Aluminum Co. of America is seeking to create this impression, either through you or through newspaper commentators who are willing to lend their offices to a fight for monopoly, I assure you that it has not the slightest foundation in fact.

If the Government's prosecution of the aluminum monopoly was to any degree responsible for encouraging competition in this industry, that would seem to be highly commendable and in strict harmony with the objectives of the Sherman Antitrust Act. As shown by the record in the pending antitrust suit, the Aluminum Co. of America has been the sole domestic producer of virgin aluminum in the United States since 1893, and I would think that a member of Congress would welcome competition in this vital industry, particularly when a tremendous expansion of the productive capacity is absolutely essential for our national defense.

On May 15, 1941, Mr. REYNOLDS told me that he wanted my services as vice president and general counsel in his rapidly expanding organization. Inasmuch as I had finished the trial of the Aluminum case and had just recently been assigned to a new case by the Department of Justice, I was free to accept the offer promptly, subject to the approval of Attorney General Robert H. Jackson and Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold.

I submit these facts to you in all friendliness, confident that you will be fair enough to correct the erroneous statements and unfortunate characterizations which are contained in your speech on the floor of the House. I recognize that Congressmen enjoy a constitutional privilege with respect to all statements made on the floor, no matter how erroneous, and that they cannot be held accountable for such statements; but I am confident that you would not knowingly abuse this privilege, and that you will cheerfully correct the statements that you have made.

Very truly yours,

WALTER L. RICE,
Vice President.

FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY,
Washington, June 19, 1941.

HON. ROBERT F. RICH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICH: In reply to your letter of June 11, I am attaching a list of loans and commitments authorized by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and by Defense Plant Corporation to Reynolds Metals Co. and its subsidiary, Reynolds Alloys Co. These authorizations were all made to aid in the national-defense program.

No loans have been approved to the subsidiaries listed in your letter, with the exception of a loan of $200,000 authorized on December 14, 1934, to Richmond Radiator Co., prior to the time when Reynolds Metals Co. acquired control of this concern. This loan was subsequently canceled in full.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES.

Authorizations to Reynolds Metals Co. and affiliated aluminum companies, as of June 12, 1941

1. AUTHORIZED BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

	Amount authorized	Purpose
Reynolds Metals Co.	$15,800,000	To acquire and/or construct facilities to produce aluminum ingots, to buy bauxite, for expenses incidental to acquisition of facilities for production of aluminum alloy, etc., and for payment of debt. Plant at Sheffield, Ala.
Do	4,200,000	Build aluminum plant, Bonneville Dam area.
Reynolds Alloys Co.	[1] 3,000,000	Working capital in connection with plant at Lister, Ala.
Total	23,000,000	

2. AUTHORIZED BY DEFENSE PLANT CORPORATION

Reynolds Metals Co.	$2,920,580.50	Construction and equipment for manufacture of alloy aluminum rods and other extruded products, for use in manufacture of aircraft and other military supplies and equipment. Plant at Louisville, Ky.
Reynolds Alloys Co.	9,801,211.00	Construction and equipment for manufacture of aluminum alloys and other aluminum products, for use in manufacturing aircraft and other military supplies and equipment. Plant at Lister, Ala.
	12,721,791.50	
Grand total	35,721,791.50	

[1] Conditional agreement outstanding.

STATEMENT OF I. W. WILSON, VICE PRESIDENT IN CHARGE OF OPERATIONS, ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

At the hearing Monday, Secretary Ickes made statements challenging the good faith of the Aluminum Co. of America in its efforts to aid in this country's defense program. We welcome the opportunity to refute these accusations and we believe that when the

facts are known no fair-minded person can fail to agree that the Aluminum Co. has done everything within its power, and more, probably than any other corporation in the United States, to uphold the President and the Congress in building up our defenses.

We first want to tell this committee some of the details of what this company has done, and is doing, to increase its production of aluminum.

In 1938, when our plants produced 286,881,690 pounds of aluminum, and our total shipments were only 175,525,773 pounds, the Aluminum Co. of America finished the year with an inventory of 277,538,066 pounds of aluminum, or more aluminum than normally would be used in a year.

As late as April 3, 1939, Congress had only authorized the Navy to build 3,000 planes, and the Army 6,000. Such a program required no expansion of production facilities, particularly when the Aluminum Co. of America already had more than a year's supply of metal on hand. Yet late in 1938, the company did inaugurate a program which, with the additions since made to it, calls for a capital expenditure of over $200,000,000 of the company's money, and which has resulted in an increase in the number of its employees from 25,000 to about 50,000.

The Aluminum Co. of America is now producing well over double the amount of aluminum produced in 1938 and when its present program is completed the production of 1938 will be almost tripled. The expansion of the production of aluminum is not as simple a matter as is the expansion of many other industries. As this committee is well aware, the production of aluminum requires enormous quantities of electric power. It takes not only large sums of money, but many years to build the extensive hydroelectric developments necessary to get blocks of power in the magnitude required. An aluminum plant without electric power is useless.

In addition to the acquisition of the needed power, this increase in the production of aluminum has already required the doubling of the production of alumina, the tripling of the steamship tonnage used to bring bauxite from South America to this country, and the doubling of the production of bauxite as well. A further expansion of all these facilities is a necessary part of the existing program.

This expansion included large additional facilities for manufacturing fabricated forms. Within a few months the company's capacity to produce strong alloy sheet and extruded shapes will be 6 times that of the beginning of 1938, while our ability to produce aluminum forgings will be 16 times that of the beginning of 1938. All of these products are of vital interest to the aircraft industry.

An inquiry has been made concerning the Aluminum Co.'s attitude with respect to the Fontana power project which will require 3 years to complete. Some months ago a declaration of intention was filed with the Federal Power Commission for this project in the belief that the Commission would not require a Federal license. Such a license permits the Government to take over the project at the end of the license period on terms that might be confiscatory. The Commission, however, made a ruling that would necessitate taking out such a license. The company felt then, and still feels, that in the light of its other huge expenditures for the defense program, it cannot, with proper regard for its financial stability, put up its own money to develop this project in the face of the Government's power to take over the property at the end of the license period. Notwithstanding this feeling, the Aluminum Co. has informed O. P. M., and also T. V. A., that it stands ready to take out a license and develop this project if the Government will assist in financing the development; or, the company will sell the project to T. V. A. so that Authority may develop it; or if neither of these alternates is acceptable, the company is ready to cooperate in any other way that will make the power from this development available for the production of aluminum. The company now reiterates that position. This matter is, and for some time past has been, under consideration by Government agencies and the Aluminum Co. is ready to proceed in any manner that they may determine.

We have been criticized on the theory that estimates by various governmental agencies were in some way mistakes attributable to the Aluminum Co. of America. This we emphatically deny.

Many of the things that have been said before this committee concerning aluminum seem to be based on the assumption that it is the function of a private industrial corporation, in this case the Aluminum Co. of America, to estimate not only what it will produce to meet the defense needs of the United States, but also, to set itself up as an authority for what those needs are. Under this assumption we should not only have been able to tell how much aluminum will be required, for instance, to build the number of airplanes needed to defend the democracies, but to forecast how many of these planes will be needed.

We have not presumed to tell Congress, the Army, or the Navy how many planes are needed for defense. Our function as to forecasts is, and can only be, to tell what we will produce and how far we can expand under the instructions and requests of the Government and then to produce such aluminum. There has never been a single month when we have not exceeded the amounts of such forecasts.

We understand that the present estimates of O. P. M. call for the production in this country of at least 1,400,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. Last October, the Defense Commission advised the company that it should increase its production by an additional 100,000,000 pounds per year, or thus to a total of 850,000,000 pounds per year. The company thereupon submitted to the Defense Commission a program of further expansion which would have increased production by more than 100,000,000 pounds per year within a period of from 6 to 8 months. Since then, O. P. M. has been advised by the company, again and again, that if O. P. M. would procure the necessary electrical power, the company would increase production by such further amounts as the Government wishes. But it has not yet, to this very hour, been possible to determine at what place or in what amounts electrical power will be made available, and, until this is known, the company cannot proceed with the construction of the necessary plants in which to produce the additional aluminum desired by the Government.

Mr. Ickes stated Monday to this committee: "I have a profound conviction that the Aluminum Co. of America would prevent the necessary expansion of our aluminum manufacturing facilities, regardless of the consequences to the country or the world, in order to get them all within its own domination and control." He further stated, referring to the Aluminum Co. of America, "It did its damnedest to prevent us from making this contract for power with the Reynolds Metals Co."

We want to state, without reservation, that the Aluminum Co. has no desire to prevent the necessary expansion of the aluminum manufacturing facilities in this country, or to get them all within its domination and control. We are interested in but one thing, that there be sufficient aluminum produced to meet the defense needs of our country. Furthermore, the Aluminum Co. has never in any way done anything to make it difficult for the Reynolds Metals Co., or anyone else, to go into the aluminum business, and has never endeavored to prevent the Reynolds Metals Co. from obtaining power.

The company has no desire to use the present emergency for the purpose of increasing its own position in the industry. This is shown by the fact that the company has repeatedly offered to put all of its technical resources at the Government's command, to design and build plants for Government operation, if it so desires, and to furnish the technical staff to make this possible or, if the Government prefers, to operate for the Government under a management arrangement. The company has also offered to use its own resources, as far as they will go, in financing any expansion program adopted by the Government, in addition to the $200,000,000 it has already used for expansion. No company could offer to do more.

Monday, Secretary Ickes referred to a request of February 4 from O. P. M. for an additional 65,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power, and explained why he would not allot it to the Aluminum Co. He also said that later he was again asked to allot 65,000 kilowatts of additional power to the Aluminum Co. and gave another explanation as to why he would not do that. Secretary Ickes failed to point out and perhaps he did not know that the Aluminum Co. has continuously, over the last 6 months or more, told the governmental agencies that it would make all the aluminum for which power could be obtained.

In the face of that record; in the face of the fact that the Aluminum Co. has already doubled and will shortly triple its 1938 output; and in the face of the further fact that the Aluminum Co. is spending over $200,000,000 of its own money to advance defense; it is hard to understand how Secretary Ickes could state to this committee Monday that, "When the story of this war comes to be written, it may have to be written that it was lost because of the recalcitrance of the Aluminum Co. of America."

Secretary Ickes may know how wars are lost, but you gentlemen know that wars are won by using as quickly as possible every available resource for the production of war materials.

Allegations have been made that the Aluminum Co. of America is a monopoly and is a party to agreements with various foreign companies, or foreign agencies, under which it is claimed production of aluminum has been restricted in this country. These and other similar questions are now pending in the courts against the company and its officers. In view of the fact that these suits are still unadjudicated, we feel constrained to remain silent in the face of these charges, believing it to be improper to discuss, or make any representations, publicly regarding matters which are still pending before the courts for decision. Suffice it to say that all of the principal officers of the company have vigorously denied that any such agreements exist, and they likewise have denied such charges are justified. I can assure you that it is no easy matter to be compelled to keep quiet in the face of charges that we regard as unfounded, but the proprieties of the situation have unfortunately made this necessary.

The Aluminum Co. of America was the first company in the world ever to produce aluminum at a price which brought it into commercial use. It pioneered the industry. It is still the foremost company in the aluminum industry, in spite of the fact that it has had the most severe competition from foreign companies, at least one of which is government owned.

The Aluminum Co. of America has given the United States leadership in this industry, both from the standpoint of knowledge and technique, as well as quality of product. Until Germany came into the fruition of its

enormous armament program in 1939, the productive capacity in the United States was the greatest of any country in the world. In pioneering this industry, the principal job of the Aluminum Co. of America has been to find new uses for the metal. The problem of the company, therefore, has heretofore been not the production of aluminum, but the finding of people who would buy the metal and use it.

Let me assure you gentlemen that the sole desire of the Aluminum Co. of America is to be allowed to use its every resource in the production of aluminum for the defense of the country. We urge that we be allowed to do so.

The Arkansas Valley Authority Is Inevitable if Our Floods Are To Be Controlled in Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTHWEST AMERICAN

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, either there will be an Arkansas Valley Authority or there will be major floods on the Arkansas, Red, White, and St. Francis Rivers.

Herewith I insert an editorial appearing recently in the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark.:

[From the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark., of June 7, 1941]

CONTROLLING FLOODS

How floods are controlled by combination power- and flood-control dams was illustrated this week at Grand River Dam in northeast Oklahoma.

Heavy rainfall sent a 12-foot rise down the Grand River from the upper branches.

Engineers at Grand River Dam opened the spillway gates ahead of the floodwater and reduced the level of the lake by 2 feet, in order to make room for the floodwaters when they arrived. The water let out of the dam moved down the lower stream well within the banks. The floodwaters which moved into the lake restored it to its original level.

Such a reservoir permits holding floods and the orderly discharge of their waters in such quantities that the lower stream can move them within its banks. Without such a dam, the 12-foot rise would come downstream all at once.

That sort of arrangement can be worked and is worked wherever flood-control dams are installed. It can be worked just as well with dual-purpose dams, for flood control and power production, wherever the capacity of the reservoir is sufficient to provide power and leave storage capacity above the minimum power pool level for floodwaters.

That kind of flood control, coupled with use of the energy of falling water for power production, is the purpose of the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority proposal, now pending in Congress.

The Grand River Dam is owned and operated by the Grand River Dam Authority, a creation of the State of Oklahoma. Its primary function is power. Flood control and aid to navigation are secondary.

The majority of the flood control and power dams now building in the Southwest are constructed by the Federal Government, through the United States engineers. Several are owned by private power interests.

The purpose of the Arkansas Valley Authority proposal is to create a single Federal authority with the legal power and the finance to build needed works, and to operate them as a whole so they may best accomplish the triple purpose of flood control, power production, and aid to navigation.

Letter to the President Urging That the United States Should Not Enter the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

LETTER FROM FRED A. HULSEBUS, HARLAN, IOWA

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter written by Mr. Fred A. Hulsebus, of Harlan, Iowa, to the President of the United States, dated May 10, 1941. Mr. Hulsebus tells me that he had a great number of his friends pass on this letter, who insisted that he send it to the President before he did so. Having been personally acquainted with Mr. Hulsebus for a number of years, I know the desire which prompted him to write this letter was motivated by his deep concern for the best welfare of his country in these distressing times. The letter follows:

MAY 10, 1941.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In these troublous times when most of the world is full of hate, fear, jealousy, malice, and greed, I know that you are carrying a tremendous load and responsibility and that you are bothered by all kinds of people and flooded with thousands of letters, all telling you what to do and what not to do.

I have often wondered how anyone in the highly charged atmosphere of words, writings, and propaganda of Washington could do any thinking at all, not alone think clearly.

Instead of writing this letter I wish that I could have a talk with you here, right now; here where we could put our feet upon the ground, look about, and see all of the wonders of God and nature at their best; here where we could be free from reporters, politicians, or anyone if we wished. I am sure that after a short acquaintanceship and a talk we would both have a different slant on some things than we have now, and that we would agree on most things.

It is generally easier to judge a letter if you are acquainted with the writer and his background. Therefore, I shall introduce myself the best I can. I was born in Illinois and, with my parents, moved to a farm located in this county in the year 1886. I was reared on the farm, and have spent the past 40 years in the telephone, hardware, and automobile business in this county.

My father was born in Germany, but his ancestry goes back to Holland. My mother was born in the United States, but her parents came from Switzerland.

I am about your size and age, and almost everyone tells me that I look like you. I am mechanically inclined, and take a great interest in public and political affairs. I am a Republican, but I agree with you on much of your domestic policy, but cannot agree with you on much of the foreign policy.

Every citizen must admit that the President of the United States has information that everyone does not get. We, as private citizens, get our information from history, friends, papers, radio, and many sources, and much of it is propaganda.

As I see it, to analyze, think, and judge clearly on this war, our interest in it, and the future, we must know about the events before, during, and after the World War. From a study of those events, the money system, and history, I have come to the conclusion that it is not only best for us but for the world in the end if we stay out of this war as a combatant.

In my opinion, the greatest troublemakers in the world in my time have been the money system, trade barriers, and unfair peace treaties; and the greatest troublemakers in our own United States have been our money system and group legislation. They usually work to the advantage of the "haves" and to the disadvantage of the "have nots."

I am glad that during your administration there has been some reform legislation along this line. We need much more, such as no tax-free bonds, etc., but what we need now most of all is to keep out of war. We have nothing to gain by going to war for ourselves or for the people of the world in the end, but we do have much to lose.

Our people are much divided on the question of going to war, but they are almost 100 percent united on the building of proper defense and defending our own country.

During the World War we went across to defend democracy. Today, almost everyone will admit that we came back with less democracy.

Mr. President, in the position you are in, the head of the greatest nation on earth, and the condition this world is in, with your position, influence, and great statesmanship, you can do a thousand times more good by keeping us out of this war than all of the military men and others can by pushing us in.

Most all military men and many others believe there are but two motives that move men and women to action, and these two motives are fear and self-interest. They overlook the greatest moving power of all, the power of love; love for family, love for home, love for country, love for ideals and principles. That is why Napoleon met his Waterloo; he overlooked the greatest moving power of all. That is why Hitler, Mussolini, Churchill, and Stalin will all lose in the end; they haven't a spark of love or humanity in their souls.

If you choose the course to keep us out of war, you are in the greatest position in the world to spread good will, love, and democracy.

If I were in your position, I would send supersalesman to every country that I could to create good will. I would let the world know that we were going to take more interest in a secretary of peace than a secretary of war.

Most of the people who have studied the peace terms and the events which followed the World War will agree now that hatred, fear, and self-interest, and lack of foresight

is largely the cause of this war and that we, ourselves, are not free from guilt.

We call this Nation a Christian nation, but we, with others, let thousands of persons go hungry and starve to death, and we had more than we could use.

I know, because my daughter did social-service work in France. She was a delegate also in a movement for "no more wars," which was sponsored by the young people of France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and other countries. This gave her the opportunity to spend some time in these countries and England also.

Mr. President, you are not to blame, but I would say we, as a democratic Nation, "missed the bus."

At this peace conference, some things were done, not intentionally, however, to help Germany build up an up-to-date fighting machine and people. She was forbidden to build large fighting ships, and so she concentrated on small, fast ships, which she found to be an advantage, because speed and numbers are what count most now. She was not allowed to make planes, and so she made gliders. The result is that thousands of boys and men and women can fly.

In my opinion, the bottleneck in the British fighting machine isn't lack of planes; but it is the lack of enough fighting fliers. Only a small percentage of the boys who pass for flying will make good fighting fliers. They must have a good physique, must have nerve, mechanical ability, lightning coordination, and excellent judgment. It takes time to make such a man, and I believe it takes three for each plane.

Germany did not have much after the war—no money, food. She had a wrecked nation and a wrecked government and much unemployment. Lack of money brought on bartering and bartering increased reaching out for trade. The unemployed were put to work on roads. Knickerbocker says they have the finest road system in the world. Good roads are the builders of progress, and a great arm for national defense, and last, but not least, work developed and united the people of Germany.

It is my honest opinion that if we get into the fighting of this war millions more will be injured, killed, and made to suffer, and if we must fight in all parts of the world we may lose and Stalin may win.

As a private citizen I ask you, Mr. President, to think back to your election campaign when you were meeting thousands of people from all parts of the United States, when you had a cross section of the people's thoughts from all parts, then when you made your promises to the voters. You were elected by the majority of these people. Today, you are the leader of these same people, and, naturally, as our servant we expect your first interest to lie with us. We realize that conditions have changed somewhat. We also know that there are influential and powerful groups that have selfish motives in mind. They care not a whit about the burdens, suffering, nor the future of our own people and country. They are thinking only of their interests.

In conclusion, what is to follow is hard for me to say to you, Mr. President. But what I am saying in this letter has been milling around in my mind for a long time, and I must say what my conscience dictates.

I feel that if you will make a statement as soon as possible to the people of the United States and the world, telling them that as the servant of the people of the United States you are under obligation to your people first of all but you cannot help but be interested in the welfare of humanity in all parts of the world and the future destiny of the people and nations. "It isn't the desire of my people to enter this conflict; therefore, as their leader and servant, I deem it my sacred duty to avoid conflict if possible. I also deem it my duty, as President of the United States, to do all I can to stop this horrible war. It is my belief that all of the nations would be willing to settle things at a conference table at this time if they could trust the men at the conference. To show my sincerity and willingness to help end this conflict and get a just peace, I am offering Herbert Hoover, a man whom you all know, to represent me and the people of the United States. We sincerely hope that every country will cooperate in ending this conflict."

I know that you are big enough to place the welfare of humanity and peace above everything else.

If this will accomplish what I hope it will, millions of people in this country and throughout the world will praise you and you will go down in history as one of the greatest men.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. HULSEBUS.

American Citizens of Polish Extraction Pledging Support in Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT ANNUAL PILGRIMAGE ON JUNE 15, 1941

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by a group of American citizens of Polish extraction on June 15, 1941, at the annual pilgrimage to Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, Canada, to pay homage to the soldier dead who are buried at the St. Vincent de Paul Cemetery:

We, the citizens of the United States and Canada of Polish extraction, and citizens of Poland, having gathered this 15th day of June 1941 at the annual pilgrimage to Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, Canada, to pay homage to the soldier dead who lie under the sod at the St. Vincent de Paul Cemetery, hereby express our deep loyalty to our respective Governments, and, bearing in mind that Poland, the land of our forefathers, which was only recently redeemed by the sacrifices of her brave sons, and having again been invaded by her totalitarian neighbors of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, we hereby adopt the following resolutions:

Whereas the soldiers who rest in this St. Vincent de Paul Cemetery at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, Canada, and the soldiers who rest on the fields of France and Poland, having died and given their lives in the service and on the battlefields, and for the independence and freedom of Poland and in the defense of democracy at the side of the United States, Great Britain, and their allies; and

Whereas in the year 1917 the Polish Army was organized and trained at Camp Kosciuszko, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Canada, and once again in these grave times of world history a Polish Army consisting of volunteers is being organized at Owen Sound, Ontario, Canada; and

Whereas Great Britain, Poland, and their allies constitute the first line of defense in the preservation of Christian and democratic ideals; and

Whereas the duly constituted governments of the world, based on democratic principles and ideals, are being threatened and in certain instances have already been superseded by nazi-ism and communism, and as a result of which chaos and desperation permeates all the subjugated nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That to the soldiers who are buried at the St. Vincent dePaul Cemetery at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, Canada; to the soldiers that died on the fields of battle in the first World War in France and in Poland; and to the soldiers who died heroically in Poland, Norway, Greece and Africa, and other lands, both on land and sea in the defense of Poland in the present World War, we hereby express our deep gratitude for their heroic efforts in the defense of freedom, justice, culture, and religious freedom, and in the preservation of civilization and in the preservation of governments based on the fundamental laws of God and democratic ideals; and be it further

Resolved, That to Poland, the land of our forbears, which through the ages remained and today remains the bulwark of Christianity; to Poland, which gave to the world numerous heroes and military geniuses, men of knowledge, arts, and science, we hereby express our undying hope for an early victory and the regaining of Poland's independence. In this regard we hereby appeal to all the citizens of the United States of Polish extraction for moral and financial aid, and to the citizens of Canada of Polish origin we hereby appeal that every effort be expended to enlarge the new Polish Army now being formed in Canada, and we hereby appeal to all peoples to give every financial aid possible until it hurts to the poor unfortunate victims of this war in Poland and other lands where these unfortunate human beings took refuge, and who are presently threatened with extermination and certain death.

Resolved, That to the civil and military authorities of the Dominion of Canada we hereby express our sincere gratitude and appreciation for their untiring efforts in permitting the organization of the Polish Army in the first World War and in this present war, and we express the hope and confidence that the new Polish Army formed at Owen Sound, Ontario, Canada, will become a mighty power under the command of General Sikorski in England. In commemoration of the brave heroes of Canada and Poland who gave their lives fighting together for freedom and liberty of Canada and Poland, we hereby place a wreath to their sacred memory at the Soldiers' Monument at Niagara-on-the-Lake; be it further

Resolved, That to the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, we express our deep gratitude for the far-reaching necessary steps he has taken in the defense of the United States; in sponsoring the lend-lease bill; in declaring a state of emergency; in taking proper action in curtailing subversive elements among labor. To the King of England, George VI, and his able Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, the civil and military authorities of Canada and Poland and their allies, we extend a message of admiration and our sincere hope and confidence in final victory for Great Britain, Poland, and other countries fighting side by side with Great Britain, based on God's law and democratic principles and ideals.

Resolved, That we hereby fervently appeal to all citizens of the United States and the Dominion of Canada, regardless of race, color, or creed, for extreme loyalty to their respective Governments. May the one-hundred-and-odd years of continued peace and friendship between the United States and Canada continue to be an inspiration and beacon light of peace and friendship among nations, based on love and the spirit of good neighbors.

We hereby unqualifiedly denounce any and all subversive activities in any shape or form

in the United States and Canada, and we fervently urge all the citizenry of both countries to mutually cooperate with their authorities for the better defense of our respective Governments and for the better securing of our liberties by buying defense bonds, and, if need be, to give our lives in the service of God and country.

Long live the United States.
Long live the Dominion of Canada.
Long live freedom.

Los Angeles Nazis Prepare for Lindbergh Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEWS RESEARCH SERVICE, INC.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include therein two articles, I am inserting an article from the news letter published by the News Research Service, Inc., which gives very important facts and information which I feel will prove of interest to the membership and to the country. The article is as follows:

A new political party is about to emerge on the American scene. Its spokesmen will include appeasers, Fascists, Communists, Nazis, pacifists, so-called isolationists, Coughlinites, and professional patrioteers. Membership will consist of all elements bearing the same labels. Prominent speakers are now touring the country, addressing mass rallies, conditioning the public mind to follow the soon-to-be-unfurled party banner. As yet, no official anncuncement of plans has been made, but message bearers have been instructed to allude cautiously to the advent of this organization, and to report—to the powers behind the scenes—the mass reactions to these subtle hints.

Ex-Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, leading the vanguard of speakers, is scheduled to speak on June 20 at a mass meeting at the Hollywood Bowl in Los Angeles. His appearance will put the finishing touches to the conditioning process of Angelenos, subversive and otherwise. The following exposé concerns itself, mainly, with Los Angeles, but N. R. S. correspondents report that similar activities prevail everywhere in the land. Lack of space, however, prevents the presentation of details. All indicate how the public mind is to be prepared for acceptance of the new appeasement party.

THE LONE EAGLE SWOOPS TO CONQUER

Two days after President Roosevelt declared a national emergency, Lindbergh addressed a mass meeting in the Philadelphia Arena. More than 16,000 persons, inside the hall and out, booed and hissed the name of the President. Adolf Hitler's name was cheered by this vast throng, which fanatically declared itself against any aid to Great Britain, any preparations that will lead us into war—even a defensive war.

Present at this meeting, among others, were Heinrich Schafhausen, German Vice Consul; Peter Kreckmann, manager of the North German Lloyd offices; Rev. Sigmund von Bosse, one-time president of the German-American National Alliance (which N. R. S. exposed in No. 133); Capt. William Schmidt, of the Philadelphia German Societies; Dr. Bessie Burchett, a school teacher recently expelled when she displayed anti-Rocsevelt and pro-Nazi placards in her classroom; Kurt Geppert, president of the Rundfunk Klub (German Radio Club); Thomas A. Blissard, chairman of the Committee for the Preservation of Constitutional Rights, the Coughlinite organization of this city; and representatives of various mothers' groups.

Climax of the evening was Lindbergh's question, slyly put: "Is it not time for us to turn to new policies and a new leadership?" Nazi heilers and their fellow travelers shouted their enthusiastic "Ja." His call for new leadership reverberated all over the Nation. America First speakers everywhere repeated it, and many commentators referred to it, including Westbrook Pegler, who said:

"I want to know just how Lindbergh will turn the trick (of a new leadership) without resorting to the method used in all European countries which changed leaders to avoid trouble and found themselves on leash to Hitler."

The Philadelphia Record saw the significance in the flyer's statement and treated it appropriately in a featured cartoon.

When put on the spot as to what he meant, Lindbergh tried to crawl out from the dead give-away of his own words, by saying:

"Neither I nor anyone else on the America First Committee advocates proceeding by anything but constitutional methods. It is our opposition which endangers the American Constitution when it objects to our freedom of speech and expression."

On June 10, Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, writing in Washington Merry-Go-Round, pointed out that some America First generalissimos are trying to get rid of pro-Nazi elements in the organization. At the recent Lindbergh meeting in Madison Square Garden John T. Flynn, of the New York branch of America First, took the platform, denounced the presence of Joe McWilliams and other Fascists, and asked them to leave. Flynn and his supporters have been unable to get any help from America First platform stars and little headway has been made in the purification of the committee. Christian Front leaders are now gunning for Flynn's scalp.

The attack upon real Americans, who sincerely believe in isolation, but who would have no truck with the Nazis, is just getting under way. Father Coughlin immediately made himself their spokesman. Said he, in a back-page editorial in Social Justice of June 9:

"For some time dire rumors have been circulated about certain individuals who take it upon themselves to act on behalf of the America First Committee. The purpose of this comment is not to blast the America First Committee but to ask the responsible heads of the committee—including Gen. Robert E. Wood—to make a pronouncement before radicals within the ranks of the America First Committee succeed in splitting the organization into a thousand segments.

"Recently, Mr. John T. Flynn, of New York, went out of his way to assail Mr. McWilliams, seated in the audience of an America First meeting at Madison Square Garden. Why? Social Justice holds no brief for Mr. McWilliams. But the point is, if the America First Committee decides to accept only those whose lives, religion, philosophy, associates, business partners, etc., are streamlined to fit the definition of America Firstism as concocted by Dorothy Bromley, then the America First Committee will soon develop into the 'America Last' Committee. * * *

"If Father Coughlin's friends are not pleasing to the America First Committee, then it is high time for the Christian Front to go outside the catacombs where it has been slumbering for some time. * * * Definitely, the pro-Marxists, Dorothy Bromleys, and others want the America First Committee rent in twain. * * * As you remember, the National Union for Social Justice went through the same turmoil now being experienced by the America First Committee. The Communists joined our ranks. And the Communists split the organization from within."

Social Justice is on sale at practically every America First rally throughout the Nation. What the paper stands for is best revealed in a startling editorial, captioned "Colonel Lindbergh," in the May 12, 1941, issue. This editorial, sacrilegious to the extreme, compares the once Lone Eagle to Jesus Christ, setting him upon a pedestal to be worshipped by the duped masses.

"WE"—LINDBERGH AND INGALLS

On June 10, Laura Ingalls, famous aviatrix, addressed a meeting of the Los Angeles division of the National Executive Committee of the Mothers of America to Keep the United States Out of War, whose national chairman is Cathrine Curtis. The audience was liberally sprinkled with people whose names are familiar in the files of Government agencies concerned with the investigation of subversive activities. Miss Ingalls aroused her listeners when she revealed a plan to fly over Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Detroit, and Washington, D. C., with other flights to be arranged as the plan nears completion. She intends to take to Washington a large batch of petitions for presentation to President Roosevelt. In explaining this, she said:

"The plan is that I shall fly the petitions you are now filling, to Washington, where Cathrine Curtis will present them to the President, and if she does not, I will take them in the back way myself. I have always been able to reach anyone I really wanted to. I suggested this to a mothers' rally in San Francisco, and Mrs. Henry Morris' group is going to cooperate, too. I will also call upon Mrs. Rosa Farber to join us in this. We will be able to get publicity because airplanes are news." (Mrs. Morris, daughter of Mayor Rossi, is head of the Curtis group in San Francisco. Mrs. Farber is head of the Detroit group and closely affiliated with Coughlin.)

On June 12, Miss Ingalls spoke before the Women's Activities Group of the America First Committee, at Los Angeles headquarters. She endorsed a United Europe under Hitler, although she was careful in the phrasing of her recommendation. Calling for "vulgar, fanatical action on the part of mothers whose job it is to inject themselves in the controversy," she argued: "For us women, the issues are clear-cut. We are not interested in what happens in Europe. All we are interested in is seeing our boys live, instead of fighting and dying."

Of course, the flyer carefully avoided to point out that the developments in Europe concern us greatly. Her policy evidently is not to let the right hand know what the left is doing, for she added:

"We need an American symbol of unity. We ought to adopt an American salute—the outstretched left arm. This is the old Indian salute, and therefore, purely American, and no one can accuse us of being Nazis, for the Nazis use the right arm."

After the meeting, the aviatrix spoke to a group of women, reminding them that the swastika is an old Indian sign, therefore American. She showed them a bracelet she was wearing, containing many swastikas as part of the design.

Miss Ingalls is not a newcomer among those who would sell out to Hitler at any price. Four weeks after this war got under way she clamored for a new Munich. This time England was to be sold down the river. America was spared for later.

On September 27, 1939, Laura Ingalls—always publicity hungry and inclined to do the dramatic—created a national stir when

she dropped appeasement pamphlets from an airplane over the White House zone. The Civil Aeronautics Authority suspended her license for two violations. Investigation revealed that Miss Ingalls was flying in the interests of a committee headed by none other than Cathrine Curtis. The next day both women appeared and demanded to be admitted to a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee. When refused entry, Miss Ingalls burst into a denunciation of the Government, exclaiming:

"And this is the Government of the United States! I can't understand it! Imagine! Holding hearings behind closed doors. This is a dictatorship already!"

NAZIS AND COPPERHEADS

Several hours after Miss Ingalls's Los Angeles address, Mrs. Louise Ward Watkins took up where the former left off, presenting another peace-at-any-price harangue, similar to that reported by NRS a week ago.

Very dramatically it was announced at this meeting that ex-Colonel Lindbergh will speak at the Hollywood Bowl on Friday night, June 20. Members were told that the bowl was obtained at a very low cost "because the management looks with much favor upon our cause." Admission will be free. Immediately machinery was set in motion to prepare for an overflow attendance. Nazis who were at this meeting forthwith reported to their own organizations that the lone eagle is winging westward and "it is up to us to make the most of it."

Los Angeles Nazis received the news of Lindbergh's coming with great joy. Typical is the reaction of the German-American Alliance (also known as German-American League), headed by Dr. H. A. Gebhardt, attorney for the German consulate. On Sunday, June 15, the alliance held a folk festival at Hindenburg Park.

At bund headquarters, under ex-citizen Hermann M. Schwinn's direction, great quantities of literature were readied for distribution, among them batches of reprints of Lindbergh's Letter to the American People. Originally published in Collier's magazine, this was reprinted by Edith Marion Shol. Mrs. Shol is editor of the American Freedom magazine, head of the American Freedom Association, and her Nazi activities, already described in detail in previous news letters, include the printing of literature for Los Angeles subversivists of all sorts.

Another propaganda missile is a cartoon recently released by Chicago Nazis. It is a sequel to the drawing reproduced in NRS No. 143, captioned "The Betrayal," showing Uncle Sam nailed to a cross that symbolized the lend-lease bill. The follow-up picture shows multitudes of Americans being led through the portals of the United States Constitution by Columbia, by America First, by Crusading Mothers, and "patriotic" groups. It states that it is "The answer to the betrayal (H. R. 1776) of the internationalists, money changers, social experimenters, warmongers." It was drawn by a prominent Chicago artist of German origin, whose past affiliations with Nazis are well known. Misspelling of certain words has a German flavor, as, for instance, "hypocrisy" being spelled "hypocracy." Original sponsors of these cartoons include Elizabeth Dilling and Newton Jenkins, whose Nazi activities are well known.

Also among the planners for the Lindbergh rally are F. K. Ferenz, notorious as exhibitor of Nazi-propaganda pictures; Ellis O. Jones, founder and head of the National Copperhead Association; and Bruce Tarkington Dowden, America First Committee speaker, recently found guilty by a Los Angeles jury of assault and battery.

Ernest Lundeen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. R. T. BUCKLER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, when Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, was killed in an airplane accident August 31, 1940, Minnesota and the Nation lost one of its pioneer and most energetic liberals.

Senator LUNDEEN was one of the builders and founders of the Farmer-Labor Party, which has enacted and advanced a fine social program in Minnesota. He was one of its leaders and one of its strongest fighters for its principles for two decades.

Senator LUNDEEN was a man of great principle and great courage. When to some people he may have appeared obstinate, it was not obstinacy at all; he refused to compromise on principle so long as he thought that he was in the right. To do the expedient thing never appealed to his nature; it was always to do the right thing.

That Senator LUNDEEN suffered because he charted his life along that course is quite generally known. He suffered politically, and he suffered economically. He knew, at the time, that he would be made to suffer—to take punishment—when he championed causes that for the moment were unpopular. But he lived to see the day when he was vindicated and the causes for which he fought were generally approved.

Everyone who knew Senator LUNDEEN—ERNY LUNDEEN, as his friends knew him—knew that he loved human beings. His conversations were intimate, and he loved to talk with people, heart to heart. He was warm and affectionate. His family ties were warm and affectionate—which made the blow of his death to his friends and his charming family, of wife and two children, the terrible shock that it was.

ERNEST LUNDEEN served his country in war and in peace. He answered his country's call during the Spanish-American War while a mere youngster, and he served in the ranks. No call to service to his country would ever have gone unheeded. He was raised in the atmosphere of America; he breathed the American air, and he was American through and through—a son of America who was never anything else than pro-American.

But while he was pro-American, and thought always of the interests of America first, he deeply sympathized with the common people of all countries suffering because of war. He knew that they were the innocent people who must bear the hardships of wars—wars that they did not create and for none of the responsibilities of which they should share.

Senator LUNDEEN's record, in the Minnesota Legislature and in Congress as a Representative and as a Senator, is a record of support for progressive measures for the betterment of all the people, and particularly for the betterment of the masses struggling for a better life. He was their friend. To America's record of progress, he has lent a historical contribution.

Willis Benjamin Gibbs

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, late a Representative from the State of Georgia

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, BEN GIBBS died during his first term in Congress, but during that brief period he rendered excellent service to his Nation. I had the pleasure of serving on a subcommittee with him, and so came to know him well and to have a high regard for his ability and his character. He was regular in his attendance at committee meetings and did with thoroughness the tasks assigned to him. He was blessed with a strong sense of humor and a deep understanding of people. These characteristics, together with his practical and charitable approach to all problems, made him a valuable member of the Judiciary Committee. We regret the untimely death of this splendid Member and good friend.

The Proposed Trade Agreements With Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. HUGH BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a statement made by me before

the Committee for Reciprocity Information on June 23, 1941.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appear before this committee not alone in my capacity as a Member of the United States Senate, but as a producer of agricultural products. General farming and livestock feeding is the only occupation or business in which I am financially interested. I feel that I can speak the sentiments not only of my fellow citizens of Nebraska, but likewise the producers over all the western and central western agricultural area, where livestock production is such an important part of their program.

Since many concessions to be granted under the proposed agreements will involve agricultural products and since agriculture is Nebraska's major industry, any concessions or reductions in tariffs on farm products are of particular interest to the people of my State. Livestock and livestock products are the principal source of Nebraska farm income. In 1940 $181,000,000, or 78 percent of Nebraska's cash farm income, was derived from the marketings of these products. Nebraska farmers produce meat, wool, and other animal products, dairy products, fruits, vegetables, flaxseed, as well as other commodities, tariffs on which the administration now proposes to reduce. The only purpose in reducing tariffs on farm products is to encourage imports of farm products, yet agricultural imports from Argentina and Uruguay amounted to over $80,000,000 last year. In other words agricultural imports from these two countries in 1940 represented about one-fourth of total Nebraska's cash farm income, or about twice the amount Nebraska farmers received in Government payments for complying with the farm program. Last year imports of farm products from these two countries represented about $660 per Nebraska farm.

There are three questions that we must keep constantly before us in considering the wisdom of negotiating these agreements at the present time.

1. Will the proposed agreements help American farmers solve their many pressing problems?

2. Will they speed and facilitate our national defense effort?

3. Will the two agreements help or hinder our postwar reconstruction efforts?

I

An examination of the trade-agreements program to date and the facts of trade between the United States and Argentina and between the United States and Uruguay furnishes no support for the proposition that American farmers will gain from the agreements. Ever since the first World War American farmers have sought to achieve economic, political, and social equality with other groups in the population. They have attempted through every fair and legal means to receive prices for their products commensurate with the prices they must pay for commodities used on the farm. Now the administration proposes to reduce tariffs on farm products and thus to give foreign agricultural products an additional competitive advantage in the domestic market—a market which rightfully belongs to the American farmer. Such a move is in direct opposition to the attempt by farmers to achieve equality, parity prices, and parity income. No less a person than President Roosevelt has testified to the truth of this statement. Speaking in Baltimore on October 25, 1932, he said:

"It is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. * * * I promised to endeavor to restore the purchasing power of the farmers' dollars by making the tariff effective for agriculture and raising the prices of the farmers' products. I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program and every farmer in the United States knows it and will not be deceived."

II

That the reciprocal trade-agreements program would increase exports of farm products has been the major argument advanced by the New Deal to justify the trade-agreements program to farmers. Secretary Hull and others have claimed that reducing tariffs would stimulate imports, thus giving foreign customers more dollars with which to increase their purchases from us. This was the theory, but has not worked out in practice, for farm exports have actually declined. Exports of agricultural commodities were lower the fiscal year 1939, or in the last year prior to the outbreak of war, than they were in the fiscal year 1934, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed, or even in 1932. Cotton has for years been the No. 1 export problem confronting the New Deal administration; yet cotton exports in August 1939 were at their lowest level in over 60 years.

Exports of all farm commodities in the fiscal year 1939 were valued at $683,000,000, compared with $789,000,000 in the fiscal year 1934 and $752,000,000 in the fiscal year 1932. Lard exports, cured pork exports, and wheat and flour exports in the fiscal year 1939 were all below the level reached in the fiscal year 1932. In the last year before the outbreak of war, agricultural exports were only 24 percent of total exports, or the lowest on record with the exception of the 1940 fiscal year. Meanwhile imports of competitive agricultural commodities had increased from $375,000,000 in the fiscal year 1932 to $486,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939.

An examination of our trade with Argentina and with Uruguay indicates that these agreements will not open new markets for American farm exports. This is true for the simple reason that the economies of Argentina and Uruguay are based on the production and export of agricultural and pastoral products. In 1939 pastoral and agricultural products made up 94 percent of Argentina's total exports. Argentina ranks along with Canada as one of the two most important surplus food producing areas of the world. It is the largest exporter of wool and beef, at times has exceeded Canada as an exporter of wheat, and ranks third after New Zealand and Australia in shipments of mutton and lambs. Virtually the same is true of Uruguay. Exports of animal and animal products constitute more than 90 percent of Uruguay's total outward trade. Although reducing farm tariffs would make it possible for Argentina and Uruguay to increase their exports of farm products to the United States, it is quite unlikely that they would increase purchases of the very commodities that they are striving to sell.

Nor can it be demonstrated how the proposed agreements will expedite our defense effort. National defense is a matter of national morale and productive efficiency. Reducing tariffs on American farm products will lessen rather than increase the morale of American farmers, and American farmers, it should be recalled, constitute 25 percent of total population. Nor will the agreements, if negotiated, speed the assembly lines which are producing tanks, airplanes, and ammunition or the launching of ships. Although it might be argued that some of the products on which we are contemplating granting concessions are essential to defense, the record shows clearly that products which might be so classified are already flowing to this country in increasing quantities irrespective of our present tariff structure. Accordingly it cannot be demonstrated that our present tariffs are restricting the flow of essential defense materials to this country.

Although the proposed trade agreements will not help us in producing for defense, it should be observed that any steps taken to reduce tariffs on farm products will tend to nullify the agricultural phase of our defense and aid-to-Britain program. At the present time we are encouraging farmers to increase their production of livestock, dairy, and poultry products as well as their production of certain vegetables by price-raising activities. As President Roosevelt observed in 1932, lowering tariff duties on farm products is inconsistent with the objective of increasing farm prices. Farmers, he said, know this "and will not be deceived."

As noted above a New Deal argument in support of its reciprocal trade-agreements program has been that reducing tariffs would stimulate exports of American products. The great bulk of our exports to Argentina and Uruguay, however, consists of metals and metal manufactures, machinery and vehicles, and other products which we are not even producing in sufficient quantities for our own purposes. For these and other reasons the proposed agreements cannot be justified on the basis of national defense.

III

In 1940, when Congress was asked to extend the life of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 3 years, it was argued that the trade-agreements program would have an important role to play during postwar reconstruction years. The program, it was said, would help achieve the progressive lowering of barriers to world trade. There is no factual evidence, however, to support this argument. Trade barriers throughout the world actually increased during the period when we were negotiating trade agreements and lowering tariffs. Officials of the State and Commerce Departments have testified to the validity of this fact. If one is to be realistic, one will recognize that the present war will create problems more difficult of solution than those which confronted us during the years from 1934 up until the outbreak of World War No. 2. Since the trade-agreements program was unable to cope with prewar problems, it stands to reason that it will not succeed during postwar years when the problems will be magnified many times over. When peace comes, as it inevitably will, we will need even stronger weapons with which to combat these trade barriers and trade restrictions. When that time comes the higher our tariffs the more bargaining power we will have. Consequently, this is no time to effect a further reduction in tariffs by granting and generalizing concessions in the proposed Argentine and Uruguayan trade agreements.

Historical background of the tariffs as affecting livestock producers in the United States today

In properly considering the proposed trade agreements, there are a few historical records I would like to point out.

I

(a) Until the turn of the century, 40 years ago, there certainly was no need for a tariff on cattle or other meat animals or upon meat products, since no other country in the world could compete with the Great Plains States in the production of meat animals. Land values were extremely low, labor costs were equally low, taxes were relatively so unimportant as to be seldom considered, and, finally, transportation costs (railway freight rates) were still at very low levels.

(b) Argentina and other large foreign producing areas had not yet come into prominence. In fact, cattle and sheep could not successfully be produced in the Southern Hemisphere to be shipped as live animals many thousands of miles through equatorial regions to Europe, and artificial refrigeration, which made possible the shipping of frozen

and chilled beef, veal, mutton, and lamb, had not yet been developed.

(c) Turning to the demand side of the picture, there was an immense foreign market (in United Kingdom and Europe) for meat animals, especially cattle and sheep, so that from the United States we exported as many as a million cattle a year (on cattle boats) and exported the necessary feed along with the animals, so that the fattening or finishing job was carried on near the point of slaughter and final use. In other words, the United States was a tremendous exporter of meat and other livestock products in the form of live animals and feed.

At that time cattle and sheep, as well as the food grains, wheat and rye; the feed grains, corn, oats, and barley; and special crops like tobacco and cotton were all in the same position. We were heavy exporters and feared no competition and needed no tariffs. Internationalists and free-traders in general were brought up under that school. They seem to be blind to the fundamental changes which have taken place since the turn of the century.

The situation described above gradually changed between 1900 and the World War.

II

Introduction of electrical refrigeration: Development of scientific refrigeration, including the chilling and freezing of beef, veal, mutton and lamb, led to a real revolution in sources, destinations, costs and prices of red meats. Such regions as Australia and New Zealand, Argentina and Uruguay (and other lesser areas), became the world providers or sources of supply for great consuming areas in the United Kingdom and western Europe. Animals were "finished" in the producing areas, slaughtered there, and only the finished products were shipped to the consuming centers. Thus, on the one hand we have vast new producing areas coming into the picture; we have a complete new type of trade with Europe; and from the standpoint of our own great Middle Western States, farmers were forced to turn to "corn and hogs," the products from which were converted into hams, shoulders, bacon, lard, and the other pork products which have made that region famous.

III

The World War likewise led to the plowing up of millions of acres of land in the Great Plains area which found its way into the production of wheat and rye and the production of corn, oats, barley and other feed grains. This pointed in the direction of less emphasis upon cattle and more emphasis upon hog production.

IV

The World War too led to a tremendous increase in transportation costs. It no longer was economic to ship live cattle from the Great Plains region to coastal cities for transshipment to European markets. On the other hand, the cattle and sheep of such regions as Australia and New Zealand, Argentina and Uruguay and other lesser areas were produced relatively very close to the coast lines. In other words, the cost of bringing them from producing areas to the coast cities for shipment or for slaughter was very low compared with transportation costs in the United States.

V

While land freight rates in the United States mounted higher and higher and became prohibitive from the standpoint of middle-western farmers, governments of great nations such as the United Kingdom, United States, and continental European countries encouraged the development of the merchant marine, as an auxiliary service to their navies, and supported ocean transportation from government funds by the payment of a multitude of different kinds of subsidies for the merchant marine. Briefly, land freight rates went higher and higher while ocean freight rates went lower and lower, relatively.

Summary

From the above it will be seen that a veritable revolution has taken place during the last 40, or, indeed, the last 25, years, and the United States is no longer in position to compete in the foreign market as an exporter of meat animals or products and feed grains. From year to year, on the other hand, we have faced the opposite situation of competition in our own markets from the products of these other foreign producing areas.

The great consuming centers of the United States lie along our coast lines. It is actually cheaper for them to secure meats and other livestock products from foreign areas than from our own central regions. Hence the need for tariffs to protect domestic markets.

VI

There is an interdependence between the manufacturing and distributing centers of the coastal areas and the great agricultural groups of the Mississippi Valley. If farmers of the Great Plains States cannot market their products in the United States, they, in turn, cannot buy the manufactured products from domestic industries. It is, therefore, in the interest of the people in the coastal cities to buy from domestic producers if they wish to sell their products to the 25,000,000 farmers who live inland.

VII

The difficult position of the great body of inland farmers is increasing daily. Recently all workers in coal mines were given an advance in wages approximating a dollar a day. Is this extra dollar to be spent buying Argentine beef? Most of the workers in the iron and steel industries during recent weeks or months have been advanced in wages at about the same rate. Is this dollar, too, to be used in buying Argentine beef? Wage earners in a multitude of other industries are rapidly being granted similar wage increases. And is this another dollar to be used in buying Argentine beef? All railroad workers (numbering about 1,000,000) are now negotiating for wage increases in harmony with those recently granted mine workers and others. If these advances are granted, transportation rates must be advanced in proportion. All of this points in the direction of higher costs to farmers for everything which they produce to ship in the direction of the coasts and everything which they wish to buy which is brought in from the direction of the coasts.

Conclusion

With the above broad picture in mind, the query presents itself, How are American farmers to attain or preserve parity prices if rates of duty are reduced? (During the last 15 years sanitary regulations have supplemented tariffs in protecting the American market for American farmers. If these sanitary regulations are removed or modified, farmers will face even greater difficulties.)

If rates of duty are to be reduced,

A. It will not suffice merely to limit imports by some tariff quota permitting a certain quantity of imports at the lower rate and unlimited imports at present rates of duty. Imports must be limited by absolute quotas, or tariff rates and sanitary regulations must be preserved.

B. If rates of duty are reduced, they should be definitely linked to a proviso to the effect that the lower rates of duty shall not be permitted to operate unless farmers are receiving at least price parity for their products.

VIII

There are a number of other very important considerations which would need to be dealt with. Only one further item will be mentioned here. Because of monetary policies pursued by this country and most foreign countries, exchange rates and monetary values are in a state of utmost confusion. Frequently foreign areas can now ship into the American market without regard to tariff rates. At the present time sanitary regulations rather than tariffs are controlling factors.

IX

So far as foreign policy is concerned, including the good-neighbor policy with Latin American countries, the greatest need at the present time is to strive for world peace. This should be followed by the building up of a great market for Argentine products in the United Kingdom and on the Continent of Europe rather than a program to provide a market in the United States for competing farm products.

X

During the turmoil of war is no time to negotiate a revolutionary change in our economic relations with foreign nations in matters of trade, exchange, tariffs, etc. Following the return of peace—that some time is certain to come—we can better plan long-term hemispheric trade policies than at this time of war hysteria. Our friends in the Southern Hemisphere should not expect to balance their foreign trade by totally disrupting our domestic economy. We want hemispheric solidarity—but not at the expense of national solidarity.

I conclude that there is no justification whatsoever for negotiating the proposed agreements at the present time. They will not help farmers solve their many and trying problems; they will not increase exports of American farm surpluses; they will not aid our defense program, nor will they facilitate post-war reconstruction. The decision to negotiate these agreements at this time was ill-conceived and not conducive to national unity. Early in 1940 the State Department terminated trade-agreement negotiations with these same countries. I submit that this was a wise decision and one that could be followed at the present time.

The Sugar Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

LETTER BY HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter appearing in the Washington Post of June 24, 1941, written by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and printed under the heading "The sugar bill defended."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 24, 1941]

THE SUGAR BILL DEFENDED

A STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

To the EDITOR OF THE POST.

SIR: Now that you have published the reply of the Maritime Association of New York to your editorial of June 8 expressing approval of the sugar bill introduced by Senator ADAMS, of Colorado, and the undersigned, the supporters of this legislation are under

a double obligation to you, for Mr. Callaghan's letter has clearly revealed the insubstantial and sectional character of the opposition to this proposal. I venture to set forth a few undisputable facts to demonstrate the soundness of your own editorial opinion and the weaknesses of Mr. Callaghan's argument.

The bill, already passed by the Senate and now pending in the House, is very similar to a measure introduced in that body by Representative HARRY COFFEE, of Nebraska, and approved several weeks ago by the House Committee on Agriculture. The bill, therefore, has the endorsement of a substantial majority of the United States Senate and of an important standing committee of the House. It can be defeated only if opponents succeed in confusing the issue which was set forth with admirable clarity in the Post editorial of June 8.

The proposal is simply that, in the present emergency, with an acknowledged shortage of shipping, domestic sources of sugar supply be first utilized to fill the anticipated Philippine deficit before certain Latin American countries are given a larger share in the American market than they have ever enjoyed. The position of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York is that the farmers and planters of 23 States and 3 island possessions should not be permitted to utilize their present productive capacity to supply the American market with sugar the Philippines cannot deliver. It argues that American consumers should be made even more dependent than they now are on foreign sources of supply, even though the Nation is confronted with a shipping crisis and is in great need of strategic commodities like rubber and tin.

These are commodities which must come from overseas because they cannot be supplied by the sugar States nor even by the port of New York. It is probable that the Maritime Association of the Port of New York might more profitably devote its energies to an attempt to secure shipping to bring in these necessary supplies rather than to the attempt to cut down a domestic agricultural industry and thus risk a shortage of sugar as well as of rubber and tin.

Mr. Callaghan has with commendable frankness acknowledged his "bias," to use his own word. He warns us that he speaks only for the shipping industry of a great port. We are therefore the better able to judge the merit of his arguments when, for an imagined benefit to his city, he advocates the suppression of beet and cane farming in more than a third of the United States. I think the facts demonstrate that he is in error.

"In the first place," says he, "no agency of the United States Government connected with shipping and defense has ever stated that an expansion in the beet-sugar industry is necessary to relieve a shipping shortage."

Very well. Let's look at the record.

On April 5 last the Maritime Commission, having been charged by the President with the duty of making a survey of shipping facilities, addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture in which is definitely and explicitly recommended the reallocation of the Philippine sugar quota.

This is what the Maritime Commission wrote:

"As of March 25 there remained approximately 635,000 tons of duty-free Philippine sugars to be brought to this country in accordance with established quotas. While we cannot give you an accurate estimate at this time, it is apparent from the demands for ships and space that consideration should be given to the reallocation of quotas if this can be done, so that the quantity of sugar to be transported from the Philippines can be reduced, and the ships made available for the transportation of other strategic commodities which are urgently required in the defense effort. A reduction in the required importation of sugar from the Philippines will make tonnage available for the transportation of rubber, tin, ores, wool, and other strategic commodities which must be brought to this country in large quantities from the Straits, the Dutch East Indies, the Philippines, and Australia."

The need of rubber is so great that only last week the Government suspended all private imports of that commodity from the Far East, and, effective today, according to the announcement of Federal Loan Administrator Jesse Jones, a Government defense corporation has become the exclusive buyer of rubber imported into the United States from the Far East. But the Maritime Association of the Port of New York wants to use ships for sugar instead of for rubber, although the farmers of 23 States, if permitted, can grow more sugar.

On May 31 the Division of Priorities, Office of Production Management, issued a statement in which it said that copper had been on that day added to the list of vital defense metals under mandatory, industry-wide control. It pointed out that copper is urgently needed for the manufacture of shell cases, small-arms ammunition, fire-control equipment, power and telephone equipment, switchboards, generators, and parts in plane motors.

But the Maritime Association of the Port of New York wants to use ships to transport the sugar American farmers can raise, instead of using them for copper. In the face of the specific recommendations of the Maritime Commission for a reallocation of the Philippine quota and of the official declarations of that Commission, of the R. F. C., and the O. P. M., Mr. Callaghan seeks to convey the impression that the defense agencies have never taken a position, and that there is really no shipping shortage.

The Maritime Commission wants to use ships for rubber, tin, ores, and other strategic commodities instead of for sugar, but the Maritime Association of the Port of New York wants the House of Representatives to defeat the sugar bill so that instead of using our own home-grown sugar beets and sugarcane to supply the Philippine deficit, we must become dependent on Peru and San Domingo.

If, however, it will be difficult if not impossible to secure enough ships for Chilean copper, as O. P. M. predicts, where are we going to find the ships for Peruvian sugar?

Here, then, are the irrefutable facts:

1. This country urgently needs rubber, tin, ores, and other strategic commodities from the general area of the Philippines.

2. This country urgently needs copper from South America.

3. The United States Maritime Commission, for the purpose of obtaining strategic commodities, recommends that shipping from the Philippines be used to transport these commodities rather than sugar.

4. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is prepared to buy 500,000 tons of Chilean copper, but the Office of Production Management seriously doubts whether there will be sufficient shipping available to bring in all the copper we need.

5. The New York Journal of Commerce shows that shipping rates have increased approximately 500 percent in the last 8 months.

6. The beet farmers of the United States, who have been compelled this year to reduce their plantings by 170,000 acres, and the producers of Louisiana and Florida sugarcane, who will be permitted to market only 448,000 tons while they are capable of producing 580,000, can supply sugar for the American consumer without the use of a single ship and without impeding the importation of strategic commodities needed for national and hemispheric defense. Let me remark that it is a good deal more important for San Domingo, Peru, Cuba, and, incidentally, the port of New York, that we get rubber, tin, and copper in sufficient quantities to perfect our hemispheric defenses than that Latin America send in and New York City receive sugar which we can produce at home.

It will be noted that the brunt of Mr. Callaghan's attack is directed against the growing of sugar beets, and he charges that this domestic industry is subsidized by the Government at the expense of the consumers of this country. This is a common charge by those who do not understand the sugar law and those who understand it so well that they would like to undo it for the purpose of making the consumers of the United States once more wholly dependent upon the seaboard refiners of cane sugar.

The charge is demonstrably unsound. It is supported by arguments which, consciously or unconsciously, misrepresent the facts, as in the case of Mr. Callaghan's misquotation of Vice President WALLACE. In his letter to you he writes about "subsidy system for sugar which, according to the Vice President of the United States, HENRY A. WALLACE, costs consumers and the Public Treasury some $350,000,000 a year." Vice President WALLACE has not made any such statement. As Secretary of Agriculture, he endorsed and supported sugar legislation from the beginning. In 1937, when a decision of the Supreme Court had invalidated the processing tax and when the sugar industry was seeking to continue the quota system without the tax, Secretary WALLACE argued for the tax, but not against the quota system nor against the beet-sugar industry.

A reading of the whole letter shows that the argument of Mr. WALLACE was that a sugar act without a processing tax would result in undue profits for the refiner at the expense of both the farmers and the consumers. It will be observed that the Secretary was comparing the cost of sugar to American consumers in 1936 to the depressed prices that prevailed in the world market. The whole purpose of the sugar legislation was to provide reasonable prices and a stabilized market for all engaged in the sugar industry—producers, processors, seaboard refiners, agriculture workers, refinery workers, and consumers. It was enacted precisely because the depressed prices of the world market made it impossible for any factor in the sugar industry to operate at a profit.

Consumers were protected by the provisions of the bill under which the Secretary of Agriculture determines the amount of sugar to be consumed. He may raise his estimates if the price should get out of line. So successful has the operation been that the retail prices of sugar since the enactment of the Sugar Act have been lower than at any time in the history of the sugar industry.

If American consumers should again be obliged to depend for their sugar supply upon shipping facilities from off-shore areas and upon a refiner-controlled industry, they might expect to see again the prices which they paid during the last war. The average prices year by year during that crisis went up steadily from 9.3 cents per pound in 1917 to 19.4 cents in 1920.

Under the Sugar Act, despite the benefit payments to farmers of which Mr. Callaghan complains, the consumer has never paid more than 5.8 cents. These benefit payments are not a subsidy in any real sense of the word because they are paid out of the proceeds of a processing tax which is borne by the industry itself. The tax falls upon processors and growers, not upon the consumers, and amounts to a transfer of a portion of the excess profits of processing sugar from the processor to the farmer.

Without casting any burden upon the consumer, the Sugar Act has so reorganized the entire sugar industry that it has stabilized and improved conditions for every person engaged in it. It has been particularly successful in improving labor conditions upon the cane plantations in Hawaii and Puerto Rico

where, until this law was adopted, sugarcane was raised under the substandard labor conditions that have notoriously existed in Cuba and San Domingo.

To argue as the Maritime Association of the port of New York does that sugar beets should not be raised upon the family-sized farms of the 21 States now engaged in that industry, but that our sugar supply should be brought in from the Caribbean and Latin America, is merely to argue that for the benefit of the organized refining industry of New York City, the beet farmers of the United States should be driven from the industry and their place taken by the plantation exploited labor of areas which do not have our standards of social existence.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

WASHINGTON, *June 23.*

The German-Russian War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of discussion in the country about Russia's entrance into the war. There appears in the New York Times this morning an editorial entitled "America, Britain, and Russia." It is one of the outstanding editorials which it has been my privilege to read, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 26, 1941]

AMERICA, BRITAIN, AND RUSSIA

It will make for greater clarity in the thinking of the American people and for greater speed in the action of their Government if from the very start of this new discussion of our policy toward the German-Russian war, we drop the false and misleading slogan of "Help Russia" and concentrate our attention on the real aim: "Stop Hitler!"

Certainly, the only people in this country who want to "Help Russia," in the sense of helping Stalin, are the handful of our domestic Communists, who time and again have shown their hatred of every American principle, their unfailing intellectual dishonesty in the face of Stalin's twists and turns, and their willingness to sabotage our own defense program in any way they can.

The rest of us have no use whatever for the Government of Russia. We bear no ill will against the Russian people; we should like to cherish the hope that one unintended result of this new war may be to bring them closer to some kind of humane and democratic rule. But we have only the utmost detestation for the brutal regime of Stalin. And we have not the least desire to enhance the prestige of that regime, or to hail it as a new-found friend, or to help prolong its stay in power, or to increase its capacity to do us evil.

But the question of stopping Hitler is another matter. Every act of the Congress of the United States—from repeal of the arms embargo, through the adoption of compulsory military training; the decision to build a two-ocean Navy; and the passage of the Lease Lend Act—and every test of the sentiment of the American people, wherever and by whatever means that test was taken, reveals a deep and well-founded conviction that an aggressive, ruthless Nazi Germany is our most immediate danger—a danger now so rapidly expanding and so near to breaking down the defenses of the Atlantic world that our own free institutions have been put in deadly danger, and that they will remain in deadly danger until this Nazi Germany is halted in its tracks.

What has happened as a consequence of this sudden turn in the fortunes of the war is that we have now been given an unexpected opportunity not to help Russia but to help stop Hitler. That is what the American people want to do. That is why they are willing to pay unprecedented taxes, and why they are impatient with the old doctrine of business as usual, and why they demand that Congress pass such measures as the Lease Lend Act, and why they applaud their President every time he makes a fighting speech and leads them another bold step forward.

There are four compelling reasons, we believe, why American action at this new crisis in the war can best take the form not of helping Russia but of stopping Hitler by redoubling our aid to Britain. The names of these reasons are time, strategy, incompetence, and unity.

First, time: If there is one thing we ought now to have learned, it is that Hitler strikes with tremendous speed. We were going to help France, we were going to help Yugoslavia, and we were going to help Greece. Our help never got there. It never got there because the battle was over before we made up our minds to act. In the present case, even if our resources of weapons and munitions were inexhaustible—and they are not—we could not possibly transport these weapons and munitions across the Pacific and expect the Russians to transport them across Siberia in time to affect the critical stages of this new war on the eastern German front.

Second, strategy: By sending our weapons to Britain instead of Russia we can make them count at once. A thousand American bombers and pursuit ships and fighting planes, delivered at British ports within the next 3 weeks, might well be the decisive factor in the winning of this war. They would enable Britain to bomb Hitler's vital war industries almost at will while his hands are full on the eastern front; or else they would force Hitler to deflect a great part of his air power from the east to the west in order to defend himself, in which case there would be much greater likelihood of his bogging down interminably in Russia.

Third, incompetence: Even if we were willing now to trust a Russian Government which we have never trusted in the past, there is the question of competence as well as of good faith. The Government of Russia is notoriously incompetent. It is quite possible that American war material sent to Stalin would end up in Hitler's hands. That will never happen in the case of American war material sent to Britain. The British have shown both their courage and their ability to manage planes and ships. They will fight those planes and ships to the last ounce of strength that lies in them.

Fourth, unity: It is already clear that aid to Russia would involve the American people in a discussion of issues which are irrelevant to the all-important central question of seizing this chance to deal Hitler a deadly blow. American aid to Britain has had at every step the overwhelming support of our people.

The course is clear. Let the President comb our Army and our Navy for as many planes as can possibly be spared. Let him fly the big planes to Britain. Let him put the smaller planes aboard our ships. Let him arm those ships and give them the protection of our Navy, to make sure that they get there.

Now, with Hitler engaged in war upon two fronts, we have an opportunity for action that may never come again if it is lost. This is the time to strike.

The Proposed Trade Agreements With Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement submitted by me before the Committee on Reciprocity Information in opposition to proposed tariff-rate reductions in imports of agricultural commodities in connection with negotiations for reciprocal trade agreements with the governments of Argentina and Uruguay.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before your committee today to urge most respectfully that due consideration be given to the welfare of the farmers of the United States, in any trade agreements negotiated with the Governments of Argentina and Uruguay. I note that there are listed for consideration in the proposed negotiations under the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act a very comprehensive list of meats and meat products, practically all of which would be directly competitive with livestock production of the United States.

I wish to say that I appreciate the difficulties which your committee, and the State Department, face in negotiating trade agreements with any other nation. The United States is an industrial nation. Naturally our manufacturers are seeking foreign markets. But the United States also produces surpluses of a number of farm commodities.

Naturally, our manufacturers desire that these agreements, when completed, provide increased foreign markets for their manufactured products, but not increased domestic markets for products of foreign manufacturers. And naturally, also, the American farmers, paying higher wages and higher prices than farmers of other nations, do not desire to have the American market flooded with farm commodities produced in foreign lands.

I believe I appreciate also the fact that in the present world situation, there is a great desire on the part of the Government of the United States—and I am in hearty sympathy with that desire—to cultivate friendly relations and increase trade with the nations of South America. We want to be good neighbors to the South American peoples. We want them to be good neighbors of ours. And all of us are in agreement on that kind of a policy. We want to be good neighbors with the farmers of Argentina and Uruguay.

But, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Reciprocity Information, I

would also call to your attention the fact that you have some farmer neighbors even closer than in Argentina and Uruguay. These are the farmers of the United States; the farmers of Kansas, whom I represent, and all the other States in the Union. Particularly affected by any trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay probably will be those farmers engaged in the production of livestock, and those States and communities depending largely upon livestock production for income and purchasing power.

The importance of the proposed trade agreements with these two nations to the people of the Corn Belt, the Great Plains, the Southwest, and the cattle country of the Northwest, is plain when one reads the list of articles included in the scope of the proposed negotiations. For the record, I will call special attention at this point to these items:

Argentina: Casein, vegetable oils, tallow, oleo oil and oleo stearine, meat extract, prepared and preserved meats, cheeses, corned-beef hash, wools, cattle hides and skins, dog food, blood, bones, lamb and sheep fur and skins, fertilizers, hoofs, horns, sausage casings, and horse, sheep, lamb, goat, and kid skins.

Uruguay: Casein, tallow, oleo oil and oleo stearine, meat extract, preserved and prepared meats, wools, wool pelts, cattle hides and skins, blood, bones, fertilizers, and sausage casings.

In other words, Argentina and Uruguay have surpluses for export, and seek a market for those surpluses in the United States, of many of the same farm products which the farmers of the United States already produce in surplus quantities. Any agreements made which allow increased importations of these commodities into the United States threaten irreparable injury to the farmers, particularly the livestock producers of the United States.

I believe I am entitled to presume that the main purpose of the proposed trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay is to increase our trade with these countries; another purpose is presumably political rather than economic—to promote hemisphere defense.

Now, I am in favor of building up our foreign trade, but not at the expense of our domestic welfare.

I am not in favor of sacrificing the farmers of the United States to promote our foreign trade.

Any attempt to build up our foreign trade at the expense of our domestic economy is attacking the problem from the wrong angle.

I hold it is fundamental that our trade with foreign countries flourishes most in periods of domestic prosperity.

When farmers have adequate purchasing power, then is when we import the largest quantities of necessities and spend most freely for foreign luxuries.

The intelligent way to stimulate and expand foreign trade is to create a sound domestic prosperity. In the long run, trade depends upon markets. Markets depend upon purchasing power.

Anything which improves the purchasing power of the American people will encourage foreign trade. Anything which tends to destroy the purchasing power of the American people, or of any considerable group of the American people, defeats the admittedly desirable objective of increasing foreign trade.

I favor increasing our foreign trade through policies that will increase the purchasing power of the American market.

I am opposed to what I consider the fallacy of trying to build up our foreign trade through diminishing the purchasing power of the American market.

It is my contention that if these proposed trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay are to be effective they must result in diminishing the purchasing power of those great areas in the West and Southwest that are so largely dependent upon a prosperous agriculture, particularly a prosperous livestock industry, for general prosperity in those areas.

Now, it seems to me there are one or two things in connection with these reciprocal trade agreements that are almost self-evident.

The reciprocal trade-agreements policy is based upon a mutual adjustment of tariff rates downward. I believe it is self-evident that the purpose of reducing the tariff rate on any commodity is to encourage the country with which the agreement is made to believe it will dispose of larger quantities of that commodity in the American market.

It happens that nearly all the exportable products of Argentina are directly competitive with the products of American farms.

When it is proposed that changes be made in the tariff rates on numerous farm products of Argentina, we are entitled to believe—and Argentina is entitled to believe—that means more of the Argentina farm products will be imported into the United States.

If it does not mean that, then our State Department would be guilty of attempting to flimflam the Argentine people—and we know that Secretary Hull would not be guilty of flimflamming those people.

If it does mean that, it seems to me almost inescapable that these increased imports from Argentina will either displace an equivalent amount of United States produced products in the United States market and/or force a lower price for all the commodity sold in the United States. When you increase imports of farm products into a domestic market already oversupplied, you drive the market price of that commodity downward. I hope this committee will bear that in mind in making its recommendations for tariff reductions on farm commodities from Argentina and Uruguay, also bearing in mind that these reductions also will apply to other nations.

I have no doubt you will be told that the additional imports will be so small, in comparison to the total domestic consumption, that the price effect will be imperceptible. That is just not true. The effect is not imperceptible. It is immediate and very noticeable.

The reason for this is simple. In an open market the lowest offer sets the price. And in the United States we have normally an open market on farm commodities.

Without reviewing the entire history of the reciprocal trade agreements so far negotiated, I will simply state that the experience of American agriculture under these agreements has not been particularly happy. Tariff reductions on farm commodities have increased trade in those commodities, but the increase has been in imports of competitive agricultural products or products that are similar to or interchangeable with farm commodities produced commercially inside the United States.

Importations of such competitive products were valued at $486,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939, as compared to $410,000,000 in fiscal year 1934, before the act became effective. That was an increase of some 16 percent. In those 5 years imports of unmanufactured tobacco increased from $25,000,000 to $38,000,000; vegetable oils, from $38,000,000 to $54,000,000; flaxseed from $18,800,000 to $21,800,000; wool imports, $10,400,000 to $16,700,000; canned beef (including corned beef), $2,700,000 to $8,400,000; cattle, $700,000 to $16,700,000. On the other hand, farm exports dropped 13 percent, from $787,000,000 in 1934 to $683,000,000 in 1939.

Now it is proposed to make additional reductions in tariffs on farm products. That State Department's announcement indicates that tariffs will be reduced on important dairy products, animal products, fruits, vegetables, farm crops. Of course, none of us will know until after the agreements are completed, upon what items tariff reductions will be made, nor how much the reductions will be; presumably around 50 percent.

No matter how much language is used to make these trade agreements sound palatable, the fact cannot be escaped that the real purpose is to increase imports of farm products into the United States from these countries.

If it is argued in support of these proposed trade agreements that they are necessary to our national defense and our national security, it seems to me that is in effect arguing our national defense depends upon importing food and other farm products from beyond our shores. Administration spokesmen also contend that to have a strong national defense we must increase our economic efficiency and promote the national welfare. I fail to see how reducing tariffs and encouraging the importation of foreign-produced farm products, while the Federal Government is spending a billion dollars a year to curtail production of farm commodities in the United States is sound economics. The trade agreements and the A. A. A. taken together just don't make sense.

I can even remember back to the time when President Roosevelt himself—in a campaign speech at Baltimore in October 1932—assured farmers he would not reduce tariffs on farm products. The very thought of doing such a thing he declared to be "absurd." He knew of "no effective excessive high tariff duties on farm products" and as I remember it, promised specifically that such duties would not be lowered. It is only fair to state, however, that since that time there have been some 150 or so reductions in tariffs on farm products, in connection with the trade-agreements program. It seems sometimes to us out in the Farm Belt that promotion of foreign trade through these trade agreements consists in providing for more and more imports of farm commodities, and increasing exports of nonfarm manufactured goods.

I know it is contended that lowering duties on farm products and increasing imports of farm products will provide foreign countries with necessary dollar exchange to buy our products. Specifically, that we reduce tariffs on flaxseed, dairy products, meat products, and so on, Argentina and Uruguay will increase their sales of these commodities to us, and in return will then buy more from us. But they will buy nonfarm products. In other words, this program compels the American farmer in effect to finance the farmers of Argentina and Uruguay on the one hand, and the American manufacturers on the other.

Rather interestingly, the things which these countries take from the United States are largely products which are secondary to our own national defense and to the aid-to-Britain program; some of them articles on which it is proposed to put heavy taxes so that our own people will buy fewer of them so the materials in them will be available for national-defense industries. And that doesn't seem to make any more sense than does the program of paying American farmers not to produce because of surpluses, and then encouraging imports of these surplus farm commodities.

That leaves the argument that we must negotiate these trade agreements—and provide for increased imports of farm commodities already produced in surplus or, as in the case with beef cattle, which will be produced in surplus quantities as the cattle cycle moves upward—in the interest of hemisphere defense. In other words, we must buy from these countries to hold them in line, just as Britain bought tobacco from Turkey (at the expense of our tobacco growers) to hold Turkey in line. After which Turkey entered into an agreement with Hitler, I believe.

Now, I will say this much. If I believed these proposed agreements would aid in hemisphere defense; if the proposed agreements did not jeopardize the American farmer; if the agreements were required to be ratified by the Senate—then I would be unequivocally in favor of proceeding with the negotiations. But I do not believe these agreements are necessary to hemisphere defense; their effect will be to depress farm prices, reduce farm income, seriously impair farm purchasing power; the agreements are not subject to review by either branch of Congress.

Furthermore, I would point out that the present tariffs are not so high as to shut out imports from these countries. In 1940 we bought $17,629,000 worth of goods from Uruguay, and sold only $11,275,000 worth in return. What is more, our purchases from Uruguay were 88 percent larger than in 1939. Our purchases—imports—from Argentina increased 35 percent over 1939 in 1940. We took more wool (164 percent increase); more animal products, more dairy products, hides and skins, undressed furs, corn, oats, bran, pears, tungsten ore, lead ores, tin ores, than in 1939. Our present tariffs are not prohibitive; they do serve as a measure of protection for the American farmer. And I maintain that protection should be continued, in the interest of farmer morale as a necessary part of sound national defense.

In closing I appeal to the committee, and to the State Department, to show as much good will and good neighbor spirit in dealing with the welfare of the American farmer as in taking care of the interests of the farmers of Argentina and Uruguay.

The Services of the Catholic Hospital As a Health-Caring Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA, BEFORE CATHOLIC HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the 17th of June last, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] delivered an address in Philadelphia before the Catholic Hospital Association. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate greatly the privilege of addressing this meeting of the Catholic Hospital Association of the United States and Canada.

As a member of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor I have for some years been actively interested in the subject of national health and in the problems incident to the expansion and improvement of facilities for the care and treatment of the sick and indigent among our citizens. In connection with our legislative activities in Washington we have often had the benefit of the valuable experience and advice of your able representatives appearing before our committee hearings. It is therefore appropriate that I should take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the splendid assistance rendered by your association and its able officers in connection with these national problems.

I feel particularly indebted to Father Alphonse M. Schwitalla, president of your association, and the Reverend Morris F. Griffin, senior trustee of your association, both of whom have on many occasions attended our hearings and rendered conspicuous aid in the study of these important problems. I must not fail to also mention Mr. William F. Montavon, director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, of Washington, D. C., who has likewise been of material assistance to us in Washington in considering these problems.

For a long period of time the Catholic hospitals have been an unfailing source of social strength among the private agencies devoted to the service of the sick and the control of illness. The great service which has been rendered by Catholic hospitals in these two countries can never be fully evaluated. History shows us that the establishment of Catholic hospitals in Canada and the United States roughly approximates the onward movement of cultural areas. This was true in the days of the Spanish exploration and settlement of the great Southwest and likewise appears true in the case of the pioneers who founded Quebec and Montreal, whose advent was coincident with the establishment of Catholic hospitals in Canada.

To the daring pioneering spirit of the sisters who planted the Catholic hospitals at the frontier of the western march of culture we owe a debt which can never be paid. Their supreme courage, their unfaltering faith, and their progressiveness in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles have carried the Catholic hospitals to a high pinnacle in the social development of the United States and Canada.

Another source of high service to both nations is the idealism, unselfishness, and motivation of the Catholic hospital sisters. The Catholic hospital, in almost all areas where it has gained a foothold, has been a center of diffusion of social influences for the betterment of the people. While they have played a leading part in the technical development of our hospitals, their spiritual contributions have been of greater significance.

We hear altogether too much emphasis upon economics in health care and too little of the importance of the individual's triumph over himself in the maintenance of health and in the endu ance of illness. The Catholic hospital has not minimized the evils of illness, and has, of course, bent all its efforts to the eradication of disease and the promotion of health. But neither has it seen in illness the one great social evil which so many present-day advocates of national-health programs would have us to believe it is. The philosophy of life that sees only evil in human suffering, and fails to recognize that in suffering there often appears a hidden benefit which enables many a patient to step from the depths of depravity to a better and fuller life, precisely because of his illness, is a philosophy which in the present day is popular, but, manifestly, a mistaken one. It is in this field of spirituality that the Catholic hospital sister exercises such a profound influence and has given the Catholic hospital such a high position in the life of these two nations.

Life is the greatest of our material possessions, and the health of our people is our greatest national asset. Today, far more than in any normal times, it is necessary to safeguard the health of the people of our democracies, and to strengthen the social services which are vital to the operation and the survival of democracy as a way of life. In these trying times service to the sick and prevention of disease are especially important in helping people meet the stress and strain involved in this great world crisis affecting so seriously these two democratic nations.

Although the well-being of the populations of the United States and Canada has vastly improved in the last 50 years, much remains to be done. For example, in the United States we are now deeply concerned over the high proportion of rejections under the United States Selective Service Act because of physical and mental infirmities uncovered among the enrollees. The figures recently made available confirm the conclusions from numerous surveys and special studies that a large amount of ill health persists, even in the years of life when health should be at its highest level. To effectively reduce the burdens and suffering caused by preventable sickness, all our existing facilities, private as well as governmental, must be used with the greatest skill we can command.

The growth of Catholic hospitals has been coincident with the settlement, expansion, and cultural developments of the United States and Canada. Indeed, so great has been the growth of these hospitals that, in the year 1940, in the United States and Canada combined, there were 900 Catholic hospitals and over 400 Catholic medical, health, and nursing agencies. The 689 Catholic hospitals in the United States in 1940 equal about 10 percent of all registered and nonregistered hospitals in the country. It is significant to note that Catholic hospitals comprise more than two-thirds of all the registered hospitals operated by church organizations in the United States.

I have been interested to review the extent of the facilities which the Catholic hospitals of the United States and Canada have available and the amount of service they furnish. The figures are impressive and worthy of note. Exclusive of other medical and institutional agencies, during 1940 these hospitals maintained more than 127,000 beds to meet the hospitalization needs of these countries. An additional 30,000 beds would be added to this number if the beds in other Catholic medical and institutional agencies were considered. In the continental United States, of a total of about 121,000 beds in all hospitals operated by religious organizations, Catholic hospitals contained over 92,000 beds, or more than three-fourths.

It is not enough to supply hospital beds and facilities; it is more important that they be utilized. Hence, more significant than the figures I have cited are the facts concerning the use of the Catholic hospitals. In 1940, in both countries, over 3,000,000 patients received more than 33,000,000 days of hospitalization. Somewhat more than two-thirds of the patients and of the hospital days apply to the United States and somewhat less than one-third to Canada. Also, it is heartening to note that the use and occupancy rates of the hospitals are increasing.

The importance of the Catholic hospitals in the hospital system of the United States is further evident when it is noted that the patients admitted to Catholic hospitals in the United States comprise about 25 percent of all patients admitted to all general hospitals in the country and about 86 percent of all patients admitted to all church hospitals.

It would be expected that hospitals owned and operated by a church whose fundamental precepts include the care of the poor would provide a considerable amount of charitable service. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that in the United States about 18 percent of the patient-days of care furnished in the Catholic hospitals in 1940 were given without cost to the patient. In Canada, the corresponding figure was 45 percent for free service. The number of free patients in the Catholic hospitals of the United States declined during 1940 by 11,000 under the figure for 1939. This reduction in free service is not, I understand, the result of any change in policy with respect to furnishing free care.

It was probably due to economic improvements in the condition of the people and to a greater participation by the hospitals in the funds set aside by other private agencies and by government bodies for the support of the poor and the indigent in need of hospital service. Group hospitalization plans have also had a part in reducing the demand for free hospital care in the areas where these insurance plans are in operation. Apparently, such private and governmental funds are not as substantial in Canada as in the United States; the volume of free service increased in Canada from 37 percent in 1938 to 43 percent in 1939 and further increased to 45 percent in 1940.

The financial burdens, of which the Catholic hospitals relieve many whom they serve, are indicated not only by the figures on free service but also by the large proportion of persons who pay only part of the cost of hospital care. In the United States and Canada during 1940, 32 percent of all the patients served in the Catholic hospitals received care at partial cost. Thus, more than 58 percent of the patients hospitalized in the Catholic hospitals of the United States and Canada combined received free care or care at partial cost. In Canada, 72 percent of the patients received free or part-pay care.

Even this brief review of services rendered to the sick by the Catholic hospitals would not be complete without mention of the care given by these hospitals to nonhospitalized patients. Catholic hospitals have established extensive facilities for aiding such individuals. In the United States, 133 organized out-patient departments are recorded for Catholic hospitals; also, 314 hospitals have reported that they maintain emergency services and 268 that they operate facilities for the care of ambulatory patients. In Canada, the Catholic hospitals have 117 departments providing these services. These various kinds of out-patient facilities have given aid to a total of about one and three-quarter million sick persons in both the United States and Canada. Thus, it is quite apparent from even these few statistics that the Catholic hospitals are not unmindful of patients who need care but who do not require full hospital bed service.

Of all the hospitals operated by the various religious organizations, those operated by the Catholic Church are the most important from the standpoint of number and volume of services rendered to society. Not only are they important in this sense alone, but also because their services are not restricted to Catholics. It is noteworthy that of the total number of patients served in the Catholic hospitals of the United States in 1940, or in 1939, about 60 percent were non-Catholic patients. Since most of the Catholic hospitals of Canada are located in the Province of Quebec, which is predominantly Catholic, it is not surprising to find that only 39 percent of the patients in the Catholic hospitals of Canada were non-Catholics.

These few facts concerning the Catholic hospitals and their operation indicate that they have had and have a very important place in the provision of health services in the United States and Canada. Also, the Catholic hospitals have not only played an important part in providing medical care, but they also carry great responsibilities and are making large contributions in the training of medical personnel of all important types.

These brief and general considerations of Catholic hospital facilities and services must be supplemented by a few comments directed to the special problems of today. Speaking of our own country alone, it is quite obvious that the hospitals of the United States have a very important part in our preparedness program. And the Catholic hospitals, as the largest representative of church hospitals, will undoubtedly contribute to the medical preparedness problems of today as effectively as they have done in the past.

Not only will your hospitals contribute to the prevention and care of physical and mental ill-health; but just as important, if not more so, they will contribute to the enlargement of the medical, nursing, and other technical personnel so vital to our national well-being, especially in this time of national emergency.

At this time when many physicians are being called into the military services, it is of the utmost importance that they be replaced with well-trained physicians and that the supply of physicians be not only unimpeded but, if possible, even increased. The Catholic hospitals have rendered valuable service in the training of physicians through their participation with medical schools and through the many interneships and residencies available in these hospitals. There can be no question about the desirable continuance and expansion of these functions. One avenue of approach to increase their public service would be to see that all Catholic hospitals do everything within their capacity to meet high professional standards and thereby become qualified for the training of interns and residents.

The Federal Government is acutely aware of these needs and opportunities. I am confident it will endeavor to minimize the effects of defense requirements in interrupting the training and supply of physicians, or in reducing the opportunities of the hospitals for civilian service.

As some of you know, I have given much effort to the development, under the national-defense program, of an orderly policy to safeguard the education and training of medical students, and to assure a constant supply of trained physicians. I heretofore introduced in Congress a bill providing for the deferment of medical and dental students, interns, and resident physicians. I am, therefore, gratified to note that, as a result of hearings on that measure, Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Deputy Director of Selective Service, on March 4 proclaimed a policy of deferment from military training of individual medical students, and also a qualified deferment of interns. In announcing the policy of deferring medical students, General Hershey recognized that there could be no replacements for students withdrawn from medical schools, and that, if the supply of medical students who are to be graduated into the medical profession is reduced through their induction to serve in nonprofessional capacities, an increasing reduction of physicians available for military service, as well as an aggravation of the increasing over-all national shortage, would result.

Our need for auxiliary medical personnel is also, or is likely to become, acute. In all these fields of education and training I am confident that our Catholic hospitals and institutions will give generous and wholehearted help.

The quality of the training which nurses have obtained in the nursing schools connected with Catholic hospitals has been of high order. I understand that these schools can substantially increase the number of students they undertake to train and that this subject is receiving careful attention. Judging by the past, we have good reason to assume that the Catholic hospitals will not only do their share in the training of additional nurses, but that they will also carefully review the services now performed by nurses and make whatever adjustments are necessary and practicable so that the professional skills of nurses may be utilized to the fullest.

Without a doubt, it will be feasible to increase the number of trained laboratory technicians and other technical personnel. Training of personnel is an important aspect of defense in which the Catholic hospitals can aid our nations.

Today, more than ever, it is important to view the work and the opportunities of hospitals from a broad perspective. It is not enough to serve only the immediate patients in the beds or in the out-patient facilities. It is necessary to utilize health-service opportunities in all their aspects. Every city, town, and village in our countries is affected by the health problems created by national-defense activities in addition to the health problems already there.

Nutrition, for example, is now being recognized as a major problem. Advances in knowledge concerning human nutrition which have been made in the past two or three decades should be made effective in the daily life of every family in our nations. The cooperation of the Catholic hospitals can be of great aid in spreading such knowledge through the programs of health education, dietetics, and effective family budgeting. We must recognize, of course, that it is not enough for our people to know what the right foods are; this alone will not assure physical and mental health and vigor. Nutritional knowledge is useless without a basic economic security or, in plain words, enough family income for the purchase of essential foods. So, a nutritional health program must be accompanied by sound measures for economic security to assure work and income and social security for the family.

In times of stress new health problems constantly arise. They must be met and solved. They will entail considerable scientific study and research. The well-equipped personnel and laboratories of the Catholic hospitals can render important service.

Health needs are particularly serious in those areas where defense activities are concentrating new or larger populations. In attacking the problems of sanitation, medical care, and public health—including the prevention and control of communicable disease and the special protection of mothers, children, and infants—there will be need in many areas for the extension and multiplication of public-health services. In other places it will be necessary to create entirely new services. And the special services, facilities, and programs designed to deal with health problems will need to be closely coordinated with educational, recreational, religious, and other activities.

The new industrial areas multiply manyfold our tasks in the field of industrial hygiene. To insure productivity for defense, not only is it necessary to have fair working conditions for the worker in regard to wages and hours, but also our factories and mines must be so operated that industrial accidents and diseases and industrial fatigue will be reduced to a minimum.

However, we must not concentrate so intently on the health problems arising from industrial and military projects that we neglect the health of civilians in our nations. Thus, for example, special attention must be given to the correction of physical defects in those young men who would otherwise be eligible for military service; yet it is equally important that we make adequate provision for the health needs of the civilian population to insure their fullest participation in the defense efforts of our nations. A considerable number of Catholic hospitals are located in the defense areas of the United States. These hospitals will, I am confident, play a strategic part in meeting the varied needs of these communities.

We must never forget that health is not a negative concept; it is positive; its fullest expression requires a well-rounded life. Therefore, those interested in promoting health must be fully aware of the importance of wholesome recreation. As you know, there has recently been established the United Service Organizations to provide for the leisure-time activities of defense workers and members of the armed forces. It is gratifying that the Catholic Hospital Association is

a member of the National Catholic Community Service, a unit of the United Service Organizations.

I appreciate that I have dwelt at great length on the statistics of Catholic hospitals and other medical facilities, and I have indicated a few of the specific ways in which these hospitals and facilities can aid in the national-defense program. I am not unaware that statistics, though informative, do not usually form the basis of an entertaining address; and yet these simple facts and figures in relation to the origin, development, and expansion of Catholic hospitals in the United States and Canada are a truly inspiring story of cultural growth in our two countries. The self-sacrificing character and spiritual strength of the personnel of our Catholic hospitals needs no encomium from me. Facts speak more effectively and more eloquently than any mere words of mine.

In any final sense, service for the sick is primarily a spiritual undertaking. The devotion of your personnel, in the service of their fellow men, is the leaven that our nations need most of all to strengthen their activities toward the supreme goals of democratic and Christian living.

Food for Small Democracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY RAYMOND S. RICHMOND

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of an address delivered over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. on Saturday, June 21, by Raymond S. Richmond, secretary of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies. This address, entitled "Food for the Small Democracies," was part of the weekly farm and home period of the National Grange, which has endorsed the proposal for finding a formula through which millions of helpless and unarmed fellow humans in the small nations, overrun by the Germans, may be saved from starvation and subsequent pestilence. Mr. Richmond's address gives the essential factors relative to Senate Resolution No. 124, which was recently presented jointly by 37 Senators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Millions of Americans are listening to this program in the comfort of well-ordered homes. Not far from their living room is the kitchen and in the kitchen it is probable there is a well-filled ice box. If any in this listening audience should feel even mildly hungry, that hunger can be satisfied by walking a few steps and opening the ice-box door.

Hunger in this land of plenty is something very transient. It is even something pleasant because it merely awaits satiation by the eating of the next meal. And in the United States there is always a next meal. No citizen of our country is starving or needs to starve. How fortunate our lot.

Let me give you a tragic—an appalling tragic—contrast. Millions are starving in the small invaded democracies as I talk. Theirs is a terrible gnawing hunger—a hunger they have absolutely no means of satisfying. They have no ice box, or if they have it is as empty as Mother Hubbard's cupboard.

MILLIONS THREATENED WITH STARVATION

The war in Europe has already slain its thousands. Starvation threatens to slay its millions. And back of starvation crouches the unfailing companion of mass malnutrition—pestilence.

In Belgium and Poland unarmed defenseless populations are starving. The food situation in these countries is tragically acute. It is hardly less acute in Norway. The Netherlands are beginning to feel the pinch. Finland, although not at war, has been intermittently blockaded. She is suffering extreme hardship. Some of these little countries import as high as 50 percent of their foodstuffs when life is normal there.

There is only one voice that can save these peoples. That is the voice of the American people. That voice is being raised in increasing volume. The starvation of these friendly small nations, who have always lived at peace with us, is something that cannot and must not be hushed.

Belgium, Poland, Norway, and the Netherlands are caught and helplessly pinioned between two mighty forces. One is the German invasion and the other is the British blockade.

Through no fault of theirs, millions of children, women, aged, and infirm in these small invaded countries are slipping day by day down toward the valley of the shadow of death. They cannot revolt. They haven't arms. They haven't the physical strength. If they are permitted to starve they will even lose the will to revolt. They must be saved. Hunger will not wait. While we, in the well-fed comfort of our homes, debate the rights and wrongs of Europe's devastation, these small invaded nations totter on the brink of the world's greatest mass catastrophe.

Millions of Americans are gravely concerned about the situation. They insist that something be done. A Nation-wide committee has been formed to enlighten the American public and to assist in finding a formula through which the lives of these helpless folk may be saved. This committee, of which Herbert Hoover is the honorary chairman and of which I have the honor to be secretary, has on its roster 900 outstanding citizens, representing every State in the Union. Back of the national committee are 4,000 local committees.

"GIVE US THIS DAY OUR DAILY BREAD"

This is not a pressure committee. Democrats and Republicans alike are united in common cause—the saving, rather than the destruction, of human life. In Congress its supporters are drawn from both parties. This is not a political question. The members of the Committee believe they are following the teachings of Holy Writ. "Give us this day our daily bread" is to these men and women of the committee more than just an isolated line from the Lord's Prayer. Forty million helpless people in the small invaded democracies are breathing that line from the prayer of prayers, with hope in their hearts, as they stretch out their hands to us in their desperate hour.

Will America, her granaries bursting with burdensome food surpluses—surpluses so great that they constitute an economic liability—hear the piteous plea of these small peoples, who are not our enemies, but our loyal friends?

There are those who want to go to war to rescue these peoples from the invader. There are those who, while wanting to save these peoples, are willing to starve them in the meantime, which is a curious paradox. They say the food blockade is Great Britain's chief weapon. They contend that any system of food relief will aid Hitler. They believe Germany is being starved out. Let us examine, in the cold light of reason, these contentions.

If the intention of the blockade is to starve Germany, that weapon is falling on the just and not on the unjust. It is clear that Germany is 88 percent self-sufficient in foodstuffs. It is Germany's victims, Great Britain's allies, who are starving. Yesterday I talked with an American who has just returned from Berlin. He tells me that while there are no table delicacies to be had in Germany, none there are near starvation or are likely to be. True, the meals are uninteresting, but they are meals and they sustain life at a reasonable level. So much for the effect of the blockade on Germany.

It may well be that Germany has a moral and ethical obligation to feed the conquered peoples. Does anyone expect the German military machine to be motivated by morals or ethics? None of us are that naive. Germany's moves are plotted and charted in Germany's interest alone.

DIFFICULTIES CAN BE OVERCOME

Millions of Americans believe that agreements can be reached between the belligerent governments and representatives of the captive democracies, whereby the starving in these countries can be fed without benefit to Germany or without in any way impairing Great Britain's heroic defense. If agreements are reached, and they are violated by Germany, the experiment can be stopped and the everlasting onus for mass starvation will not then rest on Great Britain and her blockade and the United States with her enormous food surpluses. And the whole world knows we have these life-saving surpluses.

The National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies recently made a proposal for a trial feeding in Belgium through which 3,000,000 children, women, and unemployed men would be fed on the spot by soup kitchens. This trial feeding would require monthly 25,000 tons of breadstuffs and 20,000 tons of meat, fats, beans, peas, and rice for soup materials and milk and cocoa for children.

The Germans have agreed to furnish the soup kitchens the 25,000 tons of breadstuffs monthly. They have agreed to refrain from requisitioning imported and native food supplies. They have agreed not to attack mercy ships. The 20,000 tons per month of soup materials needed is definitely not available on the Continent of Europe, and must be imported through the food blockade. All of Europe is experiencing a destructive shortage of fats. To date the British Government has declined to lift the blockade to let the 20,000 tons of soup materials get through to these starving friends of theirs and ours.

It is proposed that the trial feeding be administered by a neutral commission, which would safeguard the guaranties. Under the trial-feeding plan there would be no large supply of foodstuffs on hand at any one time. If the Germans violated their agreement, the German Nation could not possibly benefit from a military standpoint and the experiment could be abandoned forthwith.

American ships need not be used in transporting supplies to the stricken countries. There is neutral shipping available from unembroiled nations.

DEMOCRACIES NOT ASKING FOR CHARITY

These people are not asking for American charity, unless compassion itself is the highest form of charity. They want to buy our food with their money. The exiled Belgian Government has funds with which to finance the test feeding and has indicated its willingness to use those funds on behalf of its people. Further, the Belgian Government has urged the British to permit the test feeding.

The Netherlands and Norway have money to finance the feeding of their starving citizens.

Some funds may be needed for Poland, where there has been a limited feeding of 50,000 children under way for many months. This operation has been conducted by the Commission for Polish Relief, Inc., an American body. The Polish commission has sustained its work through occasional small grants from the Polish Government and through voluntary subscriptions on the part of Americans of Polish ancestry, of whom there are several million in the United States. I do want to make it absolutely clear that the American public will not be asked to raise money for these test feedings. America is asked to raise its voice to the end that the pending mass tragedy may be averted. Time after time Mr. Hoover, as the guiding spirit of the food committee, has been appealed to by the exiled governments and by prominent and trustworthy citizens in the countries involved to continue his efforts to save them.

GENERAL PERSHING AND ADMIRAL PRATT APPROVE PLAN

Let me enlarge for a few moments on the statement that the feeding of these starving captive peoples can be accomplished without military gain for the Germans. I am going to give you the exact statements made by two men who should know. The first is Gen. John J. Pershing, our World War commander. He said recently:

"I wish to send my greetings to those who are endeavoring to find a method by which food supplies can be furnished to the democracies in Europe occupied by the German armies. There is no doubt millions are in jeopardy unless they are given aid from somewhere. From my own war experience and some knowledge of the problems involved, I have every confidence that the salvation of these people can be worked out along the lines proposed by Mr. Hoover without military loss or benefit on either side. The interest of this committee in maintaining American ideals and the friendship to America of these nations by saving these millions is worthy of every support."

Admiral William V. Pratt, who dealt with the blockade in the past war and who long commanded the United States fleet, said:

"I have no hesitation in saying that this aid can be given under Mr. Hoover's proposals without any damage to Great Britain. Taking the long view of the future of constructive forces in the world and America's relation to it, it is of vital importance to America that Mr. Hoover's plans be carried through. Not only is the need pressing now, but what is of equal or more importance, an organization must be perfected now to start a more extensive campaign when this war is over. Only America will be able to meet this emergency."

There is now pending before the Senate of the United States Senate Resolution No. 124, dealing in full with this tragic problem. The resolution was presented recently by Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma on behalf of himself and 36 other Senators. The resolution has been referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator WALTER F. GEORGE is chairman.

The resolved section of the resolution recites:

"Resolved, That the Senate of the United States does express the conviction that immediate steps should be taken to formulate some plan to prevent this impending tragedy of mass starvation in the various countries heretofore named, by the institution of a system of complete guardianship of relief guaranties through some neutral agency or government; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate of the United States, through the Secretary of State, endeavors as quickly as possible to work out, in cooperation with the British Government and the accredited representatives of the other governments concerned, the setting up of systematic and definite relief for all stricken and hungry countries, beginning with Belgium, where the need is now the most acute; this relief to be based on agreements by the belligerents for the protection of the native and imported food supplies, with rigid safeguarding of such relief so that no military advantage whatever may accrue to the civil populations or the armed forces of the invading nations."

MANY SENATORS FAVOR PROPOSAL

Millions of Americans hope this resolution will be favorably reported out of the Committee on Foreign Relations and that it will be adopted by the Senate at an early date. We know the resolution has tremendous support in the Senate as well as throughout the country. If you agree that we must try to do something to save the lives of these people it would be helpful if you would make your own compassionate feeling known by writing your own Senators and Congressman.

Unless something is done to save these people, democracy on the Continent of Europe is forever doomed. These people are our friends. They subscribe to our pattern of life. Up to the limit of their abilities they have tried to hold aloft the torch of freedom and the ideal of respect for the rights of their fellow man.

AMERICA MUST NOT FAIL THEM

We dare not fail these little countries. If we coldly turn our backs on their plight, their belief in us will wither and die and the mothers and fathers of babies who perish, and others who grow up with horrible malformations, will excoriate us through many decades to come. Our alleged compassion and mercy will be a bitter myth to them.

The wounds of war can be healed, but the wounds resulting from a cold-blooded and callous policy of starvation will never heal. By raising our strong voice on behalf of our helpless European friends we can keep alive in their hearts their belief in God and His mercy. We can prove to these little nations again, and for all time, that the spirit of democracy embraces justice, mercy, and compassion, and that, therefore, democracy deserves continued life on this troubled globe.

Flag Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY CHARLES MOYNIHAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Charles Moynihan, a well-known Montrose attorney, is perhaps the most eloquent orator in Colorado. On Saturday, June 14, Flag Day, he delivered an inspiring address at Rifle, Colo., in which he paid a stirring tribute to the flag of flags. I should like to have excerpts from that address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where Members of Congress and others might enjoy them.

Mr. Moynihan points out the futility of converting to our thoughts peoples who have no conception of nor desire for our traditional idealism. He apparently feels, too, that our boasted "arsenal of democracy" ought to be something more substantial than a pretty phrase; that, instead, it consist of arms, airplanes, tanks, and ships, and, furthermore, that it be conserved for peoples who are not only fighting to preserve democracy as we know it but who are also already converted to the ideals of the democracy which we espouse. Mr. Moynihan points out quite effectively that we "speak forcefully" to "totalitarian states armed to the teeth" only when forceful words are backed by a club behind the door.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOYNIHAN GIVES FLAG DAY TALK AT RIFLE TODAY

We assemble today to give a tribute of veneration to the flag of our country. These services are for the purpose of giving the citizenship of America an opportunity to refresh their homage to an emblem of the deepest spiritual and patriotic significance.

That flag is not merely a combination of colors. It is a symbol, in every fiber of which is written the historical background of the struggles of our forefathers to provide for us the form of government we today enjoy. It symbolizes a group of hardy people who were willing to suffer the hardships of a dangerous voyage to reach an unknown shore where shelter and food had to be produced from the wild countryside—all in order that the dignity of the individual could be developed and preserved; where religion was to be a matter of conscience between the individual and his God; where the decree of kings was subordinated to the deliberate voice of the people; freedom of speech and of the press were to become the inalienable rights of the citizen.

It symbolizes a constitution wherein were written the proven truths of almost 300 years of colonial laboratorial experience; a national independence that by trial and error the universals of human rights, of human privileges could be vindicated.

It symbolizes a nation preserved from disunity as a result of a great Civil War.

It symbolizes a free expression of the spirit of private enterprise, with the result that by the exercise of human energy and ingenuity the highest standard of living the world has ever known is everywhere available in America to the man who will work and save.

* * * * *

Government under our theory was to be the agent of man and to reflect the humanitarian sentiments of the average citizen to the end that he could live together with his fellows in a spirit of peace, tolerance, and human consideration, so that he could dwell in a country where free speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion were to represent the foundation stones of an unusual endeavor, inspired by human beings for the primary benefit of the individual citizen.

After many experiments a flag was finally designed for the purpose of symbolizing not only the enveloping accomplishments of the forefathers but the efforts of each succeeding generation to fulfill the creed which had always been that of the founders and disciples of America. The flag was to be an altar of devotion.

* * * * *

I repeat today no detailed history of our country's past. That is well known to all of us. Hate, suffering, poverty, and an inclination to murder fellow human beings and crush the highest ideals of individual dignity and self-preservation which it has taken centuries to acquire, like a drifting cloud, afflicts the world of the present; and so today we find a fear complex surging like an hallucination inspired by the wrath of God, filling

our hearts with fear, and muddling our minds with confusion.

We see the purpose and spirit of democracy crushed and denied over a greater portion of the world. We see the forces of totalitarianism and dictatorships rushing like mad molochs, scattering anguish, blood, human destruction, and death with increasing severity, and continuing the invasion of areas where human rights had theretofore been recognized and enforced by established law, and taken for granted as much as the air we breathe.

The essential realities of democracy are a combination of law, equality, and justice. A totalitarian state has none of these, and hence is the worst of all possible states.

Many of the younger members of our generation were born under an unlucky star, because during their formative period we paid little attention to these characteristics, and particularly to the fact that each thereof was merely an approximation of the weaknesses and prejudices of the average citizen.

Thomas Jefferson fully recognized this during a period of scanty population and before inventions had made possible the congestion of people in large urban centers, when he uttered with the fervor of a prophet:

"My God! How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and of which no other people on earth enjoy."

The forces of totalitarianism cannot last because they are not human; they are not moral; their way is not the spiritual way. No matter what men think, the human heart is the compass which controls the direction of a human being's longing for a high destiny.

As people we are so apt to become discouraged over trends and events about us that are not fatal in themselves.

After all, devoted and patriotic as we are to our America, we should not fail to remember that it is impossible for us to convert peoples and nations whose traditional thoughts for centuries have been different from ours. While America may be the "arsenal of democracy," it is my judgment that she cannot serve any purpose other than to cooperate with like-minded peoples to preserve our great political ark of the covenant. A citizen of Australia can talk with citizens of Canada, New Zealand, the United States, with citizens of Scotland, Wales, or England with an understanding for the simple reason that Anglo-Saxon civilization is like-minded in its major purpose: The dignity and development of the individual's rights. Beyond this it is too much to hope that we can command the peoples of other nations to change their minds, or to adhere to theories and aspirations foreign to their traditions and backgrounds.

No matter what the status of nations is, I realize that old orders change, but I also know that new orders change, too. Only one thing never changes—the human heart. Revolutions and ideologies may lacerate it, even break it, but they cannot change its essence. After fascism, and communism, and socialism, and capitalism are over and forgotten as completely as slavery in the old South, the human heart will still be clamoring for the old things it wept for in the Garden of Eden—love and a chance to live, a chance to adore something, somewhere, somehow.

If we but realize this, the whispering comments of our heart today will give us the faith we need to seek constantly the fixed star of human hopes which never fades and never becomes nonexistent. The clouds may hide it for a moment, but it is still there. So long as it exists our faith must be stronger than the darkness which temporarily obstructs our vision.

In our present dilemma there are two or three things the unofficial citizenship of our America ought to know. From the standpoint of mechanical equipment, is America today in truth and in fact the "arsenal of democracy"? To what extent have we progressed in completing the manufacture of arms, airplanes, tanks, etc., to be prepared to meet an attack? Whatever else may be argued, the truth is that we must recognize realities. Totalitarian Germany is literally armed to the teeth, and because of that fact no nation and no combination of nations has been able to thwart or for any length of time obstruct either her attack or her advance. What is the state of our preparedness? If it is such that we are ready for war, we may speak forcefully.

Theodore Roosevelt said once we should speak softly but carry a big stick. There is much in his philosophy. If we are prepared, we do not need to boast. Our ample preparedness will be known and will protect us. If we are unprepared, we are like the dog which bays the moon to no purpose other than to hear the sound of his own barking.

Morgenthau Magic!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) DAILY ARGUS-LEADER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, as Congress is about to be confronted with one of the largest and most sacrifice-compelling tax bills ever to be proposed, the entire country is at long last becoming interested in the methods by which taxes can be prevented from becoming confiscatory in nature. America is awakening to the stark reality that, after all, Uncle Sam does not pick his money off from bushes or pump it out of wells but that he really does exact it "from the sweat of the man who toils."

Consequently, the following editorial written by Fred C. Christopherson of the Daily Argus Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., is especially timely and telling. His analysis of the miraculous method by which Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau proposes to reduce the tax burden for us all merits a most careful reading in view of the fact that there are still many old-fashioned citizens of the horse and buggy era in this country who have the antiquated, pre-New Deal theory in the backs of their minds that the way to reduce taxes is to spend less money.

This new formula for escaping the sting of the tax collector should give special cause for rejoicing to all Americans who still believe in Santa Claus, or who hope to provide dairy products for the undernourished by feeding them rich slices of the cheese from which they think the moon is made.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader of June 24, 1941]

MORGENTHAU MAGIC

In order to promote public understanding of the sale of defense bonds now under way, the United States Treasury has prepared a series of informative questions and answers.

Idly thumbing through these, we encountered the following oddity:

"Q. By buying all the defense bonds I can afford and then some, do I do anything to keep taxes down?

"A. Yes. If you will do this and influence all your friends to do this, you will produce a great effect. The more money raised by borrowing, the less need be raised by taxation."

Alice in Wonderland couldn't have done better than that. Evidently our Treasury is living in a fantastic world of make-believe—a delightful paradise where we can eat our cake and have it too.

Surely Secretary Morgenthau and his aides must be gifted with some extraordinary power. They promise the millennium and the normally impossible.

Such magic. Such a beautiful world of finance into which we are invited.

We buy defense bonds. In return the Government will pay interest and in due course retire the principal. And yet this operation will reduce the necessity for additional taxes.

To say that that is remarkable is to put it mildly. We never appreciated before just how wise Secretary Morgenthau is.

We wonder, however, why he stops where he does. Why not eliminate taxes entirely by selling more bonds to the people? The more bonds that are sold, he says, the lower the taxes will be.

Then, too, why be selfish about it? Why not impart the secret of this perfectly grand method to the Governors, the mayors, and the others who are associated with tax-levying bonds? Why must we pay any taxes?

Evidently our own Governor Bushfield, our own Mayor John McKee, our own county commissioners, and our own board of education are hopelessly benighted. They are so old-fashioned that they believe in levying taxes to obtain the money required for public purposes.

How silly! How absurd! Why don't they just sell bonds to the people as Secretary Morgenthau is doing? If the people buy enough bonds, as the surely wise Secretary informs us, they won't be required to pay taxes.

But that's too perfect, too ideal. There must be a flaw somewhere. We remember that once upon a time the State of South Dakota sold a lot of bonds. But it didn't work out in quite the way that Secretary Morgenthau now suggests. In due course we had to repay the bonds along with the interest. It so happened, as the statistics show, that we didn't reduce the necessity for new taxes. In fact, we expanded it. We were compelled to levy taxes not only for the principal of the bonds but the interest as well. In some cases the interest accumulated so largely that we paid back eventually as much as $2 for each $1 that we borrowed.

European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on last Saturday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people of the United States could, if they would, stage a demonstration of determination to keep out of Europe's war that would make certain our noninvolvement. There is but one condition preventing such a demonstration. That condition is the continuing success with which foreign and domestic propagandists have convinced or caused millions of Americans to entertain something of conviction that our entry into the war is an inevitable thing.

This condition is not as discouraging as it might be, for the reason that this defeatist attitude is waning, that people are gradually coming to realize that the thought of inevitability is planted and nursed by forces with the most selfish kind of purposes to serve—incidentally, purposes to be ultimately served not by themselves but by the sons and purses of 100,000,000 and more of Americans unless those Americans quickly awaken to the need for a united front against war.

The oft expressed and repeated thoughts that "the President's conduct of our foreign policy has been such as to make our staying out of the war impossible," or that "we've gone so far now that we cannot stop," or that simple thought that "we just can't stop it now; it's too late," are so exceedingly shallow that the people must, given time, quickly discover themselves to be but the victims of propaganda in which they themselves unwittingly become a participant.

Getting into this war is not inevitable for America. It is as fair to say that our staying out of the war is inevitable. Indeed, it is fairer to assert the latter, since the desire to stay out is so overwhelming on the part of the American people. Yet this overwhelming majority has let the interventionist minority plant the defeatist thoughts to an extent which was, at one stage, carrying our country to the precipice of war.

Getting into this return engagement of war to Europe is only as inevitable as we, the people of America, will permit it to be. Staying out of this war is inevitable if only the people will continue and multiply their forceful demands upon the Government at Washington to keep its promise to the people to keep our country out of this mess which seems destined to wreck every civilization that lends its hand to it. It would be well at the same time if the people would politely suggest that the same Government at Washington cease its almost daily issuance of engraved invitations to all the rest of the world for trouble and war.

If a sizable proportion of American fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters who deeply sense the consequences of our involvement in the war were to make their views and demands heard by their letters to their Congressmen, their Senators, and their President, the door to the chance of our involvement would be closed quickly and tightly. Squelching the defeatist attitude will bring this result.

We cannot help but observe how an awakened people have improved upon the chance to stay out of war in the very recent weeks. Those millions who have conquered the defeatist complex have brought about magnificent changes, changes in spite of newspapers, fireside chats, cabinet speeches, and a virtual blitzkrieg of propaganda to drive us to war. The result is an amazing demonstration of how successfully democracy can operate if only the people will themselves play their rightful part in the conduct of that democracy by making known their wishes and interests. Democracy falls down only when the people it is presumed to serve ignore their own responsibility to it. Democracy fails when a small minority, such as are the American interventionists, can convince a great majority, such as are the American noninterventionists, that the only way we can have unity in this country is to follow the wishes of the minority.

Following passage of the lend-lease bill there was good reason to believe that the chance of staying out of Europe's war was next door to being insignificant. The march to war by the interventionists had been and continued to be so rapid as to make it seem quite impossible to even halt for a brief moment the tramping feet and rolling drums of war. But the small chance that remained of staying out was used, first by a few, then more and even more of Americans, until today, in spite of what we see and hear each day, the chance of staying out has been multiplied to a degree that causes many of us to feel that it is better than a 50–50 chance. But this degree of chance will continue and increase only as the people will continue and increase pouring their wishes and their expectations in letters to their Representatives and especially the President. The interventionist hope in this hour is that the people will let up in their splendid effort and leave to them, the organized interventionists, the exclusive ear of the President who shapes our foreign policy.

These interventionists had the President fooled plenty up until a few weeks ago. They alone were sending their letters and telegrams supporting each step that took us nearer to war. The masses of people were filing their prayers with Congress. The President could not draw any conclusion other than that the people were with him in the moves he made; his mail proved it to his own satisfaction. When the people got onto the interventionist game and started expressing their views to the President, he sat up with a start; was, some say, bewildered to a point that caused him to send agents out over the country to try to sense the real pulse of the people. It was no doubt this expression of feeling by overwhelming numbers that caused the canceling of a fireside chat and that caused the President to back up the day after he made his recent public address in which people were given to feel that he was going to ask repeal of the neutrality laws and undertake convoys in spite of his promise to the contrary.

Ah, democracy does work when the people contribute their part to its operation and decline to let a minority rule the day by instilling a defeatist complex in the majority.

Defeatism on the part of the people is not going to be as fully squelched as it should be, however, until people will stop to do more thinking and pause long enough to let truth have its hour in times when propaganda has so much of fiction which selfish ones would make the base for American judgment and decision. I am sure there has never been so devastating a line of fiction laid down upon which to base a most serious decision as is that line of fiction planted by those who would have us in this present war. Have a look at some of this fiction:

First. Much circulation is given the story published by a British aviation machine to the effect that Germany and Italy have developed types of bombers capable of successfully attacking our eastern seaboard, or, with bases at Dakar, capable of attacking the Panama Canal. This is fantasy, pure and simple. American aviation authorities will acknowledge that the Germans have a type of plane capable of flying from Germany to New York, but carrying and dropping a bomb of only 10 or 12 pounds, but unable to fly back to its base after it dumped its "firecracker."

Second. Then we have the fairy tale about how utterly dependent is our American future upon the British Navy. When we are really thinking and not just letting someone plant convictions for our adoption without any thinking, we know full well that through the lifetime of our Nation the only navy that we've had to build against in a large way—the only navy that has successfully operated in an aggressive way against North, South, or Central America—has been the same British Navy.

Third. The fiction that a Hitler victory in Europe would be followed by a Hitler invasion of America is too silly for words. If we will use our defense dollars for defense, we can finish Hitler and all his associates before they get within sight of America, even if they combine in the operation to invade. Right here let me suggest that there should well be a unity of mind on this issue of American defense, however. Our defense needs are multiplied each day if we would prepare for the very worst that might develop out of these pending wars, for President Roosevelt has been overlooking no opportunity for the past 2 or 3 years to shake the American fist at virtually every power on earth, and this at a time when it would have been smart to try to make a few friends instead of all enemies for ourselves.

Fourth. The livest bit of fiction afloat at the present time, it seems to me, is that to the effect that if the old order in Europe does not continue to prevail, then we are doomed to loss of our foreign trade, to trade isolation. Normally, our foreign trade constitutes between 3 and 6 percent of our total economic dependence. If we are any good at all, we can increase our American consumption to a sufficient degree to take up the slack if we had to lose all our foreign trade. But why must we conclude that there is even a chance for loss of our foreign trade? Come what will to Europe and Asia, they are going to need some things that we can supply more economically than anyone else. We will need some things that they can supply. We'll go on trading. Bernard Baruch, answering the suggestion of a totalitarian victory as a challenge to us commercially, recently declared (though his declaration found very few news outlets) that the United States can undersell the totalitarians in the world markets, and that it would be Germany and not the United States that would be "on the spot" in the event of a complete German victory. Incidentally, wouldn't we do well in this hour to remember that our severest competitor in the field of foreign trade has always been Great Britain with her control over the trade channels over the earth?

Fifth. Fiction? Look to that which would have us join with Britain in a policy and program of stopping and destroying the aggressor nations. The pages of the last three centuries of history are overflowing with the accounts of military aggression accomplishing the building of the most titanic empire of all time—the British Empire. As recently as 1937 Britain was bombing civilian populations in Arabia in order to accomplish British dominance there. And we would make Britain our ally in stopping aggressor nations. What preposterous fiction.

Sixth. Fiction is the base for a lot of thinking over here these days, but none of it compares with that thought that if we'll just take a hand in this pending war on the British side, we can win and save freedom of the seas again and make impossible more *Robin Moor* incidents. What folly. What utter deception that lets this thought be encouraged. We acknowledged after the last war that in time of war there was no such thing as freedom of the seas. Congress wrote laws acknowledging this. President Roosevelt gave lip service to support of these laws.

Freedom of the seas went by the board in 1919 when, at Versailles, Woodrow Wilson failed to win a consideration for No. 2 of his 14 points. Who smothered this honest Wilson effort to win freedom of the seas after Europe was done with her last war? None other than England and France. They wouldn't give the cause or theory a chance. Read what Lloyd George and Winston Churchill wrote in their books covering the peace conference about freedom of the seas. Why,

they wouldn't tolerate freedom of the seas. What they wanted was what they had always had, namely, freedom of the seas for Britain, sovereignty and dominance over the seas by Britain. Will we now let ourselves be moved to war again, this time to help Britain win freedom of the seas? Minister Eden may go on contending that Britain is fighting for freedom of the seas and for the four other eloquent freedoms which the President is declaring it American purpose to deliver to all the world in our own time and generation, but for my own part, I'm inclined to listen to the British statesmen who denied us freedom of the seas when they had it to give but bluntly refused it.

I find no pleasure in saying these things at this time. While Britain stands courageously in her battle against the forces which would destroy her, I would find it much more pleasant to overlook and forget the fiction about which I have spoken were it not for the fact that the future of my own country was so largely dependent upon what we did with this fiction. America's grave need in this hour is for a substitution of fiction by truth, truth we all acknowledge when we let the record instead of propaganda have our ear.

Thus far there has been no substantial offering to demonstrate that the causes involved in the present war are different than those which have plagued Europeans for generations. They are the same causes that fooled us once before into unending costs, burdensome debt, depression, heartbreak, and hospitals filled with men, many of whom wish they hadn't come back from over there; the same causes America helped the Allies to win, only to be told afterward that we hadn't done our full part, when they full well knew that we had more boys fighting in France than Britain had during the concluding war months, and only to hear ourselves called Uncle Shylock. The cause abroad today is the age-old cause of determining who shall dominate Europe; this time, shall it be Britain or Germany. I'm frank to confess that it would seem easier to get along in a world where the prevailing order continued because we never easily accommodate ourselves to the possible necessity of change. But the chance or danger of change does not merit the pitching by the United States of her young blood, her wealth, and her energies into so futile a cause as is a European war, especially when we so well know that even though we might help to win a war over there we can't inflict a peace to our liking after the war is won. Thomas Jefferson put it well when he said:

"For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality, and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character."

If it be thought that Jefferson is out of date, and that he had no right to tell we of 1941 what was right and wrong, then let us turn to a more modern American who dresses this fine Jefferson theory in modern garb; listen to Dr. Wilbur, president of Stanford University.

"If anyone believes the American people can go out and force other nations around to our way of thinking, that person has a Hitler complex."

Fiction, hate, fear, and uncontrolled emotions can be our complete undoing if we Americans don't more largely guard against drifting back into pitfalls from which the patriots of 1776 freed us. Isolation of the right kind has built America to the point of greatness and happiness above all nations. That is the Washington and Jefferson kind of isolation—isolation from the hates, fears, jealousies, power politics and wars of Europe. None will deny this, that such isolation has been exceedingly good for us, and that it hasn't hurt Europe. None will deny this, that our nearest approach to disaster accompanied our ignoring of the Washington kind of isolation and returning for a taste of those European bitters back in 1917-18. Why haven't we learned better the lessons which far-seeing fathers and experience have tried so hard to teach us? Shall we let fearmongers convince us that this present European war is really our war?

By the way, whose war is it anyway?

We dig up $7,000,000,000 as a first installment in our lending and leasing of Britain's war to make it unnecessary for Britain to spend of her own wealth to make purchase of such materials as she needs from us. We call it the lend-lease program. In Canada, a part of Britain, at war, they haven't thought of a lend-lease program and get from Britain cash on the barrel head for what they sell to Britain.

We go on selling oil to Japan—without which Japan couldn't last very long with her undertaking in China—while Secretary Ickes threatens gasless Sundays in America.

The Food Minister for Britain asks us to inaugurate creamless days in the United States so there can be more butter and cheese for Britain. A few days later Secretary Wickard urges Americans to eat less cheese.

And while all this goes on, the Canadian Travel Bureau, inviting us to come to Canada for our vacations, advertises in the New York Times of June 8 as follows:

"It is easy to enter and to leave Canada; there is absolutely no rationing of food."

Whose war is this anyway?

Well, in spite of all the effort of some to make it seem like our war, it still very definitely is not our war. And it seems rather certain that the sooner we let the world know that we don't plan to be in it, then the quicker will come whatever kind of peace is to be had in Europe and an end to the madness that besets them over there. If Britain finds she cannot finish and win this war which she herself declared, let her ascertain and advise us what kind of a peace is available before she asks and expects us to pour blood and more wealth into her defense. We are certainly entitled to a more truthful statement of reasons and principles than has yet been afforded. We need far more than a mere echo by Anthony Eden of President Roosevelt's four freedoms and freedom of the seas.

Whatever emergency confronts our country today is pretty largely home-made. The President, since his quarantine speech, has gone out of his way to challenge virtually every power on earth. That gives us an additional defense obligation, an emergency to be sure, but this doesn't of itself call for such attitude as that demonstrated by the President in his Friday message to Congress, his effort to be spectacular in closing the offices of German consuls in this country, or the feverish effort to instill fear in the American heart while he assures us that the only thing we need fear is fear itself.

If the President and the interventionists have failed to sell their emergency to the people it doesn't follow that we must be blitzkrieged and incidented into war hostilities and bad temper. The truth is they have not been able to sell the people this war abroad, however much the people are ready to accept the need for a large defense program. The people will respond to reason but they are without the sufficient reason to believe they are getting defense out of these mad hours of talking and spending. The kind of a sales talk the people need is one of more frankness than leadership has yet afforded.

In light of what Woodrow Wilson encountered in his effort to win freedom of the seas, it is nothing short of childish to be trying to make a national fire of the *Robin Moor* incident.

Perhaps we do not know the reasons for the Presidential moves in closing the German consular offices, in which event frankness would help in this hour when there is so much reason to believe that the German representatives here have been guilty of nothing more than what British agents from Halifax on down have been guilty of, namely, propagandizing America. (Incidentally, it is with some rejoicing that we see the German propaganda here ended. It will leave the interventionists without chance to charge American opposition to involvement in the war to Nazi propaganda. And if we could be freed from the British propaganda we could get down to some real American thinking again.)

There is too much reason to believe that all of this bluster by Washington is only intended to build a psychology that will break down the determination with which the people of this country are opposing our further involvement in the war. At times one wonders how large may have been the promises made to Europe by spokesmen like Bullitt and Donovan. If there are commitments which the President feels binding he must be everlastingly reminded of the commitments he has made to the American people to stay out of this war. And it will be well to remember that the promises by Bullitt and Donovan, if promises were made, have been in every case kisses of death.

Before we let ourselves be moved any deeper into Europe's war, let us try to get values straight. Those values were splendidly defined by the patriots who warned against involvement in the wars and politics of Europe. What Britain would have us do today is definitely what Britain would not do for us if we were in her shoes. Indeed, British statesmen have made Britain's policy doubly clear.

Lord Palmerston has said: "England has no eternal enmities and no eternal friendships. She has only eternal interests." Not bad policy for our own pronouncement.

The following sounds for all the world like George Washington, but its real author is Winston Churchill. Hear him: "We must be safe from undue foreign pressure. We cannot confine the safety of our country to the passions or the panic of any foreign nation which may be facing some desperate crisis."

We need to readopt this advice for ourselves. And we need to be done with the foolery of foreign voices which would have us fighting for most uncertain causes. For instance, here was Lord Beaverbrook, in 1938, saying of Hitler:

"There is no man living whose promise given in regard to something of real moment I would sooner take. He is simple, unaffected, and obviously sincere. He is supremely intelligent."

And, on Armistice Day in 1938 we found Mr. Churchill saying:

"I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations."

Beaverbrook and Churchill are the same men who today would have us fighting because this same Hitler is a madman, insincere, unintelligent, a man whose word is worth nothing.

Come, America, let's get back to earth while there is still time to save the things we cherish. If we are determined to commit suicide we can do it much more cheaply and cleanly by another plan. Poison can be had at less than 10 cents per dose to do the job on 130,000,000 people, entailing a total cost of only $13,000,000, if we must insist upon wiping ourselves out of the world.

This is the hour for real courage, the kind every American was born with, the kind that lets us stand up and fight every move that would take us nearer to war. Let's be ready for more incidents, ready to tell the President and the interventionists that these incidents must not involve the lives of the people of America so long as they remain incidents we appear to be inviting through our spokesmen.

Let there be an end to fear and fiction, acknowledgment that our defense line is where it has always been, not in Europe. And let us have a functioning by Americans

that forces Government to be representative of views and wishes of the great majority.

It is the duty and right of Americans to speak out. No reflection attaches to one who will speak out; for, after all, this is no contest to determine the future of any banner or cause other than our own—no contest to ascertain what Americans love Britain most or hate Hitler most. It is alone a contest to bring a united front in support of America and her future.

Russia and the Four Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by my colleague [Mr. TAFT], delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on June 25, as to Russia and the Four Freedoms.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Are we going to get in the war? And if so, when? Those are the questions which every American, certainly every American in Washington, is asking. I have often stated the reasons why I believe that it would be contrary to the future welfare and happiness of the people of this country for us to intervene in the war now proceeding between Germany and the British Empire; that it would mean war for many years to come, with all its terrible results. Those reasons are not shaken by the surprising war between Germany and Russia. I believe they are greatly strengthened.

There can be no doubt that a great majority of the American people are opposed to our going outside of this continent to make war on a nation which has not attacked us, no matter how wicked that nation is. But there is an active war party and I do not mean to identify that with either political party, which has urged one argument after another upon the people in a frank effort to change their convictions and develop an excitement and hysteria for war.

First it was said that we must go to war now for fear that Hitler will later overwhelm the world and conquer the United States. The force of this argument has steadily declined until today hardly a military or naval expert claims that Hitler can successfully attack the United States across the Atlantic Ocean. I notice that even the President is laying little stress on this argument today. There has been some question raised as to whether we were going to have all of our defenses ready in time to meet any possible attack. The Russian war certainly postpones for many months any attack which Hitler could possibly make; and makes even more certain a defense of the United States sufficient to discourage any military or naval attack.

As for foreign trade, I have often pointed out that the danger to our trade, which the President now emphasizes, is grossly exaggerated. I do not believe the American people will ever go to war against a European nation on the theory that some day it may be a successful competitor for foreign trade. If Germany controls Russia, it will reduce the Nazi interest in securing South American raw materials rather than increase it.

But fundamentally the effort to persuade the people of the United States to enter the war has been made on emotional and moral grounds. It has been an effort to build a war upon the American love of democracy and freedom and the American hatred of the things for which Hitler stands in Europe. I yield to no one either in my love for freedom or my hatred of Hitler. But there are two great objections to waging an aggressive war outside of a nation's territory for love or hate, or any other moral issue.

First, the method proposed, war, destroys the very morality which we seek to uphold. In his January address the President announced that we were going to establish a moral order throughout the world; freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world; freedom to worship God everywhere in the world; freedom from want and freedom from fear everywhere in the world. No one can deny the desirability of spreading democratic principles and these four freedoms to every corner of the world; but it is obvious that the forcing of any special brand of freedom and democracy on a people by the brute force of war, whether they want it or not, is a denial of those very democratic principles which we are striving to advance. It is a revival of the slogan of the World War that we must make the world safe for democracy, which the World War certainly did not do. It is a belief in our divine appointment to reform the world. It is akin to the religious fervor which inspired the Holy Land crusades of the Middle Ages. It is exactly the reasoning by which the Spanish Inquisition enforced Christianity on infidels who preferred to believe in other gods.

The complete absurdity of going to war even to spread our highest ideals is certainly revealed by the present situation in Europe. In the alleged battle between the totalitarian states and the democracies, we now find Communist Russia transformed into a democracy. In some way the illusion was created in the newspapers and radio and movies by skillful propaganda that Greece and China and Brazil and other friendly nations were democracies, although they were governed without question by dictators. But how can anyone swallow the idea that Russia is battling for democratic principles? Yet the President on Monday announced that the United States would give all possible aid to Russia, the character and quantity of the aid to await only a disclosure of Russian needs. Because overnight Russia is transformed from an aggressor into a democracy, the Treasury has released $40,000,000 in Russian assets, although the assets of France are frozen tighter than a drum.

To spread the four freedoms throughout the world we will ship airplanes and tanks and guns to Communist Russia. But no country was more responsible for the present war and Germany's aggression than Russia itself. Except for the Russian pact with Germany there would have been no invasion of Poland. Then Russia proved to be as much of an aggressor as Germany. If through our aid Stalin is continued in power, do you suppose that he will spread the four freedoms through Finland and Estonia and Latvia and Lithuania? Do you suppose that anybody in Russia itself will ever hear of the four freedoms after the war? Apparently we are to follow bundles for Britain with packages for Petrograd. In the name of democracy we are to make a Communist alliance with the most ruthless dictator in the world. Could there be a greater travesty on the false propaganda fed to the American people that this is a great moral issue between ideologies? If Hitler wins, it is a victory for fascism. If Stalin wins it is a victory for communism. From the point of view of ideology there is no choice.

But the victory of communism in the world would be far more dangerous to the United States than the victory of fascism. There has never been the slightest danger that the people of this country would ever embrace bundism or nazi-ism. It is completely foreign to every idea we have learned since the nursery. But communism masquerades, often successfully, under the guise of democracy, though just as alien to our real principles as nazi-ism itself. It is a greater danger to the United States because it is a false philosophy which appeals to many. Fascism is a false philosophy which appeals to very few indeed.

On May 27 the President made a great emotional appeal to the people. He said, "Today the whole world is divided between slavery and human freedom—between pagan brutality and the Christian ideal." On May 27 Stalin represented human slavery and pagan brutality. On June 24 he represents human freedom and the Christian ideal. The President said further, "We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression—freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—freedom from want—and freedom from terrorism." Will that part of the world which Stalin conquers with our airplanes and our tanks be consecrated to freedom of speech and expression? Will it be consecrated to freedom of every person to worship God in his own way? Will it be consecrated to freedom from want and freedom from terrorism? Or, after a Russian victory with our aid, must we step in with our armies to impose the four freedoms on 200,000,000 people 10,000 miles away, who have never known either freedom from want or freedom from terrorism? Surely Stalin won't do it. Surely we must know by this time that Stalin's promises are as valueless as are those of Hitler himself.

The attempt to picture a world divided between two great ideologies, the attempt to create a great moral issue behind our supposed duty to spread the four freedoms everywhere in the world, have been utterly destroyed by the new Communist alliance. The shouters for war are left with but one cry, "We hate Hitler. Hitler must be destroyed." Hate is hardly the basis for a moral issue. From the utter confusion of the present situation in Europe the American people can only conclude that these quarrels are European quarrels, from which at all costs we must keep our country clear. Furthermore, should we attempt to carry through the moral principles implied in the four-freedoms theory, we would face war for years to come, for Germany can only be crushed by a land army, and a land army made up principally of Americans. But today we could not transport an Army to Europe if we would without tremendous losses from submarines and dive bombers. It is futile to bluster about the kind of freedoms we will impose everywhere in the world.

And yet the Russo-German war may perhaps be the solution of the present problems of the world. It might actually lead to peace. It seems to indicate that Hitler has given up the idea that he can conquer the British Isles by invasion. It seems to show that he believes the future of Germany rests on the Continent of Europe rather than on the seas. I sincerely hope that it may lead to some discussion of peace before the end of 1941, and before we ourselves are further involved in a European quarrel. The President should certainly explore the possibilities of such a peace, with as little publicity as possible. I have only contempt for those radio commentators who treat every suggestion of a peace which would have millions of lives as German propaganda. Whether Hitler will accept terms which can possibly be acceptable to England I do not know, but the United States should certainly not block the making of any peace

which is acceptable to England. We must not force England to accept any terms which may be acceptable to Hitler, but neither do I believe that we should prevent their making peace on any terms which the English people feel is to their advantage. This is their war. They began it justifiably. They are the people who have been bombed, and whose cities have been destroyed. It is up to them to make the decision. But let them not make it with the idea that the United States is ever going to send a great expeditionary force to the Continent of Europe. The German-Russian war has made that policy ridiculous, if it was ever under consideration. I am glad to see from General Marshall's statement Monday morning that we are not contemplating any substantial enlargement of our present Army.

This country can be united on a policy of no intervention in Europe and aid to Britain. We can make that aid infinitely more effective if we abandon the rule of world benefactor; if we leave Balkan politics alone; if we avoid a Communist alliance; if we adhere to the simple policy of aiding Britain. Why do we want to aid Britain? Because by and large they do have the same ideals as we ourselves. Because they are our close relatives, from whom we derived fundamentally the whole theory of our government. Because the destruction of Britain and the British Empire would mean an unsettled world, with the greatest hazard to the peace and prosperity of the entire world. That is a wholly sufficient reason without any spreading of the four freedoms anywhere else in the world.

How can we aid Britain best? By the simple process of speeding up our manufacture of airplanes and tanks and war materials of every kind. That is our task in the war, and up to this time we have woefully failed in its accomplishment. The lease-lend bill was hailed as the great savior of England, and those of us who opposed its conferring of dictatorial powers on the President, including the power to give away our arms to Russia and every other country in the world, were practically accused of treachery because we insisted on debating the bill for 3 weeks. Yet in a period of almost 3 months the total transfer of defense articles from American supplies totaled only $75,000,000, whereas it was contemplated that from American Army and Navy supplies alone $1,300,000,000 worth was to be transferred to England. During the same period we spent on W. P. A. approximately $300,000,000. We must correct our utterly inefficient organization for defense. We must stop the strikes and go to work. Apparently we have wholly fallen down in our construction of pursuit planes, so that today the British don't want our pursuit planes and infinitely prefer their own. We have heard a lot of talk of convoys, but no one has denied the published figures that only 4 percent of the ships going from this country to England have been sunk. Even this figure is higher than the fact, because the bombing planes, which are so important to England, are flown over on their own power. There is no evidence that our entire Navy could substantially reduce the sinkings which do occur from submarines and from German planes and from the bombing of English ports after the arrival of merchant vessels. The whole outcry for convoys, the pushing of our patrols farther into the eastern Atlantic, the playing of great international politics, all seem designed to involve us in the war, with or without the consent of Congress, rather than to our real task of aiding Britain with every kind of war material, and particularly the airplanes which they must have to secure control of the air.

The Russian war has weakened every argument for intervention. The war party knows that the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to war, and so it is trying to urge the President into an aggressive war without consideration by Congress. I cannot be convinced that any President will involve 130,000,000 people in the horrors of a modern war without the approval of the Representatives of the people in Congress assembled. No war by a democratic country can possibly be successful unless it has the overwhelming support of the people, by whom and for whom that country always has been governed.

Work of Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

LETTER FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration in the Agricultural Department in which the Administrator gives some statistics and presents an interesting picture of the operations of the Farm Security Administration, which, I am sure, will not only furnish desirable information to Senators but also will give an excellent understanding of what that Administration has done and is doing in the way of farm security.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 7, 1941.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NORRIS: Since the beginning of the present emergency, it has been generally recognized that the health, welfare, and morale of our people are vitally important to national defense. Providing for these needs among low-income farm families has been one of the essential contributions of the Farm Security Administration to the Nation's defense efforts during the past year.

We have just completed a special survey undertaken last winter to measure the progress being made by borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. It indicates the gains in terms of money, living standards, and capacity for self-support which have been made during 1940 by handicapped and low-income farm people all over the country. It occurred to me that you might be interested in seeing the figures for the State of Nebraska.

In Nebraska there were 11,086 active standard rehabilitation borrowers at the end of 1940. The survey showed that the average borrower earned a net income of $593 during the year, as compared with $387 in the year before he borrowed from Farm Security. In other words, the typical family increased its annual net income by 54 percent. This means that Farm Security borrowers in Nebraska have increased their total annual incomes by $2,292,917 since coming on the program. Naturally this growth in prosperity and purchasing power has been reflected on the books of merchants and other businessmen of the State.

We were pleased to find that borrowers in your State are rapidly repaying their rehabilitation loans. Already $3,659,674 has been repaid on loans totaling $15,091,599, although much of the money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years. Throughout the entire country rehabilitation loans totaling $420,865,050 had been made as of December 31, 1940, and $149,626,442 of this sum had been repaid. As you know, loan funds currently are advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instead of coming from direct appropriations.

In view of the fact that none of the borrowers from Farm Security was able to get adequate credit anywhere else and that many of them formerly were on relief, we feel that this repayment record is a tribute to the honesty and industry of these needy farm people. There is ample evidence that the great majority of them are getting back on their feet and becoming permanently self-supporting. In large measure, this progress is due to the advice and technical guidance in sound farm and home management which accompanies each Farm Security loan.

For example, we encourage our borrowers to get away from one-crop farming—particularly of surplus crops, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat—and to raise as much as possible of their own food and feed for their livestock. During 1940 the average Farm Security family in your State produced $190 worth of goods for home consumption, as compared with $121 before they came into the F. S. A. program. This produce for home use included 372 gallons of milk per family, 393 pounds of meat, and 197 quarts of vegetables and fruit canned for the winter. This increased production of food did not, of course, add to the supply in the commercial markets, since virtually none of it was offered for sale. It simply meant a better diet, better health, and a rising standard of living for these families.

Often it has been necessary to work out an adjustment of the family's old debts before rehabilitation could be successful. Local farm-debt-adjustment committees have been set up for this purpose. They have no legal authority to compel adjustments, but by bringing the farmer and his creditors together for a friendly discussion they usually are able to arrange a scale-down of the obligations, reduced interest rates, or extension of the payment period. Such adjustments frequently save the farmer from foreclosure and, at the same time, enable the creditors to get substantial payments on what might otherwise have been bad debts.

This service is available to all farmers, whether or not they are rehabilitation borrowers. Altogether, debt reductions totaling $5,815,970 have been negotiated for individual farmers in Nebraska. This represents a scale-down of 25.9 percent. As a direct result of these adjustments, $277,802 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

In addition, reductions totaling $282,386, or 45.6 percent, have been negotiated in the debts owed by irrigation districts and similar farm groups.

In making this special survey, our field employees reported that there are 7,806 families in Nebraska who are eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans, but have been unable to get them because of the limited funds available.

In addition to the rehabilitation program, Farm Security is carrying out the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which provides a limited number of loans to competent tenants to enable them to buy family-type farms.

During the first 3 years of this program we made 151 such loans in your State, totaling $1,488,111. This year we expect to make about 110 Bankhead-Jones loans in Nebraska, amounting to approximately $1,033,556. Throughout the country, delinquencies of these loans have amounted so far to only 2.6 percent, or $23,658; and this has been more than offset by the fact that other borrowers have been able to make advance payments

totaling $196,765, as the result of good crops and management.

I am hopeful that this rather detailed report may be useful to you; and if you would like to have any further facts about our program I shall, of course, be glad to supply them. Some time during the year I hope that you may find an opportunity to visit some of the borrowers from F. S. A. in your State and see for yourself the efforts they are making to get a new start as independent, taxpaying citizens.

Sincerely,

C. B. BALDWIN, *Administrator.*

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE SIMMONS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a very worthy and patriotic speech recently made by the chief justice of the Nebraska Supreme Court, Hon. Robert G. Simmons, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Shall we, at this memorial time, devote our speaking to fulsome praise of the heroic deeds of our revered dead, or shall we honor them by a reexamination of the principles of government in which they believed and by a rededication of our lives and purposes to the maintenance of the institutions of freedom which they served? I prefer the latter course.

Relatively too much emphasis is being put upon the probability of the actual invasion of this country by the armed forces of foreign powers. That is not our most imminent danger. There is another kind of invasion that we do need to fear and against which we must actively guard.

For a number of years we have been invaded not by armed forces but by ideas and concepts of government not only foreign to our own but openly and violently opposed to the ideals of government upon which our American system is based.

Admittedly we should be prepared to defend against physical invasion. We should likewise be alert to repel openly and vigorously the existing invasion of principles of government that are more subtle, deadly, and destructive than any invasion of armed forces. If this invasion of ideals contrary to ours is successful, it will not be necessary for foreign powers to invade our shores with either armies, navies, or air forces. Their aims will have been accomplished.

The vital danger to democracy in America is not from the outside but from those persons within our country in whose hearts there is no longer the faith of those who built our institutions.

Shall we preserve not only the form but the substance of our institutions? This is a contest that we have here at home now and one in which we should vigorously engage now. It is to the important phase of this contest that I desire to direct your attention.

In public discussions we refer to the struggle, now engaging the world, as one between the dictatorships and the democracies. What is the distinction between these two great groups of nations? The dictatorships are somewhat easily described. Their forms of government are generally the same. They are not new except in name. They are throwbacks to the system of absolute monarchies, discarded centuries ago. Then, as now, force dominated; then, as now, rulers were supreme; then, as now, people had only the privileges that governing classes saw fit to permit them to exercise; then, as now, rulers contended that people existed to serve the state. The dictatorships are movements backward in the science of self-government.

What are the principles upon which the democracies are founded? What is the common denominator of the democracies? It is obvious that we must look beyond forms of government to find the answer.

We may say that the democracies represent the tolerant governments of the world, and the dictatorships the intolerant. The democracies represent those nations where governments permit and encourage a difference of views on political, economic, and social problems and methods; where racial differences and the different religious faiths and ideals of peoples are respected and protected. Certainly there is no tolerance of ideals, principles, races, or religions within the totalitarian systems. But that distinction is not sufficient.

The democracies exalt the individual as against the all-powerful state. But why should men have rights superior to the state? Why should not governments be all-powerful so far as the individual is concerned? What is the underlying ideal that distinguishes the philosophies of the two systems of government? We of the democracies answer that men have been endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights.

The fundamental difference between the two systems, democracies and dictatorships, is that the democracies are founded upon the ideal and belief that God has given to men on this earth rights that no government may properly invade and which all governments must respect. The dictatorships recognize no such rights and no such supreme authority.

The difference is between a political system based on the age-old faith of men in God and a political creed that does not recognize the hand of God in the affairs of men.

What has happened these last years during which we have watched peoples and nations move away from liberty and toward the dominance of government? Bishop Hunt, of Salt Lake City, has well given the answer. I quote: "The collapse of our civilization, which is now seriously threatened, is primarily the collapse of ideals. It is the loss of respect for Christian standards and principles. Conduct, itself, alike of men and nations is secondary * * * to the ideals by which it is motivated. Ideals come first; when they are lost, all is lost."

So long as human actions and relations are to be governed by a code of moral and spiritual standards, then just so long is religion a vital part of the political, economic, and social system of a nation.

We are not confronted with the problems of world leaders failing to live up to their ideals, but rather with the problem of world leaders who have discarded the ideals that have heretofore dominated civilized government. Why do the dictators violate treaties, scoff at their pledged word, resort to treason, and commit savage acts of pillage and slaughter against races and whole nations of peoples? The answer is that they are no longer controlled by the moral and spiritual standards by which those things have been heretofore instinctively judged to be wrong.

Rulers who do not believe in God, who regard as highly moral anything which they wish to do, those rulers cannot consider that they have transgressed the moral and spiritual codes and cannot understand why other nations and peoples reproach them and condemn their actions.

Why do the dictators attempt to suppress or dominate all religious ideals, thinking, and organizations? There must be two reasons: First, the dictator cannot tolerate a divided allegiance. Second, and more important, the dictator realizes that he must control the moral forces and the spiritual thinking and beliefs of the peoples whom he governs in order that he may dominate and direct those forces. To accomplish his purposes he must either control or wipe out the religious beliefs of his subject peoples. For that reason he attacks the age-old religions of the world.

Can we accept the proposal of the dictators that democracy no longer has a place in the government of men? Weigh well what it means if democratic institutions are to be cast aside. It does not mean merely that the form of democracy is gone. It means that the moral and spiritual concepts of human relations between man and man, and man and God are no longer to be respected and preserved by governments. Are the concepts of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man no longer to be the spiritual guides of our political organizations? If that ideal is no longer to control, then slavery to the State is the highest position to which man can possibly aspire.

If these ideals upon which our Government is founded are right, then, while we cannot foresee the steps which we must take, we can chart the direction which we must go and the purpose which we must have.

Our attention during the last few months has been focused upon the question of national defense. We are largely of one accord in our belief that we need, and must speedily acquire, a stronger navy, a larger army, and a greater air force. But those three things—great armies, strong navies, mighty air forces—will not preserve our institutions. Add to them, if you will, the ability to mobilize the entire manpower of this Nation and our great material resources—put them all together, large army, navy, air force, manpower, material resources—all of them together will not preserve institutions of free government in this country—for those things are instruments of power that, once they fail to function, cannot save us.

We must look beyond strong forces and material resources for the assurance of the maintenance of our institutions. This means not only that we must develop the strength of our military forces and be in a position to mobilize the vast resources of this country in the event of war; it means that we must have a rebuilding of the moral and religious forces from which strength of character comes.

The men of my profession delve day after day into the written law of the country. We refer to the common law, principles of equity, to statutes, and constitutions. These laws that have been accepted as the permanent basis of our system of justice do not rest upon their own foundation. They are not solely the "I say so" of constitution drafters, legislative bodies, or courts.

They rest upon the higher law. Any act of ours, either as individuals or as a nation, that fails to recognize that higher law, that tends to tear down the spiritual forces of this Nation, or that denies the Creator from whom those rights come, is an act which weakens and tears down our Government and its institutions. Undermine the religious basis of our Government and you undermine our whole social, political, and economic system. Take out of our laws, our constitutions, and our institutions all the precepts that are based upon religious principles and you will have remaining but a few shattered pieces

of a once great system of laws and government. The strength of democracy is in its religious foundation. There was its origin and there it must look for its perpetuity.

We must come again to believe as a people in a God that means honor, decency, and justice between men and nations and once again establish a recognition of the God-given rights of men as the basis for human conduct. We must again come to believe that the principle of man's brotherhood is not a principle to be whispered in cloistered places but that it can and must be made into a reality and that it controls the conduct of our relations with each other as individuals and the relations of our Nation in dealing with the nations and peoples of the world. The brotherhood of man rests upon the fatherhood of God. But believing is not enough. We must put behind our belief the force of a public opinion that will once again make our ideals fully effective in matters of government.

The Nation has and will again change as the composite individual changes. If the individual weakens, if the home influence deteriorates, if community standards fail, the Nation will likewise weaken, deteriorate, fail. It is a matter of personal duty and personal responsibility. It calls for the recognition of our individual share of the blame and our individual obligation to help in the restoration of the spiritual and the moral as the directing forces in the Nation. It is stated in our Declaration that the Creator has endowed us with certain inalienable rights. It necessarily follows that we are likewise endowed with certain inalienable responsibilities.

Let us recognize also that the blood stream in the person that we now call an American comes from the best blood of practically every race in the world. It has been blended here into a new race called American. We will not restore the moral fabric nor maintain the spiritual forces of this country unless we recognize that there shall be no distinction among Americans because of race, color, or creed. The true test of an American is loyalty to our institutions and the principles upon which our Government is founded. This is a matter not of race, color, or creed, but is a matter of the spirit and mind, the heart and soul of the individual.

I realize that there is a marked difference as to methods of worship between the great Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religious organizations. But we need not now be concerned with those methods of worship and the differences that have divided us. We are now concerned with rights of men. We must recognize that underlying the faith of Catholic, Protestant, and Jew is the all-important ideal of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. That is the unifying principle that is common to all. It is that ideal that the totalitarian governments desire to suppress. That being true, we should then have the wisdom and the courage to recognize that we have a common right to maintain, and a common ideal to promote and preserve. I am not urging the merger of our religious institutions nor that any one of them surrender its distinctive characteristics. I am urging that there is need for cooperation, real and earnest, to the end that rights sacred to each be not lost to all.

The right of every person to invoke divine assistance for his country, worship God in his own way, and by methods which to him are right, must be fully safeguarded by all of us. No other method is just nor safe.

So I, a Protestant, urge that we make common cause and unite our forces for the defense and maintenance of the common ideal that is the basis of our Government as well as of our religious faith.

To me, this is the fundamental task which we face in America. It is vital to us in this country—not only to ourselves but to our children's children. It does not concern America alone. We must recognize in this country, that, if the great Republic that is ours should fail to maintain its ideals—that is we fail—free government fails on this earth, and that our America is the sole hope of multiplied millions of people elsewhere in the world, their hope that somewhere, somehow, sometime, they too may be able to govern themselves.

Proposal to Feed Starving People of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

LETTER FROM FRED BRENCKMAN

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in view of the great suffering now existing in the various parts of war-torn Europe, and in view of the great surpluses of food which are to be found in our own country, I ask that due consideration be given the efforts made by the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies to provide a workable plan to save these people from starvation. Unquestionably, millions of our fellowmen are now threatened with starvation. The difficulties in the way of feeding them are well known to all who have studied the subject. However, we of America must not fail in this time of international crisis to retain within ourselves the spirit of goodwill and respect for the common need of defenseless men, women, and children.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Fred Brenckman, of the National Grange, and I would ask for the printing of a radio address delivered by Mr. Raymond S. Richmond over stations of the National Broadcasting Co., on the Grange Hour, from Washington, D. C., on June 21, 1941, but the Senator from Oklahoma has already had Mr. Richmond's address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1941.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: Enclosed herewith please find copy of a radio address made by Mr. Raymond S. Richmond, secretary of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, over stations of the National Broadcasting Co. in connection with the regular monthly program of the National Grange, Saturday, June 21.

The Grange believes that every effort should be made to devise and put into operation a workable plan to save from starvation the peoples of the small democracies of Europe which have been overthrown by the brutal might of the German military machine. In our opinion, the outlines of the plan that has been evolved by the Committee on Food for the Small Democracies is sound and workable. It should be given a trial. There could be no greater reproach to our civilization than to have it said that we callously allowed millions of innocent and defenseless men, women, and children to starve without even making an effort to save them.

It should be kept in mind that the peoples of these small countries are not asking for charity. Their exiled governments have the necessary funds to pay for any food that may be sent them.

It seems to us that Mr. Richmond's address gives in brief but completely understandable form the essential factors relative to Senate Resolution 124 and House Resolution 245, which deal with the food question.

We hope that you may find time to read Mr. Richmond's fine address and that you will do all in your power to aid the cause for which he speaks.

Sincerely yours,
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

The Job of Senate Pages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ARTICLE BY ROBERT MARCH

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very unique and interesting article prepared by Robert March, one of the Senate pages, entitled "The Senate Page Job—Its Unique Opportunities."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PAGE JOB—UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY

(By Robert March)

Amid the myriad occupations engaging the thought and energies of the lads of this vast country, I believe the occupation of the select group of boys known as Senate pages is paramount so far as preparation for later life is concerned. I should like to introduce the reader to this group of boys—21 in all—engaged in carrying out the wishes of the 96 Members of the Senate of the United States. Obviously, the most that any occupation can do is to expose the individual to the opportunities incident to the execution of its duties. It is entirely up to the individual boy to take advantage of these opportunities, and thus gain the impetus that the page job can give toward development of better citizens. Therefore, what I have to say will apply only to the type of boy who is far-seeing enough to improve these opportunities—a type which happily comprises the majority of the Senate pages. Having been a Senate page for the past 4 years, I seem to have arrived at the point where I have a yearning to inflict upon some hapless reader my views on the subject.

The occupation of page is an ancient and honorable one, which has descended to us from far back along the misty corridor of history—from the time when monarchs began hiring young boys to transmit their messages from ear to ear. Among these young fellows who have been elevated from the ranks of other boys of their age, a certain pardonable pride has continued to be manifested in bearing and action.

A boy may become a Senate page upon arriving at the age of from 12 to 16 years, when training and responsibility are of the most value in developing his character. Just

as he is beginning to comprehend the immensity and complex nature of such momentous issues as government, social problems, and life in general, he becomes a page and commences to absorb the varied knowledge that a page acquires in his ever-changing and always interesting duties.

His daily job necessitates his being actually present during all the debates in that august body, where he hears all the important questions of the day discussed from every point of view. Various subjects which he has undoubtedly heard his parents and their friends discussing are brought forcefully to his attention, and he acquires a sense of perspective regarding the relationships of the three branches of government. A deep respect for law is instilled in him as he hears it interpreted in language which is not too difficult for an intelligent boy to understand. He realizes that the true purpose and aim of all laws and legislators is actually to promote harmony, to make the life of the individual more secure and happy, and to promote the general welfare. He learns that the Constitution, instead of being merely a well-worded ideal, is a practical working basis which constantly guides the Senators and Representatives in their work of governing the greatest country on the face of the earth. Another point is the first-hand knowledge which he gains of the intricacies of parliamentary law.

Sitting on the steps at the base of the rostrum where the Vice President presides, the page observes the operations of the Senate with increasing interest as his time of service lengthens and his knowledge consequently broadens. No humorous situation arising from a Senator's ambiguous statement or the enforcement of a parliamentary rule escapes the alert minds of the pages as they sit in a row, all dressed in black with neat white collars, like so many penguins, conversing quietly together as they await the Senators' slightest whims. A boy serving in this capacity has a wonderful opportunity to cultivate the friendship of important officials, and to establish contacts which oftentimes are invaluable to him in later life when he needs recommendations of a friend important enough to command the attention of an employer. He also learns to appreciate the value of friendship with his fellow workers. Since the nature of the pages' duties require that they associate very closely most of the time, they learn the advantages of cooperation and gain appreciation of the better qualities of character in other lads of their age. As they scurry about the Senate Chamber in the morning preparing the Senators' desks for the day's session, they realize that they must work together to accomplish their job in as short a time as possible. If one of their number is absent because of sickness, the rest must cooperate and include the duties of the absent boy among their own. Thus, they are prepared to accept the responsibilities of citizenship when they arrive at the proper age.

From the time that the page first enters the hushed carpeted Chamber of the Senate till he takes leave of his fellow pages on the expiration of his appointment, the necessity of maintaining the honor and reputation of the pages is impressed upon him. Constant striving to do his work perfectly and to merit the approval of those in charge does much to develop his perseverance and industry. He becomes accustomed to obeying orders without question, though in a different manner from that of military camps. Rather than obey orders literally, with no thought as to their effect, he is taught to use his intelligence in carrying out his instructions. He endeavors to save as much time as possible by doing things in the most efficient manner. All this necessitates the exercise of judgment, thereby helping to create in the page a proper sense of values. This is of great importance to a boy at this period in his life. If he can learn to discriminate between trivial incidents and those which may affect his standing as a page, if he can analyze and retain the facts he gathers on the floor of the Senate, he is indeed better equipped for life than he would have been had he not had this opportunity. All the while he is scurrying around the famous Hall which has echoed the oratory of so many famous statesmen, his whole manner and attitude are undergoing a change. For instance, he is learning to place a high value on public property. Since he is often detailed to protect the property of the Senate, he comes to regard with disgust the ravages of the souvenir hunters who have no thought but for their own pleasure.

Many, if not most, of the Senate pages come from far distant parts of this great land to take up their duties in Washington. They leave home at the age when the value of money is just being brought to their attention. From their life back home, during the course of which their needs were taken care of by their parents and they probably had very little need of money, they are plunged into a new life in the Nation's Capital. From the carefree life of the ordinary boy with no more than a few cents in his pocket, the page makes the transition to the life of a wage earner making over a hundred dollars a month—$4 a day. From this fact arises, perhaps, one of the most debated questions concerning the advantages or disadvantages of being a page. It is said that this sudden increase in available money is detrimental to the page's welfare, in that he loses his appreciation of the importance of money as a tool in the complex modern life. It is argued that the page obtains his money too easily; that his idea of the relationship between the effort put into an occupation and the remuneration received suffers; and that he would not thereafter be satisfied with any of the ordinary jobs that he might merit outside of the Senate. This may be true of a few pages of less mature minds, but certainly it does not apply to the majority. Most of the pages are busy laying aside as much money as possible for college, after which they will be better equipped for future vocations. Many boys have found their jobs as Senate pages of invaluable aid in assuring them of success in later life. Some of them have become Senators themselves, or administrative officials, or have become well-known lawyers such as one gentleman in Wall Street who writes a card every year to "the youngest page" and one to "the oldest page."

Another question frequently considered is that of the page's education. Practically every page has been singled out on the street because of his distinctive uniform and asked by some interested gentleman or lady how he obtains his education. If you could but visit the United States Capitol, you would learn to your complete satisfaction the facts about the education of pages. They are required to rouse themselves from sleep early enough to enable them to get to school at 15 minutes past 7 o'clock every morning. In the winter it is a very trying experience for the young boy, with his desire for variety and diversion, to open his eyes on the bleak world at that time of morning and suddenly realize that another day just like the one preceding is about to begin. At that time of morning a peculiar distortion seems to affect the page's outlook as he wonders why he undergoes the trials and tribulations of a page. But as he overcomes this brief period of pessimism, and goes about the operations incident to getting to school on time, his outlook begins to change for the better, and another link in the chain of his character is forged. He realizes that he must get to school on time because his school time is precious and not to be wasted. Upon arriving at the Capitol he proceeds to the suite of rooms designated as the Capitol Page School. Here he must obtain most of his education from books—those age-old conveyors of knowledge. Instead of having every fact and theory thoroughly discussed and explained and served to him on a "silver platter," he must glean his knowledge for himself from the inanimate combination of printer's ink and paper. It is quite necessary for him to be able to weigh matters carefully in his mind, and to sort out the important facts and principles from those which are not so important. Unconsciously, an ability to form opinions based not on prejudice but on careful observation and analysis of facts is developed. Having very little time left after the demands of school and work are satisfied, the page comes to place a high value on spare time. He acquires the ability to fit his school work into any spare moments he has in the evening, and thereby maintain a high scholastic standing. The page works hard and plays hard.

During the long winter months the page scarcely sees the light of day. He arrives at the Capitol just as the tops of the buildings are turning in the east from gray to pink, and he bursts forth in the evening just as the sun is disappearing below the horizon in the opposite direction. During the summer, while the perspiring townsfolk grumble about the horrible heat, the page sits and dreams about the wind-swept trees bathed in golden sunlight, with broad expanses of lawn upon which one might stretch and forget the world. Tourists about to enter the Capitol, who happen to encounter one of the pages on his way to lunch, must wonder at the way he halts on the threshold of the out-of-doors as though fascinated by the scene before him. However, rather than lament the fact that he is compelled to spend his time indoors, the page's versatile nature prompts him to find recreation in his work. In his youthful enthusiasm, his daily duties seem more interesting, and he is able to relax while working. This ability to enjoy his work, if gained while young, will be a tremendous asset to brighten the long hours of work in later life.

At this juncture one may wonder just what sort of a group of lads the Senate pages are after they have been duly exposed to the influences of their occupation. Of course, you may be skeptical and may persist in regarding the system as unjustifiable, as do many who have obtained no first-hand knowledge of the facts. You would probably be immensely reassured, however, could you but visit the Senate and observe for yourself the quiet, orderly manner in which this group carries out its instructions. Instead of a horde of egotistical, ill-mannered young barbarians, one finds as intelligent, friendly, and mature a group as will be found anywhere in the country. This fact speaks well for the wholesome influence of the page job; and since these boys represent the best class of boys in America—the boys who will be its future leaders—one is assured of the bright destiny of our country.

Gasless Sundays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CARROLL COUNTY (N. H.) INDEPENDENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from

the June 13 issue of the Carroll County Independent, published at Center Ossipee, N. H., entitled "Gasless Sundays." It is an editorial dealing with the serious effect that gasless Sundays will have upon the recreation industry of my section of the country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Carroll County (N. H.) Independent of June 13, 1941]

GASLESS SUNDAYS

Folks in New Hampshire and New England are not taking too kindly to the idea of gasless Sundays. This is not through any lack of patriotism or lack of desire to cooperate with the Government in its short-of-war effort.

It is simply a feeling that New Hampshire folks are being called upon to sacrifice a part of their livelihood before any other people in the Nation are called upon to do so.

Now here in New Hampshire recreation is the State's second largest industry. The major portion of the income from the recreation industry is received during the summer months. And over half of that summer income comes in over the week end. Thousands and thousands of people drive to New Hampshire late Friday afternoon or on Saturday, spend the week end, and return to their city homes late on Sunday. Gasless Sundays would stop all this business. Furthermore, thousands of families, because the head of the household could not pay them a visit each week end, would not come to the State at all to hire a cottage for the season, but would spend the summer at their city homes.

Looking back on the gasless Sundays of the first World War, it is remembered that hardly a car moved on the highway. People did not gas up on Saturday in order to drive on Sunday. The gasless Sunday was established to conserve gasoline by stopping pleasure riding on Sunday, and people lived up to the spirit of the edict.

It is anticipated that gasless Sundays in New England would mean just that. A few cars would be on the road carrying elderly people to church. Doctors, undertakers, firemen, reporters, policemen, and clergymen would use their cars if necessary. Otherwise no traffic would move.

This would practically wreck New Hampshire's recreation business.

Now, the people of New England and the people of New Hampshire have stood adversity in the past and they are willing to face it again, provided they are convinced that the sacrifice is necessary and that other folks are in the same boat with them.

It is admitted that there is plenty of gasoline and fuel oil in the United States. It is simply a question of transporting it to New England. Because many tankers have been assigned to English use there are not enough to haul gasoline and fuel oil from the South to New England ports.

Folks in New Hampshire would be perfectly willing to have gasless Sundays provided that the Canadians were having gasless Sundays also, thus proving their good faith in the matter of war effort. We would be perfectly willing to have gasless Sundays, or an occasional gasless Sunday, provided that folks in other sections of the Nation would also have gasless Sundays and release for New England's use tank cars, tankers, and gas transport trucks.

New England folks would be better resigned to gasless Sundays and lower temperatures for oil-heated homes, if the Government would shut down W. P. A. projects and C. C. C. camps and put the men thus released to work chopping wood to furnish heat here in New Hampshire. With millions of cords of fuel rotting in the woods, it seems a shame that it should continue to go to waste while men are busy on made-work projects.

European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

LETTER FROM NEIL SABIN

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I take it that one Neil Sabin is a draftee in the service of his country at the present time. I ask unanimous consent that his letter, published in the Nashville Tennesseean, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWER REQUESTED

To the Editor: The four of us sat in the tent door and talked as the sunset faded over behind the flagpole. We were asking questions and discussing problems which were looking us in the face. Those of us in here and the rest of you people out there. Even the boys in the camps are beginning to wonder about the war, about its outcome and our entry into it. Suddenly it seemed that war was on top of us and as we discussed the war we realized the concern that everyone had in it, not just the soldiers but the mothers, fathers, the ministers and merchants, playboys and plowboys.

Isn't there time yet to stay out of this thing? We're not actually fighting yet; can't we pull up short of the final plunge? We couldn't decide. That morning we'd seen a newspaper headline, "America was destined to enter the war." We decided about that and quickly. It was pure unadulterated hokum and shouldn't be allowed. While we're still a democracy let's not be such fatalists.

If we go into this war let's do it with our eyes open. Not driven in like a horse with destiny as a blind bridle. We all like to be considered as peace lovers. Americans do, but have you seen anything to beat the way these peace lovers are clamoring for blood or the way they're yelling for higher wages and striking when they don't get them? We aren't cowards; we're as brave as the last generation, I think, but we want a few questions answered before we're sent 3,000 miles away to risk our lives for strikers.

First of all, we agreed, we'd like to know for what and for whom we're going to fight. If we're going to fight for England again we want our English cousins to agree not to call us suckers and fools for entering the war as they did last time. It hurts our ego and makes us pause to wonder about their sense of gratitude. For the last 20 years we've been schooled and drilled on the effects of propaganda in the last war so don't expect us to turn our coats overnight and go joyfully forth to get a bayonet in the belly just because someone waves the flag and says we're ready. We want some thinking done first.

We'd like to know how we'll be, as Americans, when it's over. We might be making poppies or pushing them up but if we aren't will we be better off? If we win will we annex some new territory or settle the problems of Europe? Rather won't we be inheriting the age-old hatreds, intrigues, and squabbles which have existed as long as Europe has? Admittedly we aren't after territory; we aren't in it for the money then. The other alternative was tried back in '17 and '18. Remember how it turned out? If we restored the old balance of power to Europe we would be curing her of a cold only to give her a fever.

If we must go to war, then give us some answers to our questions. Give us some bread and butter reasons. If it be necessary for us to go and if you so decide after you've given the matter your gravest consideration, then let's do it up brown. Let's dally no more with strikes which cause our Army to go without arms. Let's stop strikes and start our own propaganda in the enemy country as they have in ours. Build up a mechanized army such as is needed to match the enemy's, not an immense array of partially trained and partially equipped men.

Before we go over with such an army let's be sure. Be sure that this is the only course we can follow to guarantee our freedom. Never in the history of the United States has there been greater need for clear thinking by the whole people. Where do we stand in the clear cold light of reason as we turn the situation over and over in our minds? Have you done that? You owe it to yourself and to us. What's to be gained and are we sure of gaining anything? What's to be lost? Reason it out, people. Sit down with your balance sheet, with your debits here and your credits there. You do that with other problems. This is one of the biggest problems you will ever face. If you can balance your son's life, his mind, or his eyesight against the gain, if you can balance your heartaches, and if you're able to say "Never again" without crying; able to balance the loss of freedom and increase in prices and taxes against the gain; if you can do that much and get an even break; if the sheet balances at all, then let's unite under the assurance that we're doing the only thing to be done.

This much you owe us though—to give this question of war entry your gravest consideration. Tell us what we're fighting for and for whom. Give us some war aims or get England to formulate some. Give us some new slogans to replace the old worn out ones we have now. If we're to go, make us believe we're settling something. Tell us we'll have something to bank on, something to build on and live for when we're out of this mess.

Give us the answers, people.

NEIL SABIN,

RECEPTION CENTER,
Fort Oglethorpe, Ga.

Tribute to the Late Samuel E. Hudson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a eulogy, written by Horace C. Carlisle, of the late Samuel E. Hudson, a publisher and literary light well known throughout New England.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAMUEL E. HUDSON

Samuel E. Hudson, humanity's friend,
Great guiding light of the Woonsocket Call,
Has brought his labors on earth to an end,
Deeply bemoaned by the great and the small;

Throughout New England he'll sadly be missed,
Throughout Rhode Island he'll be missed far more,
Throughout Woonsocket, the people insist
That they've lost none whose death they so deplore.

Samuel E. Hudson, a man among men,
For sacred honor religiously stood;
Master he was of his own tongue and pen,
As he went daily about doing good.
Faith, hope, and charity, graces divine,
Until God called him from earth to depart,
In a far better world than this, to shine,
Dwelt in communion in his happy heart.

Samuel E. Hudson has fought the good fight,
And has triumphantly, peacefully won;
For in the law of love was his delight,
And his prayer daily was, "Thy will be done."

So, "It is finished," he, too, might have cried,
As he was breathing his last parting breath;
He has been called home, to ever abide,
Where there's no more pain, or sorrow, or death.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

War and Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY GORHAM MUNSON

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the March issue of the University Review, published by the University of Kansas City, there appeared an article entitled "War and Finance," by Mr. Gorham Munson, one of the outstanding thinkers, writers, and leaders on monetary matters in the United States.

Not alone because the article discusses legislation introduced by myself, but also because it is, in my opinion, a work of challenging interest, I have asked that it be printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

[From the University Review of March 1941]

WAR AND FINANCE

(By Gorham Munson)

Within a few hours after England declared war on August 4, 1914, the gold standard broke down. Prior to that date there was in England, except for checks and Bank of England notes, no paper money in general use. The ordinary citizen for the most part used copper, silver, and gold coins, and the well-to-do carried the now obsolete sovereign purses, especially designed for gold coins. After 1918 a generation grew up that has never jingled a gold coin in its pocket, and many have never even seen a gold coin.

On Saturday, July 25, 1914, Sir Frederick Atterbury, Controller of H. M. Stationery Office, received two callers who came in the name of the Chancelor of the Exchequer. One of these callers was Sir John Bradbury. The callers wanted—10 days be it noted before England declared war—to get paper money made. These notes became popularly known as Bradburys. The print order was given to Waterlow & Sons, and the following Tuesday, one week before the declaration of war, printing of the "Bradburys" started.

The bank holiday, due on August 3, was extended by proclamation through August 6. On August 5 the whole British banking system was insolvent. Its cash assets were only 1/6d in the pound of its liabilities; the gold reserves of the Bank of England had fallen to £9,960,640. The gold standard was revealed as fraudulent.

On August 6 the Government went to the rescue of the banking system. It passed the Currency and Bank Note Act and authorized the issue of paper money. It advanced the new money to the banks up to 20 percent of their liabilities—and then turned around and proceeded to borrow from the banks to the tune of £8,000,000,000 during the war period.

Taxes were able only to cover one-sixth of the expenditure of that period and the national debt rose from six hundred and sixty millions sterling in 1914 to almost eight thousand millions sterling in 1919, the rise representing the expenditure which it was deemed impracticable to recover in current taxation. Five-sixths of England's war expenditures was therefore financed by credit grants from the banks. The discovery was made that a world war could be financed to unprecedented lengths by borrowing from the banks supplemented by taxes.

In 1914 economists variously predicted that the war could not last for 6 weeks or 6 months or 2 years because the belligerents would run out of money. They did not dream that paper money would be found as good as gold; nor did they appreciate what bookkeeping could do. After the war the Cunliffe commission enlightened them on the technique of creating war credits, and post-war textbooks on banking began to admit that, as Reginald McKenna, banking authority, states it, "Every bank loan creates a deposit and the repayment of that loan destroys the deposit." "Every bank purchase of securities," he added, "creates a deposit and the sale of those securities destroys the deposit." Nowadays the intelligent section of the community understands that banks create money (credit) to lend, and that is one of the important pieces of knowledge gained from World War I. It is also accepted today that the orthodox way to pay for a major war is by taxes and government borrowings from the banks.

World War II, however, vastly more expensive than its predecessor, is battering down this orthodox conception which, as we have seen, wasn't orthodox in 1914. The imperative of war is making huger demands upon a financial system whose principles derive from medieval goldsmiths and whose outlook derives from Adam Smith, and a struggle is developing between those who think primarily in terms of men and supplies and those who are addicted to numbers and abstractions.

John Maynard Keynes' premise is that the Nation's real credit is rightfully owned by the private banking system and that, therefore, in 1914 when the people of Great Britain rescued their financial system it was quite proper for the banks to proceed to make the people of Great Britain loans upon the people's own credit and to charge them interest to boot.

"In the early days of the war"—

Mr. Keynes said in the New Republic for July 29, 1940—

"I proposed a financial plan for Great Britain. It was based on certain premises which should be obvious and are certain beyond dispute. War effort on the scale required in Great Britain must swell the wages bill, for employment has increased, longer hours are being worked at high overtime rates, and the wage rates themselves are rising. On the other hand, it is evident that there can be no similar increase in the amount of goods available for private consumption, since the whole object of the employment is to produce for war. On the contrary, an adequate war effort will require some diversion of the production effort which provided previously for private consumption. Thus a larger purchasing power will face a smaller volume of purchasable goods. If nothing is done about it, the sure consequence must be a rise in price until the smaller volume of goods sells for an amount of money equal to the larger volume of purchasing power.

"If by some general plan or agreement, consumers spend only a part of their aggregate money incomes, they will be able between them to buy just about as much as if they spent all their incomes, while the unspent balance will still be theirs to spend after the war when productive power can again be released to provide consumers' goods.

"In detail the plan took the form of proposals for deferred pay on a graduated scale by which a suitable proportion of everybody's income was withheld by the Treasury either as taxes or as a blocked savings deposit which would not be available until after the war. In the case of the richer classes the greater part of their contribution was to be withheld permanently as a tax; in the case of the working classes the greater part or the whole was to be withheld temporarily as compulsory saving and returned to them after the war."

Meanwhile the British Treasury would expend the savings to prosecute the war. There has been some speculation about the method of returning the compulsory savings or deferred pay which the Government would spend to carry on the war. Would the Government tax the taxpayer to pay him back the deposits he was compelled to lend? Would the banks be ordered to create credit for the return of the deposits and give this credit debt-free to the compulsory savers? Mr. Keynes suggests that a capital levy would do the trick. But would it? The owners of capital would have to sell or mortgage their property in order to have cash to pay the tax; only the banks, who can create credit, would be able to be purchasers, and this would mean, as it meant in 1919–21, the further large transfer of private property into the hands of the banks. Mr. Keynes did not advocate his plan for America. "The United States is," in Mr. Keynes' own words, "still a long way off the special situation for which my British plan was devised." The reason is the colossal industrial and agricultural capacity of the United States which causes Mr. Keynes to conclude that "your war preparation, so far from requiring a sacrifice, will be the stimulus, which neither the victory nor the defeat of the New Deal could give you, to greater individual consumption and a higher standard of life. You can still invest more and spend more."

NAZI FINANCE

The German system, with the gestapo alert to prevent bidding down of prices of Government securities and with a club behind the suggestions to business firms to invest their bank balances in Government securities, out-Keynes Keynes with totalitarian efficiency.

Germany has established a thoroughgoing control of the earnings, savings, and investments of her citizens. She has not had to resort to increased note circulation and has thus far obviated the danger of inflation. She places limitations on what the population can buy, and Schmidt significantly says that there is no place for surplus money to go except into Government securities. Like other nations, Germany finds that tax income is inadequate to finance all her war needs, and loans are essential; but there is a difference in the "silent" investment in Government securities.

There are two incipiently revolutionary elements in the Nazi financial system. Vehemently rejecting the gold-standard theory, Hitler has proclaimed that "work is our gold," that physical production is the cover for German money, and if this thought, namely that money should be related to physical supply of goods and services, is

followed through, one reaches revolutionary conclusions about monetary science. The Nazis incidentally have not thought as far along these lines as have some advanced economic thinkers in England. They are, however, quite clear that, in principle, national bookkeeping is radically different from private bookkeeping. This means that the state can make the rules (customs) of a national monetary system, and national accounts are derived from a monetary system created by the state. On the other hand, individual and corporation accounts must take the national monetary system for granted, trade in its tokens, and abide by its customs or rules. The Nazis have made a few new rules designed to increase the credit-power of the state, not nearly as revolutionary as certain new rules propounded in heretical British thinking on finance designed to increase the credit-power, not of the state, but of the individual citizen.

The Nazis face up to the problem of preventing an undue expansion of bank deposits resulting from financing the Government's deficits, devising a way of getting deposits out of the banking system and getting savings back into the stream of commerce. The Government would sell securities to the Reichsbank thereby creating a new bank deposit to be used by the Government to purchase armaments from munitions manufacturers. This meant the transfer of the deposit from the Government's account to the manufacturers' accounts. The manufacturers would then find themselves, as a result of profitable operations, in a stronger cash position and would receive "suggestions" that their excess cash be used to buy blocks of Government securities from the Reichsbank, thus removing and extinguishing the bank deposit originally created in the Reichsbank by its purchase of Government securities.

Nazi finance is a debt-generation system far more orthodox than heretical, and it is a misnomer to call it a financial revolution. Its new rules appear in the way in which Government debt is expanded. The Government sells its securities to the banks in order to get Government checking accounts upon which to draw for armaments. Industrialists who profit by the armaments orders and accumulate excess cash (bank balances), invest it in Government securities already held by the banks. Thus, deposits created by the securities are removed from the banking system, and savings are invested and find their way back into the commercial stream. This "dynamic use of Government securities," this "silent financing" is a smart trick (backed by force).

A DEMOCRATIC FINANCIAL INVENTION

Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, has developed a special interest in the study of money, and there are probably only two or three other Members of the House who have read as widely as he in this field. Mr. VOORHIS has in his proposed war-finance legislation drawn most of his leading ideas from the social-credit scheme of Maj. C. H. Douglas, cleverly adapted to the American problem of national defense in two bills, H. R. 1396 and H. R. 2851, introduced in the current Seventy-seventh Congress. H. R. 1396 is designed to meet the present situation of rearmament. H. R. 2851 is intended to be effective upon declaration of war.

Mr. VOORHIS rejects the cornerstone of Keynesian and Nazi war finance of Government loans from the banking system, giving as security the real credit of the people on the assumption that banks own this real credit. Mr. VOORHIS says flatly that a government should be the source of its own money and not the borrower of it, recalling the precedent of Lincoln in financing part of the cost of the Civil War with money (the famous greenbacks) issued directly by the United States. His argument for this new cornerstone for national wartime finance he presented on August 3, 1939, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix. So the Voorhis plan begins with the issuance by the United States Treasury of unborrowed "printing press" money, greenback currency, debt-free legal tender. The United States currency notes proposed by Mr. VOORHIS would carry a special clause limiting their use, not as legal tender for all debts, but as a cash reserve for bank loans. They would carry a 100-percent reserve clause; the banks could lend only an equivalent amount of dollars for the dollars of the special greenback currency deposited in them. Thus Mr. VOORHIS neatly prevents the new notes from forming excess bank reserves and thereby opening the door to inflation.

The purpose for which the new currency would be issued is to meet appropriations by Congress for the defense orders of the Army and Navy. We would arm ourselves and we would fight, if necessary, on money issued free of debt, backed by—to quote from H. R. 2851—"the vital assets, the natural resources, the physical plant, and the cultural heritage of the Nation."

At what rate should the new money be issued? And how shall it be called back? These are the crucial questions, and the answers given by Mr. VOORHIS are beyond dispute scientific in that they relate to physical quantities susceptible to measurement. The new money shall be issued at the rate of production of war goods; as the defense articles come into being, so does the money which represents them. The new money shall be recalled to the Treasury at the approximate rate at which the war goods are (a) delivered to the military and naval establishments of the United States as provided in H. R. 1396, or (b) at the anticipated rate of their consumption in warfare according to H. R. 2851. The generalized principle is that money should be canceled at the rate of consumption of article produced.

The means adopted for getting back from the community the money distributed in respect of new armament production is a tax schedule adjusted to the rate of delivery or destruction of the armaments. This pay-as-you-go tax schedule would naturally be a stiff one, but it would meet and defeat any inflationary tendency not otherwise controlled by the price-fixing methods normally employed by governments in war situations.

The final touches put by Mr. VOORHIS upon his bills reveal how inventiveness along democratic lines in finance works, as contrasted with the ingenuity of the strategists of totalitarian finance. In H. R. 1396—popularly referred to as the Voorhis guns-and-butter bill—the money taxed back by the Treasury is paid into a national-debt reduction account used to meet all payments of interest and principle of the direct obligations of the Government as they mature. By this remarkable stroke the people of the United States in making their armament effort would actually be paying off their national debt. The national debt would be converted into a permanent non-interest-bearing noninflatable currency, the immediate effect of which would be a consistent reduction of interest charges on the national budget.

In H. R. 2851 the final touch is that at the conclusion of the war the unexpended balance in the National Defense Credit Account would be distributed as a citizens' victory bonus. All citizens of the age of 21 or over would receive pro rata monthly payments for 12 months, a surer way of obviating the post-war slump than Mr. Keynes' problematical return of deferred pay.

It should be emphasized that the Voorhis plan is not an improvision. Mr. Keynes' compulsory-savings plan is, and Nazi finance is certainly a kit of improvised tricks. Behind the Voorhis plan are 22 years of credit research and considerable body of literature expounding the principles of national debt-free money, the ratio of production and consumption as the governing factor in prices, and the national dividend to which the citizens' victory bonus is akin. The Voorhis plan can be clothed in an argument rich in practical data and theoretical justifications. It would absolutely prevent such impeding of our defense effort as both the French and British suffered from deference to financial conservatism. The Voorhis plan is as superior to Nazi finance for building a war machine as Nazi mechanized warfare proved itself in May 1940 superior to the first World War conception of the French General Staff.

Annual Commencement of Houghton College and Seminary, Houghton, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, why should we wait until a man is dead before saying kind things about him? Why not pay him some tribute while he is still living and can appreciate it? Why not pronounce an encomium while he is still alive and vital and all his family can take both comfort and courage to carry on?

On Monday morning, June 9, 1941, our very able and distinguished colleague from New York, DANIEL ALDEN REED, gave a remarkable address at the annual commencement of Houghton College and Seminary at Houghton, N. Y., which is not only a challenge to the youth of America today but which is also a message of encouragement and hope to a disillusioned and bitter generation. His excellent speech is so full of elevated thoughts and is expressed in such eloquent language that even the most cynical among us should be convinced not only of its truth but so moved by its inspirational idealism that we will carry on and go forward in a broken, bruised, and bleeding world.

After Congressman REED finished his address to a wonderfully fine group of Christian young men and women of this institution of learning that trains mind, body, and soul, he was presented by Dean Ray W. Hazlett to President Stephen W. Paine who conferred upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws:

Dean HAZLETT. Mr. President, we would be the most sanguine of optimists if we should fondly believe that any faint echo of what we say here this particular day in June in the year of our Lord 1941 will surmount the tumult or shatter the silence of 10 decades hence. And we would be the most self-infatuated of egotists, were we wistfully or willfully to imagine that any record of our present participation, or even of our presence on this planet, will be handed down to a posterity separated from us by 1,000 aphelions and perihelions in time and space—if indeed there remains then a recognizably human posterity that has survived the disintegrating forces of hate and destruction

that surround us and threaten to engulf our civilization.

Nevertheless, we still believe that there are regenerative influences that will resist the corrosion of the centuries and the mutation of millenniums. I have already mentioned personality in the area of Christian scholarship; I would now like to add a second permeating principle—namely, that of personality in the area of Christian statesmanship. There is no essential difference between these complementary and reciprocal categories. Christian love and life service is the common cohesive principle of a happy, enduring society and a sound and stable government. In fact, the teachings of Jesus Christ contain the ideal democracy, and His life comprehends the essence of the democratic spirit. As the baccalaureate speaker of yesterday so forcefully expressed it, the Kingdom of God is to be found in the hearts of the humblest and the poorest and the weakest, as well as of the greatest and the wisest and the strongest—a simple, unostentatious kingdom waiting to be released in the lives of each of us as a positive aseptic principle and principle of good wherever we are, and as an antiseptic force to destroy hate and unselfishness, and to abolish evil and human misery wherever they are found. Truly, he who would be the greatest in this kingdom must be the servant of all.

The whole career of our distinguished speaker of the morning is a living exemplification of both Christian scholarship and Christian statesmanship in a democracy. Educated at our great neighboring university at Cornell—partly, we may assume, because Wheaton then seemed to lie too far away on the western prairies, and partly because Houghton was hidden among the encircling hills of the Genesee Valley, and besides was not qualified to grant college degrees in 1899—his service has been characterized by altruism rather than aggrandizement, by a love of people rather than of abstract humanity, and by devotion to the dictates of duty and conscience rather than to the demands of expediency and popular caprice. Content to start the practice of law in his home city of Dunkirk, he was soon appointed to a position of trust and honor in the legal excise department of his own State, and shortly thereafter became an eminent jurist who presented his cases with equity and eloquence before the highest tribunals of the Nation. His ever-widening sphere of influence became international in its scope when in 1918 he was appointed to head a special mission to France as the representative of the Government of the United States. Upon his return in 1919 he was elected from the Forty-third District of New York State to the Sixty-sixth Congress—an office which he has filled with the best interests of his satisfied constituency at heart to this present hour. His legislative acumen as a member of the all-important Ways and Means Committee is nationally appreciated and applauded.

I consider it a rare privilege and a very great honor to present this exponent of loyal, intelligent citizenship in action and service, this exemplar of the civic righteousness that exalteth a nation, of the constitutional rights and democratic liberties which our forefathers fought for and dedicated with their blood, this exegeter of the highest type of American education and Christian statesmanship—the Honorable DANIEL A. REED for the degree of Doctor of Laws.

President PAINE. DANIEL A. REED, we understand that in your mail you are frequently addressed as the Honorable DANIEL A. REED. This, no doubt, is a short way of calling you Honorable Mr. REED. Your friends at Houghton deem you worthy of this adjective. Through your years of legal practice, through your years as our Representative in Congress we feel that you have guarded well your good name, and that your diligent labors in the Legislative Halls of the Nation make you more worthy than ever of the title "Honorable." Today Houghton College wishes to join those who honor you for your faithful stewardship.

And now, under the authority of the regents of the State of New York, and of the trustees and faculty of Houghton College, I confer upon you the degree of Doctor of Laws, honoris causa, in token of which I present you with this diploma, and cause you to be invested with the proper academic costume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fitting tribute to one of our great Americans who is admired for his intellect, respected for his integrity, and loved for his character by all who know him. As Emerson once said: "What you are speaks so loud that I cannot hear what you say." All of us who know DAN REED—his students while he was coach at Cornell University, his most intimate friends and neighbors, his colleagues in the House of Representatives—rejoice that this signal honor has been wisely and graciously bestowed upon him. He is worthy of it.

For nearly a quarter of a century DAN REED has been a Member of the Congress of the United States, serving for many years on the powerful Ways and Means Committee, loyal to his friends, devoted to his duties, and always placing the interests of his own country first. Never has he wavered or faltered in keeping his oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. Modest, diligent, unassuming, calm, deliberate, kind, accommodating, and helpful to all classes and kinds of men; with a penetrating insight, sagacious discernment, and a soul filled with sympathy and affection for all who toil and suffer, DAN REED has won for himself an abiding and eternal place of affection in the hearts of his fellowmen. I am sure that all the Members of the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike, join with me in congratulating him upon this well-deserved honor that has been bestowed upon him by such a fine Christain college and in wishing for him and his good family life's richest blessings.

Under the leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by Congressman REED before the graduates of the various schools of Houghton College on June 9, 1941. It speaks for itself more beautifully and convincingly than I could in any words describe it:

ADDRESS BY HON. DANIEL ALDEN REED BEFORE THE GRADUATES OF HOUGHTON COLLEGE, AT HOUGHTON, N. Y., JUNE 9, 1941

I am delighted and highly honored to be with you on this happy occasion. I am grateful to President Stephen W. Paine and to the trustees and the faculty for the invitation to again visit this beautiful educational institution. To stand before an audience of young men and women, such as I now see before me, is always an inspiration. It gives me faith and hope for the future of our Republic.

Infinite pains and great sacrifices have been made by others to prepare you young men and women to go forth from here to enrich the social, civic, and spiritual life of the Nation. I am sure that there are fathers and mothers in this audience who have sacrificed much that their son or daughter might be equipped to live a more useful and a nobler life. Perhaps I can illustrate the point by a story:

A young man entered one of our universities, and at the end of 4 years won the highest honors for excellent scholarship. The evening for his graduation came. A gold medal was to be presented to him. Seated in the rear of the great hall was a little woman, plainly but neatly dressed. It had been a hard struggle for her to assist her son financially during his 4-year course. The night had arrived, however, when she was to see her son receive high honors. A gold medal was to be presented to her son. The presentation was made. The son left the stage, walked to the back row of chairs where his mother was seated and, in the presence of a great audience, he pinned the medal on her coat. The boy knew that it was she who by her toil and sacrifice had made it possible for him to win his scholastic victory.

I would impress upon you that there are few privileges that any of us enjoy the source of which cannot be traced to the sacrifices made by others. The benefits of the present are largely a heritage from those who have sacrificed for us in the past.

What has been the high purpose of the training you have received during your course here? I believe it can be summarized in the words of Daniel Webster, who once said:

"If we work upon marble, it will perish; if we work upon brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble to the dust. But if we work on men's immortal minds, if we imbue them with high principles, with a just fear of God and love for their fellow men, we shall engrave on these tablets something which no time can efface and which will brighten to all eternity."

I believe that the faculty of Houghton College has engraved on your minds the highest principles of righteousness, a just fear of God, and love for your fellow men. Let neither time nor circumstances efface these fundamental ideals from your mind and heart. Then, too, there is another test you might apply to determine in your own mind the full measure of your education. I believe it was Isocrates who said:

"Whom, then, do I call educated? First, those who control circumstances instead of being mastered by them; those who meet all occasions manfully and act in accordance with intelligent thinking; those who are honorable in all their dealings, who treat good-naturedly persons and things that are disagreeable; and, furthermore, those who hold their pleasures under control and are not overcome by misfortune; finally, those who are not spoiled by success."

These thoughts and principles relating to your education are a great heritage from the past, and it is upon these that the best in civilization has been achieved.

I am interested in you personally. I am anxious to see you succeed. But, naturally, I desire to have you use your influence, as educated citizens of a free country, to preserve, protect, and defend the principles which have made your country great. The Constitution under which you live has come to you as a great heritage. It comes to you in trust to use, then to pass on unimpaired as your bequest in trust to the next generation.

A young college man was heard to say: "There is much to say for nazi-ism, because it has a philosophy, while our Government has none."

It is evident from this young man's remark that he had little, if any, acquaintance with our Government or its background. I cannot urge too strongly at this crucial time that every young man and woman give careful study to his own Government and the philosophy upon which it rests. Succinctly stated, it is, in the words of the immortal Lincoln, "A Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

It is a grand and glorious thing to feel that you are a sovereign citizen in your own right.

That you live under a Government conducted by you through agents of your own choice who can exercise only such powers as you, as a sovereign citizen, have bestowed upon them.

Our original Constitution was mostly derived from the history and from the experience of the American Colonies and States. Most of its provisions are purely American in origin. There are many provisions of the Federal Constitution which were lifted almost verbatim from the State constitutions. The important thing for each of you to remember is that each officer of the Government can exercise legally only such powers as are granted to him or such powers as may be implied from those expressly given.

I would impress upon you that in every sense of the word the Constitution under which you live is the expression of the sovereign will of a sovereign people. You will often hear it said that the Constitution was drawn by men whose property interests were then at stake; that they were not interested in human rights. Beware of the purpose of such propaganda, for it states only a half truth, which by itself creates prejudice in the minds of the thoughtless. The fact is that we are not living under the Constitution as it was drawn. There were men who insisted upon a Bill of Rights, the adoption of which had to be assured before the States would agree to ratify the Constitution. The preservation of the individual liberties, guaranteed to each of you in the Bill of Rights, is a heritage of liberty which, if you are to remain free and sovereign citizens, you must be ever on the alert to preserve and protect. What are some of these liberties?

The Bill of Rights, which is a heritage for the protection of your freedom from governmental tyranny, is of vital consequence in this day of world chaos and madness. Among your liberties are:

Religious freedom.

Freedom of speech and of the press.

Security from unreasonable search and seizures as it relates to your persons, houses, and papers.

The right of jury trial.

The right of habeas corpus.

From bills of attainder or any ex post facto law.

From any involuntary servitude.

The right of peaceable assembly and the right to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

These are only a few of some 24 personal liberties guaranteed to you as free sovereign citizens.

There is one department of the Federal Government, the chief function of which is to protect from invasion the liberties of the people. The Supreme Court of the United States is your Court—the people's Court. It stands guard to repel any tyrannical usurpation of power on the part of the Executive or of the Congress. The danger to a free people from tampering with the Court was well expressed more than a century ago. William Tudor warned:

"Whenever any set of men shall entertain designs against the Constitution, either to overwhelm it in the anarchy of simple democracy or to found on its ruins a usurpation of monarchial power, they will commence their operations by open or insidious attacks to weaken or overthrow the judiciary."

You must realize, if you would remain free sovereign citizens, that you must resist with all your influence any attempt to weaken or destroy the independence of the courts.

I wish you might have been present at the unveiling of a marvelous painting in the rotunda of the Capitol at Washington. The artist, Howard Chandler Christy, with superb skill has produced the scene of the signing of the Federal Constitution. The characters seem to be life-size and lifelike. Among them, seated not far from George Washington, is the venerable Dr. Benjamin Franklin, and near him sits young Alexander Hamilton. They are conversing. Hamilton is saying to Dr. Franklin: "What have we here?" To which the Doctor replies: "We have a Republic if we know enough to keep it."

The task before us is to preserve and protect our heritage. Let us remember these words:

"That which raises a country, that which strengthens a country, and that which dignifies a country—that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the hearts of millions, and bows down the pride of nations to her—the instrument of obedience, the fountain of supremacy, the true throne, crown and scepter * * * is character."

So long as you and others like you can maintain the ideals, traditions, and fundamental principles upon which our Republic rests, you will find no lack of opportunities to serve and to succeed. But you young men and women may feel that, even equipped as you are mentally, physically, and morally to commence active life, there may be lurking in your mind that there are others more fortunate to meet the competition of these times. Do not yield to any such inferiority complex. Let me very briefly present a picture for your consideration.

In the fall of 1917, during the darkest days of the World War, I was in France. While in Paris an elderly French professor of the old University of Grignon invited me to visit that institution. I was reluctant to accept because I felt that most of the young French students were at the front, that there would be little to see at the university, except the buildings and the campus. Much to my surprise, I found the classrooms filled, not with physically sound young men but with the maimed, blind, legless, armless, and the physically handicapped injured soldiers. I saw elderly men who had been blind for years, guiding young men to the chapel to listen to inspiring music. These old men were impressing upon the minds of the young men, recently blinded at the front, that life could be beautiful and that they could be happy and useful in their community once they were trained for some new vocation. Not only the blind but others who had been torn by shot and shell were being taught some vocation suitable to overcome their respective physical disabilities.

This humanitarian service made a deep impression upon my mind and heart. Here were men being rehabilitated not only physically to engage eventually in some gainful occupation, but to be restored spiritually.

I came back to this country in 1918. I was elected that fall to Congress. As a member of the Committee on Education, and later as its chairman, I fought for appropriations to carry on this work of rehabilitation, first for our veterans and then for all physically handicapped persons. What has been the result? There have been 120,000 physically handicapped persons retrained and placed in gainful occupations. If these unfortunate persons had been permitted to become public charges, the annual cost would amount to $60,000,000, but, as a result of the expenditure of a total of $36,000,000, these persons are now self-supporting. One large industrial plant employs over 11,000 such retrained men and women.

I want you who are physically fit, well educated, to face the world determined to succeed. Let no handicaps stop you.

Furthermore, my good friends and fellow graduates, you are destined to live in an age when there will be thousands of opportunities available to you which were not existent a generation ago. Science is far out on the horizon, beckoning millions of young men and women to enter into a new inheritance. War, cruel, barbarous, and devastating as it is, will end. The laboratory and the Patent Office will turn the benefits of research into the activities of peace. The chemurgic age is here. You will live to see agriculture come into its own. We hear much about the sorry plight of the farmer, but for the farmers of tomorrow a new, brighter, more interesting, and more prosperous day is dawning. Chemurgy is now turning the waste material of the dairy into beads, buttons, belts, and other useful products.

The time is not far distant when instead of taking farm land out of production, millions of acres now abandoned will be required to supply industry with the raw material for the manufacture of an infinite variety of useful products.

You young people are stepping out into a new world of hope and opportunity. While you are the legatees of the labor and research of others, the bequest you educated young men and women make to future generations will, I believe, surpass by far that which others have bequeathed to you.

Finally, let me remind you of the great responsibility that is yours. Remember that:

"There is no act of man which is not the beginning of a chain of consequences so long that no human providence is high enough to give us a prospect to the end."

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD A. KELLY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the following is an address delivered by me on May 17, 1941, at the dedication of the National Youth Administration Experience School at Chicago Heights, Ill.:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, leaders of industry and education, ladies and gentlemen, in coming here tonight to participate in the dedication of this building that will house the National Youth Administration Experience School, on the south end of Cook County, I shall endeavor to carry on my part in this program in a creditable manner.

As a Member of the United States Congress for the past 11 years it has been my privilege to voice my opinions and support in its behalf.

In creating the National Youth Administration, as a Federal Security Agency, to secure for the youth in this Nation a proper and better course for them to follow, many people ask the question why was it necessary for the Federal Government to undertake such a task and the answer is that during the height of the depression and the years following, with the tremendous avalanche of unemployment facing this Nation, there was no discrimination as to ages, and the youth as well as their elders faced the future with but little hopes that they could serve in some capacity beneficial to mankind.

So, with a new phenomenon facing this country and recognizing the serious nature of the problem of youth unemployment and its undesirable implications for a healthy society, Congress created the National Youth Administration to attempt at least a partial remedy for what was becoming an alarming situation.

This new agency almost immediately upon creation found itself faced with a twofold

function. Not only was it necessary to alleviate present distress but at the same time it was necessary to make an effort to determine the basic causes of youth unemployment, its extent and nature, and to conceive and promote plans for an effective and permanent solution. There are people sitting here on this platform who you will hear from that can give to you a more vivid picture than I of the necessity of this project.

These problems and their solutions became the problems of every man elected to public office; upon them rested the responsibilities to their communities. I have had the pleasure of serving in Congress the city of Chicago Heights, Ill., during my tenure of office. You of Chicago Heights have had some fine chief executives. The late Judge Hood, for whom I always had a very deep admiration; the Honorable Daniel Bergin, that upon an occasion as early as 1934 foresaw the future depletion of our youth unless something along this nature materialized; and the present mayor, from whom you will hear a little later who will address you upon the subject The Tragic Waste of Youth Power.

Not only was it necessary to alleviate the present distress and to make an effort to determine the basic causes of youth unemployment, it required exhaustive studies undertaken by the N. Y. A. as well as other Government and private agencies.

Vocational guidance a century ago consisted for the most part of advice given by relatives and friends. This, coupled with the academic training given in school, was believed to constitute aid for the individual in selecting one of a limited number of vocations usually open to him. Family tradition, restricted mobility, and an economy of nonindustrial nature effectively served to limit one's occupational choices. With the advent of a large-scale manufacture, increasing specialization of industry made it very difficult, if not impossible, for the young person to make, with the customary aid, a sound choice of occupation.

Agencies willing or able to provide vocational guidance were relatively rare. Sampling various kinds of work by drifting from job to job represented the only method used. Vocational maladjustment, with its waste in cost of training, inefficient work, personal dissatisfaction, and high turn-over, was an inevitable concomitant of such method.

Although the adverse effect of vocational maladjustment on emotional life and the prevalence of social unrest was apparent, cultural lag was retarding the acceptance and growth of vocational guidance facilities. Conditions were slowly improving, but the available facilities could only help a small percentage of those in need of guidance.

In a great many cases, also, it was found that the doors of employment were shut to youth because they lacked the required "work experience." In such cases they were faced with the dilemma of not being able to obtain work because they had no experience and not being able to obtain experience because they could not obtain jobs. Work had to be provided if this impasse was to be avoided.

Continued rebuffs were resulting in disintegration of personality, lowering of morale, and destruction of values.

In order to get authentic information of the distress that was facing our youth, those drilled in educational institutions patriotically gave their services to this Nation with information and also themselves to try and solve these problems, while they hide away in the background, unnoticed in many cases, a grateful Nation and those who lived and labored with these problems will never forget the full measure of their devotion.

Some years back—in fact, on the last day of December 1937—I was called to a manufacturers' meeting held in the city of Harvey, Ill., and discussed problems in general with those assembled. One of the problems that I called attention to was what are we going to do with our young generation. I specifically called attention to these men that I thought they should give at least 2 days' work per week in order that these boys and girls might have some knowledge of skilled work in case the wheels of industry were geared up. Some agreed, others did not, but it is, as always, the opinions of men that make it possible for democracy to work, and I am proud to know that industry is cooperating 100 percent with the National Youth Administration.

In all our troubles, domestic and foreign, and the solving of our problems women have played a major part. Women especially have contributed more than their share in building up the National Youth Administration, because it is the women who have to bear the brunt of suffering when a crisis envelops a nation. It is with their encouragement that inspires man to carry on. One of the finest contributions I have ever read about the courage of women is the inscription on the monument dedicated to the pioneer women of America at Ponca City, Okla., depicting the lives of all American women.

In conclusion I wish to quote the words of the President of the United States in his message to Congress asking for their consideration for this noble project, in which he said: "Democracy is not a static thing. It is an everlasting march, for when our children grow up they, too, will have problems to solve. It is for us, however, manfully to set ourselves to the task of preparations for them, so as to some degree the difficulties they must overcome may weigh less heavily upon them. I am confident that the American people, understanding these problems, and having put their shoulders to the wheel, will build a better America for the children yet to come."

Eternal Vigilance Will Preserve the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader in the House of Representatives and Chairman of the Republican National Committee. This very timely and able address was delivered in my district June 23, 1941, before the McLean County, Ill., Women's Republican Club, Bloomington, Ill. The address follows:

Madam Chairman, ladies of the McLean County Women's Republican Club, and fellow citizens, it is always a very great pleasure for me to visit the State of Illinois. It is an even greater pleasure to attend the annual banquet of the McLean County Women's Republican Club. The women of America have contributed much to good government, and they will contribute much more. The Republican women have been a tower of strength to the Republican Party. The pleasure of being here is augmented by the fact that I can be with my good friend, Representative ARENDS, who, as you undoubtedly are aware, is one of the outstanding Representatives of the State of Illinois. He is also one of the sound, sane, solid, dependable Members of the United States Congress as well. Starting at the foot of the Military Affairs Committee, he has risen in seniority until he is our third ranking member. This committee, as you know, has carried a tremendous burden in the last 2 years. The Seventeenth District of Illinois is fortunate in times like these to have a Representative like Mr. ARENDS in the House. His work as a legislator has been of great value to the Nation and to his party. I sincerely hope you will keep him in Congress for many years to come.

We find ourselves here tonight midway between Flag Day, which is past, and the Fourth of July, which is to come. Those two events have vast significance in this year of 1941.

It is going to tax the courage, patriotism, self-reliance, energy, and ingenuity of the American people to make certain the flag, to which we all paid a special homage on the 14th of this month, shall continue to be the symbol of enlightenment, individual liberty, free constitutional government, free press, free religious and political beliefs, in short, the symbol of our American way of government and our American way of life.

It is going to require not only great vigilance, but a consecrated devotion to country, to liberty, and a profound faith in Almighty God to perpetuate that real independence which we celebrate on each Fouth of July.

It is going to tax the patience, perseverance, and determination of the American people to maintain and to perpetuate the biparty system of government which has been evolved in this Nation over the years as the best form of free constitutional government in the world.

Many grave new stresses and strains are pressing upon us to swerve us from a continuation of our American way of government and of life. Some of these pressures are brought about by design. Some are brought about by force of circumstances. All of them must be watched if we are to keep the torch of liberty aflame on the continent of North America while the rest of the world is engulfed in the conflicts of war.

Tremendous tasks and gigantic responsibilities confronts us. We have in 8 years accumulated the most stupendous national debt ever piled up in any country in the world. On top of that colossal debt we must now pile another even greater debt, because we must build, and build quickly, a national defense which will be impregnable against any assault which could come from any source at any time in the future. That defense must be built as efficiently, as quickly, as economically as possible. We must make ourselves strong enough in long-range airplanes of the necessary military types, in tanks, in ships, in guns, and munitions to help maintain peace and liberty in the world without having to engage in armed conflict.

We want peace, but we can have peace only by being prepared for war. In this critical hour we cannot afford the luxury of strikes which will retard the defense of America.

When boys are being drafted at $21 a month, the people demand they have the guns, the ships, and the planes to equip them for their efforts. We must not fail the boys who are laying their jobs, their futures, and their lives upon the altar of security for their country.

We have a tremendous advantage—for which God be thanked—in our geographical location on the globe. We are removed from quarreling Europe by 3,000 miles of stormy Atlantic Ocean. We are removed from the conflicts of the Far East by the thousands of miles of Pacific seas. Nevertheless, we must build our national defense with the greatest expediency, efficiency, and economy possible. We must begin to cut down, and to cut down drastically, on the nondefense expenditures. Taxes necessitated by all these expenditures are going to be enormously

heavy. While we are doing these things, we must be very vigilant against being persuaded by a highly organized propaganda to give up one by one our liberties in this country when such sacrifices are not necessary.

We must beware of the power and the danger of political propaganda. It has been by the power of organized propaganda that the liberties, the freedom, the property, and the very ideals, cultural and spiritual, have been filched from the peoples of many other nations. It has been by the power of such propaganda that peoples once proud, cultured, and with a bright and shining history of past achievement have succumbed to the tyranny of dictatorships in other parts of the world.

The threat to our free institutions from propaganda is very real. We see the present administration spending nearly $100,000,000 a year for propaganda purposes. The air, the press, the movies, and the mails carry a flood of appealing arguments.

It's a tremendous influence which can be put into motion by the forces of the administration. We can see how difficult it is for the opposing side to be heard.

The one hope is an alert and intelligent citizenry.

Eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty—today it is the price of peace as well.

As we move nearer and nearer to war, we move more and more toward the consolidation of power in the Federal Government against which we have been warned by every statesman from George Washington down to the present day.

The American people must be constantly on guard to save their rights and liberties. This was strikingly revealed by the demand of the administration for the so-called seizure bill.

That bill, as originally requested, would have given more power to the Executive than was asked to fight and win the first World War. The administration wanted the power to take the watch out of your pocket; or the small savings account you have accumulated through years of thrift and toil. It sought the power to seize your newspaper, your business, your home, or your farm at any price the President should fix, and to sell it to whomsoever he desired at whatever price he pleased. It wanted the power to thus take your property to sell, destroy, or to hold and operate for all time.

If this bill passed the Congress as demanded by the administration, America would have found itself with a first class dictatorship in operation here at home.

The mighty voice of the Nation was raised in opposition to this proposal. Now it is being urged in a modified form, although the President already has plenty of power to break any jam in the defense production. The incident clearly shows how dependent the people of America are on an alert and courageous Republican Party.

There was no need or excuse for this demand for superconstitutional powers. I pledge you here and now we will keep faith with the people and fight to protect their rights and privileges.

I wish to speak plainly to you here tonight. I wish I could speak as plainly to every man and woman in the United States. I want to say to you, the ideals of our forefathers, our free constitutional government, our Bill of Rights, our American way of life, will be preserved and perpetuated by the vigilance, the common sense, the patriotism, and the love of liberty of our own people here at home.

We are standing tonight, my fellow citizens, on the threshold of a great decision. Are we going to admit that constitutional Republic set up by our forefathers is only a fair-weather Government, and, to meet present world conditions, we must abandon our form of government and our way of life for the same kind of totalitarianism we are opposing? Or are we going to stand firm on the ground that grants of powers to the executive branch of the Government shall have reasonable time limits placed upon them and shall expire with the ending of an emergency? Either we shall decide our way of government and of life are not as effective under modern conditions as the way of despotism, of absolutism, or of communism, or we are going to stand fast on the American way of doing things and demonstrate the superiority of that way.

In deciding these questions we may be deciding whether or not our people shall, for generations to come, live under the totalitarian power of the Federal Government until perhaps they may become so accustomed—so conditioned—to servitude under an all-powerful Central Government that freedom such as we now know will be but a dim memory and a futile hope.

There comes to my mind as I speak to you here tonight a profound question touching the whole of human life and experience—touching the whole of human society and human government—which the Man of Nazareth propounded when he asked:

"What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

Well may we ask ourselves tonight, "What shall it profit us—or the rest of the world—if, in trying to preserve liberty for others, we shall lose our own liberty here at home?"

In these hectic days we must not overlook the significance of what is happening in our Federal courts. Six years ago the people won a famous victory in preventing the packing of the Supreme Court. Happy over their victory to protect the American form of government, they lapsed into a renewed sense of security. But time marched relentlessly on.

Now we find the Supreme Court and most of the other Federal courts have been thoroughly packed.

There is no longer any effort to maintain a balanced court of political philosophy or economics, as has been the American conception in the past. Only men of a specific philosophy are honored with judicial appointments. This must be of grave concern to all the thinking people of this country.

When the New Deal administration came into power in 1933 there were five Republicans and four Democrats on the Supreme Court bench. Now there are seven Democrats and two Republicans.

In the 9 years of the New Deal administration not a single Republican has been appointed to the Supreme Court. That is in contrast to the appointment of two Democrats by previous Republican Presidents. If Republicans have been given any recognition in the lower Federal courts, such instances have escaped me.

It is true, a Republican and a great jurist—Justice Stone—was elevated to the Chief Justiceship. We all hailed that as a good appointment; but the whole record is one which rightfully gives the American people much concern.

It indicates very forcibly the one hope of those who want a balanced government must be realized through the election of a Republican House in 1942.

As sinister events tread on one another's heels, and as the outlook becomes darker and darker, we must, in making our decisions, reflect long and deeply upon the possible consequences of such decisions as we shall make. We must not give up liberty in America. We must keep uppermost in our minds the preservation and the perpetuation of free government and free enterprise; of free press and free speech; of religious and political liberty in this Nation. If the way of free, constitutional government does not prove adequate to meet the situation which confronts us today, it will not be the fault of our plan of government or our plan of life; it will be because we have become so soft and because we have been beguiled so far from the ideals of our forefathers that we lack the courage to uphold liberty and freedom and culture in this Nation. I, for one, shall never believe the American people have lost their courage or their self-reliance until I see it happen.

We do have those among us who are hostile to our ideals. For 8 years there has been too much coddling of the Communists. They have been entertained and dined by high officials. They have been allowed—indeed, encouraged—to flourish in our schools, our labor organizations, and in the Government itself.

It was revealed 2 years ago that more than 3,000 men and women with communistic affiliations are holding posts with the Government—some in positions of extreme importance.

Everybody has known of the infiltration of Communists into a few of our labor organizations.

The administration long failed to act in the face of this growing menace. As the great national crisis became more acute the short-sightedness of the course became obvious, and efforts are quite properly being made now to clean up the subversive elements in labor organizations. For the good of the country and the good of labor itself this clean-up must be brought about.

I would suggest the Government could proceed with its job with better grace if it cleaned out its own ranks. Any man or woman who seeks to destroy the American form of government and the American way of life must be separated from the Government pay roll and rendered harmless to the national defense.

While these problems of war and of defense engage our attention, we must not forget the grave domestic problems which remain to be solved. Those internal problems have been obscured by the excitement over war and the hasty activities of building the national defense, but they have not been solved, even in a small degree. Quite to the contrary, many of these domestic problems are being aggravated by events which are transpiring. We must be on our guard lest these problems, hidden now under the mists of propaganda, and the clouds of fear, and the smoke of preparation, shall suddenly loom up like ugly peaks out of the clouds to wreck our Nation.

We must be alert to the dangers which may confront us while war continues. We must also be alert to what may be even greater dangers which will confront us in the economic chaos, sure to follow the war, when the battling nations have been bled white and have become financially exhausted.

We must, at all hazards, my fellow citizens, maintain the biparty system of government in this country. We must maintain the right to question, and the right constructively to criticize whatever methods are employed, whatever policies are pursued in the prosecution of our own affairs. Let us not forget that even in England constructive criticism has not been suppressed.

Now, this may seem a dark picture. It is a dark picture. For long years we have taken all of the freedom, and the liberties, and the privileges embraced in the Bill of Rights as matters of course. We are now suddenly confronted with the necessity to fight spiritually, culturally, politically, and socially to maintain and perpetuate those liberties for ourselves, and our children, and our children's children.

But, dark as the picture may seem, there is a bright side. We have the greatest capacity for the production of necessities and luxuries of peace or the implements of war of any nation in the world. Our capacity to produce exceeds that of all the nations of Europe combined. We have the most enlightened people in the world. Our wage earners, with good leadership, will be found to be the most patriotic, intelligent, and capable workmen in the world.

I am confident the sons and the daughters of those pioneers who came to the uncharted shores of North America, and by their courage, self-reliance, energy, and thrift carved out of the plains and the forests of this con-

tinent the great, rich, enlightened and powerful Nation which is ours today—the sons and daughters of those pioneers, I say—will meet the trials and the tests which confront us, and they will keep burning brightly the torch of liberty here in the United States. The lamps of freedom will not be extinguished. They will continue to burn here in our own beloved land as a beacon of hope to those peoples who have been subjugated, whose liberties have been wrested from them, whose rights have been trampled upon, and whose countries have been devastated by the ruthless depredations of godless dictators.

These lamps of freedom will be kept burning by the election of a Republican House of Representatives in 1942. We must have a Republican House to stand guard; to see to it that the enormous powers which have been given to the executive branch of the Government are properly used and then promptly returned to the Congress and the people when the emergency is ended.

Liberty will again reign in those places in the world where it has been temporarily extinguished.

The American people have the intelligence, the capacity, the patriotism, the industrial plant, the natural resources, the geographical position, and the will to preserve the American way of free government and the American way of free life. They will do it.

In this critical hour America demands unselfish and patriotic leadership. It must be a leadership which will subordinate poltical aims and aspirations to the vital job of making America safe. It must be a leadership big enough to forget old prejudices and bitterness and make us a united country. It must be a leadership which will not permit anyone or anything to interfere with marshaling 100 percent production in our struggles to arm America.

We have the money; we have the resources; we have the manpower to keep ourselves an unconquerable people. All we need is the spirit and the determination to utilize the priceless advantages we possess.

We must throw out the Communists, the Fascists, all "fifth columnists." We must make sure no Trojan horses are hidden anywhere in America. We must put the "palace guards" who would remake America back into their realm of theories while practical men save the Nation. We must squelch the wreckers and selfish exploiters who have too long taken the country on a perilous "joy ride."

We must be all out for a united America—an America true to its philosophy and ideals; an America in which the people shall continue to rule; an America determined to remain free and to work out its destiny in its own way.

With such a true American spirit we can have a united country, and in this unity we will have the strength and the courage to overcome any obstacle or any foe.

What Happens to a War Order Marked "Rush"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER TROHAN

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Trohan in the Chicago Tribune entitled "What Happens to a War Order Marked 'Rush' ":

[From the Chicago Tribune of June 14, 1941]

WHAT HAPPENS TO A WAR ORDER MARKED "RUSH!"—A TOUR THROUGH MAZES OF RED TAPE

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 13.—The Tribune today presents the story of a single British "rush order" for war supplies. The story presents an amazing picture of what goes on behind the scenes in American arms production and the drive to speed aid to Britain.

The reporter tracked the jungles of British and American red tape on the trail of a contract for a vital item of military equipment. The quarry was tracked down when the trail was nearly 4 months old.

It is estimated that another 3 months will have elapsed before the material reaches the front at which it is needed. By that time the need for the material may have long since disappeared, but that is the risk that red tape brings.

THE STORY STARTS

Here is the story:

First week of March 1941: Colonel A., with the sun-baked forces of Gen. Sir Archibald Wavell on the Libyan front, was impressed with the performance of an American combat vehicle. The vehicle was of a type which American industry is ready and equipped to turn out in quantity. The colonel persuaded his superiors that 250 of these combat vehicles were needed to stem the advance of Axis Powers. His request was given quick clearance by General Wavell and a requisition was cabled to London.

March 7 to April 10: The requisition made the round of British bureaucracy. More than 70 signatures were required before the order was given final approval. In that period it was examined by dozens of major and minor bureau heads and passed through several ministries. Several cables were exchanged between Cairo and London on minor specifications. Dozens of copies were made of the order.

LONDON CABLES WASHINGTON

April 11: London cabled British purchasing agents in Washington to ask that the 250 units be procured under the lend-lease program, which had been passed since Colonel A. made his original request.

April 11 to April 17: The order went the round of British purchasing offices here before it reached the proper hands. More signatures were necessary before the request could be transmitted to the American Government.

April 17: Two British businessmen, dollar-a-year men attached to the British purchasing mission office, walked into the War Department office of Colonel XYZ, who is in charge of procurement of the item being sought. The American colonel, in sympathy with the need of the British colonel, who by that time had been waiting 1 month for the needed material, promised every aid. The American colonel, a reservist called to active service because of special aptitude, reported in the strictest confidence that he could have called up several pals in the manufacturing business and have had them turn out the needed 250 items by "a week from next Wednesday." However, the operation of the Lend Lease Act requires that he first secure a directive. Only the President of the United States can authorize expenditures under the Lend Lease Act.

MAKING THE ROUNDS

April 18: Started on round of War Department.

April 19: Saturday and half day in the Government. Nothing done on order in question.

April 20: Sunday full holiday.

April 21: Order continued round of War Department.

April 22: Order moved across the street to Federal Reserve Building to desk of Lend Lease Administrator Harry Hopkins. Full day required for the trip.

April 22 to April 29: Order glided around spirals of red tape in Hopkins' office. Snagged several times. One day required to send order few blocks to White House.

April 30: Order in White House for President's signature. Mr. Roosevelt busy writing speech urging Nation to buy defense stamps and bonds so that armament production can be speeded.

May 1: President calls for creation of a 2,000,000-ton shipping pool to speed shipment of war supplies to Britain. Order remains unsigned.

CONFERENCE ON SPEED

May 2: President lunches with Lord Halifax, British Ambassador, and Malcolm MacDonald, Canadian high commissioner, to consider means of speeding shipment of supplies to Britain. Order unsigned.

May 3: President leaves for week-end in Virginia retreat, leaving order behind.

May 4: President busy delivering speech at Staunton, Va., birthplace of Woodrow Wilson, asserting America is ready to fight for the kind of faith which actuated the World War President.

May 5: Order still unsigned. President ill.

May 6: In a speech which had the blessing of the President, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson said that Britain is beaten unless aid is rushed to her. The President met with his war cabinet to consider ways and means of creating the most powerful bombing fleet in world for Britain. Order still in White House.

May 7: President voted power to seize foreign ships as means of aiding Britain. Order unsigned.

PRESIDENT IS BUSY

May 8 to May 12: President believed busy writing major speech for delivery before Pan American Union, which was to carry forward his aid-to-Britain program. Speech canceled because of President's illness. Order unsigned.

May 12 to May 26: Order still in White House.

May 27: President Roosevelt in radio address to Nation proclaims unlimited emergency in calling on Nation to make all-out effort to bring victory to British cause. No action on order.

May 28: President rests from speech effort. No action on order.

May 29 to June 3: President leaves for week end at Hyde Park, N. Y. Leaves order behind.

June 4: Colonel XYZ hears order was signed by President. However, he is unable to act on verbal order. Must await actual document.

June 5 and June 6: Order en route to Colonel XYZ.

June 7: Order reached Colonel XYZ. Because of his sympathy for British fellow officer, who has now been waiting 3 months, the American officer takes the order personally over to the Office of Production Management, where 12 signatures are required before the contract can be cleared. Secures 2 signatures.

ANOTHER SPEECH MAKER

June 8: Key O. P. M. official out of town delivering a radio speech calling for prompt action to aid Britain. Day lost.

June 9: Secures five signatures.

June 10: Secures all the remaining signatures. If Colonel XYZ had not personally carried this order to the O. P. M. offices himself it would have spent 3 weeks to a month shuttling around the various offices.

June 11: Bids are asked on the contract. Here the story ends for the present, but Colonel A is still a long way both in time and distance from the combat vehicles he asked the first week in March.

Next week contracts will be signed. More signatures. The material will be turned out in 2 weeks. Inspection will necessitate more signatures. Shipping by freight will require more signatures. Still more will be needed to get the items aboard a vessel bound for their destination.

By late August, with the best of luck, Colonel A, of His Majesty's North African forces, may see the first of the vehicles he ordered—if he is still alive and if there is a British North Africa.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call attention to the testimony given yesterday by Hon. Donald M. Nelson, Purchasing Director for the Office of Production Management, before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. In his testimony Mr. Nelson is quoted as stating that the Office of Production Management "very definitely" takes into consideration labor difficulties and interferences in placing orders and locating new manufacturing facilities.

In connection with this testimony, I desire to call attention to the very fine record of the workers in my home State of Louisiana. We have had only one strike to date affecting any national-defense unit or program in the entire State of Louisiana, and that was settled in a few days. Alien influences, who have no doubt contributed to labor unrest in other sections, are practically nonexistent in the State of Louisiana. The surplus labor is available and anxious to be employed. The spirit of the people there cannot be surpassed in any section anywhere. In addition to which there continues to exist the urgent necessity for decentralizing our defense industries, and to date but an infinitesimal portion of defense industries have been located in Louisiana.

The Louisiana State Federation of Labor has gone on record publicly as being opposed to strikes in defense industries during the national emergency. The resolution, which was adopted at a regular meeting of the executive council of the Louisiana State Federation of Labor on May 11, 1941, well expresses the sentiments of our workers, and reads as follows:

Resolution urging the Louisiana State Federation of Labor affiliated unions to ban strikes during national-defense emergency

Whereas we are now passing through a great national emergency and are engaged in a national effort to increase productions; and

Whereas there now exists a demand for service and sacrifice if necessary; and

Whereas labor is willing to give service and make sacrifices in order to protect the American form of government and our democratic institutions; and

Whereas it is our purpose to guard carefully and protect well the legislative and economic interests of the workingmen and women of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive council of the Louisiana State Federation of Labor, That it does hereby urge all unions affiliated with the Louisiana State Federation of Labor to adhere to a strict nonstrike policy during the national-defense emergency; however, be it further

Resolved, That the Louisiana State Federation of Labor does oppose the enactment of antistrike, antiunion, and compulsory labor legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Louisiana State Federation of Labor do hereby further pledge itself in its devotion to our country, to our unions, to the principles of liberty, freedom, and democracy during the days which lie just ahead, and also repeat our patriotic determination to protect and preserve America and its cherished institutions at any cost.

I have this morning written to Mr. Nelson, commending him for his stand, and calling his attention to this and other advantages to be found in Louisiana.

The letter to Mr. Nelson is as follows:

JUNE 26, 1941.

HON. DONALD M. NELSON,
Purchasing Director, Office of Production Management,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: According to the daily press, you are quoted as having testified before the House Appropriations Subcommittee yesterday to the effect that the Office of Production Management "very definitely" takes into consideration labor difficulties and interferences in placing orders and locating new manufacturing facilities.

I am very glad to see your Department taking this position. In this connection, I desire to call your attention to the very excellent labor record of the workers in my home State of Louisiana. To date, we have had only one strike affecting any national-defense unit or program in the entire State of Louisiana, and that was settled in a few days. There is no doubt that some of the strikes in defense industries in other sections of the country have been called, in part at least, through alien influences. Alien influence in Louisiana is very small. The surplus labor is there and anxious to be employed. The spirit of the people cannot be surpassed in any section anywhere.

The Louisiana State Federation of Labor has gone on record publicly as being opposed to strikes in defense industries during the national emergency.

In addition to the attitude of our people, we have a climate unsurpassed in the United States, permitting work outdoors as well as indoors the year around. Fine harbors and three ports, including my home city of Baton Rouge, are to be found in Louisiana and all located in the heart of tremendous reservoirs of natural gas and oil. Power and fuel are there in practically unlimited quantities. Splendid highways cross our State in every direction.

Despite these many natural advantages, almost no defense industries have been located in Louisiana. All of these advantages above cited, together with the urgent need for decentralizing our defense industries, join in urging that you give full consideration to the locaton of defense industries in Louisiana.

I assure you that you will find every Member of the Louisiana delegation, all of the officials of the State from the Governor down, capital and labor, employer and employee alike, ready and willing to cooperate with you and give you all of the information and other assistance possible to enable you to determine defense industries that might be advantageously located in our section.

Very sincerely yours,

J. Y. SANDERS, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Reduction of Duty on Tungsten Ore and Concentrates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, OF MONTANA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made to the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

In 1939 the Jardine Mining Co., a new venture, produced for the use of American industry 20 tons of concentrates of this much-needed material, averaging 68.2 percent WO_3. In 1940 this mine doubled its production by shipping 42 tons of approximately 70 percent concentrates. This is a high form of tungsten concentrates very much desired by our high speed tool steel industry which ordinarily has to get along as best it may with tungsten concentrates averaging from 40 to 60 percent WO_3.

In the proposed foreign trade agreement with the Republic of Argentina, announced by the State Department May 13 of this year, tungsten ore and concentrates are listed as one of the commodities subject to negotiation for reduction in duty. The import duty on this commodity amounts to 50 cents per pound of tungsten contained in the ore or concentrates. The history of our tungsten production after the last war shows clearly the absolute necessity for tariff protection. Had it not been for this protection there would have been no tungsten mines in operation at the beginning of this present emergency. In normal times tungsten comes in from China at very low prices because Chinese labor receives less than $50 per year whereas American labor engaged in the production of tungsten ore and concentrates receives on an average from $1,250 per year upward.

At the present time there is exploration and prospecting work being carried on in the State of Montana which has already shown additional valuable deposits of tungsten ore to be available. The Jardine Mining Co., in Park County, Mont., has increased its production very materially to meet the present shortage. Any reduction in the import duty on tungsten ore and concentrates will not result in the importation from Argentina for the present emergency of a single additional pound over and above the shipments which will come in without any reduction in duty. However, a reduction in this duty at this time will discourage exploration, prospecting, and development as it did in 1919, 1920, and 1921. Men engaged in exploration, development, and production of tungsten ore will cease development work when they realize that at the end of this emergency the Chinese and other foreign ore will flood in here and cause the loss of their investment of time, work, and money.

While the tungsten-producing industry of Montana is perhaps not as large as that of other States it is entirely probable that it will be increased greatly in the present emergency for the use of our national-defense industries. It is important to my State in that it furnishes a living to many more when development now under contemplation for production is carried out. Under the circumstances I urge that for the benefit of the people of Montana and the Nation in the

present serious emergency that "tungsten ore and concentrates" be immediately stricken from the list of commodities subject to negotiation for reduction in duty under the proposed foreign-trade agreement with the Republic of Argentina.

Grants-in-Aid to the States for General Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following statement from the New York State Board of Social Welfare:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE,
Albany, June 18, 1941.

To: Representative MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of the State of New York.

From: The New State Board of Social Welfare.

The New York State board of social welfare endorses the recent recommendation of the Social Security Board that the Federal Government establish a program of grants-in-aid to the States for general relief, and urges your support of this program.

In asking your support, we wish to stress the fact that New York State has taken leadership in assuming responsibility for the care of dependent persons. You will recall that in the depression of the last decade New York was the first State to make public, State-wide provision for the unemployed, setting up the temporary emergency relief administration in October 1931. Later, when the persistence of mass unemployment in the face of industrial recovery made it apparent that the problem was not a temporary one, New York replaced the emergency agency with permanent machinery within the State department of social welfare to coordinate general relief with assistance to the aged, to the blind, and to dependent children. Thus, since July 1, 1937, this State has had a single agency to direct and supervise the administration of all four programs of public assistance.

How great the needs have been, and how heavily their burden has fallen upon State and local government may be seen from the following figures which cover only assistance granted, excluding costs of administration:

Fiscal year ended	Expenditures for public assistance			
	Amount	Percent local	Percent State	Percent Federal
June 30, 1938	$171,836,579	52.7	37.6	9.7
June 30, 1939	181,085,804	51.8	37.9	10.3
June 30, 1940	174,914,894	50.7	37.2	12.1

Of the public-assistance totals given above, general (home) relief financed entirely by State and local government accounted for the following expenditures:

Fiscal year ended—	*Home relief*
June 30, 1938	$127,334,625
June 30, 1939	128,010,839
June 30, 1940	118,349,093

To finance such heavy relief expenditures imposes a severe strain upon local and State resources. In May 1941 general relief was being provided for 225,000 cases, including some 650,000 persons, to whose needs the Federal Government made no contribution, although among these cases there were approximately 50,000 families with at least one member who would be eligible for W. P. A. placement if suitable projects were available. It is estimated that families having no employable members represent nearly half of the current case load.

In the opinion of the Board the following considerations point clearly to the need for Federal grants-in-aid for general relief, with reimbursement of 50 percent of the cost of such assistance and its administration in States having acceptable programs operating in all political subdivisions:

1. The Federal Government should recognize need wherever it exists without regard to employability, age, or special disability. The provisions of the Social Security Act covering assistance to the aged, to the blind, and to dependent children have furnished notable leadership to all the States in establishing programs for these special classes of dependents and in meeting minimum standards of relief. A similar provision for general relief would complete the circle of Federal responsibility for the needy. Federal aid for general relief would tend to equalize the disproportionate burden now borne by the minority of States that, like New York, have consistently pursued a policy of giving adequate relief to all needy persons, whether or not they meet the technical qualifications of eligibility for the federally aided programs.

2. Federal grants-in-aid for general relief would constitute an important step toward the eventual fusion of the four separate programs—old-age assistance, assistance to the blind, aid to dependent children, general relief—into one coordinated whole. This should make major administrative economies possible, especially in personnel.

3. If W. P. A. is to be continued in the future, Federal grants-in-aid for general relief would counterbalance some of the inequitable features of the operation of that program. At the outset, it was generally understood that W. P. A. would provide for all needy adult employables, leaving the care of unemployables to the States, but this goal has never been realized. Moreover, operation of W. P. A. on a greater scale in some States than in others, sudden reduction of quotas, and changes in policy—such as the dropping of aliens from W. P. A. and the adoption of the 18-month limitation on continuous employment—have resulted in leaving large numbers of the unemployed either entirely without aid or in forcing States and local communities to assume heavy and unexpected relief burdens. The past experience of New York State has been that with each W. P. A. lay-off a large percentage of those dismissed reapply for general relief. The State has often had to make drastic changes in relief policy and program to take up the slack left by unforeseen action on the part of the W. P. A.

4. The W. P. A. program has been greatly reduced in the past 2 years, another cut is proposed at the present time, and further curtailment appears inevitable as the pace of industry increases. The final result may be the entire elimination of W. P. A. and the withdrawal of the Federal Government from direct operation of a work-relief program. In that event, some equivalent contribution to the States must be made by the Federal Government if a chaotic situation is to be avoided. Grants-in-aid would lend flexibility to State-local operations by allowing coordination of local work relief with home relief within the framework of the general relief program.

5. We believe that Federal assistance offers the only solution of the problem of the dependent migrant. Movement of families across State lines in search of economic betterment inevitably results in a byproduct of indigency when jobs fail to materialize or prove to be of short duration. A critical situation has developed in many parts of the country in recent years, and national defense is now intensifying the problem through the stimulus given to the migration of labor. More dependency is in prospect when industry slows down on completion of the Nation's armament. Since the so-called migrant problem is interstate in origin, growing out of the demands of the national economy for a mobile labor supply, the solution is properly a national concern.

It is highly significant that the Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens, House of Representatives (the TOLAN committee), while attempting to confine itself to its congressional mandate to study migrancy, was forced to the realization that this question cannot be separated from that of general relief as a whole. The committee accordingly recommended in its report that Congress study whether Federal aid should not be extended to cover all needy residents, settled and nonsettled alike.

The New York State Department of Social Welfare is making an extensive study of the whole question of settlement and the relief of destitute migrants. A Federal program of grants-in-aid for general relief would pave the way for eventual abolition of the diverse State laws regarding settlement and residence, would tend to equalize among the States the burden of caring for needy migrant workers and their families, and would ameliorate the condition of a group to whom relief is often denied merely because of a technical barrier—lack of legal settlement.

The New York State Board of Social Welfare is convinced of the necessity of Federal grants on a matching basis, not merely for the nonsettled but for all needy persons for whom Federal work programs are not suitable or available and who are not eligible for the present federally aided categories. This is a much sounder solution than any program aimed at the assistance of migrants alone, since the latter would set up a favored group for whom relief would be much more adequate, in many States, than for the local settled cases.

6. Although national defense, by giving employment to vast numbers of workers, is cutting the need of relief on the one hand, it is creating new relief problems along other lines, quite apart from those arising from the increased migration of labor. Men volunteering for military service often leave families with insufficient income for their support, and some public provision must be made. The selective-service draft also causes some dependency, even though deferment is generally given to those whose induction might be expected to create hardship at home. Another concomitant of national defense is the rise of living costs, already making itself felt in higher rents and higher prices for fuel and for certain foods. This obviously increases the cost of maintaining relief recipients.

7. We regard the provision of adequate relief throughout the country as a necessary element in the upbuilding of national morale and as a foundation for health, welfare, and other related activities. It is our firm belief that Federal participation in financing general relief, along with Federal leadership in establishing reasonably uniform standards of care and administration in all States, is the best method of consolidating social gains and

insuring a rounded program which includes all classes of dependents.

Respectfully submitted.

Alfred H. Schoellkopf, chairman; David M. Bressler; John S. Burke; Mrs. Agnes G. Fitzgerald; Lawrence S. Greenbaum; T. Arnold Hill; Charles H. Johnson; Kevin Kennedy; Dr. J. Richard Kevin; Paul S. Livermore; Solomon Lowenstein; J. F. Sabine Meachem; Mrs. Mary K. Simkhovitch; Dr. Francis B. Trudeau; Mrs. Alice Wood Wynd.

All Sections of Our Military Service Are Full of *O–9's*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

ALL SECTIONS OF OUR MILITARY SERVICE ARE FULL OF "O–9'S"

Germany sank an American ship carrying contraband of war as such contraband is defined by both Germany and England.

President Roosevelt declares that this sinking was an act of piracy. Perhaps he is right.

The difference between war and piracy is but a slender and unstable hairline.

But if the sinking of the *Robin Moor* by the Germans was piracy, the sinking of the American submarine *O–9* by our own Government is lunacy.

The *O–9* was 23 years old, and was recognized as out of date and dangerous.

She had been laid up and out of use for several years. She had lately been recommissioned.

The *O–9* was built to withstand at best the water pressure of 200 feet.

She went down to 440 feet.

The *O–9* lies at the bottom of the sea, not far from where the *Squalus* sank.

Thirty-three men were rescued from the *Squalus*.

Twenty-six died unrescued.

The *O–9* is an older and worse ship than the *Squalus* was.

There were 34 fine young American boys sunk on the *O–9*.

It is certain that none survive.

No sound has come from the *O–9*.

Divers making the "deepest working dives ever made in the world" found the *O–9* crumpled by the enormous water pressure lying on the ocean bed.

There she will forever lie, as the Navy has officially abandoned all attempts to salvage the ship.

The *O–9* could only live 24 hours without resurfacing, and she has been down more than 4 days.

The venerable death trap was doomed—doomed from the moment it was recommissioned.

Francis P. Golden, whose son was a member of the *O–9's* ill-fated crew, said his son told him 2 weeks ago that in a 2-foot submersing test the *O–9* was found to have 19 leaks, "and that water poured into her right away."

Ota Eagleton, of Del Norte, Colo., whose son Charles was a signalman of the *O–9*, reported that his son wrote him last week that the antiquated craft "behaved badly" in test runs and that "everything was wrong with her."

Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, a member of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, said yesterday:

"I want to know why this out-of-date submarine had to be placed in active commission. I do not know what policy of the Government made it necessary."

Surely, Senator, a cowed Congress does not expect to be officially informed.

Representative BATES, of Massachusetts, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, declared Sunday:

"If we have any incompetence running around in military circles, we should find out now and not later."

Gentlemen of the Congress, you have found out now and you will find out later many times more disastrously if you proceed on your blind course of plunging this Nation into war equipped, or unequipped, with outmoded instruments of war.

The fate of the 34 devoted young Americans on board the *O–9* death trap is but a solemn warning.

They have been consigned to their ocean grave.

Services have been held over the sunken ship which is their untimely tomb.

Some will say such are the fortunes of war.

But no.

Such are the fortunes of folly.

Such are the results of haste, waste, and incompetence.

Such are the effects of sending our good equipment abroad and not sufficiently supplying our armed forces generally with modern machinery—of trying to make modern war with antiquated arms.

Let us recognize facts if we are going to prevent more catastrophies and unnecessary loss of life on a far, far greater scale.

What happened to the devoted crew of the *O–9* will be multiplied a thousand times if our country goes to war with antiquated machinery.

Hundreds of thousands of fine young lives will be sacrificed in battle, and not only in battle but in unsuitable camps and unsanitary hospitals.

In the war of 1917 more Americans died from neglect and disease than in battle.

In a new war, hastily entered into, the proportion of death from unsatisfactory camps and hospitals might not be as great, but the death in battle would be enormous if our country, with outdated equipment of the *O–9* character in all military departments, had to compete with the perfectly modern mechanized equipment of other better-prepared nations.

Manpower alone does not win wars.

Japan, with less than 100,000,000 people in all its dominions, takes successive bites out of China, whose population probably exceeds 400,000,000.

Modern war equipment, modern war methods are essential to success.

Our Army now is in very much worse condition than our Navy.

Congressman Ross A. COLLINS, of Mississippi, named by the Reader's Digest "the outstanding military expert in Congress," writing in the Digest says:

"The bulk of our new Army will be infantry, cavalry, field artillery, etc.

"Most of the men will travel on foot.

"Of our 33 divisions, only 1 is fully motorized—that is, equipped with motor vehicles to transport men—and only 2 are armored and mechanized panzer divisions."

And, furthermore, Mr. COLLINS says:

"We haven't now and can't get for months or years enough modern and essential material (machinery of war) to train and equip a mass army.

Mr. COLLINS, in addition, states that the "lessons from the Battle of France have been before us for a year.

"We know that the mechanical might of only 12 panzer divisions, aided by a few thousand airplane pilots, inflicted staggering losses and swiftly shattered France's old-style mass army."

Mr. COLLINS quotes a Nazi officer who writes in the New York World-Telegram, and says:

"We considered the panzer force a weapon whose powerful fire in combination with its protective armor, speed, and mobility is superior to all others.

"We attacked en masse and rushed on in an avalanche.

"Without our panzer units the rapid destruction of the enemy would have been impossible."

Our American airplane forces are in as bad condition as our field forces.

We labor under a lamentable insufficiency of modern planes while our best product is sent abroad.

Moreover, we are handicapped by antiquated methods in management.

Says Mr. COLLINS:

"Young officers who are eager for change and improvement offend red-tape conservatives above them and drop out or are dropped out as was Gen. Billy Mitchell, prophetic post-war advocate of a united air service.

"For every good reason of European experience and of common sense the President should establish a separate air department at once to be directed by men who know aviation."

But the aged Secretary Stimson, who reputedly goes to sleep at Cabinet meetings and is something of a human *O–9* himself, declares against a separate air department in spite of European war experience.

The antiquated *O–9* submarine whose disastrous sinking has stirred the Nation, is but a type, a symbol of the outmoded equipment and method persistent in all departments of our military menage.

All sections of our military service are full of *O–9's*.

If we go to war with them, like the unfortunate crew of the submarine, we may be sunk.

Mr. COLLINS, in concluding his fine article, appeals to the fathers and mothers of America and says:

"Their own sons will be taken away from them and many of them will be needlessly sacrificed unless we are adequately prepared to fight with the weapons of today instead of an inadequate supply of the weapons of yesterday."

Gentlemen of the Congress of the United States, learn the lesson of the *O–9* and keep our Nation out of war until at least we are prepared for war.

Federal Assistance to Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include the following address delivered by me at Williamston, N. C., before members of the Martin County Farm Bureau and other farmers in Martin County and eastern North Carolina.

In addition to my address on agriculture, I stated, "We have stood by and watched the rape of Europe and checked off one democracy after the other. We are seeing the next to the last big democracy fight for its life and very existence, and if it fails, Heaven help us."

I stated that I had voted for the continued flow of arms and ammunition to Britain; that while favoring the organization of labor, I disfavored strikes retarding our preparation for national defense. I stated that it was mandatory upon our Government to supply the young manhood of our country which we have drafted from the high and low, the rich and poor, the proper implements of war to defend themselves, as well as to defend us; and therefore it was mandatory upon Congress to prohibit further strikes in our national-defense plants, and that I would vote for such legislation.

With the enactment of tariff legislation some 150 years ago, the Congress of the United States began a series of legislative actions for the benefit of various groups in society. Since that time the tariff has been broadened and raised on numerous occasions. National and State legislatures have enacted child-labor laws, maximum-hour laws governing working conditions, compensation laws for labor, and our present important statutes covering minimum wages and maximum hours. All these laws affecting labor were designed for the benefit of those people who work for others—to improve the condition of the laboring man, and to stop or prevent the exploitation of labor. In fact, much of our earlier legislation has been designed to benefit some specific group in the Nation—the immigration laws were primarily for the protection of labor, just as the tariff was to give special benefits to industry.

Labor has not been the only group to benefit from Federal or State legislation, however. Business interests have also been long recognized and protected by our legislative bodies. The corporation laws enabled business and industry to control prices through the limiting of production; a practice which industry and business have followed for years. The interstate commerce laws were for the protection and benefit of certain groups, and we could go on naming a number of other laws that have been enacted for other groups.

It has been only recently that the Congress of the United States has taken cognizance of the disadvantageous position of agriculture because of the privileges extended to other groups.

John C. Calhoun recognized the effect of a tariff on agriculture when he stated 113 years ago:

"So partial are the effects of this (protective) system, that its burdens are exclusively on one side and its benefits on the other. It imposes on the agricultural interest of the South, including the Southwest, the burden not only of sustaining the system itself, but that also of the Government.

"* * * We are the serfs of the system out of whose labor is raised, not only the money paid into the Treasury, but the funds out of which are drawn out rich rewards of the manufacturer and his associates in interest. Their encouragement is our discouragement."

For a hundred years after Calhoun made this statement there was an almost continuous increase in the tariff rates, which placed farmers of the South at an increasing disadvantage with most other groups in the Nation. When the world trade and other economic conditions were changed so drastically following the World War, the cumulative effects of our long-time tariff policy began to be felt in earnest by American farmers.

It was not until 1933, when the present Democratic administration came in, that laws were passed to give direct assistance to farmers and to accord them some of the benefits through national legislation that many other groups had enjoyed for a long time.

It is true that prior to the farm programs of this administration some national legislation had been passed to benefit farmers. These included setting up the National Extension Service, Vocational Education Service, and the Farm Credit Administration, and the Federal Farm Board. As worth while as these efforts were, none of them dealt directly and extensively with the problems of farmers, or fully recognized the handicaps farmers were facing. However, by 1933, the predicament of the American farmer had become so acute that something had to be done, and Congress that year passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Each year since Congress has amended and modified the act in order to improve it, thereby making it better serve farmers. Often we have had to follow the trial-and-error method because we did not have much experience prior to 1933, but Congress has courageously faced the situation, and has not hesitated to change the legislation in order to improve it. No doubt, it will be modified and improved from time to time in the future. While phases of farm legislation have been changed, the objectives have been constant since 1933, and the first objective has been, and still is, to achieve and maintain equality for agriculture with other groups in our national economy.

To obtain this objective the programs have attempted to bring about a balance in the supply of agricultural commodities in line with the demand; to insure adequate supplies at all times, so that consumers as well as producers would be protected; and to conserve our soil resources not only for this generation but for generations to come. By this method we hope to make this Nation a better place in which to live, and to leave our children's children a more fertile land from which to get a better living. Another objective of the farm legislation has been to conserve and use our water resources and to prevent soil erosion—if we can stop the soil erosion we will have much less to worry about in the human erosion on the farm.

We have worked toward these objectives by giving to farmers, through national legislation, the machinery whereby they could, through the democratic procedure of a referendum, control the quantity of an agricultural commodity going on the market. This is merely giving to agriculture a privilege which industry has practiced for years—the privilege of controlling the quantity of their product going on the market.

Under the agricultural programs payments have been made to farmers to divert land from soil-depleting surplus cash crops to soil-conserving crops and uses. Farmers of the Nation and of the South have exploited their land for years not through choice but through necessity. The soil is the farmer's source of his income, regardless of how meager that income may be, and he has had no desire to deplete his soil. He has been seriously concerned about the erosion on his own farm, yet even with most of his cropland devoted to cash crops, his income from farming in the past has been inadequate. It has not been large enough to provide him with a standard of living even approaching that of the average American. As for cash expenditures necessary in preventing erosion and building the soil, these were entirely out of the question for most southern farmers with the incomes which have been received from farm marketings.

A depleted, eroded soil would mean eventually a poverty-stricken people—American farmers living on the plane of the hungry people of the Orient. We cannot have a people strong, healthy, vigorous, aggressive, and able to defend democracy if we do not produce the food and fiber necessary to sustain such a people.

The farm program has made it possible for agriculture to be better prepared for defense than any other group in our Nation. Farmers have not only built up reserves in the soil but they have also built up reserves of corn, wheat, cotton, and other foods and fibers so that this Nation cannot only defend itself but can supply products for the defense of other democracies. They can do this with the satisfying knowledge that we have adequate food and fiber left for all our own needs. No bottleneck has developed in the supplies of agricultural commodities. In fact, there are adequate reserves of grain and fiber, much of which the Government has taken title to under the loan program at prices below current levels.

In addition to the loan stocks which farmers can withdraw for sale, the Government has title to over 6,000,000 bales of cotton, over 150,000,000 bushels of wheat, and more than 200,000,000 bushels of corn, any part of which is immediately available to the Government should it be needed in our defense effort. In the face of strikes and other industrial difficulties which now constitute a large portion of our daily news, it might be interesting to note that, at average prices for these important commodities this last year, returns for labor of farmers who produce these commodities to feed and clothe the Nation have averaged less than 10 cents per hour. This wage was not all cash income. For example, out of the 10 cents an hour a southeastern cotton farmer received for producing cotton, only 3.7 cents an hour was in cash and the remainder was in the form of fuel, food, and housing, which he obtained from the farm as a part of his living.

If the price of cotton had increased since 1909 in the same proportion that wages have increased in this period, cotton would be over 30 cents per pound today. Not only have wages advanced considerably even since the boom year of 1929, but the cost of living of nonagricultural persons has declined. At the present time both total factory pay rolls and weekly earnings per worker are above the 1929 levels, but the cost of living of these groups, measured by cost of food, clothing, and rent, ranges from 12 to 25 percent lower than in 1929. When compared with returns farmers are receiving, one would hardly think agriculture is still a part of the national family.

When you realize what a very small cash income a farmer receives for his labor, it is no wonder that they cannot buy the goods of labor and industry, and cannot buy the services of business and professional people. Because of this, it is not only farmers, but the people of the South generally who have suffered from the low farm-purchasing power.

Despite all the handicaps, the farmer has contributed to national defense with the reserves which are now available to this country and the democracies of the world. He has done it without asking for an amortization of his establishment; he has done it without asking for "cost plus" on his production; he has done it without having a guaranty of minimum wages and maximum hours. Farmers are now and will continue to fulfill one of our greatest needs in national defense. They are patriotically producing the food and fiber without which we could never be a strong nation.

As a result of the spending for defense of the democracies, wages have been increasing, the cost of services has been increasing, the

price of machinery and equipment has been increasing, in fact the price of everything a farmer buys has been increasing, yet up to 8 months ago there was no comparable increase in the price of farm commodities. As a result the farmer was finding himself each month in a relatively more unfavorable situation as compared with the other groups in the country, with the cost of the things he buys going up and the prices of the things he sells not going up.

Congress recognized this fact, and recently passed an 85-percent-of-parity loan on cotton, wheat, tobacco, corn, and rice. Eighty-five percent of parity merely means that the farmer can borrow an amount on these commodities which will enable him to buy 85 percent as much of the things he needs as he could buy with the same quantity of these products in the period 1909-14. This means that the farmer's wage for producing cotton, for example, will be increased from 10 cents an hour to about 16 cents an hour, which is about one-half of the minimum wage in industry, and the farmers are receiving no time and a half for overtime. While 85-percent-of-parity loans will improve the farmer's situation over what it was a year ago, he still will not be on a basis of equality with industry, business, and labor.

With the talk of higher prices for farm products, perhaps a word should be said about consumers. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, Congress has charged the Department of Agriculture not only with improving farm income, but with safeguarding the interests of consumers. This part has not been forgotten, but the consumer angle has received much publicity in recent months, and much of this publicity is based on erroneous thinking. In the first place, it has already been pointed out that factory pay rolls and industrial workers' incomes are now substantially above the level of 1929, while the price index for foods and all commodities, or cost of things bought, is substantially below the 1929 level. This, of course, results in a greater purchasing power for nonfarm people than they had in the boom year 1929. On the other hand, income from farm marketings is some 20 percent below the 1929 level. Until there is a closer relationship between these two figures, it does not seem to me that all of the concern should be felt for consumers.

It might also be well to remember that at the present price levels there is only about 8 cents worth of cotton in a $2 cotton shirt, and only 1.2 cents worth of wheat in a loaf of bread. If prices are increased to 85 percent of parity this should raise the cost of a shirt by only a few pennies, and the price of a loaf of bread by less than half a cent. Farmers are usually interested in learning that the clerk who handles the shirt in the store gets more out of the selling price for his labor than the farmer who raised the cotton contained in the shirt. And each time you send a shirt to the laundry, the laundryman gets more for his work than the farmer received for producing the cotton it contains.

In thinking of consumers of cotton goods, there are many factors besides the price of cotton which affect final selling prices of cotton goods. Broadly speaking, the wholesale price of cloth is made up of two items of cost, the price of cotton and the mill margin or manufacturing cost. When the defense program started last June, wholesale prices of 17 cloths averaged about 21 cents a pound, about half of which represented cost of cotton, the other half being the margin for the mills. Now cloth prices are up to 51 cents, but the two factors making up this cost are no longer anywhere near equal. In this period of less than a year, cotton prices advanced about half a cent, while the mill margin has almost doubled. If mill margins had remained unchanged, cotton prices could now be about 20 cents a pound and the effect on consumers of cotton goods would be the same.

I have selected cotton to use as an example, but by the same yardstick I could have pictured the identical condition with tobacco and peanuts.

For example:

PEANUTS

If you purchase a 5-cent bag of peanuts on the street, the farmer has received approximately only three-tenths of 1 cent for the peanuts in that bag. That is, if peanuts are bringing as much as 4 cents per pound.

TOBACCO

When you pay 15 cents for a package of cigarettes, the farmer has received for the tobacco in the cigarettes approximately 1 to 1¼ cents. Averaging the market price of the tobacco purchased by the manufacturer at approximately 20 cents per pound.

The surplus problem we have today is a problem that we cannot solve as individuals. However, farmers have the machinery to act collectively through a national farm program. They have the means to act together for their own interests at the same time they are working to produce the things most needed in this all-out effort for defense.

Food will help win this war as it did the last war and as it has all other wars. Not only must our armed forces be adequately fed, but all the workers of industry and the entire civilian population must be well fed if we are to be able to put forth the efforts necessary to really help the democracies. Total war means we must have healthy, courageous, and calm people who are able at all times to exert themselves to the limit, and we can do this only when our people are getting an adequate diet. Farmers have and will continue to provide the Nation with all these basic necessities.

During the past 17 years I have assisted in all legislation for farmers.

Since becoming a Member of Congress I have worked and voted for farm legislation. I fought to restore to North Carolina its just and proper peanut legislation. I fought to have tobacco named as one of the agricultural commodities in the lend-lease bill.

I voted for 85-percent parity loans on cotton, wheat, rice, corn, and tobacco, and crop insurance.

I will continue to work and vote for all good farm legislation.

Proposed Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANCIS CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA BEFORE COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I offer for the RECORD a transcript of the exchange of statements and my testimony when I appeared before the Committee on Reciprocity Information conducting hearings with respect to the proposed trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay, yesterday, June 24, 1941:

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. before I go into the little statement I prepared, I was rather interested in the observation the chairman made with respect to excise taxes. I wonder if he would care to say whether the committee feels that the authority under the trade agreements in dealing with excise taxes extends to the reduction of excise taxes which may have been enacted by Congress since the Tariff Act of 1930, and since the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934, as well as to any that might have been in effect at the time the Trade Agreement Act was enacted?

Chairman RYDER. So far, the trade-agreement authorities have proceeded on the assumption that the excise taxes are in the nature of duties; as, of course, they are. They are collected like duties and otherwise. I think the first agreement with Canada in 1936 produced that kind of tax on lumber, and since then the Trade Agreement Act has been amended twice.

Now, as to whether any excise tax was imposed since the Trade Agreement Act was passed or not, I do not recall. I do not think any has been, but I am not certain.

Mr. CASE. The reason I asked the question was because of the logic of the principle involved. You may remember that there was some alarm on Capitol Hill about 3 years ago, when it was understood that there was some suggestion in certain quarters; the theory was held that the Trade Agreements Act gave authority to reduce the tariff duties of 1930 by 50 percent, and then in a subsequent agreement to use that as a new base and to reduce it further.

Chairman RYDER. No; that never has been advocated. No one has ever advocated that so far as I know.

Mr. CASE. I understand that that was true, because at the time there was some furore about it, and the Secretary of State stated in a letter to me that that was not contemplated.

In other words, that interpretation would seem to indicate that it was understood that the Trade Agreements Act authority rested upon the base of the 1930 status. Now then, if the opinion is held——

Chairman RYDER (interposing). You mean the 1934 status, at the time of the adoption of the Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. CASE. Yes; the duties in effect under the 1930 Tariff Act. Of course, there may have been some changes under the flexible provisions between 1930 and 1934, I presume.

Chairman RYDER. And most of the excise taxes were between 1930 and 1934.

Mr. CASE. Yes. But if it is regarded that the base was the duty in effect at the time of the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act, then it would seem to me that in applying that principle with regard to excise taxes it also should be regarded as being based upon the excise taxes in effect as of 1934, and that if Congress should subsequently enact excise taxes, they would not be subject to consideration.

Chairman RYDER. I do not know that that last point has ever been directly passed upon in this committee, Mr. Case, or that the committee is competent to pass on it.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that consistency would prevent the Trade Agreements Act from disturbing excise taxes passed since the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the responsibility of your committee, as well as of mine, is to the people of the United States. We have developed a standard of living in this country which has been pegged and cross-pegged by a complex system of railroad rates, wage-and-hour laws, fair-trade rules, commodity loans and tariffs, to say nothing of the vast structure of commercial loans, real-estate mortgages and bond issues based upon them. And I am sure that you are as earnest as I in your desire to support and maintain the economics of the country on which what we

call the American way of life depends. It is my privilege, then, to place before you a few observations on how that American standard of living is involved in the proposed trade-agreement negotiations with Uruguay and the Argentine.

My remarks will not go into the details of rates which I leave to the experts scheduled for appearance, but will be directed to the fields of interest for the people of South Dakota whom I have the honor to represent.

Probably no trade-agreement agenda ever covered so many items of direct concern to the Western States as do the items listed for consideration in the notices on these hearings. In the field of metals, you are proposing to consider the reduction of rates in the most marginal industries: Beryllium, mica, tungsten in refined or ground states, and, apparently, it is proposed to go even further and freeze or bind the present free entry for crude beryl and beryllium ores against the establishment of any duty in the future.

In the field of livestock products, apparently, it is proposed to consider a blow against the entire range of interests from birds to cattle and from hoofs and horns to hair and hides. Needless to say, the people of the West who are aware of what is proposed are tremendously aroused. By special-delivery letter, air mail, yesterday I received a copy of resolutions just adopted at the annual convention of the South Dakota Stock Growers Association, which included this paragraph:

"Whereas it has been announced that trade agreements will be negotiated with Argentina and Uruguay; and

"Whereas there are included among the items for tariff reductions canned beef, hides, and numerous byproducts of the cattle industry, although the duties on many of these products are now too low: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we protest any further reductions in these duties as being entirely unwarranted."

The resolutions further point out that the insurance of a stable and adequate supply of meat foods for the country is the natural and important contribution which the livestock industry makes in times of national emergency, and it is strongly urged that nothing be done to destroy that stability and capacity.

Your announcement lists a great many grades of wool as being subject to consideration. In that connection, I wish to bring to you a bit of testimony that developed in recent hearings of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department.

General Corbin, of the Quartermaster's Department, was testifying on the purchase of woolens for army clothing and blankets. He had stated that it was Army policy, under the Buy American Act, to buy domestic wool. He said, "If the price offered is kept within our price range." I asked him then: "What do you mean by within range?" The general replied: "We have considered 5 percent."

I then asked what that 5 percent was supposed to cover, whether it was to maintain a ratio to the general commodity level; in other words, whether it was a parity price or whether it was designed to allow for differences in cost of production, fair labor standards laws, high taxes, fixed railroad rates, etc. General Corbin replied: "We consider that the tariff on wool takes care of most of those problems."

I mention that because I do not want you to escape the responsibility that the Army as well as the rest of the country places upon you to see that the tariff is maintained at such a level as will allow a proper differential to protect the American standard of living, as buttressed by these various price-fixing devices that we have adopted in this country to maintain economic standards in various lines of activity.

It will be remembered that the Buy American Act, in policy, was supposed to permit a differential of 25 percent for the purchase of domestic products in order to give American producers a chance at supplying the market their tax dollars paid for. Under the testimony that 5 percent only is the differential permitted in practice, and the further testimony that the War Department depends on the tariff to protect the difference in costs between domestic and foreign fixed costs and standards of living, I lay upon your committee, Mr. Chairman, the earnest plea that you do not let the livestock producers of this country down.

Now, the livestock situation has been covered in detail by some of my colleagues, and I see listed for appearance such authorities as Mr. F. E. Mollin, secretary of the American National, who preceded me this morning; Mr. F. R. Marshall, of the National Wool Growers; Mr. J. B. Wilson, of the Wyoming Wool Growers; and others, so I shall not dwell further upon the subject.

I wish to speak briefly, however, upon the mineral field that you propose to invade. It is the field of the marginal industries—mica, beryl, and tungsten. These are some of the minerals for which the United States is most eager at this time, and it is a matter of amazement to me that you propose to throw a wet blanket on the possible development of such industries at this time.

Senator MURDOCK, in his discussion, spoke of manganese, and he also spoke of the situation with regard to aluminum, and drawing from those lessons that should be considered when you are proposing to invade other fields of the metals or mineral industries; and that recalled to my mind the experience or the object lesson that we have had in manganese. In 1929, and as recently as 1929, a tremendous manganese field was discovered in South Dakota. A company expended between $300,000 and $400,000 on the exploration of that field following the enactment of the 1930 Tariff Act, which set up some duties on manganese.

In 1934, when the Trade Agreements Act was passed, it was followed shortly by the Brazilian trade agreement, which cut the tariff duties on manganese in half, and it cut them in half, as I understand it, upon the belief that we had no large manganese reserves in the country. This company, which had developed a process which was a practical and economic process for the processing of this manganese ore based upon its expenditure of $300,000 to $400,000 over a period from 1930 to 1934, had raised its finances for the erection of a $500,000 plant to start the processing of that manganese. The Brazilian trade agreement wrecked the plans of that company, and they were never able again to pick up.

Now, I know that when I brought this question up 3 or 4 years ago I was told, "Well, that was because your reserves were not large enough, and we felt justified in making a reduction because in the period from 1920 on, when there was some encouragement given for manganese following the World War, no great development was done." But that overlooks the basic fact that this deposit was not recognized until 1929, and even then it was not fully explored until this company had had an opportunity to do some exploration work.

More recently, under the $2,000,000 fund which the Senator has already mentioned, the Bureau of Mines has engaged in an exploratory survey, and they have stated in their initial reports that so far from being limited even to the 102,000,000 tons of metallic manganese in 8 townships that were cited in the United States Geological Survey Report of 1929, it appears that there are probably 6 times that quantity of manganese reserves there; and in a report which I have seen, by Mr. Hedges, of the Bureau of Mines, he states that there is enough ore suitably placed for open-pit mining, exposed, that does not have to be stripped, to serve all the domestic needs of this country for more than 50 years, and that unsupported by any importations—unsupported by any supplementary production from any other fields in the country—and that the total reserves there are such that it is beyond calculation. He uses the term, "It is like comparing the gold in sea water in their ultimate test."

Now, I lay upon this committee a very serious burden because I am saying to you that the Brazilian trade agreement stopped the development of that field at a time when a private company had expended $400,000 and was prepared then to finance a plant for the development of the largest reserve in the country that, if it had been developed and were in production, would have solved today one of the most fundamental problems that we face in this national emergency.

The Congress has been called upon to pass hundreds of millions of dollars to build cargo ships in an attempt to bring manganese in from other countries, and yet the figures that were cited before the O. P. M. Committee just a short time ago indicated that we have been receiving no shipping from the countries on which we have relied to supply at least two-thirds of the total amount of manganese that we need in this country, and with that object lesson before you, with a realization that the Brazilian trade agreement nipped in the bud the development of a manganese deposit that would have solved our domestic problems, I say to you that you ought to proceed very cautiously when you propose to invade the field of these marginal minerals and metals, such as mica, beryl, and tungsten.

The gentleman from Idaho has referred to the discovery that the Bureau of Mines has made in tungsten in some of the western States. A discovery of sheelite deposits which offer a source of tungsten was one of the most important developments that have come out of this strategic-minerals investigation.

In Circular No. 6821 the United States Bureau of Mines, reviewing the importance of tungsten, says: "It is one of the pivotal war minerals, since the comparative efficiency of tungsten-alloy cutting tools is 3 to 5 times that of carbon steels. In the final analysis the problem resolves to the question of the insurance premium the country is willing to pay to reduce the risk of being wholly dependent on foreign countries for tungsten needs in time of national emergency."

Between 1898 and 1936 the tungsten production of mines in the Black Hills of South Dakota is estimated at $1,279,797, but the greater part of this, $1,106,740 of it—better than 90 percent of it—was produced in the 4 war years, 1915 to 1918, under the stimulus of war prices. My contention is that instead of considering a reduction in the tariff at this time the policy of the Government should be to increase the protection given in the hopes of getting a domestic industry started, letting them have the benefit of wartime prices to absorb some of the shock of establishing a new industry, and then giving them the assurance of protection in normal times so that the next time an emergency comes along the mines will have been opened, the ores blocked out, the mills in shape to run.

I know that someone will shrug his shoulders and say, "But if we need tungsten now, shouldn't we lower the tariff so that we can get it?" And to that I want to say, with as much definiteness as I can, "That is a dangerous theory. It is not the price that keeps us from getting tungsten from abroad. It is shipping, and our emergency arises from the fact that we have not developed domestic production to which we can turn."

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, as earnestly as I can, I want to say to you that you have in your hands the welfare of this Nation as no other body. You decree economic life and death to individuals, to firms, and in

these important fields, to the Nation itself. My plea is that you do not destroy the capacity of our people to satisfy our needs in these deficiency metals. And, with respect to livestock products, may I say that it is folly for anyone to suppose that the United States can absorb the production of the South American countries and maintain a market for its own large production. Surely you gentlemen agree with me on that, and I appeal to you to maintain the domestic welfare of the United States in these days of strange doctrines.

Chairman RYDER. I want to thank you for that very excellent statement, and also for the statement by the other Congressmen who have appeared this morning. I want to assure you that they will be given very thorough consideration.

Gas for Japan's War Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OREGONIAN, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Oregonian of June 7, 1941, entitled, "Gas for Japan's War Planes."

The editorial follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of June 7, 1941]

GAS FOR JAPAN'S WAR PLANES

During the first 3 months of 1940 there were no restrictions on export of gasoline to Japan and other countries outside the Western Hemisphere. The embargo on export of aviation gasoline, the commodity presumed to be essential to effective operation of war planes, was ordered on July 31. Yet a dispatch from Washington tells us that in the first 3 months of this year Japan imported from this country five times as much gasoline as it imported in the corresponding 3 months of a year ago, when there were no restrictions.

The gasoline thus going in much greater quantity to Japan may be assumed not to be aviation gasoline. It includes, however, much high-grade gasoline, which, by the addition of antiknock ingredients, can be converted into aviation gasoline. And the concurrent export from this country of $110,000 worth of antiknock preparations to Japan reveals that conversion of the fuel into aviation fuel is its true destination.

Our sympathies are strongly with China in the war now going on in the Orient. Our material interests also lie in the success of Chinese resistance to the Japanese "new order." We give practical aid to China in the form of loans, and sell Japan the fuel necessary to bomb the Chinese Armies from the air. Moreover, our own relations with Japan are precarious, and the thought that persists among us on the Pacific coast is that these delicate relations may be broken, and that the airplane fuel that we sold to Japan may propel planes which will bomb our cities.

The same dispatch tells us that the administration is fully cognizant of the situation and is permitting export to Japan of strategic materials for the time being "for very good reasons." Two reasons are cited. They are not "very good reasons." One is "appeasement." The other, that it is America's policy to lull Japan into a sense of false security and corresponding neglect of reserve stock building, so that when and if we do stop shipments, the embargo will be an effective one. The spokesman for these two doctrines was no doubt dissembling. And it may well be that officially to set forth the true reasons would be ill-advised.

It is a fair supposition that the watchful waiting strategists are for the time being in the ascendancy in Washington with respect to policies in the Orient. Word has hitherto come forth that there are two schools of opinion on this branch of foreign policy. One is that Japan understands only direct action or force, is in no position to make reprisal, and if it took the headlong chance, would be made short work of. The other argument, the one that seemingly predominates, is that Japan is poised in the south China Sea for attempted seizure of Malaya and the East Indies, and if we embargo essential war materials, would strike recklessly and effectively enough to cut off for a long time our access to strategic materials obtainable only in the Far East in quantities sufficient for our own defense program.

The United States is dependent in whole or major part on the Asiatic southeast for 5 of the 14 commodities listed by the Army and Navy as strategic materials. The 5 are rubber, tin, tungsten, Manila fiber, and quinine. We have been depending on that region for 88 percent of our rubber and 80 percent of our tin. Moves have been taken to build up stocks in these materials and develop new sources of supplies and substitutes.

The situation resolves itself into a question of whether our own vulnerability with respect to strategic materials has been overcome, and whether Japan's vulnerability as a naval power is correctly estimated. That a showdown approaches is implied by Japan's new pressure on the Netherlands East Indies for release to Japan of quantities of petroleum, rubber, and tin. Japan fears a drying up of the imports from America. The three commodities are essentials to successful warfare or defense, but so are automobiles and automobile parts, and machinery and scrap metals, these last not to be obtained by Japan anywhere in the world at present unless it be from the United States.

The squeeze of a complete embargo on export of war materials to Japan would seemingly strangle Japan in short order notwithstanding statistical comparisons of Japan's naval strength with that part of ours which could be spared for operations in the Pacific. The Government may know what it is doing when gasoline is permitted to go to Japan in growing volume, but the people do not think so. Last fall a Gallup poll showed 90 percent of those participating to be in favor of a complete embargo.

Proposed Reduction in the Tariff on Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, OF MONTANA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

Under the Constitution the President may make treaties with other countries with the advice and consent of the Senate. Treaties or proposed trade agreements which are known as reciprocal trade agreements in which one nation trades the right to send to another nation surplus industrial or agricultural products on a lowered tariff basis. The main surplus product of Argentina and Uruguay is beef. The Government is proposing in the Argentine and Uruguay trade treaty to reduce the tariff on beef and in return therefor these two countries will lower the tariff on our manufactured products such as our motorcars, refrigerators, and such other articles which we manufacture and which they do not. Beef producing is the principal occupation of many of our Western and Southwestern States. Please remember that it is our own people, the persons who have the property that the tax collector can find, are the ones to whom we look for taxes. We should not sell down the river our livestock producer to the end that the manufacturer of such products as I have mentioned will profit at their expense. That is the result of the proposed trade agreements so far as the beef producer is concerned.

I further wish to call the attention of the members of this committee to the fact that the cattlemen were squeezed out by the banks following the debacle of 1929, and many of them either had to go out of business or just survive from that time until the fall of 1933 by the skin of their teeth. We in Montana sold good beef over the scales at as low as 2 and 3 cents per pound for the years 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933, and, of course, suffered losses every year during that period of time. Our debts piled up with accumulated interests as well and taxes were unpaid.

Beginning in the fall of 1933, a gradual improvement took place in the cattle industry, and since that time, owing to the increase in the prices of beef, the byproducts, etc., the cattlemen are now just getting in reasonable financial condition to carry on. However, we have been for the last 2 or 3 years and now confronted with an increase in our taxes and cost of materials for whatever we have to buy to keep up our ranches as well as a sharp advance which has to be met in wages. I deplore any action that this committee would take which would result in forcing our cattlemen to compete with those of other countries where the cost of operation and standard of living is much lower; where wages are much lower and climatic conditions require much less preparation and expenses in connection with production of food supplies for our livestock and where taxes are much lower. We in Montana must provide feed for cattle for 5 to 6 months out of the year and pay on an average from forty to seventy dollars per month for competent ranch help, also board and lodging, whereas the wages paid in the countries mentioned are negligible as compared with ours. I appeal to the committee to bear in mind the fact that, after all, it is on our American masses, and particularly the farmer and stock grower, who cannot hand their taxes on to the other fellow in the price they get for their products will fall the burden of meeting the major part of our increased tax bill. I am, therefore, opposed to any reduction of tariff on beef and beef products from those countries.

I believe that the American market should be reserved for the American producers up to their ability to supply the market's needs, as that is the commitment both major political parties gave to the farmer and stock grower in this country in their platforms in the recent campaign. We can do no less than keep those pledges. I might add that we now have on hand large surpluses of byproducts of beef which are depressing on our markets. Also

at this point please remember the huge investment of our meat-producing class of people, which amounts to over $4,000,000,000. This does not include dairy cattle. It is well also to remember that 70 percent of our total national farm income comes from our livestock and dairy products.

I also wish to call to your attention that the Government is spending huge sums of money for national defense along the two coasts, but the Middle West like my own State is barren of any share in such industries, as we have no defense industries. Consequently we have no mushroom prosperity in my State.

I do not want to see our good-neighbor policy expanded to the point where it will sweep our Western States clean of the livestock industry and compel cattlemen to leave their own country and go to South America to make a living. If such a policy is carried out, that is what will happen to many of our stock growers, and a great industry will be destroyed, resulting in more unemployment and poverty.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK, TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, which I sent to the Committee on Ways and Means with regard to the pending tax bill:

JUNE 26, 1941.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
House of Representatives:

After years of experience with the tax laws, we should now be able to eradicate hardships caused by a not too realistic application of our revenue statutes and at the same time not impair the necessary revenues of the Government. I wish to call your attention to a few items that the committee might well consider as a basis for helpful amendments.

1. Education: While the head of a family has a deduction of $400 for dependents under 18, it is not until a child reaches the age of 18 that he presents a most serious expense problem and that has to do with his final education. Tuition and upkeep at colleges are expensive and it is good public policy for the Government to encourage heads of families to provide for the college education of their children. Therefore, I believe that a deduction of $400 should be allowed to the parent paying for the education of a child over 18 years of age in a recognized college or professional school.

2. Medical: Medical expenses are so very often a tremendous hardship on the head of a family that I believe the amount spent for necessary medical treatment should be allowed as a deduction from income taxes.

3. Legal expenses: Very often persons are forced to defend themselves in the courts without any hope of a money judgment or the payment of their legal expenses. Necessary and reasonable legal expenses, I believe, should be allowed as a deduction against income taxes.

4. Prepayment of taxes: The Government is endeavoring to educate the public to a prepayment of taxes. I think it would be far more advisable to allow a discount because of prepayment. It would make it worth while for taxpayers to anticipate the next year's taxes by immediate payment and the Government would not be required to borrow against taxes.

5. Deduction of taxes from income: The greatest hardship involved in the income-tax law is the fact that year after year taxpayers pay taxes on money that was used in the prior year for the payment of taxes. Very often taxpayers have to pay in 1 year's taxes more money than they actually earned the prior year, all of which might have been devoted to the payment of taxes. Surely the committee can either work out some general scheme of allowance of taxes from income or at least work out some realistic method for the payment of taxes so the taxes themselves will not destroy taxpayers who are, after all, the producers of the Government's revenue.

I am making these proposals in the interest both of the Government and of the taxpayer, and I trust that the Committee on Ways and Means will adopt them. I do not wish to offer amendments from the floor of the House on these points because I realize how intricate the legislative tax structure is and I prefer that the experts of the Ways and Means Committee consider these suggestions of mine in executive session and offer them as committee amendments.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
Eighteenth District, New York.

Is President Roosevelt a Communist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, by Westbrook Pegler, from the Chicago Daily News of June 21, 1941:

[From the Chicago Daily News of June 21, 1941]

F. D. R. AND THE REDS—RECORD VERY BAD, PEGLER DECLARES

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 21.—Don't ask me why President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt gave such strong aid and comfort to the Communists in the so-called labor movement and in the political ramifications of that movement until the time when Stalin gave Hitler the signal to start the war.

I don't know, and nobody has voiced anything better than an opinion. But I know they did do this and that it is largely the fault of the President, first, and then of Mrs. Roosevelt, that today Communists can tie up factories whose produce is urgently needed to defend the United States against Stalin's partner in conquest.

The Communists were repudiated by President Roosevelt in last year's Presidential campaign, and it was then undertaken to show that they had switched their support to Wendell Willkie, of all people, a Wall Street lawyer as Harold Ickes called him, forgetting, perhaps, that Mr. Roosevelt, too, had been a Wall Street lawyer and that Mr. Roosevelt had heartily endorsed the last previous Wall Street lawyer selected by the Democratic Party—John W. Davis of the House of J. P. Morgan.

MAY HAVE VOTED WILLKIE

The Communists poll so little strength it is impossible to say whom they voted for last year, and it may well be that they did vote for Willkie, knowing that this would have no bearing on the result—whatever the result. The Communists denounced President Roosevelt on only one issue—the issue of war against their ally, Adolf Hitler. But that did not wipe out the long record of sympathetic treatment which they had received from two Roosevelt administrations—particularly in the Labor Relations Board, whose chairman, J. Warren Madden, finally became so offensive that it was necessary to boot him upstairs to a soft job for life, at $12,000 a year, as judge of the court of claims.

Under Mr. Madden the Labor Relations Board was a cell of Communistic thought and sympathy, which did not merely protect the workers' right to bargain but used its power to drive thousands of them into unions, preferably those of the C. I. O., in which the Communists were concentrating their efforts. The Wagner Act gives the Board no authority to make free men and women join unions, but the Board, under Mr. Madden, coerced them anyway, by sympathizing with the unions, notably those of the C. I. O.

TESTIMONY ON THE C. I. O.

As to whether the C. I. O. is hospitable to Communists, there is no need to inquire beyond the unrefuted testimony taken by the Dies committee and the recent issuance of a C. I. O. charter to the Trotsky revolutionary organization in Minneapolis, formerly known as Local 544 of the A. F. of L. Teamsters. Led by three brothers—Miles, Vincent, and Grant Dunn—this local has long been notorious as a violent political organization under the cover of an A. F. of L. charter.

Dan Tobin, the president of the A. F. of L. teamsters, now admits belatedly that it has "a wide reputation for strikes and disorders" and contains guerrilla terrorist units consisting of squads of five men, known as defense guards. Tobin undoubtedly has known all this for a long time, but he finally tried to disinfect or delouse the local of its anti-American elements, whereupon 544 withdrew from the A. F. of L. and was welcomed into the structural workers of the C. I. O. for its revolutionary and disruptive strength. It is not a structural union, and the C. I. O. union which embraced it is not a teamsters' union.

Tobin cannot erase the damned spot placed on the record of his own teamsters' organization, because the violent, alien character of this Minneapolis terroristic group has been notorious for years but, nevertheless, was allowed to exploit its A. F. of L. charter in the interests of Trotskyism until the national emergency made action necessary. However, Tobin and his teamsters now have given evidence of patriotic purpose, whereas the C. I. O. was quick to grant a charter to the Trotsky group.

RECORD ON ROOSEVELT

The record of President Roosevelt on communism contains the lamentable fact that he used the power of his office to disparage and hamper the Dies committee in its very trying and painful work of exposing Communistic conspirators. And it cannot be forgotten that Mrs. Roosevelt ostentatiously attended a hearing on the committee, at which her protegés of the Communistic Youth Congress were under examination, and not only gave open indication of her sympathy for the young Muscovites against this committee of Congress but, to make certain that her intent could not be misunderstood,

invited a number of the youths to the White House.

The whole record of Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt and of the administration toward communism is very bad, and it will take some positive confession of error to convince the wary that there has actually been a change of heart, if change there has been.

Farm Security Administration Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, often we legislate here without receiving an intermediate constructive report from our efforts. When such a report comes to us and it reflects the wisdom of our efforts, we are naturally proud of the good work. There recently came to me a letter containing a comprehensive report of the work of the Farm Security Administration; and while the House of Representatives is not now considering agricultural legislation, I think that all of us would do well to pause a few moments and consider this report:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 27, 1941.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: Since the beginning of the present emergency it has been generally recognized that the health, welfare, and morale of our people are vitally important to national defense. Providing for these needs among low-income farm families has been one of the essential contributions of the Farm Security Administration to the Nation's defense efforts during the past year.

We have just completed a special survey undertaken last winter to measure the progress being made by borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. It indicates the gains in terms of money, living standards, and capacity for self-support which have been made during 1940 by handicapped and low-income farm people all over the country. It occurred to me that you might be interested in seeing the figures for your district.

In the Fourth District of Louisiana there were 1,760 active standard rehabilitation borrowers at the end of 1940. The survey showed that the average borrower earned a net income of $523 during the year, as compared with $303 in the year before he borrowed from Farm Security. In other words, the typical family increased its annual net income by 73 percent.

Also significant are the gains which these people made in net worth, since that is one of the best measures of permanent improvement in living standards. Borrowers in your district increased their average net worth—over and above all debts, including their obligations to the Government—from $393 before they came into the Farm Security program to $563 at the close of the 1940 crop year. This is a gain of 43 percent.

These figures mean that Farm Security borrowers in the Fourth District have added a total of $298,443 to the wealth of their communities, and have increased their total annual incomes by $387,763. Naturally this growth in prosperity and purchasing power has been reflected on the books of merchants and other businessmen of the district.

We were pleased to find that borrowers in your district are rapidly repaying their rehabilitation loans. Already $561,361 has been repaid on loans totaling $1,123,129, although much of the money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years. Throughout the entire country, rehabilitation loans totaling $420,865,050 had been made as of December 31, 1940, and $149,626,442 of this sum had been repaid. As you know, loan funds currently are advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instead of coming from direct appropriations.

In view of the fact that none of the borrowers from Farm Security was able to get adequate credit anywhere else and that many of them formerly were on relief, we feel that this repayment record is a tribute to the honesty and industry of these needy farm people. There is ample evidence that the great majority of them are getting back on their feet and becoming permanently self-supporting. In large measure, this progress is due to the advice and technical guidance in sound farm and home management which accompanies each Farm Security loan.

For example, we encourage our borrowers to get away from one-crop farming—particularly of surplus crops such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat—and to raise as much as possible of their own food and feed for their livestock. During 1940 the average Farm Security family in your district produced $300 worth of goods for home consumption, as compared with $156 before they came into the F. S. A. program. This produce for home use included 372 gallons of milk per family, 344 pounds of meat and 260 quarts of vegetables and fruit canned for the winter. This increased production of food did not, of course, add to the supply in the commercial markets, since virtually none of it was offered for sale. It simply meant a better diet, better health, and a rising standard of living for these families.

Often it has been necessary to work out an adjustment of the family's old debts before rehabilitation could be successful. Local farm debt adjustment committees have been set up for this purpose. They have no legal authority to compel adjustments, but by bringing the farmer and his creditors together for a friendly discussion they usually are able to arrange a scale-down of the obligations, reduced interest rates, or extension of the payment period. Such adjustments frequently save the farmer from foreclosure, and at the same time enable the creditors to get substantial payments on what might otherwise have been bad debts.

This service is available to all farmers, whether or not they are rehabilitation borrowers. Altogether, debt reductions totaling $83,001 have been negotiated for the farmers in your district. This represents a scale-down of 11.4 percent. As a direct result of these adjustments, $10,580 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

In making this special survey our field employees reported that there are 4,550 families in your district who are eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans, but have been unable to get them because of the limited funds available.

In addition to the rehabilitation program Farm Security is carrying out the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which provides a limited number of loans to competent tenants to enable them to buy family-type farms.

During the first 3 years of this program we made 75 such loans in your district, totaling $376,894. This year we expect to make about 31 Bankhead-Jones loans in the Fourth District, amounting to approximately $158,525. Throughout the country delinquencies of these loans have amounted so far to only 2.6 percent, or $23,658; and this has been more than offset by the fact that other borrowers have been able to make advance payments totaling $196,765 as the result of good crops and management.

I am hopeful that this rather detailed report may be useful to you, and if you would like to have any further facts about our program I shall, of course, be glad to supply them. Sometime during the year I hope that you may find an opportunity to visit some of the borrowers from F. S. A. in your district and see for yourself the efforts they are making to get a new start as independent, tax-paying citizens.

Sincerely,

C. B. BALDWIN,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, while the matter dealt with in the letter from C. B. Baldwin, Administrator, is largely confined to northwest Louisiana, I am sure that a similar situation prevails in other parts of the country. It is important to realize that the work being done by the Farm Security Administration is primarily that of aiding our farmers who really need help by making it possible to rehabilitate themselves. A little suggestion here and there, a little word of encouragement, and a little appropriate advice and counsel go a long way with these poor farmers whose heart is in their work and whose work is in the soil. By this method we build useful citizens and bring back to our farmers new hope and enthusiasm for their work.

The figures given in this report show that new wealth has been brought to homes heretofore impoverished. They show that old communities by these methods may be brought back to a condition of reasonable fortunes; and that farming may still be made a gainful occupation to the humblest of our people.

I commend the Farm Security Administration on this report. I encourage this agency to exert more effort and more interest along the lines indicated and thereby bring to our farmers more uniformity of success and a more equal distribution of the wealth of the Nation.

National Defense Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

LETTER FROM MILO K. SWANTON, WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., June 9, 1941.

Hon. HARRY SAUTHOFF,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAUTHOFF: Opposition to a proposed new source of Federal revenue for defense was suggested in a recent meeting of the executive committee of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture. I am sure it will be of interest to you to know that after much discussion it became the unanimous opinion of the farm representatives present that the time had come when all

good Americans should cease the inconsistency of crying for defense appropriations on one hand, while on the other hand opposing every effort to raise such funds as might affect them personally.

The executive committee of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture disposed of the question by passing the following resolution which calls attention to the handicapped position of the farmer and which makes a plea for equality in levying national-defense taxes:

"Whereas today the farmers of this country are called upon to make great sacrifices, working long hours without sufficient help and facing economic inequalities; and

"Whereas to meet the tremendous expenses caused by the present national crisis, various forms of taxation are now under consideration: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That in providing defense revenues, such defense taxation be graduated on a basis, equitable among all economic groups, so as not to further widen the great disparity already existing between agriculture, industry, and labor."

Sincerely yours,

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

German-Americans Are Loyal Patriotic Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM HUDLETT, MEMBER OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF OHIO, AT A RECENT GATHERING OF GERMAN-AMERICAN CITIZENS IN CLEVELAND, OHIO, JUNE 22, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the Honorable William Hudlett, member of the General Assembly of Ohio from Cuyahoga County, and a leader in German-American activities in the State. Mr. Hudlett's speech in plain understandable words expresses the patriotism and loyalty of the citizens of the United States who are of German extraction.

In these days of hysteria without just cause our German-American friends are assailed by pseudo patriots as Nazis, "bundites," "fifth columnists," and so forth. This is not a new form of attack. It was with us prior to and during the last World War. Only those who would nurture intolerance and bigotry would assail the patriotism of any citizen, regardless of race or religion, unless that individual actually expressed himself in terms of disloyalty to the free institutions of America.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, in the name of "Die Deutsche Zentrale" I welcome each and every one of you most sincerely. Today we are here to celebrate "Heimatsfest." In other words we came out here to our farm to mingle and meet with old friends and, of course, to make new friends. We are here in this most beautiful spot which we can call our own to enjoy the invigorating air, the beautiful sceneries, and to relax, with our families, away from our daily routine of work and worries.

Unfortunately this farm is not patronized as much as it might be. The membership of the Deutsche Zentrale, in comparison with the German-American citizen population, is, strange as it may seem, very small and very often discouraging to those who work so hard to keep this farm in operation.

Let all of us who are here today be one united family. Let's all be happy that we are here in the United States of America, the greatest land on the face of the earth. Let's be happy because we have the privilege of congregating here as a free people, as citizens of this fine land, and let us be happy that we can enjoy all the privileges and opportunities which no other country has to offer.

I know that most of you were born and raised on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. I know also that you have many and beautiful memories of your childhood days, when, with your mother and father, sisters, and brothers, you enjoyed the early days of your life; when you went to school and then to work; when you took your girl friend out for the first time or when the ladies made their first date. You went together to fine places—and I know that you all remember so well that it did not cost very much, either. As a matter of fact, it could not cost very much, because not many had the means. And yet what beautiful memories.

And finally you came to America. You remember the first glimpse of the Statue of Liberty—the symbol of freedom. Then your first step on American soil. You were very happy. I know, by my own experience. I know that most of you felt right then and there that a great and wonderful change took place; and with a new lease on life, with new hope for a better future for yourself and families you found and made for yourself a new home.

Your Uncle welcomed you with open arms. He took good care of you from the first minute on when you landed. He made you feel at home, he provided for you, he gave you a job and security. Your Uncle is also my Uncle. He's everybody's Uncle; yes, ladies and gentlemen, Uncle Sam is the greatest uncle anywhere.

And then what? Uncle Sam, with open arms, invited you to become a citizen. Yes, he did. And what did you do? You accepted, immediately, and how. You became a citizen of the United States. How did you feel then? Of course, you felt great. You felt great, because I know. When the man gave you your final papers you were the happiest person alive. That was then, and, this very day. The same papers are just as good—yes, even better, because today we realize the importance and the value of our citizenship.

Waving a flag or saying "I am a citizen of the United States" does not make you a good citizen. There's more to it. Not a single day goes by without a chance for you not only to show but to prove that you are a good citizen. Now is the time, as never before, that all of us—yes, I mean all of us—should stand shoulder to shoulder as citizens of this great United States and do our share and our duties.

This is a democracy, and under a solemn oath you swore allegiance to this democracy. Do you want anyone to question your loyalty? Of course not. Then do not at any time give anybody a chance. You as a single person have the right to resent doubts. And we, as a large body, have a duty, a very important duty, to perform.

We American citizens of German origin resent very strenuously constant and unfounded attacks against us.

For many years (I remember 30 of them) great political leaders attended to our affairs and told us what fine people we were. They told us of the great part we took in building this country, that our pioneers, in forming this land, took one of the greatest parts in it. They praised the German-Americans as one of the finest races.

Ladies and gentlemen, what are we today? Nazis, "fifth columnists," enemies to our country. The men who praised you before were wrong—or those who make these charges today are wrong. You did not change and you will not change. I know you too well for that. Our Government can depend on your loyalty. Let's not boast of what others did many years ago. Let's all do our part today.

Let us help financially, support our President, stand united, support the Constitution of the United States. Let's all defend our freedom, buy Government bonds, take an active part in all of our governmental affairs, study politics, go to the polls to exercise our franchise, and above all, defend our rights and our honor.

We have no place in this country for men and women who under the protection of citizenship papers worship any other country or its leader. We don't want them here. I know that you don't want them here.

We are proud to be American citizens. We are good and loyal citizens.

In the presence of our flag, therefore, let's all stand and rededicate our loyalty by repeating our pledge:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands. One nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Recognize the Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ARTICLE FROM LOUISIANA WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial recently appearing in one of the weekly newspaper of the State of Louisiana under the title of "Longevity Pay for Postal Employees."

LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Congress has been considering the longevity-pay-system bill for some time, but it has been dragging along and securing scant attention. There has been no salary increase for postal employees since 1925. The entrance grade salary for letter carriers and clerks is $1,700 per annum, with annual promotions of $100 until the maximum grade of $2,100 is reached. The custodial employees average $1,200 per year.

The proposed longevity pay applies to postal employees. After 10 years of service they would receive $100 per annum increase, and for every 5-year period thereafter an additional $100 per annum until 30 years of continual service is rendered, when the maximum of $2,600 is reached. Under present conditions prevailing in the country, unless this longevity legislation is enacted, postal employees will be attracted to other work, and the Government and the public will lose the benefit of their trained service. There are comparatively few promotions available to a carrier or clerk, and at the present time when he has reached the $2,100 grade at the end of 5 years of service he is through as far as further salary increases are concerned, for even

though 40 years are spent in the service there will be no increase in salary. No matter how efficient the employees may be, the peak in salary has been reached.

This longevity legislation was first proposed in 1928 and action on it is now long overdue. The bill was set aside when the depression emergency started and Congress had to devote its entire attention to the acute emergencies resulting from the depression.

It is very fine to have the American people say, as often as it is said, that "our Postal Service is the best in the world," and let it go at that, but, after all, the employees are entitled to just a little more than praise. Give the post-office employee something substantial, something with which he can be a credit to his employer and a credit to the American people, something with which he might give to his wife and family the fruits of his devotion, faithfulness, and loyalty.

Perhaps nowhere in the Government is the necessity for efficiency and fine morale stressed as in the Army and Navy, and in those Departments the principle of longevity pay has long been recognized and accepted as in accord with elementary justice and as an important factor in the promotion of the service in those vital branches of our National Government. The principle which has proven its success in those Departments might well be put into effect in the Post Office Department, where at all times, but especially in emergencies, the operation of the Government, the business of the Nation, and the personal relations of the citizens depend on the efficiency, faithfulness, and skill of postal employees.

Considered from every angle, the Congress should pass the longevity-pay bill and thus recognize the years of faithful service rendered by the postal employees of the country. No doubt, the bill will be approved when it has clear sailing. The delay should not be suffered for any great length of time in the future.

An American Peace Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN M. VORYS, OF OHIO, FOR INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was invited to address the fifteenth annual session of the Institute of Public Affairs on the campus of the University of Virginia at Charlottesville last Tuesday evening, June 24. The general topic of the institute this year was "The United States, the War, and the Future." The topic for Tuesday was "The Obligations of the United States as a World Power." In my address in the evening I suggested that the obligation of this country as a world power was to lead the world to peace as soon as possible.

Believing that my suggestions may be of interest to my colleagues in Congress, I extend herewith, under leave given me by the House, the address I made before the institute:

AN AMERICAN PEACE OFFENSIVE

I speak tonight in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson, who said: "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none."

The obligation of the United States as a world power is to lead the world to a just and satisfactory peace as soon as possible. We cannot do this tomorrow, or next day, but the time to discuss this is tonight.

First, let me qualify myself to take part in a discussion of foreign affairs in the temperate dignified language of contemporary diplomacy—Hitler and Stalin are pirates, bloodthirsty gangsters, guttersnipes, criminal scum. I hate Hitler and Stalin. So what? Neither of them is going to accommodate me by letting me bomb them personally or by fighting it out man to man. It is now considered clever to say—let them tear each other to pieces, like two Kilkenny cats—but they won't do it. Instead, millions of Russian and German boys who probably don't want to die are dying, and who probably aren't really mad at anybody are killing each other.

I cannot prophesy how or when the Russo-German campaign will be decided; I leave that to the strategists of the institute. We all know this, however: We do not want this campaign, or this war, to end with Russia triumphant, dominating the world, or with Hitler triumphant, dominating the world. We look forward to a world order of peace and justice not dominated by any single power, not even Britain, in which America will do its part—a leading part but not a dominating part.

This means that we are for a peace that shall not be dictated by any single power. This means that our foreign policy, our obligation to the world and to ourselves, involves more than having Hitler beaten by someone. "Beat Hitler" is a popular slogan, but it is not a foreign policy.

We overpersonalize and oversimplify this struggle. If Hitler and Stalin were both to die tomorrow—if, in fact, they are dead now and some of their numerous stand-ins are taking their places—the war is not won if their systems stand. If, on the other hand, their systems change, or are overthrown from within or from without, then Hitler and Stalin won't matter any more than the old wood chopper of Doorn who died recently, too insignificant to be hated any more.

Our mortal enemy is the totalitarian system, with its force, its lawlessness, its lying, its ruthlessness.

How shall we defeat it?

One way is to defeat it right here at home; to stop the growth of uncontrolled power, regimentation, bureaucracy, censorship, double dealing in foreign affairs.

Another way is by meeting the system on its own terms and opposing force with force, lawlessness with lawlessness, lying with lying, ruthlessness with ruthlessnes, even if this means the bombing or the starving of the women and children of Belgium and France. There are two objections to this:

1. Democracies are not so good at these tactics as dictatorships unless they surrender their democracy.

2. We are not ready yet to meet force with force. We can send token forces of men, planes, or ships. We, too, can take part in heroic evacuations, but we are just not ready for a military offensive. If we abandon aid short of war, we may find ourselves in war short of aid.

There is another way to defeat the Hitler system, and that is by an American peace offensive. We are not ready to fight now, and Hitler knows it. On the other hand, we are getting ready fast, and Hitler knows it. We are not ready to launch an American military offensive, but we are in a strategic position now, before we get in, to launch an American peace offensive.

We are told that this is not the right time. Both Churchill and Roosevelt have discouraged the mention of the word "peace." We must not forget that once we are in war there never is a right time to discuss peace, as shown by the experience of the nations now fighting. If we are losing, peace talk sounds like surrender; if there is a stalemate, it sounds as if we were losing, and sad experience teaches us that peace is not made wisely in the flush of victory. Right now, when we are not ready to fight but will be ready soon, we can lead the world in a peace effort, for the world knows we are leading through strength and not through weakness.

If Britain is losing, we can open negotiations for peace better than she can, and an American peace offensive could be our most effective aid to Britain.

If, as is more likely, a stalemate lies ahead, we can propose peace better now than if we are in, and locked in the stalemate with the others.

If Britain is to win, then we had better obtain some commitments on peace terms while we are needed by the British, rather than wait for another Versailles, when what former Ambassador Bullitt calls "our moral authority" will be gone, because they no longer need us.

We are ready now with the weapons of peace. Surplus food for the starving in Europe. Surplus cotton and wool for those who are naked and will be cold. Surplus gold to finance the crumbled economies of Europe. Friendship to intervene where hatreds are aflame.

You may say these are frail weapons to stop a war machine, a gangster economy. I say these are the most potent weapons on earth. When have starving, naked, penniless, hated people been able to resist food and clothes and gold when offered in friendship?

We must use our peace weapons wisely and courageously and shrewdly and aggressively.

Let's get this clear. We are not going to offer or approve a peace of surrender or defeatism or appeasement. While we would be mediating and would not expect to dictate terms, we would not agree to the dictation of any such terms by anyone else.

We won't take a nonaggression pact dependent on Hitler's honor. We would insist upon guaranties so that we would not have to rely upon Hitler's word, and Germany would not have to rely upon the word of the other belligerents. Terms could be arranged for impounding arms by all sides under joint or international control, strategic positions could be put under such control, other conditions could be arranged that would involve no injury or loss of prestige to any nation intending to keep the peace, so that peace would depend upon more than Hitler's mere promise.

But we are told that Hitler would never agree to any such terms or to any decent terms now. We have an epidemic of mindreaders. People who cannot tell you what Hitler will do in war next week or next month or next year can read his mind as to what he will do in peace now and 10 years from now. They get it from something he said or wrote, although they say you can't trust anything he says. I don't pretend to know Hitler's mind, but we have heard in Washington, in Congress, very definite reports that Hitler would be willing to call it quits with Britain, leave her fleet and Dominion intact, restore every pre-World War conquered country, and settle the rest at the conference table. Why shouldn't he?

We learn through many leaks in the censorship that the German people want peace. Germany has had enough aerial bombing, has lost enough men, more than we lost in the entire World War, to bring the "glories" of war home to the people. Among the German people are many who fear the

dynamism of Hitler, who fear that each Nazi victory merely sets the stage for further fighting, further suffering. The German soldiers in the occupied countries are becoming restless. We hear on good authority that the possible entry of America into the war brings up ominous memories in Germany. The mind readers may be wrong about Germany and peace.

Suppose, however, that Hitler will not make peace, that his offers are purely for propaganda purposes, that Hess and Funk and the rest are only to divide us. Then let us turn his own offers—his own tactics—against him. If we launched a peace offensive, intelligently, aggressively, and in good faith, and it failed, it would nevertheless unite our own people as they are not now united, would divide the German people, and would hearten the conquered people. The time to try it, however, is before we go in. We will never have such a chance again.

Our President says that not even a tenth cousin of a peace proposal has been made. It seems to me that the statements of peace aims by Anthony Eden and Secretary Hull are at least first cousins of a peace proposal, but if it be true that neither our country nor the British nor Germany are exploring the possibilities of a just and satisfactory peace now, they had better start now.

What are our peace aims? "Beat Hitler" is a war cry, but it is not a peace aim. Much of our confusion is because of lack of unity on peace aims. There are elements in this country who intend to beat Hitler, and in the doing of it, make us over into a Fascist state by destroying the rights of free labor. There are those in this country who are willing to beat Hitler if, in the doing of it, they can set up a dictatorship of labor unions which shall destroy free capitalism. There are those in this country who think that if we ignore the war, the war will ignore us. There are those in this country who feel that we can regain the good old days and the good old times if only Hitler is destroyed and Churchill's England is preserved. Can we have national unity on any one of these peace aims?

What are our peace aims? The two great spokesmen, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, have been reticent and vague on this subject. President Roosevelt has promised everyone the four freedoms and self-determination. Mr. Churchill has said he favored a few "practical measures of reconstruction," but disliked all talk of a new order and wanted to preserve traditional England. Harold Laski and many others in Britain are discussing British peace aims and are insisting that a democratic new order be adopted in England now, not after the war.

The self-labeled 1941 committee commentary has suggested that Britain must "win the peace," as well as the war, and has suggested a program.

Mr. J. B. Priestley has gotten into difficulties as a radio commentator because of his impatience to discuss peace aims.

The Malvern Conference of the Church of England stated a peace program which proposed "a cooperative commonwealth as a new order for Europe." The Pope has presented to the world the peace aims of the great Catholic Church.

In this country, Vice President Wallace, making an unusual speech for a Vice President and doubtless with the approval of the administration, has publicly suggested a pax democratica with a bill rights and a bill of duties.

While statesmen and politicians are vague and brief as to peace, while editors and columnists who are so helpful in predigesting ideas for us are for the most part silent as to peace talk, the church people are talking peace. A number of conferences are being held to attempt to formulate into a workable program the Christian ideal of peace on earth among men of good will. Dr. E. Stanley Jones, a great Methodist missionary and world statesman in the realm of the spirit has said that America's role in this crisis should not be that of intervention or arbitration but of mediation, to produce a cooperative world centered around one idea—equality of opportunity. He suggests for discussion a seven-point program.

Many Americans are struggling to formulate and state our peace aims. Their proposals are all vague and various, as they must be on a vital question that has had so little attention. They have one thing in common—none of them describes a world, an America, such as we now know.

They also reflect what every real student of this war knows—that a world revolution is going on as a part of, and cause of, and result of this war. There is violent disagreement as to just what this revolution is. It is called a revolution against the West, against Roman law, Greek logic, Christian idealism, against democracy, against the "haves," against gold and naval power. James Burnham calls it "the managerial revolution," a label approved by Stuart Chase as something different from capitalism or socialism. I can think of no better quick description than this—a revolution against traditional capitalism. It is going on in every country, going on in the United States. So far it is not our war, but it is our revolution. It is more than a wave of the future, it is the tide of the present, and the scum and guttersnipes may dirty it but they cannot control it for long. If we could only understand it, and in some way think it out instead of fighting it out, as we fought out the Protestant revolution, the French revolution, the industrial revolution, we could make this a better country, a better world. I have some suggestions for peace aims for America. Like the others, they are vague—a basis for discussion rather than a final set of demands:

First. We will preserve this country as a republic and work out the internal effects of this world-wide movement on our system by peaceful, intelligent evolution—not by violent, blind revolution.

Second. We will preserve our hemisphere intact against the military or political aggression of the world.

Third. We recognize the right of similar areas to preserve themselves intact against our military or political aggression.

Fourth. We believe that neighboring states must learn to live together peacefully in union, as we have. We will not approve of the domination of one race, or one nation, or one man. We are opposed to unions or axes based solely on color, language, race, or ideologies. We want a regime in Europe that is not a balance-of-power mosaic. We believe people who live near each other must unite in peace.

Fifth. We believe in equality of opportunity for all nations in markets, raw materials, acquiring land and emigration to all undeveloped lands.

Sixth. We believe in reciprocity of opportunity as to markets, materials, land, and emigration as between developed lands.

Seventh. We will do our part in maintaining world peace, order, and justice based on these principles. We will not enter any arrangement that inevitably involves an immediate war.

Eighth. We will participate in progressive disarmament.

We should start tonight to formulate our peace aims. It will take time and study and discussion. As Anatol Muhlstein says in New Europe:

"In order to have a general conception of what a pacified Europe should be, it will not be sufficient to consult in a hurry between two plenary sessions some prominent experts brought together on the eve of the peace congress.

"This is a long-range work, a work of thought and scientific research which independent minds must undertake without delay."

I have no set idea as to how our proposal should be made. The President will have to take the leadership. On the other hand, I doubt whether a peace offensive would be effective unless the Congress joined. After the sad experience of President Wilson, and in the light of the unreliability of Executive commitments in Europe and elsewhere, we will have to do more than merely send a Presidential note. We must show the world the whole country means business.

But some will say peace now would only be a truce. I do not think so, but always before we have thought each war was the last war and at the end that we were entering perpetual peace. Perhaps it would be wise for us to know this time that war would come again unless we waged peace as bravely and wisely as we wage war.

Suppose all we could get would be a truce for a few years. Who would be the loser? We need those years to complete our arming. On the other hand, Mr. Churchill said Sunday Hitler's "machine cannot stand idle lest it rust or fall to pieces." Let's make it idle so it will rust and fall to pieces. Delay is on our side.

Are we in danger of defeat by the Nazis in peace? They think so, and so do many of our prominent interventionists. I am amazed at the craven defeatism of those Americans who are terrified by the Nazi system in economic competition with ours.

I believe in the American system. I agree with Barney Baruch who says Germany, not the United States, will be "on the spot" economically even if Germany is successful in Europe.

In peacetime competition with Germany I have faith in persuasion versus pressure, Yankee ingenuity versus Prussian efficiency, free labor versus slave labor, Christian love versus pagan hatred, American friendliness versus Nazi nastiness.

My countrymen, America has not led the world in war. I feel certain we could, but before we risk everything in trying it, let us risk nothing by trying to lead the world in peace—something in which we know we can lead the whole world. We have our faults and our frailties, but after all, in cold blood, the Nazis are not the greatest nation on earth, Britain is not the greatest nation on earth—we are the greatest nation on earth. We owe it to thousands abroad who are otherwise sure to die this year to give them the chance to live in peace before we send our thousands to die with them.

Safeguarding the Sugar Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY FRED BRENCKMAN

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative, the National Grange, over stations of the National Broadcasting Co., on the Grange Hour, from Washington, D. C., June 21, 1941:

Congress is at present considering legislation to amend the Sugar Act of 1937. Under

this act quotas are allocated to domestic producers of sugarcane and sugar beets. Quotas are likewise fixed for our island possessions, as well as Cuba. About 30 percent of our domestic consumption of sugar is allocated to the continental producers of sugar beets and sugarcane; 42 percent goes to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and the Virgin Islands, while Cuba gets the remaining 28 percent, including the very small amount that is allocated to other foreign countries.

America leads the world in the consumption of sugar. Our domestic consumption amounts to more than 6,500,000 tons a year, which is at the rate of more than 100 pounds for each man, woman, and child in the country.

Under the provisions of the Philippine Independence Act the duty-free quota of the islands for the present year is fixed at 982,000 tons. However, because of the growing scarcity of shipping and a tremendous increase in ocean-freight rates, the Philippines will not be able to fill their quota this year.

SHIPPING AND INSURANCE RATES SOAR

As an example of the way the freight rates have soared, before the war the cost of shipping a ton of sugar from the Philippines to the United States was $6.75. Today the rate ranges from $25 to $35 a ton. This does not take into account the rise in insurance rates, which are also heavy.

Under the Sugar Act of 1937, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to prorate any deficit in the Philippine quota to foreign countries other than Cuba. In pursuance of its good neighbor policy, the administration has been very anxious to allot to certain South American countries that portion of the Philippine quota which the islands cannot fill under present conditions.

By a vote of 45 to 26, the United States Senate early this month passed the Adams-O'Mahoney bill, S. 937, directing the Secretary of Agriculture to prorate to foreign countries other than Cuba 75,000 tons of the allotment which the Philippines cannot fill this year. The remainder of the unfilled quota of the Philippines, if any, is to be equitably apportioned among domestic producers.

Secretary of State Hull voices strong objections to the Adams-O'Mahoney bill. He alleges that its enactment "would repudiate the policy of hemisphere defense and the economic cooperation which the American republics agreed upon at the Habana Conference less than a year ago."

The fact is, however, that the 75,000 tons allocated to foreign countries other than Cuba is about three times the allotment to which these countries are entitled under the present act.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that the advocates of the Adams-O'Mahoney Act are on the right track in maintaining that it is not in the interest of national defense to put an unnecessary strain upon shipping facilities by bringing more sugar from such countries as Peru and San Domingo, which lies east of Cuba, when we have in the United States huge surplus stocks of beet sugar which cannot be sold at present because they are in excess of marketing quotas.

COFFEE BILL PLACED ON HOUSE CALENDAR

The House Committee on Agriculture has favorably reported H. R. 3582, introduced by Congressman HARRY B. COFFEE of Nebraska, bearing on this question.

The Coffee bill is directly and fully responsive to the request which had originally been made in 1937 by Secretary Hull on behalf of the Dominican Republic, Peru, and other South American countries. As the report of the committee shows, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture in 1937 requested that the deficit of dutiable sugar from the Philippines be transferred to foreign countries. At no time was it stated or understood that foreign countries were promised that they would be given any part of the duty-free quota of the Philippines.

It is impossible, therefore, to justify any claim that the adoption of Congressman Coffee's bill would be a repudiation of a promise. In fact, the Coffee bill pays scrupulous regard to the good-neighbor policy. The good-neighbor policy is a worthy concept, but, just like any other good thing, there are definite limits beyond which the United States Government cannot go without trampling on the rights of American producers.

Most of the opposition to the Adams-O'Mahoney bill, which has already passed the Senate, and to the bill by Congressman COFFEE, comes from the eastern seaboard, where most of our cane-sugar refineries are located. The eastern seaboard refineries base their opposition on the prospect that any increase in the quota of the beet-sugar areas would reduce cane refinery operations. This manifestation of local patriotism is disappointing and unfortunate, coming at a time when unity in the national-defense emergency is so essential.

There are 17 cane-sugar refineries in the United States, of which 4 are in New York. Let us assume that these 4 would benefit by giving to foreign countries a larger share of the sugar market of the United States. Louisiana has 6 refineries and they handle the crop of that State, as well as some of the sugars of Puerto Rico and Cuba.

Under the Coffee bill, the sugar producers of Louisiana and Puerto Rico would furnish their share of the Philippine deficit and in the event of a still further deficit in domestic areas Cuba could furnish its share.

SURPLUS OF DOMESTIC BEET SUGAR

As I have said, domestic areas have a surplus of sugar which cannot be sold because it was in excess of the marketing quotas. The domestic sugar-beet industry on January 1, 1941, had on hand inventories of 1,754,000 tons. Its quota for 1941 is 1,589,000 tons. This means that more than 165,000 tons of beet sugar from the 1940 crop must be carried over until 1942, in addition to the full production of the 1941 sugar-beet crop.

The industry usually markets about 350,000 tons of beet sugar from the current crop during the last few months of each year. The existing surplus of beet sugar amounts to more than 500,000 tons. This was produced in direct compliance with the Sugar Act and has protected consumers against excessive prices.

Because of this surplus, the acreage planted to sugar beets in the United States has been reduced more than 16 percent in conformity with the Sugar Act. Various beet-sugar factories throughout the country have been forced to close down because of this reduction in acreage.

If domestic areas are enabled to market some of their excess sugar this year, increased acreage allotments to domestic growers may be available next year. This would reopen some of the closed factories and relieve unemployment.

It should be understood that the Sugar Act and the quotas which it provides was designed to protect the domestic sugar industry as well as consumers. Without any restrictions on imports, the domestic sugar-beet industry would probably have been driven out of existence. Under present conditions the beet-sugar industry is in a position to protect domestic consumers against price gouging and scarcity, if it is simply permitted to function.

It is argued, with good reason, that under existing abnormal conditions this country ought to emancipate itself so far as possible from dependence on sea-borne sugars, for access to that sugar is rendered precarious by lack of ships and the need to divert all the ships possible to aid Great Britain in the battle of the Atlantic.

If shipping space is scarce this year, it is easily conceivable that it may be still more scarce next year. If we fail to take advantage of the opportunity to expand sugar production at home, there may be a repetition of the conditions that existed in the United States during the first World War, when sugar was retailed at from 30 to 35 cents a pound and when families were strictly rationed in the bargain.

As I have already indicated, only 30 percent of the sugar we consume is produced in the continental portion of the United States. Under existing conditions, we would be fully justified in producing 40 percent of our sugar at home.

HISTORY OF SUGAR INDUSTRY OUTLINED

It is interesting to note that sugar is found in almost every plant and, therefore, has been eaten by man from time immemorial. Commercial sugar today comes almost entirely from the sugarcane and the sugar beet. Sugarcane came first. It probably originated on the banks of the Ganges in India. The first real records of the manufacture of cane sugar were written from 300 to 600 A. D. Sugar making was introduced into Spain in the year 755, and the art soon spread, aided by the vast trade renaissance of the seventh and ninth centuries.

Sugarcane was brought from Europe to the rich soil of the West Indies and then to Brazil and other parts of South America. Cheap slave labor made possible the rapid development that followed in the next two centuries.

The Jesuits are credited with importing and cultivating the first sugarcane in Louisiana, about the year 1750. The first company to refine American-grown sugar is said to have started operations in 1795, a few miles from New Orleans. Practically all of the cane sugar produced in the United States comes from Louisiana and from Florida.

The first successful beet-sugar factory in the United States dates from 1879 in a plant which is still operated at Alvarado, Calif. A decade or two before, Brigham Young had tried to make beet sugar in Salt Lake City, bringing the imported machinery overland by ox train. While Young and his followers triumphed over many other seemingly insuperable obstacles, their attempt to make beet sugar failed.

The sugar beet is white and larger than the ordinary red garden beet. It is cultivated in almost every country in the Temperate Zone from Italy to Sweden, and in 19 American States from Ohio to the Pacific. Successful production depends on soil, topography, water supply, and drainage. The beets are sensitive to frost when very young, but can withstand low temperatures as they approach maturity. Crops take about 6 months to mature. In this country havesting starts in July in California and really gets under way throughout the Nation about the 1st of October. The beets are pulled before the ground freezes, although they wait many weeks for final conversion into refined sugar.

Sugar beets are grown by nearly 100,000 individual farmers of the United States, who in turn sell their product to about 80 beet-sugar factories located at strategic points in the areas of production.

The Bureaucrats' Gift to the Farmers—Russian Whiskers and Leather Boots

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching the harvest sea-

son, the time in the year when God blesses the farmers and all the people of the land with the fruits of their labor. Undoubtedly, the occasion of this harvest will be as memorable to today's tillers of the soil as it was to our Founding Fathers.

The Pilgrims, founders of this great Nation, were ever mindful of the veneration man owes to his Creator, and set aside a special day to give thanks for the blessings of harvest.

I doubt, however, if the American farmers of today can really give much thanks for the blessings of the 1941 harvest season. This harvest season will be different. It will definitely mark the American farmers' introduction to the beginning of a complete communistic agricultural program that was made possible by the recently enacted amendments to the so-called marketing quotas under the A. A. A., passed by this Congress May 13, 1941, and which made so strongly for the setting up of compulsory corn and wheat quotas.

This bill was supposed to give something to the farmer. If it did, I am afraid the gift will turn out to be Russian whiskers and leather boots. And this should be expected since the President yesterday, in his June 24 press conference, startled the country by announcing faith in communistic Russia to such an extent that he intends to give them full material benefit of the notorious lend-lease bill, which should be properly called lend-lose bill, because it so generously dips into the money pocket of the American taxpayer. Well, thank God, my conscience is clear on that score because I voted against the lend-lease bill—H. R. 1776—and one of my reasons for voting against same, as the record will show, was that the bill made aid possible to Russia and I feared the administration might desire to help Russia. I warned this House against that danger in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1941, entitled "The So-Called Lend-Lease Bill." And I warned this Nation over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the evening of January 22, 1941, when these January 24 RECORD remarks were given as a radio address.

I also warned this House on April 29, 1941, of the viciousness of these so-called marketing quota amendments. It was my opinion at that time that my remarks were timely. Today, as harvest time approaches, I think they are more timely because this legislation draws the American farmer nearer to his doom. At this point I would like to read to this body again the warning I issued on this floor on April 29, which went unheeded:

Mr. Speaker, I am voting against this bill which will, if it passes, make the farm program compulsory for all farmers.

Congress and the bureaucracy which grew out of the A. A. A. program and the administration or its spokesmen have persistently in no uncertain terms assured the farmers they would never make this program compulsory. Now all pretense is thrown to the winds and henceforth all farmers will be compelled to join the program or be penalized for not so doing.

Even the farmers who were not in the program and who planted wheat last fall will be, under this bill, forced to pay as a penalty about 50 cents per bushel for all wheat they raise over and above the quotas fixed by some bureaucrat here in Washington who probably in his entire life never planted a grain of wheat. Could anything possibly be more unfair than this?

I understand the Agriculture Department intends to exempt corn from the program for this year, but it will be in the hands of that Department to do whatever it pleases.

I do not believe the majority of the farmers of the United States if they had an opportunity would vote for this compulsory feature in the farm program. I believe most farmers still feel that they are more capable of managing their own farms than the politicians in Washington.

Ever since I have been in Congress I have been warning the farmers and people of my district of the danger of the farm program ultimately becoming compulsory. Now it is here if this bill passes. From now on it may be expected the bureaucrats will pull the rope tighter and tighter around the farmers' necks. This bill now tells them how much they can plant. Soon they will be told what they can plant, when they can plant it, and how much they can keep of what they produce.

This is just another long step toward making agricultural slaves out of the American farmers.

In the short space of 6 weeks the things which the supporters of these marketing quota amendments denied have come to pass. The American farmer has been denied the right to plant what he wishes, the amount he wishes, and the right to keep that which he produces. It makes him an agricultural slave.

Abuse of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY C. J. MURPHY

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present a very lucid statement made by C. J. Murphy, an attorney at Grand Forks, N. Dak., in regard to Senate bill 674, relating to procedure of administrative officers and agencies of the Government. The statement is presented herewith:

Senate bill 674, which would prescribe "fair standards of duty and procedure of administrative officers and agencies," should be promptly passed by Congress. Every Member of Congress must be painfully aware of the abuse of power by many of the new Federal bureaus and the resulting detriment to business. Members of these boards ignore common rules of fair play, have lost all sense of impartiality, and seem to have the conviction that the men connected with industry are arch criminals.

This bill, if enacted, would require that the functions of those presiding at hearings shall be "judicial in nature," and their conduct governed by "the accepted canons of judicial ethics." What would we think of a judge of one of our courts who would be willing to play the part of investigator and prosecutor of a case pending before him for decision? Would there be a chance, if this practice prevailed in the courts, that we would be governed by law—not men? What would become of what is left of the Bill of Rights? It is just as important, perhaps more important in view of the growth of administrative law and agencies, for us to have impartial men passing upon the issues and problems of present-day business.

The men in our bureaus who are supposed to counsel and advise businessmen and aid them in managing their business under our complex and often bewildering statutory law, are in the habit of disqualifying themselves from the very beginning of proceedings. They not only become complainant, but resort to almost every third-degree method invented for bringing hardened criminals to justice. There is the ex parte counseling with underlings of bureaus who are making investigations, without the knowledge of the accused, unnecessary demands for access to business books and records, newspaper publicity for the Government's side of the case with derogatory statements or insinuations against the defendant, or at best silent treatment, decision of questions of fact without reading the evidence, upon the say-so of some young whippersnapper who says he read the record, and so on. This sort of thing cannot continue without the loss of the last vestige of our way of life.

Many cases might be cited to prove these charges, but it is not necessary as they must be well known to the Members of Congress. They will undoubtedly be aired plenty in debate on the present bill. One of the most flagrant cases was decided by the National Labor Relations Board and came before the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. The dissenting opinion of Judge Stephens points out the many abuses of the rights of citizenship and dangers that confront us in the future growing out of the maladministration of law by half-baked uplifters and radicals of every grade.

It is clearly the duty of every patriotic Members of our Congress to give this bill preferred attention, to the end that it may be passed so overwhelmingly that there will be no veto. However, should the measure meet the fate of the Logan-Walter bill it should be passed over the veto.

Lippmann Aids the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, Walter Lippmann is one of the Nation's outstanding columnists. Realizing the great influence of pens of men of his stature, I have noted with pleasure his honest factual reporting and the complete reliability of his statements.

Among his outstanding qualities is his constructiveness. I was happy to see in his column appearing in the Washington Post of June 19 that he is lending his support to the St. Lawrence seaway. His logic is refreshing, and I hope that the contagion of his straight thinking will be effectual now.

The article follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—OUR UNUSED RESERVES
(By Walter Lippmann)

A question of very general importance came up before the House committee on

Thursday when Secretary Stimson was testifying in favor of the agreement with Canada to develop the St. Lawrence seaway. This is a project which, besides developing a considerable amount of hydroelectric power in a region where it is badly needed, would open a channel for shipping from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. Whatever regional and other objectons there may have been to the project in the past, it is fair to say that on the merits it would be an immense advantage to us today if it had been completed years ago. Who can seriously deny the value of being able to develop American sea power in the heart of the North American Continent, and of being able to provide the great inland industrial and agricultural centers with access to the sea? We must wish we had had the foresight to carry out this project in the years when we were spending so much money on less valuable things.

The only real question now is whether, since it will require several years to complete it, we ought to regard the seaway as a genuine defense project. Secretary Stimson, who surely has as vivid a knowledge of the urgency of the defense program as anyone and certainly is not remotely interested in boon-doggling, has now urged Congress to approve. That ought just about to settle the matter for those who have kept an open mind, and particularly in view of Mr. Stimson's argument that he regards this long-range undertaking as necessary preparation "for a very long emergency."

This poses the question which appears again and again in planning the defense program—how to combine quick results as soon as possible with greater results in the long run? For, looked at one way—that of stopping Hitler this year—we must sprint; looked at the other way—that of insuring Hitler's defeat, we must prepare for a long-distance run. The correct planning of the total effort requires a sound and bold judgment as to when to sprint, when to get ready for the long run, and how, if possible, to do both.

It is, in fact, necessary to do both. Obviously, Hitler has to be stopped so he cannot win, and no less obviously he will be defeated more quickly if, when he has been stopped, the preparations are well advanced for an overwhelming production in the long run. There is no paradox in saying that the more fully we are prepared for a long war, the shorter the war is likely to be.

Now, for the United States there is, speaking broadly, no reason why we cannot combine the sprint with the long-distance effort. We can do both better than any other nation in the world, because we have incomparably the greatest reserves of industrial power. Our immediate emergency effort, considerable though it is, uses a much smaller proportion of our much greater industrial power than the war effort of Germany or Britain. Therefore, there can be no question of our being able to push the emergency program and also to supplement it with a longer-range program. We have an unused reserve.

"Keep 'Em Flying"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

LETTER FROM THE ADJUTANT GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including below a letter from the War Department regarding the recently adopted slogan, "Keep 'Em Flying."

The spirit back of this slogan is fine and commendable. It typifies united action.

The idea is another product of Lt. Col. Harold N. Gilbert, of the Adjutant General's office, an outstanding officer who only last November stood before the Secretary of War and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for "exceptionally meritorious service in a position of great responsibility." Already Colonel Gilbert possessed the Distinguished Service Cross for "extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against the enemy" and the Purple Heart, for wounds received in action. I trust the idea embodied in the following letter will meet with universal favor and cooperation:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MYERS: The War Department requests your cooperation and assistance in popularizing the recently adopted slogan, "Keep 'em flying!" It is the desire of the Department to make "Keep 'em flying!" a popular everyday expression used by persons in all walks of life throughout the Nation. It is designed to focus the public mind on unity of purpose and action in our national-defense effort and applies to the wheels of progress in the whole national-defense program as well as to airplanes.

The objective, of course, is to get people everywhere to use the phrase "Keep 'em flying!" as an expression of felicity, high morale, or as a toast, to the point where "Keep 'em flying!" will replace such everyday expressions as "So long," "I'll be seeing you," "Down the hatch," "Good-bye," "Good luck," and similar expressions. In short, "Keep 'em flying!" is to be our expression comparable to "Thumbs up."

Thanking you, and with kindest regards.

"Keep 'em flying!"

E. S. ADAMS,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARD JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, are we convoying ships across the ocean? Many would like to know definitely the answer to this question. Robert S. Allen and Drew Pearson, prominent columnists of Washington have answered this question very definitely in a release they have sent directly to certain newspapers throughout the Nation, and not through United Features Syndicate that usually releases the column of these two reporters.

We cannot expect unity of action on the part of our Nation unless our people are informed as to what is transpiring in this critical period, and especially are they entitled to know what part our Government is taking in this world conflict.

It is common knowledge that agents of the Axis Powers are familiar with the aid we are extending to Britain, and therefore by giving this information to our own people we will not be aiding the Axis Powers by giving them information beyond what they already have.

This release by Pearson and Allen was printed on June 24 in the Long Beach Independent, of Long Beach, Calif., and the following is a copy of that release:

INSIDE ON AIR PATROL

(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—A group of American naval vessels have just returned from their first experience at Atlantic patrol and/or convoying. Whatever it is called, they helped to get about 80 British merchantmen safely most of the way to the west coast of Africa. There the British took over.

Just after the American warships left Nazi bombers sank four British tankers. They were big, modern tankers capable of making 17 knots, but held down to about 9 knots by the slow speed of the convoy.

The manner in which the new Atlantic patrol operates is unique in naval history. Here are the mechanics:

United States warships picked up the British merchantmen in a British Western Hemisphere port—in this case, Bermuda. (Sometimes the north Atlantic route is used via Halifax, but the route is seldom the same.) Prior to that British vessels had been concentrating for several weeks in various West Indian ports—wheat and meat ships, together with oil tankers. The British merchantmen which awaited the United States patrol in Bermuda chiefly carried munitions. Oil tankers comprised the most important part of the convoy, there being about 30 of them, a number carrying airplanes on their decks.

Three United States airplane carriers, 6 destroyers, and 3 cruisers accompanied the convoy across the Atlantic—but never within sight of the 80 British merchantmen.

One airplane carrier steamed ahead of the merchantmen, another to the rear, another to the north. Each carrier was protected by two destroyers, zigzagging constantly. The carriers performed the most important part of the patrol, keeping their airplanes constantly scouring the sky.

GERMAN RAIDER SUNK

Once a plane sighted a German surface raider and radioed its position to British warships, which rushed up and sank her. The battle took place so close to American vessels that they could hear the firing, though they never saw the ships. United States radio operators picked up a distress message sent to Berlin by the Nazi vessel, saying that she was sinking.

On another occasion an airplane carrier detector picked up the vibrations of a submarine and signaled it to come to the surface. When there was no answer, United States destroyers immediately dropped depth charges. After that the detector picked up no more vibrations.

Later, another submarine was detected and warned to come to the surface. It did so and proved to be one of the long-range French submarines—the largest in existence and manned by a Free French and British crew. It carried a small airplane aboard.

When the patrol reached its meeting place with the British, near the Cape Verde Islands, off the African coast, it turned north, and shortly after this the 12 United States naval vessels headed home.

In the same issue of the Long Beach Independent appeared an editorial on this question of informing the American people of what our Nation is doing in this war. This editorial reads as follows:

TRUTH WILL OUT

The Independent again today publishes a sensational news release by Pearson and Allen, authors of Washington Merry-Go-Round. This article did not come through the regular channels which distribute their syndicate articles. This newspaper is fully aware of the great responsibility which falls upon it in publishing news which has been turned down by those in charge of national syndicates. It is gratifying that this responsibility has been accepted by an overwhelming number of those newspapers through the Nation which subscribe to Pearson and Allen's informative and remarkably accurate account of what goes on in Government. This response on the part of the American press reveals an alert insistence that the truth in the news be made known to the people of this Nation regardless of attempts to suppress such truth.

It is one thing to suppress news of actions which are yet to happen, because premature release might endanger such actions, but it is quite another thing to suppress news of actions that have already taken place, news, which, incidentally, is known to all the governments involved in this war.

The President in his latest speech on the international situation told the people that we were going to deliver supplies to Britain. It is evident that such a policy is being carried out according to Pearson and Allen's story. However, the people of the United States were not told that these actions had been carried out. Why they have not been told these facts, we do not know, but whatever the reasons may be cannot obscure the duty of democratic government to fully inform its people of every act and every move as soon as these are made.

Anyone in government who does not subscribe to such a principle does not belong in government conducted in the American way.

As a people we will not attain unity of purpose nor confidence in our leadership nor build up our morale unless our leadership deals with us frankly, openly and honestly. So long as we remain a democracy the right of the people to know all the facts of those activities which may take us into war is so absolute as to be unassailable except by those who are the enemies of democracy.

Our public-opinion polls indicate that the American people would undoubtedly support any action no matter how drastic in order to carry into operation our policy of aid to Britain. Those who criticize these polls, such as Senator WHEELER and others, disregard all of our past experiences which have shown that the polls in question are remarkably accurate indexes of public opinion. From first-hand knowledge of how such opinions are gathered and how great an effort is made to secure unbiased and uncolored opinion, we believe that they are far more accurate as a sample of public opinion than any unsupported statements from groups who assert their contrary.

With such polls revealing a vast majority of opinion supporting the policy of the President, we cannot understand the reticence on the part of Government officials to return that confidence. There is an increasing tendency to suppress news from every quarter of Government, and we insist that such tendencies are dangerous to the security of the state. History is consistent in revealing that suppression of news is exercised more zealously in the direction of covering up stupidity and blunders than it is in keeping vital information from the enemy.

This newspaper supports the proposition as outlined by Pearson and Allen that so long as the American people are the ones who are going to shed the blood and do the shooting in any war in which we may become involved they are not only entitled to know the facts, but they will be given the facts by a free press. We further indict those who would hide the facts from the American people as failing in their first and most solemn responsibility to those who support them in power to account fully, frankly, and often for their stewardship. No group, no clique, no man, is indispensable in a democracy, and if we must, in order to maintain our constitutional rights, demonstrate that fact, we are confident the American people can and will find those who have enough confidence in them to believe them capable of dealing with truth to serve them. Let us remember it was Jesus who said:

"The truth shall make men free."

So long as we struggle to maintain freedom, so long must we struggle to maintain truth, as both are the great foundation stones of our Nation.

As was said recently by a public-opinion expert:

"The American people may be deficient in information but they are long on common sense." Armed with truth that common sense would be our greatest weapon.

The New York Stock Exchange and Its Relation to World Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. BARNES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. EMIL SCHRAM

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Hon. Emil Schram, chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on June 25:

Mr. Toastmaster and gentlemen, my feelings in facing this audience tonight are, I must confess, somewhat mingled. In the first place, I deeply appreciate your having extended to me this opportunity to spend an evening informally with you in so cordial an atmosphere. I had hoped for just such an occasion as this in order to become better acquainted with all of you in advance of the time when I shall assume my new duties. The courtesy shown by the members of the exchange and the Association of Stock Exchange Firms in arranging this dinner is, I know, characteristic.

Quite apart from this warmth of friendly fraternity, however, I cannot fail to sense that tonight I am undergoing what might be called a baptism by total immersion. I am reminded this very minute of a young lad back in Illinois who once heard that there was a job open as watchman at the crossing of the single-track railroad which bordered our farm. The railroad boss told the boy he would have to undergo a strict examination. Quite enthusiastic about his abilities, the youth said, "Ask me anything," and thereupon his prospective employer came at him with this query:

"Suppose you were at the crossing, and two trains were coming along 60 miles an hour—head-on. What would you do?"

"Well—I'd blow my whistle."

"Yes, but suppose your whistle was out of order."

"I'd always wear a red shirt, and I'd take it off and flag the train."

"But suppose it happened at night."

"Then I'd swing my lantern."

"Suppose you had no oil in your lantern."

"In that case I'd holler for my sister."

"Your sister? What for?"

"So she'd come and see the damnedest wreck she ever saw in her life."

In case any of you are in doubt, I think I should tell you at this point that, although some have said the exchange is at the crossroads, I do not anticipate that there will be any head-on collision, or that I will have any use for a whistle, a red shirt, or even a lantern. Besides, I haven't any sister.

If you have been reading the press comment I suppose you have already noted that this fellow who stands before you as your president-elect is jumping from the stockyards to the stock exchange—that he has had a passing acquaintance only with the bulls on his farm back home, and until very recently had never met any of the kind that are supposed to frequent the Street, although lately they have been conspicuous by their absence.

Next Tuesday, when I sit down at my desk at No. 11 Wall Street, I shall become an integral part of your community. This is probably the last occasion upon which I can speak to you with any sense of detachment. It is for that reason that I am now so bold as to present a few of my personal observations with respect to the exchange and its relation to world events at this time. I know you will accept these remarks in the spirit in which they are offered—that you will be patient with one who, entering this intricate field, intends to balance with sincerity what he may lack in technical experience.

As most of us realize, the drastic national-defense steps now being undertaken are absolutely imperative if we are to protect that precious heritage which identifies our American way of living. Today nothing will satisfy our people except the efficient and effective production of those things which are essential to the full defense of our Nation. Last week, at another meeting in this city, I had occasion to remark that the democracy we are struggling to preserve must not be weakened in the defense process but must be strengthened. Quite obviously, then, full economic efficiency is a vital part of our preparedness. This requires the fullest development of all those facilities which contribute to the success of our economy. Free markets are a proper and necessary adjunct of that democratic system to the preservation of which the country has now consecrated itself. I regard the stock exchange, therefore, as an institution whose continued vitality is of national concern.

In the past few weeks, out of natural curiosity and self-interest, I have been assembling and assimilating a few ideas, most of which will, of course, sound platitudinous in your informed circle. For example, I was impressed by the fact that the history of your exchange, which had its origin a century and a half ago, almost parallels in time the history of the Nation. Yours is an organization with a long and honorable record of which both you and the Nation have a right to be proud. I know, too, that, regardless of popular notion, the exchange is not mysterious—no more so than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of which I am now Chairman, is mysterious.

In this connection I want to say that I believe that these two institutions possess a great many attributes in common. Nor do I regard my new position as representing an abrupt transition from my duties with the Government during the past 8 years. I refer, of course, to the obvious fact that both the R. F. C. and the exchange are institutions which exist to perform a worthy public service. Surely no one will deny that the exchange has a great national service to perform because of its strategic location—not on the periphery but in the very center of our economic orbit.

As I visualize it, the exchange is the public square in the business community of America.

It is the meeting place of capital and industry. Through those companies whose securities it has on its list it presents a composite panorama of American business. To me this is a thrilling and exciting picture.

According to reliable estimates, some twelve to fifteen million people in this country own securities directly, not including that large number who have an indirect ownership in securities through insurance and bank accounts. How many of this number own securities listed on your exchange I do not know, but in any event a great many people and a great many institutions require the services of your market. It goes without saying that these investors want to see that market maintained at maximum efficiency and maximum serviceability. There is no room for pessimism concerning the future of this exchange. It occupies a permanent place in our economy. Those who really need this institution—the investors of capital—will not permit it to be destroyed.

Let me say that, while I have emphasized the essential usefulness of your market to investors, I fully appreciate the constructive influence of speculation by informed people who can afford to assume risks. That kind of speculation unquestionably contributes to market stability and thus serves the interests of investors.

Without financial pioneering the development of the vast resources of the Nation would have been immeasurably retarded. One need only to recall the early history of our great industrial empires to realize the important role played by risk money in the economic growth of the country.

Because your exchange is affected with a public interest, because it is vital to the American economy, the problem of the future would seem simply to be this: How can it best serve that public interest which is the reason for its existence?

Looking at this problem from the point of view of one who is uninitiated in stock-market custom and tradition, but who, nevertheless, confesses some familiarity with business in general, I would say that the answer to this problem lies in the operation of the exchange both as a business enterprise and as a public utility.

In assuming my new position as president of your exchange, I shall feel, therefore, that I am becoming a part of a thoroughly businesslike organization. The desirable steps which have been taken recently by the exchange itself to introduce the corporate form of management demonstrate your determination to provide the framework for competent operation of your market place. This forward-looking measure indicates the sincerity with which you accept your public responsibility. As a result of this concept, I believe that you cannot fail to command the universal respect of both the Government and the vast numbers who make use of your facilities.

In this connection I am pleased at the warm reception which you have given tonight to my predecessor, Mr. Martin, who has done honor to me by taking leave from his military duties and coming a long distance to be present on this occasion. It is gratifying to witness this demonstration of your esteem. I feel that I am under a special obligation to Mr. Martin by reason of the many constructive achievements which have marked the 3 years of his administration. I realize that my own path has been made easier because of the work which he has done, and I am happy to join with you in paying tribute to him.

Mr. Martin recognizes, as I do, that our first responsibility is to the public. Although we live in an age of propaganda and monstrous build-ups, the beating of drums through elaborate publicity campaigns cannot win a lasting public confidence. Public confidence is only the reward of public service. Never before in the history of this Nation has there been presented a riper opportunity for public service—a service devoted to the fortification of our economy and to the protection of our democratic system.

The exchange is merely a mart through which securities are bought and sold. Through your listing requirement of full disclosure of comprehensive information, you see to it that the merchandise available on your market bears an honest label. I know that it has been repeated that "the Stock Exchange is not Wall Street, nor is it Wall Street's keeper." It should be recognized, however, that the public does not understand this delineation. Unhappily, the term Wall Street, through a psychological tyranny of words, has come to be a generic term applied to all brokers and dealers in securities wherever they transact their business. The exchange has been more sinned against than sinning in having the derelictions of some individuals for whom it was not responsible unjustly heaped upon its doorstep.

One of the bright spots in your story—and one which has helped to increase public confidence—is your support of sound financial policies in business. This is a subject with which I can claim some familiarity, due to my association with the R. F. C. for the last 8 years. The R. F. C., too, in connection with loans of every variety—loans to banks, to railroads, to drainage and irrigation districts, and to business enterprises—has always insisted upon a regular amortization of funded debt. To me it is quite apparent that only through such sound policy can the interests of the investor be safeguarded. It has been the fundamental purpose of R. F. C. to assist in establishing such financial practices in order to insure the economic stability of the Nation.

To the extent that the exchange continues to assert a position of leadership in this direction, the closer and happier will be its relationship with the Securities and Exchange Commission, which is interested in the same objective. It is illogical to suppose that the S. E. C. is intent upon either the destruction of the exchange or the strangulation of security markets. The S. E. C. appreciates, just as we all do, the vital position which the exchange holds in our economy. The purpose of the S. E. C. is the same today as it was at its inception: To require a full and fair disclosure of the character of securities sold and to prevent inequitable and unfair practices in security markets. To undertake this important task, to effect an external regulation which had never before been attempted, the S. E. C. had to be permitted in the beginning a wide field for experimentation. Obviously any subject possessing such variable factors as the security markets could hardly be regulated by any rigid formula. I earnestly believe that the S. E. C.'s regulations, together with your own, have afforded that strong measure of protection which is essential to the public interest. One day, not far distant, the merit of such accomplishment will have become axiomatic.

In this time of rapidly changing concepts one should not cling tenaciously to the inertia of the past. This is a trying period calling for bold action. For instance, we at R. F. C. during the last year have been acquiring vast quantities of strategic and critical materials, financing the construction of emergency-plant facilities—doing a whole host of other things which it was never dreamed would ever come within the ambit of R. F. C.'s authority. Such jobs have been undertaken simply out of necessity—which is still the mother of invention. The same attitude must prevail in every branch of our economy.

I have never in any sense been a radical. Neither do I consent to the name conservative—especially if a conservative is defined as "one who will not look at the new moon out of respect for that ancient and honorable institution, the old one." Besides, except from a personal point of view, the terms are entirely relative and it is hard to tell where the one ends and the other begins.

I have not donned overnight a Joseph's coat of conservatism. In speeches all over this land, during my tenure as Chairman of the R. F. C., I have said and I now repeat, that I do not subscribe to the theory of government in business except as an emergency measure. Some of you fear competition from government in the investment field. I do not share those apprehensions. There has been too much talk about the Government—and not enough talk about our Government. Today business and government have become a team in the defense effort. From this relationship a finer understanding is sure to result.

Cooperation must be the keynote of the hour in America. It is important to remember that, while the dictatorships are characterized by compulsory tactics, a representative democracy must grow by that upon which it feeds. And that is voluntary mutual effort. The prime object and purpose of this country at the present time is to prove to the world that a free people can work together for defense. Such cooperation cannot be conscripted—it must spring from the faith and hope of those individuals who cherish the freedom of our society.

This spirit of cooperation was certainly appreciated by an old darkey on a worn-out farm down South who was approached by his deacon for a contribution to the church.

"This sho' is a pretty crop you and the Lord raised on your farm this year, Brudder John," said the deacon.

"Yeah," said the good brother.

"The Lord sho' has been gen'rus to you this year," said the deacon.

"Yeah," said the brother.

"Well, don't you think you ought to be grateful to the Lord and give a little donation to the church and the parson?"

"Well," said the good brother, "I donno 'bout dat. You oughta' seen dis place las' year when the Lord had it by hisself."

I believe this thought of cooperation has particular application to the stock exchange. Its problems call for firm and aggressive administration and for an enthusiastic acceptance of that type of leadership. I do not expect that my administrative task will be easy. But neither do I expect that it will be too difficult because I recognize that both of the essentials to a successful administrative program are conspicuously present in your organization. I refer to the integrity of the exchange and to that deep desire, which I know pervades your entire membership, to operate it in a manner to serve best the public interest.

I expect to bend to the oars, but if you should cease to row our craft will only move in a circle. I am no Aladdin with a magic lamp, no Moses promising to lead you out of the wilderness. I offer no panacea for all your ills. But I do say—and I believe with all my heart—there is no problem facing the exchange today which we cannot solve together by intelligent effort and earnest endeavor. Suppose we—I mean all of you—the membership, the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, the management of the exchange, myself included—suppose we make the resolution tonight that we apply the same resourcefulness, the same ingenuity, and the same energy to this business as we see displayed by management of the companies listed on your exchange. Is there any doubt as to what the results would be?

I believe that your Association of Stock Exchange Arms can perform a useful and valuable function by assisting in the rehabilitation of your business. It strikes me that you have in this association the nucleus of a powerful trade body, a trade association devoted to your highest aspirations. Such an association, adequately financed and staffed, should become a vigorous coordinating force. Many examples of cooperative effort have

been set by other industries. As I visualize it, your association, properly organized for such a purpose, could become the strong right arm of the exchange. I do not attempt, of course, to prescribe any particular program, and I am not suggesting that the exchange relinquish any of its responsibilities or functions. I present this to you merely as an idea which I believe to be sound and which I suggest for your serious consideration.

In the days ahead there is opportunity for everyone to contribute patriotic service, service which in many cases will be of equal consequence with that rendered in the military offices of the General Staff. Within this category are those activities protecting national credit, those activities preserving civil rights, those activities promoting economic stability, and those activities insuring free enterprise.

The defense of such principles constitutes as great an evidence of patriotism as any citizen of this Nation can reveal.

It is service of this character to which I dedicate my future efforts as president of our exchange.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD is a great blow to our country. Senator SHEPPARD worked himself to death in the interest of the people he loved, had the honor to serve for a long period of time, and in the interest of our national preparedness program, which placed a very heavy burden upon him in view of the fact that he was the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. Senator SHEPPARD was really casualty number one in the present national emergency, and the disabilities which caused his death were incurred in line of duty. He is, therefore, just as much a hero as if he had been a soldier in uniform and had been killed upon the field of battle in the defense of his country and his country's cause.

It was my privilege to know Senator SHEPPARD all my life. I have lived in the same city, Texarkana, Tex., with him for 16 years and have been rather closely associated with him in Congress longer than 12 years.

Senator SHEPPARD was a man of strong character, strong convictions, and possessed the courage, persistence, and the ability that are so vital in the accomplishment of the many good things advocated. Very few men in public life have demonstrated the courage and strength of character that Senator SHEPPARD demonstrated upon many occasions when his personal views conflicted with his party's platform and his party leaders. His course, in such situations, was always commendable and invariably resulted in his enemies and opponents having a higher regard for and greater confidence in him.

No one ever questioned his veracity or his honesty. In addition, he was trustworthy, dependable, loyal, able, faithful, courageous, and efficient. He was genuine in every way. No State or congressional district ever had a more loyal and faithful Representative. The good, true, Christian life he lived is an inspiration to every person who knew him. He was always a public-spirited citizen in the locality where he resided, and in the Nation no greater American has ever lived.

At the time of his passing he was the Dean of Congress. If he had lived and had been reelected in 1942, and doubtless he would have been reelected without opposition if he had lived, by the time he served out the term commencing January 3, 1943, he would have broken the all-American record for length of service in Congress. He first came to Congress in 1902, as a Representative of the First Congressional District of Texas, the district that I now have the honor to represent. In 1913 he was elected to the Senate.

The only five Members of Congress who have exceeded his record of service were: Representative Cannon, Republican, of Illinois, once Speaker of the House, who served 46 years, but nonconsecutively; Morrill, of Vermont, who served 43 years and 7 months consecutively in the House and Senate; Frye, of Maine, 40 years and 4 months consecutively in both Houses; Gillette, of Massachusetts, 38 years consecutively in both Houses; Swanson, of Virginia, 38 years nonconsecutive service in both Houses. Swanson was a Democrat, the others Republicans.

At the end of another term of service Senator SHEPPARD would have served consecutively 46 years and 2 months.

No Member of Congress, House or Senate, has ever been held in higher esteem, more loved or highly respected by his colleagues than Senator SHEPPARD. By reason of his passing the people and the country have suffered a great loss.

Business and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. BARNES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

ADDRESS OF EMIL SCHRAM, CHAIRMAN, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Emil Schram, Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, before the National Retail Credit Association, New York, N. Y., Monday, June 16, 1941:

I have been asked to speak to your association this afternoon on the subject of business and government. Certainly no topic is of greater importance during this critical time of national defense. For today we find that the whole of our Nation's business has taken on a governmental aspect, and the whole of our Government has taken on a business aspect—all in a concerted effort to carry through to successful completion our huge national-defense program. Business and government have truly joined hands in an all-out effort which supersedes all other interests.

To all of us the strengthening of our defense on the massive scale necessary to modern warfare is a new experience. Although convinced of its necessity, although seeing clearly the implications of war, many of us, nevertheless, are inclined to be overawed by the proportions of our preparedness program. Methods of national defense, like methods of international aggression, have undergone tremendous change. The successful defense of a nation now depends upon its productive capacity, and only that nation which is economically strong can endure.

It has been said that "we live in deeds, not years." If so, certainly this country has lived within the past year more life than in the normal span of 10. Nineteen hundred and forty was a year of awakening. We began that year with Europe in what was termed a "phoney war"—a war we thought would never come within striking distance. We began that year with a beautiful dream that a peaceful nation could stay at peace. At year's end that dream was shattered. America has now witnessed nation after nation torn from the paths of peace and now it is alive to the fact that wide reaches of the earth are ruled by men who observe only a "grab" law. The ingenuity of the machine age has resulted in a new peak in brutality. Today we know that America cannot be allowed to make a false step by standing still—that with the ramparts we must watch, a new vigilance is necessary—a vigilance combined with service. Every American has a vital part to play. Our modern minutemen must keep farms, factories, stores, industries. Thus only will the outcome of any future conflict be predetermined. We are faced with a new conception of industrial mobilization—the mobilization of finance, of labor, of business. And all planning must now take account of defense needs.

Because of the vital importance of credit in our defense economy, the members of your association should be most concerned with these economic changes which have already taken place and with the changes yet to come. Credit has been the object of your investigation and study for a great many years. By Latin derivation, of course, the term "credit" denotes faith or confidence. In this modern time of international aggression and conflicting ideologies, it should be recognized that this credit—this faith or confidence—is the mortar which binds the structure of business, society, and government.

It has been my good fortune to be connected for more than 8 years with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and during more recent years to serve as its chairman. The activities of the R. F. C., like those of your own association, have always been associated with credit. In the beginning, the R. F. C. was concerned with the rehabilitation of the entire credit structure of the country. Unless the pressure of current events has erased the recollection from your minds, you will recall that it was a complete break-down of our credit structure which brought the R. F. C. into being. You are, I believe, familiar with the record: October 1929—Black Friday—America facing the horrible reality of economic collapse—finally

that grim day in January of 1932. The Congress acted boldly and authorized the establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to meet the economic crisis.

The problems of the thirties—closed bank doors, depressed agricultural prices, migratory labor, ceaseless unemployment—Congress called upon Reconstruction Finance Corporation to help meet them one by one. Its authority became manifold—it embraced loans to agriculture, banks, insurance companies, public bodies, drainage, levee and irrigation districts, railroads, business enterprises, and a myriad of similar activities—the familiar story of "billions out and billions back." The flow of credit was turned on and off, first in one field and then in another, as the needs of the country shifted.

This participation by the Corporation in such varied phases of our economy was not at first contemplated. Rather, it stemmed from a recurring recognition by Congress of the Corporation's ability to assist in solving constantly changing economic problems. Thus it has been said that Reconstruction Finance Corporation serves as an economic catalyst—an agent that produces desired economic changes without itself being changed.

Shakespeare has said that "one man in his time plays many parts." So also has it been with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Just now it finds itself absorbed in the biggest job in its history—the job of financing a large share of the defense program. History with its well-known flair for repetition will record with some satisfaction that Reconstruction Finance Corporation began in 1940 to perform the role of the old War Finance Corporation, which the lawyers by prophetic coincidence had used as its prototype.

As always, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is operating in the twilight zone of banking. The private institutions of this country can and will finance the major part of the defense program. They occupy a key position in the broad plan and at no time in history has their sound condition been of greater importance. It is their function to make loans to business to keep it operating at maximum capacity and efficiency. There are certain activities, however, which, although an essential part of the defense program, cannot with any degree of propriety and practicality be handled by private banks. Hence, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, filling its customary role as an emergency financing institution, has stepped into the breach and has begun the task of providing funds for such special purposes. Because these recent activities of our Corporation are of vital importance to the Nation at large I should like to tell you something of their general character.

Within 3 days from the date of the President's approval of the enabling legislation of last June, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had created two new defense agencies, the Rubber Reserve Co. and the Metals Reserve Co. The purpose of the first is to acquire and carry a reserve stock of crude rubber. The Metals Reserve Co. was formed in order to acquire vital defense minerals and metals and to provide for their safe and practical storage without the disruption of normal marketing conditions. The company is acquiring as rapidly as possible reserve stocks of tin, antimony, chrome, copper, graphite, manganese, zinc, tungsten, and other metals. In order to complete this task, it is necessary for the company to vary its purchasing practice in accordance with the customs of the trade. Defense Supplies Corporation was likewise created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to acquire and carry reserve supplies of certain strategic and critical materials such as nitrate of soda, diamond dies for use in the wiredrawing industry, and wool.

The urgent need for the expansion of our productive capacity requires a ready reservoir of credit for plant facilities. To meet this demand, Reconstruction Finance Corporation last August created the Defense Plant Corporation. Aside from the War and Navy Departments, which use direct appropriations, this Corporation is the only agency of the Government providing for the financing and construction of production facilities.

In setting up this Corporation a lease arrangement was evolved which has proved to be a most flexible and expeditious method. Quite simply, it provides for the construction of the emergency plant facilities by the contractor, with Defense Plant Corporation assuming the cost, taking title in its own name, and leasing the facilities to the contractor for a fixed period, subject to a provision for renewal and an option to purchase. In the case of manufacturers and suppliers having contracts directly with the Government, the rental is generally nominal, and Defense Plant Corporation receives an agreement for reimbursement by the War or Navy Department. In the case of subcontractors, an actual rental is required to be paid by the lessee based upon a percentage of its sales.

Defense Plant Corporation has already approved total commitments for the financing of emergency plant facilities—including the acquisition of land, buildings, and necessary machinery—aggregating over $600,000,000, and it has agreed to a general aviation program involving about a billion dollars of additional funds.

One of the Coporation's first undertakings was the construction of a plant in Hamilton County, Ohio, in conjunction with the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, comprising approximately 37 acres. It was my privilege to speak on the occasion of their ground-breaking ceremonies last October, and I stated at that time that such activity was a positive symbol of the real ability of business and Government in this great democracy to collaborate efficiently in the interest of the common good. Last week again it was my privilege to attend the dedication ceremonies for the same plant and when I witnessed the first airplane engine coming off that huge assembly line in what is now the largest factory in the world under one roof—all completed within the short space of 7 months—my conviction about business and government was given new strength and vigor.

Emergency plant facilities are of three distinct kinds. First, there are those facilities requisite to the national-defense program which are being built by the Government itself. As explained by Mr. Knudsen, plants having no commercial value after completion of the defense program must be financed by the Government itself and title to such properties must vest in the Government itself, even though the actual operation of the plant may be delegated to private industry under a management-fee contract. This category of facilities embraces munitions plants, loading plants, and heavy shell forging and arms plants of which there is little present private capacity and of which there is certain to be surplus capacity after the emergency is over. The Government will have absolute control of such plants and can elect to retain them for future emergency use.

Second, at the other extreme, there are those facilities which will be made available by private industry as a result of normal expansion in the ordinary course of business, without cost and without risk of any kind to the Government. In general, these facilities consist of manufacturing plants which have a real economic value entirely apart from the defense program.

Third, and midway, are the cases in which the emergency plant facilities, whether built with the aid of public or private capital, will be paid for directly or indirectly by the Government. In general, these facilities consist of plants carrying on operations that will be expanded far beyond any probable normal use—plants filling defense orders which fall somewhere between outright munitions (such as powder for which the Government will build its own plants) and purchases of regular commercial items (such as blankets where needed extra capacity will be added by private contractors).

With respect to facilities of this third classification, it has been felt that the cost of construction should be segregated from the cost of the supplies and that the reimbursement or payment of the cost of the construction should be made directly rather than being covered into the unit price. It is to satisfy the demand for this type of Government financing that R. F. C. has, as I have explained, inaugurated its lease plan through the Defense Plant Corporation. The Government cannot expect private business to assume the entire cost of such facilities. For the present, at least, the Government should own this increased plant capacity. When the emergency has ended the manufacturer will have the option to acquire these plants to avoid undesirable competition. I feel very strongly that this option to purchase is a necessary right of the manufacturer, since the time will come when the disposition of these plants will be at issue. I do not believe that the Government itself should ever operate these manufacturing units in peacetime.

I have attempted in these remarks to give you an interim account of the stewardship which you have entrusted to those of us who are associated with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In this great national-defense program it is important not only that the activities of the Government be known to all of the people but that they be thoroughly understood as well, for only through such intimate understanding will the country be able to achieve that national unity which is so essential to the success of the preparedness drive. We do not intend that what the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does shall be shrouded in secrecy but, rather, that it shall be exposed to the light of public inspection to the end that all the citizens of this country shall know what their Government is doing for the common defense and the common welfare.

While the Nation is committed to this all-out program of defense and is preparing to make whatever sacrifices such program may require, it is not content to make unnecessary sacrifices. The democracy we are struggling to preserve should be strengthened in the defense process, not weakened. Two important considerations should be of direct concern to your association. The first is price stability. We all know that we cannot achieve our goal of democratic defense with anything less than full efficiency in the use of our economic resources. But full economic efficiency requires price stability. Like a sword of Damocles hanging over our national head is the memory of the skyrocketing prices and high cost of living which spiraled upward as a result of the last war. We cannot allow that disaster to recur in our economy. Someone has said that inflation is like a balky horse: You lash it and lash it and it won't move; then suddenly it bolts and you cannot stop it. Inflation, of course, is exceedingly unpredictable. The United States has at the present time, however, not only the determination to combat it but the machinery as well. Not only is the Government policing prices but business itself, having learned its lesson, is doing some policing, too.

Just as important is the second consideration which is of immediate concern to your association—the protection of the national credit. The people of this country have been educated to a high standard of living—the highest in the history of the world. It is, of course, only proper that every person in the country should be permitted to profit by our technological progress. But it should be remembered that people will not abandon easily that which they have been permitted to enjoy. Hence, there arises the issue of expanded consumer credit. We all know that it is no

longer necessary for a man to have the cash in his pocket when he goes out to make a purchase. Consumer credit is now an accepted medium of business. Therefore it is essential that this credit of the individual be safeguarded and protected if we are to preserve the American standard of living.

We have all heard the note of warning. The industrial index is soaring upward, pay checks are growing, and it is anticipated that the national income this year will approach the $85,000,000,000 mark. Knowing that defense production cannot last forever, it requires little imagination to see the economic chaos which lies ahead if we allow this double demand upon our productive capacity to go uncontrolled. We are now reconciled to the fact that this country will eventually be faced with a tremendous national debt due to the terrible urgency of defense expenditures. We need not, however, be reconciled to consumption debt—it can and should be prevented. The considered opinion of your financial leaders is that we cannot in times like the present mortgage our future through uncontrolled installment purchases.

I know that it will require great courage on the part of retail dealers not to extend to their customers terms more liberal than those granted during the depression years. The working people who have been denied a just share in life's advantages during recent years will quite naturally want to acquire some of the fruits of their increasing incomes. They will be dominated by the belief that the days of economic adversity are over, and they will be eager to capitalize their future earnings. Without some brake upon this tendency, the tragedies of 1921 may easily be reenacted. Many persons believe that the "silk shirt" era of the last war will not be repeated—that the public has learned its lesson and will not be so foolish again. Time alone will tell. But the only safe course is to apply that proverbial stitch in time and persuade the people that the high wages of the present may not be of lasting duration and that never has the old philosophy of saving for a rainy day been so pertinent as right now.

The Government's defense-bonds program is a step in this direction. The worker who has a reserve fund in the form of Government bonds has a prop which he may lean on in the future. When the post-war period of readjustment comes he can use his defense savings to meet the needs of his family, and his spending at that time will be of general economic benefit to the country.

What is necessary all along the line, therefore, is self-control. Higher taxes, defense savings, price-stabilization orders—all of these will furnish a measure of protection against the dangers of inflation. But without the voluntary assistance and cooperation of you businessmen who occupy such a strategic position in our national economy no real success is possible. In all of our considerations we must take into account the national good. We can no longer be a nation of small ambitions and of petty selfishness. We must unite in a single ambition to perpetuate our democratic way of living and of the liberties of our priceless heritage.

Do not think that I believe for one moment that this country cannot meet and overcome any force or any combination of forces that may threaten our institutions. Come what may, this Nation will survive. We have the men, the money, the resources, and the courage to withstand any assault and to triumph over any foe. But to do the job, to make ourselves so strong that no one will dare question the determination to preserve our Nation's democracy, we must stand shoulder to shoulder, each ready to do his part. We must submerge those things that do not contribute to the national defense.

Let us admit that in the beginning our defense machine creaked a little from idleness and disuse. Let us admit that in the beginning our machine had difficulty in keeping on the main highway and showed too much of a tendency to turn off on side roads—some employers, for example, continued a rear-guard battle against inevitable economic and social changes; some labor leaders refused to distinguish between just payment for honest toil and tribute exacted in a grave emergency; and some industrialists were too greedy for war profits. But now our defense machine is well oiled. It is moving ahead at an accelerated pace day by day.

Amidst the welter of confusing economic concepts there are many factors which furnish a source of confidence—things which do not receive much comment but which, nevertheless, are weather vanes of successful cooperation. Business management, for example, is working longer and harder hours today with no strikes, no sit-downs, not even weekends to furnish respite from its new double responsibility. Labor, too, is giving a good account of itself despite some newspaper headlines to the contrary. It should be remembered that while a few striking thousands are receiving wide publicity for their obstructive tactics, the working millions are quietly on the job. What is more, the subversive elements motivating the conduct of some misguided labor leaders are now being put into firm check. Finally—and this is the keynote of my remarks to you this afternoon—both business and Government are cooperating efficiently and effectively as never before in the history of our country. The Government is receiving invaluable assistance not only from the mills and the factories participating in the defense program but also from those individual businessmen who are devoting their time and efforts to defense work throughout the land. Many men of skill and experience, executives both big and small, are working harder for the Government now at a dollar a year than they ever have for their own companies at high salaries.

I am sure that as a consequence of this common effort there is today a growing respect, a better understanding, between business and Government. Whatever is good for this country now is vital to this country after the conflict is over. What we all want is a stronger, happier Nation to pass on to our posterity—a Nation which is plentiful and sound—free of sickness, ignorance, and poverty, and abounding in those civil liberties which are so precious to our American tradition. These defense measures of today are therefore merely steps in the forward march to the attainment of that assured future for our country—a country which has grown to leadership amongst the nations of the world, with a leader's privileges and responsibilities—a country whose future is the salvation of the world.

Federal Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1941

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, it will be my purpose to inform the people of my congressional district of facts in connection with their Government and the Twenty-fifth Congressional District of Illinois.

POPULATION

On June 23 the Bureau of the Census issued a release showing the total urban and rural population by counties. This release disclosed that there were 7,897,241 people in Illinois. Of these, 2,087,591 are listed as rural and 5,809,608 listed as urban. The Twenty-fifth Congressional District breaks down as follows:

County	Total	Urban	Rural
Alexander	25,496	14,407	11,089
Franklin	53,137	26,594	26,543
Jackson	37,920	17,526	20,394
Perry	23,438	10,661	12,777
Pulaski	15,875	None	15,875
Randolph	33,008	8,774	24,834
Union	21,528	4,092	17,436
Williamson	51,424	26,914	24,510

OIL CONSUMPTION

The Bureau of Mines forecast the daily average supply of domestic crude oil needed to meet the market demand in July will be 3,847,100 barrels—17,100 barrels more than the estimated June demand. The Bureau said effects of adjustments required in transportation and consumption caused by withdrawal of 50 tankers from trade routes running from the Gulf to the east coast are "still too indefinite to be accurately measured." It said present information "indicates at least temporary curtailment of the Gulf coast markets" and an increase in the relative production of refinery districts to the north and east.

NURSES WANTED

The Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service issued a joint statement that the shortage of nurses "beginning to be felt in our towns and cities" threatens "the safety of our civilian population." The statement, signed by Maj. Gen. James C. Magee, Surgeon General, United States Army; Rear Admiral Ross T. McIntire, Surgeon General, United States Navy; and Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, said:

> Although current requirements are being met, it is essential to prepare immediately for potentially greater demands for nurses. The situation can be met only by a large increase in the number of women entering the Nation's accredited nursing schools.

The statement reported "an important initial step toward the preparation of more qualified nurses is about to be made" using the facilities of Bryn Mawr College and the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, with the support of the American Red Cross.

MEDICAL SUPPLY DEPOT

The War Department announced the Surgeon General's Office has selected St. Louis, Mo., as the location for the main Army medical supply depot; and the Army has purchased the Mart Building in St. Louis at a price of $2,300,000 for it. The largest supply depot was previously in the Bush Terminal Building, Brooklyn, N. Y., the Department said.

WHEAT CROP IN UNITED STATES

The Department of Agriculture reported prospective winter wheat output in the nine principal producing States decreased from an estimated 488,770,000 bushels on June 1 to 476,310,000 bushels on June 16. The Crop Reporting Board's first midmonth estimate of wheat production indicated that crop prospects declined in most Western and Midwestern States, the Department said.

WORLD WHEAT STOCKS

The Department of Agriculture said world wheat stocks would reach a record

high on July 1 in spite of reduced crops in Australia, Europe, and north Africa. With a world crop expected to be about the same as last year, supplies for the entire 1941–42 period will be of record size, the Department said. The carry-over of old wheat will be equivalent to 60 percent of a year's domestic needs, and with the new crop prospects world stocks will be increased an estimated 200,000,000 bushels, amounting to almost a full year's domestic supply, the Department reported.

MAIL TO SOLDIERS

The War Department announced that mail to Army personnel should carry the grade and full name of the person addressed, and that the Army serial number, if known, should follow the name. The letter or number designation of the company of which the soldier is a member, the identification of the regiment or separate battalion, and the Army post-office number and its location should be included in the address, the Department said. Letters and packages now delayed due to improper addressing may be further retarded as the men leave their permanent stations to participate in the summer war games, the Department said.

MATERIAL SHORTAGE

Some airplane factories and machine shops have restricted hiring schedules because of shortages of materials, Social Security Board reported, while the severity of shortages of competent machine-shop, aircraft, shipbuilding, and general metal workers has continued. The demand for construction workers has improved in almost every region, the Board said, following a general decline in February while building activity was shifting from military to industrial and residential building. An ample supply of construction workers is available, the announcement said.

HOW WELL ARE WE PREPARED?

The United States News both asks and answers this question in their June 27 issue. When they asked:

Is United States ready if Hitler shoots again? Answer is: In part.

As for the Navy: It is ready. Both the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets are geared to instant action. Both are at a high level of training and experience. Navy's air force is strong and increasingly well equipped.

As for the Army: It isn't ready. It is just taking form and is lacking in equipment and in experience. But nobody sees any early use for a land army; everyone looks on the new Army as an investment in the longer-range future.

As for the Army Air Corps: It isn't ready, owing to equipment shortage: But the Air Corps now is beginning to come along fast; is to be ready in near future.

As for industry: It is gearing itself slowly to war production; is starting to break peace-time habits; is beginning to grind out military equipment. Aircraft industry is doing an impressive job. But over-all, American industry will not be turning out war equipment in volume before October.

GEN. JOHN A. LOGAN

House Joint Resolution 200 provides for the purchase by the Congress of a bust of the late Senator from Illinois, Gen. John A. Logan. If passed, the bust will be placed in the Capitol along with that of Lincoln and Grant.

Statement Before Committee on Reciprocity Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 27 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN THOMAS OF IDAHO

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made before the Committee on Reciprocity Information, protesting the lowering of the tariff on farm products and minerals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The matter which I want to discuss today is the question of resumption of trade-agreement negotiations with Argentina.

It is to be recalled that in the late summer of 1939 our State Department announced that it would undertake the negotiation of a trade agreement with the Government of Argentina. The list of commodities posted for possible duty concessions at that time was substantially the same as is proposed in the pending negotiations. It included, among other items, casein, fats and oils, beef and veal, cheese, hides and skins. Hearings were held before this committee and vigorous opposition was recorded by many organized farmer-producer groups to the reduction of duties on these admitted competitive agricultural products. Then quite abruptly the negotiations were called off. The fact that so much opposition was registered to the proposed agreement coupled with the fact that the authority of the President and Secretary of State under the Trade Agreements Act was to expire by limitations the following June 1940 contributed, without doubt to the decisions to terminate negotiations. The word "terminate" I use advisedly. It is the identical term employed in a joint statement issued by the Argentine Government and our own at the time, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

"In the reciprocal trade negotiations between the Governments of the United States and Argentina, notwithstanding the efforts of both parties, it has not been found possible to reach a satisfactory basis to permit the conclusion of an agreement, and the two Governments have agreed to terminate them."

It is unnecessary for me to go into details about the debate in the Senate over the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreement program, but in March 1940 I pointed out the undeniable fact that if the authority to make trade agreements is extended another 3 years a most serious blow will be dealt to agriculture. I had in mind this very resumption of negotiations with Argentina and other South American countries, notwithstanding the announced termination of such negotiations in January 1940, 2 months previous.

Now as then, the State Department demonstrates its willingness to reduce tariffs on a large number of commodities for which the American farmer already needs a larger market. This is how the President, the State Department, and for that matter, the Congress, barters away the previous protection accorded by law to that important one-fourth of our population, the American farmer and his family.

Inasmuch as negotiations have been reopened with Argentina, what I had to say in March 1940 additionally regarding our trade relations with this South American country forcibly illustrates this triparty breaking of faith with American agriculture. It illustrates, too, the logrolling tactics of the administrative branch of the Government to assure the perpetuation of the trade-agreement program. I quote again from my remarks to the Senate body:

"At present negotiations with Argentina have been stopped; but I do not believe there is a particle of doubt in anyone's mind as to why they were stopped. It was not because the State Department suddenly discovered that we have a corn surplus or that the cattle industry is already being injured by imports of canned beef. It does not take lengthy hearings to develop these facts.

"Moreover, the agreements that have been made previously, over the strongest protests farmers and producers were capable of making, indicate that perhaps the Department is not particularly concerned by the extent to which American markets are injured by trade agreements. The negotiations were called off because the State Department is asking the Congress this year to renew its authority to write tariff laws. Officials of the State Department have condemned Congress for logrolling. Apparently their desire is to roll their own logs; and they are now doing it on a grander scale than Congress ever attempted.

"More important than the reason for calling off negotiations on the treaty with Argentina, as far as the people I represent are concerned, is the fact that there is no assurance that the negotiations will not be reopened after the law has been reenacted. When Secretary Hull was asked in the course of the House hearings, 'Is it your idea that conditions may so change that negotiations may be resumed a little later?' he replied, 'This general statement said that these negotiations were terminated.'

"The statement referred to is a joint statement by the Governments of the United States and Argentina, released by the State Department. It is not at all reassuring when we compare it with the statement of the President of Argentina, who is reported by an Associated Press dispatch to have said that he feels that President Roosevelt would favor a resumption of the negotiations in the near future, and he is quoted as saying, 'For my part, I fully desire it.'

"In the light of what tariff reductions have already cost the people of the West, I feel safe in saying that our people do not share the attitude of the President of Argentina. The Argentine proposal was a threat to their prosperity, which only the expiration of the Trade Agreements Act can remove."

We are now removed more than a year from the time I made these remarks. The Congress did extend the Trade Agreements Act. The administration has resumed negotiations with Argentina. It did not take the vision of a prophet to see what was in the offing with this bit of logrolling on the part of the State Department.

What are the changed conditions which cause negotiations to be resumed? 'True, there is a war. There was a war in January, March, and June 1940. Hemispheric solidarity was the sugar-coated tablet then; it is today, more so since the European conflagration reaches nearer our shores. But what are the facts? Should hemispheric solidarity be achieved at the practically sole expense of the American farmer? That is what the proposed agreements with Argentina and Uruguay accomplish in purpose. When one goes down the list of products on which possible concessions will be made we find that nearly all are products of the farm.

Facts relating to production figures, available supplies, etc., undoubtedly will be pre-

sented by interested producers or their representatives. I will not take the time of the committee to present them in advance, but do wish to present an over-all concise picture of what the farmer is up against in this program which militates against his very existence.

I would like to comment briefly on just a few items upon which you are preparing to consider concessions. For example, in the line of dairy products you propose to make concessions on casein and Italian type cheese. Both of these products are produced in this country, and any reduction in the tariff rate will be reflected immediately in lower returns to farmers producing the raw materials for these products. Last year our dairymen produced about 50,000,000 pounds of casein, which, at current prices, is worth well over $5,000,000 to the farmer. This casein is produced in more than 300 factories located in 22 of our States. The existing tariff wall on casein is not excessive, because last year we imported about 25,000,000 pounds over the tariff wall. Domestic producers of casein are already giving one-third of our domestic market to foreign countries, notably Argentina, and any reduction in the tariff rate will result in their giving all of it away.

On cheese the story is much the same. Last year we produced 26,000,000 pounds of Italian type cheese as compared with our normal imports of around 20,000,000 pounds of this kind of cheese. In 1938, 1 year before the war, we imported 57 percent of our domestic consumption of Italian type cheese. Even in the war year of 1940 we imported over one-third of our needs. This does not indicate that our present tariff is too high. Argentina is currently shipping us 1,500,000 pounds of cheese per month, which, on an annual basis, is more than six times as much cheese as Argentina exported to all countries 4 years ago. The milk which goes into the production of our own Italian type cheese is worth around $4,000,000 annually to our farmers. A reduction in the tariff rate will make it virtually impossible to maintain our domestic production of this type of cheese.

In the contemplated agreements duty concessions are proposed on cattle hides, despite the fact that hides are the most important byproduct of our important cattle industry. In 1940 Argentina exported to us over the existing tariff about $10,000,000 worth of cattle hides. Our tariff on hides of only 10 percent ad valorem is, if anything, too low already in light of the heavy importations. Since 1933 our imports of cattle hides have increased about 60 percent.

It is proposed to lower the duty on various meat products, notwithstanding the fact that our own meat industry is the very backbone of our agricultural system. In 1940 we imported about $5,000,000 worth of meat products from Argentina, and I understand it is proposed that we grant concessions on a substantial proportion of these imports. On the other side of the picture it is of interest to note that our exports of meat products to Argentina are virtually nonexistent.

It is further proposed that concessions be granted on certain types and kind of wool, despite the fact that our imports of wool have been increasing, and that we are large producers of this commodity. In 1940, the American farmer received $110,000,000 for the sale of wool. Despite our tariff wall, Argentina is already sending us large quantities of wool. Our imports of competitive wools have been increasing year by year and at an alarming rate. In 1940 our imports of wools of the type produced in this country were higher than in any of the past 16 years of record, and were twice as great as last year.

This alarming increase may be attributed in part, at least, to concessions made in other trade agreements. As I have publicly pointed out, the proposed concessions on wool come at a time when the tariff rates on shoddy and wool rags which supplant virgin wool in the American market has been sharply reduced in the British trade agreement with a resultant tremendous increase in importations.

I have been advised that several briefs have been filed stressing the importance of an adequate tariff for tungsten, and, from the information I have, any material reduction on tungsten would work a very serious hardship upon the producers.

Recently new discoveries have been made in several of the western States including Utah and Idaho, where real prospective mines are being developed, and the production of tungsten could be materially increased if the industry is let alone. However, if it is confronted with a material reduction in the tariff, it would simply mean that these mines could not be developed which would slow down production and prevent the Nation from becoming self-sufficient in this important strategic metal.

I will not encumber the record further with the statement of the situation as it has been carefully covered by others.

In concluding my remarks, may I say that this whole program of trade agreements, past and prospective, forces the American farmer and workingman to compete with people of other lands who work for small wages and live under conditions which we in America cannot tolerate. In the light of our past commerce with Argentina and Uruguay it is inevitable that the American farmer will bear the brunt of any trade agreements we make with these countries. The record is clear. Practically everything we import from these countries are competitive agricultural products, while on the other hand practically everything we ship to them are industrial products. Under these circumstances, I would like to know how we can negotiate the proposed agreements with these countries without forcing the farmer to shoulder the entire burden. It is, of course, highly desirable for us to promote hemispheric solidarity. Such a program is legitimately in the interest of our own national defense. But, I raise the question: Is it the American way to ask one segment of our population, namely, farmers, to pay the bill for this good-will program which is intended to benefit the Nation as a whole?

Russian Entrance into European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 27 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MANCHESTER (N. H.) UNION LEADER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester, N. H., Union Leader entitled "Still Intolerable," pertaining to the entrance of Soviet Russia into the war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader]

STILL INTOLERABLE

In giving its pledge of all possible aid to Soviet Russia in its defense against Nazi Germany, the United States Government has taken pains to emphasize that such a step does not alter in any way its opposition to communism.

In his statement on the issue Acting Secretary of State Welles used the following words:

"To the people of the United States, this and other principles and doctrines of communistic dictatorship are as intolerable and alien to their own beliefs as are the principles and doctrines of Nazi dictatorship. Neither kind of imposed overlordship can have, or will have, any support or any sway in the mode of life or in the system of government of the American people."

This statement should be kept clearly in mind by every American. The crude materialism of Communist thinking, its negation of religion, and the insincerity, the cruelty, and the international meddling of Stalin's dictatorship become no less obnoxious because Soviet Russia has suddenly joined the defense against Hitlerism.

But, as Acting Secretary Welles has said, we must be realistic. The immediate issue before the American people is whether Hitler's plan for universal conquest, for the cruel and brutal enslavement of all peoples, shall be halted and defeated. If our aid to Soviet Russia, now fighting against Hitler, will help to accomplish his eventual defeat, then that aid is well placed for that purpose, and that alone.

One needs only contemplate a few other possibilities to see that the entrance of Soviet Russia in the war against Hitler is a great gain. Suppose, for instance, that instead of being forced into the war against Hitler, Soviet Russia had joined the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis. This would have weighted the scales in Hitler's favor so greatly as to multiply many times the difficulty of his defeat. Or suppose that Soviet Russia had remained on the sidelines, until Hitler was defeated. What would the problem have been then? Many people have contemplated this possibility which would have required that after Hitlerism was crushed, the menace of Russian communism would have had to be disposed of.

But neither of these possibilities occurred. Instead Hitler chose to make an enemy of Soviet Russia and throw her into the camp of his opponents. This means one of two things: Either Soviet Russia will eventually be defeated and Hitler's power enhanced by control of Russia's vast resources, or Soviet Russia, through outside support, will be able to stay in the war and aid in the destruction of Hitlerism.

The latter alternative certainly is most desirable from the American standpoint, and upon that basis American aid is proffered, although the Soviet ideology is highly obnoxious. In rendering such aid the United States Government should require that the Soviet Government cease meddling in other nations' affairs and give some evidence of a willingness to cooperate in achieving the ends of freedom.

Russian-British Alliance Provides New Reason for America to Stay Out of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected comradeship which has made

communistic Russia an active, shooting ally of Britain in the war is causing a great many former interventionists in America to reexamine their thinking and to bring them to realize the folly of trying to control the destiny of Europe, Asia, and Africa from a distance of three to seven thousand miles. More and more it is becoming clear to true Americans that the best way to protect our way of life in our sphere of influence is to mind our own business, mend our own defenses, and manage our own affairs so well that the seeds of discontent from which foreign "isms" are developed will be destroyed here at home.

Illustrative of the return to sanity which is being registered in America even in sections formerly so badly confused and frightened that they had lost a true sense of perspective is seen by the following quotations from recent editorial comment.

EVEN NEW YORK TIMES OPPOSES SLOGAN OF "HELP RUSSIA"

Mr. Speaker, let me first cite you the first two paragraphs of the lead editorial in the New York Times on the subject of aid to Russia which President Roosevelt and Sumner Welles so hastily tried to propose as an acceptable national policy for America.

[From the New York Times of June 26, 1941]

AMERICA, BRITAIN, AND RUSSIA

It will make for greater clarity in the thinking of the American people and for greater speed in the action of their Government if from the very start of this new discussion of our policy toward the German-Russian war, we drop the false and misleading slogan of "Help Russia" and concentrate our attention on the real aim: "Stop Hitler!"

Certainly, the only people in this country who want to "help Russia," in the sense of helping Stalin, are the handful of our domestic Communists, who time and again have shown their hatred of every American principle, their unfailing intellectual dishonesty in the face of Stalin's twists and turns, and their willingness to sabotage our own defense program in any way they can.

In this morning's Washington Post—an early advocate of all-out intervention—Mark Sullivan strikes out savagely against the President's proposal to give all-out aid to the communistic armies and calls upon the President, the Congress, and the country to reject such an un-American proposal.

Let me submit one more exhibit from a wide variety of examples which can be found in the eastern press denouncing any proposal to give aid to Russia which might in turn be used against America's European friend—honest, faithful, courageous little Finland. I quote from an editorial in the Washington Times-Herald of June 25.

The prospect of a Hitler victory over Russia is dreary enough. But how much brighter for us is the possibility of a Stalin victory? * * * The thing for the United States to do, we believe, is to go no deeper into this war than at present, to steer clear of entangling alliances with the Soviet and with everybody else, to keep its powder dry, and collect a lot more of it, by expanding its Navy as rapidly as it can and building a large army of plentifully equipped and highly trained mechanic-sergeants at top speed. * * * If we stick our fingers into this war we're likely to get a hand chewed off, no matter who wins.

SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) ARGUS LEADER REFLECTS MIDWESTERN VIEWPOINT AGAINST ENTRANCE INTO WAR

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the leading newspaper of South Dakota, which is frequently read by many of you in the congressional cloak rooms, pretty well typifies midwestern sentiment as expressed editorially throughout the country. Now—more than ever—it is important that this country stay out of the foreign war.

[From Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader]

AN EPOCHAL SWITCH IN THE TIDE OF WAR

Germany's declaration of war against Russia is not just another incident. It is a major event—in truth, an epochal development in the course of the conflict.

The world was stunned in last August 1939 when Berlin and Moscow announced the signing of a friendly treaty. It was a circumstance that was as ominous as it was surprising. It meant that Germany was to enter this war on a basis radically different from that which existed at the beginning of the World War. Then Russia was her enemy and her difficulties in the war were accentuated by her position.

So it was with considerable satisfaction that Hitler drew attention to the Russian treaty at the opening of this war. Germany this time, he said, would not be required to fight a war on two fronts.

But that is now history. Germany is again fighting on two fronts—a huge, sprawling enemy at the rear and a vigilant, alert, and efficient one in the front.

The rupture between Germany and Russia was a natural consequence of an abnormal alliance. In Mein Kampf Hitler attacked no one with more bitter feeling than he did Russia. He expressed contempt not only for the Russian form of government but for her people. He derided the Russian leaders and flayed their characters. The Russians shared his hatred.

The alliance, therefore, was formed in an atmosphere of mistrust. Both Stalin and Hitler felt perhaps that each was serving his own interests to advantage. But Stalin did not appreciate then the great strength of the German military machine. He did not realize that he was more likely to become a victim than a coconqueror.

Russia, it appears, has some things which Hitler must have. When Russia refused to assume a puppet role like Italy, Hitler was compelled to act. He needs the food of the Ukraine, for example. He wants to be in a position where he need not worry about a molestation in the rear.

It is true that Russia is not strong in a military sense. If Hitler had no other problems on his hands, he might find it quite simple to subjugate her. But he is fighting England and he has the constant job of keeping the already conquered nations under his heel. In consequence, he cannot devote his full attention to Russia.

And Russia, because she is so large, cannot be overwhelmed in a blitzkreig as Norway or Holland was. Hitler may capture a few miles of Russia, but a generally successful campaign involves extended operations over a long front.

Americans are naturally deeply interested in this late development in the holocaust in Europe. It will have a bearing on our attitude toward the war.

Steps will be taken, no doubt, to list Russia among the nations entitled to receive aid under the lend-lease bill. This measure was intended supposedly to assist the democracies but that was more or less camouflage. Its primary purpose was to assist in the defeat of Hitler.

This incident should serve to emphasize the war more in its exact basis. Despite what many persons say, it is not an ideological war.

It is fundamentally a power war, with many queer alinements in prospect. We now have little Finland, bloody but unbowed, fighting with Germany against Russia.

Just a short while ago Germany assisted Russia in conquering her. But Finland is not to be criticized. She has been tossed about by circumstances wholly beyond her control. Insofar as she is concerned, Russia was the major aggressor. In now fighting Russia, nevertheless, she is using resources obtained in past through American assistance.

The position of Finland deserves more than passing attention. It is something to consider in the extension of aid to Russia. Before we go too far in shipping our supplies to other countries we should make sure that our home defenses are adequate. Russia is now against Germany, to be sure, but she might be with her again.

The whole incident also emphasizes the extreme desirability of the maintenance of a nonbelligerent role on the part of the United States. Let us watch our step. Let us consider America first.

The world is shaking on its foundations today. The present catastrophe may engulf all of civilization. If we can keep out of it, we can maintain here a citadel and a cathedral of progressive humanity.

If we become involved, all of this may be lost, and the world will descend into a dark age whose end the present generation is not likely to see.

But if we remain solid, we can serve as a central nation around which the world can be rebuilt and order can be restored.

The necessity for our involvement—since Sunday's development—is less and the outlook is much brighter.

The Seaway and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS DAILY GLOBE-DEMOCRAT OF JUNE 19, 1941

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Daily Globe-Democrat, June 19, 1941:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 19, 1941]

THE SEAWAY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Under the guise of the present national emergency the administration has launched a new offensive to push through Congress the $285,000,000 St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Secretary of War Stimson, who as Secretary of State in 1932 signed a waterways treaty with Canada which the Senate rejected in 1934, and Assistant Secretary of State Berle were the first witnesses for the project when the House Rivers and Harbors Committee opened its hearings on the proposed agreement this week. Both insisted it is a national-defense undertaking.

Cross-examined by members of the committee, both men countered with the grim prediction that this war will be an exceedingly long one. Berle even drew a comparison with the Napoleonic wars.

A decisive reason for rejecting the seaway and power project is that it stands in the

way of our immediate defense efforts. Money and engineering skill which are urgently needed for our defense program should not be diverted for a power and waterway scheme which cannot possibly be completed in less than 4 years and probably would take 7 years. While the administration witnesses stressed the necessity for power for defense projects, Mr. Stimson admitted that the O. P. M. has estimated the peak of arms construction will be passed in 1942—long before the seaway could be completed.

As expert economists have pointed out, if additional transportation and power facilities are needed, there are other and cheaper ways of obtaining them.

Even if Mr. Stimson's pessimistic prophecies are borne out, the facts do not support the seaway as a practical defense measure. It was considered carefully by the Senate 7 years ago, and there is nothing in the present emergency to reverse the Senate's rejection of the treaty.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill to be the most equitable flood-control legislation that has been presented to the House since the great flood of 1927. The bill is not perfect, it is not all that some of us had worked for, but it is much better than previous flood-control bills. We believe it should be unanimously passed by the House.

On April 21, 1927, a portion of the district of which I have the honor to represent, suffered the most tremendous and devastating flood recorded in history. The flood of that year in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River took a toll of something like 200 lives, rendered approximately 700,000 people homeless for approximately 1 month, and inflicted property damage estimated to be upward of $200,000,000. Since 1927, we have been wanting flood control within the levee walls of the Mississippi River, but nothing has been done by Congress during all of these years to accomplish this desire on the part of our splendid citizens. It is commonly known that flood control in this section of the Mississippi River is the greatest problem of its kind in all the world. General Tyler, before our Flood Control Committee hearings this year, testified in part as follows:

It is well known that flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River is the greatest problem of its kind in all the world. For over 50 years, or perhaps 100 years, progress on that plan has been continuous until the protection now afforded is good—better than anybody 25 years ago thought it would be.

After the devastating flood of 1927 the only request our citizens made of the United States was that our National Government give us a fair assurance that the calamity of 1927 would not again occur.

On May 15, 1928, the Congress of the United States recognized and accepted national responsibility for flood control on the main stem or channel of the Mississippi River throughout its alluvial valley, and adopted the Jadwin plan, as set forth in House Document No. 90, Seventieth Congress. The Jadwin plan, among other things, provided for diversions from the main channel of destructive floodwaters in excess of the carrying capacity of the then existing levees, the most important of which diversion was the Boeuf floodway in the critical middle section of the river lying immediately south of the mouth of the Arkansas River and flowing through southeastern Arkansas into Louisiana designated to carry approximately 100,000,000 cubic foot-seconds of water, 6 times the volume of water flowing normally over the Niagara Falls.

The property owners of that area upon the passage of the act assumed that it was necessary for the floodway to be constructed in order to give the maximum levee benefits possible to the greatest area affected by the floods, and while they did not desire to sell their property and very greatly hoped for adequate flood control, they felt that under the guaranty contained in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States that "private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation," they were entitled to equal levee protection or just compensation for their property. They were willing for the authorities to determine which should be done: (1) Levee protection; (2) compensation for property, caused by the floodway. I think it can be said that the property owners accepted the decision at that time of Congress, that the sacrifice of their property in the Boeuf floodway was necessary in order to protect the remainder of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, and, of course, assumed that they would receive fair and reasonable compensation for their property.

To this end a test suit to collect reasonable compensation for their property was prosecuted through the Supreme Court of the United States under the style of Mrs. Julia Caroline Sponenbarger against United States, and the Court's decision was to the effect that they were not entitled to compensation. Hence, if they are not entitled to compensation, they now take the position that they are entitled to equal levee protection with their neighbors to the north, south, and east of the Mississippi River, such levee protection now being possible according to the testimony and reports of our Army engineers.

In the report of the Army engineers, contained in Document No. 90, several suggestions for the control of the floodwaters of the Mississippi River were made. They have been very efficient in their work and have secured the maximum benefits from several of the methods suggested in House Document No. 90, to reduce the flood hazards of the Mississippi River. Some of the methods are as follows:

First. Dredging the river annually.
Second. Side channels.
Third. Set-back levees.
Fourth. Straightening river channel.
Fifth. Clearing between levees.
Sixth. Forestry work, and,
Seventh. A multiplicity of other minor suggestions.

On page 18 of the Commission's report, further to illustrate how successful the efforts of our Army engineers have been in the operation of several methods of flood control, as above mentioned, we find that the Mississippi River has been shortened between the mouth of the White River and the lower end of the Glasscock cut-off approximately 137 miles. This was done by straightening the river channel. It is well established that the Army engineers have very greatly increased the flood-carrying capacity of the Mississippi River through the other methods mentioned above, and, as a consequence, have very greatly reduced the height of crest flow lines of all floods confined between front line levees.

General Tyler further testified before our Flood Control Committee, as follows:

In 1928, when the existing project was laid down to include a west-side overland floodway in the middle section, the capacity of the main river leveed channel was estimated at about 1,950,000 cubic feet per second, and the capacity of the floodway at about 1,250,000 cubic feet per second. The capacity of the main river leveed channel at Arkansas City is now about 2,600,000 cubic feet per second. Had these conditions existed in 1928 serious consideration quite probably would have been given to confining the project flood between the main levees, for to do so would not have involved such substantial increases in levee heights as were then estimated.

The report of the Mississippi River Commission contained among other things the following statement:

Had the flood conditions of today existed in 1928, consideration also would quite probably have been given then to a west-side floodway of less capacity than the one recommended and adopted.

These accomplishments were recognized in 1936 when Document No. 1, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, was filed with the Congress covering the flood control of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River. This report was dated February 12, 1935, and the abandonment of the Boeuf floodway was recommended by the Chief of Engineers and a modified floodway provided, referred to then as the Eudora floodway. The Eudora floodway was a miniature floodway of the original Boeuf floodway. At that time, owing to the improvements which had been made by the Army engineers regarding the control of floodwaters of the lower mississippi River, it was considered advisable to have a small modified floodway, and that the modified floodway, in view of these improvements, would be ample in every respect to control any flood which could even be visioned in the future by the Army engineers.

Our engineers have continued their very fine work on flood control in this and other sections of the Mississippi River, and now on page 30 of the Report of the Mississippi River Commission, before our committee, we find the following language:

Under existing conditions of the main river channel there are three physically feasible alternatives to the adopted plan which will afford protection equal to that contemplated by the existing project when it was

adopted, and a fourth which will give protection equal to that afforded by levee and flood-wall projects on other rivers.

According to this, there are now five feasible plans presented to the Congress, and which the Flood Control Committee considered. The engineers outlined those plans and said that either at this time would give adequate flood control, but that the plan to be selected is one of policy for the Congress of the United States, and not one involving a question of engineering. The Report of the Mississippi River Commission sets out in full the five plans presented to the Flood Control Committee.

Prior to the presentation of the report of the Mississippi River Commission, as a member of the Flood Control Committee, I introduced H. R. 3064 in the House of Representatives, and Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, introduced S. 705 in the Senate. My bill was and is as follows:

A bill to amend the project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby amended so as to provide that the project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River existing at the present time in accordance with the provisions of said act, is hereby modified and as thus modified is hereby adopted, as follows:

Pending the completion of the ultimate plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is authorized to make revisions in the grades and sections of the main line Mississippi levees on both the east and west banks and to adjust and equalize the unequal freeboards which now exist, or may hereafter develop. Between the latitude of the Arkansas River and a point at, or south of, Deer Park, La., revision, adjustment, and equalization shall be made so as to obtain net grades of existing front-line levees generally of such height above the computed crest flow line of the project flood as the Chief of Engineers may deem advisable as affording reasonably safe protection against such project flood.

The Boeuf floodway, in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway, as well as the back protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project, adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned.

The levee on the south side of the Arkansas River shall be enlarged in grade and section so as to afford, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, reasonably safe protection against the project flood of the Mississippi River.

From time to time additional protection against floods shall be given simultaneously to, and equitably distributed between, the Yazoo River backwater area and the Red River backwater area under such plans as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers.

The total authorizations heretofore for the flood-control project of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River shall not be increased by reason of any provision in this act, but any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made or authorized for said project may be expended upon any feature of the said project, notwithstanding any restrictions, limitations, or requirements of existing law.

The bill carries out plan No. 4 of the Mississippi River Commission.

Before the Flood Control Committee this year I exerted every possible effort to secure the approval of the Overton-Norrell bills. Each of these bills, as above stated, provide for the abolition of the floodways, construction of the levees on the Arkansas side to the 1940 grade and section, equal in height and strength to the levees on the opposite side of the river, giving fair and equal protection to both sides of the river.

The Mississippi River Commission reported that this could be done. General Tyler and his corps of assistants testified before the Flood Control Committee that such plan could be done. Engineers and a number of lay witnesses gave the same testimony. Testimony also before the Flood Control Committee was that under the law now Mississippi levees are from 3 to 6 feet higher than the levees on the Arkansas side in various places, and that under the law they have the flood protection of the floodways and fuseplug area on the Arkansas side, and that the citizens of Mississippi very vigorously oppose the abolition of these existing differences between the east and west sides of the river.

After much testimony and extensive arguments the Flood Control Committee finally recommended the adoption of Plan No. 4, which was the provision of the Overton-Norrell bills, with one modification, to wit: That the levees in the Yazoo Basin on the east bank of the Mississippi River, south of Coahoma-Bolivar County line in said plan, shall have a 2-foot freeboard over the west side of the river in this area.

The Flood Control Committee rewrote my bill, and I quote in part from the bill now under consideration, H. R. 4911, which is the omnibus bill of 1941, from line 6 of page 10 to line 6 on page 11, having to do with this section of the Mississippi River, as follows:

The project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended by the acts of August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby modified and, as modified, is hereby authorized and adopted, and the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) The existing engineering plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River is hereby modified so as to provide for the construction of plan 4 as set forth in the report of the Mississippi River Commission, dated March 7, 1941, to the Chief of Engineers, except that the levees in the Yazoo Basin on the east bank of the Mississippi River south of the Coahoma-Bolivar County line in said plan shall have a 3-foot freeboard over the project flood, and all levees shall be constructed with adequate section and foundation to conform to increased levee heights. The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway, as well as the northward extension and the back-protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned, and the provisions of said acts relating to the prosecution of work on said floodways and extensions are hereby repealed.

The actions of the Flood Control Committee in reporting this change in the law with reference to the Mississippi River is adequately supported by our Army engineers. I quote their testimony in part as follows:

Whatever may be the ultimate plan for the middle section, it is apparent that advantage should be taken of the opportunity to attain increased protection at small cost by bringing up to some common and higher grade the lesser levee freeboards that now intervene between reaches of maximum stage lowering. Not to do so is to fail to obtain the maximum possible return on a portion of the present investment, for the maximum possible return on a portion of the present investment for the maximum freeboard is the controlling freeboard and makes the contiguous higher freeboard of little avail.

Complete confinement of the project flood to the leveed channel of the main river throughout the middle section appears now to be physically practicable.

The Euroda and Boeuf floodways, insofar as they represent definite projects and locations, could be abandoned.

General Tyler has testified that No. 4 would give greater flood-protection benefit to a wider territory than any of the other suggested plans. General Tyler and the other engineers, however, take the position that since they have advised Congress with reference to the engineering and financial feasibility of these several plans, and that either is now physically possible from an engineering standpoint, the plan actually to be inaugurated is a question for Congress to determine, as it is purely a matter of policy, and not an engineering question.

For approximately 14 years the citizens of the Boeuf and Eudora floodways have been subjected to the constant and continuous menace of the floodways, fuseplug area, and differentials in existing levees from 3 to 6 feet in the floodway area. They have lived for approximately 14 years under the shadow of the fuseplug levee that might at any unexpected time be used by the Government in diverting the destructive waters of the Mississippi River and consequently again, and in a most terrifying form, flood their lands as was done in 1927 when approximately 200 people lost their lives, 700,000 others were made homeless for approximately a month, and something like $200,000,000 worth of property was destroyed. If the floodway is not necessary they do not wish to live under the shadow of the act of Congress providing for the floodway. Their property has been constantly damaged by virtue of the provision of our statutes, insurance rates have been increased, loans cannot be secured, and normal development cannot be expected by that section of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi until the floodway is abolished, and they are given equal levee protection.

The adoption of the Overton-Norrell bill, even as amended herein by the committee, and placing in operation plan No. 4, as modified, will have the effect of restoring an empire on the west side of the river in Arkansas, and Louisiana, to its rightful position. It will remove the constant fear that has been upon them for 14 years, and the hazards and uncertainty under which they have lived, give the west side security, increase values, and permit a healthy, normal development.

They are desirous that these mandatory provisions be enacted by the Congress to divert the presently existing fuzeplug levee in southeast Arkansas into a standard levee of 1940 grade and section, giving to all the property owners in the presently existing Boeuf and/or Eudora floodways adequate protection.

I have also been intensely interested in adequate levees on the south bank of the Arkansas River from Little Rock to Pine Bluff, Ark., for the protection of one of our best agricultural areas and for the protection of other important enterprises.

Fortunately, we have succeeded in obtaining a favorable report and recommendations from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army. After the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors had completed a thorough study of the matter over a period of several years, I and others who have been earnestly interested in flood control in this area were pleased to have this highly important recommendation.

Need for these levees is emphasized by the lengthy history of disastrous floods in the locality from Little Rock to Pine Bluff. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors found that "during the 66½-year period of record, flood stage has been equaled or exceeded 46 times in Little Rock." These floods occurred in an area where the property value has been set by Army engineers at $2,375,310 and the farm income is estimated to be $1,180,079 annually when not interfered with or damaged by floods. The vast extent of damages is not known. Estimates, however, that have been made reveal the desperate need for action by this Congress. Other than the destruction of crops, there has been with each flood tremendous damages to fences, farmhouses, barns, and other outbuildings, farm implements and tools, drainage ditches, loss of livestock, damage to existing levees. These represent direct losses. Indirect losses include interruption of business and gainful occupation during and after a flood, interruption of traffic, evacuation and reoccupation of the flooded areas, the pollutior of wells used for drinking water, the increased number of breeding places for mosquitoes, and the creation of other conditions adverse to human health and happiness. All of these conditions reveal the need for corrective legislation.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has made this recommendation:

Raising, strengthening, and extending of these levees to give complete protection against floods—at a cost fully warranted by the amount of direct damages prevented, the indirect damage that will be eliminated, the appreciation in the value of lands that can profitably be put to productive use, and the general though intangible benefits to a large number of people through the threat of frequent disruption of normal activity. The Board recommends that the levees along the south bank of Arkansas River between Little Rock and Pine Bluff, Ark., be raised, strengthened, and extended generally in accordance with the plan contained in the report of the district engineer, at an estimated first cost of $641,000.

The Flood Control Committee has presented the recommendations of the Army engineers providing this levee for the Arkansas River in the pending bill to the House for consideration, and I sincerely hope that this feature of the bill is retained.

I appreciate the actions of our distinguished chairman in agreeing to plan No. 4 submitted by our Army engineers and modified by the committee as above stated. I appreciate the actions of the committee in voting the additional flood-control protection for Arkansas. I very greatly appreciate the fine cooperation I have had from General Tyler, Major Reber, and other engineers from the War Department. They have all been very helpful. Of course, I deeply appreciate the efforts of citizens of Arkansas and Louisiana in coming to Washington and testifying with reference to the matter before our Flood Control Committee, and on behalf of them I wish to express my appreciation to the membership of the House for the passage of the bill today, and I sincerely hope that it is passed in the Senate and approved by the President.

If it is finally enacted into law, I am advised by our Army engineers that it will constitute a very enormous saving to the Government and at the same time there will be expended in the building of the levees on the Arkansas and Louisiana side the sum of $31,453,000. The sums of $17.128,000 for work in Arkansas and $14,325,000 in Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, last but not least, I desire to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] who so ably represents Chicot County for his very fine cooperation and outstanding service with reference to perfecting this plan before our Flood Control Committee. He has rendered every possible service.

Utilization of Ex-service Men for Industrial Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McINTYRE

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF WYOMING COUNCIL OF DEFENSE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution recently adopted by the State of Wyoming Council of Defense, of which Col. Goelet Gallatin is the chairman:

Whereas the United States of America is engaged upon a tremendous national-defense program; and

Whereas it recognizes the necessity of utilizing its total manpower to the best advantage of the program and to the best interests of the Nation; and

Whereas it is cognizant of the valued experience along military lines of that group of patriotic citizens referred to as ex-service men; and

Whereas this experience can be utilized for industrial protection, thereby releasing men for the more active pursuits of labor and the Army: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Council of Defense, Civilian Defense, and other allied departmental agencies so recommend and broadcast to industry the desirability and necessity of utilizing ex-service men for all types of industrial protection and activity where mature judgment, valued experience, and a patriotic desire particularly qualifies them.

No Man Who Does Not Have Vision Will Ever Realize Any High Hope or Undertake Any Great Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter addressed to me by Mrs. Muriel Smith, 2234 West One Hundred and Seventh Street, Chicago, Ill.

I want to call the attention of those who may happen to read these remarks and this letter to the importance of the statements as made by her in the last paragraph of her letter.

I am wondering if our people as a whole are carrying, deep down in their hearts and in their minds, the seriousness and importance of our national-defense program at a time when it appears that the war which is now raging in Europe may be extended to every nook and corner of the world.

It is true that in this war we are combating ideologies as well as violence. Just look what we have to contend with in our own country and how much it would mean to us in helping Great Britain and in building promptly and efficiently our own national-defense program if, as stated by Mrs. Smith, our people as a whole were deeply concerned in heart and in mind about the seriousness of this war and the importance of standing up and defending the freedom of our people.

The bill referred to in Mrs. Smith's letter is the type of legislation that would be helpful, not only in training the boys and girls of this country in that outstanding and most important vocation in life, agriculture, but it would tend to instill into their hearts and minds the type of citizenship that would carry with it the importance of living and defending the American way of life.

In that agriculture is the very bulwark of our democracy, and in that no national-defense program can be successful unless it has back of it a well-balanced agriculture, I am hoping that the Members of the House will give careful and favorable consideration to this most important piece of legislation.

The letter follows:

THE BEVERLY HILLS WOMAN'S CLUB,
Chicago, June 19, 1941.

Hon. H. P. FULMER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULMER: May we, the public-welfare department of the Beverly Hills Woman's Club, offer you our sincere congratulations upon the introduction of your bill, H. R. 4530? A quotation from Woodrow Wilson, which we have adopted as our club motto for the coming year, when we shall be earnestly concerned with the national-defense program, seems to fit you admirably. It is as follows:

"No man who does not see vision will ever realize any high hope or undertake any great enterprise."

We hope that your bill will become a law, allocating, as it does, funds for a constructive purpose, which we deem highly indispensible for the preservation of the American way of life, by educating our youth in American principles. 4-H Clubs accomplish this work so effectively and at such a minimum of cost that we urban mothers regret our children cannot also share in these projects; however, what benefits rural children is an indirect benefit to all children.

National defense must be carried on from within, in the hearts and minds of our people, as well as from without, by armed force; we are combating ideologies as well as violence. In the scramble for armaments, the promulgation of an idea must not be lost. Therefore we would add our little bit of encouragement to your efforts for 4-H work. Please have a hearing soon.

Sincerely yours,

MURIEL SMITH.

Whatcha Gonna' Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB E. DAVIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

POEM BY A CONSTITUENT

Mr. DAVIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by a distinguished constituent, a country newspaper editor, author, and humorist, Mr. Mack Sauer, of Leesburg, Highland County, Ohio:

WHATCHA GONNA' BE?

"When you get big,
Whatcha gonna' be?"
I say to my lad
As he climbs my knee.
He says he's gonna' run
A newspaper press,
Or be a band leader
In fancy dress,
Or sell ice cream cones,
Like his playmate's dad.
Ah, the plans are many
Of this little lad.

The Russian lad
On his daddy's knee
Isn't asked:
"Whatcha gonna' be?"
It's not up to him,
It's up to the state,
Which rules his life,
Which decides his fate;
In Germany, too,
Where men aren't free,
What folly to ask
"Whatcha gonna' be?"

Oh, I'm thankful to God
That in America still
My little boy
Can be what he will;
He can choose his faith,
His vocation, his all,
And he knows not
Of a dictator's call.
What a blissful joy
With my lad on my knee
To say: "When you're big,
Whatcha gonna' be?"

—*Mack Sauer, Leesburg, Ohio.*

War Supplies Held Up by Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

ARTICLE BY JAMES L. WRIGHT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James L. Wright, which was published in the Buffalo Evening News of June 14, 1941:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of June 14, 1941]

RUSH ORDERS FOR WAR SUPPLIES HELD UP 4 MONTHS BY RED TAPE—MATERIALS UNITED STATES MANUFACTURERS COULD TURN OUT IN 2 WEEKS ARE DELAYED AT CAPITAL DESKS

(By James L. Wright, Buffalo Evening News Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—"Rush orders" for war supplies by the men actually doing the fighting on the other side of the Atlantic often take 4 months to clear the desks of London and Washington officials when the American manufacturers could turn out the supplies so urgently needed in 2 weeks.

There have been so many generalizations about how governmental red tape is tangling up the delivery of essentials in this state of unlimited emergency that it was decided to trace through a typical "requisition." The sample, which may be called "Contract X," showed:

1. After an officer in the British Near East forces dispatched from Cairo in early March his "rush order" for 250 units of a standard American-made commodity, 70 different signatures, approving the requisition, had to be obtained in London before the order could be cabled to the British missions here.

STILL FURTHER DELAY

2. In Washington, the order had to pass over at least 10 desks, including that of Lease-Lend Administrator Harry L. Hopkins, before it reached the blotter of President Roosevelt, the only person who can authorize lease-lend expenditures.

3. It was presented at the White House late in April, but nothing more was heard from it until early June when word was received that the President had approved the expenditure. That was a verbal report, however, and it took 2 days more for the formal authorization to go back down the line to the buyers' desk.

4. Because every expenditure of more than $500,000 must be cleared though the Office of Production Management, and this one runs into big money, the "clearance" process has been started. Fourteen more signatures must be obtained before the contract can be signed and the bids still are out.

SITUATION IS TRAGIC

The goods called for in the rush order can be turned out here in 2 weeks after the contract is signed, but if they successfully run the gauntlet of Nazi submarines and airplanes after they have been made and loaded they probably will reach the colonel in Egypt, if he is still alive, so that he may use them in his desert fighting about 6 months after he sent in his urgent call.

The way in which London and Washington officialdom becomes entangled in its own red tape and gets everything snarled, while these same officials are crying for speed, more speed, and still more speed, would be uproariously funny if it were not so tragic. The situation was described here this week in this lighthearted but graphic way:

INTERNATIONAL RED TAPE

"Whitehall old red tape is being joined to American young red tape, with Harry Hopkins as the minister and the President as the bottleneck." To that a group of harried British and American purchasing agents, all businessmen working for their government, added this song of their own composition, a sort of safety valve for their pent-up emotions:

Oh, we would be a mighty nation,
If we could get that allocation.

Undoubtedly, situations such as that surrounding contract X are what Defense Purchasing Agent Donald M. Nelson had in mind when he told reporters here this week that there is too great a lapse between the point "where the need is felt and the time when action is taken."

But, in answer to demands for allocation of some of the work the President personally attempts to handle, he himself has contended that he really has less paper work to do now than he had in normal times.

DENIES HE IS SWAMPED

He also says that he is able to turn his attention more largely to war preparations now that he is not snowed under with multitudinous duties.

Nevertheless, it took an exasperated Army purchasing agent more than half an hour just to trace the zig-zag course of contract X through its labyrinthian maze, from the time a British colonel put in his rush order early in March until two British businessmen walked into his office with it on April 17, and he delivered the approved requisition to the White House late in April for Mr. Roosevelt's signature. A 6-week delay followed.

Asked how many separate pieces of paper were and will be required for the transaction, the Army buyer shrugged his soulders and replied: "You'd have to figure it out in hundreds of papers; I just wouldn't know."

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Russia may need God before the end of this hot July.

Our $50,000,000,000 war baby is now in the same phew with Stalin.

One thing sure, we won't hear anything more in the chats about fighting for the democracies.

If MARTIN DIES fails of the senatorship there is a chance of sending him as Ambassador to U. S. S. R.

Mr. Churchill urges us to aid Russia. Thank you, Winston. This meets with both our inclination and convenience.

Two tragedies in Philly a year ago this week: Gen. Smedley Butler was buried—and an interventionist unwittingly was born.

How are we going to "die on our feet or live on our knees" when we have been down on another part of our anatomy for over 8 years?

The tradition of George Washington isolation suffered again when the President encouraged our boys to enlist in Canada for the European dog fight.

Earl Browder may now supersede Henry Stimson as Secretary of War. This would be a great stroke for national unity and would settle the labor problem at the same time.

Josephus Daniels said in a speech to the electors at the Mayflower during inaugural that Franklin Roosevelt in '17 was more anxious to go to war than President Wilson, Newton Baker, or himself.

Why the reason for all these degrees to the G. O. P. standard bearer—because he had joined the brain trust, or for the confession that his campaign promises were just political oratory?

A thought for the 4th of July—the new Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress gave and took with Lord Halifax on Wednesday evening, and the general opinion later was that they had loved England more on Tuesday.

Importance of Air Power to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE BIRMINGHAM AERO CLUB, BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Birmingham Aero Club, of Birmingham, Ala., sponsors of the national air carnival, requesting the Congress to take immediate steps to, create a separate unified air force.

Whereas during the recent course of world events the war crises in other parts of the world have definitely proven the importance of air power to national defense; and

Whereas at a meeting attended by numerous aviation leaders during the Eleventh Annual National Air Carnival held in Birmingham, Ala., June 7 and 8, 1941, a resolution was unanimously adopted calling for the immediate establishment of a separate unified air force in the interest of national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of governors of the Birmingham Aero Club, sponsors of the national air carnival, That, in our opinion, a separate unified air force in our country is absolutely necessary to the defense of the democracies of the world, and particularly to the Western Hemisphere; and be it further

Resolved, That we urgently request the President of the United States and the Congress to take immediate steps to create a separate unified air force; and be it still further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies to the Congress, to the Governor of each State, and to the press.

Adopted June 9, 1941.

KATHRYN OLIVER,
Chairman of the Board.
R. L. SIMS,
President, Birmingham Aero Club.

Attest:
RALPH C. MCCLUNG, *Secretary.*

St. Lawrence Seaway a Swinging Gate for Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

LETTER FROM PAUL M. SMITH, EDITOR OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS JOURNAL

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, at the hearing of the St. Lawrence project before the Rivers and Harbors Committee the other day, the Lieutenant Governor of the State of New York was very emphatic that organized labor wants the St. Lawrence seaway constructed. I have had a great deal of correspondence with labor groups concerning this subject, and am convinced that labor organizations all over the country are awake to the deleterious effects this seaway would have upon the present commercial, industrial, and transportation facilities of the country. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Paul M. Smith, editor of the Locomotive Engineers Journal, which expresses the feeling of that group on the subject:

Baited with glittering misconceptions, the farmers of the great agricultural areas of North Ameria are being led to believe that the St. Lawrence waterway and power scheme will help them get more money for their products. They are told that such a project would make the area a mighty "gateway to world trade."

Skillful investigators of the scheme have neglected to mention that this so-called gate to world trade, which is so generously offered this grea area—at the expense of the already overburdened taxpayers—is a swinging gate. One that will swing back and smack the face (and security) of the very same farmer and businessman, small and large, who would have to struggle to pay this enormous tax bill. The great farm areas should become alert to the fact that America's agricultural markets are jeopardized by this scheme, which is being proven unsound economically and politically.

A quick survey of world trade conditions reveals the "back swing" that could be expected from the St. Lawrence scheme. Most of America's trade, except for war and defense transactions with Great Britain, is with South America and probably will remain so balanced for years to come. Our good-neighbor policy will see to that.

In return for our goods Latin America offers principally agricultural products, cattle, and hides. Through lower living standards and peon labor their cost of production is much cheaper than in the United States and Canada. Thus the St. Lawrence scheme would enable them to dump these products into the very center of America's own agricultural area and would do much to demoralize the markets.

Not so long ago, you may recall, a number of small, ocean-going boats from South America came through the circuitous St. Lawrence route and unloaded their cargoes of grain in the Midwest. This raised havoc with grain markets in the area.

With the good-neighbor policy enforced, politicians would find it most discomforting and embarrassing to endeavor to raise protective tariffs to guard our agricultural markets in the Midwest. Thus, through the St. Lawrence scheme America's great army of farmers would toil in their fields to raise the taxes for a project that would severely cripple their own market.

Increased opposition to the St. Lawrence project is becoming more evident throughout Canada and the United States, as people become more familiar with its economic and political effects. As a defense measure it cannot be completed in time to be of any use in the present conflict, and when completed it could be used only about 7 months of each year, because it would be icebound and unnavigable 5 months of the year. As a power project, steam plants have been conceded to be far more desirable, because they can be erected where the power is needed more quickly and at less cost.

A channel 27 feet deep is specified in the project, which eliminates the possibility of building warships of capital size—battleships or cruisers—in the Great Lakes shipyards, as many of the project's proponents would have us believe. Lake shipbuilding facilities are already congested with their share of the construction of boats which can go through the existing water route.

As we consider the St. Lawrence scheme in the solid light of day, we must not neglect the fact that it will do much to harm the farmers of Canada and the United States. Neither can we forget that the scheme will serve to drain millions of dollars from overburdened taxpayers in every part of the country now (and for many years to come) when every effort and dollar is urgently needed for advancement of a vital rearmament program.

PAUL M. SMITH,
Editor, Locomotive Engineers Journal.

The Late Senator Ben Williamson, Sr., of Ashland, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE B. BATES
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, Senator Ben Williamson, Sr., of Ashland, Ky., died in a Cincinnati hospital Monday night. Senator Williamson was recognized, even by those who disagreed with him, as an important influence not only in the business world, but in the political, social, and spiritual thought of eastern Kentucky. It will, perhaps, be many years before the real contribution of his long and useful life of public service can be adequately appraised. He was always looking ahead discussing events of the day and attitudes of the day not in terms of any hypothetical, existing

situation, but with a profound conviction that nothing is fixed and all things must be judged in their relation to changing times. We have lost a great American and a great Kentuckian, whose passing will be felt by thousands of citizens to whom he has been a friend and benefactor.

What Is the Catholic Stand on War for America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

ARTICLE BY T. FRANCIS BENNETT

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by T. Francis Bennett, which was published in the Tablet, a Catholic weekly, under date of June 7, 1941:

[From the Tablet of June 7, 1941]

WHAT IS THE CATHOLIC STAND ON WAR FOR AMERICA?

(By T. Francis Bennett)

"If after the war into which we are now being led, as happened after the World War, certain hostile writers and speakers allege loosely that the church abdicated her post as a moral guide when war was impending, it will be a satisfaction to be able to say that the accusation is unjustified."—The Catholic World, New York City.

(The following editorial opinion of the Catholic Press of the United States was expressed during the past month. Due to limitations of space only a few Catholic papers can be quoted.)

WHY PEACE?

"The major portion of the Catholic Press has been consistently opposed to our involvement in the European conflict. It shouted opposition to the first moves to amend our original position of neutrality, pointing out what has since come to pass, that each amendment would edge us closer to the conflict.

"Its editorial policy was not planned in any pact among the various units throughout the country. It was based spontaneously on the principles of sheer patriotism, that America's defense and security come first, and on the conviction that neither a moral responsibility nor intelligent self-interest could find a place for our country in a conflict not of its making and out of its power to control the aims, methods of operation or the basis of peace that would follow the outcome of the war."—The Evangelist, Albany, N. Y.

"Our Land is America. We want her, who offered to Catholics in days gone by an almost unexampled refuge for the free development of the faith, to survive and prosper in this perilous world."—The Catholic Transcript, Hartford, Conn.

THIS IS NOT OUR WAR!

"Let us do away with the hypocrisy of the propaganda which is trying to draw the American Nation into the war on the thesis that one of the sides is fighting for the preservation of Christianity. The present war is not a holy war. It is an old-fashioned foreign war for colonies, for trade, for raw materials, for mastery of the sea, and mastery of the air. American citizens, who are Christians and who are devoted to Christianity, will not be misled by labels and slogans and trade-marks. The present World War was distinctly 'not made for Christianity.' The United States should determine to stay out of it. (The Catholic Tribune, St. Joseph, Mo.)

"What is needed is not dabbling in international politics, but adherence to the principles enunciated by the Holy Father. So long as this Nation remains at peace, "like a strong man armed," we will be the one power that can help to negotiate a peace founded upon justice and charity." (The Catholic Standard and Times, Philadelphia, Pa.)

"Nor is there any reason why the people of our own United States should have any illusions about democracy, or possible democracy, over there. Nothing will be gained by shedding of American blood in a foolish effort to clean up the situation. The age-old hatreds and petty despotisms will continue because there is no present indication that they will be eradicated. It is the business of America to attend to her own interests, to purify her own soul, and to see to it that she is not involved in, or contaminated by, the many evils which have brought Europe to the brink of ruin." (The Superior California Register, Sacramento, Calif.)

WHY MUST WE ENTER THE WAR?

"Certain groups in America and many people in England think it is our duty to enter this war. Why? The only answers ever given to this 'why?' are fantastic. First, if we don't get Hitler, Hitler will get us—like the big, bad wolf. Just imagine 130,000,000 people protected on either side by thousands of miles of sea, afraid of invasion. The threat is not offered seriously. It must not be taken seriously. The other answer to the 'why?' is to save Christianity and civilization. That sounds almost blasphemous" (Ave Maria, Notre Dame, Ind.).

"We should know that immediate invasion is only a remote possibility, that Herr Hitler cannot hope to successfully garrison all of Europe, let alone take on, in the havoc of the present, the strongest industrial power in the world. No doubt the economic possibilities are alarming, the future definitely disturbing. Declaring war, however, is not a solution at the moment. The sensible course is to follow a calm, resolute program of national defense, in the meanwhile supplying all aid to the victims of aggressor nations. We hope that this conduct will not unleash the dogs of war on our peace-loving land" (The New World, Chicago, Ill.).

"As has been said many times by many observers, no country in its right mind goes to war—unless perhaps in those very rare cases in which, without any provocation or previous controversy, it is actually invaded by a foreign foe and must needs protect itself" (The Inland Catholic, Spokane, Wash.).

"The Nation is united in resolute opposition to the spirit and methods of totalitarianism and its atheistic basis. There is a wide difference of opinion, however, on the best means of combating it. It is our considered and firm conviction that we should build up our defenses to such a point that no nation or combination of nations will dare molest us, utilizing them only in the event they are needed for self-defense. We thoroughly disagree, therefore, with those who advocate immediate military action against the totalitarian powers" (The Catholic News, New York City).

WHO WANTS AMERICA IN THE WAR

"It may well be that there is a strong case for our entry into the war for American reasons. If so, we would prefer to have the case stated by responsible Americans than by foreigners, no matter where they were born. The war propaganda by foreigners in this country is dividing Americans and preventing American unity, such a unity as we shall need if we do go to war. The most offensive and ill-mannered, of course, are the French and British hybrids. They presume that most Americans feel more sympathy for them than for the brave Finns, the betrayed Bohemians, the cat's-paw Poles, and the deserted Belgians" (The Monitor, San Francisco).

"Watching the drift of the tide, noting the trend of oratory and newspaper and magazine comment, one is compelled to ask—is our country really ours, or do Americans hold their land as a kind of fief, with the title of real possession held overseas? It may appear to be a ridiculous question to ask. It would have been ridiculous as short a time ago as 6 months. But not now. One could almost gather the impression these days that Americans who believe Europe should settle its own problems are guilty of supreme selfishness. Subtly it is conveyed that to think first of America is in some odd way 'unpatriotic'" (The Pilot, Boston).

IS THIS OUR WAR

"The American people have no personal interest in this war. Whether we are to be duped as we were in 1917 depends entirely upon ourselves. If our emotions are permitted to rule our reason, we shall surely be embroiled, sooner or later. And every effort will be made to arouse these emotions. Even now they are being worked on and we should expect them, catch phrases, studied insults, falsehoods, and appeals to our vanity. All of this will be for the sole purpose of our giving our lives and our money for the same thing we did 22 years ago. In the light of that experience, would it be worth it? There is a need, and indeed a grave need, for a protracted period of sanity on the part of the American people" (The Indiana Catholic and Record, Indianapolis, Ind.).

"This European power politics is not our war. We had no part, as a people, in its declaration and we must have no part, as a people, in its waging. But this war against Christianity in our educational, social, and political life, right here in America, is our war. As a Christian people we must enlist here in America to fight here in America for the duration of this war against Christianity here in America. There must be no participation of America in this war. There must, there will, please God, be a united America for the honest defense of our homeland and not for the defense of the pelf of imperialism. There must, there can, and there will be peace if the people of our country, and people everywhere turn back to God, and give ear to the constant, never-changing plea for peace of Christ's vice regent on earth, Pope Pius XII."—The Catholic Week, Birmingham, Ala.

WHAT IS THIS WAR ABOUT?

"War brings a curse upon all nations that resort to it without a just cause. Those who remember the years preceding the first World War know that since then we have been living in an age of frustration. Even the balance of human thought, as a result, received an upset from which it has not recovered. * * * And now here we are fighting again over the same old issues. And the present state of the world is a hundred times worse than the first. The fight to get is opposed by the fight to keep. Quite a simple and sordid fact underlying all the bunk of propaganda."—The Tidings, Los Angeles, Calif.

"Uncounted numbers of wars have spattered Europe—in fact, the whole world—with blood. At the close of each war, the survivors meekly buried their dead and paid the costs. * * * The present century is stained the reddest of all centuries. One asks: How long

will it be until man returns to his senses and to God? God-led, man is the creative force of the world. Estranged from God, man is the destructive force of the world."—The Advance Register, Wichita, Kans.

MUST THE PEOPLE YIELD?

"If the majority, or even a fair number, of the 80 or 90 percent of American citizens who are positively opposed to the involvement of this Nation in war would speak out now, they would preserve this Nation's peace and strength and future. Why should one fear to speak out for America when America so sorely needs our voice? If our Nation be pushed into this war, then and after the war ends there will truly be things to fear" (The Catholic Northwest Progress, Seattle, Wash.).

"All polls of public opinion show that we desire to stay out of war. The man on the street tells you this. The mothers whose young sons are in selective-service training camps tell you this with choked voices. What the future holds in store for us we do not know. But to have one of the very small number of men who can tip the scales away from national peace to war make the gross misstatement that Senator PEPPER has, is an insult to our common intelligence. He should be told by letter and telegram just how wrong he is" (The Catholic Chronicle, Toledo, Ohio).

"This is no time to stop in persistent efforts for the achievement of peace for these United States and for the world. * * *

"The 'what's the use' attitude furnished by a resignation when the going is tough will not suffice now for the seekers of a peace of justice and charity" (The Catholic Courier, Rochester, N. Y.).

"Within the last few weeks, the movement against armed intervention by the United States in the European war appears to have gained strength. The American people still hope to see the downfall of Hitlerism, and they have not changed from their original wish to give Great Britain whatever aid may be possible, without compromising our own national welfare or safety. * * * As far as can be ascertained, the determination of the American people to keep out of war is stronger than at any time since the outbreak of hostilities in Europe" (America, New York City).

THE MEMORY OF THE OTHER DEAD

"There will be a special poignancy in the observance of Memorial Day this year in view of the terrible scenes of death and carnage which are being enacted in Europe. The memory of the first dead is still living and vibrant in the hearts of their surviving relatives. And now they are forced to witness again a similar holocaust. Americans will breathe a prayer that such scenes will come to a speedy termination and that American blood will not again be spilled on foreign battlefields."—The Providence Visitor, Providence, R. I.).

"Let every son who loves his mother and every mother who loves her son send a wire to Washington registering a plea for peace. The people of America do not want war. They are willing to work to protect their own country. They do not want to go out and become involved in other nations' century-old quarrels. Only by besieging the President and Congress with repetitions of their desire for peace can they make the force of their opinions felt."—The Daily Tribune, Dubuque, Iowa.

"Since May of 1940, war with its grief and devastation has been creeping closer to American homes. Last year many a Catholic family was enough personally interested in what seemed foreign affairs to respond to the Pontiff's appeal for special prayers. This year we don't see how any Catholic family can dare fail to unite in prayers for peace."—The Catholic Herald Citizen, Milwaukee, Wis.

WHAT HOPE FOR PEACE?

"While one faction of world leadership shouts in fiendish glee at anticipated victory and the other calls for crushing vengeance, the Father of Christendom appeals for a just peace. * * * The holy father puts little hope in the prospect of stirring up sufficient good will among men or of finding enough men of good will with sufficient desire or power to put quick end to the conflict. His Holiness looks to divine intervention and calls upon the Christians of the world to win and merit God's help by their heartfelt intercession" (The Evangelist, Albany, N. Y.).

"Actual war is now devastating large portions of the earth, but its shadow really falls on the entire world, including our own beloved land. Men everywhere hate war, but they are being driven into it by the ill will of a few who do not fight themselves but force others into the battle lines. War is the harvest which the world reaps from its sowing the seeds of hate. * * * Mary brought God into the world at the time of the Incarnation. Mary can bring God back into the world of today that has exiled Him. She will bring Him back as the Prince of Peace if her children are sincere in their request to have Him end His world exile" (The Universe Bulletin, Cleveland, Ohio).

"The breath of war is felt upon the Nation, and actual immersion in war's horrors seems almost unavoidable. The compass of the ship of state has been set, and the course marked out is through stormy seas. If the catastrophe of actual war for this country is to be averted, it will not be through the diplomacy of the Nation's leaders, but only through the divine intervention" (The Catholic Standard and Times, Philadelphia, Pa.).

"In the universal confusion, minds are deluged with the reports and tales of the spreading wars. Now one nation succumbs, now another; hope of victory against aggression, despair of the conquered, alternate their play upon our sympathies. It is difficcult to consider the hope of peace; it is difficult to bring ourselves to pray for peace. Even the Pope does not visualize a hope for an early peace. And yet peace must come; we must hope for peace; we must pray very fervently for peace. Our Holy Father calls us to a crusade of prayer for peace." (The Florida Catholic, Miami, Fla.)

LET US PRAY

"Let the prayer go up to Heaven for right guidance of those in authority, for God's help on their efforts to defend our country and its liberties, for God's blessing on their earnest efforts to do all that is right and needful to keep far from America the devastation and ruin and oppression that are today the portion of so many countries abroad. God bless our fields; make them yield unto us all the bounties of a good harvest; keep them for productive growth, not for destructive blows of clashing armies." (The Catholic Courier, Rochester, N. Y.)

"If the power of prayer is again released and used in the lives of common men and women, if the spirit declares its aims clearly and boldly, there is yet hope that our prayers will be answered." (The Record, Louisville, Ky.)

"The Holy Father again formally, and as the head of Christ's Church, asks that we pray for the return of peace. In a special appeal he asks that we approach Our Lady during her month of May with this one definite petition. The language of the Holy Father is remarkably incisive in his analysis of what we ought to work for and pray for." (The Catholic Sun, Syracuse, N. Y.)

"We ask her (the Blessed Mother) not only to put an end to the cruel slaughter and miseries of war, but to recultivate the world, stripping from the hearts of men all the unholy passions that are a barrier to the peace of Christ. We cannot ask for more and it would be senseless to ask for less" (The Southern Cross, San Diego, Calif.).

"At the feet of her who is the Help of Christians and the Queen of Peace, let us pray perseveringly for the great boon of peace. Let us ask Christ for this peace in Mary's name and through her all-powerful intercession. When Mary asks her Son for us, Christ will not refuse her request" (The Messenger, Belleville, Ill.).

TWO CONTRARY VIEWS—OUR TASK

"Certainly no recriminative charges of past fault or failure to stand by these same principles (enunciated by Lord Halifax as Britain's 'war aims,' and by President Roosevelt as the 'four freedoms' for the world), or to vindicate these rights; no plea for 'isolation' in the present from the world's great agony; no willingness to accept a 'negotiated peace' at any price that may spare us the suffering of 'persecution for justice' sake'; no selfishness or softness of heart will suffice to excuse us as a people from the task which lies before us: to recognize the inherent evil of the totalitarian philosophy and its threat to our own way of life, and to be ready, willing, and determined to do all that must be done to defeat it, completely, finally, once and forever" (The Church World, Portland, Maine).

DENYING THE CRISIS

"There is a small group within the country that is more concerned with stirring up hate and mistrust to gain their own ends than in promoting national unity. They criticize everything that is not in perfect agreement with their own narrow aims. Most of them are living in a neat world of unreality that denies our national crisis. Their chief means of attack is vicious, destructive criticism rather than the constructive criticism that should be expected of them. * * * There are many sincere and honest people in the various peace groups but they seem to be fast losing control to other groups and individuals who have dedicated themselves to a permanent campaign of name-calling, half-truths, and malicious criticism" (The New World, Chicago, Ill.).

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I made at the Memorial Day services held on Sunday, May 25, at Mount Holly Springs, under the auspices of the South Mountain American Legion Post, No. 674, of Mount Holly Springs, Pa.:

I salute each and everyone of you who, by your presence here, reconsecrate this annual Decoration Day, so sacred to all of us; who by your presence, give honor and recognition to those who by their actions have bequeathed to us freedom, liberty, and union; who are upon this occasion dedicating yourselves anew to the solemn pledge that the deeds by which these departed heroes upheld our ideals and institutions shall not have been in vain. Others before them had won

these prized possessions at great cost and sacrifice; and molded with certain knowledge and uncanny skill the framework to preserve them. Those who rest in these little green tents so near us now have done their utmost to give them to us intact, whole, and undivided.

It is a cheering thought to think that while Father Time has brushed away with gentle hand much of the heartache and sadness caused by the departure of these brave men and women, yet each year adds to their stature, their luster and their glory. The magnitude of their achievement increases as the days grow into years and as the years grow into decades. A great English poet, Gray in his Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard once said, "The paths of glory lead but to the grave." This I do not believe. All of us here today are giving testimony to our belief that the paths of glory lead beyond the grave. Our United Nation of free citizens proves that fact.

How fitting it is that this day in spring was chosen—when the earth is again bursting into song and color and giving us sure and certain proof that there is a new birth after death, and that our loved ones are not truly dead, but have just gone forward and upward to a better life than this.

Now and for many years past we pay homage to those who have passed on to the Great Beyond—"To that bourne from which no traveler returns"—after using freely and gladly of their strength, their energy, and their blood to build this Nation into a bulwark of free civilization and to cement our Union into an indivisible and indestructible unit. When we do so, we also rededicate ourselves to carry on the purposes and ideals which they have achieved.

History tells us that this custom of setting aside May 30 as Memorial Day, or Decoration Day, for the soldiers of the Civil War originated in the South. There were located most of the battlefields of the war. Near these battlefields were the last resting places of the mortal remains of so many of the brave soldiers of both sides. A young Virginia girl, Cassandra Oliver Moncure, is reputed to have originated the idea in May of 1866. Flowers were placed on the graves of the brave men of both armies. Gen. John A. Logan, of the Grand Army of the Republic, witnessed these services. It was he who, 2 years later on May 5, 1868, issued an order appointing May 30 of that year as Decoration Day for the Grand Army of the Republic. That day was chosen because it was the date of the discharge of the last Union volunteers of the war. Since then various States one by one have adopted it as a holiday. Today nearly all the States observe the day. There is no national law on the subject, however.

Instituting the reverent custom of Memorial Day, Gen. Logan said: "It is our purpose to inaugurate this observance in the hope that it will be kept from year to year while a survivor of the war remains to honor the memory of the departed." General Logan's hope will be fulfilled. The veterans of the Civil War have honored this request and all patriotic Americans have proudly claimed the privilege of joining with them in doing so. And when the last of the old comrades muster out and fall in with the ranks of that vast silent army, when the last bugle call has blown, free Americans throughout the land will continue to place the flowers of spring in tribute and devotion upon these graves.

On the hillside above the narrow pass of Thermopylae stood a marble lion—the emblem of fearless courage—and at its base was written the inscription:

"Go tell the Spartans, thou that passeth by,
That here obedient to their laws we lie."

To this shrine of Spartan valor the Spartan mothers brought their sons so that they could read this message sent by the dead to the living. The mothers would tell the story of Leonidas, the young king of the Spartans, and his Spartan band, who gave up their lives in defense of their country.

We have witnessed recently the remarkable bravery with which the Greeks, thousands of years later, have opposed the forces of oppression and have struggled against what they knew to be overwhelming odds in order to maintain their freedom and institutions. We cannot but feel that the inspiration of these ancient heroes produced to some degree in some divine and mysterious manner the courage shown by their descendants. Thermopylae has lived again.

We would be unworthy of our own heroic dead if we should fail to do our utmost or put forth whatever effort, no matter how great, in order to preserve the priceless heritages they have left for us.

There could be no more appropriate place to pay tribute to the heroes of the Civil War than in this spot in the Cumberland Valley, skirted and rimmed with so many of the historic battlefields of that war; with so many of its towns and villages yet bearing scars from that conflict. In that time of stress troops were moving to and fro all around us. Not far from here is where the decisive battle—the battle that made inevitable the final result—was fought—the Union preserved. We Americans have always known by instinct and intuition that the Battle of Gettysburg was one of the decisive battles of the world. Historians of other nations after long study agree with us. As time marches on, the importance, the far-reaching significance of that battle, and of the preservation of our Union have become increasingly crystal clear. In the precarious, brittle world situation that challenges us today, think what it would mean to us if this country had been divided into groups of smaller States or nations instead of being one powerful and united whole, able to mobilize all its resources, ready to defend its security, safety, and integrity with them. Think how important this fact is to the other peoples of the world also. We can hold aloft the torch of freedom and liberty much higher as we are today. In union there is strength. We can make the light of liberty burn more brightly amid the storm clouds of a war-torn world when the 48 stars embrace all the land between the Atlantic and the Pacific, between Canada and the Gulf of Mexico.

We could not have fought for freedom if our forefathers had not made all men free. For if the principle of secession had once been established it is only logical to assume that it would have been carried farther and farther; that both a separate North and a separate South would have broken up later into yet smaller units by further use of that same principle. This sentiment is shared by our brothers in the South just as much as by those of us in the North. A southern Representative in Congress, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], expressed this view in a Memorial Day speech some years ago, when he said, "I shudder to think what might have happened had the South prevailed." Today the North and the South are one. Indeed, there is no North, no South, no East, no West. The bitterness and ill-feeling which was bound to be created by such a war and its emotional aftermath have almost entirely vanished. The common purpose with which all sections of the country joined strictly together to further our ideals in the World War provided the final crucible in which were washed away the few remaining antagonisms which existed at that time. Never did so many go so far to fight for so little of material value as did those boys of 1917 and 1918, who, with shining eyes, marched forth on that great crusade to make the world safe for democracy, and to end all wars, and who asked nothing for themselves. The fruits of their victory and their achievements have been largely dissipated by hands other than their own. Yet their idealism remains today—as it always will—one of the great moral and regenerative forces of the world. When we look at the totalitarian governments of today, and when we see the four horsemen of the Apocalypse again riding roughshod over more than one-half of the world, we know that their high objectives were well worth fighting for. If those boys had had their way the world would have had throughout the peace we still cherish so greatly and strive to preserve in our own land; and countless thousands who now feel the tyrants' heel would enjoy the blessings of freedom.

Today North, South, East, and West seek to provide for our common defense and to safeguard these same rights and principles which those to whom we pay honor and homage today paid for so willingly but so dearly many years ago.

In many parts of the world, man—like Narcissus—has fallen in love with his own image. His intellectual advances and achievements have outrun his spiritual growth and development. Today we are forced to see that intellectual and physical progress are not worth much if unaccompanied by spiritual gains. The inventions which have annihilated time and space are being used to destroy everything else on the face of the earth, including man himself. The airplane is erasing an age-old civilization in Europe and England. The factories built by toil to create articles for the enjoyment and use of people are now turning out instruments to obliterate useful articles previously created. They are making future toil more necessary and more certain. We are not turning swords into plowshares, but strictly the reverse. The acceptance of force as the decisive and only method of argument has forced every nation to take steps unstintedly and to the utmost of its ability to protect itself by force against threatened force. No matter how peace-loving a nation may be, it cannot afford to remain unarmed in a world aflame. We will have no sure and lasting peace throughout the world until our eyes have seen the "glory of the coming of the Lord."

It was just a little more than four score years after the founding of our Republic until the time the first shot was fired at Fort Sumter. It was four score years today since that shot was fired. The critical junctures in the history of the United States recur at intervals of approximately 60 years. Again today we are called upon to make fateful decisions and to take prompt action to insure our safety and security. We cannot afford to take chances. We cannot afford to gamble with the turns of the wheel of fate.

The life, the liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of a great people must not be subjected to even the slightest risk. We have always had these privileges and perhaps have become accustomed to regard them as part of our natural environment, like the trees and the birds and the air and the sun. It may not be humanly possible to really know the true worth of such gifts unless one has had the bitter experience of living without them. We are proud to be citizens of this Nation. We look back on our glorious past and perhaps we have a tendency to think that this glorious past insures of itself an equally glorious future. But empires have risen and empires have fallen. Nations which long ago decayed and crumbled away also had their periods of amazing success and prosperity. Our own Nation has had its periods of true greatness and it has had periods when it has been less great. Today we are America. What we do and what we are will determine what the future of this country will be. These whom we honor today have given us most favorable opportunities. The strength of any government at any given time is no greater than the composite strength of all its people. It rests upon the

aggregate of each and every one of those who form its citizenry.

Americanism is not something inherent—not something which is just here with us of itself because of the fact that we possess the peculiar advantages of being American citizens—but it is something we must create by our daily lives. We must appreciate this and act accordingly, if our Nation is to continue as a dynamic force for right and for freedom.

There are strange forces alive in the world today. It is almost impossible at this time and at this distance to judge their real meaning, their real danger or their real threat. No one can tell today what Hitler proposes to do or what he will be able to do. It would certainly be the part of folly not to assume the worst, not to take every step to guard against whatever may impend. This is not fear nor hysteria but the brave caution of an intelligent people. Many people in many places underestimate the degree of danger which this country may face at a not too distant future time. No one can say what it is, how great it is, or how imminent it is. Today is the time to create full protection against that danger. The destiny of our Nation has been won because—with all our faults, with all our comings and goings, with all our ups and downs—because at the critical junctures of our history we have been able to unite and meet the state of affairs resolutely and adequately. I am sure we will be able to do that now as in the past. But it seems to me to be the duty to point out on this solemn occasion that we must not risk in even the slightest degree the blessings which the heroes whom we honor today have given us. We must remember them and what they did and what they died for.

"Lord God of Hosts be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Do You Think?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I am making over the radio this evening:

Good evening. My remarks tonight are not directed to those who are inaccessible to truth or thought. Nothing can be gained by counseling with a closed mind. Action cannot be expected of the inert, who fail to take an interest in progress and exercise their right of controlling the destinies of their government.

It is notoriously shameful that, while most of the world is engaged in a brutal and exhaustive war to save freedom and representative government, we are forced to plead for interest and action in crucial domestic affairs.

I must borrow the statement of Charles Steinmetz, who said, "Cooperation is not sentiment; it is economic necessity." In building the long-delayed seaway—we have the economic necessity—we must have the cooperation. Simply, this means that every wide-awake American has a task to do. Your job is to immediately advise your Senator and Representative of your sentiments for the waterway. If you build support behind him, he cannot fail.

A few days ago I addressed you over a Nation-wide hook-up and pointed out the revelations of history showing how the selfish little people had impeded progress. Tonight I want to weigh with you the arguments they have solemnly pronounced in their efforts to keep national development at a minimum.

In war time it is easy to confound an issue and complicate thinking. For example, the opposition has viewed with alarm the vulnerability of the locks of the waterway. In the event of an attack, do you think that this area would be any more prone to attack than the terminal yards and sidings of the railroad systems in New York, in Cleveland, Buffalo, Milwaukee, Chicago, and other great transportation centers? Do you believe for one minute that the locks on the St. Lawrence seaway would be less safe from attack than those on the Panama Canal? It is certain they will be more safe than the loading wharves of the great cities on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts.

The vulnerable spots of the seaway will be located far inland and our defense would have to be completely paralyzed if an attacking force were able to carry their depredations this far into the continent.

We all know that it is more difficult to destroy a water transportation system than one on land because of decentralization. To bring water-borne shipping to a standstill, an enemy would have to completely demolish all the docks, all the harbors, and all the ships. To end trucking and the railroads, they would need only to severely damage our trunk highways, railways, and terminals. Without tracks and highways, trains and trucks are of no use.

The nearsighted opponents of the waterway must admit that they have been caught in the mesh of their own superficial thinking. To pursue this idea further—if an aerial attack could demoralize one transportation system, such as the railroads—then the crying and obvious need for a collateral water route is apparent to everyone. In order to protect ourselves from all future contingencies, we should start the project immediately so that we might have another well-developed transportation facility. But a question to my listeners—Do you think, my friends, that this type is reasoning advanced by the selfish and sectional interests is honest or sincere—that this is the kind of representation you deserve?

It is argued with force and vehemence, but with an equal amount of insincerity, that shipping will be seasonable and that the benefits of the seaway will be questionable.

Let us examine these statements in the cold light of common sense and good reason. For the sake of argument, we can admit that traffic will be suspended for a short period of time. The pertinent questions, however, are, When will the greatest need be felt, and can we enjoy the timely benefits of the facilities?

The answer is emphatically in the affirmative. When agricultural development is at its peak in early harvest time, we can fill the steamer holds with grain and other agricultural products from the farms in the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Montana, Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

When the demand for industrial goods is the highest, we in the Middle West can get our farm machinery, our industrial goods, our gadgets, and our commercial and pleasure cars from the factories of eastern and central United States.

The completion of the seaway will encourage the building of a new type of lake boat that will be available for coastwise service. During the ice-bound period on the Great Lakes, the ships can be utilized and operated from ocean ports, thus guaranteeing the Great Lakes sailor year-around employment where before it was seasonal. To continue to construct the old type of lake carriers, which are not suitable for other uses, is merely another case of our economic shortsightedness.

To return to the question of national defense and the part to be played by the seaway. The opposing interests doth protest too much that the project has no relationship to our defense program. I suspicion that their repetitious declarations are efforts to reassure themselves.

We need ships—desperately. In the Great Lakes areas much of our construction facilities are begging for an opportunity—for use and development. All this while the yards on the seacoasts are packed with orders—deliveries are scheduled years ahead. With the completion of the waterway we can build larger merchant and navy craft for delivery to coastal bases. Our skilled unemployed can find jobs where they have built their homes. There will be no migration of workers with its attendant serious problems.

A recent survey shows that there are 3,000 skilled shipbuilders located in and near the Head of the Lakes who are ready to respond at a moment's notice to the call—to help build ships.

To expand facilities for the production of much-needed aluminum, we not only need plants, but we must have greatly increased sources of low-cost electric power. The power project on the St. Lawrence will supply millions of kilowatts of energy so critically needed. To the people of New York and surrounding States, this will mean that you have resources for new industries and to expand the old.

At the head of the Lakes lie our great iron mines. We must have additional marine facilities to carry the mass tonnage of ore for expanded industrial and war production needs.

The farseeing—allseeing—opposition to the seaway has ordained that this world crisis will soon pass—that the project cannot be completed in time to be of use in the defense program. I prefer to accept the opinion of the President and the Army and Navy staffs. It is generally conceded now that, with the latest developments in the war picture, the conflict will be of great length Do you think that when peace has been declared after this period of slaughter that it will mean the cessation of our defense efforts? The seaway will be needed in time ahead.

From a commercial standpoint, the project has long been needed and will long be used. It will take years for us to build up our merchant marine; much time in the future will be given to maintaining and expanding our Navy. We can take a lesson from Herbert Spencer, who said, and I quote. "The wise man will remember that while he is a descendant of the past, he is a parent of the future." I say to you tonight, look ahead, America.

We are proposing to spend hundreds of millions of dollars for roads over which to transport troops and war materials. For some years in the immediate future we will maintain an Army of several million men. Why is it not logical to use our natural waterways for the transportation of materials while the highways and railroads are choked with troop movements.

To the men and women on the farm, in small businesses or large, to those in labor's ranks, let us briefly see how this affects your pocketbook. Time will not allow many examples—I propose to use one which affects all. I would like to show you what happens to a cargo of wheat from which we get our daily bread.

In shipping a typical cargo of 275,000 bushels of wheat to New York City from the

breadbasket of the Nation it costs $13,750 to ship it to Buffalo or Port Colburn where it must be elevated at a cost of $2,750. It is then loaded out and, since we are taking the cheapest route, we will send the grain from Buffalo to New York by barge on the Erie Canal. It will cost another $13,750 to get it to our harbor there and then we must pay a lighterage charge of 1 cent per bushel, or $2,570. This makes a grand total of $33,000 which does not include inspection fees and weighing fees in the Buffalo elevators, insurance costs, loss from handling, or demurrage or storage

What does this mean? That the farmer of the Middle West might have a large share of this as his profit—if he had this, he could spend more with his local merchant and buy more goods from the manufacturers. It means that the workingman in the East would pay less for his bread and get more for his work because the farmer could purchase what he makes. That, my friends, is just plain, ordinary, everyday economics.

But, since we are looking at the dollar sign, what about the project itself? The power portion of the project, representing some $93,700,000 is to be self-liquidating and will be administered by the New York Power Authority. This is approximately one-third of the entire construction cost.

One of the most specious of all the arguments is the one pointing to the need of men and machinery for defense work and exclaiming, with more vigor than veracity, that we cannot spare them to work on the waterway. What nonsense! Pause to look at the figure compiled by the Federal Security Administration and see the huge numbers still on relief and W. P. A. rolls. Not only have we the manpower, but we have an overabundance of construction machinery to use.

Figures compiled by the American Federation of Labor disclose that we have 6,500,000 still unemployed. The largest share of this group live in the areas bordering the Great Lakes. It is the character of unskilled labor that will be used to construct the seaway that would not be absorbed for national-defense requirements.

Census figures show that in the last brief decade 6 of the great grain States have lost 290,000 inhabitants. This loss cannot totally be ascribed to the drought nor to the depression. The indisputable facts remain that the tillers of the soil left their farmsteads because of lack of profit due to the high cost of transportation and their inability to get farm products to market. During the depression it cost twice as much to ship wheat from Salina, Kans., to Chicago than it could be sold for. North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma have lost their people year after year because of the crushing consequence of the transportation rate structure levied against the interior of the country. Removal of the bottleneck from the St. Lawrence would not only restore the lost population but give them the added producers they are entitled to. A chain is as strong as its weakest link—a nation as its weakest state. Let us tear out the barriers to dynamic national development.

In Europe all of the countries are traversed by extensive canal systems—without which their economies would fail. All of the heavy traffic of the continent goes by ship and barge, the fast traffic by rail. In our planning for the years ahead I believe that it will be necessary for us to develop other water routes in the interior of the country. But, first things, first. The seaway takes precedence because of its importance to national defense. After the war years—when we are building new wealth in consumer goods—we can and must develop our other trade lanes. This Nation can be as great and as powerful as the limits of our imagination, ingenuity, and ambition. Julius Barnes remarked in hearings on the seaway, "Anyone who has ever prophesied against this country's growth and expansion and American industry, has been discredited by following events."

Let me again urge you to assume your share of the responsibility in our efforts to build the seaway. Wire, write, or phone your Senators and your Congressmen. Remember, the time is now.

I would hate to have my suspicions confirmed that much of the opposition to the seaway is motivated by partisanship rather than by national economic considerations. What difference does it make whether the seaway is built during a Republican or a Democratic administration? This project is too great to play peanut politics with. I think we should put the elephant and donkey aside for the moment and raise the Stars and Stripes. If the glory must be shared, let us remember that Presidents of both parties have been greatly in favor of the route to our inland seas.

Good night.

Economy and Efficiency Essential to the Nation's Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. E. E. COX, OF GEORGIA

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered yesterday over the radio:

Fellow citizens, I welcome this opportunity to warn my fellow Americans of present grave dangers.

Our form of government, our economic institutions, our system of free enterprise, and our social structure are under attack; they are losing ground. Those who insist upon changing our governmental, economic, and social institutions are in full march; their potential victory is nearer than our people realize.

We are threatened with loss of the fruits of hundreds of years of toil and sacrifice. We appear to be abandoning the gains, as well as the ideals, of our courageous ancestors who by their blood and sacrifice created this great, rich, free Nation which they bequeathed in trust to us.

Our government of laws is being supplanted by a government by men. Our long-established and well-proved principles of Americanism are being driven back before the onslaught of socialism and communism. Our principles of local self-government are being eaten away by the dreadful canker of centralization.

At this hour we find ourselves irrevocably committed to war. That this would be our fate we have known—many of us—for nearly a year. That it is a fate we could not avoid with either safety or honor I accept as a fact. But I am gravely disturbed by the divided or dual program that has been adopted—a dual effort of carrying out an unprecedented program of national defense, coupled with a program of changing an entire social order. To the demand for complete defense there has been attached a condition that there must be no pause in the reforming of America. The dangerous policy is being followed of dividing the command between the trained soldiers and the theoretical reformers.

In the conflict between these forces the attention of our people is being diverted from the toil and sacrifice they must make if we are to win in the war at arms and in the economic struggle which now faces us. The attention of our people has even been diverted from the very problem of financing the defense and our preparation for whatever struggle may lie in store for us in the war. That taxes should be increased is an idea accepted by all; but that the results of increased taxation should flow into the hands of unscrupulous racketeers or be used in a determined effort to subversively change our system of government is beyond any justification.

We are told now that we are headed toward a $90,000,000,000 Federal debt. We are also told by another administration authority that we may be certain we shall be compelled to spend at least $40,000,000,000 annually until the war ends. Our Federal debt may go to $90,000,000,000, it may go to $150,000,000,000; no man in or out of government knows what the ultimate debt will be.

In spite of this alarming prospect, our Government has made no appreciable reduction in expenditures for nondefense activities. What does such a financial course mean? It can mean only that the present solvency of our Government cannot long endure. It can mean only ultimate national bankruptcy, and, as a consequence, collectivism in its most abhorrent form.

Those who are determined to change our form of government have swarmed into the offices of the Government to bore from within like so many termites, and to undermine the foundations of our American institutions. They find the opportunity and take the means of despoiling the people of their liberty. They conjure up alleged gifts for the people, but they offer gifts of which the people should beware. They take all from the pockets of the people and give back some under the guise of governmental largesse. They pollute the channels of public information with destructive alienism. They are masters of subversive propaganda. They control, in large part, the methods and the means of an organized and powerful propaganda. These subversive elements, working within the protection of the Government, hidden away in Federal offices as they are, are getting in their deadly work of undermining home rule and local self-government by promises of Federal aid. That Federal aid is always conditioned upon a surreptitious Federal control. The alleged gifts of bread proffered by these political buccaneers are always accompanied by handcuffs and leg irons for the liberties of the people. Such gifts of bread, the price of which is liberty, turn to bitterness in the mouths of free men and women.

For some time the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has been considering new rates of Federal taxation, the heaviest in our history. If these rates become law we still will be approximately $10,000,000,000 short of the estimated 1942 expenditures.

Every taxpayer in the Nation will be compelled to make sacrifices now unthought of to meet the expense of an impregnable defense. Thousands of our people heretofore untaxed by the Federal Government because of their low rates of income will soon find themselves compelled to contribute to these new Federal taxes. The new levies will reach far down among the ranks of our citizens earning low incomes.

The fact that we are engaged in the building of a national defense, that we must make haste in building this national defense, is no shadow of excuse for wanton waste and inefficiency. On the contrary, it is a challenge to

the leadership of this Nation and to the common sense of our people to see that the greatest efficiency and economy are practiced in the defense and nondefense expenditures. Our citizens must bend their backs, the sweat of their struggles must fall in the dust to pay for the waste and the inefficiency and the racketeering just as much as for the legitimate expenditures.

The bureaucrats proceed as though expenditures for nondefense purposes are as imperative as those for defense purposes. They have proceeded as though the public purse were the reservoir for a never-ending flood of money to be allowed to flow in every direction suggested by the whims of bureaucrats and theorists.

Those bent on reforming our institutions threaten to make our Nation of farm homes a nation of collectivised and industrialized agriculture, modeled upon the principle of a W. P. A. day of 6 hours, and of an industrialized relief wage far beyond the economic capacities of our farmers. We cannot safely close our eyes to the fact that millions of our farmers must still work by the "can-to-can't" system. They must sweat and toil from the earliest hour of dawn when they can see to work to the last hour of dusk when they can't see to work any longer. They must thus toil to pay the interest upon federalized mortgages. They reflect, do those farmers, the effects of a vast social scheme that penetrates even into the sanctity of our homes. Those theories, put into practice as they have been, constitute a noxious growth of administrative bureaucratic boards, commissions, and departments which has disturbed our entire national economy and which now threatens, under the opportunity of this war emergency, to engulf us in a system of collectivism that inevitably will overwhelm us unless we have the courage and the will to halt it.

There can be no retrenchment in our expenditures for defense, but there can be, and there must be, economy and efficiency in the building of that defense.

Were it not for the fact that today two great forces, each of which is opposed to our American way of government, our American way of life, and our American ideals, have become engaged in a struggle to determine the supremacy of the one or the other, we should be confronted with probable aggressions against ourselves.

For the moment fate has halted the threat of totalitarian and communistic aggression against America. This does not mean, however, that we may curtail our expenditures for national defense. It does not mean that we can for a moment halt the program upon which we are engaged. For us this struggle between these two alien forces constitutes only a brief respite of which we must make the most. When one or the other of these two brutal forces—communism or nazi-ism—shall have emerged victorious from their present struggle our respite will be ended. We will again face certain economic, if not military, struggle with the victorious power.

It is utterly vital to the welfare of this Nation, to the very security of our homes and our people, that we submerge every consideration, that we yield every theory to the one practical necessity of efficiently and economically constructing our national defense as quickly as possible.

The needs of our present program of national defense require a minute examination of every purpose, other than defense, for which a dollar must be spent.

It is gravely disquieting that within recent years the expenditures of our Federal Government have increased constantly. These increased expenditures, for other than defense purposes, reflect the increasing growth and expansion of the Federal Government in its invasion of those provinces once regarded as exclusively the field of local self-government. These vast expenditures for Federal relief have tended more than all else to disturb the normal national economy. They have tended to destroy the economic relationships which once existed between employer and employee, and have affected our manufacturing industry to the point of disruption, and now threaten to disrupt agriculture as well. Necessary relief can and must be carried on without it being transformed into an agency for political domination or made the vehicle by which those who would remake our governmental and our social institutions ride to their goal.

We must not, we dare not, forget that we must continue to live as a Nation and a people after the national defense is achieved, and after the wars have ended. Dangers so grave as to make all thoughtful men ponder will face us in the economic chaos which necessarily will follow the titanic struggle at arms now in progress. Every dollar that can be saved in governmental operations now in the non-defense activities will be a dollar less in a burden which in those days to come may prove well-nigh insupportable for our people.

We must be realistic. We must be sensible. Our Government must see to it that we do not go into bankruptcy or into inflation. The Congress and the people must see to it that in seeking to maintain and perpetuate liberty for others in the world, we do not lose our own liberty and become the victims of some form of abhorrent absolutism.

America must be on guard!

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the city council of the city of Chicago:

CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO URGES ILLINOIS SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN TO SUPPORT GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Whereas an agreement has been signed by the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway project; and

Whereas the President of the United States has affirmed his support of this project as a necessary part of our national-defense program; and

Whereas the ratification of this project would make Chicago a world port and a shipping center of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the completion of this project will expedite the transport of industrial and agricultural goods from the Middle West to all ports of the world; and

Whereas besides its transportation facilities, this project will make available a new source of electric power for our rapidly expanding national industry; and

Whereas a vast program of shipbuilding will be stimulated by the construction of this seaway; and

Whereas this program of shipbuilding will include not only the largest cargo vessels but also every type of naval vessels, with the exception of battleships and aircraft carriers, which are vital to national defense; and

Whereas not only Middle West industry but also the large agricultural population of the the Middle West will profit through the establishment of this project, which will provide a new outlet for farm commodities; and

Whereas a provision of this agreement allows the Sanitary District of Chicago to utilize all the water necessary for the performance of its municipal functions; and

Whereas Mayor Edward J. Kelly has signified his endorsement of this project as a stimulus to Chicago shipbuilding and transportation and a significant addition to our national-defense program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Chicago does hereby urge all Illinois Senators and Congressmen in the United States Congress to support the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project for the best interests of the United States and the continued growth and progress of the State of Illinois, and that a copy of this resolution be sent by the city clerk to every Illinois Representative in the Congress and Senate of the United States.

Our Country, Right or Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

POEM BY KARL VASS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of Congress, I do not know Karl Vass, but do greatly like this song and poem he wrote. It is a good time to have this in the RECORD, too.

OUR COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG

Between the broad Atlantic
And the wide Pacific shore,
Is a land of peace and freedom,
May it reign for evermore;
May our country ever be right,
May our legions ever be strong,
And may we ever be ready to fight,
For our country, right or wrong!

Our Navy is the finest
That has ever sailed the seas,
And it helps maintain Old Glory,
Proudly rippling in the breeze;
May our country ever be right,
May our Navy ever be strong;
And may we ever be ready to fight
For our country, right or wrong!

Our Army is the bravest
That a foe shall ever meet,
For it fights for peace and freedom,
And has never known defeat;
May our country ever be right,
May our Army ever be strong,
And may we ever be ready to fight
For our country, right or wrong!

Our airmen and marine boys
Are as gallant as a knight,
Eager each to serve his country,
Serve his country, wrong or right;
May our country ever be right,
May our legions ever be strong;
And may we ever be ready to fight
For our country, right or wrong!

—*Karl Vass.*

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Its Effect on the Coal and Railroad Industries in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania is one of the many States that is bound to feel the adverse effect of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. For the information of my colleagues, there is herewith inserted a radio address delivered by me over the radio stations in my district. The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, because of Congressional duties it is necessary that I remain in Washington; hence I am using the facilities of this radio station to discuss a legislative measure that is vital to the welfare of every citizen in Pennsylvania. I refer to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Since June 16 the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives have been holding hearings on this controversial measure. I am frank to say that those favoring this seaway project have left no stone unturned in their frantic efforts to unearth some sound reason for this proposed project. Instead of logical and sane reasoning, the most weird arguments have been advanced in support of their claims.

We who live in Pennsylvania must depend upon the coal and rail industries for our daily bread, hence we are quick to recognize that the St. Lawrence project is the return of an old political pet idea defeated by the United States Senate in 1934, and now stands before us garbed in its new regalia—the armor of national defense.

The St. Lawrence seaway is not a new idea. Since the turn of the century it has raised its head many times only to be subdued by calm deliberation and sound reasoning. On March 19, 1941, after 5 years of negotiations, President Roosevelt authorized the signing of a treaty with Canada for the construction of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway and the development of the hydroelectric resources of the international-rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

We are told that the St. Lawrence project, which cannot possibly be completed and in operation before 1947, 6 years hence, is a necessary adjunct to our defense of the Western Hemisphere.

In the same breath industries within the Great Lakes region are promised cheap power; Great Lakes shipbuilding yards are promised huge contracts to build oceangoing vessels; inland cities such as Duluth, Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit are to become great inland ports; and the midwestern farmer is offered cheap transportation rates for his products.

The treaty contemplates that the project be divided in two parts, one for the construction of dams on the St. Lawrence River to be used in the development of new sources of cheap hydroelectric power subsidized by the Government, and the other for the construction of a 27-foot channel from Montreal to the head of the Great Lakes, a distance of 1,200 miles, 90 percent of which is wholly within the Dominion of Canada, and at an eventual cost of $1,200,000,000.

The average American is being led to believe that the St. Lawrence project is being wholeheartedly accepted by not only this Nation but likewise by our Canadian neighbors. On the contrary, it is common knowledge that not only high Government officials in Canada but the people in general have opposed this project for years as being economically unsound. It is significant that Canadian labor organizations are loud in their protest, because this project will destroy thousands of jobs.

We can well appreciate the position the Canadian people have been forced to take on the St. Lawrence project. Were it not for the American program of aid to Great Britain our Canadian neighbors would be as militant in their opposition as millions of Americans who recognize this project as a destructive influence because of its devastating effect on the economic stability of both nations.

It is not difficult for us to agree with our Canadian neighbors that the proposed St. Lawrence project is of little value and cannot be justified at a national-defense measure. Since we as a Nation are building our own defenses and engaged in a superhuman effort to aid Great Britain, the digging of an international ditch and putting the Government of the United States in the power business on a larger scale at a cost of over one billion dollars, is not only ridiculous when Great Britain needs ships and implements of war, but it is likewise an undreamed of folly.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that this St. Lawrence project will require at least a period of 7 years before it can be placed in operation. During the construction of the locks, dams, and generating plants and after completion, the entire project, both from a power and seaway standpoint, will prove an easy target for enemy bombers or "fifth columnists." Even the ships using the seaway would be open to attack from the air.

Little has been said of the gigantic task facing the United States in defending the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Military experts predict that it will cost over a billion dollars to erect and maintain suitable defenses, since the St. Lawrence seaway from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth, Minn., at the head of the Great Lakes will require military posts at strategic points.

Keeping in mind that this so-called national-defense project will require at the utmost 7 years of intensive effort to insure completion, let us consider the argument that our defense industries are in immediate need of additional electric power.

If we are in immediate need of electric power why not expand existing water and steam generating plants both on the American and Canadian side of the Niagara River, which can be accomplished within a 2-year period to enable generating millions of kilowatt-hours of electricity? Why not come into the heart of the Pennsylvania coal fields and construct steam-generating plants that can be completed and in operation within a period of 2 years and at one-third the cost of hydroelectric plants. The construction of these steam-generating plants will make possible millions of kilowatt-hours of electricity and at the same time would give employment to thousands of coal miners and railroaders in the great Keystone State.

To further prove that the St. Lawrence seaway as a national-defense project is a myth, let me call your attention to the fact that this seaway, which is intended to provide a 27-foot channel from the head of the St. Lawrence River to the head of the Great Lakes, will be closed to navigation for 5 months of each year, since the St. Lawrence River is icebound and the surfaces of the Great Lakes are solidly frozen.

This seaway will cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars, deprive thousands of railroaders and coal miners of employment, and will be open for navigation only 7 months of each year.

As previously mentioned industries within the Great Lakes region are promised cheap power; Great Lakes shipbuilding yards are promised huge contracts to build ocean-going vessels; inland cities such as Duluth, Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit, are to become great inland ports; and the midwestern farmer is being lulled into silence by glittering promises of the rich harvest he will reap in cheap transportation rates.

Were these fanciful dreams to come true, the nonbenefiting citizens of our country will pay 85 percent of the cost of this project which I have already stated will be in excess of $1,000,000,000 dollars. In addition, the annual maintenance cost will be $15,000,000 on the seaway alone, which will mean that every ton of freight carried on the seaway will be subsidized by the taxpayers of America at a cost of $2.50 per ton.

Ladies and gentlemen, do you realize that the vast majority of American citizens own life insurance policies and that from a recent report it is revealed that one-fourth of the assets of American insurance companies are invested in American railroad securities and other utilities; and as a result the St. Lawrence seaway will affect every life insurance policyholder in the United States?

Yes; there is much idle talk about these so-called benefits from this St. Lawrence project. Yet on the other hand, there is a strange silence by those testifying at the congressional hearings in regard to the thousands of American citizens who will be driven to the relief rolls of the Nation by the destruction of their jobs.

Let me give you a few facts and figures showing the effect of this St. Lawrence project on our great State of Pennsylvania. No State in the Nation has more at stake in the rise and fall of employment in the coal and railroad industries, the distribution of pay rolls, the payment of taxes and the purchase of mining and railway materials and supplies. As these earnings in Pennsylvania fluctuate, the economic balance of the Nation swings to and fro.

Practically every State is a purchaser of Pennsylvania products. The railroads spent close to $173,000,000 in Pennsylvania in 1940 for fuel, materials, and supplies and approximately $41,000,000 within the State for new equipment. The vast army of railway employees in Pennsylvania numbering 118,718 in 1940 exceeded any other State. In wages, these employees received close to $218,000,000, while at the same time the railroads paid approximately $15,000,000 in taxes in the State of Pennsylvania.

It is interesting to note that the total production in Pennsylvania of bituminous coal in 1940 amounted to approximately 113,000,000 tons, employing on an average of 118,000 wage earners with an annual pay roll of approximately $138,000,000.

The total production of Pennsylvania anthracite coal in 1940 was approximately 52,000,000 tons with approximately 92,000 wage earners receiving a pay roll of $78,000,000. The bituminous and anthracite coal industries in Pennsylvania pay an annual tax of $23,000,000. Ladies and gentlemen, these facts and figures speak for themselves. Frankly, if this St. Lawrence project is completed it will vitally affect our two basic industries—coal and railroads—with pay rolls running into millions of dollars and employing thousands of good Americans.

Let us consider the effect of the St. Lawrence project on the coal industry and its thousands of employees. The hydropower part of the St. Lawrence project will destroy the Canadian market for American coal that has in the past used from ten to eighteen

millions of tons of coal annually, the majority of which was mined in Pennsylvania. In addition to the loss of the Canadian market, foreign tramp steamers will bring to the United States and deposit at Great Lake ports cheaply mined foreign coal which will displace the use of our American-mined coal.

The electricity generated by the hydroelectric power part of the St. Lawrence project will further displace the use of American-mined coal. The St. Lawrence project as a whole will mean the loss of 35,000,000 tons of American-mined coal annually.

Let us turn our attention to the plight of the American railroads and the thousands of railway workers in the event the seaway part of the St. Lawrence project is completed.

During the 7-month period when the Lakes are not frozen over and transportation impossible, dirty, foreign tramp steamers, manned by foreign crews and paid a scale of wages far below the standard of American shipping, will carry their cargoes to inland ports instead of discharging them at Atlantic coast ports of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, as is the present custom. Thus millions of tons of freight will be diverted from the American transportation systems. Every thousand tons of freight diverted from the American railroads means one less freight train; and every railroader knows that fewer trains mean fewer jobs. Then, too, it is a fundamental truth that when business is flourishing on the railroads the coal miners are steadily employed.

Ladies and gentlemen, this St. Lawrence project is nothing more than an attempt to saddle the American taxpayers with added burdens through the unnecessary expenditure of public funds. Yes, it is a direct challenge to every American citizen and especially we who reside in Pennsylvania.

In the name of thousands of fellow Pennsylvanians whose jobs are destined to be abolished as the result of the St. Lawrence project, I ask you to join with me and other Members of Congress from Pennsylvania who are opposing the sabotage of jobs that will result from this St. Lawrence project.

Your assistance is needed and you can best serve your country and your neighbor by writing your United States Senators asking them to oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project. In addition, you should urge your relatives and friends in other States to write their own Representatives in Congress protesting this attempt to saddle the American people with unnecessary taxes and, at the same time, to destroy two basic industries of the great Keystone State. Every loyal Pennsylvanian should meet this challenge to the welfare of our State by enlisting in this campaign to defeat the proposed St. Lawrence project.

Thieves Fall Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ALTOONA (PA.) MIRROR

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, newspaper editorials play an important part in molding public opinion on matters of national interest.

Since Hitler declared war on Soviet Russia volumes have been written in an effort to explain the unusual situation whereby "Hit," "Muss," and "Joe" came to the parting of the ways.

However, it did not take volumes for Harry Johnston, editor of the Mirror, Altoona, Pa., to make a fitting and telling observation on the turn of events in the Old World in the issue of the Altoona Mirror for June 26, 1941. Recognized as a journalist of no mean ability, Editor Johnston "hit the nail on the head" proverbial fashion with the following timely editorial to which he gave an apt title. The article follows:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of June 26, 1941]

THIEVES FALL OUT

Josef Stalin, whose American representatives only last week were attempting to disrupt the American national-defense effort because Comrade Joe and Dear Adolf were pals, is today put to the embarrassing necessity of countermanding orders to United States reds to sabotage our industry, for the tender ties of affection that Joe felt for Adolf are no more.

There is nothing strange in this. We can find a parallel in fairly recent United States history. Gangsters who ruled our greatest cities during the mad twenties on a totalitarian scale. Occasionally it became necessary for an Al Capone or a Legs Diamond or a Dutch Schultz to form a temporary alliance with a neighboring gangster so that they together might operate against a third.

But the moment the third rival was liquidated the first gangster never hesitated to rub out the second.

Until Hitler's pact with Stalin in 1939, the American communists pretended to be "good democrats," and cooperated with the free nations of the world. Overnight, Moscow ordered a right-about face and Communists cooperated vigorously with their erstwhile enemies, the Nazis. Now the shoe is on the other foot and the pinkos in this Nation cannot be blamed for a slight attack of bewilderment.

Russia was Napoleon's downfall; it may well be Hitler's.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of June 16, 1941:

[From the Chicago Daily News of June 16, 1941]

KELLY FOR THE SEAWAY

Mayor Edward J. Kelly's forthright support of the St. Lawrence seaway puts an end to an anomalous political line-up that has made Chicago ridiculous. To have the economic capital of the Great Lakes Basin apparently opposed to the canal has been a terrific handicap in Congress to the seaway cause.

Representatives and Senators from the East, far West, and South could not help but be perplexed to find that former Mayor Hoan, of Milwaukee, had led the fight, while the greatest city on all the inland seas either sulked in its tent or actually tried to cut its own economic throat.

We congratulate Mayor Kelly on his frank avowal. We do not recall that he ever did publicly make a statement opposed to the seaway. After 8 years' service in the mayor's chair, it would be very difficult indeed for any man of sense to oppose what is so patently a primary interest of the city. Kelly's engineering career and his connection with the existing canal and drainage systems of the Chicago region were other factors that made his present stand inevitable. We hope and believe that the mayor's statement will not only have a good effect in Congress but will abate the sniping at the seaway project that has so long come from the sanitary board and its political affiliates.

Governor Green should now come to the aid of the State, the city, and the seaway. Illinois is a lake State. Its metropolis is a lake city. Illinois needs the seaway.

The Calamity Howlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MISSOURI FARMER

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including a timely and pertinent editorial from the current issue of the Missouri Farmer, the official organ of the Missouri Farmers' Association.

The Association has long been recognized as the largest and most successful farm cooperative in the Nation. It owns and maintains elevators, exchanges, processing plants and commission agencies, which in the last 25 years have brought its members millions of dollars in dividends, savings on purchases and profits on sales, including $2,000,000 saved in commissions in the handling of livestock alone.

The editorial is from the trenchant pen of F. V. Heinkel, President of the Missouri Farmers' Association and one of the outstanding farm leaders of the day. President Heinkel has long been associated with the cooperative farm movement, is versed in agricultural economics and is unusually well qualified to speak on farm problems and farm legislation. His statement should have a wide audience:

[From the Missouri Farmer]

THE CALAMITY HOWLERS

The daily press of the country is squalling "bloody murder" over the action of Congress in making loans available to farmers at 85 percent of parity. Raymond Clapper, the columnist, termed it "the farm grab." Even the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, noted in times gone by for its fairness to all, denounced the measure, branding it "this philosophy of 'getting something for homefolks.'"

Just when this matter was under consideration by Congress, the United States Department of Agriculture, which agency of

the Government is supposedly looking out for the farmer's interests, aided and abetted the calamity howlers by pointing out to the press that this measure means an increase of 20 percent in food prices to consumers. This is both an indefensible and unpardonable act which the farmers of this country will long remember.

The fear is expressed that this support of farm prices will become the basis of a general spiraling of prices. That there is danger of inflation is generally recognized. But in God's name, should the farmers of this Nation—the people who furnish so many soldiers, and food for the the entire Nation and part of Great Britain as well—be called upon to make greater sacrifices than any other class of people? At a time when the prices of things they must buy are rising, can farmers be expected to meekly submit to an economic crucifixion?

Can it be that the daily press of this country, which presumably reflects the sentiment of city people, expects agriculture to go on forever feeding the Nation at less than cost of production? Is their contention the outgrowth of mere ignorance or is it pure selfishness?

The danger of a spiraling price structure is very real. But high food prices will not be one of its causes. The wheat surplus is the largest ever known; the carry-over of corn into the next crop will set a new high record; there is so much cotton on hand that the planners in Washington wonder what ever will become of it; livestock numbers are huge. Indeed, the capacity of American farmers to produce food is unlimited; we can feed this Nation and half of Europe, and there'll be plenty for all.

Farmers have held the bag all down through the ages, and especially has this been true during wartime, our experience during World War No. 1 being particularly fresh in our minds. And now that some patriotic men in Congress have taken a few steps to forestall some of the calamities that befell agriculture during the last war, and subsequently the whole Nation as a result, there are those in our cities who point to them with scorn. They would have the farmers of this country bear the whole brunt of prosecuting the war in Europe by producing food at less than cost of production.

Industry has been careful to safeguard its profits. We remember that the big airplane manufacturers, to use one example, producing war materials most urgently in demand, held out for bigger profits before they would speed up production. Uncle Sam has been called upon to build plants for many private owners. Organized labor has been quick to demand increases in pay on the grounds that living costs have mounted and that they should share in the increased profits of industry.

All of these measures may or may not have been justified, but let's concede that they have been. Aren't farmers entitled to the same consideration? Shouldn't sauce for the goose be also sauce for the gander?

Back in 1920 farmers were getting 53 cents out of every dollar consumers handed out for food. Even then farmers were getting skinned, a fact which has been freely admitted by Congress; we cite its various farm legislation as evidence. But last year farmers were receiving only 42 cents of the consumer's dollar, while nearly half of the farmers in America have lost their farms.

Everybody should be ready to do his part in protecting cur country. But we might as well be practical about it. We contend that everybody should bear his share of the cost of national defense.

We do not admit that Government loans at 85 percent of parity will at last solve the farm problem. On the contrary, the very figure itself is an admission that farmers are not to receive their just share of the national income. The fact that loans are to be used as a price prop is an indication of weakness. But we must make allowances for what Congress is confronted with—many a Congressman and Senator would gladly have gone the whole way for agriculture, but strong opposition forced a compromise. We shall be grateful for even this much help when general price fixing starts, as seems inevitable. (F. V. Heinkel, president, Missouri Farmers' Association.)

The Significance of Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of Flag Day on June 14, the mayor of the city of Flint, Hon. Osmund Kelly, issued a proclamation decreeing a civic celebration of Flag Day to be held on June 14, and requested that the Flint Lodge of Elks, B. P. O. E., No. 222, conduct their Flag Day ceremonial as a part of the civic observance of the day. The Elks gladly accepted this invitation and through their exalted ruler, A. C. Lyon, and their secretary, Irvin L. Young, immediately started preparations therefor. Fay B. Murphy and Clifton L. Howard were appointed as cochairmen of the arrangements, and in conjunction with City Commissioner Lawrence H. Griffin greatly contributed to the success of Flag Day by their efficient services.

It was my privilege to be selected as speaker at that occasion. Naturally, I greatly appreciated the honor because, as a member of the Elks, I know full well the patriotic foundation of that fine order and the zeal and patriotism it had displayed toward the flag and what the flag represents.

The Elks had been very diligent in preparing for this event and, through the Boy Scouts, distributed throughout the city of Flint more than 40,000 flags to be displayed on Flag Day. Under the auspices of the B. P. O. E., the American Legion, and other patriotic organizations, supplemented by several fine bands and drum corps, a parade was formed through the principal streets of the city of Flint, with more than 1,000 patriotic citizens in line.

I certainly was proud of my home city of Flint for the patriotism manifested on that occasion. Thousands of people lined the streets of the city during the parade and several thousands attended the Flag Day exercises at Atwood Stadium. The Elks' Flag Day ceremonial was conducted in a splendid manner by the exalted ruler, A. C. Lyon; the American Legion and other patriotic organizations also taking part in this tribute to the American flag.

The spontaneous and patriotic enthusiasm which everywhere greeted the flag convinced me that the great rank and file of the American people are loyal and patriotic and believe in everything that the flag typifies and represents. The thriving city of Flint is but a cross-section of this great country of ours and its loyalty and patriotism is representative of the loyalty and patriotism of our people throughout the entire United States.

My address, in part, was as follows:

June 14 was Flag Day, proclaimed by the President of the United States, by the Governors of the 48 States, and by heads of municipalities throughout our great country. It is the final day of a week set apart to reaffirm our faith in the ideals for which the American flag stands and our loyalty to the Nation over which it has flown, for a century and a half.

Born of a right to self-rule, after years of oppression by a tyrant king, the Stars and Stripes are the history of a struggle by a determined people to be independent and free.

The Stars and Stripes symbolize 8 years of struggle and sacrifice to form a union of States. Each star is the history of a sovereign State. Their setting on a blue field signals to mankind that here is a Nation, dedicated to personal freedom and religious rights, a sanctuary to oppressed men and women, the world over, where they might have life and liberty and where they may pursue happiness.

The red stripes represent human sacrifice and the blood spilled by our Nation's heroes in winning the freedom which is ours; the white ones, the purity of purpose of a greater, nobler and holier America. In the whole is cryastallized all the hopes and fears of a nation, established in the righteous principle of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and freedom of worship.

During the years of trouble with England, all sorts of queer flags had been designed as standards for the colonies, first by one colony and then by another, each, however, having a distinctive pattern and design all its own.

But of all the flags and symbols since the world began, there is none other so full of meaning as the flag of our country. That piece of red, white and blue bunting, represents 5,000 years of struggle upward; it is the full-grown flower of ages of fighting for liberty; it is the century plant of human hope in bloom.

General Washington, George Ross, the uncle of Betsy Ross, and Robert Morris constituted a committee of three to prepare a suitable design for the new American flag. After some study they submitted their design to Betsy Ross, a widow then, 24 years of age, living in Philadelphia, conducting the upholstery business which her husband had previously run.

Betsy Ross, an expert seamstress, then drew a draft of the flag with 13 red and white stripes and 5 pointed white stars in a field of blue, which the committee accepted. They submitted the flag to Congress, but this flag was not approved until many designs were studied and discussed by the Members of the Colonial Congress.

Finally Congress, on June 14, 1777, adopted for the Nation the flag designed by Washington, Morris, and Ross, and made by Betsy Ross. The language of the congressional resolution was as follows: "Resolved that the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a field of blue, representing a new constellation."

In 1794, with the admission of two new States into the Union—Vermont and Kentucky—two additional stars and two additional stripes were added.

The flag flying over Fort McHenry on September 13 and 14, 1814, when Francis Scott Key wrote the Star-Spangled Banner, had 15 stripes and 15 stars.

It was my privilege a week ago to visit the old historic Fort McHenry at Baltimore. As I

wandered over that old battleground it seemed to me that a panorama of my country's history came before me. I could vision Francis Scott Key, confined as a prisoner on one of the boats in the English Fleet, waiting patiently during the 25 hours of bombardment, wondering whether at the beginning of dawn the American flag would be flying; and I could feel the thrill that must have come to him, when, with the first appearance of dawn, he found the flag still there; then he put his whole heart and patriotic soul into the burning words of the Star-Spangled Banner, now our national anthem.

As the Nation grew in size, it became impossible to add one new stripe and also one new star for each State and still preserve the symmetry of the flag. So Congress, in 1818, passed an act providing that the flag should be composed of 13 stripes, representing the original 13 States, and that new stars should be added on the July 4 following the admission of additional States. Therefore, in the flag today the 13 stripes signify the Thirteen Original Colonies and the 48 stars signify the 48 States of the Union.

I want to call your attention, particularly on this day, to the significance of the American flag. Our flag is emblematic of the sovereignty of our Nation.

It represents the ideals, aspirations, and history of our people and engenders a feeling of patriotism and respect.

It flies perpetually over the Nation's Capitol as a sign of national perpetuity.

It flies over the schoolhouses of our Nation signifying the Nation's endorsement of education and the Nation's protection.

It flies over the capitols of all our States and over our courthouses, signifying the administration of justice.

It is the symbol of every right enjoyed by the American people.

It represents the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It reflects the wealth and grandeur and patriotism of this great land of opportunity.

It signifies the law of the land.

It stands for peace and good will among the nations of the world.

It believes in tolerance.

It is the badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny.

At a time like this, when European monarchies, kingdoms, and republics are constantly changing or crumbling, our American flag has a greater dignity, a greater significance, a greater purpose than ever before.

Let me call your attention to this paradoxical statement; that the United States is today the youngest of the great nations on earth, and at the same time it is the oldest continuing Government on earth. Our Constitution and our flag for more than 150 years have remained intact, and the principles that they guarded more than 150 years ago they are still guarding with greater patriotism than ever before. So our flag today represents, in these critical times, our standard of national defense.

I am glad to tell you today that the United States Navy is the most efficient, the most powerful, and the most capable navy in the world. As of January 1, 1941, the United States has 323 combatant ships, consisting of 15 battleships, 6 airplane carriers, 18 heavy cruisers, 19 light cruisers, 85 new destroyers, 78 old destroyers, 37 new submarines, 68 old submarines; in addition to these we have 173 auxiliary vessels, making a grand total of 496 major vessels with many others of every type in process of construction.

The Army now consists of 1,418,000 men. Up till now, the Army has not been fully equipped, but at the present time rifles and machine guns are being manufactured in great quantities. The Army is still, however, short of ammunition and sadly lacking in tanks and all sorts of artillery; there is little antiaircraft and no antitank equipment worth mentioning, but our production is being speeded up at the present time, and with the patriotic wave sweeping over this country, our Army will soon be fully provided with all necessary equipment for the Nation's protection.

No national defense today is adequate with just an army and navy. The European war has taught us fully and completely the value of a sufficient air corps. Under a bill recently passed by the House, 12,856 additional airplanes are provided for the Army. It is the hope of the Department of War that 50,000 airplanes may be maintained in operation. Our Army Air Corps, however, is yet lacking in bombers to train its pilots in handling the complex equipment they would have to fly in case of war.

I desire to call your attention to two things which I think should be remedied. First, is the discrimination which seems to have developed in parts of this country preventing Negroes and other worthy groups, all citizens, from contributing their share to national-defense efforts. This is wrong and should be remedied, as the flag shows no distinction as to race, creed, or color.

The second criticism has been much discussed in Washington and throughout the United States. It is the proposed plan of Secretary Ickes to establish gasless Sundays in our country, apparently in the interest of national defense. I feel sure that the American people would cooperate in the enforcement of this plan, providing the same was wise and necessary, but we are still continuing to sell large quantities of gasoline and oil to Japan and to Russia.

It seems difficult to understand why, if there is such a scarcity of gasoline and oil in this country, we are still selling them to potential enemies like Japan and Russia; to be used by Japan, at least, in her war with China, whom we personally claim to be helping. This is a policy which is so inconsistent that it should not be countenanced by the people of this country. Our Nation is giving aid to China and the democracies, by way of supplies and money, but when we sell oil and gasoline to the enemy of these democracies, we are placing the weapon in their hands with which to defeat the same democracies which we are attempting to aid.

I have visited, in my official capacity, many of the naval air bases, navy yards, cantonments, and other phases of our national defense. Wherever I go I see the American Flag. This flag has never been lowered in disgrace, may it never be lowered in disgrace. It is the purpose of our national-defense program, in its Army, its Navy, and in its Air Corps, to build up a complete and adequate national defense; a national defense that shall be second to none; a national defense that at all times will be able and capable of protecting our country from attack by any foreign foe, in order to preserve every right Americans cherish.

Farm Organization a Bulwark of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, OF ALABAMA

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include a notable address delivered by Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, of Alabama, over a Nation-wide hook-up over the radio, during the National Farm and Home Hour, sponsored by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

While Senator BANKHEAD is a man of many interests, and has rendered distinguished service in many fields, he has contributed more to agricultural legislation than any other man who has ever served in the American Congress. It is not too much to say that but for laws placed on the statute books through Senator BANKHEAD'S indispensable cooperation, cotton would frequently during the last several years have been selling as low as 5 cents a pound; wheat, 30 cents a bushel; and hogs as low as $3 a hundred pounds; and with the buying power of the farm thus depleted, the effect on business and employment and on the country generally can be easily and accurately estimated.

More than any other one man, Senator BANKHEAD is responsible for legislation which, in the last decade, has increased farm income, encouraged farm ownership, assisted in the practical solution of current farm problems, and otherwise contributed to the welfare of the farmer and the Nation. That has been particularly true in the current session as well expressed by President Edward A. O'Neal, of the National Farm Bureau, who said in introducing Senator BANKHEAD:

Like his distinguished father, who preceded him in the Senate, and his great brother, the late Speaker of the House, he has been a stalwart friend of agriculture. Senator BANKHEAD has guided more major farm bills through the United States Senate than any other statesman. Every farmer in the United States owes a debt of gratitude to him for his championship of American agriculture.

The complete text of Senator BANKHEAD'S address follows:

A month ago today the Senate of the United States approved a bill providing for mandatory 85-percent-of-parity loans on the 1941 crops of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco. This loan, coupled with conservation and parity payments which will be made to A. A. A. cooperators, will give producers of these great basic crops a parity price for the first time since the farm depression hit American agriculture in the early twenties.

I rate it as the most important farm legislation yet enacted by any Congress of this Nation. Naturally I am well pleased because of the part I had in its enactment.

This broadcast today is the first appearance of the American Farm Bureau Federation on the National Farm and Home Hour since the President signed the 85-percent-loan bill. It is, therefore, a victory celebration in which I am honored to participate.

Without the vigorous support we received from the American Farm Bureau Federation, especially its able president, Edward A. O'Neal, we probably could not have passed this legislation. My own State Farm Bureau president, Walter L. Randolph, was very helpful, as was Earl Smith, of the Illinois federation, and many other States—north, south, east, and west—which revealed that the farmers of this Nation were united in support of it.

If anyone asks me what the American Farm Bureau Federation has done for agriculture this year, I would answer that through its very active support of the 85-percent-loan bill this splendid organization of farmers operating at the grass roots has materially aided in adding more than $700,000,000 to the income

farmers will receive this year. On the basis of the best estimates that can now be made, it appears that the 85-percent-loan bill will add around $273,000,000 to the income of our wheat producers this year. It will increase cotton income at least $239,000,000, corn income at least $180,000,000, tobacco income by $18,000,000, and rice income $11,000,000. More than 6,000,000 farm families will receive a direct share of this increased farm income.

This money is sorely needed and farmers are entitled to every penny of it, but the additional income is by no means all; this law has renewed hope to farm people and restored a portion of the old dignity enjoyed by farmers. It is a big step in the restoration of the profit motive to agriculture which is highly important.

The 85-percent-loan plan was advocated by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its convention in Baltimore last December, following similar action by the Alabama Farm Bureau 2 months before. From the adjournment of the Baltimore convention until the law was finally signed by the President on May 26, the Farm Bureau left no stone unturned in its efforts to write this plan into law. Never have I seen the power of organized agriculture more strikingly demonstrated or more effectively used.

Congress is in sympathy with the farmers, for Congress realizes that a sound and prosperous agriculture is absolutely essential to our national well-being and the success of our defense program. Faced with a wartime loss of their export markets, huge surpluses, and low prices for farm products on the one hand, and rising industrial prices and wages on the other hand, farmers were rapidly approaching a great disaster.

Congress wanted to do something to prevent this disaster, but Congress was divided. Some Members favored one plan and some favored another. If there had been no one to speak for the farmers of America and tell Congress what farmers wanted, discussion over the merits of various farm plans might have dragged on until it was too late to save agriculture from disaster. Fortunately, however, American farmers did have an organization through which they could speak to Congress with a united voice, and this voice tremendously helped to solidify Congress.

The Farm Bureau prepared some of the economic reports and statistical tables that were needed to explain and justify favorable action on the bill. President O'Neal and State Farm Bureau leaders from all sections of the United States appeared before at least four congressional committees to explain their position and objectives. When the matter finally came to a vote the Farm Bureau sent personal messages to every Member of the Senate and most of the Members of the House urging that they support this legislation to give farmers the parity they have so long sought and to which they are justly entitled.

With farmers from all parts of the country united and supporting a single plan, Congress approved the bill by a vote of 275 to 63 in the House and 75 to 2 in the Senate. This is the most overwhelming approval Congress has ever given a major piece of farm legislation.

I hope that this victory for organized agriculture will give farmers everywhere a new faith in the value of organization; and I hope that it will convince nonmembers of the need for united action and membership on their part.

United through a sound and constructive organization with able, honest, and constructive leadership, farmers can secure fair and just legislation. Without organization the big victory just won will be lost and farmers will return to the position of being the most important but the poorest paid group in our national economy.

Since the earliest history of our Nation, leaders of public thought have recognized the value of organization and the futility of individual effort in solving the problems of agriculture. The individual farmer has been pitted in economic struggle against highly organized and centralized financial, industrial, and labor groups; and under such conditions the individual farmer could but lose.

We have the 85-percent loan law, but only for 1 year. We must make it permanent. To do so, the congressional leaders from farm States will need every bit of support they can get from organized agriculture, and organized agriculture needs every good farmer as a member, for farm organization is a bulwark of our democracy.

In conclusion, let me say that my interest in agriculture is not confined to the welfare of the farmers alone. Speaking in the Senate I pointed out that our capitalistic economy depends for its very existence upon balance—balance between the various groups of our population. If, through tariffs and other Federal legislation, the Government favors industry and labor at the expense of the farmer, the Government must eventually help the farmer, too. Otherwise, we set up a series of disturbances that can be just as disastrous in their effects as interferences with circulation in the human body. If we clog the channels of trade through favoritism to some groups, we tend to cripple the country; we cause arthritis of the economic system.

Parity for agriculture, therefore, is essential to national parity and security. Stated differently, parity for farmers means parity for manufacturers, bankers, and merchants because all are dependent upon agriculture and economic balance. It all comes together in a safe, sound, and prosperous democracy which is our paramount objective.

Again I congratulate the Farm Bureau and urge its officers and members to push forward with their good work.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WORTHINGTON (MINN.) GLOBE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project means much, not only to agriculture but also to the Nation as a whole.

I wish to quote herewith an editorial published in the Worthington Globe, of Worthington, Minn., in support of such seaway construction.

I believe this editorial well expresses the average opinion of the people of the Midwest in relation to this great and worthwhile project:

[From the Worthington (Minn.) Globe]

THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—ONCE AGAIN, POWERFUL EASTERN INTERESTS ARE OPPOSING THIS PROJECT WHICH MIGHT COST THEM FINANCIAL CONTROL OF THE MIDWEST

President Roosevelt's recent revival of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project once more has touched off a storm of criticism from eastern interests.

Politicians, carriers' associations, newspapers and syndicated columnists in the East all have been enlisted in the fight against the proposal.

The Midwest, of course, favors the project because it would provide the key by which this huge land-locked area would be able to win itself cheaper transportation rates and consequently higher profits for its agricultural products.

There is an additional important reason right now why the waterway should be constructed, regardless of the eastern criticism. That is because it will make possible the moving of our shipbuilding industry, so vital to our national defense, to inland centers where it would be less vulnerable to attack from a foreign invader.

The East fears this movement inland as it would imperil its tight hold on the economic life of the Middle West. Yet the east and the west coasts not only are naturally endowed for sea travel but benefited from the building of the Panama Canal, so that they can't logically object to this aid to the Midwest.

There is another reason, too, why the construction of the waterway should not be opposed by the East. It will provide a new source of electric power, which many agree is badly needed in the eastern industrial areas.

Although on first glance it would seem probable that the railroads would oppose the waterway, the statements of the presidents of 10 great roads made at the time the project was proposed indicate they too give it support.

Those roads with eastern termini on the lakes favor the waterway because the low cost of deep water navigation will extend the radius of distribution and develop railroad traffic to and from the ports; increase car efficiency through quicker turn-around and resultant greater earnings per car; recover for these roads a just proportion of the total revenue on interchange traffic; and increase traffic in the territory they serve.

Those reasons are as logical toda, as they were when expressed back in 1925.

On these grounds, it would seem that now is the logical time for construction of this project not only because of its value as a defense move in supplying power and providing new interior shipbuilding facilities but also in promoting production in our great agricultural Midwest.

Ernest Lundeen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this occasion has been set aside to give us the opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of our colleagues who have been called away, with acknowledgment of the frailties of life, and a medium of expression of our sympathies to the loved ones and friends of the departed.

The tragic death of the late Senator LUNDEEN was a shock to the Nation in general and to the State of Minnesota in particular. The high honors which came to him in his lifetime far transcend anything which may be spoken or written

for him today. These honors are a testimonial in themselves of the confidence, affection, and respect entertained for him by the people of Minnesota.

Senator LUNDEEN was twice elected from Minnesota to the House of Representatives and then elected to the United Sates Senate. During that time of service he impressed himself upon his colleagues as a man of loyalty and courage, who fearlessly expressed his views and convictions—a trait much admired by even those who disagreed with him politically.

He was a typical son of the Middle West. Born in South Dakota, he was reared and educated in Minnesota. He achieved success against great odds, which gave him a deeper sense of sympathetic understanding of the problems of the unfortunate; and in all his career he was ever solicitious of the cause of those whom he represented. His interest in legislation was always in that which he believed to be beneficial to the greatest number of people.

Senator LUNDEEN was a veteran of the Spanish-American War and was a Member of the war Congress at the outbreak of the last World War. He voted against this country's entering that war. As a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee he opposed involvement of the United States in the intrigues and entanglements which would take this country into war. He loved his country, and the cause of peace had in him its stanchest advocate.

His devotion to his family was exemplary and his untimely death has taken a kind husband and father from the home which he loved so much. Throughout his long public career he had the devotion, advice, and constant companionship of his splendid and intelligent wife.

His death is a loss to the State, his country, to his family, and to his friends; and we join in sharing the grief of his family and extend to them our deepest sympathy.

He is not dead, but sleeps;
Such souls forever live.

Farm Organization an Indispensable Factor in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. CLARENCE CANNON OF MISSOURI

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered over the radio June 14, 1941, as follows:

We are coming on the air this morning in the first broadcast since the enactment of the farm parity bill. Agriculture is the last of all the industries to win legislation stabilizing income, and the President's signature certifying his approval of this important law climaxes a 20-year battle waged by the farmers of America for their fair share of the national income.

The national income is a big pie from which Uncle Sam cuts a slice for each of his children. Some years the pie has been larger than others, as the national income has increased or decreased. In 1929 the national income was $80,000,000,000. In 1933 it had dropped to $45,000,000,000. This year statisticians predict it will be over $90,000,000,000. So the size of the farmer's piece of pie has varied with the national income—some years larger and some years smaller. But the distressing feature is that for the last 20 years, whether it was large or whether it was small, it has been each year smaller in proportion than the slices received by the other children. Each year industry, labor, mining, transportation, banking, and Uncle Sam's other children have been getting more and more of the pie and the farmer has been getting less and less of the pie. Now, why is this? It is due to the fact that Congress has been passing laws increasing the size of the slices given the other children. Congress passed the fair-trade law, and industry's slice was larger. Congress passed the wage-and-hour law, and labor's slice was larger. Congress passed the coal bill, and mining's slice was larger. Bill after bill has been passed and each bill increased somebody's share of the pie. But you know you cannot give one child a bigger piece of pie without giving some other child a smaller piece of pie. To cut one piece larger, you must cut another piece smaller. And when the others got more pie the farmers always got less.

But now, at last, thanks to Senator BANKHEAD, Senator RUSSELL, and Congressman FULMER, and the members of their committees, and the farm-minded Senators and Congressmen who voted with them; and thanks to President O'Neal, and the Farm Bureau, and especially the loyal, far-sighted members of the Farm Bureau back home on the farms who supported both President O'Neal and the Congressmen—thanks to them all, because all of them had a part in it, and none could have succeeded without the other—thanks to them all, we at last have a law stabilizing agriculture's piece of pie—a law insuring our share of the national income. It is the law we have been working for these 20 years. It prevents cutting the farmer's pie smaller. It increases the size of the farmer's piece of pie to what it was from 1909 to 1914. As a result of this law the price of cotton, which was selling at 9 cents a pound, is today selling at 14 cents per pound. Wheat, which was 68 cents per bushel, is already up to $1.03 a bushel. Corn, which was 59 cents, is now 75 cents. Hogs, which were $5.83, are now $10—all as a direct result of the operation of the new farm law passed by Congress and signed by the President of the United States. And it hasn't hurt the consumer. Wheat has gone from 68 cents to $1.03, and bread is still 10 cents a loaf. Cotton has gone from 9 cents to 14 cents, and no extra charge on a shirt. In fact, it has helped the consumer by helping business, and all business is supported and accelerated by farm buying power.

We have been often told that you can't legislate farm prosperity. But the proof of the pudding is the eating. Here we have a practical and convincing demonstration of the fact that laws will help the farmer as much as they will help labor and industry. Although we have on hand the largest wheat surplus ever known, althcugh there is a cotton surplus in excess of 11,000,000 bales, and notwithstanding we had this year the largest carry-over of corn in the history of the world, this law has legislated 5 cents more per pound into the pockets of the cotton planter, 48 cents more per bushel into the pockets of the wheat grower, and an extra 25 cents per bushel into the pockets of the corn farmer. Farm legislation pays, and pays in cash.

In short, legislation is the only solution of the farm question. Agriculture can never hope to secure fair prices or maintain parity income with other industries in any other way. We must be in position to secure legislation—just as every other industry has already secured legislation—and that brings us to the crux of the whole matter. How can we secure legislation? The answer is simple. We can secure it just as we have secured this law. We can secure it in the same way labor and industry secure it. Through organization—and in no other way. Let us take a leaf out of labor's book. Within my recollection I have never known organized labor to bring any piece of major legislation on the floor of the House which the House did not pass. Why? Because every State and national legislator knows that labor rewards its friends and punishes its enemies—that, regardless of party or partisanship, it supports those who support its legislative program. And until farmers are sufficiently organized to similarly support their legislative programs they cannot hope to secure fair prices or equality of income.

Now, my friends, organization is especially important during the coming year and on until the end of the European conflict. The bill just passed is for one crop season only. It expires next year. It must be made permanent. And still more important, provision must be made to sustain farm prices in the inevitable aftermath which will follow the close of the war. The collapse of farm prices following the close of the World War will be mild in comparison with the crash in farm prices which will follow the close of this war unless permanent and effective laws can be passed to meet the situation.

Vice President Wallace, our former Secretary of Agriculture, who has intimate association with both agriculture and legislation, sounded a stern note of warning yesterday when speaking here in Washington before the national A. A. A. conference, he warned against what he termed "a terrible debacle" for which we must be prepared when peace comes. Beyond the peradventure of a doubt the debacle will come—it will strike with the fury of a cyclone when peace is declared. We have seen it come before and it is certain to come again unless we prepare now to meet it by the enactment of permanent legislation which will maintain farm prices along with industrial prices and union wage scales. We must have votes here in Congress to enact that legislation, and the only way to get them is through your influence—through your cooperation in your local farm organizations. Our government is a representative government. But Congressmen can't represent individual farmers. They have no way of knowing what one busy farmer needs or wants. But as a member of a strong farm organization you can send men here who, like Edward O'Neal, have studied your problems and know your needs and know how to present your case. It is to be regretted that every farmer in America could not have been here these last crucial weeks to follow President O'Neal in his long and strenuous campaign for this bill. It could not have been passed without him and his organization. But the hardest fight is ahead, and he needs more support back in the States—back in the congressional districts. He needs you. We farm Congressmen need you—we need your cooperation and encouragement and support, through your membership in your farm organization. If you are not a member—join now. If already a member, enlist in a membership drive. Bring in every neighbor. In no other practical way can you contribute so much to your own income and your family's standard of living as by building up your home farm organizations and backing their efforts to give you parity

prices and protect agriculture in the trying days ahead.

And in no other way can you render a more unselfish service to the Nation. Depressions do not stop with the farmer. They start with the farmer—as they started with him at the close of the last war. But once started they sweep on until they engulf every business in the land. In supporting legislation to maintain farm prices and farm buying power, you are serving not only your own family and your own community and all businessmen dependent on farm patronage, but you are protecting your State and Nation against a paralyzing depression that is as certain as death and taxes unless the farm organizations of America are strong enough to meet the challenge. And whether they are strong enough depends on you and your neighbors. It is your responsibility and your opportunity. As Ed O'Neal would say, God bless you. You've got a big job on your hands. And it's your job.

Amendment to Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the House today—the purpose of which is to amend the Farm Marketing Quota Act, by striking out the penalty of 50 percent of the loan value of wheat and restoring a straight penalty of 15 cents per bushel.

The Department of Agriculture, in compliance with the act recently passed by Congress, providing for a loan of 85 percent of the parity price—placed the loan value at 98 cents per bushel on wheat produced in compliance with the marketing quota. Wheat not under the quota will carry a loan of about 58 cents per bushel.

I think the penalty of 49 cents per bushel is too drastic. Wheat in the Middle West is now selling for about 80 cents per bushel. It is clear that wheat in excess of the program is therefore penalized about 60 percent of its present market value. I believe this is out of line and hardly think Congress intended to impose such a severe penalty. I am informed that a great many farmers who voted for the quotas did not understand that these penalties would be so drastic.

When the wheat crop was planted the law provided for a penalty of 15 cents per bushel on excess wheat. This provision was in effect until it was changed on May 29 of this year. Farmers had a reasonable right to assume that such penalty would prevail until the crops were harvested. I do not think a penalty amounting to 300 percent of that originally provided should have been imposed at such late date.

I realize that the farmers by a large majority agreed to comply with this legislation immediately after the law was passed. Even at that, the passage of such retroactive legislation does not seem justifiable under the circumstances. The penalties should not have been so excessively increased on this year's wheat crop.

If the farmers want crop control, certain penalties must be provided and those who restrict their acreage and stay within the program are entitled to benefits not shared by those on the outside. I believe, however, that since a loan on wheat of 98 cents per bushel for cooperators has been established we should not go to such an extreme as to penalize the grower of excess wheat to the extent of 60 percent of its market value.

N. Y. A. Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

ARTICLE BY JAMES N. BLISSELL, CITY EDITOR, LIMA (OHIO) NEWS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I insert the column of James N Blissell, city editor of the Lima News, of Lima, Ohio, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the membership may see Mr. Blissell's observations of the N. Y. A. in Lima. I am sure the membership will be glad to have this report from a fearless, patriotic American editor on this important subject:

(By Jim Blissell, city editor, the Lima (Ohio) News)

Economists use many barometers in gaging the trend of business, such as bank debits, car loadings, sales-tax receipts, electric-power output, etc. Among the newer barometers of recent years have been the W. P. A. rolls and the number of persons on relief.

With business and industry literally crying for help, decided drops have been noted in relief cases and in many instances the W. P. A. has reported that completion of some projects was being delayed because of a labor shortage. The reduction of 43 percent in W. P. A. personnel ordered last week is welcome news. First and foremost, it indicates that industry is absorbing many able-bodied men. Now all that needs be accomplished to meet the back-breaking efforts of private enterprise will be some common sense in the administration of Government programs such as W. P. A. and N. Y. A.

The whole socialistic scheme of things makes the blood of the average American boil. Last week this pillar speculated upon a rumored $75,000 building program here by N. Y. A. to retain workers for defense industries.

It was officially stated from Columbus headquarters that N. Y. A. proposes 10 such buildings throughout Ohio to train 3,000 workers. Official N. Y. A. news releases, with elaborate photographic displays, say the shops will train machinists, sheet-metal fabricators, welders, short-wave-radio assemblers, operators, etc.

Certainly some of the "bull of the woods" machinists who spent years at the bench learning a trade and earning the right to carry a journeyman's card must smile up their sleeves when they learn of the plan to turn out machinists in batches from N. Y. A. schools.

The whole proposition looks from where we sit as just another "make work" program of New Deal visionaries, who shed crocodile tears for sacrifices on the one hand and do a "Coal Oil Johnny" on the other with taxpayers' money.

BIG EXPANSION WORK UNDERWAY

Certainly the starry-eyed visionaries can point to the reduction in W. P. A. rolls, but how about the National Youth Administration? Workmen last week were knocking out partitions in the Dominion Building for a further expansion of N. Y. A. activities there. Some of the N. Y. A. workers who were getting "field training" putting in a new store front in the room on the first floor of the city building were just bubbling over with inertia as they listened to a portable radio on the job blasting forth with Beat Me Daddy, Eight to the Bar, and other jitterbug numbers calculated to inspire men to lofty and noble efforts.

To many the appearance of a radio on such a job might be comparable with the agricultural experiments of years ago when it was found that old Bossy gave more milk when sweet strains of My Darling Nellie Gray were wafted on the evening breeze. To others it is indicative of the like-it-and-be-damned attitude so familiar with those heading up these experimental and costly programs.

Housewives in the Lakewood Avenue sector, where the resident training center is located, inform us that after the girls are given training, many refuse to accept work. One specific case was reported where a girl did take a job for 2 days. During that time she informed the lady of the house that Mr. —— told her, "She wouldn't have to work." She elucidated further that after a 30-day training period the girls are permitted to go home, remain away a month, and return for another 30-day period. This particular young lady, our informant added, admitted to doing nine hitches at the training center.

For the length of time that the program has been in operation, it seems fair to assume that certainly all the potential recipients have been trained in some work or other. As a matter of fact, if this were not the case, the barrage of publicity constantly released by N. Y. A. citing the glories and advantages of the program would be needless.

This latest craze for spending and experimenting is economically unsound on its very surface. In the first place, it presupposes that in not 1 of the 10 cities where buildings are to be erected is there a suitable structure that might be rented. Oh, no. That would never do. As is the case in Lima, hundreds and hundreds of square feet of floor space must be utilized, high rents paid, old tenants displaced for expansion, and juicy leases signed; then, on top of it all, the N. Y. A. will erect buildings itself.

One wonders what would be the reaction were some of these trained program directors and their satellites asked to clean up Hog Creek or the city dump for the same money they are receiving for riding about in station wagons and doling out salt tablets to stenographers.

One wonders the reaction of workmen who will stand side by side with graduates of training schools, the cost of which they have to help pay. The workmen stand to be displaced by the very men whose basic training they paid for.

Industry has not been asleep at the wheel. It would be interesting to know how much in dollars and cents and man-hours it has cost the Lima Locomotive Works, Inc., and Westinghouse, for example, right here in Lima, to train workmen in the past 6 months to a year.

You can bet that the men at the head of these industries are not going to take any N. Y. A. trained short-course machinist and put him to work on valuable jobs without first retraining him in their own methods and on their own equipment.

Another angle which the N. Y. A. propagandists and program planners seem to have overlooked is the availability of machines on which to train their machinists. Every milling machine, drill press, lathe, shaper, etc., in any kind of running order will bring top prices today. Where does N. Y. A. hope to get the equipment for the boys to play with for several months as they tinker and listen to radios?

Several of the big moguls of N. Y. A. hereabout have wondered out loud why this corner is not sympathetic to the program and statements that have been heard that our information was wrong and figures misquoted and misconstrued.

RECORDS WILL TELL THE STORY

If that be the case, we make this proposition: Let some disinterested person examine the records of the N. Y. A. here and let officials give explanations for every question asked and we will print what the probe does reveal and let Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer be the judge of the worth of the program.

We have contended from the start that this youth movement is a hotbed for deep thinkers and left wingers. It might be well for the Dies committee to spend a little time looking into the background of some of the leaders, utilizing some of the $100,000 which Congressman BOB JONES' insistence made available to investigate members of subversive organizations who are on the Government pay roll.

The warning that the dangers from within are more pernicious and real right now than the dangers from without cannot be reiterated too often.

As Edwin Markham, poet and prophetic genius, phrased it:

"I fear the vermin that shall undermine
Senate and school and citadel and shrine;
The worm of fraud, the fatted worm of ease,
And all the crawling progeny of these.
I fear the vermin that shall honeycomb the towers
And walls of state in unsuspecting hours."

Labor and the National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF GEORGE MEANY, SECRETARY-TREASURER OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Mr. George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, on labor and the national emergency delivered June 24:

The organized workers of America carry on their shoulders a tremendous burden of responsibility during the present national emergency.

Our job is to cooperate to the very limit with our National Government in its defense efforts and, at the same time, preserve to the workers of a future America the ways of democracy so essential to industrial advancement and social progress.

The decision of Adolf Hitler bringing Germany into open conflict with her former partner, Communist Russia, in no way lessens the need for America to speedily prepare as never before to fight for her life in a world dominated by force.

Optimists may look upon this new phase of the European conflict as a stroke of good fortune for the democracies in that the pressure on the British may be eased somewhat while Germany is engaged on its eastern front. However, who is there who can say with authority that Hitler will not have full control of the vast resources of Soviet Russia within a very short space of time? If and when this happens, England and America and those who believe in England and America will face a situation graver by far than that which we have faced up to now.

No matter what disagreement there may be among Americans as to what our attitude should be toward this latest development, as to what our attitude should be toward the general European picture, there can be no disagreement as to the purpose of Hitler: World domination achieved by force.

Nor can there be any disagreement among thinking citizens of our country who sincerely believe in our way of life that America cannot long survive as a free nation, governed by the democratic methods of a free people, in a world dominated by Hitler.

No organization in America has a longer record of hostility to Adolf Hitler and his hateful system than has the American Federation of Labor.

Eight full years ago, a long, long time before the people of our country achieved such a virtual unanimity as now exists on the subject, the American Federation of Labor saw Hitlerism for what it was and denounced it repeatedly in the most vigorous language.

I point these things out to give you the background of the American Federation of Labor's forthright opposition to totalitarianism of all types going back over a period of many years.

It is also appropriate to point out at this time that the American Federation of Labor, which demonstrated its patriotism in 1917 and 1918 by its sacrifices and service to the Nation, continues to be the patriotic organization which it has been from the day of its birth 60 years ago.

A little more than a year ago our national Government launched the national-defense program, designed to make our country so strong that no dictator or combination of dictators could succeed in any attempt to destroy our democracy. As an integral part of our national-defense policy, our Government decided that it would give aid to Great Britain and to other nations resisting the Nazis. The United States launched a program of production of tanks, and guns, and planes, and munitions calling for the expenditure of many billions of dollars.

Huge sums were appropriated for the construction of cantonments for our new Army, as well as for the construction of naval air training stations, new factories and plants for the production of the tools without which our Nation could not consider itself safe.

From that day last spring when our national-defense program was launched by the Government of the United States until this very moment—right now—the American Federation of Labor has been giving its most wholehearted support and cooperation to the great effort.

I cannot speak for other organizations but, so far as the American Federation of Labor is concerned, this is where we have stood from the very outset of the national-defense program, and this is where we stand today.

The 5,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor are workers who realize that they cannot be good trade-unionists unless they are, first of all, good citizens. Realizing that, we have been giving, are giving, and will continue to give to our national Government the most unstinting type of cooperation.

In the last few months we have all seen headlines by the hundreds in which the word "strike" has appeared. We have seen the essays of columnists and the writings of the men who compose the editorials, all seeking to give the impression that labor is striking left and right and impeding the national-defense program.

Contrary to the impression that might be gained from the headlines, columns, and editorials, all the workers of America are not on strike, nor are they all about to go on strike. As an actual fact, millions of organized American workers—members of thousands of trade-unions—are plugging away, day in and day out, giving their very best to the defense effort.

The facts prove that, so far as the American Federation of Labor is concerned, the unions affiliated with our movement have turned in one of the finest pieces of cooperation in all history.

Let us take a look at the War Department's and the Navy Department's building construction programs in which, as everybody knows, the workers involved have been A. F. of L. members. Secretary of War Stimson recently issued a very interesting report. This report dealt with the $1,200,000,000 cantonment construction program of the War Department.

Did the building trades of the A. F. of L. impede the cantonment construction program? The report of Secretary Stimson supplies the answer. The answer is this: Out of a total of 40,607,000 man-days worked on the cantonment program, only 14,875 man-days were lost as a result of labor difficulties.

This percentage of delay was so small that it amounted to only three one-hundredths of 1 percent.

Is this cooperation? Of course it is. I have no desire to make invidious comparisons, but in view of the vicious attacks which have been made upon organized labor it is only fair to point out that neither industry nor any other part of the national community can point to a record of cooperation surpassing—or, for that matter, even approaching—that of the building trades unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor which I have just cited.

On the Navy's air training station and other building construction, the story is much the same. The records of the Building and Construction Trades Department reveal that there was only one stoppage. This was in Boston and it was ended within 2 days.

Now, of course, there is much more to the defense program than just construction work. In the factories and the mills we are turning out a thousand and one different articles in staggering numbers. In this regard the record shows that, taking all defense work from the start of the program through the end of last month, only one man-day of work has been lost by an American Federation of Labor strike for every 2,400 man-days of work performed. Translated into percentage terms, that means that only one twenty-fourth of 1 percent of defense-work time was lost.

Notwithstanding this almost 100-percent record of avoidance of production stoppages, the American Federation of Labor is not satisfied. On May 28, immediately after the President's declaration of an unlimited national emergency, the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor renewed its pledge to avoid strikes, to use to the full the facilities of the United States Conciliation Service and the National Defense Mediation Board and went even further than that. The executive council called upon every union affiliated with the American Federation of

Labor to refrain for any reason whatsoever from calling a strike interfering with national-defense production until full opportunity has first been given to the Conciliation Service and the Mediation Board to bring about a peaceful settlement.

Despite the low wages which some employers have insisted upon paying while themselves making enormous profits, despite the refusal of some employers to obey the National Labor Relations Act—in short, despite the fact that workers in controversy with employers usually have legitimate grievances—the American Federation of Labor recognizes that we are not living in normal times. We realize that we must make sacrifices.

Therefore, the American Federation of Labor is requiring its affiliates to forego strikes and to submit their grievances to the National Defense Mediation Board—a board, incidentally, whose establishment was first recommended by the American Federation of Labor.

The Mediation Board has been doing and is doing a splendid job of adjusting labor-management controversies in a fair and expeditious manner. Our unions have been cooperating wholeheartedly with the Mediation Board and will continue to cooperate wholeheartedly with it.

Despite this splendid record of cooperation, we find today that the rights and freedom of the 5,000,000 patriotic American workers in the American Federation of Labor are threatened, right here at home, by the forces of reaction within our own land.

There are today proposals before Congress which are viciously antilabor, which are viciously antidemocratic and which, if enacted, would carry us a long way toward the Hitlerism we are supposed to be preparing to protect ourselves against. These proposals would give Congress the right to compel workers to work without their consent.

Recently there were several strikes which were obviously not designed to benefit the workers. These strikes, on the contrary, were designed to give aid and comfort to those who would destroy our system of government.

One of these strikes was engineered by known Communists and constituted a deliberate attempt to sabotage the national-defense program. This challenge the Government could not ignore and was therefore compelled to resort to strong measures.

As a result of this case and a very few similar cases, some Members of Congress are displaying an almost hysterical determination to place repressive antilabor legislation on the statute books. They do not seem to realize that this is no time to attempt to punish all labor for the sins of a few individuals.

Neither do they seem to realize that the enactment of such unfair legislation—legislation seeking to establish in this democratic Nation a totalitarian principle precisely like those enunciated by Hitler and his gang—would cause terrific resentment and bring about a condition of utter chaos in industry.

Voluntary avoidance of work stoppages is one thing, and, in view of the national crisis, acceptable to the overwhelming majority of American workers. Compulsory servitude, in flagrant disregard of the thirteenth amendment to our Constitution outlawing slavery for all time, is quite another thing and—to be quite blunt about it—would not be tolerated by the American people.

A compulsory servitude law—and no matter how lavish their sponsors may be in the use of sugar coating, that is just exactly what these bills before Congress call for—could not possibly be enforced without the extreme use of police power, and probably not then.

The great national effort in which we are now engaged calls for a spirit of national unity based on the fundamental principles of the democracy in which we all share a common vital interest. We cannot defend that democracy by methods which are repulsive to all who cherish liberty nor by methods which, by their very nature, destroy democracy itself.

This does not mean that the American Federation of Labor recommends strikes in this time of critical national emergency. As I have pointed out in some detail, the position of the American Federation of Labor is quite the contrary. The position of the American Federation of Labor in this hour of crisis is that even wholly legitimate strikes must be avoided if it is humanly possible to do so.

President Roosevelt, in describing the grave dangers which confront our Nation, did not exaggerate. The situation is an extremely menacing one. On this there can be no division—no disagreement.

Organized labor, as represented by the American Federation of Labor, stands foursquare behind the President of the United States. Organized labor knows better perhaps than any other group of citizens what happens to the liberties which we cherish when democracy goes under and totalitarianism comes into power.

The need of the hour is for national unity. Sound management, constructive liberal government and free, loyal labor—all must unite in this effort. We must work and, what is more important, we must work together.

It is for this reason that legislation designed to punish the workers of America because of the sins of a few obstructionists is so very undesirable. Were such legislation ever to go on the statute books of our country, our national unity would be torn to tatters and Adolf Hitler, without having fired a shot, would have won his greatest victory.

Not in any narrow spirit but with the welfare of our country at heart, the American Federation of Labor urges with all emphasis that compulsory servitude legislation ought not to be and must not be enacted.

Our Vital Need for Defense—Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, OF IDAHO, AND OFFICIALS OF ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of Congress, I have secured permission to extend my remarks and include a letter received from the local representative of the Aluminum Co. of America and the statement of Vice President I. W. Wilson concerning the policy and operation of his company, the Alcoa, which I insert in the RECORD with my reply to Mr. Hall's letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1941.

Mr. ARTHUR P. HALL,
Aluminum Co. of America,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR HALL: Your courtesy in supplying me with copy of the statement of Vice President Wilson of your company outling the situation affecting the production of aluminum and the activities of your company which accompanied your letter of June 16 is appreciated.

I am sure the Alcoa is deeply concerned with defense of our country and would not with direct intention restrain the production and manufacture of the vitally essential product to our national defense—aluminum—but the record of your company in establishing and maintaining the prices of aluminum by curtailing production for its especial advantage is open to question as to the subversive effect on the national economy and in the present emergency is detrimental to the public welfare.

With the people of our Nation burdened with business conditions that are operating to increase the national debt and endanger our national economy and the security of our system of government, a grave situation intensified by the growing danger to our national defense, there can be no temporizing with the policies and practices on the part of a private company that brought about the condition in the aluminum industry your letter and the accompanying article attempt to explain. What is said of the aluminum industry and the activities of the Alcoa can be said of the monopolistic companies in all other lines of manufacture and distribution, a trend that if carried to its ultimate conclusion will result in wrecking our national economy and the final destruction of the very companies now operating to secure and retain for themselves unfair advantages at the expense of the producers in this country engaged in our great basic industries, namely, agriculture, mining, lumbering, and fisheries.

No; Mr. Hall, we—you and I—must use our influence to reverse the monopolistic trend and protect the broad principles of unfettered competition that the law of supply and demand can come into full play to restore and establish a parity between the prices of the products of our basic industries and the manufactured necessities used by the people engaged in these industries. Let's join hands in securing the enforcement in spirit and in fact of the Sherman antitrust law.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1941.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: There have been so many misrepresentations as to what the Aluminum Co. of America is doing now and arranging to do in the near future to uphold the President and the Congress in the defense program that I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith a statement made on behalf of the company by its vice president, Mr. I. W. Wilson, before the Truman committee of the Senate on Tuesday, June 17, 1941.

You will be interested in this because the production of aluminum is so vital at this time and you will want to know the facts regarding the situation.

If there is any further information that we can give you as to the past, present, and future production program of the Aluminum Co. of America, we will be very glad to give you any and all information that you may at any time desire.

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR P. HALL.

STATEMENT OF I. W. WILSON, VICE PRESIDENT IN CHARGE OF OPERATIONS, ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

At the hearing Monday, Secretary Ickes made statements challenging the good faith of the Aluminum Co. of America in its efforts to aid in this country's defense program. We welcome the opportunity to refute these accusations and we believe that when the facts are known no fair-minded person can fail to agree that the Aluminum Co. has done everything within its power, and more, probably than any other corporation in the United States to uphold the President and the Congress in building up our defenses.

We first want to tell this committee some of the details of what this company has done, and is doing, to increase its production of aluminum.

In 1938, when our plants produced 286,881,690 pounds of aluminum, and our total shipments were only 175,525,773 pounds, the Aluminum Co. of America finished the year with an inventory of 277,538,066 pounds of aluminum, or more aluminum than normally would be used in a year.

As late as April 3, 1939, Congress had only authorized the Navy to build 3,000 planes, and the Army 6,000. Such a program required no expansion of production facilities, particularly when the Aluminum Co. of America already had more than a year's supply of metal on hand. Yet, late in 1938, the company did inaugurate a program which, with the additions since made to it, calls for a capital expenditure of over $200,000,000 of the company's money, and which has resulted in an increase in the number of its employees from 25,000 to about 50,000.

The Aluminum Co. of America is now producing well over double the amount of aluminum produced in 1938 and when its present program is completed the production of 1938 will be almost tripled. The expansion of the production of aluminum is not as simple a matter as is the expansion of many other industries. As this committee is well aware, the production of aluminum requires enormous quantities of electric power. It takes not only large sums of money, but many years to build the extensive hydroelectric developments necessary to get blocks of power in the magnitude required. An aluminum plant without electric power is useless.

In addition to the acquisition of the needed power, this increase in the production of aluminum has already required the doubling of the production of alumina, the tripling of the steamship tonnage used to bring bauxite from South America to this country, and the doubling of the production of bauxite as well. A further expansion of all these facilities is a necessary part of the existing program.

This expansion included large additional facilities for manufacturing fabricated forms. Within a few months the company's capacity to produce strong alloy sheet and extruded shapes will be 6 times that of the beginning of 1938, while our ability to produce aluminum forgings will be 16 times that of the beginning of 1938. All of these products are of vital interest to the aircraft industry.

An inquiry has been made concerning the Aluminum Co.'s attitude with respect to the Fontana power project which will require 3 years to complete. Some months ago a declaration of intention was filed with the Federal Power Commission for this project in the belief that the Commission would not require a Federal license. Such a license permits the Government to take over the project at the end of the license period on terms that might be confiscatory. The Commission, however, made a ruling that would necessitate taking out such a license.

The company felt then, and still feels, that in the light of its other huge expenditures for the defense program, it cannot, with proper regard for its financial stability, put up its own money to develop this project in the face of the Government's power to take over the property at the end of the license period. Notwithstanding this feeling, the Aluminum Co. has informed O. P. M., and also T. V. A., that it stands ready to take out a license and develop this project if the Government will assist in financing the development; or the company will sell the project to T. V. A. so that Authority may develop it; or, if neither of these alternatives is acceptable, the company is ready to cooperate in any other way that will make the power from this development available for the production of aluminum. The company now reiterates that position. This matter is, and for sometime past has been, under consideration by Government agencies, and the Aluminum Co. is ready to proceed in any manner that they may determine.

We have been criticized on the theory that estimates by various governmental agencies were in some way mistakes attributable to the Aluminum Co. of America. This we emphatically deny.

Many of the things that have been said before this committee concerning aluminum seem to be based on the assumption that it is the function of a private industrial corporation—in this case the Aluminum Co. of America—to estimate not only what it will produce to meet the defense needs of the United States but also to set itself up as an authority for what those needs are. Under this assumption we should not only have been able to tell how much aluminum will be required, for instance, to build the number of airplanes needed to defend the democracies but to forecast how many of these planes will be needed.

We have not presumed to tell Congress, the Army, or the Navy how many planes are needed for defense. Our function as to forecasts is, and can only be, to tell what we will produce, and how far we can expand under the instructions and requests of the Government, and then to produce such aluminum. There has never been a single month when we have not exceeded the amounts of such forecasts.

We understand that the present estimates of O. P. M. call for the production in this country of at least 1,400,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. Last October the Defense Commission advised the company that it should increase its production by an additional 100,000,000 pounds per year, or, thus, to a total of 850,000,000 pounds per year. The company thereupon submitted to the Defense Commission a program of further expansion which would have increased production by more than 100,000,000 pounds per year within a period of from 6 to 8 months. Since then O. P. M. has been advised by the company, again and again, that if O. P. M. would procure the necessary electrical power the company would increase production by such further amounts as the Government wishes. But it has not yet, to this very hour, been possible to determine at what place, or in what amounts, electrical power will be made available, and until this is known the company cannot proceed with the construction of the necessary plants in which to produce the additional aluminum desired by the Government.

Mr. Ickes stated Monday to this committee: "I have a profound conviction that the Aluminum Co. of America would prevent the necessary expansion of our aluminum manufacturing facilities, regardless of the consequences to the country or the world, in order to get them all within its own domination and control." He further stated, referring to the Aluminum Co. of America, "It did its damnedest to prevent us from making this contract for power with the Reynolds Metals Co."

We want to state without reservation that the Aluminum Co. has no desire to prevent the necessary expansion of the aluminum manufacturing facilities in this country, or to get them all within its domination and control. We are interested in but one thing: That there be sufficient aluminum produced to meet the defense needs of our country. Furthermore, the Aluminum Co. has never in any way done anything to make it difficult for the Reynolds Metals Co., or anyone else, to go into the aluminum business, and has never endeavored to prevent the Reynolds Metals Co. from obtaining power.

The company has no desire to use the present emergency for the purpose of increasing its own position in the industry. This is shown by the fact that the company has repeatedly offered to put all of its technical resources at the Government's command, to design and build plants for Government operation, if it so desires, and to furnish the technical staff to make this possible or, if the Government prefers, to operate for the Government under a management arrangement. The company has also offered to use its own resources, as far as they will go, in financing any expansion program adopted by the Government, in addition to the $200,000,000 it has already used for expansion. No company could offer to do more.

Monday Secretary Ickes referred to a request of February 4 from O. P. M. for an additional 65,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power, and explained why he would not allot it to the Aluminum Co. He also said that later he was again asked to allot 65,000 kilowatts of additional power to the Aluminum Co. and gave another explanation as to why he would not do that. Secretary Ickes failed to point out and perhaps he did not know that the Aluminum Co. has continuously, over the last 6 months or more, told the governmental agencies that it would make all the aluminum for which power could be obtained.

In the face of that record; in the face of the fact that the Aluminum Co. has already doubled and will shortly triple its 1938 output; and in the face of the further fact that the Aluminum Co. is spending over $200,000,000 of its own money to advance defense, it is hard to understand how Secretary Ickes could state to this committee Monday that, "when the story of this war comes to be written, it may have to be written that it was lost because of the recalcitrance of the Aluminum Co. of America."

Secretary Ickes may know how wars are lost, but you gentlemen know that wars are won by using as quickly as possible every available resource for the production of war materials.

Allegations have been made that the Aluminum Co. of America is a monopoly and is a party to agreements with various foreign companies, or foreign agencies, under which it is claimed production of aluminum has been restricted in this country. These and other similar questions are now pending in the courts against the company and its officers. In view of the fact that these suits are still unadjudicated we feel constrained to remain silent in the face of these charges, believing it to be improper to discuss, or make any representations, publicly regarding matters which are still pending before the courts for decision. Suffice it to say that all of the principal officers of the company have vigorously denied that any such agreements exist, and they likewise have denied such charges are justified. I can assure you that it is no easy matter to be compelled to keep quiet in the face of charges that we regard as unfounded, but the proprieties of the situation have unfortunately made this necessary.

The Aluminum Co. of America was the first company in the world ever to produce aluminum at a price which brought it into commercial use. It pioneered the industry. It is still the foremost company in the aluminum industry, in spite of the fact that it has had the most severe competition from foreign companies, at least one of which is Government-owned.

The Aluminum Co. of America has given the United States leadership in this industry, both from the standpoint of knowledge and technique, as well as quality of product. Until Germany came into the fruition of its enormous armament program in 1939, the productive capacity in the United States was the greatest of any country in the world. In pioneering this industry, the principal job of the Aluminum Co. of America has been to find new uses for the metal. The problem of the company, therefore, has heretofore been not the production of aluminum but the finding of people who would buy the metal and use it.

Let me assure you gentlemen that the sole desire of the Aluminum Co. of America is to be allowed to use its every resource in the production of aluminum for the defense of the country. We urge that we be allowed to do so.

American Agriculture Unified in National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY EDWARD A. O'NEAL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in concluding the National Farm and Home Hour program over the radio Saturday, June 14, 1941.

President O'Neal said:

It is indeed a joy to those of us who have been fighting for farmers over the years to hear tributes to our Farm Bureau organization such as those which have been paid it today by Senator BANKHEAD and Congressman CANNON. In all the years that I have been working for agricultural equality I have never heard more forthright statements on the necessity of farm organization. I am deepiy touched by the tribute they have paid my organization.

I hope the farmers of America will heed the good advice given by these two distinguished leaders of the Congress, who know whereof they speak. Through organization and with their leadership we are making progress in our long struggle to bring about a fair balance between agriculture, labor, and industry, the three great groups that make up our Nation. I believe the overwhelming majority by which Congress recently passed our commodity loan bill, which will give farmers parity for the first time in more than 20 years, is a clear indication that the people of this country are beginning to recognize the place of agriculture in our national economy.

We are going to press forward until we get a permanent farm program that will assure farmers of full parity every year on all of their crops, both basic and nonbasic. In this endeavor I know that we shall have the sympathy of both Congress and the President of the United States. After signing the loan bill the President wrote me a letter in which he said: "I know that I may count on your assistance and that of your organization in bringing about the necessary changes to strengthen the present farm program so that the objectives of parity for agriculture may be reached and held."

Farmers, I'm sure, are delighted to receive this evidence of the President's reliance on farm organization and his strong desire to reach the parity goal—a goal from which the American Farm Bureau Federation has never wavered. Congress has certainly shown its overwhelming desire to restore farmers to parity, and farmers are deeply grateful.

To the farmers of America I want to say that in a highly organized democracy such as we live in today, the objective of parity can only be accomplished through organization. Unity must be our watchword and we must demonstrate our unity through membership in strong, independent farm organizations. I am happy to say that a great deal of unity already exists between our great national farm organizations. Last week 15 representatives from each of our big 3 farm organizations—the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the American Farm Bureau Federation—met in Chicago to draft a statement of policy for agriculture in the national emergency. This statement, which expresses the views of the great majority of the farmers of the United States seems so significant to me that I am going to read it as the concluding part of my remarks.

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF FARM CONFERENCE ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

"Agriculture recognizes the seriousness of the present national and international situation affecting the lives, liberties, and security of all our citizens, our democratic ideals and institutions.

"During this acute emergency it is imperative that we have national unity and a willingness to toil and sacrifice on the part of all citizens and all economic groups. We have already demanded of our boys that they make heavy sacrifices. This is no time for any group, whether in industry, labor, or agriculture, to seek a selfish advantage.

"True patriotism and the security of all demand that all groups should contribute their utmost to produce everything essential to national defense with maximum speed and efficiency. Adequate defense requires that there be no stoppage or delay in production and distribution of essential materials or services in industry or agriculture. National safety demands that immediate action be taken to provide adequate means for continuing operations whenever disputes arise, until differences are composed. We recognize the rights of labor and agriculture to organize and to bargain collectively, but the emergency requires immediate, effective authority and action to eliminate all acts or threats of violence, destruction of property, intimidation, coercion, and illegal collusive practices whether in industry, labor, or agriculture.

"The production of food and fiber is essential as a part of the defense program. Agriculture, therefore, is as vital an arm of national defense as any industry engaged in the production of war materials. Agriculture must be accorded equal recognition with industry and labor, and be properly represented on all national-defense agencies by persons who are familiar with agricultural problems and who have the approval of national farm organizations.

"The emergency requires that personal and group selfishness be subordinated to the common good. Therefore, it is in the interest of all the people to develop and maintain a fair economic balance between farm prices, industrial prices, and the wages of labor on a level that will assure the maximum production and consumption of goods and services. Wherever price controls are applied, they must conform to this fundamental principle.

"In order to prevent dangerous inflation and an undue accumulation of debts as a result of the enormous expenditures for national defense, we urge that, insofar as practicable, the costs of the defense program be paid from current income. This requires a tax program with a broad base, in which everyone will take part in accordance with ability to pay. In this emergency all unwarranted profits of industry, labor, and agriculture, should be recaptured by appropriate taxation to help pay the cost of the defense program.

"In order to avoid undue centralization of governmental control and to safeguard the welfare of agriculture as a vital arm of national defense, it is imperative that farmer participation and farmer control be strengthened in all national agricultural programs, that all unsympathetic influences be eliminated from agencies set up to serve agriculture, and that, in line with congressional policy, such agencies be directed to recognize and encourage farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives and other organized farm groups.

"To the attainment of these objectives we pledge to the President and the Congress of the United States our fullest cooperation and support and to that end we request our executive officers to constitute a committee to take whatever action may be necessary to effectuate this program." (Chicago, Ill., June 5, 1941.)

What Is Behind Sudden Move To Beat Down Prices of the Necessities of Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during the past several days rumors have been afloat about the Capitol that a strong effort will be made by some of those Members of Congress representing industrial centers to fix the price of all farm commodities. It is also rumored that legislation is now in the making and will actually be presented here during the next few weeks to give Mr. Leon Henderson, Commissioner, Division of Price Stabilization, Office for Emergency Management, power to fix the prices of all the products of the farm.

For some time very few Members of Congress gave any credence whatever to such reports. The proposal is, of course, absurd. However, the rumor has been so persistent that I cannot refrain from expressing my opposition to any such proposed legislation now or in the future.

What seems to be a forerunner of this drastic proposed legislation is a resolution sponsored by the able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life, to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives.

Just what the author has in mind or considers the necessities of life is, of course, a matter of conjecture. It cannot be denied, however, that the farmers of the country who till the soil from morning until night, year in and year out, furnish the necessities of life. They certainly furnish all food and clothing to peoples of all classes everywhere. Food and clothing must be admitted to be the two most essential necessities of life. Therefore it is only fair to suggest that this resolution is aimed primarily at the farmer. It might be well to consider just what is behind this sudden desire of some to investigate and, if possible, beat down prices of the necessities of life.

All of us know that for the past dozen years the farmer has been producing the necessities of life considerably below the actual cost of production, and now that a few commodities and some livestock have recently risen slightly above parity, a few of our professed friends from the industrial sections of the East have become very much alarmed. They seem fearful lest the farmer might at last secure a reasonable profit above his actual cost of production for some of his farm commodities that make up the necessities of life.

I note also that in section 2 of this same resolution describing the duties of the proposed committee that "it shall investigate the problems facing the purchases of goods in the markets of the country."

I cannot support such a resolution at this time, nor any of the similar resolutions and bills that are to follow, which I have every reason to believe is to be aimed at agriculture. If a committee of Congressmen is to be appointed to investigate any wrongdoing, I shall insist that the resolution be broadened to include more than a mere investigation of the necessities of life and the purchase of goods in the markets of this country. Certainly any resolution should be broad enough to investigate profiteers who are taking advantage of the present emergency for their own personal gain. There is no use fooling ourselves there is a lot of profiteering going on at this time. Why not have a real congressional investigation of every phase of profiteering? Why not find out why some of the shoe manufacturers have taken advantage of the present emergency to raise the price of shoes sold to the Army more than 33⅓ percent? We might investigate the raincoat and overcoat manufacturers and those persons and concerns who are securing contracts of various kinds under the national-defense program. We might do well to investigate certain of the $1 per year "patriots," some of whom are reported to be interested in Government contracts. Let us see that all profiteers and would-be profiteers get a good, sound investigation.

Another thing Congress might well investigate is the price of everything the farmer must purchase to be used on the farm. The farmer would like to know why the price of his binder, plow, cultivator, mower, rake, and hoe—in fact, all of his farm machinery—has increased from 25 to 50 percent during the past few months. Let us make the investigation thorough. Surely the things that the farmer is compelled to buy in order to make a respectable living and feed the world should come under the caption of necessities of life.

American Farm Bureau, American Federation of Labor, and National Catholic Welfare Conference Express Support for House Joint Resolutions 59 and 76

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

STATEMENTS OF EDWARD A. O'NEAL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION; PAUL SCHARRENBERG, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR; AND REV. R. D. McGOWAN, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor for me to be able to include with my remarks three splendid statements from three of the outstanding organizations of our country in support of my resolutions to create an outstanding commission to develop now a program that will basically solve unemployment and prevent a depression from resulting after this period of defense spending is over.

The statements are as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWARD A. O'NEAL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, TO COMMITTEE ON LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 27, 1941

For several years, the American Farm Bureau Federation has been advocating a national conference or series of conferences of the leaders of agriculture, industry, labor, and government to iron out their differences and formulate a constructive program that will restore and maintain a fair economic balance between these great economic groups.

In December 1938 at the annual meeting of the Federation in New Orleans, a strong resolution was adopted urging the President to call such a conference; "to call together representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture selected from a list of those recommended by the duly selected leaders of the three major economic groups, to discuss a program of action designed to promote economic balances between these groups on a basis that will permit full utilization of our great productive resources." The resolution further urged "that in view of the serious effect of the present maladjustment, these representative leaders be kept in session until they have agreed upon such a program."

I desire to insert in the record the full text of this resolution.

From time to time we have reiterated this recommendation. At our last annual meeting in Baltimore, last December, the following resolution was adopted:

"Domestic unity

"Agriculture will do its part in promoting domestic unity and domestic harmony. Such unity and harmony between groups has always been important and now it is vital. For the past decade and more the farmer has not enjoyed parity with industry or with labor in the prices of his products. The American Farm Bureau Federation has always favored a common understanding and a common approach to this problem by the three large groups which comprise our economic life.

"It is now of especial importance that we solve our problems in conference rather than in conflict. We again invite and challenge the leaders of industry and the leaders of labor to join with agricultural leadership in a conference or conferences to solve our common problems, and establish economic balance."

During the past few years we have held numerous forums in which leaders of agriculture, industry, and labor have participated. Many of us have participated in the well-known Fortune magazine round-tables. My experience with these discussions by representative key leaders of our great economic groups leads me to believe that much constructive progress could be achieved if a means can be found through which the representative leaders of agriculture, industry, labor, and Government can sit around the table and discuss the great fundamental problems and issues that are so vital to the welfare of the whole Nation and formulate definite policies and measures to restore and maintain a fair economic balance in our economy.

For that reason, I wish to strongly endorse the method of procedure set forth in House Joint Resolution 59 by Congressman VOORHIS, of California, which provides for the establishment of a national commission to be composed of representatives of the Senate and House of Representatives, the executive branch of the Government, and representatives of farmers' organizations, labor unions, business associations, and church organizations.

Perhaps three representatives of each would result in too large a commission. I believe that the executive officers of the national farm organizations, labor organizations, business organizations, and religious organizations would provide the most effective type of representation. This would have a very important advantage in that these men, duly elected by their respective organizations, could speak with authority for vast segments of our population, and through the machinery of their organizations, could quickly and effectively carry back to a very large segment of the people, the conclusions and recommendations of the commission. They could quickly mold public opinion to support whatever program is worked out.

That is the main reason why I do not like the type of commission proposed in House Joint Resolution 76, which provides for a governmental type of commission composed of representatives of the House and Senate and six other members to be appointed by the President. I am skeptical of the results which might be attained by such a body. We have had a great many investigations and studies by governmental agencies of many kinds. All too often they conduct extensive studies and file their reports which are valuable and informative, but that is the end of the matter.

I want to see some constructive action emerge from such a study. I do not believe we are going to get the kind of action we need without enlisting the interest and participation of the responsible leaders of these great organized economic groups in our Nation.

No one group can solve its problems by itself. The agricultural problem cannot be solved by farmers alone; the farmer is dependent upon workers for his markets and upon business for the distribution of a large part of what he sells and what he buys. The problems of labor cannot be solved by

labor alone; the farmers and those directly dependent upon them provide the largest single market for products of labor. Neither can industry alone solve its problems. It can increase its efficiency and control its production and prices, but farmers and workers constitute their market.

If we are to achieve a fair economic balance that will permit the maximum utilization of our goods and services and the maximum income for all the people, we must act together in the spirit of unity rather than conflict.

Important segments of industry organized to control production and prices of their products to raise them and maintain them at levels relatively much higher than the rest of the economy. Then labor organized to raise its wages and shorten its hours and maintain these unit wages as far as possible during depression periods. Agriculture in self-defense and for self-preservation resorted to production control to try to get its prices up to parity with industrial prices and industrial wages. But we cannot keep this process up indefinitely. Artificially high unit prices for goods and wages tend to restrict consumption and to prevent the maximum utilization of goods and services.

We believe the national interest will best be served if industry will place greater emphasis upon volume production and total profits rather than depending upon the profit on the unit of production, and that the best interests of labor, as well as the Nation, will be served by placing much greater emphasis upon maintaining an adequate income for labor earned through increased production rather than keeping the chief emphasis upon hourly wages.

American agriculture stands ready to meet industry and labor on this basis in producing for abundance, but agriculture cannot practice abundant production while industry and labor practice extreme scarcity. We have been doing that too long already; that is one of the main reasons why the purchasing power of agriculture during the past 20 years has been at such low ebb—the farmer has not been able to exchange his goods on a parity basis with the products of industry and labor.

We cannot have the maximum interchange of goods and services between our great economic groups until we restore and maintain a fair economic balance, so that these goods and services can be exchanged on an equitable basis.

When this great emergency period is over, we are going to need such measures to preserve a fair balance and to maintain the largest utilization of goods and services possible. We should begin now to prepare for the grave problems of reconstruction and readjustment which will follow this emergency. We must not allow our economy to collapse as it did after the other World War. We must not repeat the tragic mistakes at the close of the other World War, when the bottom dropped out of farm prices and enormous supplies of farm products which had been built up by farmers to help win the war were dumped on the market with disastrous results. We have learned how to conquer and to harness the destructive forces of nature. We can and should learn how to conquer and utilize the great economic and social forces in a way that will best promote our economy and preserve our ideals of democracy and our democratic institutions.

We are a great and powerful Nation. We have the resources of materials, machines, money, and men to provide an abundance for our entire Nation, the like of which has never been seen. We have demonstrated already what we can do as a free people working through democratic processes and ideals.

We must begin now to meet the grave problems that lie ahead in the spirit of unity in order that we may preserve our freedom and our democratic institutions and maintain a high standard of living.

STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 59 AND 76 BEFORE THE HOUSE LABOR COMMITTEE, JUNE 25, 1941, BY PAUL SCHARRENBERG, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

The American Federation of Labor favors the passage of House Joint Resolutions 59 and 76 for several reasons.

It has been said that experience is the best teacher. Our experience of the last World War sheds a calcium light upon this hearing. We entered the last World War with high and noble purposes. We made victory possible and did not ask nor did we receive compensation of any kind. It is not necessary to dwell upon this point. Our record in that respect is well known. Indeed, it speaks eloquently for itself. The point we want to stress is that we took too much for granted. We very generally assumed that after we had licked the Kaiser this world of ours would be a better place to live in and that everything would be all right after victory had been won. Certain qualifications should be noted as regards the official attitude of the American Federation of Labor. The St. Paul convention of the A. F. of L., which met in June 1918, while the war was still in full progress, appointed a committee on reconstruction to thoroughly investigate the problem of reconstruction and to take such steps as might be found possible to safeguard the interest of the soldiers and sailors and workers during the period of reconstruction.

Shortly following the signing of the armistice, this committee on reconstruction submitted a comprehensive report which received the full approval of the A. F. of L. executive council and was subsequently endorsed by the annual convention in Atlantic City.

Several State federations of labor also drafted reconstruction programs. It was my privilege to serve as secretary of the reconstruction committee appointed by the California State Federation of Labor. I vividly recall the energy and enthusiasm we put into the job of planning for a better future.

Unhappily, the political psychology of those days gave us the "return to normalcy." So the various reconstruction proposals were placed on the shelves and the men who had burned the midnight oil to produce these inspiring declarations became sader but wiser men.

The years following the signing of the peace treaty brought untold misery and privation not only to the demobilized soldiers and sailors but to millions of Americans in all walks of life. So-called normalcy finally ran our Nation "head on" into the economic disaster of 1929.

And now we are, shall I say, deeply involved in another World War. As you know, the American Federation of Labor, through its highest officials, has given a solemn pledge to give service to capacity in the present unlimited national emergency. In the language of my distinguished chief, President William Green: "We, the workers, have as much at stake in this world-wide battle for human freedom as any other group in our Nation. We pledge our cooperation, our services, and our devotion."

There are different opinions as to the ultimate result of this war, but we all agree that some day, sooner or later, there must come an end.

Shall we then let history repeat itself? Shall we then again, virtually overnight, throw millions of workers out of munition and airplane factories? Shall we again witness the spectacle of ghost towns designed for shipyard workers, who have suddenly received their dismissal notice? Shall we again add to this great army of newly unemployed the soldiers and sailors who are suddenly returned to private life?

It is to prevent such a catastrophe that the American Federation of Labor lends its support to the resolutions introduced by Mr. VOORHIS.

Social and economic forces are already operating to shape the post-war future. Either we must give serious thought to this matter now, or one day we shall awake to the fatal realization that we are too late.

The patriotism that resists world aggression and defies autocracy is worthy of all praise, but it reaches its highest plane when guided and supplemented by the wisdom that profits by experience and plans for a better future.

The resolutions under consideration may need revisions. The A. F. of L. does not urge their adoption without amendment. For example, we ourselves shall probably suggest amendments. We believe that the proposed membership of 24 for a national commission is top-heavy. We know that in practice a commission of 24 is not generally a smoothly operating body.

However, we do most earnestly and sincerely urge favorable action upon these resolutions. We do so not because of the idealism which inspired these resolutions, but because of their practicability. We support these resolutions because we believe them to be highly constructive in character and excellently designed to benefit not only a part of society but to bring to all the people greater hope for a better day, a brighter life, greater liberty, and a larger degree of prosperity and happiness.

REV. R. S. M'GOWAN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR SOCIAL ACTION DEPARTMENT, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE

Joint Resolutions 59 and 76 provide for a commission to study post-defense unemployment and recommend a program to deal with it.

In the normal course of the abnormal events of our time, the unemployment will be staggering when the defense program subsides. We may soon be using even as much as half of our physical and human productive capacity for defense. If we do not plan right and execute right, we shall have tremendous unemployment when the half, or less, given over to defense, is released to civilian needs. Ironically we shall then, unless we plan now, prove ourselves capable only of employing the people and producing a full supply of goods when foreign war threatens, but incapable of peacetime organization for the peacetime welfare of all the people. That will be the most tragic fate that America could meet.

Both of these joint resolutions provide for a mixed commission of Government representatives and private citizens. Including private citizens is wise. Hardly anyone contemplates that legislative measures, however necessary, are enough. While governmental representatives should be on such a commission, if for no other reason than to plan the needed laws, nongovernmental representatives should be included if for no other reason than to plan action on the nongovernmental and economic field.

Joint Resolution 59 seems superior to Joint Resolution 76 in several important respects. In two of these matters Joint Resolution 76 might be interpreted to mean what Joint Resolution 59 explicitly says.

One is that under Joint Resolution 59 the commission is to study and recommend plans for present unemployment as well as post-defense unemployment. The other is that the commission is specifically to consider both governmental and nongovernmental action. If Joint Resolution 76 is made the basis of this committee's report, it should

be amended to cover these two points and not leave it to the commission to decide by interpretation.

For it is not only true that present unemployment needs specific study and handling. It is also true that things can be done during the defense program which can at least cushion the shock of post-defense unemployment. For example, the bad balance among prices and the bad balance among incomes are commonly known to have been the chief causes of unemployment, regardless of the many ramifications of these two causes in the investment market, the financial system, the financing of Government loans, the tax system, foreign trade, etc. By proposing things for the period of the defense program the commission will be better able to propose things to be done afterward, and at the same time propose things that will ease the shock when the defense program subsides. Besides, who knows whether the defense program will not last many years, and how much need there is of doing a tremendous amount to guide the defense program so that we shall not be utterly swamped afterward?

Moreover, legislation on this matter is no cure-all. Few think of legislation as such unless they commit themselves to a Communist or Nazi-Socialist state. Joint Resolution 76 would no doubt be interpreted to include recommendations regarding nongovernmental steps. But it is better to be specific.

Joint Resolution 59 would, however, provide a better commission. Joint Resolution 76 provides a commission of only 12 members and Joint Resolution 59 a commission of 24. When one remembers how great the problem is and how many phases of it have to be treated, the conclusion is plain that any commission would have to divide into subcommittees for more minute consideration of a number of subjects. For example, the problem of prices and parity between agricultural prices and industrial prices and among industrial prices themselves; for example, the cooperation of business, labor, agriculture, and government to secure such prices; for example, the same cooperation for right incomes; for example, taxes; for example, foreign trade; for example, the financing of new enterprises; for example, the system and costs of distributing goods; for example, public works and their place in a program of full production and full employment; for example, the fitting of defense production into production for civilian needs. These are some of the high lights. No doubt a commission in outlining its work will find still other points for minute consideration. A commission of 24 is small enough for such subcommittees. A commission of 12 is, I think, inadequate.

Joint Resolution 76 does not provide for representation of the executive department of the Government, and Joint Resolution 59 does. The executive department is making studies on this matter, chiefly through its Resources Planning Board. That Board, able as it is, cannot do the whole work. Even if it drew up sound plans it could not get the people to accept them out of hand. That makes a general commission necessary. But the executive department has, in fact, great resources of information and experience which forbid its exclusion from such a commission as this. It is true that the commission might simply ask for the compilation and presentation of the information that the executive department possesses. But that would not harness the experience of the executive department. Neither would it allow full use of the executive department's interpretation of the information.

Joint Resolution 59 has another distinct superiority over Joint Resolution 76. Joint Resolution 59 provides that most of the nongovernmental representatives on the commission should be appointed from the people's own economic organizations. Joint Resolution 76 says nothing about who they should be. Joint Resolution 59 is in this respect a great step forward. If we are to make our economic life produce what the people need and get it to them, a large part of the planning and execution has to come through a decent cooperation of business and labor, agriculture, and the consumers. A decent cooperation—indeed, any sort of cooperation—is impossible without its being mainly an organized cooperation. Isolated efforts of lone individuals to cooperate would themselves result in organization. Joint Resolution 59 provides that public representatives on the commission shall come from the economic organizations of business, labor, farmers, and consumers. These organizations the people themselves have voluntarily created and do now voluntarily administer. They are close to the problems that this commission will have to deal with. They are working with those problems day by day. They are in a key position in the execution of any plans this commission would recommend—certainly in all the nongovernmental phases of a program of action, and probably also in several of the recommendations for legislation. To leave them out would be a serious error.

Indeed, the error might turn out to be disastrous. As I read the history of our time, we have turned our back on individualism and threaten now to go collectivist, and the threat of going collectivist arises from the failure or the excessive slowness of the business, labor, farmer, and consumer organizations to work together and to work with government, and of government to work with them, to solve this very problem of unemployment. Collectivism in either its Communist or Nazi form is suicidal. The remedy, granting all right legislation and administration on things that government alone can handle, is the governmentally assisted cooperation of the people's own economic organizations. Joint Resolution 59 recognizes the place of these economic organizations, which even now are going through the process of being educated in working together. Joint Resolution 59 will give them further training and will let them, with the help of Congress and the executive department, work out a program of their own that, so far as their place is concerned, will let us end unemployment and yet not seek to end it by the slavery and war of collectivism.

Joint Resolution 59 has another advantage which at first reading, I must confess, left me cold. The commission would include three representatives of religious organizations—presumably Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish. The more, though, I have thought it over the better I have liked it. What made me cold to it at first was the thought that religion has the purpose of teaching morality, including economic morality, and inspiring people to live up to it, while this commission will necessarily have to consider and plan detailed laws and detailed economic proposals upon which religion, as such, has no competence. But the more I thought it over the more convinced I became that religion ought to be represented.

First, the religious representatives would formally express the morally right thing in economic life. That would be a great advantage, for if a thing is morally wrong it is hopeless in every other way. Second, they might serve to reconcile conflicting interests on the Commission by emphasizing that ending unemployment is a religious obligation. And finally religious representation on the Commission would help, I think, in the distinctly economic and legislative phases of its work, since in each of the three religious bodies there are priests, ministers, and rabbis who have become expert in the economic and legislative means of ending unemployment as well as in the moral laws of economic life.

A special reason why they should be on the Commission is that we reached the state of permanent unemployment, and may reach collectivism, only by denying the religious truth that economic life has something to do with the dignity of every man and the brotherhood of all men. Giving an eighth of the Commission to representatives of religion is a symbol of the hopes of a new time that will be different from the past and yet not be a collectivist night.

The only objection to a commission on unemployment that I can see is that so many of the men in the Senate, the House, the executive department, and business, labor, farm, consumer, and religious organizations are so busy at present work that they can give little time to the future. Joint Resolution 59 provides, however, for alternates to sit for the regular representatives in their absence, and lets us have a continuing Commission of delegates and proxies to continue the work to the end.

Yonder Is the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this is the season of the year immediately following Father's Day—June 15—when tributes to fathers are very much in vogue.

Among the heartfelt tributes to fatherhood is a poem written by Lewis A. Harding, an outstanding citizen and attorney of Indianapolis, Ind., entitled "Yonder Is the Hill."

This poem expresses the affection of a loving son for his father, the late James L. Harding, who sleeps in the little country cemetery at Rossburg, Decatur County, Ind.

Mr. Harding, my constituent, the author of the tribute, holds three degrees from Indiana University, has taught in high schools and universities, and is widely known as a public speaker.

The poem is as follows:

Yonder is the hill my father saw,
Yonder the road he trod;
Yonder are the self-same woods that draw
Life from the land of God!

Yonder was the school my father had,
Yonder the place he knew;
Yonder was his vale of youth in glad
Light from the realm of blue.

Yonder he is on the vision now,
Yonder the old-time lad;
Glamour of the sickle, team, or plow,
Making his welkin glad.

Yonder he is in the fields of flowers,
Near where the maples bow,
Chasing the gay butterflies for hours,
Yonder or yonder now.

Yonder he was at the brim of life,
Coasting the hill he knew;
Yonder he was, facing peace or strife,
Laying his life out true.

Yonder he is now upon my sight,
Filled with his fire of youth;
Yonder he seeks in the House of Light,
Finding the Way and Truth.

Yonder he was with a lover's soul,
Walking the paths of spring;
Yonder he soon found his lover's toil,
Maiden of worth for king.

Yonder he is in a humble cot,
Guarding a precious bed;
Shedding then swift to an older tot,
Tears; for the babes are dead.

Yonder he was at the grave of those
Roses of love at birth;
Loosing a mother's appalling throes
Clutching her out of earth.

Yonder he is at the break of morn,
Stirring his household folk,
Growing till seven and two were born,
Shielding his home an oak.

Yonder he is among common kings,
Doing the best he can;
Yonder he is in the maze of things,
Making his way a man.

Yonder he was in the toil of day,
Shriven by deaths and pain;
Yonder he was with his heart of play,
Singing an old refrain.

Yonder he was under stormy sky,
Weathering rain or snow;
Yonder he was at the rainbow nigh,
Calm in the matchless glow.

Yonder he is in his years of gray,
Mould for a Senator;
Yonder he is at the end of day,
Sensing his call from far.

Yonder he lies 'gainst the fenceless blast,
Stricken by passioned stroke;
Yonder he lies as his life was cast,
Fallen the solid oak.

Yonder he was on the hilltop blessed,
Laid in his grave so still;
Yonder to hear in the silent rest,
Rain and the whippoorwill.

Yonder he is in forgetfulness,
Far from the pulse of man;
Yonder, O Lord, in quick restfulness,
Quitting earth's course he ran.

Yonder, yes yonder his manly form
Only we see no more;
There it went under in sorrow's storm
Close to the old church door.

Yonder he was then and there he is,
Heaven or here or there;
Yonder he is with the chums of his,
Thunderous, dark and fair.

Yonder he is now and here he was,
Yonder he was and is;
Yonder he is now and there he was,
Ever he was and is.

Yonder he is now for ay with me,
Climbing the Rossburg hill;
Yonder he comes over land and sea,
Rousing the world so still.

Yonder he is, O yes yonder now,
Yonder with saints of his;
Yonder with glory and peace of brow,
Yonder he ever is.

Yonder then nearer he gleams again,
Climbing the hills of gold;
Yonder he walks with the saved of men,
Heavenly scene untold.

Lo, from yon hills does he straightway fly,
Down to the place I stand;
Folding me close he uplifts me high,
Into that Eden land.

Yonder, then yonder I walk with him,
Glory in old and new;
What a voice—vision—and what a vim—
Father! — is — is — this you!

I am thus heir of the heights sublime,
Into the heavens hurled;
Borne by the strength of this father of mine
Gone from the life-time world.

Yonder — anew — is the hill he saw,
Yonder — the road he trod;—
Haunts of the heart that forever draw
Up from that sacred sod.

Russian Policy and American Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 28 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, entitled "Russian Policy and American Defense."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

RUSSIAN POLICY AND AMERICAN DEFENSE

If it were certain—if, indeed, it were probable—that the Nazi and the Soviet Armies will destroy one another, it would still be dangerously unwise for the United States to sit back and relax. There would still be needed our utmost power and effort to restore some kind of order and sanity in our world. But, in fact, the notion that Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia will exhaust one another is wishful thinking of the most reckless sort.

Our policy and our attitude must be based not upon the gambler's hope in the highly improbable but upon a stern calculation that in European Russia the German Army is much more powerful than the Russian. The measures we take now should be based on the assumption that Hitler's forces will be tied up in Russia only for a relatively short time, and that in this short time we must fortify and reinforce our position in both oceans.

The American policy should be based not on wishes, emotions, or ideologies but on the fundamental fact that we have to defend our vital interests in two oceans and that we possess a one-ocean navy. The avowed strategy of our enemies, as set forth in the Japanese-German-Italian pact of last September, is to render the American Navy impotent in the Atlantic by tying it up in the Pacific. By this device, which has thus far been highly successful, the defense of the Western Hemisphere against the European Axis has come to depend almost entirely upon Great Britain, with no real support from our own sea power.

The position is intolerably dangerous. For if the British resistance were broken for lack of reinforcements, the American naval position in the Atlantic would be desperate, and in the effort to save it the American position in the Pacific would have to be sacrificed. Thus our fleet, now standing guard in the Pacific, would fail to hold what it is now guarding, and it would be confronted with the infinitely difficult task of policing defensively a whole hemisphere against surprise attack in both oceans by superior forces striking from better situated strategic bases.

Since we have to defend ourselves with the Navy we possess, not with the Navy we intend to have in 1946, and with what forces we can create in the near future, the fundamental object of our policy must be to unlock American sea power, which is now almost completely immobilized in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. We cannot afford at this critical time to have the most powerful navy in the world, our own greatest weapon, pinned down by the diplomacy of the Axis.

It is of vital importance, to be sure, that the whole position in the southwestern Pacific—in China, Malaya, the Netherlands Indies, the Philippines, and Australia—should be made invincible. But though the American Navy, as it is now placed, has protected that position, we must ask ourselves very carefully now whether what looks like the protection of the Pacific is not becoming a snare and a delusion. It would be just that if it turned out that we had allowed this powerful fleet to be immobilized at Hawaii while the position in the Atlantic was allowed to go from bad to worse. For in that event the fleet would have to be withdrawn from the Pacific to protect this hemisphere from direct attack. Thus the fleet which is wholly occupied in guarding the Pacific would no longer be able to guard the Pacific.

A way must be found to guard the Pacific and at the same time to liberate American sea power for much freer action in both oceans. The American Navy, we must realize, is by the ingenuity of the Axis diplomacy, locked up so that at the crisis of this great struggle it may be able to do little harm to the Axis and no great good to us. Pinned down as it is in the Pacific, it is superior to Japan. But it would be unable to fight Japan if Japan struck only if the British position in the Atlantic crumbled. Then if that happened, this great navy would have to give the Japanese a free hand while most of it rushed off to save a desperate position in the Atlantic Ocean. And with a free hand Japan would then be able to coerce us into dividing our fleet so as to get some protection in the Pacific.

This problem—the basic problem of American defense—is not at all insoluble, and indeed immense progress has been made recently toward making it feasible to solve it decisively. A system of defense, based primarily upon air power and submarines, has been organized in the region from the Philippines to Singapore, and since Japan's great and irremediable weakness is her lack of air power, the position in the southern Pacific is not nearly so vulnerable as it was a few months ago. The firm attitude of the Netherlands Indies in negotiating with Japan reflects this radical improvement in the position.

This relieves to a considerable degree the demands upon the American Navy. For it is no longer the only force available to check Japanese expansion southward and Japanese closing of the road to free China. This has justified such transfers of American ships from the Pacific to the Atlantic as have been recently under way.

But while there can be no question of leaving the Pacific, other moves may now be possible which will give the fleet still greater freedom of action—still greater freedom, that is to say, to go wherever it is most needed without surrendering anything of importance in the Pacific. These possibilities arise from Germany's war against Russia. For now Russian Siberia is in a position where, unless there is a collapse throughout Russia, Siberia can no longer collaborate with the Axis. If regardless of what happens in European Russia, the Russian Army, Air Force, and Navy in the Far East do not fall under Axis control, then our whole position in the

Far East—that of the American Navy, of the Chinese armies, of the British and Dutch—will be greatly improved. For with the Russians in Siberia, the new defenses in the south Pacific, the reinforcement of China, and the increased freedom of the American Fleet, we shall have come a long way from the days when Mr. Matsuoka signed the triple-Axis pact last September.

When we ask ourselves what should be our Russian policy, we should not be children and fall into quarrels about words, ideologies, or vain schemes to intervene in the war in European Russia. Our Russian policy should be that of adult men asking to serve the vital interests of the United States, and that means that we should concentrate our Russian policy on Siberia: First, in order to prevent Siberia from falling under Axis control; second, as a means of stabilizing the Far East, and, above all, as a means of disrupting and dislocating the triple Axis so that American sea power may no longer be immobilized.

America First Rally at Dubuque, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 28 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND FRANCIS J. L. BECKMAN

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Nation-wide radio address by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Francis J. L. Beckman, Archbishop of Dubuque on the occasion of the America First rally at Dubuque, Iowa, on June 21, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Duty can be a stern and terrible thing. In every man's life there are obligations and responsibilities which may not be shirked except at the expense of others. The discarded burdens of irresponsible people but add to the load upon other shoulders. A neglected duty today may bring disastrous consequences tomorrow, and even at this fateful hour decisions are being made which may profoundly affect whole generations of the unborn.

And so, my dear friends, tonight finds me heavy-hearted but determined, at this microphone. As a prince of the church, this time, not alone as a citizen, do I bring my message—a message delivered in line of bitter duty and intended primarily for the children of that flock over which I am bound as shepherd to watch zealously. If in addition, I can bring some comfort by means of this broadcast to millions of my fellow-citizens—that shall be.

To begin with, let us be clear on one point: On the day that our Congress repealed the arms embargo with the pretext "it would keep us out of war"—on that day our people were tricked into the parlor of the interventionists. On that occasion I joined my plea with those of my countrymen who were valiently striving to prevent repeal of this law because they were far-sighted enough to see in such action a first step toward war. But over our earnest plea to the Congress the lying tongues of the hypocrites prevailed. With "measures short of war" they proceeded diabolically, step by step, maneuvering us to the very brink of military involvement which is our position at this moment.

Who would have dreamed 5 years ago that we would thus be led again by the propagandists? And the climax of all this trickery—that monstrous perpetration upon our people who found no vote for war or peace at the November polls. The same bloody brigands who had their way in the last war saw to that. The democracy of which they prattle so effusively was for all present purposes, if I may borrow the phrase, "sold down the river" on November 5. What a great laugh these Judas Iscariots and Benedict Arnolds must have enjoyed next day at the expense of the trusting millions; and, tragically, what a great laugh at the expense of all our beloved America stood for.

Yet it is not enough that our people should be humiliatingly subjected to the vile indignity of the lie, but for those who cry the truth now come the slurs and the revilings. From the temples of the moneyed mighty the flood of denunciation rolls forth: "These are not of Christ; these are not of democracy—bundists, Communists, pacifists—these are all of the same stamp; disregard them—crucify them." But, oh, take comfort, people, for if Christ Himself were this moment to return and confront these modern Herods, and Pilates, and Neros for their crimes before the world, He, too, would be crowned by them a bundist.

Therefore, proudly conscious of your own strength, you dear fathers and mothers, you of all faiths and earnest patriotic convictions, you Americans stand up courageously with Christ to your persecutors and make your louder voice for peace prevail. Even the valiant English would understand that in thus acting we, the united 83 percent, are merely at long last exercising our prerogative as a democratic majority. If our letters and our telegrams are not enough, let us represent ourselves personally to the governmental authorities. This criminal betrayal of our people at the hands of the few must never be consummated; for, indeed, the future of all morality, of confidence in government and the democratic process hinges on the proof that our people still do the debating and the deciding. Imagine, the suicidal stupidity of risking our own democracy at home while vainly trying to impose it abroad.

It has been said that there are two sides to this question, and our interventionist brethren accuse us of "ostrich" tactics. To them we would answer and appeal in all earnestness: "What proof have you that your side of the matter is the just one? The American people took your advice 24 years ago and emerged from the chamber of horrors wiser and sadder after Versailles. Now it is our turn to have our way."

Mr. President. I address you humbly and with all the dignity which becomes your high office; in the name of the 83 percent whose will has been grossly disparaged, also in the name of my spiritual children over whose welfare I am gravely concerned, Mr. President, I respectfully address you:

You have given the people of these United States your solemn pledge that the youth of our land will not be sent to fight in any foreign wars. We choose to believe that that pledge was given unequivocally and without mental reservation of any kind. To repudiate that pledge, Mr. President, would be to break down the last vestige of public trust in Government. For if we cannot trust your word, then in whom of our governmental leaders are we to trust? As a churchman, therefore, I solemnly adjure you not to break faith with our people.

I realize, Mr. President, the extreme difficulty of your position; for on the one hand you are faced with a small but formidable group who control the economic life lines of the Nation, and on the other—the people. Little people, to be sure, with little power of themselves, but, united in peaceful democratic existence behind an impregnable defense they could constitute an invincible moral weapon with which to beat the very brains out of communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and all "isms" everywhere. Take heart, Mr. President: free yourself of those who are evilly attempting to influence you against the majority will. In this you will most certainly have the united support and acclaim of all our people.

Their immediate destinies and the destinies of millions everywhere at this moment lie in your powerfully equipped hands. In temporarily surrendering this power, Mr. President, the people expect and have every confidence that you will use it in conformity with your pledges. Yours is indeed the opportunity of a whole era in history. The role of a peacemaker is the role of a true child of God and one appreciated by all mankind save those whose interests dictate war. For my part, Mr. President, I would rather go down fighting the cause of peace, suffering any abuse and persecution, than to stand idly by while millions of our youth are prepared for the slaughter. I repeat, with the great prelate of the east, that the continuation of this senseless war truly means the end of our civilization, with complete moral, spiritual, and material collapse at the end of the long road.

No, Mr. President, this time we promise you that the opposition of our people will not be broken down. Your pledges will be kept because we will help you keep them. This time the golden calf must go unworshipped, the sacrificial altars unadorned. Our boys are staying home, and in your own words "they are going into training to form a force so strong that of its very nature it will keep the threat of war from our shores." May God bless and guide you in this critical hour.

What the Great Interior Is Thinking in Regard to the War Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, with war provokers, mainly on the eastern seaboard, trying by every hook and crook to force the President into war, the Gallup Institute of Public Opinion comes along with another poll on my proposed constitutional amendment to give the people a right to vote on participation in foreign wars—the sixth poll it has taken on that subject—and the result, as on all former occasions, shows a majority of the American people to be in favor of that proposal, which is as fundamentally democratic as any of the guaranties of the Bill of Rights. Deeply

and ineradicably embedded in the convictions of the American people is the thought that those who have to suffer and, if need be, to die, and to bear the unspeakable burdens and costs and griefs of war, should have something to say as to whether we shall enter foreign conflicts across the seas. This conviction is almost universal among the women of our country, and why should it not be? Women go down into the shadow of the valley of death to bring our boys into the world. Why should they not have something to say as to whether their own flesh and blood shall be hurled into the hell of a foreign conflict?

While the war provokers, and their stooges, the columnists, are trying, unpatriotically and I think disrespectfully, by all of the arts of cajolery and bulldozery to induce the President to take the fateful steps into war, the great interior of the country remains calm and sane. By the great interior I mean all of the vast expanse of the country from the Alleghenies to the Pacific coast. There is no saner spot in all of that section than my home State of Indiana. I was born and brought up among those people. I am bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh and I know how they feel about the climactic issues of the times. Illustrative of how they feel, and typical of the sentiment of the great interior, was the poll taken recently by the Indianapolis News, one of the really great journals of America and of the world, which showed 95 percent of our people to be opposed to entering the European war and 92 percent of them opposed to convoys, because they believe convoys would lead to war.

In the great interior there is unity—unity in favor of national defense and unity against going into the European war. The unity for the first of these proposals—national defense—is 100 percent perfect. For the last—staying out of European wars—it is at least 95 percent, and the 95 percent are determined that the 5 percent are not going to drag us into the war. That is flat.

The determination of the great interior that America shall stay out of a shooting war and that there shall be no expeditionary force into foreign lands has become set and solidified during the last few weeks and it is now stronger than ever before.

If I were to undertake to interpret the composite mind of the great interior I would say that some of the thoughts to which our people universally subscribe are these:

First. They are Americans first, last, and all the time. They want our policy to be an American policy.

Second. We already have gone too far in undertaking to manage the affairs of the world. Ankara, Damascus, and Singapore are outside our bailiwick.

Third. Britain is entitled to such aid as we can give her, but not to the extent of our entanglement.

Fourth. We are woefully lacking in military equipment and, in any program to aid Britain, we must bear in mind the staggering deficiencies in our own requirements for defense.

Fifth. Too many provocative speeches are being made by our war-minded statesmen and too many inflammatory articles and editorials are being printed.

Sixth. America's best policy, both from the standpoint of its own future and its opportunity for service to humanity, is to keep out of the war. If we enter the conflict we become just one more belligerent, taking over a fight we did not start and matching our inexperience and lack of equipment with the strength of the most efficient and highly mechanized war powers in the world. If we stay out we will inevitably become the logical leader in reconstructing a new and better world out of the ashes of the present conflict.

These six points, I believe, truthfully represent the line of thinking of the great interior. I find that out there the people, while they do not understand some of the moves that have been made, have faith that the President will not be stampeded by the war promoters. They are quoting with assurance his final word of the late campaign at Boston, on October 30, when he said:

> And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

The people of the great interior support the President's attitude as expressed in that speech, and they are back of him in his efforts to keep this country out of foreign wars. They are enthusiastically sustaining him in his purpose to build up our defenses so that no foreign foe would ever dare to violate the peace of the United States or any other country in the Western Hemisphere.

The predominant thought of the great interior approves my proposed constitutional amendment giving the people a right to vote on sending our men into foreign wars and regrets that the amendment is not already a part of the Constitution. Letters pouring in at my office plead for the adoption of the amendment and indicate that there would not now be so much uneasiness throughout the country if it were a part of the Constitution.

By unanimous consent of the House, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a clipping from the New York Times of Friday, June 20, giving the results of the Gallup poll, as follows:

MAJORITY FAVORS WAR REFERENDUM—56 PERCENT WOULD HAVE PEOPLE VOTE ON GREATEST OF ALL ISSUES, GALLUP SURVEY FINDS—ONLY 6 PERCENT ARE UNDECIDED—ANALYSIS REVEALS THE INTEREST TAKEN BY THE PUBLIC IN LUDLOW'S PROPOSAL

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., June 19.—The campaign for a national referendum, or vote of the people, on the question of war is being pushed by isolationist groups in Congress. Claiming that the American people have had no opportunity to vote officially on this greatest of all issues, these groups propose a national roll call in which all eligible voters would participate.

The country has been divided on the war referendum idea, with a slight majority in favor, as shown in sporadic checks by the American Institute of Public Opinion. The size of the majority has varied from time to time, running as low as 51 percent when the war broke out to as high as 60 percent in the beginning of 1940. The latest survey on the subject, completed early this month by the American Institute of Public Opinion, shows the following:

"Should a vote of the people be required before Congress can send men to fight overseas?"

	Percent
Yes	56
No	44

Only a small proportion of voters—6 percent—expressed no opinion on the issue.

The referendum proposal was first placed before Congress by Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, who has sponsored it at nearly every recent session. At one time a House resolution to bring the bill to the floor for consideration failed by only a few votes, and the bill has continued to be the center of wide controversy and interest both in and out of Congress.

If a national referendum were taken today on the question whether the United States should go to war now, there can be little question that it would show a large vote against entering the war.

The institute's latest measurement of war sentiment, published May 16, showed the following vote among those with opinions:

"If you were asked to vote on the question of the United States entering the war against Germany and Italy, how would you vote—to go into the war or to stay out of the war?"

	Percent
Go in	21
Stay out	79

Hess, Nazi Buchmanite, Plots in Britain To Switch War Against Russia—German Peace Terms Revealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

ARTICLE FROM IN FACT, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the little publication, In Fact. It makes interesting reading:

[From In Fact, New York, N. Y., of June 30, 1941]

HESS, NAZI BUCHMANITE, PLOTS IN BRITAIN TO SWITCH WAR AGAINST RUSSIA—GERMAN PEACE TERMS REVEALED

Simultaneously with Nazi declaration of war on Russia, In Fact has received information from London and from diplomatic officials in Washington telling the secret of Hess' flight, revealing the plot of British appeasers and Buchmanites to switch the war into an Anglo-German war against Russia, and the peace terms which Hitler offers to achieve this end.

Hess, third most important Nazi, it is confirmed, brought a proposal of war and peace—war against Russia which Britain was asked

to join, and peace which would repay Britain for aiding Hitler.

The peace terms, In Fact learns from a Washington source which obtained them from the Yugoslav minister, are as follows:

1. Restoration of France with the exception of Alsace and Lorraine.

2. British Empire to be left intact.

3. Restoration to Germany of German East and German West Africa and certain other former colonies.

4. Britain to make peace with Germany and join in the offensive against Russia.

5. Hitler to be given a vast territory from Prussia to the Black Sea, including Kiev, and Ukraine granary, and Odessa.

(At the same time In Fact obtained these peace terms, June 22, the United Press Madrid correspondent obtained a similar set of terms which included "division of Europe into German and British spheres of influence" and "German expansion eastward at Russia's expense.")

In Fact learns from London that the attempt to change the character of the entire World War is still being made, all the principals in the drama being Buchmanites.

Buchmanism, or moral rearmament, is a sort of religion founded by a Pennsylvanian named Frank Nathan Daniel Buchman; it has made great headway in British Tory circles, among Washington pro-Fascist officials, among employers who want loyal labor without paying increased wages, and, strangely enough, among certain American labor leaders—who will be named here.

Hess was revealed as a Buchmanite in a broadcast from London by Collier's representative, William Hillman, but Hillman missed the real story. He reported: "Hess went to Britain as a penitent seeking peace, as a Buchmanite moved to confess his sins and mistakes and those of his Nazi associates and try to plead with the British to help him put an end to the slaughter of men. Hess aimed at peace as a true Buchmanite, who is supposed to stand up and confess his sins, and he has not spared himself or his fellow Nazis."

HESS' MISSION TO BRITISH HITLERITES AND BUCHMANITES

The fact now revealed, despite Churchill's reneging on his promise to make a full statement to Parliament, is that when Hess asked to be directed "to the estate of my friend the Duke of Hamilton," he was getting in touch as planned with one of the foremost leaders in Britain of the pro-Hitler, Tory, Buchmanite groups. May 10, when he landed, Hitler was already deep in plans for the invasion of the Ukraine, as he had predicted in Mein Kampf and openly threatened in prewar speeches.

Amidst all the ballyhoo and propaganda following Hess' flight it now is known that there were a few straight facts—that Hess expected to get gasoline and return in 2 days; that he was deliberately sent to make peace with Britain for the purpose of switching the war.

Another fact, that the landing was made purposely on the land of the Duke of Hamilton, is significant. In Haxey's "Tory MP," which exposes the British ruling class as pro-Hitler, the Duke of Hamilton is hardly mentioned, but one of the most notorious Fascists in Britain is listed as the Marquess of Clydesdale. As In Fact revealed (May 26) the Anglo-German Fellowship was a holding company Hitler set up in Britain for Nazism, with 28 lords and 24 members of Commons as leaders. They counted Lord Lothian a member and Lord Halifax (who just got a degree at Harvard) as an agent whom they sent to visit Hitler (London Times, December 3, 1937). The Astors, Vickers, Lever the soap king, Lazard Bros. the bankers, and Thomas Cook were members. But Clydesdale was mentioned along with the two others as most influential in Nazi affairs in Britain. Since Clydesdale's father died after Haxey wrote his exposure, it is this same pro-Nazi who is now known as the new Duke of Hamilton.

This Hamilton has been known as a sympathizer with Buchmanism as well as Hitlerism. His sister-in-law, Lady Prunella Douglas-Hamilton, is a Buchmanite volunteer worker. The duke is the fourth largest landlord in Britain.

BUCHMANISM, THE ORIGINAL APPEASEMENT MOVEMENT

Neville Chamberlain and almost all the appeasers of Munich, journalists of the Beaverbrook and Rothermere press who advocated fascism, and the Nazi movement in Britain were filled with Buchmanism. This was natural. The entire idea of this American "religion," which is also known as M. R. A. and Oxford Group, is appeasement.

In America the Buchmanites plead for unity and for peace between capital and labor, between employer and employee; they are against strikes and list among their adherents many notorious labor-fighters, such as, Harry Chandler, of the Los Angeles Times; Louis B. Mayer, of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer; Paul Shoup, of the Southern Pacific; Elmer Howlett, of the Merchants & Manufacturers Association. Incredible as it may appear, Buchmanism also has a number of union labor leaders on its list.

A few weeks ago 50 members of Parliament passed the following resolution: "That this house, observing that the organization led by Dr. Buchman has made no public utterance in condemnation of Hitler and other aggressors; believing that its activities have been harmful to the British cause in many countries * * * urges that the president of the board of trade revoke the license granted * * *." A. P. Herbert, writer and Oxford's member of Parliament, had previously protested the use of "Oxford" by Buchman, but 33 members of Commons, 25 lords, 12 baronets, 21 leading journalists were Buchmanites, and Buchman got his incorporation (Parliamentary Reports, Hansard, June 13, 1939).

BUCHMAN FOR HITLER, MUSSOLINI, FRANCO

The Buchmanites boasted in 1939 that the surrender of Czechoslovakia to Hitler was their work.

Buchman spoke glowingly of Mussolini and openly endorsed Hitler. "I thank heaven for a man like Adolf Hitler," he said (Time, September 7, 1936). He also declared, "Human problems * * * could be solved with a God-controlled democracy—or should I say theocracy—and through a God-controlled Fascist dictatorship." He also said, "Spain has taught us what Godless communism will bring." Zion's Herald (Methodist) replied: "God-controlled fascism! The terms are mutually exclusive. As well talk of a God-controlled hell. When God controls, fascism is thereby ruled out."

Among Buchman's converts were several Nazi baronesses, Nazi leaders, American Wall Street men who (Dr. Shipler, editor of the Churchman, reported) were the most vicious anti-Semites; Jewish rich men, including Louis Mayer and other Hollywood employers; and, strangely enough, labor leaders.

Despite Buchman's open declaration for Hitlerism, fascism, appeasement, and reaction, he has been able to mail out thousands of endorsements from William Green, president, American Federation of Labor; David Dubinsky, of the International Ladies Garment Workers; Daniel J. Tobin, president, Brotherhood of Teamsters; James B. Carey, national secretary, C. I. O.; and George Harrison, vice president, A. F. of L.

In Fact wrote Dubinsky, Tobin, and Carey, saying they were probably unaware when they endorsed Buchmanism that Buchman had endorsed Hitler; also that Buchman's labor appeasement was intended to "soothe labor, disarm labor, stop strikes, make peace between the lion and lamb (capital and labor) with the lamb inside the lion. If you know anything at all about M. R. A., you know it is antilabor."

Both Dubinsky and Tobin have not replied. Carey, whose name appeared on Buchmanite literature 2 years ago, writes In Fact: "You are more than mistaken should you say that I have endorsed the moral rearmament movement of Dr. Frank Buchman."

The latest broadside issued by Buchman is entitled "You Can Defend America." It pleads for teamwork in industry, which every labor leader knows means not asking for better wages or working conditions. The Buchman broadside repeats the stale lie that "France failed in the factory before she failed at the front." The appeal is a typical National Association of Manufacturers' propaganda hand-out against labor. But with it went a letter from A. F. of L. President Green saying he hoped it would be "in the hands of every union man in the country * * * (and all citizens) to strengthen their spirit for endurance and sacrifice."

The Hess appeasement campaign in Britain is the most important Buchmanite movement to date. In Fact has no information on the degree of its success, but many Washington observers, pointing out that Winston Churchill was the principal organizer of the numerous international invasions of Russia from 1918 to 1923, believe that Hitler would not have attacked Russia this week without assurances from important sections of the British upper class—Tories and Buchmanites—that they will try to switch the war at an appropriate moment to aid fascism.

An Aluminum Plant for Arkansas of Tremendous Benefit to that State and the Economy of the Southwest—Excerpts from O. P. M. News Release and Recommendation

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, at long last it appears that aluminum is going to be produced in the State of Arkansas where 95 percent of the Nation's bauxite deposits are located. For decade upon decade our rich bauxite deposits have been hauled out of my State, and about all we have received in return has been a hole in the ground.

Late yesterday the Office of Production Management announced that it has recommended to the War Department the immediate construction of a huge aluminum plant somewhere in Arkansas capable of producing 100,000,000 pounds annually.

Furthermore, the O. P. M. announced in the same statement that the chief source of power will be from the Grand River and Brazos dams and from the sour-gas fields of Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas, practically all of which will be delivered to the plant over Rural Electrification transmission lines.

In this announcement I see a fourfold victory for the people:

First. The Aluminum Co. of America's monopoly is being broken in spite of that company's previous indications that there would be no shortage of aluminum.

Second. The national-defense program will be greatly accelerated.

Third. This is a victory for public power. Private utility companies have fought the public power program consistently, claiming they can furnish sufficient power for any industries for Arkansas. These companies collapsed in their efforts in this instance, and R. E. A. came to the rescue through its connections with certain public power projects. The transmission system that will be built to this plant, wherever it is located, will anticipate, and include, the huge power projects under construction and projected on the White and Ouachita Rivers.

Fourth. This plant will greatly benefit the economy of Arkansas. Next to Mississippi, we are the most agricultural of all the States, and thus far in this war, as in World War No. 1, the trend had been to locate industries in the North and East at the expense of the South and the West.

The location of an aluminum plant in Arkansas in connection with her public power development marks the beginning of a new day for the Wonder State. This, however, must be only the beginning of a great industrial program for a State whose undeveloped natural resources rank her No. 1 in the Nation and whose average per capita income, because of the lack of such development, is third from the lowest of the 48 States.

The present aluminum capacity in the United States is 800,000,000 pounds annually. That of Germany alone is over 1,000,000,000 pounds. The 100,000,000-pound increase from Arkansas is part of her program to increase the Nation's capacity to 1,400,000,000 pounds annually.

The recommendation by Director William S. Knudsen was based on a joint report by the Federal Power Commission and the Office of Production Management. I quote a significant statement from the O. P. M. release:

> New aluminum plants should be located where they will be economically sound after the emergency.

O. P. M. also stated that—

> It is contemplated at the present time that all the new plants involved in these recommendations will be Government owned but privately operated under a lease arrangement.

The recommendation pointed out that 67,500 kilowatts of the power is to come from the "Brazos and the Grand River hydro developments and the Gilmer and Arsenal Hill Diesel plants now under construction."

The text of the recommendation also contains the following statement:

> The aluminum plant should be located in relation to these ultimate sources of power supply. Production of additional 100,000,000 pounds annually will be possible (in Arkansas) when new gas-fired steam plants have been built.

It is significant that each of these new plants will depend ultimatetly upon public sources for its power. It is important to observe that the public power developments of this country which have been fought constantly by the private power octapus are coming to the aid of the country in this critical hour and that private power developments are wholly inadequate and cannot be depended upon.

The Development of Our Domestic Resources of Strategic Metals—Adverse Effect of Reducing the Tariff on Tungsten Proposed in Reciprocal Trade Agreements With Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, OF IDAHO, TO THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the period since our Government has gone into our western mining States to make wholesale withdrawals of public lands, to establish forest reserves, grazing districts, national parks, and Federal monuments, the development of our mining resources has been serious retarded. Restrictive measures on corporation financing by the Securities and Exchange Commission has further reduced the opportunities to develop new mines.

During the same period and more recently mining in Canada has made great advances due to the liberal and constructive policy on the part of the Canadian Government, which is being reflected in the increased business prosperity of the Dominion, while mining in our Western States has languished under the handicap of lack of roads to open up isolated areas in the national forests and Government-owned lands due to the indifference and neglect of Government officials and the downright opposition to mining development in some departments of our Government.

Canada, by its constructive and liberal policy in the development of its mineral resources, has surpassed us in the production of gold and greatly increased its production of other metals found in the Dominion. It has taken the emergency of a threatened war to direct the attention of our Government to the vital necessity of developing our own resources of mineral and strategic metals. At this late day the long-sustained campaign of a few western stalwarts in Congress to overcome bureaucratic indifference and opposition is becoming effective with most encouraging results.

The activities of the United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines have succeeded in uncovering immense sources of supply of strategic mineral in our Western States. With this accomplished when we are on the eve of a period of expansion and mining development to provide an adequate supply of sorely needed and vitally important strategic minerals to be mined within our own borders, this development program that has been worked out with so much technical skill and expense by one branch of the Government, is menaced by a program of another Government agency, the Department of State, in the negotiations being undertaken with Argentina to reduce the tariff on tungsten.

In this connection I insert my statement made to the members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information of the Tariff Commission urging that tungsten be removed from the provision of the agreement to be negotiated with Argentina and also for the continued protection of our livestock industry:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Secretary WHITCOMB. Representative WHITE, of Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, coming from the State of Idaho, I come before you to discuss two of the commodities that are being considered in the proposed trade agreement to be entered into between the United States and the Republic of Argentina.

I may say at the outset that I am in sympathy with and voted for the policy of the reciprocal trade agreement, not to go back into history and discuss the national issues of the tariff and all that, but I will say that I have long felt that some scientific, impartial, and nonpartisan system should be adopted, and I think this is the nearest approach that has ever been attempted in this country. It is a great constructive measure, and I am in sympathy with it, and I have defended it, in my own district from unreasonable attack.

I appreciate the need of expanding our own markets to increase prices and prosperity in our country through our international trade, and I realize that under monetary and financial conditions today we must have some exchange of commodities, either manufactured articles or the raw materials, and I think that the policy that has been adopted by our Department of State in this administration is one of the most constructive that has ever been undertaken.

I say that at the outset of this presentation, I think that in considering these commodities and the mechanics of the program, care must be exercised that we protect our own interests and our own commodities, for the best interests of the American people.

Now, I want to come to you first to talk about tungsten, and I am going at this point to earnestly urge your committee to remove tungsten from the consideration in these negotiations just as you removed lead from the considerations in your trade agreements with Canada.

We are now on the verge of a great expansion in this branch of the mining industry, to produce the strategic metal so vital to our steel industry, to our manufacturing industry, and to our national defense—tungsten—and that particular need has long been recognized by the Government and by our branches of the Government in charge of these particular industries, particularly the Bureau of Mines.

In a program to foster this industry the Bureau of Mines, at considerable expense to the Government, has gone into the mining

sections of the Western States to make its investigations and to do actual exploration work, at considerable cost, with very favorable results. We are in a position now, if we have any means of protecting this infant industry, to build up a supply for our own need from our own resources.

I have before me a release from the Bureau of Mines from which I desire to quote. This, by the way, is the result of explorations made at considerable expense in my own State of Idaho in a very isolated area. Over two or three mountain ranges, if you please, mining companies have penetrated that country; they have built roads in there; they have opened up a new country; and very unexpectedly the Government itself, operating through the Bureau of Mines, has found great deposits of tungsten. I read from the report issued by the Bureau of Mines, released Monday, March 31, 1941:

"A high-grade deposit of tungsten ore, vital defense material, has been discovered jointly by engineers of the Bureau of Mines and geologists of the Geological Survey.

"The ore was found in the yellow-pine district, Valley County, Idaho, a district well known for its antimonial gold ores, but not previously known to contain tungsten ores.

"Since the maximum dimensions of the ore deposit have not yet been determined, the two agencies reported to the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, no estimate of the reserve tonnage of this strategic mineral is available now, but sufficient information already has been secured to indicate that the discovery may be one of great importance."

This report was made, you will note, on the last day of March. It is now near the end of June and those investigations of that particular district by extending diamond-drill bore holes down through these large deposits, have been very satisfactory.

We have in sight in this particular deposit a very large supply of tungsten ore. The O. P. M. has given priorities to steel material that will be needed in the opening up of this deposit, and all progress is being made in bringing this deposit to production.

In addition to that I may state for the information of this committee that the Bureau of Mines is conducting extensive investigations in five other States, and is finding large deposits of low-grade tungsten ore. The tungsten ore we are dealing with in Idaho is high-grade.

Now, in view of all these circumstances, and in view of the fact that we are importing a large amount of tungsten from other countries—and here I want to give you definite information on the matter—I want to state that from China we import $587,779 worth. I do not have it by tons. From Malaya, $113,063; Mexico, $89,352; Bolivia, $77,342; and from the Argentine, at present, $50,324.

Under present war conditions the reduction of the duty on tungsten ore and concentrates would not result in increased imports, and at this time it would be most harmful to American producers. When the emergency is over, in fact, it may result in our mines being closed down indefinitely. That is something for you gentlemen to consider very seriously.

We will need tungsten for our defense long after this present emergency is over, and by decreasing this duty you will not stimulate imports. You would simply discourage and in fact bar the development of our resources and the work that our Government is undertaking. It can go so far; the Government can prove this tungsten, it can explore the ground, but it takes private initiative and private capital to develop the mines, to bring them into production. And I hope that you gentlemen will just remove this item of tungsten from the articles that are being considered under this trade agreement.

Now, coming to the matter of beef, I want to say a few words and call your attention to a few salient points in connection with our cattle-growing and livestock industry. I do not think there is any industry on which our farming is at present more dependent than the stock-growing industry, for an outlet for some of the products of the farms. You can take it around the circle. I may point to something that I learned not so very long ago, that down in Florida, where they have an excess of sugarcane for grinding, they are not permitted under these quotas to manufacture into cane sugar. They are buying up cattle and using that as material for fattening these cattle and to put them in shape for the market. That is only a minor thing, but when we come to think of our forage, our hay land, our beet-pulp byproduct, that is being used to fatten sheep and cattle; when we think of the byproducts of the flour mills, bran and shorts, and of the wheat manufacturing industries going into feed for cattle, and our corn in the great corn States going into the feed lots to fatten cattle, I say positively that the cattle industry in this country is one of the most important outlets for the raw materials produced on the farm.

And I want to say this to you, that we all appreciate and understand that agriculture has been in a depressed condition for a long time, and the other branches of industry have been taxed pretty heavily to support and assist agriculture to a stable position, and one of the bright spots in agriculture at the present time is the market for cattle and meat. As I pointed out, it is an outlet for the products of other raw materials of the farm, and it would be a serious mistake, as I see it, to bring cattle back into the same position or below the cost of production, which we generally understand the farmers are struggling against in producing the other agricultural products in this country, a condition which the Government is going to step in and attempt to relieve by making very liberal appropriations.

Now, when the production of cattle is helping the situation on the farms to the extent that it is, it would seem to me that by bringing in importations, that will bring the price of cattle down and bring them below the cost of production; that such a program is unthinkable. I hope that you gentlemen will give this matter the most careful consideration, and that you will particularly take into consideration what our domestic market and a fair price for cattle mean.

I want to call your attention, from my own personal experience, to the conditions that prevailed in 1933. I remember going into the market with 100 head of good fat cattle. In fact, I cut out 13 Shelly cows, as we called them, a cow that was not good for a cutter. We hear talk today about canners, but you know a good cow that has produced several calves and is now ready to be turned off, she may be fat and in good shape, but still she is a cutter and falls in that class.

I took these cattle into the yards, into the Union Stock Yards, in November 1933, just the day that the processing tax went into effect on hogs, if you remember, and what do you suppose I got for 100 head of cattle—fat steers and calves and cows, all in good shape, an even 100 head? Well, I got $10.20 a round. I got $1,020. Now, do you think that anybody could say that $10 per head for cattle—and many others got prices within that range—would return the cost of production? Why, they hardly paid for cutting the hay crop that went into the feeding of the cattle, or the wages of the man that fed them, to say nothing of the taxes on the land.

The cattle industry, gentleman, is the basis of the prosperity of the farm in the West. It is the basis of the whole farm economy. A man in the dairy business must turn off his male stock; he must find an outlet for this product, and that is one of the most profitable things under present conditions of the dairy industry; that is, the return from the sale of what you turn off in the way of beef, whether it is male calves, whether it is veal, or steers that you raise or whether you turn off your milk cows or whatever you have. On every farm in the West where they have a farm of any size they keep a little herd of cattle. They may be in the dairying business, they may be in the livestock business, it may be a wheat ranch, but still they keep a few cows; and when the wife wants a new dress or they want to make a payment on the automobile and particularly when they must pay taxes they can sell a steer, and I will tell you, when you go into this cattle matter you are going right to a very responsive spot in the whole national economy.

Chairman RYDER. We are very glad to have your statement. You understand, do you, that neither cattle nor beef are included in this, but that it refers only to canned meat?

Mr. WHITE. Well, we are dealing with the matter of the finished product of the cattle industry. The canned meat comes into direct competition with the byproduct of our dairying and cattle industries because we must turn off our surplus cattle, our bulls and calves. We do not use a bull over two seasons, and we must also turn off our superannuated cows, no matter how fat they are. They are good food, they are good meat. Do not get in your mind the idea that they are not fit for food. And we must turn off our male stock.

I hope you gentlemen will take into consideration the welfare of the farmers and livestock industry, for as I said—and let me emphasize it—you are touching a very vital spot in the national farm economy.

Chairman RYDER. We shall give full consideration to your presentation and to the Senator's.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

ADDRESS OF JOHN J. GRIFFIN, OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered on Memorial Day at Festus, Mo., by the Honorable John J. Griffin, of St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Griffin has devoted much of his time during the past decade to educating our people to the dangers of the un-American activities that have been carried on in this country. His address follows:

MEMORIAL DAY SPEAKER CALLS AMERICA TO UNITE AGAINST DESTRUCTIVE FORCES—JOHN J. GRIFFIN DESCRIBES ENEMIES WHO ARE BORING FROM WITHIN TO DEFEAT DEMOCRACY'S PURPOSE

As we gather here today, it is with the hope that all they who are assembled for the same purpose, throughout the Nation, may obtain strength from the spirit of those who have gone on to rededicate themselves to these same principles of liberty and freedom, in order that we may become a united Nation,

united in purpose as well as in deed, to overcome the forces that are at work in our Nation today to make a mockery of the sacrifices of those whom we honor.

It is essential that you and I, as well as the millions assembled throughout the Nation today at gatherings such as this, lay aside all differences of opinion. Forget the fact that we are Jews or Gentiles, Catholics or Protestants, Democrats or Republicans, and become a united people, possibly with different views on religious, social, and political lines, but with united views on patriotic and national lines.

Therefore, with this object in view, let us proceed. First, I might tell you, if you will pardon the personal reference, that just a year ago today I made the principal address at a ceremony similar to this at Jefferson Barracks, and as I stood on the platform overlooking "God's acre" where the remains of our Nation's heroic dead were mingled with God's earth, I paid my respects to the enemy forces within our shores. The result was, the following morning the German Consul in St. Louis notified our bank that he could not do business with a banking institution that had an official such as I connected with it. The answer he received from Byron Moser, the president of our bank, was that we were an American institution; that we intended to remain as such and if it ever became necessary for us to exchange ideals and principles for enemy dollars, we would close the doors of our bank.

I sincerely trust that the same German Consul has his agents here to make notes of my remarks, and if not that he will have the opportunity of reading them from the copies of your local newspaper files.

SATAN IN HUMAN FORM

In my opinion, and I think it is an opinion that is shared by man, Satan himself has come out of the depths of hell and has taken human form to carry on the fight of anti-God that is raging in Europe. Hitler, in my opinion, is possessed of the evil one.

Nazi-ism is not a national political party—it is a religion; a religion that claims its leader is God; a religion that denies the existence of a Supreme Being, but in its hypocritical pronouncements calls that Being to witness its acts; that hypocrisy is merely for the purpose of deluding the unthinking people, or is merely a smoke screen to hide the real purpose behind the movement.

Nazi-ism, communism, and fascism all three have the same aims and objects, and those aims and objects are to destroy in the minds and in the hearts of the people a belief in a God and a hereafter. They are not anti-Jews or anti-Catholics or Anti-Lutheran, or anti any particular religion; they are anti-God. The leaders know and understand that under the totalitarian form of government that a belief in a God and a hereafter, and a belief in justice, decency, and honesty cannot exist in the same sphere with our principles.

Is this a far-fetched statement? If you think so, let me quote the exact words of the leader of the German Nation:

"The religions are all alike, no matter what they call themselves. They have no future—certainly none for the Germans. Fascism, if it likes, may come to terms with the church. So shall I. Why not? That will not prevent me from tearing up Christianity root and branch, and annihilating it in Germany."—Adolf Hitler.

NAMES ANTI-AMERICAN GROUPS

In carrying on their work in America, their system of propaganda is very insidious, very clever, but nevertheless as the records of other countries show, it is very effective. In this country there are in excess of 500,000 Nazi agents and their sympathizers; the agents in the pay of the German Government, the sympathizers, the unpaid, unwitting, simple tools of the "fifth column," and the bundists, a standing army in our midst to do the job of destruction demanded by their employer.

In addition to that group, you have in excess of 1,000,000 members of the Communist Party who pay dues into that organization. They are organized in America as a standing army and with their sympathizers are here for the purpose of destroying our democracy.

These paid agents of the enemy government will be found in every walk of life. You will find them in the schools, colleges, and universities as teachers and professors.

You will find these paid and unpaid agents in the youth organizations of the country. They are instructed to join every organization, whether it be political, social, or religious, in order that they might carry on the propaganda of destruction.

CREATE UNREST AND STRIFE

We find these same paid agents and emissaries of hell in labor organizations, creating unrest, strife, and turmoil in order that they may do the job for which they are paid, and that is, prevent our preparedness program from becoming a reality by fermenting strikes and placing in the hearts and in the minds of the workers hate and prejudice.

We find them in the halls of finance, where again they are doing the job and doing it well by fermenting hate and strife in the ranks of capital with the hope that they will be able to turn capital against labor as well as labor against capital.

We find them in the social life of the country, some in low places and some in high places in government, either by having themselves elected to office or securing appointments to office.

We find them in the pulpits in the churches of our country, men who are supposed to be teaching the doctrines of peace and justice.

PURPOSE TO PREVENT UNITY

They are working for one purpose and one purpose only; that purpose is to prevent this country of ours from being a united country with a united people and a united purpose in mind.

There is one other element at work in this country, who, knowingly or unknowingly, aid the purpose of the subversive elements and the "fifth column," and are doing the job well; that is the element who are writing, publishing, printing, distributing, or selling this flood of indecent, filthy, obscene literature that has come upon us as an avalanche in the last few years. In addition to this group there is another group, the writers, producers, and promoters of this flood of indecent and filthy entertainment that has engulfed us in the past several years.

There must be a guiding hand and a directing force in America for all of these paid and unpaid "fifth columnists" and subversive elements that are spreading the doctrines of nazi-ism, communism, and fascism. That directing force will be found in the offices of the consuls of the governments they represent, consulates who have increased their staffs from 50 to 500 percent at a time when we have no business relations or traffic with their country.

It is your duty and your obligation to support your Government in ridding this country of these leading geniuses of evil, and return them to the countries from which they came, so that they may live under the type and kind of government they are trying to force upon us but which we do not want.

It is your duty and your obligation to drive out of our educational systems every individual who is not an American at heart and who is not teaching American principles and ideals to our youth.

MUST LIVE FOR COUNTRY

If any of you who are here today are members of organized labor, I would say to you, that unless you drive out of your organizations these subversive elements, who are at work, you are a traitor to the cause of labor.

You are untrue to the many who have preceded you and have given their lives, their energies, and in many instances their life's blood in order that labor might have the exalted position that it holds in American life today.

As I talk to you today, I can feel surrounding us that great army of silent Americans who have died in order that we might live, and I am sure they are trying with all possible force to pierce that great void where time blends with eternity in order to bring to you and to me a message, and that message would be:

"It is a blessed, a holy, and a sacred thing for one to die for one's country; but it is just as blessed, just as holy, and just as sacred for one to live for one's country." So in order not to prove false to them, let us give no consolation to the enemy. Let us from this day forth be a united people, united Americans, united for the preservation of the only nation upon the face of God's earth today where liberty and freedom reign, and where the worship of God is man's prerogative.

The Tired Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1941

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, day after day from this floor the Speaker has heard speech after speech regarding the tired executive, the tired toiler, the tired teacher, the tired soldier, the tired sailor, the tired minister, the tired mother, the tired nurse, and so on far into the session; but today, Mr. Speaker, you who are yourself a Congressman, are about to have the opportunity to hear the song about the tired Congressman; and here it is:

THE TIRED CONGRESSMAN

(By L. Patrick)

The day had worn itself into a sodden gray,
The sun had let his head down in the west,
The Congressman was on his weary homeward way
To take unto himself a needed rest.
The phone had roused him from his sleep at early hour
To bring him news about a gruntled friend,
A group of men who brought the dope on local power
Moved in to help him his full morning spend.

The headsman of the herd that moves his daily work,
Committee of his constant pride and boast,
Had held him over past the call of whip and clerk
And he had missed the roll he needed most,
Full many chartless chore and many a barren call
The fretful afternoon had seen him do
Now he was headed home for his cot out in the hall
To sleep away the pain that he'd been through.

But news awaited him when last he reached his gate,
The wife had heard it first and was impressed,
A U. S. Senate seat was vacant from his State,
A seat that he could get—and take a needed rest.

The Resources of the Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of an important milestone in our public-land history. Seven years ago Congress passed the Taylor Grazing Act, providing for Federal control, management, and guardianship of the public domain. My friends and colleagues have honored me many, many times during my long years of service in this House, but no greater honor than the one which linked the Taylor Grazing Act with my name. The letters I get from Colorado and nine other Western States stamp this law as the magna carta of American conservation. As everyone knows, the Magna Carta was the Great Charter of English liberties, delivered on June 19, 1215, by King John at Runnymede on the demand of the English barons. Those two words have for the past 726 years been applied to any fundamental constitution that secures personal liberty and civil rights. The comments I hear are to me a great satisfaction that democracy is at work in what used to be the open range of the West. And when our evenings are interrupted with news of bombings, sinkings, blitzkriegs, and international furore I think of the words of a great British general. After he had successfully pushed the Italians back and finally accepted their surrender in Africa, he told his troops, in effect:

If only nations could spend the same energy and ingenuity on constructive work instead of on destruction, this world would be a mighty fine place, in spite of the gnats that get in your hair and the sand that gets in your teeth.

Mr. Speaker, if more people in this country could witness the constructive work going on out in the range country of the West, there would be a wider appreciation of this land we are so proud to call America.

The whole world conflict today is largely a conquest for resources. The dictator must have resources upon which to base his excuse for continued fiendish conquests and human slaughter.

To get them he uses the most infamous instruments of human destruction ever devised in all history, crushing and maiming many millions of innocent and peace-loving people, pillaging and destroying more property and causing more human privation, starvation, misery, and suffering than all other wars combined in all time.

In the light of these world events today, our American way of life and our American resources take on a new and important meaning. The public range, one of our vital resources—one which until 7 years ago was being trampled to the dust through unwise competition and an utterly inadequate public-land policy—is now in the forefront of real national conservation.

We Americans are in a sense idealists; but in a greater sense we are a practical people. Every American father wants his son to have a better chance than he had. In the western range country more than 20,000 American citizens have joined hands with the Federal Government in a cooperative effort to maintain production of meat, leather, and wool on a high productive level while, at the same time, they are preserving and improving the great public-range resource so that their sons may have a better place in which to live.

Today, as on each of the former birthdays of that law, I desire to report on some of the activities and accomplishments of the Grazing Service and the Department of the Interior in the great conservation program that had its first real impetus when, on June 28, 1934, President Roosevelt affixed his signature to—

An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes.

In these critical times, it seems fitting that we should inquire into some of the basic American activities that contribute to our all-out defense effort.

From the isolated cattle ranch, tucked away in the oasis of the desert, to the factory and the assembly line, America is marshaling her forces of production in the greatest common job in our history. Democracy is in action with the determination that those things for which our fathers fought shall not be taken from us. Great edifices in this, our Capital City, throughout our country, symbolize the stuff America is made of and remind us of earlier hardships and triumphs. In the West, we see another side of America in her mountains, valleys, rivers, dams, storage reservoirs, and in her subterranean vaults of coal, oil, copper, iron, and other minerals essential for the assembly line. These storehouses of wealth are but a part of the raw materials upon which we rely for normal peacetime needs.

The West harbors still another resource—a resource that is indispensable to the livestock industry and to our national economy, as well. I speak of the public range which, by its vastness alone, seems like something ethereal. It is this land—the outpost of western civilization—a hundred and fifty million acres of public domain, which Congress finally recognized as of public import when it passed the Taylor Grazing Act.

We are all dependent upon this range in one way or another and have an interest in its proper use, management, and preservation. From it we obtain a goodly portion of the 17,000,000,000-odd pounds of meat which Americans consume annually. The western range is our source of meat for strong soldiers, of wool for warm uniforms, and of leather for sturdy shoes.

SEVEN YEARS OF RANGE CONSERVATION UNDER THE TAYLOR ACT

Much has been crowded into the 7 years of democracy on the range. In that time the 75 years of bitter cattle and sheep wars have been turned into a mutual crusade for better range and a healthier western economy. Seven years ago the 20,000 cattle and sheep operators in 10 States began to see each other's problems in the light of the common good. Instead of settling their differences with intrigue, bloodshed, and Winchesters, they compromised around the council table. The spark to this change in custom was furnished by the very able Secretary of the Interior, who called upon the users of the range to assist in, and become a vital part of, the framework of a decentralized administration. Feuds of many years have been forgotten in this mutual cooperative effort to save the resources of the Federal range and bring order, system, and stability to the land and to the livestock industry.

Recently I had an interesting talk with R. H. Rutledge, a western man whom Secretary Ickes selected to take over the job of Director of the Grazing Service which was organized in the Department of the Interior to administer grazing districts established under the Taylor Act. Mr. Rutledge and I, and my good friend Secretary Ickes, have a dream in common. We see the western range as a new frontier—a challenge to our own generation, a key to the proper and coordinated use of range and cropland, a healthy and stabilized agriculture based on wise use of our natural resources, a place where great reservoirs of wealth may be wisely used and adequately protected; the conservation of our youth, our land, and our communities—sinews of national strength and solidarity. This is a heritage for which every thinking man today wants to fight in the American way—a heritage that we shall preserve for our children and our children's children. The people of the West have accepted the challenge and I am happy to report that, already, a large part of this dream has become a reality.

ISSUANCE OF TERM PERMITS

Mr. Rutledge and I were talking, as we frequently do, about people and things of concern to the western-range livestock industry. He told me—and I was exceedingly glad to hear it—that on July 1 of this year about 60 percent of all the livestock operators using federally owned land in grazing districts will receive 10-year grazing permits. This is a forward step in the goal to stabilize and permanently make solvent the livestock industry dependent upon the public range. Most of these stockmen have been using the Federal range during these first 7 years under temporary grazing licenses. In effect, these licenses and permits are agreements between the livestock operator and Uncle Sam that the allotted range will be properly utilized.

I want to take a moment here to tell you that in the case of the Dewar test case appealed from the State Supreme Court of Nevada, the Supreme Court of the United States, on May 26, 1941, upheld the Secretary of the Interior in his plan to collect grazing fees under temporary grazing licenses pending the accumulation of necessary information to warrant the conversion of these licenses into 10-year grazing permits. This decision has set at rest any doubts regarding the legality or propriety of collecting and using these grazing-fee moneys for the construction of much-needed range improvements and for the general conservation and development of the range lands. The highest tribunal in our land has thus put its stamp of approval on what we of the West proposed and intended and our President and the Congress has approved.

Considering the fact that there are more than 20,000 cases involving 12,000,000 head of stock and a total land area of more than a quarter billion acres, and that the Grazing Service has obtained this information on 60 percent of the users, I think there is one Government agency that is making good use of the funds we provide from the Federal Treasury.

No one need tell me or any of the range stockmen the significance of the issuance of term permits in lieu of temporary licenses. I know what work has been involved in reaching that point where it is possible to foresee 10 years of grazing use. Individual applications to use the range had to be given careful attention; agreements as to numbers and boundary lines had to be reached; range and property surveys had to be made; coordinated use had to be developed between intermingled private and public properties; maps had to be prepared, in some instances of areas never before mapped; protection and improvement had to be provided for overused and depleted areas; temporary licenses had to be issued in recognition of operators' rights to use the range until an analysis warranted the issuance of term permits. The point the Grazing Service has now reached is a far cry from the time not so long ago when there were something like a million nomadic livestock roving tramp herds on these same ranges—stock belonging to nonresident owners or men whose only wordly possessions were their flocks and the meager necessities of a camp which they packed on the back of a burro or two. These men paid no land taxes; they cared not how they overgrazed or left the range when they moved along to greener pasture; they utterly destroyed the range of the local ranchmen. Orderly use has replaced the confusion and devastating abuse of free, unregulated range.

THE NEED FOR RANGE REGULATION

I have said to the House before that my father was a cattleman all his life, that I was born on the range; my home was on the range until I was grown, and my home has been in the range country all my life. Those of you who are westerners by birth or adoption know that the western livestock industry, with all its thrills of round-ups and branding time, faced a chaotic condition a few short years ago. The country which Coronado found covered with grass 400 years ago, so thick and luscious that it never failed to become erect after it had been trodden down, is definitely on the comeback trail. In winning the West the white man viewed an apparent endless resource of grass with a belief that it never could be exhausted.

Overconfidence in plenty resulted in waste, which was followed by overuse of what remained. Free range and less grass resulted in poorer stock, economic loss, and loss of topsoil that will take years to replace. When grain prices soared as a result of the first World War, lands intended by Nature for grazing were plowed up and planted to wheat and other cereal crops, only to fail when the rains did not come. Trees were cut down; sod broken. Livestock were crowded onto already crowded public grazing lands and these lands were overgrazed to a point where little vegetation remained and wind and water erosion attacked the unprotected surfaces.

Generations of misguided use, uncontrolled range competition, and the ups and downs of booms and depressions, droughts and hard winters combined to place the established livestock operator of 1934 in a precarious position. Up to this point he found the going a little more difficult each succeeding year. The western livestock man was not entirely to blame for this situation. Prior to 1934 the public range was free to all who cared to use it. This lack of a public-land policy suitable to these wild lands virtually compelled destructive competition. The stockman who depended upon the range for a livelihood was forced to use defiant and abusive methods if he stayed in business. With the protection and control afforded by this act he has demonstrated his ability to practice conservation of both land and stock.

HOME RULE ON THE RANGE

Today 56 Federal grazing districts, embracing over 140,000,000 acres of public land, have been established in the States of Utah, Nevada, California, Colorado, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Arizona, and Wyoming. In the administration of these grazing districts the Grazing Service has the valuable assistance of advisory boards composed of local stockmen who are elected by the range users themselves.

These advisory boards are made up of men outstanding in their community—men who know how to deal only one way, and that is fairly and squarely. These men bring home rule to the range. They speak out for the over 20,000 livestock operators whose interests they represent.

These boards tackle their job in characteristic fashion. They personify the democratic principles upon which our Nation was founded—the right of the people to participate in framing the policies necessary to the public interest.

Right here I want to mention an example of public service rendered by the advisory board of the Magdalena grazing district in New Mexico. The seven men serving on this board today are the same men whom the licensees have elected and reelected every year since the district was organized in 1935. To me there could be no greater tribute than is shown by this neighborly appreciation of the licensees in this district. Indeed, this is a tribute to integrity, experience, and sound judgment which all of us in this great body can well understand.

"Home rule on the range" has worked so well that livestock organizations in 1939 sponsored an amendment to the Taylor Act in which the advisory-board system was made a permanent part of the grazing-district administration. Secretary Ickes promptly endorsed this proposal. He said:

> I'm sure I don't know where we would have gone without them. They have kept us on the right track, and I can see no greater contribution to a public service than that rendered by the advisory boards. Not only have they aided the Federal Government in solving important public questions but they have also unselfishly served the thousands of stockmen whose livelihoods are so closely linked with this great conservation measure.

The net result is that each of the 20,000 licensees on the Federal range is an active conservationist. The system brings the stockman and the Federal Government together in a mutual effort for a better livestock business and stability to the forage resources.

Last year, representatives of these boards formed an independent organization to better serve the interests of the men they represent in all matters and to coordinate activities of their industry for quick and positive action in time of emergency. A few months ago, this group of men—two advisory board members from each of the nine administrative regions—met to consider proposed revisions in the Federal Range Code. The Grazing Service sought their advice, and they were requested to recommend new rules, or changes in present rules, which seemed necessary to meet the problems inherent in grazing districts. I want to say that Secretary Ickes has shown unusual interest and fine understanding of the stockman's problems. As a matter of fact, I am told that the rules under which the licensees operate are rules which they themselves have proposed.

RANGE CONSERVATION AND REGULATION PAY DIVIDENDS

Benefits to the stockmen from regulated grazing and improvement, and proper use of these western range lands, are everywhere in evidence. Calf and lamb crops are heavier than in the old days, and the production of beef, wool, and mutton is greater; grass stands are stronger, permitting the full number of grazing animals on a given area; there are decreased death losses from predators and poisonous plants; stock water and trailing facilities are becoming better each year. Stockmen are supporters of this plan of home rule on the range. They know that when a certain range is allotted to them there will be feed on that range when they arrive. It will not have been taken off by trespassers or tramp herds.

Recently, I made a special effort to get some evidence of the improved range and livestock conditions in the grazing districts. I learned, for instance, that

sheepmen in the Crooked Creek Valley, north of Lakeview, Oreg., reported a 100-percent lamb crop last year for the first time in the history of their business. In this State, more than 100 water holes have been constructed by the Grazing Service and, as one fellow put it, it has been made possible for them to "lamb" right in the middle of the desert without the risk of running short of water. Lambs marketed in Oregon the past 2 years have averaged 8 to 10 pounds heavier than previously. Ranch values are up 40 to 60 percent over 5 years ago. One prominent stockman near Burns estimated that his range privilege is worth at least half of the total value of his ranch set-up. Ranches that were going under the hammer 10 years ago are now contributing to the local tax structure.

Today the stockman who has qualified by dependent property and prior use of the range to graze a definite number of stock and definite range, has a definite asset. It has vastly improved his credit facilities. Banks and loan companies know that the man who has an established livestock business and grazing privileges on the public range contributes to the economic stability of his community and, indirectly, of the entire country. With the "tramp operators" removed from the picture, one of the most speculative influences in his business has been removed. One man in Utah considers the Federal-range rights his property demands worth an added 75 cents per head for his 3,000 sheep. There are evidences everywhere that property values have increased in line with the legitimate range rights attached to the private property upon which grazing privileges are based.

RANGE VALUES ARE BEING APPRAISED

I understand that the Grazing Service is now making an appraisal of the value of range privileges in grazing districts. This appraisal is authorized by section 3 of the Taylor Act, which requires that a reasonable grazing fee be determined from time to time for each locality. Grazing-land values are being studied in the light of all factors involved. The study includes information on commercial leases and tax data in each State concerning privately owned range; cost-and-income records from 500 typical ranches involving the use of approximately 5,000,000 acres of private range land; and complete analysis of about 250 typical ranches in grazing districts that are composed in part of public domain grazing privileges. The element of what the livestock men may afford to pay is an important feature when the values on private lands are then compared with the values of public land in the various grazing districts.

Naturally, I wanted to know what the picture looked like in Colorado. The study seems to show an extremely favorable range situation in my State—production of beef, lamb, and wool is relatively high. The many years of better breeding and better livestock practices have borne fruit. This, I think, is an indication of the healthy conditions of stock and range that now exist in all of the 10 Western States.

STRUCTURAL RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

While values such as I have just mentioned are evidenced in many indirect ways, there are other increased values in the form of structural improvements which are on the range for anyone to see. I speak of such things as stock-water reservoirs, stock trails, fences, and similar improvements put on grazing-district lands by the Grazing Service through the facilities of the Civilian Conservation Corps and by the expenditure of 75 percent of grazing-fee moneys, which, by law, are returned to the States and counties in which grazing districts are located. As one of my cowboy friends put it:

The public domain has sure had a face lifting these last 5 years.

For example, in the arid Western Range States, where stockmen formerly had to adjust their plans to meet the whims of the weather, the Grazing Service has built 1,248 stock-watering reservoirs, developed 580 springs, and drilled 223 wells for thirsty stock. C. C. C. enrollees have constructed 4,187 miles of fence on the range—enough to fence the Atlantic seaboard from Labrador to the Florida Keys. These boys have built over 9,000 miles of truck and stock trails and nearly 2,000 miles of stock driveways. They have eradicated destructive rodents on about 10,000,000 acres. They have rid the range of poison plants, reseeded depleted areas, constructed corrals and cattle guards, and many diversion and check dams. The list of accomplishments of these C. C. C. camps is so long I cannot go over it all at this time, but I do want to point to the significance of some of these things and tell you what they have meant to the range itself and to the stockman whose livelihood depends upon it.

In the case of truck and stock trails, the livestock operator can now truck his lambs and his calves to shipping points from formerly inaccessible areas and save the time and "shrink" of a long drive. Too, he can take advantage of good prices while they are good. In my own State of Colorado I know of a truck trail built by the Grazing Service enrollees across a canyon connecting 2 range areas used by 120,000 sheep during different seasons. It used to be that sheepmen had to hire extra men to force the sheep over steep and dangerous ledges in this area. Losses were inevitable—one operator lost 35 lambs while attempting to get over the 2½-mile distance. Camp equipment had to be trucked 60 extra miles to get from one side of the canyon to the other. The C. C. C. camp stationed in the locality built a trail called the Beaver Creek Truck Trail across the canyon. Operators now cross easily with their sheep in 2 or 3 hours, with no loss of stock and little or no loss in weight. Camp trucks now cross over the new trail through the canyon in second gear in 15 or 20 minutes. Throughout the Federal range territory these truck trails serve as access roads to main highways and shipping points. They reach into the back country and also serve for the transportation of mineral ores and other raw materials essential to our national defense.

Another range development typical of the many undertaken by the Grazing Service through its long-term improvement program is the Gypsum Valley improvement—again, in Colorado. When I came to Colorado in the eighties, Gypsum Valley was a veritable garden spot. However, as livestock numbers in the area increased, stock were crowded onto the valley range and at the lower end, near the only permanent water in the area, there was, twice yearly, a great concentration of stock. Here the forage was eaten off or trampled out and it was not long before erosion attacked the unprotected surfaces. Starting at the source of water—the Dolores River—erosion fingered its way 9 miles up the valley and exacted a heavy toll of forage plants and topsoil.

The Gypsum Valley problem was one of the first tackled by the Grazing Service C. C. C. camp at Redvale, Colo. First, a truck trail was built across the full length of the valley. This trail is the key to the whole project. It made possible safe and economical transportation for work crews who were to develop the entire valley; it allows easy and efficient range management by stockmen and Grazing Service officers; it permits the quick and satisfactory handling of livestock and feed.

The problem of erosion was next given attention. Small check dams, made of logs, brush, and stone, were constructed, which hold the soil and head off a great portion of the erosion in the valley. Next, stock-water developments were built in the upper portion of the valley so that the entire area might be equally utilized. Four large reservoirs were constructed in quick succession. Finally, drift fences were built at the upper end of the valley to control the movement of grazing stock. Stockmen cooperated wholeheartedly in this development and, while there is still work to be done in Gypsum Valley, an upward trend is marked and definite, and another sorely depleted area is well on the way to its former state of productivity.

These range improvements speak for themselves. A full reservoir on arid range land, where, before, there was no water at all, tells a story of true significance which the range stockman can readily appreciate.

Division fences hold stock from overgrazed areas until the grass can grow again. That is conservation. Truck trails open up new range country and permit trucking to market, instead of trailing, at a saving of feed, time, and expense. Fenced driveways reduce "shrink" en route to the shipping point. Revegetation means more grass and less erosion. Elimination of poisonous plants from the range, like the control of predatory animals, removes one of the stockman's worst hazards.

RANGE PREPAREDNESS

I am proud of the progress that has been made in range conservation on the public lands. We want to keep our people on the land. We want our land to keep the people. These objectives

cannot be realized if soil is permitted to wash away and the salt of the earth to be on the march because of wasted resources. The Grazing Service is proving that there is room for a happy people and a sound economy in the public-domain States. Western stockmen realize the real, lasting value of proper use of the range and, by refraining from expanding their numbers when prices improve, are allowing this forage to improve both in quality and quantity. This is a cushion against possible lean years of low prices or extreme drought. Care is being taken that the mistakes of the last World War are not repeated. Range and livestock are today in much better condition than they have been in a number of years. It is imperative that we maintain this improvement in order to be able to produce the maximum needs of our civilian and military arms of defense. In this resolve, the Grazing Service has the support of all who are directly or indirectly concerned with the problem. A resolution passed at one of the western livestock association meetings this spring reads as follows:

We endorse the principles involved in the Taylor Grazing Act and administration thereof, for it is proving an effective control of tenure and a wise use in the interest of conservation and stabilization of the livestock industry.

A new chapter is being written in the history of the land policy of our Nation. While improving and protecting the range resource, the Grazing Service has allotted the range for the orderly use of more than 12,000,000 head of livestock on lands belonging to Uncle Sam. Today there is less conflict, less selfishness, on the range. The present generation of range livestockmen who inherited a declining resource look to the future with courage and confidence. Government by the governed has meant a fair and unbiased apportionment of grazing rights. The recovery of the range itself is the first step in the stabilization of the western livestock industry. The younger generation of ranch-raised men and women are encouraged to remain in their home communities and carry on the business of their parents because the future looks bright. With the bloom of the desert and with range wars in the discard, we see the grizzled stockman, who helped write the colorful history of the West, counseling his children to carry on. The mistakes of the past are fast being put right.

I have been shown and permitted to use a letter recently written by Mr. Owen O'Fallon, of Gunnison, Colo., to Mr. Russell B. Rose, regional grazier, Grand Junction, Colo. The letter contains so many constructive and useful suggestions that I feel it is of sufficient interest to justify my including it in my remarks, as follows:

GUNNISON, COLO.,
May 31, 1941.

MR. RUSSELL B. ROSE,
Regional Grazier,
Grand Junction, Colo.

DEAR MR. ROSE: I am writing to tell you of my appreciation and confidence in the Grazing Service and the work you people are doing for the ranges and stockmen in this Colorado Grazing District No. 3.

I was born and raised on a ranch, and all of my some 35 years in business have been connected with livestock and ranching. I am with a considerable number of the stockmen in this district and a good many from other sections, and very nearly all with whom I have talked have about the same opinion of the Grazing Service as my own. Our livestock experience in this part of the country, as you know, has to do with open-range operation for a considerable part of each year.

The first forward step under the Taylor Grazing Act was the regulation of the grazing privileges on the range, this regulation being accomplished with a minimum of trouble and fuss. The great factor in this work was the fact that administrative personnel, as far as my knowledge goes, were, without exception, men who knew the stock business from actual experience and were able to understand the stockman's problems and talk his language. Then the stockmen had, and still have, a voice in the proposition through the advisory boards of actual users of the range, elected by vote of the bona fide range users—the ideal set-up for complete understanding of any range problem and for the resolving of this problem for the greatest good to the greatest number.

Under these conditions there is no chance, under human control, except for improvement in the condition of the ranges, which can do nothing but benefit the livestock business; for instance, the range-improvement program of the Grazing Service. In my own unit, which is a common-use unit, sheep, cattle, and horses all use the same territory. Through the rodent-control program, prairie dogs, gophers, etc., are being eliminated, thus increasing the forage for wild game and domestic stock by the amount taken and destroyed by these rodents, which is pretty accurately estimated from 15 to 25 percent.

Then the water-development program—in the lower foothills and desert, so-called, there were great tracts of public land where forage grew, but could not be utilized for the reason that watering places were so far apart stock or game could not graze except for comparatively small areas around these watering places. Result: These areas were overgrazed and great stretches left untouched. On the desert the Grazing Service, with C. C. C. labor and with range-improvement funds, has built, and is still building, small reservoirs to catch and hold water from snows and flash storms for the use of livestock and game in these unused areas, thus making unnecessary and not to be tolerated overgrazing on the areas around the old natural watering places. In the foothills small natural springs are being developed, fenced, and the water carried to troughs so animals may get clean water to drink without trampling the spring to a mudhole unfit for anything to drink from.

A new and unique water-development experiment completed last fall on the unit on which my stock are grazed produced most gratifying results and opened an almost unlimited field for such projects in the foothill country. The labor was performed by C. C. C. enrollees under Grazing Service supervision. The cost, I am told by your people, was $34.50. No material went into this project except some rock which was picked up on the hillside.

This project is in a typical part of the sparsely watered belt between the higher hills which are much better watered, and the river valleys where the livestock are fed in winter. This belt is also the principal winter feeding ground for deer, elk, and sage grouse. Domestic stock have been able to get little use from this section because of lack of water and game use restricted for the same reason. The site of this project was absolutely dry when the work started, the nearest water being miles away. The presence of two small clumps of willows some 75 feet apart and a small area of wire grass and the fact that these growths do not exist where their roots cannot reach water, led me to urge the Grazing Service to try to find water there. Two small test pits were started, one by each willow clump. Before much depth was attained, water appeared in each hole and at a depth of 8 feet a good flow of water was coming into each pit. Trenches were then dug to carry the water to an earth tank scooped out with a tractor equipped with a bulldozer. The pits were filled with loose rock to prevent caving and to obviate the possibility of animals falling in, the trenches treated the same and the earth tank riprapped with flat rock to prevent animals from miring and a beautiful tank of living water appeared where the sun had never shone on water in the memory of man. This spring there were innumerable tracks of deer and sage grouse around the tank, and on one trip there a pair of ducks rose from its surface. This tank of water will service an area in a unit carrying some 1,200 cattle, 5,000 sheep, and by wildlife people an estimated 5,000 deer and elk and one of the best sage-chicken areas in the country. Not only will it benefit the stock which water there, but it will relieve the grazing load on the entire unit by opening up the additional area now available for use. Almost countless spots with identical original conditions are scattered through the dry belt.

This is just one instance of the work of bettering the range condition being done by your Service.

Range reseeding just really getting under way, contour furrowing to spread water from the spring runoff, drift fences, eradication of poisonous weeds, among others of the range-development program, are giving wonderful results.

I firmly believe I may say without fear of successful contradiction that the Grazing Service operating under the Taylor Grazing Act, with the cooperation of stockmen and advisory boards of stockmen, has in its short life already done more to better the wildlife conditions, stabilize and protect legitimate livestock operations, protect and rehabilitate the ranges than all Government agencies and private effort, including sportsmen's organizations, combined, have done since North America was settled. The gospel of the Grazing Service, to its everlasting glory, is range improvement instead of merely range conservation. More power to you, say we all.

Very truly yours,

OWEN O'FALLON.

As the years go by we live a little more in retrospect. In conclusion, I will depart for a moment from the theme of this address and speak of our home in the West, with a few personal reflections. I have personally known all of the 21 Senators and 29 Representatives that Colorado has sent to Washington since our State was admitted into the Union on August 1, 1876. Eight of those Senators and 12 of those Representatives served before I came to Congress. I have served in Congress with all the rest of them. I can proudly say that Colorado has never had the slightest occasion to bow her head in shame for anything that any of them ever did either in his official or private life. They have all been loyal, conscientious representatives of our State. But they have been about as widely diversified as possible in their capabilities and fitness for those positions.

During the many public positions with which I was honored, including 12 years

in the Colorado State Senate, before coming to Congress, I formed a firm conviction that what Colorado and the West most needed in Washington was actual service and not oratory; not grandiose statesmanship or national reputations, but practical results and constructive help in the reclamation, conservation, and development of our vast possible resources. That was my ideal of what real Western statesmanship should be.

I am profoundly grateful to the people of western Colorado for their confidence and loyal support during all these years. They are primarily and jointly, with me, entitled to the credit for whatever success I have achieved in Washington. They have given me the opportunity to be of service in securing the many benefits and the development and upbuilding of the West in general, and my home State in particular.

When I came to Congress on March 4, 1909, I had the secret ambition of becoming one of the most really useful, constructive and practically beneficial Members that the West has ever sent to Washington and I have always cherished and earnestly tried to measure up to and realize that fond hope for nearly a third of a century.

Two Billion Dollars and 40 Years in Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, Retired, I am informed was loaned by our Army to the local Philippine Government to work for 11 consecutive years with the Philippine constabulary. He is a keen student of Philippine-United States of America relations. Under permission to extend my remarks I now wish to submit for the RECORD a statement which I have recently received from General Rivers:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 22, 1941.*

To the Honorable FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read the recent interesting speech of Judge John W. Hausserman, of Manila, before the Bar Association of Cincinnati. You had the address inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 19 instant. Hausserman has lived in the Philippines since he was discharged as a soldier of the Kansas regiment there, when our War with Spain terminated. Judge Hausserman is an able man, who has had great success in commercial life in the islands. He is popularly known as the Gold King.

I would like to mention one or two matters which Hausserman does not speak of in the Cincinnati speech. Judge Hausserman speaks with enthusiasm of the Philippines as an asset to the people of the United States. He favors our retaining authority over the distant and scattered archipelago. He makes no mention of the distance out to the Philippines nor to the difficulties attending an attempt to permanently defend those islands.

The Filipinos as a whole earnestly desire the independence we often promised them. My conviction—after years of residence in many parts of the Philippines—is the islands are an economic and strategic liability to the people of the United States. No doubt a relatively small number of Filipinos and others who are interested in the cultivation of sugar in the Philippines would be pleased if the United States held the islands under some sort of dominion government. In fact, John Gunther states in his book Inside Asia that he visited the Philippines and says the sugar men oppose independence for the islands and desire to see the independence act of our Congress revoked. As long as we hold the Philippines the greater part of the sugar from the islands, and other products, comes into the United States free of duty. This is unfair to the many farmers in Michigan and other States who are engaged in sugar growing themselves.

Japan is squarely between the United States and Manila—and on the straight, short route to the Orient. It is 4,500 miles out to Japan; to Manila it is 6,000 miles, 1,500 miles farther. President Theodore Roosevelt wrote Taft in 1907, "The Philippines form our heel of Achilles." Our Admiral Yarnell said a few years ago to a committee of Congress that in order for us to go freely to the Philippines, if we were at war with Japan, "You would need a fleet twice the size of the fleet of Japan." More than once Admiral William D. Leahy said to committees of Congress, "The defensive line of the American Navy reaches from the Aleutian Islands to the Hawaiian Islands, to Samoa and to the Canal at Panama." And, speaking on a large increase for the fleet, Admiral Leahy told the House Naval Committee, "The Navy when it is increased by the authority in this bill will be seriously inadequate to the task of sending a naval force to the Philippines."

It is well known that taxes of the Filipinos pay the expenses of the government of the Philippines—and pay for all improvements. Yet, the American taxpayers have paid about $2,000,000,000 in the past 40 years on account of the Philippines—in putting down the insurrection, keeping American soldiers and extra war vessels in the islands, building residences for our High Commissioner at Manila and Baguio, for maintaining over the broad expanse of the Pacific Ocean a transport service and so on.

Our trade with the Philippines and with China has been a great disappointment, with the balance in both countries against us. Our trade with Japan is more than our trade with China and the Philippines combined. In the trade with Japan there is a great balance on our side also.

I believe Japan will not annex the Philippines after 1946. Japan is so near the Philippines that she will in any event always get much of the trade with the Philippines.

I hope the Filipinos will get their independence. Also, I hope we will grant the Filipinos a continuation of trade privileges for a few years after 1946. With a fair start, the Filipinos will govern themselves well. They work hard and are ambitious and anxious to succeed.

Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

The National Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have always been keenly interested in the preservation of our attractive national scenery for two main reasons. In the first place, no patriotic westerner with a long view into the future can fail to recognize the value of our national parks in the Nation's economy. Our Federal parks protect the noblest scenic masterpieces in the United States and the most significant and sacred of our historic shrines. These areas form a background of the best our country has to offer, against which we citizens carry on our own individual and our national lives.

In the second place, I have a special personal interest in the National Park Service itself, since its history is so interlinked with my own public life. I have taken an active part in the creation of many of our national parks and monuments. In the early part of 1906, I joined with many other public-spirited citizens of Colorado in helping to secure establishment of the Mesa Verde National Park on June 29 of that year. Mrs. Taylor and I, with a guide and pack horses, visited that most attractive and weird region when there was not another human being within its present boundaries.

I took my seat in Congress March 4, 1909. In 1910 was launched a movement to create a bureau in the Federal Government charged with the duty of coordinating the national parks, which had grown in a somewhat Topsylike manner. People were becoming aware that they had ownership in a magnificent national heritage and were visiting the parks in increasing numbers. The new Glacier National Park had just been established, others were projected, and a coordination of national-park activities was imperative.

I am confident my personal vigorous appeal to President Taft in May 1911 had much to do with the Executive order which he issued on the 24th of May that year creating the Colorado National Monument in central western Colorado which has become one of the most popular monuments in our entire country.

The first effort to secure a parks bureau was headed by Dr. J. Horace McFarland, president of the American Civic Association—an organization that still, under its new name, American Planning and Civic Association, stands solidly for national-park integrity and against commercial aggression and nonconforming uses.

I remember that the then Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Walter L. Fisher, supported the project strongly, and that President Taft sent a special message to Congress urging the establishment of a parks bureau. Beginning in 1910, for

three successive Congresses bills for this purpose were introduced by Judge John E. Raker of the House and Senator Reed Smoot.

But the time was not quite ripe and it was not until 1916 that a bill to establish the National Park Service, introduced by Congressman William Kent, was enacted into law. That was on August 25, 1916. I took a very active and enthusiastic part in the passage of the law creating the National Park Service. I felt then and I have believed ever since that it was one of the greatest measures ever enacted in Congress for the conservation and preservation of our scenery for the instruction and pleasure of all of our citizens and all foreign visitors to our country. I was a member of the Public Lands Committee in those days, and sat in at the hearings on the bill. Even then I was interested in financing. I was afraid at that time, for instance, that in the future one park, such as the Yellowstone, might make more money through its revenues than it needed, and so I suggested that the revenues be devoted to the Service generally, giving the Department discretion in the use of the funds. And I worried for fear the Washington end of the Service would grow too large. Later, when the bill was under consideration on the floor of the House, I made this statement:

> We, the committee, want to have a systematic distribution of improvements and the expenditure of money under the Service.

We have gone a long way since then in both budgeting and understanding park needs.

In 1921 I became a member of the Appropriations Committee and ever since have followed with closest interest the activities of the National Park Service.

Even before passage of the Organic Act setting up the National Park Service, steps were taken in the Department of the Interior to coordinate park administration. Franklin K. Lane had become Secretary of the Interior in President Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet in 1913. He was a man who knew and loved the national parks, and recognized the need for a central administration. He appointed as an assistant a fellow Californian, Adolph C. Miller, to give especial consideration to park matters. In 1915, Stephen T. Mather succeeded him as Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior in charge of national parks. Also a Californian, an outdoor man who knew the national parks from actual mountaineering experience, his appointment marked the beginning of a new era in park administration.

The tale is told—I do not vouch for it, but I like it—that Steve Mather, not liking certain conditions he encountered in a national park, so wrote his old friend of college days, Secretary Lane. The Secretary, the story goes, wrote back:

> DEAR STEVE: If you don't like the way the parks are being run, come down and run them yourself.

Whatever the motivation, Mr. Mather did just that. A practical businessman, he was also an idealist, his idealism being of the same brand as that which inspired the fathers of the Yellowstone idea. Most of you probably know the story of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, but it will bear repetition. Indeed, its repetition is especially timely now, as it is the story of men voluntarily giving up land ownership and potential wealth that others might benefit.

I wish I could have been with the party that for a month in 1870 explored the country that is now Yellowstone National Park. Especially would I give much to have sat in at that campfire just before the party broke up, when they discussed preempting the wonders they had seen and ways and means of dividing them for maximum personal gain. One member of the party, Judge Cornelius Hedges, of Montana, opposed any filing of claims upon the Yellowstone. There should be no private ownership of any portion of that spectacular region, he said; rather, the whole of it should be set apart as a great national park. Eventually the others agreed. Nathaniel Langford, a member of the party who later became its historian, wrote in his dairy on September 20, 1870:

> I lay awake half the night thinking of it; and if my wakefulness deprived my bedfellow (Hedges) of any sleep, he has only himself and his disturbing national-park proposition to answer for it.

In 1872 Congress passed the act establishing the Yellowstone National Park as "a public park or pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." Thus a new concept of land use and the first national park came into existence.

Throughout the years the idealism upon which the Yellowstone was founded has been inherent in national-park management. Hand in hand with that idealism has gone a practical administration that has given the people of this country the world's outstanding scenic and historic park system.

The people of Colorado have always been especially interested in the development of the marvelous scenery of our State. Many of us worked for several years to secure the creation of the Rocky Mountain National Park. At that time there was vigorous opposition in Congress to the creation of any more national parks or monuments. Senator Thomas, of Colorado, and I were joint authors of the bill creating that park, and I had a long struggle in the House before succeeding, but I was finally successful in passing the bill through the House. President Wilson signed the law creating the park on January 26, 1915, and presented me with the pen, with an eloquent little speech. President Taft presented me the pen he used in signing the Executive order creating the Colorado National Monument, and President Hoover presented me the pen he used in signing the Executive order creating the Black Canyon of the Gunnison River as a national monument. I have preserved those pens, with many others, and also about 100 gavels that have been presented to me as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which I intend to deposit in some historical museum in Colorado for safekeeping in perpetuity.

To those of us who were in at the birth of the Service, who know of the advances made in park administration during the next dozen years, the name of Stephen T. Mather is synonymous with conservation. He was a successful businessman who, having made for himself a sizable fortune, in middle life turned his talents to what he loved best—the preservation of our superlative natural heritage. Accepting the directorship of the National Park Service in the spring of 1917, with totally inadequate appropriations due to the war situation, he gathered around him a group of enthusiastic young people, who worked longer hours and were more underpaid, I venture to say, than any other similar group in the Government before or since. Among these was Horace M. Albright, another Californian, who went on Secretary Lane's staff with Adolph Miller in 1913. I shall say more about him later. I was a most profound admirer of Stephen T. Mather. He was one of the most public-spirited and noble characters I have ever known, and I was also a genuine admirer of Secretary Lane. In fact, he was a western man, and all of the West admired him. It was a common facetious saying in Colorado that President Wilson's Cabinet was composed of Secretary Lane and nine other fellows.

From the beginning Mather spent of his personal fortune as he did of his energies—in the latter being the first of several park men who literally gave their lives for the furtherance of the cause of national parks. He strongly believed that he should use his talents and wealth for the public good. No doubt many of you have heard him say that as he made his modest fortune out of the western lands through mining borax ore, he felt it fitting that some of his money should go back to the scenic lands of the West.

Through Mr. Mather's enthusiasm—backed by intense personal effort—an appropriation of $50,000 was secured from Congress which, supplemented by a donation of $20,000 from the National Geographic Society, made possible the purchase of the magnificent Giant Forest in Sequoia National Park. Without his efforts, trees thousands of years old would undoubtedly have been chopped down to serve as grapevine posts or pencils. He himself purchased other lands in Sequoia which he donated to the Government.

Again, it was Mather, with the Sierra Club and other friends, who bought the Tioga toll road in Yosemite National Park at a cost of $15,000—and then had to get authority from Congress to give it to the people; who purchased a private holding in Glacier National Park that interfered with effective administration; who spent $28,000 of his personal funds to construct a clubhouse for the rangers of Yosemite; who paid the salaries of additional needed employees in the Washington office. There is no telling how much he spent of his own money or the total amount he inspired others to contribute to national park work.

Of even greater value to the National Park Service, as setting the standards of integrity we so well recognize today, was his handling of Federal funds. Following the methods by which he had succeeded in business, Mr. Mather refused, when asking for appropriations, to pad the initial estimates. Most of you are familiar with the time-honored—or

should I say dishonored—method of padding. A quarter of a century ago it was expected that any bureau chief naturally would ask for half again or twice as much money as he needed, in the hope that when Congress got through trimming he still would have the funds he really needed. Old-line Government people urged Mr. Mather to follow this procedure. He refused, admitting of no argument. He had run his business on business lines, he said, and so long as he managed the affairs of the National Park Service he intended to follow correct business practices.

For a year or two he took an awful trimming, but he stood steadfast on principle. And members of the congressional appropriations committees soon came to respect the estimates and justifications of the National Park Service as completely honest and aboveboard. We have not always agreed with the Service's point of view on particular points in debate, but we have never had cause to question honesty of motive. The procedure instituted by Mr. Mather prepared the Park Service for budgeting by the Bureau of the Budget. And here I want to pay tribute to Representative Louis C. Cramton, of Michigan, who, for many years, as chairman of the subcommittee handling Interior Department appropriations, was very largely helpful in building the present financial structure of the Service.

Mr. Mather had a tremendous capacity for friendship, and through it and his own enthusiasm he drew into the circle of national-park friends leading citizens everywhere. Conservationists, sportsmen, outdoor enthusiasts, writers and publishers, politicians and statesmen, professional people through him came to know and evaluate properly the place the Federal parks play in the pattern of our national life.

During his administration of the national-park system many new areas were added. Among these were the Rocky Mountain, Hawaii, Lassen Volcanic, Mount McKinley, Acadia—which was first established as the Sieur de Monts National Monument in 1916—Grand Canyon, Bryce Canyon, and Zion National Parks; and the Aztec Ruins, Capulin Mountain, Carlsbad Cave, Craters of the Moon, Dinosaur, Fossil Cycad, Glacier Bay, Hovenweep, Katmai, Pipe Spring, Scotts Bluff, Verendrye, Wupatki, and Yucca House National Monuments.

Mr. Mather's last and greatest contribution to the cause of national parks was his life. Suffering a stroke after an unusually heavy field schedule, Stephen Mather resigned on January 8, 1929, and died the following year. Of him Judge Louis C. Cramton said on the floor of the House when news of the great man's death reached us:

> There never shall come an end to the good that he has done.

Let me interpolate here that the same year another fine park man, W. B. Lewis, superintendent of Yosemite National Park from 1916 to 1927, and an assistant director of the Service from 1928 until 1930, literally died in harness. His death was the result of overwork in the early hard days of Service establishment, when men strained to carry on the heavy load until it literally broke their hearts.

Working closely with Mr. Mather throughout his service with the Government was Horace M. Albright. A Californian who was educated in the Colleges of Commerce and Law of the University of California, he joined the staff of the Secretary of the Interior in 1913. As assistant to Mr. Mather before the Service was organized, and as assistant director afterward, his was the guiding hand in legislative and organization matters, in working out new contracts with the concessionaires who had operated in many of the parks on Government franchise for years before the Service was established. In March 1919 Albright submitted his resignation, but finally agreed to continue in the Service in a field post.

Mr. Albright was a worthy successor to Mr. Mather. He had a natural adaptation for that service and he was a man of really superb executive ability. Our country is greatly indebted to both Mr. Mather and Mr. Albright and to Mr. Albright's successor, Arno B. Cammerer, who was one of the most lovable, public-spirited, kind-hearted, and fine citizens I have ever known. In July he was appointed Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, largest as well as the oldest park in the system. As the first civilian superintendent of the Yellowstone in 32 years, he took over the supervision of the park from the Corps of Engineers and cavalary units of the United States Army and organized a civilian administration.

While carrying on this important work for nearly a decade, he spent approximately half of each year, including the winter months, in general duties as Assistant Director—field—still spending some time in Washington each year on legislative and financial matters. His brilliant defense of park legislation always made an excellent impression upon committee members, with whom he traveled extensively in the West.

Upon Mr. Mather's resignation in 1929 his mantle as Director of the National Park Service naturally fell upon Horace Albright, collaborator with him on all big park projects since 1915. The executive ability shown throughout his years with the Department came to full flower during this period. Under his able direction many new and pending projects came to fruition.

Always a student of American history, Albright turned his attention to preservation of historic sites and structures and sought transfer of the military and battlefield parks and other historic monuments from the War Department to the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. With the aid of friends in Congress, he made rapid progress after getting legislation directing the National Park Service to restore George Washington's birthplace at Wakefield, Va. He had the conviction that unless all Federal parks, scenic and historic, all memorials and cherished sites of national significance, and even the District of Columbia parks, were under the National Park Service its influence would never be as strong in conservation as its policies and personnel could make it. Also, he felt that with historic and some scenic and scientific regions scattered among other departments there was always danger that the National Park Service might itself be merged with some other bureau and thus lose its identity altogether. So he was everlastingly courting mergers of other park administrations in other departments with his own in the Interior Department.

President Hoover, in 1932, in his first reorganization plan—which was opposed by Congress—proposed the consolidation of most of the Federal park areas in the national-park system. A year later Mr. Albright's program was incorporated in the first reorganization proposal submitted to Congress by President Roosevelt, and became effective in August 1933.

I have always been profoundly grateful to Mr. Albright and to Secretary Wilbur for supporting my earnest effort to secure the establishment of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison River in my district as a national monument, and we finally succeeded in presuading President Hoover to sign the order creating that monument on March 2, 1933, it being one of the very last acts of his official career.

This park reorganization, however, was never completely satisfactory to Mr. Albright, because it was expanded to include some national cemeteries, public buildings, and other holdings which he felt could not be administered with parks without getting far away from the primary objectives of the organic act of Congress creating the National Park Service.

Another field of activity which interested Albright was personnel selection and organization. He devoted special attention to reclassification of his employees and gained recognition of his Bureau as in the most important group. A firm believer in the merit system and the policies of the Civil Service Commission, he sought able, well-trained men through insistence on examinations, both oral and written, designed to obtain capable employees with exceptional personalities.

The first national historical park was established during Albright's administration, and also the first national monuments of historic interest in the East under Park Service jurisdiction. Interpretation of national parks, after 10 years' trial on a temporary seasonal basis, became a definite part of national-park administration with congressional approval. I know of no single factor that gives more pleasure and understanding to visitors to the national parks than does this interpretive program.

Throughout the years, from the very beginnings of the Service, business had been wooing Mr. Albright. In August 1933, he finally capitulated and resigned as Director. Let me say here, however, that his interest in national park affairs has never waned. His old friends in Congress and elsewhere in the Government still count him one of their strongest allies when park interests are threatened. He is a trustee of Mr. Rockefeller's corporations restoring Colonial Williamsburg and of his Jackson Hole Preserve,

Inc. Albright also is president of the American Planning & Civic Association.

When Mr. Albright became Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park in July 1919, Arno B. Cammerer, formerly with the Fine Arts Commission, was appointed assistant director of national parks, a position later changed to associate director. Later he served in the same capacity to Horace Albright.

During that period Mr. Cammerer devoted much of his official and private time to the promotion of the great eastern national-park projects, which as Director he saw come to fruition. His lavish expenditure of energy during this period laid the groundwork for the physical break that recently proved fatal. He covered nearly every inch of the lands now included in the Shenandoah, Great Smoky Mountains, Mammoth Cave, and Isle Royale National Parks; assisted in laying out their boundaries, advised the associations, commissions, and State governments on securing lands or funds for the purchase of lands; and was personally instrumental in securing huge donations for that purpose. Most of you know the story of the $5,000,000 Rockefeller contribution to the purchase of the Smokies, and of other large gifts. He also labored energetically on the Florida Everglades, never losing hope through years of discouragement. I trust this park may soon be established, as another living memorial to him.

Perhaps the most difficult part of his task in connection with these eastern parks was standing firmly against pressure from enthusiastic backers who oftimes attempted in all honesty to circumvent boundary agreements or conditions of gifts in their eagerness to secure full park status. Eager as Mr. Cammerer himself was to secure the same end, he stood adamant against any short cuts to parkhood that were not in full accord with the intentions of Congress and of contributors to the project, or that would impair the future development of the areas. A man of strong friendships, it was not easy to oppose his friends; to seem to impede progress on the projects. But Cammerer was as noted for his unswerving sense of duty as well as for his loyalty to his friends. Hurt though it must have, he acted on conviction—and future events proved him right.

Inevitably, when Albright resigned, Cammerer succeeded to the directorship—a position for which 10 years of intensive training had admirably fitted him. On the day he became director, August 10, 1933, the President's reorganization of Federal parks, for which Albright had worked so long, took effect. The day before, the Service had administered 63 areas. The reorganization increased the areas to 128, including the unit of the National Capital Parks System. Also added were the functions of various independent establishments. The administration and control of public buildings, included in the reorganization, was held by the Service until July 1, 1939, when it was transferred to a more appropriate agency.

Here you must bear with me for a personal sidelight. Back in July 1916, when the bill to establish the National Park Service was being debated on the floor of the House, I had urged that jurisdiction of all national monuments be placed under the supervision of the Interior Department's prospective new bureau. Even if my arguments did not prevail then, it was gratifying to have my judgment vindicated in 1933 in President Roosevelt's reorganization.

Close on the heels of reorganization came the rapidly expanding emergency relief programs, undertaken in cooperation with C. C. C., P. W. A., C. W. A., E. R. A., N. Y. A., and other agencies. In this connection increase of service personnel was no small part of the problem to be met. On June 30, 1939, there were 13,151 persons on the Service rolls, as against 2,000 on June 30, 1933. Handling such an increase in so short a time put an enormous burden upon the small staff of the service, both in Washington and in the field.

However, I want to emphasize that no funds spent on emergency activities could have been expended to better advantage than on national-park development. The rapidly mounting visiting list had resulted in the urgent need for many new facilities. From 1916 to 1940, travel to the areas under the supervision of the National Park Service increased from 358,006 to 16,741,855, partly, of course, through establishment of new areas and transfers of others. A recent check with the Service developed the fact that preseason travel at this time is away ahead of the same period last year. During the depression years, C. C. C., P. W. A., and other available funds were God-sends to the park administrators.

In addition to the vast increase in duties and responsibilities brought to the Service since 1933 through reorganization and emergency activities, two new programs undertaken as regular functions during Mr. Cammerer's administration are of especial interest to the various States and their political subdivisions. The first, providing for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, and objects of national significance made possible, for the first time in the history of the United States, a broad program of study and preservation of our historic resources. The Service has cooperated with the States and with local and private agencies in the designation of our sacred national shrines as historic sites, and in making agreements with accredited organizations for their development and administration, when not owned by the United States.

The other important new program was the Nation-wide study of public park, parkway, and recreational areas and facilities, undertaken in 1936, which is proving of inestimable value to the States and will be the broad basis for an adequate recreational sytem for the entire country, with coordinated planning between various agencies.

All of these new duties, added to the already arduous work of National Park Service administration, took their toll, and finally Arno B. Cammerer, in April 1939, suffered a severe heart attack which led to the submission to the Secretary of the Interior of his resignation as Director. When relieved of the duties of Service Director, he continued as regional director of region 1, with headquarters at Richmond, Va.

Mr. Cammerer's friends in Congress regretted deeply the necessity for his retirement, yet were glad, under the conditions, that he took what promised to be the safe path for him for many years. We also rejoiced when Secretary Ickes appointed as Director of the National Park Service a man steeped in park and conservation faith, a friend of all three previous directors, a man who had worked with them all for more than a score of years. We look forward to as happy associations with Director Newton B. Drury as we had with his three predecessors. He has a great history to live up to, but I am told by many who know him well that he will do all of that, and make a record of his own. I wish the new Director, Mr. Newton B. Drury, success and that he may fully measure up to the patriotic and wonderful standard of his distinguished predecessors.

As regional director, Cammerer continue to overwork, with little thought of conserving himself. His love of the work was too great. Only a few months ago he was in Florida, to push the Everglades project; then shortly afterward he went to Mammoth Cave, to solve problems concerning the change from limited to full national-park status. Away again on park business—and a collapse. Then the long journey, from which there is no return.

We need men like Cammerer in the Federal Government, and we should take steps to save those we have from death from overwork. Continued overburdening of willing workers is, in the long run, national waste.

During Mr. Cammerer's directorship two other Park Service men of long and valuable service also died in harness of heart trouble. Charles Goff Thomson, Superintendent of Yosemite National Park, carried such a heavy load of work during a period of intense and unusual activities, despite orders from his physician to rest, until a tired heart gave out. Frank Pinkley, Superintendent of Southwestern Monuments and dean of the Park Service, literally died with his boots on—collapsing a few minutes after making the keynote speech at a southwestern conference.

I mention these tragedies only to point up my statement that the National Park Service is one of the hardest working Government agencies, with a personnel which feels an undying devotion to the cause of conservation.

This review of the work of the past directors of the National Park Service would not be complete without a tribute to Associate Director Arthur E. Demaray, one of the many career men and women of the National Park Service, and to the many distinguished Members of both Houses of Congress, too numerous to mention, who supported the Service's conservation programs and promoted legislation to effect them.

Mr. Demaray has been with the Service since its formal organization in 1917, and even before that worked on park problems. For nearly 20 years he has participated actively in the administrative work, with emphasis on budgetary mat-

ters, and since 1933 has been Associate Director. As Associate Director, and for several years previously, much of Demaray's time has been spent in handling the affairs of the national-park system as Acting Director. No man knows better than he the widely diversified problems of the Service, for he has handled every angle of the work. He is favorably known to Members of Congress, through personal contacts and committee hearings. The Service is fortunate in having such a career man on its staff.

Just one more statement, and I will be through. I want to express the hope that our American people, during the grave crises with which we are confronted, will maintain a balanced outlook on life. In this we have only to follow the example set us by the brave British. Let us not be panicked into believing that there is no place in our present scheme of existence for any enjoyment—that we should not think of play, or vacations, while the world is in such a turmoil.

Such an attitude would, in the long run, defeat the national purpose. We must bend every energy to the great effort of maintaining democratic freedom; of keeping our solemn pledges to supply materials to our friends across the seas. But we can make these efforts more successful, keep these pledges more effectively, if we retain our balance. The more intense our efforts, the more need for relaxation. So let us take every opportunity we have for recreation in the great outdoors, to store up new strength, new energy, with which to attack the problem before us. Above all, let us keep our morale high, our confidence supreme, no matter what the immediate situation. Thinking back upon some of the scenes commemorated in our military and other historic parks will remind us that had our forefathers given up when defeat seemed inevitable, our history would have been very different—and the world might never had evolved the national-park idea.

I have often said that the National Park Service was the nearest and dearest to me of any of the public bureaus in Washington. I hope the approaching twenty-fifth anniversary of the official birth of the Park Service on August 25 this year may be a happy occasion for all of the Park Service people and their friends throughout our Nation and that each quarter of a century thereafter may be celebrated with increasing pleasure and enthusiasm for countless generations to come.

W. P. A. Sewing Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, due to the fact that there is definitely evidenced a reduction in W. P. A. funds for the coming fiscal year and that through this reduction of appropriations it will be necessary to curtail projects and reduce in numbers the people who, through necessity, have been upon the W. P. A. program, there should be some correction. Also in California sewing projects are being closed in order to meet the reduced appropriation requirements.

I feel that it should be brought to the attention of membership of this House that the sewing projects are the last type of W. P. A. project that should be closed. An investigation of the type of person who is employed on the sewing projects indicates that these women are not able to secure employment in a private capacity and there certainly is no place available for them on the preparedness program. Consequently it seems to me that if there is to be a reduction that projects other than the sewing projects should be closed.

Our Government is placing contracts for shirts, coveralls, and various types of garments for the men who are now serving under the Selective Draft Act. It would seem to me that if there were closer cooperation within the governmental agencies that instead of placing all of the garment contracts in private industry that certain types of these garments could be made to advantage by those women who are employed upon the sewing projects of the W. P. A., because we have been given to understand by the press that the textile manufacturers are far behind in their orders for garments. It occurs to me as being an economic fallacy to use the taxpayers' money for private contracts and appropriate money for relief requirements when by using contractual privileges within a reasonable degree the sewing projects could be made self-supporting and further keep these women gainfully employed.

While we are making our contributions to England, which is a very splendid and a necessary thing to do, we must never overlook the economic necessities for taking care of our own people at home if we are to expect national unity and patriotism. We should not lose sight of the fact that while the defense program has created many new positions which eliminate the necessity of many of our men remaining on the W. P. A. rolls, there are many localities throughout the United States in which there are no defense projects, and it is the duty of this Congress to provide means for taking care of conditions of this character because industry is still refraining from employing men in the later-year brackets.

It is my contention that we as a legislative body should look into this situation very carefully and see that there is adequate appropriation to take care of the W. P. A. necessity.

The following resolution from the Board of Supervisors of San Bernardino County, in California, indicates the concern of that body pertaining to the closing of the sewing projects:

Whereas we have been notified of a cut in the case load of the W. P. A. sewing projects from about 400 to 188, and of the closing of the sewing projects at Bloomington and Upland; and

Whereas these projects are the only opportunity for a women's work-relief program other than in professional classifications; and

Whereas with the abolishment of S. R. A. and the failure of the legislature to provide a direct relief program for the women on W. P. A. sewing projects, they must of necessity become county indigents, supported by the charity of the county, and an additional burden upon the local property taxpayers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors respectfully recommends that the W. P. A. authorities, when cutting the case load of W. P. A., give preference to women on W. P. A. sewing projects, those working in other classifications having better opportunities for employment in private industry; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, and Representative HARRY R. SHEPPARD.

The *O–9*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, William R. Cannady, 21-year-old Granite youth, a third-class fireman, was aboard the submarine *O–9*, which was declared lost. I have known and liked this young man all his life. He was my friend. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Porter Cannady, are my best friends. His grandfather and grandmother, Mr. and Mrs. W. R. Cannady, were my closest friends. Death and tragedy have stalked into the life of this family many times in recent years, and it grieves me much to think that this fine young man and those other 32 fine American citizens were sent to their death in an antiquated sardine can such as that rickety submarine *O–9*, which dropped into that deep hole off Portsmouth, N. H. That primitive relic of the last war had about as much business in deep water as an electric-light bulb in a pressure machine. If they were going to dive it at all, the Navy officials should have chosen the bed of some not too deep river or some shallow inlet such as the closer reaches off Cape Cod. We have got to train men, of course, but that is not training them; that is drowning them in a treacherous, black, watery grave. Only God can excuse such gross negligence and carelessness on the part of officials in charge.

There is something about a man or a few men trapped in a situation that can only mean slow death that has quicker appeal than the story of many more men killed suddenly and savagely in battle. Think of the horror of the slow death of these 33 young men. Think of the brutality of such an incident. Yes; think of the faces of the mothers, fathers, or wives and children, or may I say "widows and orphans." Think of the stunned expressions of the girls they were about to

marry. They line the shore at the spot nearest the watery grave and stand helplessly by, their faces asking the same mute question of every sailor, officer, or reporter who comes ashore from the scene. And out there where the searchlights play upon that black and tumbling water, with the buoys bobbing darkly to mark the location, with the divers, the winches, the derricks, the grim faces of the officers forming a pattern of desperation, as the hours pass and hope slides away without anybody's having the courage to mention the fact that it's getting late—yes; too late. It is wicked enough even when there is normal excuse. This is dangerous work, and accidents will happen. But because it is dangerous and because accidents do happen they should at least send our lads into such risk in something more substantial than a zinc outmoded strawberry crate that was new 23 years ago, before most of the young men were born. We do not face that amount of emergency—not yet.

I think we should assure all members of the armed forces that they will have as good equipment as we are sending to England. That in the future we will at least give them a fighting chance by giving them good equipment to start with. Until this is done it seems wicked to risk other lives in sister ships. The parents, wives and children or sweethearts of other young men are entitled to know that the future will not be like the past. They are entitled to a full and decent investigation of this tragedy. I urge that the *O–9* be raised for inspection of structural and mechanical faults. Navy officials said last Sunday evening that the *O–9* was officially declared lost.

I have offered a resolution in the House which will require Navy officials to raise the *O–9* and ascertain the structural and mechanical faults, and I have asked that a special committee be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to make a full and complete investigation, which I consider the just duty of the Government.

Strike Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have had long and serious discussions with members of labor organizations, not just labor lobbyists, but honest-to-God workmen who represent not a limited group of leaders but the rank and file of the skilled men who do the work.

Their reaction to the labor provisions of the May bill is an easily understood one. They fear, and rightly so, that this bill (S. 1524) inaugurates a program that has for its purpose the breaking down of the major protective legislation labor has secured in the last 10 years.

They reason, and I agree with them, that if you can forbid by legislation the right to strike for an hour or 1 day or 25 days, you can deny that right in perpetuity.

LET'S NOT OUT-HITLER HITLER

However convincing the argument that the North American Aviation strike and some others were due to clever Communist strategy engineered by a small but energetic minority, we should not let this stampede the Congress into passing repressive legislation so far-reaching as to out-Hitler Hitler.

In fact, there is sound reason for deferring all hysterical strike legislation at this time. The labor situation in defense industries is clearing up. The machinery already set up for peaceful and quick mediation and settlement of labor disputes is now in full gear. It is proving effective. It is accepted by the responsible labor leaders of both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. President Green, of the A. F. of L., said recently:

> We commit ourselves to avoid strikes, not only for trivial reasons but for scarcely any cause unless particular conditions become unbearable.

President Murray, of the C. I. O., made a similar statement.

ONLY EXTREMISTS OBSTRUCT

Only the extremists, the radicals, the hotheads, those under Communist or Nazi or Fascist influence, are trying to obstruct the operation of the system so successfully worked out for the settlement of labor differences.

Is it wise to let these extremists influence this Congress to pass strike legislation which the most recent developments prove is not now needed?

To pass this bill in the face of the determined opposition of organized labor is to create resentment among the mass of workers whose loyalty to the Nation and to the defense program is unquestioned.

We say we want a united Nation in this crisis. We will not get this by employing drastic, ill-considered statutory measures. We will get it by following a just course toward all classes of society, including those who do the work.

CONGRESS NEEDS A COOLING-OFF PERIOD

It is easy to talk in soothing tones of a "cooling-off" period for labor. I think we need just such a period here in Congress. If we defer this action for 25 days I am convinced that events will amply prove that neither the Vinson bill, the labor sections of the May bill, nor any other of the drastic bills related to it would be necessary. In a time such as this, it behooves us all to keep cool and move with wisdom and justice in our hearts instead of resentment against those who do the hard and tiring and absolutely essential tasks of today.

It is cruel, unwise, and un-American to undertake to force either labor or capital into goose-stepping. While there is evidence that a small minority of both labor and capital are employing despicable and obstructive methods, let me say, with all the force I possess, as the great Burke said, "You cannot indict a whole people."

Neutrality of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

LETTER OF FRANK J. BARRY, PROMINENT MEMBER OF THE LOS ANGELES BAR, TO FRANCIS E. McMAHON, PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted by the House, I append hereto a letter written by Mr. Frank J. Barry, prominent member of the Los Angeles bar, to Mr. Francis E. McMahon, professor of philosophy, Notre Dame University, on the right of Ireland to maintain her neutrality by refusing to yield her ports or any part of Eire to belligerent countries.

The letter follows:

FRANCIS E. McMAHON,
Professor of Philosophy,
Notre Dame University,
Notre Dame, Ind.

DEAR SIR: I write you as an Irish-American of Irish birth. I also write as a Notre Dame man.

I have read your open letter in the New Republic to Eamon de Valera, the Prime Minister of the Cabinet of Eire. You make numerous statements in said letter which are not supported by the facts of history. A few of these I call to your attention.

You say the present war is not merely for markets and territories. "It is a struggle for the possession of the human soul," you say. You say that Britain's side is "based upon law, justice, and human dignity," and Germany's side "upon arbitrary will, violence, and human slavery."

You say that you appeal for the cause which England represents today, "the cause of all humanity." You state that this cause which England stands for "is the cause likewise of America and Eire."

You state that "it may astonish us that it should be England today that resists the enemy of all religion and all true culture. But England it is."

You apostrophize upon Ireland's devotion to religious truth and leave the implication that only under England could such devotion have flourished, and you declare with emphasis that England now fights for the preservation of the Christian faith.

You declare with emotion, "wherever the flags of empire wave today, there the church is at peace."

You put the question: "What do we ask of the Irish people?" And you answer: "Merely the use of three naval bases—Cobh, Berehaven, and Lough Swilly. The treaty of 1921 reserved to England these ports. They were and are vital to her defense. In 1938, however, Prime Minister Chamberlain gave them back as a gesture of friendship, hoping that in any future hour of trial England would not be denied access to them."

You finally refer to Ireland's part in re-Christianizing England and Europe after the darkness of barbarism had enveloped them. Now, you assert, Eire can help to turn back a worse barbarism by surrendering her territory to England.

Before discussing these statements let me assure you that I condemn with all the vehemence I possess the Nazi doctrine, the Nazi policies and methods of conquest, and the Nazi way of life. But because I detest nazi-ism does not mean that I must extol the British doctrine, the British policies and methods of conquest, or the British imperialistic way of life.

I disagree with your assertion that the present war is not merely for markets and territories. I hold that that is its sole and exclusive objective. I assert that if England could be assured of the continuation of her world domination—she now rules one-fourth of the habitable land area of the earth and 15,000,000 more than one-third of the entire population of the globe—and be assured of the profits she derives from the exploitation of her vast dominions, she would care little what happens to the victims of Nazi aggression or to America. You have only to recall her callous indifference to Manchuria and Abyssinia, and more recently her characteristic cruelty in refusing permission to the Hoover committee to ship food to the hungry people overrun by Hitler. How do you reconcile these acts with what you describe as England's part in "the struggle for the possession of the human soul," whatever that means? Or how do you reconcile these with what you proclaim as England's championship of "law, justice, and human dignity"?

Where do you find the factual support for your statement that England's cause today is the cause of all humanity? Have you ever heard of British India or British Africa or the British West Indies? I invite your brief study of these British dominions so that you may learn to what extent today the cause of all humanity touches England's heart there.

You wax eloquent about England's fight against the enemies of religion. You know, of course, that she justified her first invasion of Ireland as for the purpose of bringing Christianity to the rude barbarians who inhabited that land. Have you heard about the condition of freedom of religion in Northern Ireland under England's rule today? If you have not, I invite you to study the recent pastorals of Cardinal MacRory on that subject, and then say whether England's pretended championship of freedom of religion today is not the same hypocrisy by which she has justified her passion for greed and conquest during all her history. When you have studied the situation in Northern Ireland today perhaps you may want to revise your statement that "wherever the flags of Empire wave, there the church is at peace." I cannot agree with the inference which can be drawn from this unwarranted statement that the teachings of the humble Nazarene are consistent with the waving of imperialistic flags or by any other methods than by self-effacing self-sacrifice and humility of missionaries like those who restored civilization to England when she was in the darkness of barbarism after the fall of the Roman Empire.

What, Professor McMahon, is the significance of the personal pronoun "we" in your question, "What do we ask of the Irish people?" Does it signify that you are another American who regards America as a mere dependency of England? This would certainly be a plausible explanation of the slip.

You speak of the return of Irish territory to Ireland as an act of English generosity. Do your philosophic researches ever suggest to you that there is such a principle in ethics as restitution? Do you hold that restitution means that the original aggressor has a right to retake the property restored whenever "in any future hour of trial" he may have need for it? Does such latter doctrine apply to individuals? If not, why should it be accorded to empires? And is it founded on justice? Or perhaps philosophy?

But were we to assume that the England of the past has truly reformed, Anthony Eden's very recent statement of England's war aims to the contrary notwithstanding, what bond has Ireland that at this war's conclusion England would return these bases to their rightful owner? Is the reputation of England for honesty and integrity so good that her unsecured promise can be relied upon? Has she discharged her just obligations to Ireland—not obligations of the past, but present obligations? Has she discharged her obligations to her other creditors, notably America? What security, therefore, do you offer Prime Minister de Valera that these bases will be returned to Ireland after the war? No responsible British statesman has even suggested that they ever will be returned. You know Churchill has complained that he opposed the restitution in the first instance. And you yourself intimate that their abandonment was one of Chamberlain's appeasements, an act of weakness. Despite their love of poetry, the Irish will not accept rainbow promises.

My dear Professor McMahon, I cannot conceive how you, the son of a Kerryman and the bearer of that proud McMahon name, with all the advantages you must have had, could be so uninformed upon Ireland's history of the past and of today as to suggest for a moment that the policy of strict neutrality adopted by Eire, and approved by every political party in that country, should be abandoned in the interest of an empire engaged in a war solely to perpetuate her domination over millions upon millions of people who clamor for freedom and even to perpetuate the wrongful retention by that same empire of one-fifth of Ireland's own territory.

As a true American and as the son of a Kerry Irishman you should instinctively know that America must not depend upon a traditional enemy now to safeguard or protect her.

Very truly yours,

FRANK J. BARRY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

ANOTHER DOUBLE-HEADER HOLIDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when Thanksgiving Day was moved back by Executive proclamation there was a great hue and cry against the proposal. The effort ended in confusion. Some States observed Thanksgiving Day according to the calendar makers and others observed the new day. Some States had double-header Thanksgiving Days. But the whole undertaking proved abortive. It did not generate more business. It did not inspire more folks to do their Christmas shopping earlier, and at long last there came an admission that later on the old Thanksgiving Day might result. But now comes a proposal which, instead of providing two different holidays, might result in two kinds of a holiday on the same day. We refer to Senate bill No. 1242, introduced on March 27, 1941, designating the 4th day of July of each year as Democracy Day. "Ain't" that something? Imagine a Nation-wide commingling of flags, festoons, streamers, banners, and other holiday display, some of which announce Independence Day and some Democracy Day. Imagine the folks across the street celebrating Independence Day while you observe Democracy Day. Imagine the chairman at the community celebration announcing, "Mr. John Q. Citizen will now read the Declaration of Democracy." Imagine—but you can imagine it for yourself.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The present turn of events in Europe has stimulated interest in the resistive powers of the Soviet. It is still referred to as Russia, but nowhere in the Constitution of the Soviet does the word "Russia" appear. The word "Russian" is used to describe one of the States of the Soviet Union. What about this Soviet Union? The National Geographic Society in Washington has just issued an up-to-date bulletin which describes the Soviet as 2½ times the size of the United States with 193,000,000 people divided into 175 racial groups. It is estimated that this one country contains 21 percent of the world's coal, six and one-third billion tons of iron ore, and is second in the production of oil. In 1937 it produced more than 3,000,000 tons of manganese which is an essential defense item. It has an inexhaustible supply of timber and has a potential of 65,000,000 electric horsepower. It is the world's largest wheat-producing country and seeded 102,000,000 acres in 1937. Compare that with 53,000,000 acres in the United States, 27,000,000 acres in Canada, 13,000,000 in Australia, and 19,000,000 in the Argentine. It has extensive deposits of bauxite from which aluminum is derived. In addition, it is rich in gold, silver, platinum, zinc, and other metals. It is truly a land of vast physical resources.

HERE'S HOW IT WORKS

The United States uses about 817,000 tons of rubber per year. The present rate of imports is about 1,000,000 tons per year. Normally, that should leave us with a reserve of 183,000 tons at the end of the year. The Priorities Division of the Office of Production Management, however, has issued an order to cut the rate of consumption to 600,000 tons per year. This will be done progressively so that in December of 1941 the manufacturers who use crude rubber will be able to secure only 80 percent of their averaged needs and requirements. Thus, the Government orders control of a very essential commodity even when there is no shortage. You ask why? The principal reason is that rubber is all imported from other continents and the shipping facilities grow more uncertain with each passing week. This control obviously raises another problem. If only 80 percent of normal domestic requirements will be available to industry by December of 1941, it is fair to assume that prices on tires, hot-water bottles, and other rubber items

will advance. The answer is "maybe" because the Administrator of Prices and Civilian Supply may step in and place a ceiling on the price of commodities made of rubber. Here you have a clear-cut example of the problems of supply, demand, and price control which springs from the defense program.

AGE 28 WOULD BE TOP

The amendment to the Selective Service Act which Congress will consider on July 8 provides that men who on July 1, 1941, or thereafter who are liable for training and service and have not been inducted into service and who have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of their birth shall be deferred from training and service. One of the things discovered by the Selective Service System was that 52 percent of those between the ages of 31 and 36 were rejected as physically unfit and 36 percent of those between 26 and 30 were rejected for the same reason. Another factor is dependency. Of the 5,500,000 registrants who were classified up to March 31, 3,700,000 or about 70 percent were given a III–A rating, which means deferment because of dependents. Most of these were in the upper age group. On these grounds the Selective Service System recommended a reduction of the maximum age from 35 to 28. This measure would become effective immediately after its enactment.

Cooperation in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN MONTANA COUNTIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Southeastern Montana Counties Association is meeting in regular session in the town of Broadus, in the State of Montana, on this 20th day of June 1941; and

Whereas the Southeastern Montana Counties Association is a representative group composed of farmers, ranchers, laborers, businessmen, representatives of women's clubs, civic groups, local governmental groups from a territory comprising 20 percent of the population; 25 percent of the area, 27 percent of the assessed valuation of the State of Montana; and

Whereas the people of this section of the great State of Montana have shown a willingness to enter wholeheartedly into the spirit and purpose of our present national defense and unlimited national emergency; and

Whereas this has been ably demonstrated by the contribution of manpower which Montana has made to the United States Army and Navy in ratio of 1 to 96 of its population as against 1 to 131 for the State of Missouri, 1 to 116 for the State of Pennsylvania, 1 to 148 for the State of New Jersey, and similar ratios for many other States of the Union; and

Whereas the people of the State of Montana have met with continual rebuff in their efforts to contribute of their resources to the defense of this country, other than its manpower; and

Whereas constant appeals to our Representatives in the Senate and Congress of the United States have resulted in nothing of a concrete nature in these matters while orders are piled upon orders in States already loaded down beyond their ability to produce, thus causing shortages of electrical energy, shipping facilities, production units, and machinery, and

Whereas the State of Montana is a vast area of unlimited natural resources such as minerals, developed water power, coal for steam production, natural gas for electrical development, petroleum, refined gasoline, and countless other resources; and

Whereas surveys made within the State show many machine shops now working only part time and much precision machinery in private hands which is idle and might well be used in handling a part of the contracts which are being held up in already overloaded areas; and

Whereas these facts have been communicated to our representatives in Congress who in turn have placed them with the Office of Production Management without arousing any apparent interest on the part of said Office; and

Whereas it seems to be impossible for local patriotic people to even remotely interest primary contractors in the use of the natural and developed resources of the State of Montana to the end that defense contracts might be expedited and removed from sections where they are now badly bogged down: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we again call this matter to the attention of Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Congressman JAMES F. O'CONNOR, and Congresswoman JEANETTE RANKIN with the most urgent solicitation that they, individually and collectively, spare no effort to bring the Office of Production Management and its associated officials to a keen realization of the vast natural and developed resources which are left untouched and unsued in the defense program while other sections of these United States are staggering beneath a load apparently beyond their ability to deliver in time to contribute to the saving of the British Empire in its dogged fight against the ruthless dictators of the Old World, recognizing that the fall of said British Empire would immediately bring us face to face with the task of beating off Germany, Italy, and Japan single handed in a still unprepared condition of defense; and, be it further

Resolved, That we decry the general apathy that has been shown us in our efforts to assist our Government in its defense program, both by our official representatives in the Senate and Congress of the United States and by those in charge of the Office of Production Management, and that we want those officials to know and realize that we have more than secondary efforts and resources to offer to them for the defense of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, William S. Knudsen, and Sidney Hillman, jointly charged with the conduct of the Office of Production Management, Harry Hopkins, in charge of the lease-lend plan, Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Congressman JAMES F. O'CONNOR, Congresswoman JEANETTE RANKIN, Governor Sam C. Ford, Mr. R. E. Towle, Managing Director of the Federal Reserve branch bank at Helena, Mont., Montanans', Inc., and that a copy thereof be spread upon the minutes of this organization as a part of the meeting on the day and date first recorded herein.

Ford, the C. I. O., and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that the homefolks are awakening—in fact, they have long been awake—to what is happening is shown by editorials in the smaller dailies and many of the weekly newspapers of the country.

Here is one from the Cassopolis Vigilant of June 26, 1941, published at Cassopolis, Mich., which is so concise and clear that it should be widely distributed. William Berkey, the editor, writes as follows:

We believe most people were depressed last Saturday when they read in the papers that the Ford Motor Co. had granted the C. I. O. a contract, because most of those readers realized that Henry Ford, labor's best industrial friend, and his associates, had been beaten into submission. They remembered that when the strike came at the Ford plant neither State nor Federal Government gave protection to men who wanted to continue at work nor protected the property of the Ford Motor Co. The financial loss to the company because of destruction of property, and to the workers for lost time, was tremendous. Having contracted to produce around $150,000,000 worth of defense goods such as airplane engines, bomber parts, army trucks, etc., for the Government, and with the Government fostering C. I. O. efforts, the Ford Co., it appears to us, had only two alternatives, one being to surrender and take on the C. I. O., and the other being to quit, and Henry Ford would not quit when his country needed the defense materials, which is more than can be said for the C. I. O., which has not hesitated to call strikes in factories making defense goods. Now, Mr. Ford's employees, more than 100,000 in number, must all come under the C. I. O. and have the dues taken out of their wages. What a harvest for the C. I. O. Michigan added nothing to its glory when it permitted the lawlessness at the Ford and other plants, and it may be interesting to note how Michigan is viewed elsewhere. The following paragraph from the Chicago Tribune is a good example of how we appear to others:

"Senator VANDENBERG (in his speech during the debate on the plant-seizure bill) exhibited pictures of workers being slugged by the pickets and produced copies of the Communist cards of some of the rioters. As usual in Michigan, the law-enforcement officers did little to prevent the rioters and have done less to see that known persons were punished. This was a typical New Deal treatment of a violent attack upon private management. Such attacks have had the sympathy and encouragement of the Federal Government under Mr. Roosevelt. Punishment for outrageous acts has been infrequently imposed. Protection for plant management and nonstriking workers has been infrequently given. Law enforcement has adjourned when the lawless moved in."

The surrender of the Ford Motor Co., important as it is in its implications, is not the most important phase of the matter. Real importance lies in the fact, and we believe it is a fact, that it is only part of a definite plan to bring all industry, large and small, under the iron-hand control of the group that heads the C. I. O., and, when that is accomplished, America is at the mercy of that group politically, economically, and socially. These things have come to us gradually, and one needs to look back to see how they came. While conditions may have been in the making previously, the first serious evidence of it was in the sit-down strikes which Governor Murphy, in daily phone consultation with President Roosevelt, permitted to go on indefinitely in this State, from which it spread to other States, and many people still believe that the C. I. O. contribution of nearly a half million dollars to the New Deal campaign fund was planned to gain just that kind of a hold upon the President. Then, Governor Murphy, having been repudiated by the people of Michigan, he was placed successively in two important places where he could be useful in furthering the social ideas involved—first as Attorney General, and now as Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Events have moved rapidly toward the desired end and now, although we boast a free country, not one of the Ford Motor Co.'s over 100,000 employees is free to work in their factories without having his C. I. O. dues taken out of his wages. Above is not a pretty picture but it is the picture as we see it.

The dues to be collected from Ford workmen and turned over to the C. I. O. amount to more than $130,000 per month. It certainly was a great victory for C. I. O.

The foregoing is but the expression of an opinion which I have many, many times voiced ever since the beginning of the sit-down strikes in Michigan on the last day of December 1936.

Some day those who advocate the closed shop will learn—and I hope it will not be to their sorrow—that they have, in selecting the C. I. O. as bargaining agent, exchanged the employer for a harder, more arbitrary boss, who has no real interest in them except as it can collect dues and special assessments.

When workers are forced to pay any individual or any organization for a work permit in order to earn a livelihood, it can no longer be said that freedom of action prevails here in America.

It is unfortunate that some one of these labor organizations, which are collecting billions—not millions—of dollars each year from workingmen, does not establish a factory and demonstrate its ability to operate one and to pay the wages union officials insist should be paid.

What Wins Wars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the House a significant and thought-provoking editorial from my home-town newspaper, the Madison Daily Leader, which I shall insert in the RECORD at the end of these remarks. In times like these I think it is increasingly important that all of us read our home-town newspapers and keep in touch with our home constituents instead of relying too much on the jittery comments of editorial writers for eastern metropolitan newspapers and excitable young men earning their living by rehashing the day's news in melodramatic style after the accepted manner of the current school of radio commentators.

EUROPE'S QUEER NEW ALLIANCES

The quick and queer reshuffling of alliances in Europe a week ago, has caused all clear-thinking Americans to reexamine their positions from the standpoint of this country's relationship to the war. Yesterday's "fiends" are well on the road to becoming today's "friends" to many surface thinkers and by the same snap judgment some are willing to round out the circle by dubbing our "friends" of yesterday as our despised "fiends" of today. Witness harmless, faithful, honest, democratic little Finland, who of all European nations was the only one to pay in full the war-debt payments owed the United States. She was the blue chip European friend of all America a year ago; yes, even a week ago. But today there are some who say we should lend, lease, or give money, materials, and even men to help communistic Russia with the certain knowledge that some of these supplies would be used by Stalin and his storm troopers to strengthen their attack upon Finland.

France also seems to be rapidly posing another problem to Americans who are trying seriously to know just who should be nominated for the respective titles of "friend" and "fiend" in European politics. Warm-hearted France which sent Lafayette to aid us in winning the independence which we celebrate next week and which fought shoulder to shoulder with us a quarter of a century ago and to which we sent supplies and aid until its collapse in this war seems to be drawing closer and closer to the Axis Powers. Some even now urge we should send American boys and bombers to invade French territory, to subjugate French soldiers, to sink French ships. And yet France accepts Axis aid not because she favors the pagan philosophies of Hitler or Mussolini but for the very same reason England accepts the aid of Russia—because of the law of self-preservation. It is as unfair to accuse France of betraying democracy because she is driven to cooperation with the Nazis and Fascists as it would be to accuse Britain of betraying democracy because she is driven to cooperate with the Communists of Russia. And since such accusations are unfair, it seems equally unfair for certain American journalists and speakers to endeavor to drum up hatred for the men of Vichy and the people of France while handing orchids to the men of Downing Street and the people of Britain. The people of both France and Britain are among the world's most ardent lovers of freedom and the men of both Vichy and Downing Street are driven by similar motives to accept help where they can get it without stopping in time of stress to "look a gift horse in the mouth."

IT IS TIME FOR REALISTIC THINKING IN AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, it is time, therefore, for us to quit preaching hate and to stop jumping to hysterical conclusions in America. Europe is in a terrible mess. It would be a wonderful thing if all the good people were on one side of this war and all the bad people on the other side of it. But Finland and France are far from bad and Russia, to say the least, is far from good. You can classify as you deem right such other States as Poland and China, Bulgaria and Greece, Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania, and Rumania, all of which have had war forced upon them and some of which fight under the swastika of nazi-ism and others of which now fight with the emblem of the hammer and the sickle of communism. Hating one group of states and loving another will not win the war. As Congressman VORYS of Ohio recently put it so aptly, "Stop Hitler" is a splendid war cry but it is not a foreign policy or a statement of peace aims.

After "stopping Hitler," what comes next? Subsidizing Stalin? It sounds unreasonable but unless we think our way clearly and carefully we are apt to witness such an eventuality. Rescuing Europe from nazi-ism to rape it with communism is not a pretty possibility, but it is a perfectly possible probability unless we watch our step in this topsy-turvy war.

Many times I have asked on the floor of this House and elsewhere of interventionists, of isolationists, of administration spokesmen, of columnists, and commentators who would push us into war by Executive action and without congressional debate and decision, yes, even of British representatives in this country—this straightforward question, What would you have follow the fighting? I have never received a straightforward answer. We hear many generalities about the universal application of the four freedoms to everybody, everywhere, but even the exponents of such a program openly admit that much of the world is not ready to make these freedoms function.

IT IS MORE THAN HITLER WHICH MUST BE STOPPED

Surely the aim of this war cannot be to provide freedoms which will not work to peoples who do not want them. Some simply answer, "Stop Hitler." If he were stopped by death through some act of God tomorrow, the war would go on—it is more than Hitler which must be stopped. It is a nazi-ism. It is even more than that; it is the economic and social and political conditions which gave rise to nazi-ism, and communism, and fascism. These unjust conditions we must stop so that new and worse—if worse there be—ideologies do not arise to replace the totalitarian forms which we would stop. And in stopping Stalinism abroad we must not superimpose Stalinism at home or we shall have transplanted over here what we hoped to terminate over there.

Surely statesmanship in Britain and in America is not so sterile that it is unable to provide an answer to the question, "What would you have follow the fighting?" which will give people in every land more to hope for from peace than people in any land can continue to hope for from war. Certainly we here in America, who are not in the fighting, should take some time and make some effort to answer so significant a question while we continue to prepare ourselves and to provide aid to the side of the fighting which we would like to have come out on top. It is entirely possible that if President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, and other leaders of American thought would help develop some more specific answers to the question, "What would you have follow the fighting?" it would go far toward uniting the people of every belligerent country in demands for a just and reasonable peace which would shorten the war and make more hopeless the task of any dictator who would drive his people to continued fighting because of his refusal to accept a basis of settlement which the world called just and fair to one and all.

NEITHER NAZI-ISM NOR COMMUNISM MUST INHERIT THE EARTH

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who think that a total victory for Hitler would be a bad thing for all humanity. I also believe that a total victory for Stalin would be a bad blow to all the world. Neither nazi-ism nor communism should inherit the earth after this war is over. Godlessness in all its forms must be replaced with Christianity and idealism if the world is to survive this cataclysm. It is not enough to say, "Help Russia" or "Stop Hitler" or "Aid Britain"—all these are but means to some end. More and more people are asking the legitimate question, "Means to what end?" If we will devote time enough to defining the end and to answering the question, "What would you have follow the fighting?" it is not beyond the realm of possibility that we can secure the goal we seek without expanding the war to all the civilized countries of the world. It should be worth the effort. It would seem that such a policy would at least be wiser than involving ourselves in a long and hideous war, requiring the spilling of American blood on perhaps three foreign continents to secure an end which sterile statesmanship has persistently not been able or willing to define.

The following editorial from the Madison (S. Dak.) Daily Leader, Mr. Speaker, stimulated these remarks of mine. I commend it to the reading of the Congress and the country. The decisions of today are too momentous to be left to one man, to one department of government, or even to all of America's officials combined. It will require the best collective thinking of a vast cross-section of this free Republic if we are to weather this storm and come through as a fully functioning republic of free men, solvent enough to restore prosperity to our people, and strong enough to prevent disorders at home or disturbers from abroad from bringing ruin to this last great stronghold of freedom which the world affords:

[From the Madison (S. Dak.) Daily Leader]

WHAT WINS WARS?

Two things won the World War quite as much as military victory:

(1) The growing realization in Germany that she could not win.

(2) The vision implanted in the minds and hearts of the people of Europe of a better world.

No less than a break-through on the western front, no less than the collapse of Bulgaria and Turkey, these great factors undermined morale in Germany, bolstered it in the free world.

So again, Germany will be beaten whenever Germany realizes she cannot win. The beginnings of that realization lie in the fact that despite Mediterranean successes, Hitler has not been able to crush England.

How, then, must the people of Germany feel today, confronted with the tremendous manpower and the ponderous might of Soviet Russia? We hold no tenet with the political philosophy of communism, but, as Prime Minister Winston Churchill pointed out yesterday, Russia is not fighting to defend her political system; she is fighting to defend her homeland against as evil an assault by a pledge breaker as this world has ever seen.

If Russia can bring her might to bear on the invading forces in time, and the victory on which the Nazi regime has been nourished recedes into the impossible, it may not be necessary to beat the German Armies. Confronted with a desolate prospect of years of struggle, that well-oiled machine might become a military jaloppy.

But the second element is necessary, too. It is useless to offer the world, especially that now under the heel of the Nazi conqueror, the choice of "The new order—or nothing." A negative cause is not enough.

Badly needed now is a more concrete plan for the establishment of Roosevelt's four freedoms, to which the remaining free countries are devoted. These freedoms are dear to millions now under the Nazi heel, but they must be shown at least a rough draft of a means of attaining them and putting them into force.

Hitler's new order is an improvision. He didn't start out to create a new order. He started out to aggrandize Germany. Then he devised the "new order" to give the conquered peoples hope for the future in order to enable them to stomach a repulsive present.

No one not a German wants any part of it. But you can't beat something with nothing.

The world must be shown that the free peoples are capable, after they have won, of setting up and operating a free world on a better pattern than that of Versailles. That in itself would be a weapon of tremendous power.

Defense Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN MONTANA COUNTIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Southeastern Montana Counties Association is meeting in the town of Broadus, Mont., on this 20th day of June 1941; and

Whereas the matter of adequate defense highways is now being given consideration by the United States Government; and

Whereas travel in the United States has been more in an easterly or westerly direction, thus causing better highways to come into existence in such directions to the exclusion of adequate north and south highways; and

Whereas good north and south highways are as greatly required in the defense of our country as east and west highways; and

Whereas it is quite possible to build and maintain an adequate north and south highway between Canada and the Gulf of Mexico on a water level, without crossing mountain ranges, thus providing lower construction costs and greater safety, at the same time incorporating in said highway many already well-constructed units; and

Whereas the North and South Highway from the Wyoming line through Broadus, Miles City, and Van Norman, and northward will meet all the requirements of economic construction and connect with arterial highway north and south at north and south termini with arterial highways now constructed or in the course of construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this matter be called to the attention of our Representatives in Congress with the suggestion that it be laid before the proper Federal authorities who will have the matter of military highways under consideration; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this organization and a copy forwarded to Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Senator James E. Murray, Congressman James F. O'Connor, Governor Sam C. Ford, the Governors of the States of Wyoming, Colorado, and Texas, the State Highway Commissions of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and Texas.

Can We Stop It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, unless we stop the drive toward war and the never-ceasing, increasing denial of the rights guaranteed under our Constitution, this Nation will no longer remain a democracy.

DECEIT AND SUBTERFUGE

The President has been granted far-reaching powers. In fact, before some of the latest and most far-reaching were given, he himself said that his administration had returned to Washington powers which, if exercised improperly, would shackle our liberties.

Recently Congress has given the President additional powers and each has been given upon his assurance that it was for the purpose of promoting peace and keeping us out of war. Yet each time we have learned that the power granted has been used to drag us nearer to open warfare. In short, the President has been

carrying on an undeclared war—this notwithstanding the fact that the Constitution places the responsibility for a declaration of war solely upon Congress.

This week we are being asked for legislation to keep the National Guard and Reserves beyond their year of service. Authority has been asked to keep the selectees or conscripted men beyond the original term of service.

We are being asked by the administration, through the War Department, to make a formal declaration of a national emergency, which would in effect permit the administration to use the National Guard and the selectees anywhere in the world; that is, the administration and the War Department are now out in the open seeking authority to send an expeditionary force—an army—wherever the President may direct—yes; even to Russia.

Unless the people who oppose war make their protests heard in an ever-increasing volume by the President and those Senators and Congressmen who favor sending our men to carry on a war in Europe, we shall shortly find our boys fighting as allies of Russia, whose Government denies the existence of God, seeks to abolish churches, to destroy our belief in a Divine Being.

No longer can it be claimed that this is a war to preserve democracy or one fought in behalf of any other government than the British Empire. Just last week, Lord Halifax here in Washington in substance told a group of Congressmen that England was agreeable to a "phony war" to permit Germany to gobble up the smaller nations of Europe; that England has no money with which to pay her past war debts, does not expect to pay them, nor does she expect to make any repayments on the lend-lease program.

The present war is a trade war and we can best serve our country, the cause of civilization—best preserve liberty in the world—by remaining out of it and preparing, not for an offense but for defense, a defense sufficient to meet and overcome whoever may win across the seas.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

Here in America the administration through the Labor Board, the National Defense Mediation Board, and the Conciliation Service of the Labor Department, aided by the failure of State governments, particularly in Michigan and Pennsylvania, to protect the citizens of those States, is forcing hundreds of thousands of good, honest, loyal, patriotic men and women to join a labor union and pay whatever initiation fees, dues, and special assessments may be imposed by that organization before they can exercise their God-given, Constitution-guaranteed right to work.

The President and others may talk about equality of opportunity—and you will remember our forefathers declared all men to be free and equal—but today, because of the Wagner law and the way in which it is interpreted and administered by the N. L. R. B. and the courts, men are denied the right to work when and where they find jobs. Armed picket lines, violating the laws of State and Nation, deny free speech, freedom of action, the right to property (and a job is property), and all this because of the acquiescence of the administration and the failure of Congress to insist upon amendments to the Wagner law and upon the enforcement of the laws we have.

Before we can bring equality of opportunity, free speech, and a free press to the peoples of all the world; before we force our form of government as administered by us upon others, let us, in the words of the Scripture, "first cast out the beam" out of our own eye.

Night and day, day and night, first and last, let every thought and action be guided by the desire to serve America first; to reestablish and preserve here at home the equality of opportunity guaranteed by the Constitution.

The people of this country can prevent war, if, by letter and through communications to the press, they make themselves heard at the White House.

Payments to the Several States on Account of Lands of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN MONTANA COUNTIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas a bill to provide for a uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States has been introduced in the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas it is provided by said bill that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to direct to pay annually to each State the sum equal to 2 percent of the fair value of any lands situated in such State, title to which is held in the United States, and which are (1) included within a national forest; (2) included within a national wildlife refuge; (3) administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; (4) included within an Indian reservation, or held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian; (5) administered under the terms of the Taylor Grazing Act (48 Stat. 1269), as amended; (6) sold by the United States upon an agreement providing that title shall remain in the United States until purchase price is paid in full; or (7) leased by the United States for a valuable consideration; and

Whereas there exists in the State of Montana a large amount of land classified as above, title to which is held in the United States from which very little if any revenue is derived; and

Whereas the burden of government in the counties wherein such designated lands are situated is placed wholly upon the owners of property and has reduced in many counties in the State the necessary taxable valuations and the income to such an extent that property tax has become a burden to the taxpayer: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved at a regular session of the Southeastern Montana Counties Association held on the 20th day of June 1941, at Broadus, Powder River County, Mont., That said Senate bill 1201 be enacted by the Congress of the United States and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Congressmen with a request that they support and work for the enactment of said bill.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS (MICH.) PRESS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of June 20, 1941:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of June 20, 1941]

SEAWAY ENDORSEMENTS

When it comes to character witnesses the case in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway is far ahead of that of its opponents. Six successive Presidents through the last 30 years have advocated this project and not one has opposed. Surely they could not all be wrong—not all could be accused of serving any special interest in their support of this work. In fact, it may be said that considerations of national welfare as opposed to sectional and selfish interest were the motivating influence with each one.

Against the seaway no such imposing list can be mustered. Very few national figures, free from sectional influence, have been ranged on the side of the opposition.

The first President to endorse the seaway was President Taft, who enthusiastically looked toward its consummation. President Wilson, the Michigan Great Lakes Tidewater Commission recalls, was the second to endorse the projected cut. He characterized opposition to it as that of individuals and corporations whose objections were based on "narrow and unstable grounds" and entitled to small consideration. President Harding declared that the feasibility of the sea route was "unquestioned." President Coolidge next added his backing and President Hoover ranked it as "of first importance to the whole continent." The views of President Franklin D. Roosevelt are current and widely known.

This list of six Presidents included two Democrats serving through 16 years and four Republicans serving a like period. When President Roosevelt completes his third term it will make nine complete 4-year terms through which these national leaders have unswervingly supported the seaway principle.

The only new objection raised at present is that the Lakes-to-sea project is not a defense work. But additional witnesses have come forward to refute that contention. Leaders of the O. P. M., the production agency of the whole defense effort, including Co-directors Knudsen and Hillman, have given the project their official endorsement. If the

charges that this project is not a contribution to defense were valid these men surely would recognize them as such. Instead the O. P. M. chiefs declare the seaway to be a vital part of the all-out defense effort.

What array of strength can the opposition bring against the seaway comparable to this support by six Presidents and the current leaders of the national-defense effort? It is something to think about while congressional hearings are under way.

Experimental Black-out at Turkey, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE TURKEY (TEX.) ENTERPRISE AND THE MEMPHIS DEMOCRAT

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, as an instance of the initiative and resourcefulness of the people of the Texas Panhandle, whom it is my distinct honor to represent in the Halls of Congress, I would like to direct the attention of other Members of Congress to two newspaper articles which appeared in the Turkey Enterprise and the Memphis Democrat, respectively.

I take a great deal of pride in the fact that the citizens of Turkey were the first in the entire Nation to practice a total black-out; and had the people of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Poland, and other countries also had the same type of initiative and sense of preparedness many of the calamities which have come to pass within the past few years might possibly have been avoided.

I take great pleasure and pride in directing the attention of other Members of the Congress to these two newspaper articles:

[From the Turkey (Tex.) Enterprise of March 13, 1941]

BLACK-OUT PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Government of the United States has entered into a program of preparedness for national defense; and

Whereas certain phases of the defense program in the various communities are voluntary, in keeping with the democratic ideals of our forefathers: Now therefore

I, J. W. Hardcastle, mayor of the city of Turkey, Tex., do hereby proclaim a 30-minute air-raid precaution black-out period to be observed Saturday night, March 29, beginning at 9 o'clock.

And I appoint Capt. Cole Boswell, commanding officer of the provisional Turkey home defense company, as administrative officer in this emergency, and commission him to supervise all necessary preparation for the safe and efficient conduct of the black-out drill,

And I further charge all civic and fraternal organizations, firms, and individuals to give every possible assistance, when called upon to cooperate with the commanding officer and his duly appointed adjutants.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto signed my name and caused the seal of my office to be impressed hereon at Turkey, Tex., this the 11th day of March A. D. 1941.

J. W. HARDCASTLE.

[From the Turkey (Tex.) Enterprise of March 13, 1941]

TURKEY TO BE FIRST TEXAS CITY TO STAGE AIR-RAID PRECAUTION BLACK-OUT, SATURDAY, MARCH 29—HOME DEFENSE GUARD TROOP IN CHARGE OF PREPARATIONS

Turkey, a rural community of 1,000 population, Saturday, March 29, will become the first city in the State of Texas to experience an air-raid precaution black-out.

By proclamation of Mayor J. W. Hardcastle, the Turkey home-defense guard company will be in charge of all arrangements, and all citizens are asked to cooperate in order to make the 30-minute black-out period safe and efficient.

Capt. Cole Boswell, commanding officer, and men of the organization will make detailed plans well in advance in order to insure the safety of all citizens during the total black-out period.

Business and professional men heard the plan outlined Tuesday at the Lions luncheon, and expressed whole-hearted approval of the idea. Scoutmaster George Ray Colvin said that the Turkey Boy Scout troop will gladly serve, if called upon.

Business houses will not be expected to close during the black-out, but will remain open with their lights shielded against detection from the air, since the purpose of the drill will be to determine how effectively the city of Turkey could be blacked out in the event of an air raid.

[From the Memphis Democrat of April 3, 1941]

IF THEY SAY BLACK-OUT—TURKEY CITIZENS MEAN IT'S GOING TO BE DARK

When the citizens of that little city of 1,000 people, Turkey, Tex., say they are going to have a black-out, they mean just that.

So when last Saturday night, the date for the black-out, came around things really did look dark in Turkey.

At 9 o'clock the program was begun, although people had been milling around most of the night waiting for things to pop.

Most of the lights were turned out, although some were only shaded to provide enough light for business to be carried on as usual. Some of the stores utilized kerosene lamps, while others merely shaded their electric-light bulbs.

The siren of the Turkey fire department sounded to begin the black-out. Immediately things got dark and nothing happened.

Then firecrackers, substituting for anti-aircraft guns, began to pop. No one fainted, but many a person jumped at every pop of the artificial guns.

Nothing much happened until 9:20, when the second siren alarm sounded to warn citizens of approaching bombers. Once more fireworks were used, this time in the place of bombs. The air bombs burst in midair, and a moment later, a huge bonfire was blazing about one block off Main Street.

Then came the fire trucks, with shaded lights, down Main Street at a high rate of speed. The truck rounded the corner toward the bonfire, and, a few minutes later, the fire was extinguished.

At 9:30 the all-clear signal was given, lights went back on, and the streets were cleared. The first mock black-out in Texas had been staged.

During the period of blackness a few girls of about 15 years of age ran up and down the streets calling for their mothers. Some of the citizens thought they were small children lost from their parents until the girls became visible in some of the better-lighted places.

All traffic was stopped, with the exception of about four automobiles. Those which were allowed to go through the town, however, were forced to shade their lights. When a car was allowed to go through, the lights were painted at one end of Main Street, and cleaned off at the other end. Escorts were furnished the cars which were allowed to go through.

A song meeting was in progress at one of the churches. Whether the singing was continued was not learned, but the lights had to be turned out.

The black-out was planned by the home-defense guard company of Turkey, under the direction of Capt. Cole Boswell. Mayor J. W. Hardcastle proclaimed the 30-minute period for the black-out drill to make it official. Cooperating with the defense guard unit was Carl Roewe, Turkey Enterprise editor, who released much publicity in preparation for the event.

TURKEY BLACK-OUT DRILL DEMONSTRATES HOW SMALL CITY CAN PREPARE FOR WAR

That a small city can do its part in the national-defense program was shown in the black-out demonstration held several weeks ago in Turkey.

The practice black-out, the first of its kind to be held in Texas, was all in fun, of course, but the demonstration was serious in one aspect.

The citizens there showed their willingness to cooperate, and the city was in almost complete darkness for a 30-minute period. Preceding the black-out, a siren warning was given. The second warning was the signal to extinguish lights.

Stores were kept open, but most of the people were on the streets to see what was going to happen. Traffic was stopped on the main street, and even motorists were not allowed to pass through unless it was absolutely necessary. Even then, the headlights were painted over, and auto escorts were used.

At the middle of the black-out, a bonfire was set to represent the mark of a bomb. The Turkey Fire Department rushed to the scene, extinguished the fire, and then went back to their station.

A short time later the black-out was completed, lights went back on, and business was carried on as usual.

The Great Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. A. A. BERLE, JR.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of what is commonly called a world revolution, when so many of the things in life which we had looked upon as stable are being wrenched and shaken and in some cases completely overturned, when so many men are bewildered or even hopeless, it is refreshing to listen to the voice of one who can see in all the confusion, the hope, indeed, the certainty, of a better and a more secure order, and who is rightly able to look upon present circumstances as a challenge to the energies, the daring, and the imagination of men. Such a voice was heard in the address delivered on June 11, 1941, at the commencement exercises of Catholic

University, Washington, D. C., by Hon. A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. Berle's address follows:

Not long ago, on occasions of this kind, it used to be customary to lament the fate of young men and women who were forced to enter active life in hard times. Complaint was made that no clear path was laid out and that no use could be made of the talents and training of youth. The world, it was said, was fully occupied. Work was hard to find. The earth was filled with previous mistakes; and the rising generation had the sole and dubious privilege of clearing up the wreckage.

I doubt if these lamentations were ever justified, but it is certain beyond question that there is no reason for them today. Certainly you and your fellows are the last either to pity yourselves or accept pity from anyone else.

Indeed, if you were choosing a time in history and a place in the world in which to enter active life with the most brilliant prospects, you would choose the present and you would choose America.

For we are clearly on the eve of a great conquest, perhaps one of the greatest conquests in history since the founding of the Christian church. The young men and women of today will assist in, and eventually achieve, that conquest; and no one of you will fail to share in its splendor, except by deliberate choice.

Both immediately and in the long view there is endless work to be done, and you are trained for it. Both now and in longer range there is a world to be won, and you have in your hands the instruments with which to win it. Both now and for many years there will be a very clear issue, and you are on the right side of that issue.

This is commonly called a revolutionary age, and that statement is correct. But the nature and the depth of the revolution is rarely appreciated. Students of history have long known that revolutions in themselves do not create. They merely recognize forces and situations which have long been active and which have silently made their own patterns. Suddenly the latent institutions become apparent, and what we call revolution is not their creation but their eventual recognition.

During nearly half a century new and revolutionary forces have been moving in every country, including our own. These forces are not the minor agitations to which journalists and authors have paid attention. They are more fundamental, slower moving, and infinitely more important.

What happened was that human beings suddenly attained control of vast natural forces which had never before been unlocked. Science and technical skill gave to man the solution to certain age-old problems. Until relatively recently, much of the business of living consisted of an elemental and age-old struggle to bring enough food into the world so that hunger could be met; to make enough clothes so that none need go naked; to conquer cold and darkness with heat and light; to find labor enough to do the needed work. In the space of a single generation these problems were solved, and many more besides. The physical necessities and comforts of life could be produced on an undreamed-of scale. The range of men's lives moved swiftly from the close and intimate contacts of day-by-day meeting to the far-flung knowledge of the world which comes from instantaneous communication, so that the happenings in every country became the commonplaces of every home.

Horizons changed completely. Even the historic insistence that a nation must have land ceases to have meaning in a civilization in which modern chemistry has made it possible to feed an entire country like our own from the product of a single State like Connecticut or Illinois. Physical compulsions like those which drove pagan hordes from central Asia into Europe and which have traditionally directed the course of history become minor in the presence of vaster forces which virtually place in the hands of every modern country the ability to make of its life whatever it chooses. It was inevitable that the impact of these new-found abilities should change the face of the world as we knew it.

No less inevitable was the form in which the issue would be presented. When men are suddenly endowed with new and amazing resources, the problems presented cease to be physical. They become, quite literally, moral and philosophical. For the question is no longer "How can men get what they need?", but "By what rules of life will they make use of what they have?" The struggle ceases to be an endeavor to seek possessions. It becomes a conflict of the principles which determine the minds of men who already have possessions within their reach.

In historical fact, this is the question which is now asked of modern civilization and modern thought. The warfare which has spread throughout the world is, quite literally, an attempt to find the answer.

So far as I know, no nation declined to accept the implications of the new powers which had been put into its hands. Every country of importance was endeavoring to adjust its life and its habits to the new condition. What has gone forward has been the division of nations and peoples into great camps.

One of these camps has proposed as a solution the revolution of cruelty. Under it the vast new resources are massed in the hands of an all-powerful, tyrannically ruled State whose chieftains shall hold absolute power over production and distribution, over the communications and learning and thought, over the training of children, over peace and war, over life and death. The philosophy behind this is almost animal in its simplicity. Believing that moral law is weak and unreal, it depends on force, on arbitrary control backed by fear, and by suppression of thought.

On the other side, there has slowly emerged a great group of nations and a still greater number of individuals dedicated to the kindly revolution—the swift and steady development of a society in which nothing human is alien; in which the new resources are steadily and increasingly placed at the equal service of all; but which finds its unity in the moral relationship between man and his neighbor, between nation and nation, and between men and the universe in which they are created.

These two groups are now locked in a world struggle. In many parts of the world, even where the armies are not engaged, the struggle is intense in the plane of morals and ideas. You will find evidence of it not only on the Balkan battlefield but in every American newspaper. You cannot escape it. Either the world organizes itself on the law of the kindly revolution, or it must cope with these same new and limitless resources which science has created, wielded by the uncontrolled organization of naked, animal power.

I myself have absolute faith as to the outcome of the present struggle in which you will play so great a part. I think you have the same faith; and for that reason in your struggles and work in the coming years you will have the inestimable advantage of that inner peace which alone makes the struggle and the labor of life worth while. Never yet has hatred produced any offspring. Never yet has cruelty forged a society. Never yet have lies and force politics produced more than a temporary effect. Never yet has an attempt to enslave nations produced anything except the wreck of the would-be master. Never yet have free men, working together in the bonds of a moral law stronger and more pervasive than any decree of any dictator, lost any conflict in which they have been forced to engage.

You will occasionally hear attempts made to convert you to what are sometimes called the principles of "realism." Now realism is a great word, properly appreciated, but it has been used by cynics and by half-educated men to mean merely an estimate of naked force. If bribery and corruption appeared to be a way of getting what you wanted, it was "realist" to adopt that method. If a neighbor undertook to deal with you on a basis of having more tanks and guns and bombs, it was "realist" to accept that logic and let it go at that. Now corruption is real enough; and so are bombs and bullets; but the question only barely begins there. Even in a short lifetime I have seen western civilization dominated first by one group of powers, then conquered by a second group, whose military sway encompassed larger areas than those of the Axis at this moment; and I have seen the balance change again almost overnight. During the period of your own education you have seen the so-called realism of air power shift three times on the continent of Europe. To say that any such transitory condition can really affect the moral and mental decisions on which society is based is, to my mind, a complete failure to appreciate the true realities.

For while a tank may be real, the mind of the man in the tank is a thousand times more real. A production line is certainly a fact; but infinitely more important are the principles of the men who determine the use to which that product shall be put. An army in the field is a real thing at short range; but the great reality are the beliefs of the men who are in it and who direct it.

When the great challenge came on us we were, I think, on the point of making our new inheritance available more widely and more gloriously to the people of our own country, and of our neighbors, than any nation in history. In a large sense, perhaps, it is as well that the challenge has been made, and that it has come now Few great changes are easily accomplished; and few principles maintain their purity unless their adherents are forced to stand and answer now and then for the faith that is in them. Our society like every other, ought to consider its objectives from time to time, lest it lose sight of the deep motives which brought it into being.

In all its history our country was, and still is, guided by essentially moral and religious conceptions. We have departed from this knowledge at times; and have paid a price for our mistakes; but in the main we have never lost sight of it. In earlier times our philosophy was formally religious. Even today, when the religious background is not usually stressed, the dominant emotion in this country is its inherent kindliness; its spontaneous rejection of cruelty; its refusal to accept hatreds; its underlying and constant insistence on equity, on fair dealing, and on kindness as between man and man, and as between man and his government and society. This is a moral philosophy and a moral order, whether it is explained in terms of abstract justice, or a belief in the brotherhood of man, or by still others who profess, as I do, a quite simple belief in the law and the providence of God.

From this has come, I think, the heart and the soul and the driving force of the amazing technical developments with which the world now grapples; and from it has also come our own peculiar use of them.

If you were talking today to a Nazi he would quite bluntly base his claim to a position in the world upon his ability to use and organize modern technical force. He would

point to clouds of war planes in the sky; to fleets of tanks on land; to a superb system of electro-communications which make possible the manipulation of vast masses of fighting men; to submarines at sea; to the organization of an endless supply of material of war. A race, he says, that can do these things, is entitled as of right to dominate as much of the earth's surface as he can cover. Yet electricity is an American development. The internal combustion engine, which is the foundation of mechanized warfare, was invented and worked out here. Airplanes first flew in the American skies; submarines and motor ships, like their steam predecessors, were first sailed in American waters.

To the American mind these were kindly developments. Radio communication existed for the purpose of widening the horizon of men, and not for the purpose of pumping a stream of propaganda designed to shut out truth. The mechanism of a tank was designed to serve labor and till the soil; it was not natural for us to think of it as a means of killing. Organization of industry on a mass basis was thought of primarily as a means of putting needed goods into the hands of many people. A nation which has no hatreds is slow to turn these things into implements of war. But by that very token, if it is ever required to do so, it can use these implements better than any nation in the world; and use them with more assurance, since it has no fear. There, perhaps, is the true comparison. Under the kindly revolution, the unlocked resources must be used to serve human need. Under the cruel revolution, they will be used as instruments of warfare. Today, even the right to be kind, to be human, to be understanding, and to love one's neighbor, is a right which must be struggled for. Yet, once it is rewon, we know that these human and civilized instincts will have at their command a greater ability to translate themselves into reality than has ever yet been known to history.

The end of all this is already sufficiently plain.

The conquest falls to the kindly revolution; for the kindly revolution is universal. It offers something to the mind and heart and ability of every man, whereas the revolution of cruelty crushes mind after mind, group after group, and ends by having no human resources, spiritual, mental, or technical.

But as that happens, progressively, our responsibilities will widen. The kindly revolution has not sought mastery; rather, it seeks peace. But peace is itself a dynamic conception: not to be taken and kept and held save by endless thought and effort and work. Unhappiness anywhere is a threat to peace. Want anywhere is a threat to security. Hatred anywhere menaces order. The undermining, anywhere, of the strength of the moral law which enables you and me to go our ways in peace, directly threatens us all.

For that reason, you and I, individually, and this Nation, must shoulder vastly increased burdens. We shall have to feed and clothe and house great areas of the world. We shall have to supply technical skill for those areas which have stamped out the free minds who were the creators of technical skill. We shall have to do this not in the realistic search for immediate profit, but in the absolute faith that as we contribute to peace and contentment anywhere, we strengthen the position of the kindly revolution everywhere. We shall have to recognize that we are a greatly favored area and a greatly fortunate people; and that our safety and our glory alike depends on our making it apparent that those who join us, and work with us, who seek our aid, or who ask our cooperation, have nothing to fear.

This is the great conquest. To be young, to be in it, to be of it, and to have a part of it, is beyond measure splendid.

Dedication of Federal Building, Greenwood, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. BUTLER B. HARE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to be one of the guest speakers at the dedication of the new post office and Federal court building at Greenwood, S. C., on June 12, and under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting a résumé of the address I made on that occasion:

POST OFFICE BUILDING

A detailed history of the development and growth of the Postal Service in the United States would read like a romance. A comparison of its early beginnings about 300 years ago with its extent and magnitude of today is sufficient to awaken the reason and excite the imagination of anyone. The Postal Service had its beginning in 1639 in what is now the State of Massachusetts when the court of that colony approved a petition providing that all oversea mail should be left at the home of Richard Fairbanks who agreed to deliver such mail to the addressee for 1 penny per letter.

It is my judgment the people of the United States receive more service and direct benefit from the Post Office Department than any of the other executive departments. There is nothing that would paralyze the business and economic life of the Nation so quickly and more completely than the cessation or discontinuance of the Postal Service.

I could go further and say that in my judgment no one of the executive departments exceeds in efficiency the work of the Post Office Department, and no one adheres more strictly to the law in the enforcement of its rules and regulations.

Our Government has been very generous in providing facilities for postal service in our larger towns and cities but it has been quite niggardly in providing housing facilities for such services in the smaller towns and villages.

I will not attempt to discuss this matter further today, but I have some grounds for expressing the hope that the Government may inaugurate a program within the next few years providing for better housing facilities in the smaller offices.

FEDERAL COURTHOUSE

A judicial system of some kind has been one of the first governmental agencies set up by civilized nations of the world. The necessity for such an agency has been recognized as far back in history as civilization itself. The development of such systems has been determined in a large measure by the people's conception and recognition of God. As a matter of fact, the administration of justice is based or predicated upon what we know as divine law. Really, justice itself is an attribute of divine nature. Apart from it there can be no justice. It is the yardstick by which justice is determined.

However, it is not our purpose this morning to philosophize on the origin or functions of our judicial system, but it is appropriate to say that its history can be definitely and clearly traced to the early days of Biblical history. We read in the book of Exodus that "Moses chose able men out of Israel and made them heads to judge the people at all seasons."

It is quite interesting to observe how closely our judicial system is allied to the system found in the early days of sacred history. It is particularly interesting to note that the life tenure of our Federal judges, our judicial circuits in the State, and the districts in our Federal courts are scripturally well founded. We read that Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life. And he went from year to year in circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpah, and judged Israel in all these places.

Even the functions of our courts are patterned after the judicial system of biblical days. We read in Deutronomy where the following instructions were given to judges, which is the practice in our courts today:

"Ye shall not respect persons in judgment. Ye shall hear the small and great alike, and ye shall not be afraid of the face of man."

Yes, the established policy of our Government that the decisions of the courts shall be final is not without precedent, for we read further where it says:

"According to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do; thou shalt not turn aside from the sentence they shall show thee, neither to the right hand nor to the left."

We could go further and show that historically our judicial system has upon it the seal of divine approval and is, therefore, entitled to the respect and loyalty of every person who would resort to the courts for the protection of his rights.

No doubt judges make mistakes and there may be a few unjust judges but they are few and far between, and this country and our Government are to be congratulated upon the purity and success of our courts generally. Our judges have what I consider sacred responsibilities and, upon the whole, we have so far been able to obtain men who have recognized them as such and have had the courage to discharge them without fear or favor.

Our courts, both State and Federal, are the mudsills upon which the coveted institutions of this Republic are erected. It is a great satisfaction to think there is not a right that any person has but what he can have it protected by the courts and there is not a wrong or a grievance but what he can resort to a court or judicial tribunal and have it corrected.

It is appropriate, therefore, that our Government should select convenient places and make suitable provision for hearing and determining the rights and grievances of its people.

Your city is to be congratulated upon being well and conveniently located. Your ready access and your relationship in many ways with adjoining towns and counties well justify the selection of Greenwood as a most suitable place for this temple of justice. It is a recognition of the wisdom, foresight, and the progressive public spiritedness of your representative citizens, particularly your former mayor, who is reported to have increased your postal receipts measurably by writing almost daily advising Government officials in Washington that the people here were expecting this building on the next train. I could have said it is a tribute to your patience, long suffering, and long-sightedness, for I happen to know that this building started on its way more than 10 years ago.

I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and all who have contributed their interest and efforts toward securing, locating, and the construction of this large, beautiful, and commodious building.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, today is consecrated to those who have finished their work in the Halls of Congress and in the visual world about us. Chief among them is the late MORRIS SHEPPARD, the dean of Congress, who served in House and Senate for almost 40 years.

I knew and revered him before I became a Member of this House, but after coming here I was in intimate association with him, both socially and on legislative work, until his death. He was chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and I am a member of the House committee. Our work in consequence ran in much the same channels.

As chairman of this most important committee he was in charge of legislation upon which this country today is depending to lead us safely and victoriously through the present emergency, and to preserve to us those liberties which are our incomparable heritage from the founders of this Government.

Throughout his long and vuluable service he helped individually uncounted thousands not only from our own State but throughout the Nation. No one was too poor or obscure to reach his ear and none was ever turned aside without having received every assistance in his power to render.

This work on single claims and requests, while requiring time and the giving of self in full measure, did not prevent his devoting constant work to the study of the great issues before this country, to the solution of which he contributed his abundant energy and outstanding ability.

He always cast his vote without fear or favor and in accordance with his convictions of the right, as he was given to see the right. Nothing was permitted to interfere with his attendance at sessions of the Senate and he missed none. No man who ever served in that body paid more meticulous attention to the business before it.

His understanding of the events unfolding about him and his unimpeachable honesty of purpose was recognized by his colleagues who all regarded him not only with veneration for his worth but with affection for his generous and lovable personality.

He will always be remembered for his devotion to the cause of temperance, and his authorship of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution. In spite of the repeal of that law, no person ever doubted his conviction or sincerity and none failed to praise his tolerance.

He exemplified his belief in all that is noble and fine in the life of man and has left to posterity the memory of that integrity of character and social sympathy that enriches the life of a great Nation. His work has been cut short in the fullness of his usefulness and his brilliant career and we whom he has left behind feel a sense of deepest sorrow and loss. He died as truly in the service of his country as if he had fallen on the battlefield. I extend my deep and sincere sympathy to his faithful wife and devoted daughters.

Relief for the Small Democracies of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

PETITION OF CITIZENS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

JUNE 16, 1941.

(Submitted by J. Gibson Winaris, 3330 Lake Mendota Drive, Shorewood Hills, Madison, Wis.:)

We express heartfelt sympathy for the millions of suffering people in the small democracies of Europe who are facing starvation and pestilence.

We fully endorse Mr. Herbert Hoover's proposal to find a way to effect immediate relief, and urge the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies to spare no effort to expedite this matter.

Mrs. A. W. Kelly, 412 W. Gorham Street, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. Minnie O. Crane, 424 N. Peckney Street, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. D. E. Kelly, 1906 Vilas Avenue; A. W. Kelly, 412 W. Gorham Street; G. S. Collins, 923 Swarthmore Court, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. George L. Collins, 923 Swarthmore Court, Madison, Wis.; J. G. Winaris, 3330 Lake Mendota Drive, Madison, Wis.; C. Le Roy De Land, 1707 Madison Street, Madison, Wis.; Stanley B. Jackson, 4201 Mandan Crescent, Madison, Wis.; Ralph B. Johnson, 1042 Spaight Street, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. Kenneth Newton, 329 W. Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis.; Elmo E. Housel, 434 Virginia Terrace; E. B. McMurray, 916 Shorewood Boulevard; R. M. Larson, 3005 Harvard Drive; G. E. Spohn, 353 W. Mifflin Street; Mrs. R. V. Hurley, 2022 Monroe Street; Mrs. William C. Dean, 404 State; Mrs. Rena E. Gigous, 311 W. Dayton Street; Mrs. John J. Gibbens, 815 W. Johnson; Roy T. Harris, 435 Virginia Terrace; Edith Almquist, 430 W. Dayton; Edith Anderson, 302 W. Main; Agnes Schneider, 108 Langdon Street; Margaret M. Donkle, 1711 Madison Street; A. Geneva Bishop, 619 S. Spooner; H. C. Jackson, 4014 Counsel Court; C. A. Smith, 1812 Keyes Avenue; L. P. Ellwood; O. D. Allen, 1149 Emerald Street, Madison; Harold C. Lindberg, 2909 Oxford Road; Edwin O. Winans, 3621 Twenty-second Avenue N., Arlington, Va.; Marion N. Winans, Shorewood Hill, Madison, Wis.; Iva M. Winans, 3621 Twenty-second Avenue N., Arlington, Va.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the long list of those who have recorded their feelings of regret and sadness occasioned by the passing of one of the most distinguished and illustrious Americans our Nation has produced, Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texarkana, Tex.

Among the counties I have had the honor to represent in the Texas House of Representatives and in Congress is Camp County, the county in which Senator SHEPPARD began the practice of law and one of the counties composing the congressional district he later represented as a Member of the National House of Representatives. I desire to say, in passing, that the people of Camp County are a clean, honest, moral, hard-working, and God-fearing people; they are genuine Americans. Because I, too, was privileged to live in Camp County as a small boy, it has been my good fortune to know throughout my life many of the intimate and old-time friends of Senator SHEPPARD. Those who have known a man longest usually know him best; they are aware of his powers and his weaknesses. I am positive the people of Pittsburg and Camp County, Tex., held Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD in as high esteem as the people of any area. One of the most frequent inquiries I always heard when returning to Pittsburg and Camp County from Washington was, "How is MORRIS? I hear from him occasionally." Behind this question in every instance there was more than a perfunctory interest; the interest was real.

Those in Pittsburg and Camp County who knew him personally and as a public servant for more than 40 years had the greatest love for and confidence in Senator SHEPPARD. No one questioned his loyalty, his honesty, or his integrity; he was never termed a "hypocrite" or a "demagogue" even by those who disagreed with him. Unkind words were never used to describe him or his efforts. No one doubted he was on the job, busy all the time; it was never said or intimated that he had lost the common touch.

The life he lived and the manner in which he served the people initiated and kept alive this implicit love for and confidence in him. Someone has said, "If you want a job done, get a busy man to do it." This sentence is not inappropriate in connection with Senator SHEPPARD'S tenure as a public servant. He was on the job as many of the 24 hours of the day as it was possible for him to be; he knew personally what was going on in reference to the requests of the many individuals he helped and was seeking to help; he knew personally the status of the legislation he was supporting and sponsoring; he was not content to delegate the duty or shift the responsibility. Few people know or can ever know how many separate and distinct tasks he performed every day, how many people he saw, how many phone calls he made or answered, how many departments he contacted. Always he was accommodating and tireless; he was never angry, never inconsiderate.

As a public servant Senator SHEPPARD was so fair and considerate that he knew no line of demarcation as between people who sought his help. There were no preferred or unpreferred cases.

As one of the younger members of the Texas delegation in point of tenure, I consider myself fortunate in being privileged to serve a term in the House while Senator SHEPPARD was in the Senate. Perchance I was a little more observant than some people have been in regard to the meticulous efforts Senator SHEPPARD expended to help those who requested his help. Although I had heard of Senator SHEPPARD from many sources all my life, I was never privileged to meet him until I became a Member of Congress a little more than 2 years ago. Not infrequently I talked with him and solicited his assistance. In not one instance did he ever fail to respond, and it was his policy not merely to go through the "aid" motion or to feign cooperation, but it was his policy to leave no stone unturned to accomplish the task. He did not as little as he could do but as much as he could do.

Unfortunate, indeed, it was for the people of our Nation and the people of our great State, and, in fact, people who love freedom and liberty throughout the world that Senator SHEPPARD was taken from us in this perilous period of our Nation's history. As the able and experienced chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, he was, at the time of his death, working with all his might night and day to speed up our defense efforts that America might be impregnably unassailable and impervious to attack. Indeed, his passing is an irreparable loss.

The last speech I heard Senator SHEPPARD make was before the Texas delegation when the delegation appropriately honored a former distinguished member of our delegation, Judge Marvin Jones. Concluding his tribute to Judge Jones, Senator SHEPPARD accurately stated the familiar words, "To know him was to love him; to name him was to praise him," were applicable to Marvin Jones. Of Senator SHEPPARD, by every person who ever knew him I know it would be accurately said, "To know him was to love him; to name him was to praise him."

Four short lines, words of another, in my opinion, characterize his life and his work and could have well been his own:

I think this thing to be grandly true,
That a noble deed is a step toward God—
Lifting the soul from the common sod
To a purer air and a broader view.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

TRIBUTE FROM THE PRESS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest expressions from the press upon the passing of our beloved Senator from Texas, the late MORRIS SHEPPARD, appears below:

Buried last week beneath the sod of the State he had served long and well was a quiet little man whose soul's integrity never faltered through decades of tumultuous battling for the ideals he held.

MORRIS SHEPPARD was probably the most beloved figure to tread the Texas political stage during the last quarter century. Simple in manners, quiet by nature, steadfast by choice, he went to Congress 39 years ago to succeed his father, moved to the Senate 11 years later, had been there ever since, serving as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee since 1933.

In a few years more he would have broken all records for congressional service; as it was, he was the dean of Congress.

There was nothing spectacular about MORRIS SHEPPARD. He did not like the spotlight; he loved the life of a scholar. He did the job the people hired him to do. He did it well. He did it bravely. He let the chips fall where they would.

A national magazine once wrote an article about him entitled "The Art of Being a Little Senator." He was little in size; he never tried to shake the world, but he did his job so well that when death plucked him by the ear he left the world without any known enemies.

With him many disagreed, but none hated. He was too honest, too earnest, for anyone to hate. "He never sold the truth to serve the hour, nor faltered with Eternal God for power," as Tennyson wrote of Wellington.

His quiet kindliness, his lack of bombast, was not to be mistaken for lack of ability. One of the best-educated of Senators in a body of superbly trained men, SHEPPARD was a keen student, an artful manager of affairs, and his work in military affairs left little to be desired.

Greatest fame came to him as author of the prohibition amendment, but that was only one of his many interests. But his prohibition views were indicative of his tenacity of purpose. Knowing that he was fighting for a cause lost, temporarily at least, he kept its banners waving ever and came to be a symbol of a man who stuck by his guns all the way through.

And this singleness of purpose won for him the respect, the admiration, and the votes of those who disagreed most vigorously with what he did.

But age and overwork last week took their toll, and in Walter Reed Memorial Hospital in Washington early one morning life ebbed slowly to a finish. He died as no doubt he would have wished, in full gait, with no faltering of pace, working quietly, earnestly, devotedly at his job, to the very last, a fitting finish to a career devoted to doing one's job well.

Back home they brought him, to be buried beneath east Texas clay, not many miles from the Morris County home that gave him birth 66 years ago. The Vice President of the United States, Senators, and Congressmen rode on the funeral train, while the great and not-so-great of Texas gathered to pay their last respects to a gray little man with a tender smile who never winced nor cried aloud through all the battling years.

MORRIS SHEPPARD had come home to stay. His job was done.

Hobby Day in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ORLEANS (LA.) TIMES-PICAYUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune]

"HOBBY DAY" IN THE HOUSE

The long-buried St. Lawrence seaway scheme was formally resurrected recently by a bill authorizing the President to negotiate with Canada to put it over. Long the favorite hobby of Mr. Roosevelt, it was beaten by the Senate in 1934 for reasons an American majority considered sound. Then it was generally agreed that such a deal between this country and Canada must be effected by formal treaty subject to Senate ratification. Now it is contended that the deal can be put over by simple congressional authorization. Treaty ratification requires a two-thirds majority in the Senate. Congressional authorization requires ordinary majorities. Denied senatorial ratification of its treaty form, the measure's promoter now seeks the easiest way of a simple congressional majority, though that was not considered a valid method 7 years ago.

Canada's people show no enthusiasm for the scheme, even though the United States would pay most of the bill, for all Canada's manpower and material resources are needed in the vital war tasks. The Canadian Government yielded to President Roosevelt's insistence and acquiesced in the current dicker over the objections of many Canadian folks. The American people are showing even less enthusiasm than their Canadian neighbors do. Of the Congressmen "lined up" for its support, we venture to say that few really believe the St. Lawrence seaway hobby should be put over at this time, while fewer still consider it a defense project.

In brief, the reintroduction of the St. Lawrence seaway business at this singularly inopportune time—and camouflaged as a national-defense undertaking—impresses us as fresh evidence of the President's determination to have his own way in everything. We trust that majorities in both Houses will have the courage to express the judgment and will of the American people by rejecting the costly hobby project again, regardless of administration pressure.

The Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House is naturally interested in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD's appearance—that is, the format—and desire that it be in good taste and measure up to high typography standards.

Since the publication of a very proper but at the same time very critical editorial in the June 21, 1941, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, dealing with the change of format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, several Members of the House have spoken to me wanting to know why the Joint Committee on Printing had given its assent to such a change. This change was authorized on the request of the Public Printer. Personally, as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, I opposed such a change at all times.

That this change in the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is of wide concern is apparent when we find the widely read Saturday Evening Post devoting almost its full editorial page to a very critical analysis of it.

The editorial, A Word With the Public Printer, speaks for itself and reads as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of June 21, 1941]

A WORD WITH THE PUBLIC PRINTER

As a constant reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we have watched in vain for any protest against the outrage committed upon it by a change of dress and make-up. The right to take offense belongs to Congress alone. A subscriber's feelings count for simply nothing. There is no editor to be bullied and no business manager to care whether you mean it or not when you threaten to cancel. No word of indignation has been uttered, no resolution of censure has been offered, in either the Senate or the House, and we fear now it is too late. The eye is an accommodating member; it quickly forms new habits, nor has it in itself any power of aesthetic perception. We suppose it is so already that if you were to say to a Senator or to a Representative, "Why was the Public Printer permitted to ruin the beautiful example of typography that was the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?" he would look up from the reading of his own voice in type—any kind of type—and say, "What? Oh, yes. Well, what was it like before?"

The Public Printer, of course, could not have done it without the consent of the Joint Committee on Printing. What his arguments were we do not care to know. They were specious; and we have reason to believe, as we shall show, that they were subtle. The Joint Committee on Printing did not know any better. You need no further evidence of that than its consenting. But the Public Printer, strictly in the character of printer, did know better. Moreover, he was under no vulgar economic necessity to stultify his art. His position is that of printer laureate. He has a free hand and no purse. The Government supports him. His hellbox is a charge upon the public funds.

Then why did he abandon the brevier he was using? Brevier, so named from having first been used in the Roman Catholic breviary, called also Jungfer, or Maiden Letter, by the Germans for its comeliness, is that beautiful face spoken of by Moxon as the one wherein the curves show a "sweet driving of the fats and leans into one another," and was in this use, besides, the perfect size.

And what did he put in place of it? Not minion, meaning "darling," because of the early printers' admiration for it, which ought to have been the next choice, but a thing called 7½ point. With this 7½ point he is able to squeeze the measure, with the result that you have now on a page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three columns of narrow measure where before, immemorially, there had been two of wide measure.

We have before us two folio specimens, the old and the new; yet we cannot undertake to be exact about the measure. Our rule is lost. We carried it in our pocket for many years to mark that day when we laid the empty stick across the "a" box and left the high stool to go and sit at a desk. However, it would not serve if we had it, for since we left the case another enormity of the efficient age has been to impose upon type the point system. By eye we should say the old wide measure was 24 pica ems and that the new narrow measure is 15½ pica ems. The width of a newspaper column is scant 13 pica ems—scant by a shaving of the honest pica base, done to it by the point system, in order that an eighth column might be smuggled upon a newspaper page.

Do not believe that this matter of measure is unimportant. It is significant. Look for yourself. It is impossible to be stentorian in 13 ems. Try it. But in 24 ems, which is nearly book measure, your periods may roll in the grand manner.

We have no doubt the Public Printer told the joint committee he could save some space. Yet most of the little space he gained was lost again by the necessity to use an extra rule—a page of three columns requiring two vertical rules, where a page of two columns takes only one—and besides, we have carefully estimated what he gained in space, and it is nothing—almost nothing in the body and exactly 1 inch at the top of the title page by a separate outrage.

Fancy the richest and most prodigal government in the world saving 1 inch of white paper by reducing the noble English letter title design and pushing the great seal from the middle over to the left ear, where it is half size. What was space to the Public Printer, in any case? It costs him nothing.

No; as we say, he knew better. And we know what happened to him. He departed from the character of printer to become an ironist, and to make his point he was willing to mutilate his art.

Think of him as the only human being who is obliged to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As this drudgery came to be less and less relieved by sudden occasional pleasures of the mind, it was natural that with a sense of personal grievance he should begin to speculate on the cause and effects of the decline of political eloquence. The effects, being profound, were more easily perceived than the cause.

Certainly the parliamentary principle in Government and the art of manificent rhetoric declined and withered together. You would not have to be a printer to see that. But knowing in his own craft the importance of dress, as in the example that a poor text may be saved and a good one is made better by fine printing and binding; knowing, too, his Sartor Resartus, as every printer curiously does, and therefore the theorem of Professor Teufelsdröckh that all human forms and institutions are, in fact, clothes, a printer, we dare say, would arrive sooner at the cause. It would occur to him that what was true of a book or a journal would be true also of a statesman, the outwardness in either case acting upon the inwardness—the type upon the text, the clothes upon the man—and that therefore the decline of political eloquence, with disastrous consequences to the parliamentary principle, began with the passing of the silk hat and the long-skirted coat not cut away in front. We ourselves had thought of that.

But there was a collateral question to which we had no answer. Why were those who represented the parliamentary principle—those alone—unaware of what had happened to them? Why did they continue to talk as if they were in frock coats? Why did they continue to support the manner without the dress, which was, of course, absurd?

That was something the Public Printer knew. It was because they continued to read themselves in his wide-measure brevier. And being unable any longer to bear this incongruity, he said to himself, "I will put the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a sack suit, where it belongs." And that is what he did. We are not going to cancel. Such as it is, there is one CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But we wish the Public Printer to know that we caught him at it.

Union Now Takes a Step Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

UNION NOW TAKES A STEP FORWARD

Bloody Joe has got the jump on the brothers and sisters who are panting for Union Now. Joe already has his delegate seated in the halls of Westminster.

Willie Gallacher, the turbulent member from Glasgow, can now represent both his countries. The parliamentary correspondents note that since last Sunday he has been treated with unusual affability. Willie isn't used to affability, and it may be that he won't thrive on it. When he was bounced from the Commons for violating the decorum of the Mother of Parliaments it helped his build-up with his constituents on Clydeside.

The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs took some pains to soothe Willie when he arose to demand why the British in Iceland had suppressed a Communist paper and deported a Communist member of the Icelandic parliament. They had been telling the Icelanders and the Canadian troops of occupation about the imperialistic war.

If Mr. Butler, the Under Secretary, had been a little quicker at repartee he would have assured Willie that the British authorities were merely removing their new allies to a safe place before they were taken apart by some irate Canadian. As it was, he murmured regrets.

Willie is sharing the spot light in London with Ivan Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador. At a luncheon Col. Lord Nathan, chairman of the National Defense Public Interest Committee, proposed a toast to the success of

Russia. Among those who drank it was the Finnish envoy, whose capital was at the moment being bombed by Bloody Joe's air force. Whatever he was drinking, it wasn't a Martini. He didn't choke on the olive.

There have been some lightning readjustments at Washington since Joe started defending the four freedoms, but Comrade Browder is still in the hoosegow. Fortunately American Cabinet officers are not subject to daily congressional interrogation. If Representative MARCANTONIO, who votes with Joe even if he doesn't admit sleeping with him, wants to ask Attorney General Biddle why he doesn't let Earl out he'll have to go over to the Justice Department.

The readjustments aren't all one-sided. Harry Bridges, Wyndham Mortimer, and the rest of the comrades on the industrial front will have to quit calling the cops Cossacks. The Cossacks are new dealers now.

Report on Defense Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, OF ALABAMA, AT UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and able address delivered by my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], at the defense-day banquet at the University of Alabama on last Wednesday evening, June 25.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In a world in which events move so swiftly that, even with all of the modern methods of communication, we often find ourselves hard-pressed to keep abreast of the momentous happenings of the day—to say nothing of the happenings of the hour or the moment—it seems well to stop at intervals and take stock of the situation. It seems particularly appropriate for such stock taking from time to time in regard to our progress in defense.

I am sure that each of you would like to know what has been done and what is being done in the matter of defense. It is right and fitting that you and every other citizen of the United States should want to know. And it is right and fitting that you should have such a report. And so, as one of your representatives and as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I bring you a report on what the Congress of the United States, working in close collaboration with our great President and the various defense agencies and executive departments of the Federal Government, has done to make total defense a reality.

Under our form of Government the first step toward translating a desire for total defense into a reality must be taken by the Congress. The Congress must authorize the expenditures for the weapons of defense and must thereafter appropriate the necessary funds for the purchase of these weapons of defense. Then the Army and the Navy, aided during time of emergency by the advice of civilian defense agencies, award contracts.

While the record of congressional appropriations and authorizations for national-defense measures extends back much further, in the cause of brevity I will pick up that record at the time when the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress convened on January 3, 1940. During the period between January 3, 1940, and July 1, 1940, bills were passed by the Congress carrying appropriations for national defense to the amount of $4,600,689,869. These appropriations provided for the strengthening of our Army and Navy and Coast Guard, for the building up of our air force, and for the construction of a third set of locks for the Panama Canal. They provided for civilian pilot training, for labor training, for the selecting and placing of defense workers. They provided for the purchase of strategic materials, for loans to industry for plant expansion, and for the construction of essential military and naval projects. We realized that not only was it necessary to have new cannons and tanks, but that we must have special types of railroad cars to carry these cannons and tanks. It was necessary to strengthen 2,000 bridges, many of them railroad bridges, to carry this heavy equipment. Work on strategic roads and their bridges was of vital importance. And the means to carry on this work, to carry out the program as we saw it then, was provided. In addition, provision was made for protection, which seemed adequate at the time, against espionage and sabotage.

I believe that you will agree that this was a splendid record of action and accomplishment, this record of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress between January 3, 1940, and July 1, 1940. But world events were moving swiftly—swiftly—and taking alarming turns. In May the blitzkreig against Holland, Belgium, and France began. By the middle of June, Belgium had surrendered, Holland was prostrated, and Paris was occupied.

On July 10, 1940, President Roosevelt appealed to the Congress for additional funds for defense.

In response to this appeal, the total defense bill was passed by Congress in the summer of 1940. This bill carried appropriations and authorizations to the amount of $5,246,000,000. It made possible the carrying forward of a naval construction program to give us a real two-ocean Navy—the largest and strongest Navy in the history of the world—a Navy that will insure us absolute supremacy of the seas. Within 2 hours after the signing of this bill, contracts were let for 200 new fighting ships and one repair vessel. Among these were seven battleships, of from 45,000 to 55,000 tons displacement, making them the most powerful battlecraft ever projected.

The total defense bill also provided for the completion of the total equipment for a land force of 1,200,000 men and for basic equipment for 800,000 more men, or a total of 2,000,000 men, if mobilization of such a force should prove necessary. It provided for the purchase of 18,422 planes for the Army and Navy. And $100,000,000 was provided for defense housing.

The provisions of the total defense bill related exclusively to material equipment. Under the Selective Training and Service Act, passed by the Senate on August 28, 1940, and by the House on September 15, 1940, a fair and orderly method of increasing and training the armed personnel of the United States was provided. The National Guard bill, authorizing the mobilization of the National Guard and Reserves for peacetime training, was passed in August 1940.

In line with our good-neighbor policy—the cooperation of all the Americas in a mutual cause of defense—a bill was passed in May 1940 authorizing aid to Central and South American republics in increasing their naval and military establishments through manufacture for them of weapons, vessels, and munitions. On June 17, 1940, the Senate voted reaffirmation of the tenets of the Monroe Doctrine. And in September 1940 a bill was passed authorizing half a billion dollars of export-import loans to be made available for our neighbors to the south.

The acquisition of strategic materials in which the United States is deficient is now generally recognized as of vital importance to our defense program. Back in June 1939, the Congress passed the strategic war materials bill for acquisition of stocks of materials which we lacked and to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies. Under this bill $100,000,000 was authorized for procurement and maintenance of these materials and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey, was directed to make scientific, techonologic, and economic investigations with view to devising new methods of treatment of materials, the supply of which was inadequate, and for developing substitutes and new sources of supplies. Two months later, under the Deficiency Appropriation Act, an additional $10,000,000 was appropriated for the acquisition of strategic war materials. More funds have been made available since. But the wisdom of starting early to accumulate these supplies is well proven in view of the present difficulties in regard to shipping facilities and shipping lanes. In order to assure the defense industries of an adequate supply of strategic materials, priorities have been established under which defense needs are put first.

The first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which convened on January 3, 1941, has striven to meet the challenge of international developments. On May 17, 1941, appropriations and contract authorizations amounted to a total of $37,871,000,000. That is a great deal of money that the Congress has appropriated and for which contract authorizations have been approved. What are we getting for it; how is it being spent? Well, here is a break-down that will tell you, in round figures, how that $37,000,000,000 has been apportioned:

	Billions of dollars
Airplanes and accessories	6.5
Ordnance (guns, powder, etc.)	7.2
Ships, motor, and rail equipment	8.8
New industrial facilities	3.8
Military posts, depots, fortifications, and defense housing	3.3
Other Army and Navy equipment	1.8
Miscellaneous (pay, food, reserve materials, etc.)	5.9

We, in this country, have learned that a defense program is expensive. But some of us are still vague as to why it is so expensive. Because of our fortunate position in the past we are unfamiliar with the cost of items essential to defense. For instance, a 35,000-ton battleship, such as the U. S. S. *North Carolina*, which was put into service recently, costs $70,000,000. It takes $50,000,000 to build an aircraft carrier. It takes twenty to thirty million dollars for a cruiser. It takes $3,000,000 for a destroyer, and it takes $6,000,000 for a submarine. And even after these vitally important additions to our national defense are built, they are expensive to maintain. It costs $900—about the price of some of those nice cars I saw parked outside—to fire a 14-inch gun from a battleship. And there are 124 guns in the fleet with more scheduled for the two-ocean navy. A 16-inch gun costs $1,600 to fire.

Major naval combat ships under contract or on order April 30, 1940, numbered 360, on

312 of which preliminary work has started. The Navy contracted for 629 vessels, large and small, during the current fiscal year, as compared with 23 in the preceding year. Total tonnage of major combat vessels on order last July 1 was 585,930 tons. By April 30, 1941, it was 2,226,950. Auxiliary vessels under construction between the same months had risen from 74,938 to 282,507 tons.

In addition to the many contracts, under the emergency ship program of the United States Maritime Commission contracts amounting to $726,674,500 were awarded between July 1, 1940, and May 31, 1941.

A 4-engine bomber, complete with spare parts, costs close to a half a million dollars. In April 1941, the production of military planes was 1,376, with manufacturer's estimates for May indicating quadrupled production within the year. The output of all types of military planes was almost 9,000 for 11 months, and with the addition of May's production, the year's record approaches 10,500.

The price of tanks varies from $27,000 for a light tank, to $67,000 for a medium tank and to $114,000 for a heavy tank, not including the cost of guns. The Army has more than four times as many light (13-ton) tanks on hand as it had last July, and by July 1941, the increase is expected to be six-fold. These tanks are now being produced at the rate of about 150 a month. Medium (26-ton) tanks were redesigned in the light of experience of the British and French Armies in Flanders, and production was delayed purposely so that machine-tool priority could be given more critical weapons. Quantity production of medium tanks is expected by late summer.

Scout cars, well-armed combat vehicles, are coming out at the rate of 400 a month. By July the Army will have its present requirements.

The Army had prepared housing for more than 1,100,000 men on May 1, 1941, and expects to have accommodations for 1,350,000 by the end of June. Allocations for new housing projects aggregated 87,260 units in 47 States and Territories on May 1, 1941, of which approximately 10,000 had been built. On May 3, Government funds were being expended in building 58,542 dwelling units in 124 localities of 45 States and Territories. These figures do not include thousands of homes being built with private funds, partially as a result of growing industrial activity.

Since the defense program began, nearly $500,000,000 worth of textile and textile products have been bought, including more than 3,000,000 sheets, 11,000,000 khaki shirts, 18,000,000 pairs of pants, 33,000,000 pieces of cotton underwear, 63,000,000 pairs of socks, and 9,000,000 pairs of shoes, for the expanding Army and Navy. Food purchases for the services amount to almost $700,000 a day.

More than 1,700 plants are being constructed or enlarged at a cost of $2,802,101,000. Some are already completed and almost all are nearing completion. The Government is paying 73.4 percent of the new plants needed for defense, and private industry, as represented by certificates of necessity, is financing the remainder. These figures do not include private investments in industries established before the defense program began or since built without governmental aid in the form of accelerated tax amortization. British commitments amount to an additional $146,400,000 for 47 plants.

America is fortifying herself and solidifying Western Hemisphere defense with the construction of far-flung naval bases. Sites for eight of these were acquired from Britain in exchange for 50 overage destroyers. Bases are being built at Newfoundland, in the Bermudas, in the Bahamas, at Antigua and St. Lucia in the West Indies, at Trinidad and British Guiana, and at Jamaica. Others are under construction in the Pacific Ocean, on the North Atlantic, and on the Gulf of Mexico.

Under the lend-lease bill of March 27, 1941, the Congress approved appropriations and contract authorizations amounting to $7,000,000,000 to make it possible for us to become a real arsenal for democracy, and by so doing to strengthen our own total defense in the most practical possible fashion. In addition to the funds appropriated by us, British orders placed with American industry amounted to $3,700,000,000 as of May 17, 1941.

There is still much to be done to achieve our goal of total defense. To say otherwise would be foolish and untrue. But it is true that we are well launched on this gigantic task. The early steps in such a program are necessarily the slow steps. These early steps have involved getting plants built and into operation and getting the volume of machine-tool manufacturing up to the required point. Now, with more than 1,700 new plants completed or nearing completion, and with 1,000 machine tools being delivered daily to defense industries, we are ready for quantity production. The Office of Production Management estimates that before the end of 1941 the monthly output of airplanes will be doubled, the monthly output of tanks quadrupled, the monthly output of powder and small-arms ammunition trebled, the monthly output of Garand rifles doubled, and the monthly output of .30- and .50-caliber machine guns increased fivefold. To accomplish this machine tools are being utilized 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We have a job before us. It is a big job, but we can do it and we are going to do it. That is the American way.

There are some among us—not many, thank God, but, at that, too many—who would have us believe that the task is too great, that it is impossible of accomplishment. These defeatists tell us that there is no use trying, that we are beaten before we start. To them I say that even if they are of American birth and citizenship, they do not know America or Americans. The greater the task, the greater the challenge. And when that challenge involves the defense of our country, our homes, our families, our way of life and thought, there are no obstacles great enough to stop us. Before Almighty God, with His aid and with our own determination, I say that we can and we will succeed in this great program.

We always have been and, I trust, we always will be a peace-loving people. Our program of preparedness was launched as a program of peace, not a program of war. In his first inaugural address, President Roosevelt said: "In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor, the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others, the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors." I believe this Nation is as firmly as ever dedicated to this policy. But when a peaceful community of law-abiding, self-respecting citizens is threatened by bandits, it is only the part of wisdom for the members of that community to prepare to protect themselves. The better they are prepared, the less likely they are to be visited by the bandits. We, as a nation, are simply showing the common sense that any community thus situated would show.

There is much for each of us to do. Under the new civilian-defense program every good citizen has an opportunity to volunteer to perform tasks in his or her own community. Some of these tasks may seem very humble, very routine, but when they are added up as a part of a great national effort they take on importance which cannot be overestimated. I urge each of you to volunteer for the task for which you are best fitted, or for the work most needed in your community, even if you have to learn how to do it. By such an all-out effort you will not only be taking care of work that needs to be done but you will be giving an overwhelming demonstration of national unity and the strength that goes with unity. It is the best possible answer to those among us who have been saying that we as a nation are too divided by regions, groups, races, and religions ever to unite in single, effective purpose.

Is not our opportunity here now? Can we not by our response today brighten the history of the next century? Yes; Americans now are being called to a new glory—we follow, and with high hearts, follow not the voice of dictators nor the demand of guns but quietly we follow the call of all free men of all ages; we follow the star that brought justice to man; we follow the inaudible request of the race of men to come after us. Help us, God. Give us the wisdom to do it gladly.

The Proposed Trade Agreements With Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO, BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I desire to congratulate the State Department and the administration upon their persistent and unselfish devotion to the cause of building good-neighbor psychology in Latin America, and for their sincere and energetic action in its behalf. I believe that most of the people of the United States rejoice over their conception of such a policy. Necessarily it means sacrifices upon the part of our own people to make such a policy effective. It should be obvious, however, that such sacrifices should be borne by all of the people and should not be forced upon only two groups of American citizens, the miners and the livestock growers. Placing the burden of the good-neighbor policy upon these two groups as contemplated in the reciprocal trade agreement before us today will doubtless result in a greatly enlarged market for American manufacturers of automobiles, airplanes, refrigerators, other electrical appliances, and numerous other manufactured articles. Then why should the stockgrowers and the miners pay the bill? Such a lopsided, unfair, and unequitable program ought not to be considered by the State Department or anyone else connected with this Government.

Perhaps Latin America needs our help. If so, it should be freely given at the expense of all, and not in the interest of a part of our

people out of the pocketbooks of others of our people. Let all of the people carry the load out of their common treasury, if a sacrifice must be made. It is not fair to South America to encourage their nationals to believe that this Nation is going to adopt a permanent policy of denying our own producers our markets merely to cultivate their friendship. They must know that such a policy cannot continue long in a democracy that has a free ballot.

The world needs every surplus raw material produced in Latin America, and it needs it badly. It is the duty of the United States, therefore, as a good neighbor to Latin America, to help find a free market for whatever she has to sell in the countries that require her goods. Any short-sighted policy of taking our own markets away from our stockgrowers and miners and giving them to foreign nations is neither sound nor natural, and public opinion will sooner or later compel it to be discontinued. Such a program is not a solution, for it is like building a house upon the sand.

On behalf of the tungsten producers of my State, I desire to enter a vigorous protest against any and all proposed reductions in tariffs on importations of tungsten in any form from Argentina or any other foreign country. The maintenance of the present duty and the present market for tungsten is essential to assure the continuation of the steadily increasing production of this strategically vital mineral.

Tungsten was first discovered in the United States in the year 1900 in Boulder County, Colo. During the 14 years prior to 1914 this district produced approximately 60 percent of the total tungsten mined in the United States. Since that date the production records have shown radical curve changes, due largely to lowering of prices and market conditions. A recent survey of Boulder County tungsten production shows that a radical decrease in production has taken place whenever the market price has declined below a certain level.

The records of the United States Bureau of Mines show that with the increased demand for tungsten there has been a comparative increase in production in all of the tungsten-producing States, which include Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Washington. It is estimated that 5,062,199 pounds of tungsten were produced in the United States in 1940, and that a much larger production will take place in 1941. Domestic tungsten production is being prosecuted with more vigor than at any time since the last war. New discoveries are constantly being made by small producers and old mines are being reopened at considerable expense. Several new large properties are going into production, and if necessary financial assistance can be made available, others will follow. Some of the larger mining companies of the country are making large capital investments in tungsten properties and the national demand for tungsten, great as it is, can be met by domestic producers. The United States Bureau of Mines recently stated to the Senate Committee studying the situation with respect to the supplies of strategic minerals that the United States can be made self-sufficient insofar as tungsten is concerned.

To remove the present duty on tungsten importation would be in reality to place an embargo upon domestic producers. A tariff is essential to domestic production because the tariff directly affects the domestic price and the price has a direct bearing upon domestic tungsten production. The number of employed miners in tungsten, while comparatively small, is nevertheless important to the welfare of the immediate districts in which these men are employed. There exists a differential between the cost of producing tungsten in this country and outside the limits of this country which can only be offset by a tariff. Wage standards are admittedly much lower in South American countries, to say nothing of China and other producing countries. Costs of materials have increased rapidly for mining companies in the United States during the last year. The Congress has seen fit to impose costs, such as the social security costs, on the mining industry in this country which, together with workmen's compensation costs, amount to from $1.30 to $2.10 for each $10 pay roll. These costs do not prevail outside of Uncle Sam's borders. In addition to this, local State and Federal taxes have been imposed on domestic producers to such an extent that taxes are in reality a greater burden on local producers than the tariff could possibly be on foreign producers.

To relieve the tungsten industry of these heavy burdens is virtually an impossibility; at least it is not now anticipated. The reluctance of the Federal Government to lend money to domestic producers and the restrictions of the Federal Securities Act have prevented many domestic producers from securing funds to increase plant operations. We see large sums of money loaned to producers abroad and feel that the least the domestic producers can ask is tariff protection. Seagoing transportation facilities are not available to Uncle Sam right now and it is a sound policy to encourage domestic producers instead of depending upon foreign sources in this shipping-bottom crisis.

The increased demand for tungsten can be met by domestic producers with the assistance of contracts already negotiated with foreign producers, which prevail under the present tariff. The lowering of the tariff will destroy important domestic production and not insure consumers of tungsten of a constant supply, regardless of the assertions made by those who would decrease the present tungsten tariff.

Increasing costs of production which must be met by the tungsten industry require a continuation of the present tariff to prevent the elimination of the domestic producer, with resulting loss of capital outlay, unemployment, and destruction of local markets which are vitally needed if the West is to meet the national-defense emergency and cooperate with the National Defense Commission in the manufacture of defense materials.

The tariff on tungsten added to the cost of production in China and other low-wage and labor-exploited countries has kept us in the tungsten business during peacetime to the extent of approximately 50 percent of our domestic needs. As a consequence we had trained personnel and many new deposits in sight ready to produce. The tariff provided an incentive of making it profitable to discover new deposits which are now going into production at a rate that, in the opinion of experts, will make us self-sufficient in a very short time. That fact alone justifies its imposition.

It should be pointed out that a reduction of tariff on materials used in our defense effort in the present emergency, disastrous as it is to domestic tungsten producers, neither adds nor subtracts from the cost of our defense to the United States. Whatever tariff duties are collected offset the higher price of the material, thus it becomes merely a bookkeeping transaction with an extra revenue and an extra expenditure canceling each other. However, I am thinking of the day when the defense program is ended and the reciprocal trade agreements entered into in the emergency for long periods of time may still have years to run. That is the day when importations from South America and the favored nations where labor is exploited, such as China, will close down every tungsten mine in the United States. It is, of course, understood that whatever reductions are made in this agreement to Argentina and Uruguay will extend to China and most of the tungsten exporting countries of the world.

There is no substitute for tungsten as an alloy in armor-piercing bullet cores, and it is an important element in giving alloy steels high tension characteristics. It is a short-sighted policy to deliberately make ourselves dependent upon foreign sources for this indispensable military necessity.

I have read the briefs submitted to this committee by F. E. Mollin, secretary of the American Livestock Association of Denver, Colo., and by F. R. Marshall, secretary of the National Woolgrowers Association, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

I am in complete accord with these two statements of fact and argument, and most earnestly urge this committee to give full weight to the sound logic of their appeal against lowering the tariffs on the products of the American producers of livestock. We owe the American producers of livestock a deep debt of gratitude that can be paid in part at least by protecting them against unfair competition from abroad and, taking a realistic and long-distance survey of the situation, it is decidedly in our interest to do so.

War Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

INTERVIEW WITH HON. HAROLD H. BURTON, OF OHIO

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interview over the radio with regard to war conditions given by myself on June 28.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT THE WAR?

(Interview with Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio, to be broadcast on or after June 28, 1941, over WTAM and other Ohio stations)

Question. Senator BURTON, what do most people ask you about when they meet you away from Washington?

Answer. The war. Are we going in, and if so, when?

Question. What is your answer to that?

Answer. As to whether or not we shall get into the fighting, no one knows the answer. A month ago I said that I guessed there was more than an even chance, perhaps a 60-percent chance, that we would be able to stay out of it. That estimate still holds good. Two weeks ago it did drop to about 58 percent, but since the Nazis declared war on Russia it is back to 60 percent. I believe that the President also feels that there still is a substantial chance that we shall be able to stay out it, although apparently neither Secretary of the Navy Knox nor Secretary of War Stimson thinks so. Personally, I see no adequate basis for our going in now, and if we ever do go in, it should be only because we are forced in by attack or unequivocal threat of attack. It is, therefore, useless to guess when that issue will arise, because we have no way of estimating the date of a hostile attack or threat of attack upon us. The sinking of the *Robin Moor* and the turn-

ing of its passengers and crew adrift 700 miles from shore showed such a ruthless disregard of the lives of our citizens and of treaties with us, as to indicate that it might be followed by a further and greater attack upon us by the Nazis at any convenient early date. On the other hand, the declaration of war by the Nazis on Russia on June 22 must mean that the Nazis will not attack others until after that campaign is over.

Question. What effect will the Nazi-Russian war have on the general situation?

Answer. There are at least four clear effects. First. The war between the Nazis and Russia necessarily will cause substantial losses of men, equipment, and supplies to both sides. Much of this loss will be irreplaceable—except as the victors replace their losses by taking still more from the losers. Each bit of damage done to each other by these dictators means an advantage to the free nations of the world. Second. If Russia beats off this attack, it is hardly conceivable that Russia will undertake any aggressive campaign against anyone at this time. In such an event the Nazis will be so severely handicapped by loss of prestige, men, equipment, and material, and by consumption of their limited supplies of oil and grain that this defeat may be fatal to their plans for further conquests. Third. If the Nazis win, then at least the menace of communism will have been substantially checked. However, the immediate menace of a renewed Nazi drive for world domination, strengthened by great supplies of Russian oil and grain, would endanger the rest of the world more seriously than ever, unless in the meantime Britain may have done more damage to the Nazis than they can offset by their new supplies. This brings us to the fourth and most critical effect of all, namely, the effect on the British campaign. Britain now has the greatest opportunity that has been or that probably will be offered to it in this war. It is the opportunity to attack the Nazis from the rear with Britain's full strength at a time when the Nazis' strongest forces must be concentrated on the Russian front. This may be the turning point in the whole war. This may mean the destruction of the Nazi dream of world domination. If Britain, with the aid of all possible material and equipment from the United States, can now develop such a complete and violent attack by air, and in some places also by land and by sea, as to destroy vital and irreplaceable equipment and means of production, to say nothing of manpower, it will mean much. Not only may the spirit of Germany at home be weakened but the Nazi military resources may be so handicapped that even with their victorious armies returning from Russia, and even with the addition of the great resources of Russia, they will be unable for a long time to carry out their program of an attack on Britain and of world domination.

Question. What effect does this have on the policies of the United States?

Answer. It is all in our favor. Our greatest need has been and is the need for time within which to develop our production of material and equipment and the organization of our full-scale defense program. We need every moment of this time, and it is quite likely that there will be none too much of it. Our defense program is not well organized, it is not keeping up to its expected schedule, and for that very reason this added time is a vitally important gain for us in our program. America is determined to defend herself, and the philosophy of the defense program upon which America is agreed consists of creating such a modern, adequate, and great defense force that it will be obviously superior to its opposition. We are now offered the chance to make up for much of the time we have lost. We should at once reorganize and drive our defense program with the same efficiency and determination as if we actually were at war. Upon this organization and upon our production of defense equipment and materials depends our chance to win the war without fighting it, or, if forced to fight, to win it most surely and quickly. Our course should be clear. Adequate preparedness provides our best chance to forestall and prevent any attempt to attack our territory, our people, or our rights, including, of course, our Monroe Doctrine and Pan American agreements.

Question. You have referred to the Monroe Doctrine and Pan American agreements. Do you regard these as liabilities or assets?

Answer. I regard them as important net assets, although they carry with them some serious liabilities and responsibilities, as do most things that are of value. The Monroe Doctrine is not only a traditional doctrine to keep our Western Hemisphere safe from European aggression; it is also a modern military asset, because the United States is much more safe with North, Central, and South America in friendly hands than if any of the Western Hemisphere were held as hostile bases. With the increasing speed of travel by air, as well as by land and sea, the military value of a mutual interest in each other's safety has become increasingly clear to each of the 21 republics that make up the Pan American Union, to say nothing of the Dominion of Canada.

Question. Do you think there is any likelihood of an attack by the Axis Powers on any of these nations?

Answer. The Axis program probably would not take such a simple form. For example, I suggest the following considerations as one guide to practical thinking. Inasmuch as most Central and South American nations are exporting nations, their futures depend in a great degree upon the friendly control of the seas, and particularly of the Atlantic Ocean. Today the control of the seas, and especially the Atlantic Ocean, is primarily in Great Britain, together with the United States and the governments of all of the 20 republics south of us are friendly to us and are working with us. It must be recognized, however, that in many of the nations of this hemisphere there is a strong opposition party which is more in sympathy with the Nazis, or at least with the "new order" in Europe, than with the United States. We may well give serious consideration, therefore, to the practical probability that, in the event that the control of the seas should seem likely to pass to the Axis Powers, the opposition parties in 8 or even 10 of these nations would be seriously tempted to seize control of their respective governments. If successful, this would bring Nazi domination well within our hemisphere. This would lead easily to establishing Nazi bases available to the Nazi-controlled air lines in South America. Such considerations as these emphasize the need of an active defense and lend-lease program on our part, to retain the control of the seas and of such lands that our security is reasonably assured.

Question. Should we aid Russia?

Answer. That question is up to the minute and looks into the future. It should not be answered casually. First of all, aid apparently has not been requested of us by Russia, so that the question may not arise in fact. Second, it is obvious that our all-out aid to Britain now should be increased with the greatest vigor and this aid, of course, will be of indirect benefit to Russia and through Britain some of our defense materials may themselves reach Russia. To this, under the present circumstances, there can be no objection, and if our procedure could be limited to this program the result would be most satisfactory to us and I hope that we may be able to follow that policy. This would carry out our purposes of defense without further confusion of our international relations. On the other hand, these are not times in which to quibble and we cannot hesitate to meet issues on their merits whenever it becomes necessary to do so.

Our guiding principle must be the interest and the defense of our own Nation. The authority of the lend-lease law is not authority to aid Britain or Russia or anyone else, as such. It is authority to supply defense articles only to the Government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States and this must be his guide and ours. If, therefore, it becomes apparent to the President that it is vital to our defense that the Nazis be prevented from taking by force from Russia the oil, grain, and other raw materials that the Nazis seek, to help the Nazis in their fight for world domination, we obviously cannot afford to destroy the effect of our own defense program or the effect of the materials already sent by us to Britain, by failing to give the aid needed to protect these materials from seizure by the Nazis. We certainly cannot afford to do this merely because these materials happen to be now under the control of Russia. If the President finds that as a step vital to our defense our aid is needed to defend these resources from being used against us, he should not hesitate under existing law, to send aid for such defense, whether or not it also be an aid to Russia, with whose governmental policies we are and shall continue to be in complete disagreement.

Question. What about the public discussions and meetings being held in opposition to war throughout this country?

Answer. Fair, public, and private discussions of the subject are a good thing. It is quite appropriate that the freedom of speech which we are defending should be practiced as well as preached. It is, however, an abuse, rather than a sound use, of freedom of speech to use it in calling people names or in inciting people to suspect that every opponent of theirs must have ulterior motives. The badge of the best Americanism and of the proper use of our freedom of assembly, press, and speech, is the temperance, tolerance, clearness, coolness, and the constructive character of the statements made and of the views urged. Speech is kept free, not in the hope that through it our citizens shall become abusive and intolerant, but in the hope that through it, our citizens may share their best ideas with one another and by the exchange of these thoughts guide our Nation along a sound and sensible path in its own best interest. To abuse this freedom of discussion by making unjustified charges of disloyal and selfish motives on the part of all who disagree with the speaker is to demonstrate a failure to appreciate the purpose of the freedom we have. This freedom exists so that we may reason with one another and thereby help our Nation. If we are to expect others to adopt our precious "freedom," our first duty is to demonstrate their use and their value.

Tribute to Hon. Tom Connally, of Texas, by Peter Edson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE MOBILE (ALA.) REGISTER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have here an article written by Mr. Peter Edson which appeared in the Mobile Register, a newspaper of Mobile, Ala., on the great ability and outstanding personality of

the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register of June 25, 1941]

IN WASHINGTON

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—They call TOM CONNALLY, of Marlin, Tex., the last of the long-haired Senators. All the others let the barbers cut around their ears and run the clippers up their necks, or are so baldish they don't even make it interesting for a tonsorial artist who really loves his work.

TOM doesn't reveal his age in the Congressional Directory, but he was a soldier in the Spanish-American War, and from other sources comes the word that he will soon be 65. And if you, gentle male reader of 50 or over, could grow hair like the senior Senator from Texas, you'd make the barbers be discreet, too. Get even a distant look at big TOM on the Capitol Grounds under his broad-brimmed, black 3-gallon hat and you know that there, by golly, goes a statesman, even if he doesn't wear a frock coat.

Maybe, like Samson, his strength is in that hair. At any rate, he has the strength of a longhorn steer and its courage, too, and when he starts pawin' the ground, a stampede can start any time, and it's just as well to get for the top rails of the corral fence.

NO YAWNS FOR TOM

The Senate of the United States can be the dullest of deliberate assemblies when some of the demagogs start droning, but when the Senator from Texas takes the floor it can be livelier than a barn dance. Likewise, a Senate committee can bore you to insensibility, but when the gentleman from Texas starts asking questions of a witness who doesn't want to be too specific or doesn't know exactly what he's talking about, you wake up quick.

Talkin' Texas, droppin' g's all over the carpet, and flattenin' his a's all over the table, he is again the prosecutin' attorney from Falls County with a barbed-wire flail at the tip of his tongue. He can make a bureaucrat squirm through his testimony like a coyote in the sagebrush, its tail between its legs, headin' for the hills.

Old TOM—you call him "old" affectionately, for he is a lovable cuss with a magnificent sense of sarcastic humor—has been in unusually fine form this last week or so backing his amendment to the selective-service law to permit the President to take over strike-bound plants, and ripping into the Aluminum Co. of America as its officials came before the Truman committee investigating national defense, lashing at everything which savored of bunk or didn't make sense to his Texas mind.

"The Senator from Ohio is a statesman," CONNALLY cracked at TAFT in debate. "He does not think this bill is any good, but he is for it."

A moment later, TAFT tried to make the point that CONNALLY's amendment would not prevent men from striking against the United States Government, that a strike simply meant the men ceased to work.

"Oh, they can quit if they want to," agreed CONNALLY, "and they can go plumb to Ohio."

When Senator MALONEY offered an amendment, CONNALLY accepted it, but when MALONEY came back with another CONNALLY ducked it with a gagline: "I have accepted one amendment from the Senator from Connecticut," he said, "and the quota today is only one amendment per Senator."

IRKED BY DELAYS

The debate was on for 3 days, and CONNALLY, fighting every minute, kept peppering his argument with a salty humor that kept his colleagues and the gallery grinning.

"I am not in favor of putting into the bill a great number of 'ifs,' 'ands,' 'buts,' and 'wait-a-minute' clauses," he stormed. "I want the Government to step in whenever necessary without having to wait around until three or four walking delegates decide when and if the Government may act."

CONNALLY is, as mentioned, fearless. And in threatening to take over the Aluminum Co. of America "if it did not behave" he was merely breathing more of the fire that has marked his 24 years in Washington. That long service, however, has never made him less a Texan than he ever was. He is king of the big Texas delegation in Congress, of course. SAM RAYBURN may be Speaker of the House, but TOM is Senator. Even if Gov. "Biscuits" O'Daniel should be elected to the Senate, he will have a tough time getting ahead of TOM.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY FELIX MORLEY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Felix Morley, published in yesterday's Washington Star, on the St. Lawrence seaway proposal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of June 29, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROPOSAL AIDED BY GROWING REGIONALISM—TREND TO ECONOMIC UNITY, LAYING GROUNDWORK FOR COOPERATION, SEEN ALSO IN TURKISH AGREEMENT WITH GERMANY

(By Felix Morley)

Between the St. Lawrence seaway project and the treaty "of friendship and mutual confidence" recently concluded by Germany and Turkey there would at first glance seem to be not the faintest connection.

Yet a certain relationship exists. It might perhaps be guessed from present indications that the treaty signed at Ankara June 18 will soon be followed by success for President Roosevelt in getting the waterway and power project through Congress.

Of course, the connection is very indirect, or it would be more widely recognized than is the case. There is no parallelism, or even similarity of any kind, between the two undertakings. Nor is there any historical relationship.

As a matter of fact, agitation for the present St. Lawrence project dates from the period immediately after the last war, a time when the last treaty between Germany and Turkey had just been forcibly liquidated, and when few people anywhere anticipated its restoration.

Nonetheless it would be a mistake, in this period of rapid fundamental change, to assume that events which are wholly separated in time and space are for that reason unrelated. And failure to recognize these fundamental relationships, when they exist, can only result in giving us a distorted and misleading conception of the present world upheaval.

"NEW ORDER" TO STAY, TURKS BELIEVE

The case which has been taken for illustration may be clarified, first, by considering the underlying significance of the German-Turkish treaty. Then one should ask why the St. Lawrence seaway project is now for the first time likely to triumph over the opposition which has heretofore stalled it. Finally there should be examination of the invisible unity between the two developments which is assumed.

The underlying significance of the treaty recently signed at Ankara is suggested by the evident conclusion of the Turkish Government that in one form or another the "new order" in Europe has come to stay. Because of that conclusion the Turkish leaders, heretofore regarded as anti-Axis and pro-Russian, have now bound themselves to "take no measure that is aimed directly or indirectly against" Germany.

It is wholly appropriate to argue that the Turks must have been bulldozed into signing this treaty; that it does not represent the wishes of the Turkish people; that it is a dreadful mistake which Turkey will eventually regret. All that may be true. But even in total such considerations cannot conceal the fact that the treaty has been signed.

One reason for the signing is doubtless the military weakness of Great Britain in the Near East. The evacuation of Greece and Crete has been followed by repulse of the mechanized thrust against Libya and by very slow progress against a few allegedly demoralized French regiments in Syria. And there has been nothing in the first phase of German military operations against Russia to indicate that the Turks guessed badly in signing the treaty of Ankara.

IN GERMAN ECONOMIC ORBIT

A more important influence, however, would seem to be the fact that Turkey has in late years been drawn so closely into the German economic orbit. It has not escaped notice that a pledge of even more far-reaching commercial exchange has accompanied the political agreement between the two countries.

In the last year before the war, half of Turkey's imports were drawn from Germany and one-third of her exports were going to that country. Under present conditions virtually all of the foreign trade of Turkey is Axis controlled. As often happens an act of political faith has followed an established economic condition.

We turn to the wholly different subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project, now very much to the fore although defeated 5 years ago as a treaty by the United States Senate.

The last 5 years, however, have seen a great strengthening of the scene of mutual interest between Canada and the United States.

This feeling of fundamental unity is really the keynote at the Fourth Biennial Conference on Canadian-American Affairs which I have been attending at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.

Whereas the project used to be considered separately from particularistic American and Canadian angles, with argument as to which

would benefit the more if it were carried through, the undertaking is now discussed much more as a mutual enterprise. Additional advantages are seen from both sides of the border precisely because that border is no longer the sharp line of demarcation which it used to be.

Certain of the American representatives at the Kingston conference, such as Adolf Berle, who came there after making a progress report in Ottawa, have been serving as official spokesmen for President Roosevelt on the St. Lawrence waterway issue. So it is not surprising that the project was very much to the fore at the sessions last week.

RELATIONS INTERWOVEN

A new support, however, has arisen from the long-range defense aspects of the undertaking. Even if completion would take several years, it is argued, that is not a valid objection. Since Canada and the United States are now permanent allies, both should look beyond immediate defense requirements.

It is even suggested that there is something captious in criticism of the procedure whereby the administration now seeks to put the project through Congress by a simple majority vote of both Houses, detouring the two-thirds Senate vote required for treaty ratification.

The commercial and political relations of Canada and the United States are now so interwoven, it is asserted, that there is a certain impropriety in expecting a formal treaty basis for a project deemed mutually desirable for both countries.

This article does not propose to discuss the pros and cons of the St. Lawrence waterway, nor to examine in any detail the equally controversial issue of the German-Turkish treaty. At the start a certain connection between the two was asserted. The precise nature of this connection remains to be stated.

In both cases, wholly remote and dissimilar as they may seem, a developing regional economic unity has been laying the groundwork for a measure of political consolidation.

DEVELOPING REGIONALISM

A developing European regionalism, backed by forces more powerful than those of Hitler's legions, is the fundamental explanation for a Turkish political shift which was surprising to many. A developing North American regionalism now makes probable the adoption of a mutual defense and power project which until recently was unable to make headway against very valid specific criticisms.

It is absurd to say that only President Roosevelt and a small group of new dealers really want the St. Lawrence waterway project. Economical or not, the trend of the times is working for this development. President Roosevelt did not create this trend, though he has had the intuition to recognize it and the foresight to encourage it.

Similarly, one is forced to conclude, the trend of the times is working for European unity. That it should be forcibly imposed by methods of horror, cruelty, and brutal domination is appalling. But those elements might not be so apparent today if past efforts to unify Europe had not so often been blocked by chicanery and force exercised on the basis of purely national advantage.

As one prominent Canadian put it in informal conversation at the Kingston conference: "After the overthrow of Hitler we shall have to be intelligent enough to recognize that some of his work was along the same permanent line of unification as was urged in our discussions here."

Russo-German War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimcus consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, who in my judgment is one of the best informed writers in the United States on American and foreign military affairs. This article has reference to the danger to the United States in the event Soviet Russia is crushed.

In the course of a few days I expect to say something about the air line from Denver north to Great Falls, Mont., thence to Lethbridge, and going from there up to Alaska and connecting with our important defense air ports in that Territory. The particular merits of this line are that it runs east of the Rocky Mountains, does not cross any high ranges, and is adjacent to many mountain passes over which, in emergency, planes can easily travel to the Pacific coast. It is called "the sunshine line" because it is free of fogs and other conditions interfering with air flight. It is a very important adjunct to the Government air-service defense program and should have serious consideration by that service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 29, 1941]

THREAT TO UNITED STATES SEEN IF SOVIET IS CRUSHED—HOSTILE PLANES COULD FLY TO AMERICAN CONTINENT IN 2 HOURS

(By Constantine Brown)

For the first time since the outbreak of the war Washington leaders are gravely concerned over the danger that threatens if the Soviets are crushed—hostile aircraft by the thousand within 2 hours' flight from the North American Continent. For this reason the eyes of American observers are riveted on Japan's attitude in this new conflict and all her moves and actions are followed with eagerness.

In official quarters, which have assumed for the time being a discreet silence, it is believed that if the German armies are as quickly victorious in Russia as they have been elsewhere, Japan will take advantage of the situation and invade Siberia, which will fall into her lap once the central authority in Moscow has been crushed.

Should this happen, Axis airplanes will find adequate airfields and other flying facilities in the Maritime Provinces and the prospect of an invasion of the North American Continent will become dangerously close. The problem of this country will then be the defense of the Southern Hemisphere, help to Britain on a larger scale than at present and the defense, with whatever contribution Canada may be able to make of the west coast from Alaska to California. And this is not a particularly cheering prospect.

Although at the time of this writing Japan has maintained an unexpected reserve, in well-informed quarters it is believed that this reserve will last only until the results of the German blitz are more tangible. If the Soviet forces crumble and the central authority in Moscow is compelled to flee before a victorious enemy, Japan is expected to make good her decade-long claims on the maritime provinces and possibly the rest of Siberia as far as the Baikal Lake.

The force defending that part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, estimated at the time at 100,000 men, with about 800 to 1,000 planes, will not be able to stem the Japanese advance. It is even conceivable that the military leaders in Siberia might be willing to strike a bargain with the Tokyo Government. The Japanese soldiers have never ceased to advocate Japan's expansion toward the north and the move toward Singapore and the Dutch East Indies has been only the sequel of the German-Soviet agreement of 1939. The Japanese could not go against Russia and remain the allies of the Reich.

But in most Japanese military and naval quarters the following reasoning was going on: If Japan directs her military efforts northward and takes Siberia, she accomplishes two definite things: She rounds out her empire on the mainland in the north and also deprives Chang Kai-shek of his most efficient supporter. If the war were to turn against the Axis ultimately, the Allies would not try to force Japan out of Siberia at the cost of another war. They would undoubtedly use the most drastic means to remove Japan from the southern Pacific and the Indian Ocean, once their hands were free again after the defeat of the Axis.

On the other hand, if the western nations were defeated, there would be ample time to conquer their possessions in the south. Hence the Japanese reluctance to go overtly toward the Netherland Indies in Singapore. They have taken Indo-China because it entailed no fighting and it was believed that neither London nor Washington cared particularly what happened to that French colony. But it is the opinion here that the Japanese have had a good inkling of what would happen between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Axis for the last 6 weeks. This explains fully their "patience" in regard to the administration of Batavia, which turned down Japanese "economic cooperation" plans.

GERMANY EXPECTS REWARD

In military quarters it is believed that the reward Germany expects from Japan for assisting her in conquering Siberia will be cooperation of all the elements of the Axis to down Great Britain. And Britain extends practically all over the world. Canada is a part of the Empire. Hence a military action of the Axis against the North American member of the Empire would be a logical thing.

The Russians, who have looked on aviation as a main weapon in the war since 1924, have done splendid work in Siberia. Their air facilities there could easily accommodate an air armada of several thousand planes, according to reliable reports. The harbors at Vladivostock and Alexandrovak are excellent naval bases which could be used by the Axis submarines and the Japanese Navy.

If the Japanese find that the conquest of Siberia would not entail too heavy losses, the probabilities are that the order to move north would be given to the armies which are stationed in Siberia and in Manchukuo.

SIGNIFICANCE OF STRUGGLE

Once Siberia is in Japanese hands, the threat to the North American Continent

becomes real and the danger of an invasion cannot and must not be overlooked. This is the significance, as far as Washington is concerned, of the struggle between Germany and Russia. This is also the reason why a number of conservative leaders of the administration who have never looked with favor on the Soviets and have always suspected the Kremlin's trickery are today wondering what assistance could be given to the Russians to prevent their early collapse.

In military quarters the chances of the Soviet Army's resisting the Germans better than the Poles, for instance, are considered rather small. Russia has a tremendous manpower; Russia has a large mechanized force. But it has neither the necessary brains in high places to lead the army nor the facilities to replace without delay the losses of tanks and airplanes it must sustain in a war against the Reich and its allies. The several 5-year plans of the Soviet Government have improvised an industry which is interesting, considering that it was completely nonexistent in the past, but this improvised industry cannot stand the strain of a mechanical war against a country which has all the industrial resources of Europe at its disposal.

There are many wishful thinkers who are comparing Hitler's campaign with that which sounded the death knell of Napoleon. It is true that Russia is the same vastness that it was in 1812, but the means of Hitler are different. Napoleon's men moved on horseback and on foot. His supplies came in horse- or ox-drawn carts. Hitler's 1,200,000 men move in trucks, tanks, and airplanes. The supplies for the fighting infantry and the cavalry, of which he has thrown no less than 160,000 into the battle against the Soviets, come by fast trucks and, whenever needed, by huge supply planes.

NAZI "SPECIALISTS" IN RUSSIA

Furthermore, the Germans have been Russia's ally since September 1939. While the number of specialists sent to assist the "ally" from Berlin was not as large as Berlin wanted, at least 10,000 German "specialists" have been active in various capacities. Some of these men have been in close touch with officers of the high command and divisional and army corps commanders. How much termiting they have been able to do will be seen in the next few weeks.

It is believed here that a number of Russia's military leaders have been successfully "tempted." Without doubt these are going to be the future Quislings of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Dictator Stalin is feared but not loved. The day the purging power is out of his hands there is no question that a number of high-ranking officers will be willing to consider the setting-up of a new regime without the present dictator.

He is known only by name and photograph to the army. Unlike his Italian and German colleagues, he is not a soldier and has never kept in touch with the armed forces.

All these conditions point to defeat of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

If Washington is concerned over this probable defeat it is not because it holds a brief for the Caucasian ruler of Russia, or for his political philosophy. There is not much to choose between Josef Stalin and Adolf Hitler. They have double-crossed each other and have plunged the world into its present chaotic condition.

Nobody here forgets how Stalin double-crossed the French and the British by inviting their military experts to Moscow in August 1939, when he had already secretly signed a treaty with the Reich. Nobody has forgotten the sympathy expressed by the Soviet Government to Yugoslavia and the promise of assistance, while 2 days after that kingdom's defeat Stalin kicked its representatives out of Moscow. Many quarters feel that what he is reaping now has been sown by him and his henchmen over a period of years.

Of course, Hitler's unwarranted attack on a nation with which he had signed a solemn treaty of nonaggression and which he has repeatedly described in his speeches as "our friend and good neighbor" does not make the situation more palatable. It makes it clear to everybody that Hitler's repeated declaration that it is insane to imagine an attack of the Axis against the Western Hemisphere has no more value than his recent declaration of love for Russia.

While a few months ago the physical difficulties of such an attack led many to give little credence to the fear expressed by our naval and military authorities, the situation is likely to change completely now. The day the Japanese are installed in Siberia the possible danger of an invasion becomes an imminent danger—within 24 hours.

Washington feels powerless to help the Soviets unless Russia is able to help herself by resisting Germany's blitz. Should Hitler's schedule of a 4 to 6 weeks' campaign become upset, war matériel might be sent over to the Russians by way of Siberia if the necessary tonnage could be spared. But if Hitler's blitz goes according to schedule no "lease-lend" for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics can be possible.

Our New Supreme Court—Mr. Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in a world already sufficiently full of discord, Mr. Harold Ickes stands in a class by himself. For sheer, unadulterated ability to provoke wrath, he is unequalled in an administration which has specialized in this gentle quality. How to make enemies and alienate people is a truly difficult art; but he has mastered it.

The latest in his series of forays into the realm of vituperation, denunciation, and invective is an attack upon that big bogeyman of all public officials, the octupus known as monopoly. This time it is the Aluminum Co. of America. Speaking before the Truman committee of the United States Senate, which is investigating the reasons for our highly delayed defense program, Secretary Ickes snapped out a juicy charge. He turned to ALCOA and told the Senators that if we were to become involved in a losing war it might well be that the activities of the Aluminum Co. of America would be responsible for so drastic a result.

It is an appalling charge to make. But it became still more appalling on the day immediately following Mr. Ickes' testimony when officials of this "vicious" company appeared to answer the accusation. They pointed out that their organization had just completed the expenditure of $200,000,000 for expansion purposes, that they had doubled their production since 1938 and were shooting at a goal which would triple their output in 1941. To clinch their defense, they informed the committee that the much-needed expansion of aluminum production was being held up by the failure of the Office of Production Management to approve plans for building a new plant at Fontana, N. C.

The company's spokesmen dealt in facts and figures, no less than countercharges. According to construction estimates, it takes some 80,000 pounds of aluminum to build one of the new bombers for which Mr. Ickes was pleading. To build 6,000 such planes would be a Herculean task for 1942. But even this quota would use only 480,000,000 pounds of aluminum, and by July of 1942, Aluminum Co. of America and other aluminum producers on our continent will have turned out 1,200,000,000 pounds at least.

These are the facts. Mr. Ickes apparently does not care too much about them. For 2 years an antitrust action has been proceeding against the Aluminum Co. of America. The courts have not yet handed down their verdict, but our Secretary of the Interior has. He has indicted and convicted them without benefit of trial.

What shall we say as to the wisdom of this course? Is this the time to condemn our largest producers as monopolies? Is this the proper hour to replace calm consideration of the issues by a resort to name calling? Whatever may be the merits of the argument, one indisputable fact remains unchallenged. We are seeking to produce greater quantities of materials than our country has ever turned out in its history. Is it conducive to this course to brand our large manufacturers as criminals? Or would it be more productive of harmonious relations between Government and industry if we agreed to put aside the Federal daggers pointed at the throat of management in favor of a friendly handshake?

The answer is obvious enough. It must be a source of regret that Mr. Ickes and some of his followers cannot read it.

Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, this week the Ways and Means Committee will consider excise taxes in the new tax bill. It has been suggested that there should be an increase of 2½ cents per gallon in the tax on gasoline. Let us examine this suggestion more carefully.

Wisconsin, extending more than 400 miles from the Illinois border near Chicago on the south to the city of Superior, adjoining Duluth, Minn., on the north, is one of our greatest States. Because of the extreme distance from north to south, we are able to grow almost every

kind of produce from fruit and tobacco to hard wheat. We grow oats, barley, flax and rye, sugar beets, potatoes, and, of course, all the garden vegetables. We are the Nation's biggest hemp producer and also one of the highest in the production of cheese, butter, milk, and milk products.

The production of our soil and the production of our factories depends upon gasoline to a great extent. We use gasoline engines for churning, for wood cutting, and for use around the farm. We use tractors in plowing and harrowing, in sowing and reaping, and to operate grain separators. We use trucks to carry our livestock and our crops to market. At one time we led the entire country in the production of lumber, and even today the lumber industry in the Great Lakes region is still an important industry. Gasoline-powered equipment is an important factor in the operation of sawmills, and, of course, is indispensable to the trucks which are so extensively used in conveying the lumber from mill to market. Gasoline-powered boats are essential for fishing on the Great Lakes.

To the factory gasoline-driven power turns many a cog and wheel, to the wholesaler and the retailer gasoline is essential for the life of his trade. Rapid delivery is indispensable today.

The automobile and the truck, driven by gasoline, are important to the Wisconsin farmers, the manufacturers, the merchants, the laboring classes; in short, to everyone, old and young, men and women alike. Every type of business depends on gasoline.

During 1939, for example, motortrucks were used to haul 53 percent of the livestock, 40 percent of the fruit and vegetables, 65 percent of the poultry, 39 percent of the eggs, and 27 percent of all the butter received in all the major markets throughout the country. The probability that these products thereby were hauled more cheaply and more quickly than they might have been by any other transport medium is overwhelming. That is important to every Wisconsin producer. When animal power was displaced in field work on the farm by the tractor it was also displaced by the automobile and the truck as the fundamental means of farm transportation. The resulting improvement in farm transportation is significant because the fact that transportation is one of the most important essentials of farm operation and farm life cannot be overemphasized.

I hope I have been able to make clear to you in a few words the truly essential importance of the gasoline engine, which really is the basis of agricultural mechanization, to the farmer and to his business. And when I say "farmer," I speak not only of the farmer whose farm covers half a county but also of the farmer whose livelihood depends on no more than 10 or 20 acres. For the small farmer must also produce at low cost if he is to survive, so that mechanization is as necessary for him as it is for the big farmer.

I have tried to make clear to you the importance of the gasoline engine to the farmer so that you would appreciate the importance of the gasoline used to operate these engines. Without low-cost gasoline the gasoline engine would be practically useless. Gasoline is as fundamental to the farmer's production as is his milking pail, and it is as fundamental to his modern means of transportation as is the wheel. Probably the principal factor responsible for the widespread use on the farms of mechanisms driven by gasoline engines is the low cost at which gasoline has been available.

I understand that gasoline prices today are less than half of what they were in 1920, exclusive of gasoline taxes. Until a few years back, of course, gasoline taxes were almost exclusively State taxes, and under most State gasoline tax laws the gasoline used on farms was not subject to taxation. Now the Federal Government has invaded the gasoline-tax field, and, because the Federal gasoline tax is not a road tax, no refunds or exemptions are provided for gasoline used on farms and for other nonhighway purposes.

It is for this reason that the Federal gasoline tax is particularly objectionable to Wisconsin farmers. In the opinion of the farmer, the taxation of gasoline consumption is unfair and discriminatory. The farmer believes that if the Federal Government plans to tax his consumption of gasoline, it might as well tax his hay fork or his potato hook. For the taxation of gasoline consumed by the farmer is the same as taxing his tools of production and transportation.

Someone already has pointed out that the cost of gasoline is an important item in the cost of running a farm, probably more important than it is to nearly any other businessman. Probably the only other businessman who uses gasoline quite as extensively is the commercial trucker. An artificial increase in the cost of gasoline to the farmer by the imposition of an additional 1 cent a gallon Federal gasoline tax would mean an increase of about 10 percent in the cost of gasoline. This is a most substantial increase in the cost of an important item in the farmer's cost of doing business. And when you realize that our farmer does not receive parity in his prices, you must conclude that a tax on his tools is most unfair.

The farmers of this country use about one quarter of all the gasoline consumed each year. They use this gasoline in the process of trying to squeeze a meager living out of the soil. Their success depends to a great extent on their ability to grow their crops and to transport them to market as cheaply as possible. The cost of gasoline is one of the most important factors in determining these costs. Excessive taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government thereby hurts the farmer's chances of getting a reasonable return for his labor by increasing one of his most important costs.

The people of Wisconsin adopted the gasoline tax in 1925 because they saw that it was an equitable way of taxing themselves for the construction of highways. They still pay this tax willingly because of the direct benefits they derive from it. They do not, however, embrace the Federal gasoline tax with the same willingness because it is not a tax for roads, it is a general tax, the revenue from which is used to finance the cost of the Federal Government. They are not opposed to financing such costs as are necessary for defense but they do feel that a tax on the tools a man uses in the course of earning a livelihood is a very inequitable measure for this purpose.

Moreover, using revenue from the State gasoline tax and other highway-user levies, as well as income from bond issues, Wisconsin has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in an extensive highway system, the availability of which now is indispensable to the State. The preservation of this investment is dependent on the gasoline-tax revenue of the State. If the increasingly higher Federal taxes on gasoline discourage gasoline use in Wisconsin, our State would have difficulty in replacing the curtailment in the State gasoline-tax collections.

I am adding some data that may be of interest and should be examined:

The proportion of State gasoline-tax revenue available to the Wisconsin State Highway Department now being used for payment of highway bond interest and principal, 1939, is 28.7 percent.

The total State bonded indebtedness for highways and bridges, 1939, is $21,786,187 in Wisconsin.

In Wisconsin the rate of State gas tax is 4 cents per gallon. The total gasoline tax if the Federal tax becomes 2½ cents would be 6½ cents. The total price, excluding tax, on 10 gallons is $1.39. The total tax cost on 10 gallons, if the Federal tax becomes 2½ cents, would be 65 cents. You will notice that 47 percent of the price consists in the tax.

In a table of comparative State rankings as to resources, the State of Wisconsin is 17 under debt-paying index, 15 under N. I. C. B. income in 1935, and in 1930 was twenty-fourth in taxpaying ability.

It has been stated that the oil industry pays 17 cents out of every tax dollar collected.

From the cradle to the grave gasoline accompanies us on our journey through life. It carries our beloved mother to the hospital when we are born. It brings the doctor rushing to her aid. The instruments, medicines, bandages have all been aided in manufacture and in transportation by gasoline. The food we eat at our table, the morning paper, even the clothes we wear owe gasoline a debt in part for their existence. The school bus, the oil heater, the water we use, is frequently brought to our use by gasoline. Coming to work in the morning and going home when the day is done, is the job of gasoline. Even on our holidays, when we load the family into our old car, with mother in the back seat telling us how to drive, it all depends on gasoline. And when life's fitful tale is told, and the cares of a troubled world concern us no more, it will be our faithful friend, gasoline, who will gently take our wearied frame to its last resting place.

In fairness and justice, gasoline should not be burdened any further.

Home Defense and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WENDELL BERGE

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Wendell Berge delivered last night on radio program sponsored by Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Virginia, over station WWDC, Washington, D. C.:

I appreciate the opportunity to speak this evening under the sponsorship of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I am in full sympathy with the efforts of this organization to rouse Americans to a new sense of national unity in the face of the present crisis. This is a time when we can well afford to take stock of the blessings and advantages of America and to sound a clarion call for their defense.

The defense of America can only be achieved by national unity. However we may differ in political opinions, however divergent our blood, our party interests, our callings, we have this in common: We mean to defend America from tyranny and aggression, and, so far as we can, we mean to hold out a helping hand to others who may be in even more immediate danger than at the moment we find ourselves. We repudiate the ideas of abject or slothful defeatism. We will make our country both safe and strong.

There has come about within the last 2 years a new awareness of the peril that besets democratic institutions the world over, and with it has come a new will and a new determination to defend and preserve our democratic heritage, whatever the cost. While we regret and deplore the necessity for this reawakening, it at least has brought a new faith and a new hope to millions of Americans.

This country during the 1920's enjoyed an illusory prosperity. We intended, during that period, to think largely in terms of profits and dividends, and to take for granted the perpetual security of our political institutions and our traditional way of life. With the increasing emphasis upon material prosperity, some people commenced to scoff at the institutions of free government. If we could have wealth, why should we worry about freedom? The plain and sometimes tedious ways of Main Street became the targets of scorn and ridicule. Some of the newly rich turned their backs on this country and sought residence in foreign lands where they found a life that they thought was more sophisticated and to their liking.

Then came the depression. The illusions vanished. Much of the wealth of those who had put their faith wholly in material things was swept away, and these people who had so misplaced their faith were left with no rock to which they could cling. Some of these people having previously deprecated American institutions, now assumed a defeatist attitude, apparently believing that with the collapse of the stock market in 1929 all of the future was lost for America and its people.

Now, however, with danger staring us in the face, most of those men and women who were floundering have come to a startling realization that our Anglo-American heritage is worth saving, even at the cost of blood. The cynical attitude is rapidly giving way to one of purpose, determination, and confidence. We are at last alive to the need for strengthening our defenses against attack from abroad and our institutions against menaces from within. We are ready to act vigorously, and without stint or limit, to prove by action that the methods of democracy can survive in a struggle with the most direct and ruthless tactics of the totalitarian states.

This new drive to make America strong is manifested in many ways. It is evidenced by the appropriation of billions of dollars for military defense, for enlarging the Army and the Navy, and for building the largest air force in the world. It is evidenced by the prompt and willing response of America's men to the call to serve a period in military training for the national defense. It is being shown by the response of our people to the civilian-defense program.

We hear continually of private citizens and organizations throughout the country that are anxious to have some part in strengthening our defense. Relatively few people, however, can directly participate in military activity, yet millions want to do something worth while for their country. Here in Washington we receive daily inquiries from men and women in all walks of life as to what they might do to be of direct service. Most of these people are not job seekers in the usual sense but men and women who have profitable employment. They somehow have the feeling, however, that their present activity is too far removed from the important events that are taking place. They would like to feel that they are part of this great defense effort.

Of course, it is a mistake for anyone to think that the only place for service is in the Army or the Navy or some Government position. The total effort which this country will contribute must arise way back in the grass roots. Farm laborers, mechanics, the unskilled workers who make the wheels of industry go round, office workers, housewives, citizens in every avenue of life can do their part in their daily occupations, and yet it is understandable that many of these people crave the sense of active participation that comes from doing something special outside the line of their regular endeavor.

This understandable desire can in part be fulfilled through the program now being developed by the Office of Civilian Defense under the direction of Mayor LaGuardia. The program has just been inaugurated and it will take a little time fully to develop the plans, but it is intended to organize various specialized lines of training and work necessary and helpful to the national defense, which can be performed by civilians without withdrawing them from civilian life. This plan should appeal to various private organizations. Veterans, patriotic, fraternal, business, industrial, professional, and labor organizations all over the country will respond to the program of the Office of Civilian Defense. There will be civilian defense jobs outlined for women as well as men. I am not in a position to announce details of the program of the Office of Civilian Defense, but Mayor LaGuardia has assured us that plans for civilian participation in a broad home-defense program are being worked out and will be announced and made effective from time to time. This program warrants universal support, and I am sure will receive it.

One specific thing which can be mentioned with respect to the civilian defense program is the request that has been made to the civilian population to turn over all available old aluminum to the Government. A special Senate committee this last week reported a shortage in aluminum which threatens to curtail aircraft production during the coming year. This regrettable situation, in my judgment, results from the fact that over a period of years we have allowed one company to acquire monopolistic control of the aluminum industry in this country and to control the supply. Without the stimulus of competition there has been insufficient industry expansion. The aluminum monopoly has preferred lower production and a higher margin of profit. The Department of Justice has undertaken to destroy this monopolistic control by an antitrust suit which is now pending.

But the shortage brought about by monopolistic control is already threatening us. Because of this situation we are required to call upon the civilian population to help bridge the gap in order that vital airplane production shall not be curtailed. Mayor LaGuardia on June 24 issued a call for contributions to an "aluminum shower." The aluminum will be collected through State and local officials and defense councils throughout the country. Collections will probably commence late next month. The aggregate of the contributions of old aluminum utensils and other articles, many of which have probably been consigned to attic or cellar storage rooms, should be immensely helpful in offsetting the impending shortage that threatens to slow up aircraft production.

But, apart from the specific and definite activities in which almost every citizen can participate, there is another aspect of our home defense in which every man and woman can play a part. I refer to the influence which each and every one of us can exert upon the public opinion of this country. What we think and say in these times is of utmost importance. Every person in this country can help in his or her own way to combat the flood of un-American and defeatist propaganda that is at large in the land. Most of this propaganda can only be rendered ineffective by the vigorous answers of those of us who see through it.

Most propaganda activities are not illegal as such and could not directly be made so without sacrificing vital constitutional liberties. It is not necessary that we should lose free speech in this country in order to save our democracy. Indeed this is a time when we should vigorously exercise our right of free speech. We should actively exercise our right to make resounding answer to the phony claims of the propagandists who say that democracy is doomed by the "wave of the future." We must proclaim on every permissible occasion the falsity of the assertions of the enemies of our freedom that Hitler only wants peace and would be happy to enter into trade on a basis profitable to us. These claims of the Nazi propagandists are patently false, as has been so ably pointed out by Douglas Miller in his recent book, You Can't Do Business With Hitler.

So, although as a usual thing we cannot prosecute the Nazi propagandist because his activities do not generally violate any law, we can by the energetic exercise of our right of free speech render impotent his activities. What this country needs is not less freedom of speech but more speech by those of us who believe in freedom.

This active counterpropaganda work is, to my mind, one of the most important functions of the millions of Americans who want to play a part in home defense. And we certainly have good cause to dispute the claims of the defeatists. We certainly have good reason to believe in the ultimate triumph of the democracies in this struggle, and to proclaim our belief. The events of the last year should surely give us heart. What a contrast between the outlook today and that of a year ago! A year ago France had just fallen, and responsible prognosticators were predicting the fall of Britain before the summer's end. The land invasion of Britain

seemed to be a momentary probability. Italy had just entered the war. Her strength was an unknown quantity, and her complete debacle was certainly unforeseen. Russia was supposed to be collaborating with the Axis and was relied upon ultimately to pull the Axis through any economic crisis that might come. At home we were just started on our major defense effort, and it did not seem that we could possibly make much headway before the freely predicted downfall of Britain occurred.

Now, 1 year later, Britain stands, resolute and defiant, with head bloody but unbowed. Our defense industries have been tooled up to heights of production never before reached in American history. The planes and tanks and other instruments of defense for ourself and Britain are coming out of our factories in ever-increasing volume. We are training the largest peacetime army in history. We have negotiated transfers with Great Britain which give us vital defense bases far out in the Atlantic at various strategic points. Italy has completely collapsed as a factor in the war. And now, Russia, regarded a year ago as a potential ally for Hitler, is facing a Hitler invasion. At least we know that from this time on Russia, with its vast economic resources, will not willingly be at Hitler's disposal. Russia's resistance is greatly to the advantage of Britain and this country. Regardless of the ultimate success or failure of the Russian invasion, it inevitably requires the deflection of Hitler's attack from Britain to Russia. Indeed, it already appears that in the West Britain has attained the mastery of the air.

While it is true that during the last few months the Nazis have conquered a great deal of territory in southeastern Europe, yet the economic life of those countries has been so seriously disrupted that it is highly questionable whether the territory conquered in southeastern Europe to date will be of any great military advantage.

Throughout it all this fact must be kept in mind: That with each new conquest Hitler has assumed control of masses of sullen and resentful people who hate him and his invading armies. He has gained the enmity of millions of people and the real friendship of none. This is not a promising set-up for the successful future or the permanence of Hitler's "new order."

So there are many reasons why we can face the future with hope and confidence, but the drive which will keep this country going must come from the people themselves. It is the people of America who will determine the future of democracy in the world.

We are doing all we can here in the Government. As head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice I have daily occasion to observe the operation and effect of the laws which have been promulgated for the national defense. Against those relatively few people, both citizens and aliens, who are working illegally against the interests of this country we are instituting criminal prosecutions. We have, of course, an active, efficient, Intelligence Service in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Army, Navy, and Treasury Intelligence Services. These organizations are daily on the job of investigating the various forms of subversive activity in this country. Illegal activities of this nature are being vigorously prosecuted under the direction and supervision of the Criminal Division.

Only yesterday announcement was made of impending prosecution in St. Paul, Minn., of leaders of the Socialist Workers' Party, the Trotskyite branch of the Communist movement. These persons will be prosecuted on charges that they are engaged in seditious conspiracy and that they advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Presentation of the case to the grand jury will commence day after tomorrow. This prosecution, which was authorized by Acting Attorney General Francis Biddle, will reveal the activities of members of an organization which by its own declaration of principles "will advocate the continuance of the class struggle" during any war in which the United States might engage, "regardless of the consequences or the outcome of the American military struggle, and will try to prepare the masses to utilize the war crisis for the overthrow of United States capitalism and the victory of socialism." Acting Attorney General Biddle stated in announcing this prosecution that "it represents * * * the determination of the Department of Justice to prosecute criminal subversive activity wherever it may occur."

Yet another problem which falls to the Department of Justice is that of our alien population. Most of our alien population is loyal and cooperative, and it would be a gross error if in misguided patriotic zeal we were to deny to the millions of law-abiding aliens in our midst the opportunity to help in our defense effort and to contribute their part to our national life. On the other hand, there are some aliens who are in this country illegally and others who have shown that they are not fitted for the responsibilities of American life. Appropriate action must be taken against aliens of this class. Our machinery for deportation cannot effectively deal with the problem of the subversive alien because of the fact that there are very few countries to which deportation is any longer physically possible. New legislation is needed which will enable us to deal with aliens in an effective and realistic way, and a bill is presently pending before Congress, known as the Hobbs bill, which the Department of Justice believes should be enacted immediately in order to give us powers to cope more effectively with our alien problems.

There are a multitude of activities of the Department of Justice which are part and parcel of the national-defense program, and which I would be glad to discuss if there were time. But I am not here this evening primarily to discuss departmental activities. The principal thought that I want to leave with you is that each of us, regardless of occupation, regardless of capacity to perform direct contributions to the military or economic defense program, can contribute a vital and important part in building up and sustaining the national will. And I believe that when this great country has attained substantial unity in purpose and determination, it is unbeatable on any front. In the words of Winston Churchill, that great leader who has done so much to sustain the democratic forces of the world:

"Dictatorship—the fetish worship of one man—is a passing phase. A state of society where men may not speak their minds, where children denounce their parents to the police, where a businessman or small shopkeeper ruins his competitor by telling tales about his private opinions—such a state of society cannot long endure if brought into contact with the healthy outside world. The light of civilized progress with its tolerances and cooperation, with its dignities and joys, has often in the past been blotted out. But I hold the belief that we have now at last got far enough ahead of barbarism to control it, and to avert it, if only we realize what is afoot and make up our minds in time. We shall do it in the end. But how much harder our toil for every day's delay!

"Is this a call to war? Does anyone pretend that preparation for resistance to aggression is unleashing war? I declare it to be the sole guaranty of peace. We need the swift gathering of forces to confront not only military but moral aggression; the resolute and sober acceptance of their duty by the English-speaking people and by all the nations, great and small, who wish to walk with them. Their faithful and zealous comradeship would almost between night and morning clear the path of progress and banish from all our lives the fear which already darkens the sunlight to hundreds of millions of men."

Our National Defense—Still on Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on one major goal the entire United States of America is agreed. We must have the strongest military and naval force anywhere on the face of the globe. Whatever may be our differences of viewpoint on a thousand and one other matters of policy, we are united in our determination to build for defense. This united determination will not be satisfied with anything less than maximum performance.

But what is the record? How have we utilized the tremendous productive capacity of our industrial plant? Have we used the time at our disposal advantageously? Have we built the armed forces of our country to a satisfactory stage of development in the last year?

The answers are disappointing. In the last year, our armament output has equaled less in material results than Europe produces in 2 months. Our year's production of military supplies equals what England, besieged and battered by war, turns out in only 3 months. Our requirements in ships, airplanes, tanks, ammunition, rifles, machine guns are tremendous. With the single exception of planes, our production is comparatively insignificant.

Congress has authorized huge expenditures. Our Government has at its disposal $45,000,000,000 for armament purposes. The sum is regarded as sufficient to build a two-ocean navy, to purchase full equipment for 1,500,000 men in the field, and to supply Britain with many of her needs. Of this sum of $45,000,000,000 the Army, Navy, and British purchasing commissions have placed contracts totaling $18,000,000,000. American industry has turned $7,000,000,000 of these orders into actual materials of war.

How much of these $7,000,000,000 went into the manufacture of weapons? The figures tell us that only $3,000,000,000 worth of military aircraft, guns, ammunition, tanks, and ships have been built. The other $4,000,000,000 were spent to erect camps, to furnish clothing, to provide food, and to do the thousand and one other things necessary for the creation of a preparedness program.

Only by actual comparisons can we realize the inconsequential size of this effort. Our own Government officials calculate the present output of European war industry at the figure of $2,000,000,000 per month, or $24,000,000,000 a year. The British Empire is turning out war supplies at a rate believed to be worth

$1,000,000,000 monthly. We are doing less than half as well, with a productive capacity of at least five times as much.

What all this means to the United States is all too easy to discern. Our defense today is still on order. We are lagging far behind in the competitive race for rearmament which has swept across the world. Our Government experts had predicted an all-out drive in arms production for June. Now it has been postponed until October or November.

Perhaps the most critical single weapon in modern warfare is the airplane. We have concentrated on plane production as the No. 1 necessity in the last year. In 12 months' time our factories have built 10,500 planes, one-half of them equipped for fighting service and the remainder usable for training. The speed-up here is impressive.

But even here, Nazi Germany is outdistancing us. Our Army and Navy together have some 8,000 planes, including trainers, fighters, and bombers. Germany is reported to have more than 20,000 aircraft of all types, and the Nazi rate of production is flowing along evenly while we are making desperate efforts to catch up. But catching up will not be nearly enough. Our rate of manufacture must exceed anything of which Germany is capable to satisfy the needs and the demands of the American people. We have just decided to develop a program of long-range bomber construction. It will be at least 2 years before this program begins to achieve tangible results.

In still other areas of preparedness, the record is no less discouraging. In the last 12 months, the combined energies of every American enterprise dealing with the building of cargo ships produced little more than $800,000,000 worth of shipping. Merchant ships may play a critical role in the ultimate outcome of this war. But the number of ships built is most unimpressive in comparison with the monthly records of tonnage being destroyed by Axis submarines, airplanes, and surface craft. To date, we have planned the building of 442 ships, but the first ships scheduled for delivery will not be ready until November. The big years are still far behind the hills in 1942 and 1943.

The figures of our naval-building program are regarded as more satisfactory, but no details are offered by our Government to substantiate this optimism. We know that some launchings have taken place ahead of schedule, but we do not know how heavily armored our new fighting craft may be. We do not know what new materials have been used to furnish protection from air attack and from bomb splinters.

Our development of an adequate defense machinery for tanks, guns, and ammunition is of no less importance than the production of our air fleet. In the last year we have begun to realize the difficulties in the way of ordnance manufacture. We are producing light tanks at the rate of 450 per month. This will give us 5,400 a year, but our goal is listed at 30,000. To get them will take more than 5 years. We have laid plans to build medium-weight tanks, but these will start rolling out of factories no sooner than the fall of this year. Our 80-ton tanks are still in the talking stage.

In New York City people are thinking in terms of air defense. But there are few if any new antiaircraft guns available to defend the world's greatest city. What are we waiting for? In the light of British experience, with the city of London a scene of devastation, antiaircraft preparation should stand high on the list of American priorities. The best inventive minds in our country should be turning their attention toward the prevention of air raids.

The entire defense picture is still in the sketching stage after 2 years of conversation. The famous howitzers so useful in the World War are practically nonexistent in the United States Army. Our production of powder is still described as a bottleneck item. For the tanks we are building there are not enough shells available or in production.

These are the facts. They reveal shortages in our equipment for defense which cannot be ignored without danger to the Republic. The administration has asked virtually unlimited authority to deal with our defense program. It has requested huge congressional appropriations. They have been voted. The responsibility for our long delays can be squarely fixed. It lies at the door of the national administration.

We have given complete and wholehearted support to the Government in every defense plan it has formulated. We deserve better results. We must have them speedily if our program is to succeed.

Resignation of Public Utility Commissioner Richard J. Beamish From Pennsylvania Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

LETTER FROM HON. RICHARD J. BEAMISH

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Hon. Richard J. Beamish, member of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Pennsylvania, to Hon. William M. Hargest, president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRISBURG, *June 26, 1941.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. HARGEST,
President, Pennsylvania Bar Association, Bedford Springs, Bedford, Pa.

MY DEAR JUDGE HARGEST: I am herewith tendering my resignation as a member of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

My resignation is intended as a protest against the address delivered by you on Wednesday, June 25, as president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association before the annual meeting of that body. Your address was a direct and indiscriminating attack upon all Federal administrative processes and also against the administrative bodies of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, when, after attacking Federal bodies, you said the Pennsylvania situation "is little better."

Your violent and partisan attack derives added significance when it comes from you, the president judge of a special court which by statute has been created to review cases coming from Pennsylvania administrative bodies.

Let me call to your attention and to the members of the Pennsylvania Bar Association who goosestep behind you that the Federal and State administrative agencies have been created by Congress and by the several States legislatures because of the delays and judicial malpractices arising in the courts of law.

These administrative agencies had their birth in England after Dickens, who you will recall was a court reporter, blasted the courts of law over and over again and particularly in his description of the delays and injustices that arose in *Jarndyce* v. *Jarndyce*.

You, my dear Judge Hargest, are woefully behind the times. You are attempting, you and your battalion of old-guard utility lawyers to lead the people of America back into the fogs of yesteryear. You do not realize that gone forever are the days when utility companies of high and low degree could prevent justice to the people through delays in the courts. We now have in the administrative agencies power to impose temporary rates upon companies that seek to delay justice to consumers. Through the Federal Reserve Board banking has been stabilized, through the insurance clauses of the National Banking Act deposits are secure, through the Interstate Commerce Commission rebating by railroads and chiseling by truck companies have been curbed, through the Securities and Exchange Commission Wall Street has been harnessed and piratical holding companies are being curbed, through the Federal Communications Commission extortionate telephone rates have been lowered, through the Federal Power Commission cooperating with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission the manipulations of Hopson and his gang have been exposed and their practices abolished. You pass over all the good that has been accomplished by these agencies to take a crack at young lawyers who are being used as examiners in investigations by these bodies. Let me tell you, Judge Hargest, the hope of the legal profession and of the courts is in this body of young lawyers whom you scorn. The day will come when they will stuff judicial reactionaries like you and put them on display in museums of legal antiquities.

You reserve the maximum of your spleen for the National Labor Relations Board and there you reveal why this drive against administrative processes has been set in motion. You don't like the entrance of government in cases affecting labor. Here again Judge Hargest you are late, much too late.

Henry Ford, arch foe of organized labor, has signed on the dotted line, but you catch up the torch that he has dropped and rally reactionary members of the Pennsylvania bar to attempt to fill the breach. You can't do it, Judge Hargest. A mouse can't fill the hole where an elephant once stood.

It is a matter of national congratulations that all judges do not believe as you do. I direct your attention to the unanimous approval from coast to coast when President Roosevelt named as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court that real judge, Harlan Fiske Stone. Not once but repeatedly, he has championed administrative agencies and the actions of Congress in creating these agencies. You are not too old, Judge Hargest, for lessons in law from a great judge.

When you make your broadside attack upon administrative bodies you attempt to blacken

the actions and records of the leaders in these administrative efforts. The foremost influence in this country in regulation through administration is the Honorable Robert E. Healy, of Vermont, a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. As counsel to the Federal Trade Commission, he exposed the evil practices of holding companies, and through his influence the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and other Federal bodies have been established.

Judge Healy in usefulness to the American people is as far above any person enlisted in the drive against administrative bodies as Mount Everest is above a rat hole. I would bracket his name with that of Chief Justice Stone in forecasting a new day in the cooperation of administrative regulation and legal interpretation.

I am writing this as one plain citizen to another, because you have stepped down from the bench to lead a partisan movement, from which I dissent.

My resignation is the culmination of that dissent.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. BEAMISH,
Commissioner.

The Late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article printed in yesterday's Washington Star relative to the late "Billy" Mitchell's theories now being taken seriously. The title of the article is "Prophet—Not Without Honor."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPHET—NOT WITHOUT HONOR—LATE BILLY MITCHELL'S THEORIES NOW BEING TAKEN SERIOUSLY

(By Richard L. Stokes)

Under congressional pressure in behalf of the late Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell's pet scheme, the establishment of a separate air arm, Secretary of War Stimson on June 20 ordered the creation of a unit called the Army Air Forces and embracing all military aviation in a single unified organization. It will have a semi-independent status, like that of the Marine Corps in the Navy. Although the Army compromised, the Navy is continuing an all-out fight against the McCarran bill to separate the air forces from the old line services, on the ground that it had as lief be robbed of its destroyers and submarines as be deprived of its own aviation.

While American air chiefs are struggling today with problems which General Mitchell besought them in vain to face 20 years ago, belated honors are beginning to be paid to his memory. A new airport at Milwaukee, in his home State of Wisconsin, is to be named Mitchell Field. But this is a commercial and not an Army port.

And it is interesting to note that one of General Mitchell's chief defenders at the famous court martial in 1925 was the airman who has just been elevated to Chief of the Army Air Forces—Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold.

He was then Major Arnold. Taking the witness stand in behalf of General Mitchell, he testified that of 517 officers and men killed between January 1, 1919, and July 30, 1925, 507 met their deaths in obsolete planes.

PURSUIT PLANES DECLARED UNFIT

Another high-ranking air officer, Brig. Gen. Carl Spaatz, Assistant Chief of the Army Air Corps, who was then a major, told the court the Army did not possess a single pursuit plane fit for war and the pursuit squadron had no range for gunnery practice.

What has become of the judges, prosecutors, and other witnesses who took part in the trial and conviction of General Mitchell, then Assistant Chief of the Air Service? To what extent do any of these men now hold positions in which they have authority to influence the course of national defense?

Though General Mitchell died 5 years ago, and though the sessions of the court, being public, were copiously described in the press, records in the case are still withheld as confidential by the office of the Judge Advocate General. In consequence, the present article is based to some extent on newspaper reports. Should injustice unwittingly be done, it may be charged to the writer's inability to gain access to official documents. The findings, on the best information available, are given herewith.

Of 10 officers who sat on the famous tribunal, 5 are dead. The others have retired, the last in 1934, and none has been recalled to active duty. One of their number, however, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who served as Chief of Staff from 1930 to 1934, is field marshal of the native army which the Philippine Government is training in preparation for independence. As such, in case of war with Japan, he might play a stellar role in the defense of the islands.

GULLION, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Maj. Allen W. Gullion, who was Mitchell's chief prosecutor, is today Maj. Gen. Gullion, Judge Advocate General, in supreme charge of the administration of military justice.

Army and Navy officers who testified against General Mitchell, and in that degree contributed to his overthrow, include the following survivors with their present rank and posts:

Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair, Chief of Staff, General Headquarters; reputed "brains" of the Army.

Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum, commanding the First Army, Governors Island, N. Y.

Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, commanding the Eighth Army Corps, Brownwood, Tex.

Brig. Gen. Francis B. Wilby, commanding the First Corps Area, Boston.

Col. Jarvis J. Bain, staff officer, Second Army, Memphis.

Capt. John T. G. Stapler, Chief of Staff and aide to the commandant, Third Naval District, New York.

Capt. Kenneth Whiting, general inspector of naval aircraft, eastern division, New York.

Capt. Holden C. Richardson, in charge of litigation, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department.

Commander Frederick W. Pennoyer, Jr., commanding the support force Atlantic Fleet.

Apparently no officers of the Navy appeared in General Mitchell's defense. On the other hand, several young military flyers boldly risked jobs and careers, defied the caste then ruling the Army and testified publicly in his behalf. Among such champions were the following, with their rank today:

Major General Arnold.

Maj. Gen. Gerald C. Brant, commanding the Gulf Coast Training Center, Randolph Field, Tex.

Maj. Gen. John F. Curry, commanding the Second Air Force, Spokane.

Brigadier General Spaatz.

Col. Frank M. Kennedy, Chief of Building and Grounds Division, Air Corps office, War Department.

Lt. Col. Harold L. George, executive officer, Headquarters Squadron, Second Bombardment Wing, Langley Field, Va.

An enthusiastic witness for General Mitchell was Representative Fiorello La Guardia, now mayor of New York and director of the Office of Civilian Defense. Mr. La Guardia himself had been a major in the American Flying Force during the World War, and taken part in night and day bombing excursions on the Italian front.

SUMMERALL WITHDREW

The senior Army dignitary called to the stand by the prosecution was Maj. Gen. Charles P. Summerall, who a year later became Chief of Staff, organized the country's first mechanized unit, retired in 1931, and is now president of The Citadel, South Carolina's military college at Charleston. His emergence in the role of partisan witness excited comment at the time because he had been slated to preside over the court martial. He withdrew as soon as the proceedings started on being challenged by the defense for "prejudice and bias."

Other big wigs of the Army who testified against General Mitchell included Maj. Gen. Frank W. Coe, Chief of Coast Artillery, and Maj. Gen. William J. Snow, Chief of Field Artillery. They retired, respectively, in 1926 and 1927. As a writer in service journals, General Snow still exerts influence on the policies of his arm. A witness for the prosecution who was destined to become Chief of Naval Operations was Rear Admiral William V. Pratt. He retired in 1938 with the rank of admiral, and at present is a naval writer and radio commentator.

By order of Dwight F. Davis, of St. Louis, who succeeded John W. Weeks as Secretary of War on October 14, 1925, 1 law and 12 general officers were designated as judges on October 20 to try General Mitchell on a charge, with 8 specifications, of conduct prejudicial to military discipline and tending to bring discredit on the military service.

SLADEN DISQUALIFIED

The defense used its single peremptory challenge to disqualify Maj. Gen. Fred W. Sladen, Superintendent of West Point. Like General Summerall, Maj. Gen. Albert C. Bowley, commanding Fort Bragg, N. C., withdrew when challenged for "prejudice and bias." The court, as finally organized, was composed as follows: Maj. Gen. Robert Lee Howze, president; Major Generals MacArthur, William S. Graves, and Benjamin A Poore; Brig. Gens. Edward L. King, Frank R McCoy, Edwin B. Winans, George Le R. Irwin, and Ewing E. Booth; and Col. Blanton Winship, law member, from the Judge Advocate General's office.

Howze, Graves, Poore, King, and Irwin are dead. All the surviving brigadier generals were promoted to major generals before retirement. The same rank, third highest in the Army, was later bestowed on Colonel Winship, who retired in 1933. But Col. Herbert A. White, assigned by the Judge Advocate General to defend General Mitchell, was still a colonel when placed on the inactive list some years afterward.

Since the verdict was decided by secret ballot, all that can be known is that at least seven of the judges held General Mitchell to be guilty. In a court martial not involving capital punishment or imprisonment for more than 10 years, a two-thirds vote is enough for conviction. Four ballots, therefore, would have acquitted the defendant. As chief counsel, General Mitchell chose a civilian, Representative Frank R. Reid, Republican, of Illinois, who resigned from Congress in 1934. A passage during cross-examination of the defendant almost led to a mistrial. General King, in an audible aside to Colonel

Winship, made the comment, "Damn rot." The incident was closed when General King was induced to apologize.

HEARINGS LASTED 2 MONTHS

The hearings, which opened in Washington on October 28 and concluded 2 months later with a verdict of guilty on all specifications, brought an end, after 24 years of service, to one of the most colorful careers in the Army's history. The son of Senator John L. Mitchell, of Wisconsin, William Mitchell was born December 29, 1879, at Nice, France. He entered military life by enlisting as a private in 1898, and became the youngest officer in the Spanish-American War, the first American officer under fire in the World War and the first flying officer of the United States Army to cross the German lines, on April 22, 1917. Through eminent gallantry he won the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, and Croix de Guerre with five palms. He was made commander of the Legion of Honor and companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George.

His progress was such that he became commander of the Air Service Group of the American Expeditionary Force, serving throughout the campaign in France and leading the aviation of the Army of Occupation into Germany. In 1919 he was appointed Director of Military Aeronautics; in 1920, Chief of Training and Operations; and, in 1921, Assistant Chief of the Air Service.

General Mitchell expressed his convictions on the flyleaf of a book called Skyways. It was dedicated to the author's young son and daughter, "who in their lifetime will see aeronautics become the greatest and principal means of national defense." This belief was coupled with advocacy of a cabinet department of defense, embracing Army, Navy, and air force as equal and separate components.

CONTROVERSY INTENSIFIED

With a zeal that with time grew embittered and intemperate, General Mitchell preached to deaf ears all the lessons as to the role of air power which have startled the globe in the present war. But he was a prophet without honor in his own service. The controversy was intensified rather than appeased when he won permission in 1920 to bomb several former German warships off the Virginia Capes.

The destroyers were sunk with ease, but a light cruiser, the *Friedrichshafen*, and a 26,000-ton battleship, *Aus Friesland*, remained afloat after days of bombing, though their decks were awash almost ankle deep. Finally, by accident, it was claimed, an Army flyer dropped a 600-pound bomb 100 feet from the battleship's starboard bow. It exploded underwater, like a torpedo, and the vessel went to the bottom. The cruiser was then dispatched by the same means. This experiment established, General Mitchell argued, that any battleship could be sunk from the air. It proved just the contrary, according to naval authorities, and so the debate has raged to this day.

In the early part of 1925 General Mitchell gave acrimonious testimony before a congressional committee as to the folly of Army "brass hats" in opposing extension of the air arm. Secretary of War Weeks, in a letter to President Coolidge, recommended that the disturber should not be reappointed as Assistant Chief of the Air Service. His name was not submitted to the Senate. General Mitchell reverted to his regular rank of colonel and was "buried" at the air center in San Antonio.

AROUSED BY "SHENANDOAH" WRECK

Smarting under this disgrace, he was aroused to fury by the wreck of the naval airship *Shenandoah*, with a loss of 14 lives. Calling in reporters, he issued a statement on September 5 making deadly charges, but also bristling with recriminations so insubordinate that many believed he had determined to blazon his cause to the four corners of the Nation by making himself a public martyr. This accident, he declared, was a direct result of "incompetence, criminal negligence, and almost treasonable administration of national defense by the War and Navy Departments."

When threats of discipline answered him from Washington, General Mitchell put out a second statement on September 9, more unrestrained than the first, in which he announced: "What I have said about the conditions of our national defense hurts the bureaucrats in Washington. It ought to hurt them, because it is true." He added that "Our pilots know they are going to be killed if they stay in the service in the old flaming coffins we are still flying."

On account of General Mitchell's World War record the court martial returned what it described as a "lenient" verdict. He was merely stripped of rank, command, and duty, with forfeiture of all pay and allowances for 5 years. President Coolidge approved the sentence, with some modification of the forfeiture penalties, on the ground that General Mitchell's utterances "could not be construed otherwise than as breathing defiance to his military superiors." General Mitchell resigned from the Army February 1, 1926, retired to a stock farm in Virginia, and died suddenly on February 19, 1936.

Ex-President Hoover's Call to American Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full text of the great radio address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover entitled "A Call to American Reason," on June 29, 1941, from Chicago, Ill.:

A CALL TO AMERICAN REASON

Six weeks ago I made a statement to the American people upon the relation of the United States to this war.

That address has received large approval. It has naturally been disliked by the extremists. That is the psychosis of war. That disease has two outstanding symptoms. Those who catch it lose their reason in the fever of emotion. And in that fever intolerance rises to a pitch where it seeks to frighten men from free speech by defamation.

Since making that address four momentous events have happened which greatly change the shape of things. They must be incorporated in American thinking. There is the war between Hitler and Stalin. There is the final proof that in certain vital circumstances air power is ascendant over sea power. There are the provocative actions in the sinking of the *Robin Moor*. Propaganda of fear or hate to force us into war has been intensified. It comes from foreign sources, from Cabinet officers, and American organizations. They urge step after step of executive action which would drag us into undeclared war.

There are those who argue that we are already in this war. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress has the sole authority to declare war. It is equally their responsibility to see that this country does not go to war until they have authorized it.

The only reason for not submitting the matter to the Congress would be that Congress could not be trusted. Or that the people, through them, should not be allowed a voice. No President in a democracy should take that responsibility, for there will be no unity of spirit in an executive war. If Congress decides to go to war, then we willingly give all and we willingly surrender all our freedoms necessary to win that war. And until Congress shall by constitutional action declare war, no man in America may demand the end of debate on this issue of peace or war.

In these 6 weeks, opposition against joining in this war has grown stronger in the American people. Yet we have moved officially nearer to war. And let me say at once that President Roosevelt has held steadfast to his promises not to send "our Army, Navy, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside America except in case of attack." We have not yet taken the irretrievable step into war by firing a gun.

The arguments given for our joining in this war during the past weeks have crystallized into seven categories. The first is that it would more greatly aid Britain if we go into the shooting stage of the war than for us to remain as an arsenal. The second is that Hitler means to attack the Americas and we should attack first. The third is that the American mission of freedom requires we destroy these totalitarian ideologies and impose the four freedoms on other nations. The fourth is that a free America cannot live in the same world with dictatorships. The fifth is that our economic future will be destroyed. The sixth is that the sinking of the *Robin Moor* constitutes an attack on the United States which requires war. And the seventh is that we must go to war to impose permanent peace on the world.

The American people should weigh wars just as they would weigh any other issue. They should weigh them on the realistic scales of benefits and losses, both material and spiritual.

No man can tell what the kaleidoscopic changes in this appalling situation may be. We must constantly reappraise its dangers. The constant question is what we should do now. But there are certain courses of practical statesmanship; there are certain eternal principles to which we must adhere. There are certain consequences to America and civilization which we must ever keep before our eyes.

I shall speak again without emphasizing the emotion that arises within me when the whole destiny of my country is imperiled. I can hope to appeal only to reasoning people. And it is cold reason, not eloquence, that America needs today.

AID TO BRITAIN

I shall first weigh the problem of aid to Britain before I deal with the other arguments.

In my last address I insisted that we could give Britain more aid if we stayed out of the war. I suggested that until our production increases we should scrape the bottom of the barrel. That would be more than she now receives. I stated that if we join the war we must retain a larger part of our production for our own immediate defense. Thus Britain would get less than she does now.

To prevent these supplies being sunk I proposed we hand over to Britain the same con-

voy warships that we would use if we joined the war. If she operated them, it would do her as much good as if we do it.

The recommendations were based upon just plain mathematics of what would get the most supplies to Britain—not emotional dialectics.

The bomber planes which Britain wants so badly are flown over the Atlantic and therefore are not sunk by submarines. The figures now disclosed by the Maritime Commission, the Government departments, the Red Cross, all of them, show that less than 4 percent of the supplies shipped from American ports to Britain have been sunk.

These percentages of loss could become very much larger and still the net supplies to Britain would be greater by our staying out of war.

Furthermore, many of these ships are being sunk from the air. No amount of American naval protection could stop that.

There is also the problem of Japan. We must not forget that she is under contract to Hitler to attack us of we join in this war. For her to enter would be a disaster to Britain in two ways. She would cover the seven seas with raiders sinking more British supplies. And we would need at once to retain all the air power and ships we can produce to protect our own coasts and to drive her off the seas.

In view of these disclosures and these reasons, the answer to those who argue that it would aid Britain for us to join this war is that it would do her more harm than good.

Let me add a word upon Britain's magnificent defense to those who say Britain is lost. She has not lost a square yard of her empire. She has managed to maintain an extraordinary portion of her exports of manufactured goods over the seven seas with all the labor and raw materials that implies. She still draws a large part of her food supplies by long voyages to the Southern Hemisphere. She has apparently not found the need to concentrate her life line on North America, which was done to economize shipping in the last war. She is by no means in the extremity of a siege. The war between Hitler and Stalin relieves her of immediate pressures.

REVOLUTION IN MILITARY POWERS

Before I apply the weights of realism to the other arguments for our joining this war we must take account of military developments in the war itself. They profoundly affect America's relation to this war.

It is more than ever evident that there has been a shift in the relative strength of military power just as revolutionary as was the invention of gunpowder to armored knights of old.

Comparatively small mechanized armies are now dominant over fortifications and mass armies. Air power has now demonstrated its superiority over sea power in certain circumstances.

During the past 6 weeks the *Bismarck*, a first-class battleship, was first crippled from the air. In the battle of Crete the British were forced to withdraw their naval forces in the face of air attacks from nearby land bases, with the loss of four cruisers and several destroyers. Other warships have been put out of action in the last month from the air by both British and Germans.

One result of this shift has been to assure a sort of zone around the shores of nations where bombing airplanes render attack by naval vessels very much more difficult and often impossible. The shift has added greatly to the powers of American defense.

Hitler today occupies or controls all the Continent of Europe outside Russia. Unlike the last war, there is no arena of land operations. His whole strength would need to be met on the beach somewhere. And he controls every mile of the beach.

Japan is still under agreement to attack us if we join the war. She becomes far more potent to destroy our interests in the Pacific the moment we become engaged in the Atlantic.

It is too early to forecast the military consequences of the inclusion of Russia in the war. It does not seem likely that it will bring the end any nearer.

CAN AMERICA BE CONQUERED?

With these weights we can examine the second argument for joining this war. That argument is that Hitler will eventually make a military conquest of the Western Hemisphere, and we better attack first. There are two questions here. First, can Amedica be conquered; and, second, can we conquer the Axis?

The Atlantic Ocean is still 3,000 miles wide. For either the United States or Germany to gain victory gigantic armadas of warships and transports must be set afloat. Enormous armies must be transported all at once and ready for attack on the beach on either side. Neither enough warships nor transports exist today to do that from either side. It would take 10 years to prepare. These armadas could be protected by air power only in the first part of their journey. And then naval power becomes effective. When they get closer to the shore air power comes into action. And it is now demonstrated that enough air power is almost complete defense against surface ships. And after that there must be the battle on the beach. England can prevent Hitler's crossing even 25 miles of water.

Those who assert that the Germans might capture and use the British Navy against us must now recognize that the proved vulnerability of warships from bombing planes removes most of that argument.

There is no important military man who tells me that we and Britain combined could, short of long years, prepare, transport, and land enough men or machines in Europe to overcome Axis land and air power. And not a military man of substance believes the Axis could do it to us.

There is here also the element of Japan. She is 6,000 miles away from continental United States, and conclusive grip at each other's throat is even more improbable.

Even with the development of long-range planes, the Germans or Japanese cannot make an effective air attack upon us. They could do some terrorization. But that does not win wars. Certainly, after the exhaustion of this war, the Nazis are not coming for a long time. If we are prepared, they won't think of coming.

In any event, the answer to the argument that we may be conquered by the Axis is simply that, if we prepare, America cannot be brought to subjection by any combination of military power.

As relative military power stands today, there appears no method of bringing this war to a conclusion except by years and years of destruction and exhaustion. Sea power is ineffective through blockade to bring conclusion because Hitler has supplies of food and raw material or is on the way to get them. Britain has the seven seas open. Armies cannot be effectively landed across water against air power. The defenses against daylight attack precludes the destruction of munitions works and thus manufacture goes on. The night air raids reduce cities to rubble and kill civilians, but that does not bring the war to conclusion. The end of stalemate becomes part a question of morale and stamina.

If we enter such a war we only increase the moral and economic wastage of the world. If we stay out, we preserve much for the reconstruction of the world.

And in considering all the possibilities if we go to war, we must contemplate that the British might not be able to hold out during the long years that this war would need go on. Then we would be left with no possibility of bringing the war to conclusion except by a compromise peace.

IMPOSING THE "FOUR FREEDOMS"

The third argument of those who would have us join in this war is that we must destroy the whole dictator ideology and impose the "four freedoms" on other nations.

That is, we must go to war to impose the ideals of democracy against the ideals of despotism. That is an ideological war. It is an ancient holy war. We may weigh it in both the scales of American idealism and the scales of realistic practicality.

WHAT OF RUSSIA?

In the last 7 days that call to sacrifice American boys for an ideal has been made as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. For now we find ourselves promising aid to Stalin and his militant Communist conspiracy against the whole democratic ideals of the world. Collaboration between Britain and Russia will bring them military values, but it makes the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the "four freedoms" to mankind a Gargantuan jest. We had better refresh our memories a little.

Four American Presidents and four Secretaries of State, beginning with Woodrow Wilson, refused to have anything to do with Soviet Russia on the ground of morals and democratic ideals. They even refused diplomatic recognition. They did so because here is one of the bloodiest tyrannies and terrors ever erected in history. It destroyed every semblance of human rights and human liberty; it is a militant destroyer of the worship of God; it brutally executes millions of innocent people without the semblance of justice; it has enslaved the rest. Moreover, it has violated every international covenant; it has carried on a world conspiracy against all democracy, including the United States. And do I need to prove that it continued doing this down to 7 days ago?

When Russia was recognized by the United States in 1933, the Soviet entered into a solemn agreement that they would refrain from any propaganda, any organization, or in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security in any part of the United States.

Seven years later the Dies committee reported unanimously and specifically that the Communist Party in the United States is a Moscow conspiracy, masked as a political party; that its activities constitute a violation of the Treaty of Recognition; that under instructions from Moscow the Communists had violated the laws of the United States; that throughout the entire time they had been supplied with funds from Moscow for activities against the American people and the American Government. The Dies committee only confirmed what most Americans already know. Is the word of Stalin any better than the word of Hitler?

On August 22, 1939, Stalin entered into an agreement with Hitler through which there should be joint onslaught on the democracies of the world. Nine days later Stalin attacked the Poles jointly with Hitler and destroyed the freedom of a great and democratic people. Fourteen days later Stalin destroyed the independence of democratic Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Ninety days later on came the unprovoked attack by Russia on democratic Finland. Is that not aggression, and is not every case a hideous violation of treaties and international law?

Stalin has taken advantage of the very freedoms of democracy to destroy them with the most potent "fifth column" in all history. He contributed to the destruction of France. He has daily implanted class hate in America and a stealthy war against our institutions.

In these last weeks it is declared not only by public officials but by labor leaders themselves that the strikes which hamstring the defense of the United States have been Communist conspiracies. Thus Russia has

continued her mission of destroying our democracy down to last week.

We know also Hitler's hideous record of brutality, of aggression, and as a destroyer of democracies. Truly Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, France, and the others are dreadful monuments. But I am talking of Stalin at this moment.

One of the real compensations America received for our enormous sacrifices in the last war was from the large part we played in establishing the democracies of Finland, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. We nursed them in their infancy. We spent hundreds of millions to help them grow to manhood. Does America feel quite right about aiding Stalin to hold his enslavement of them? That is where power politics has carried us. No doubt we will make good our promise to aid Russia. But the ideological war to bring the four freedoms to the world died spiritually when we made that promise.

If we go further and join the war and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in the world. We should at least cease to tell our sons that they would be giving their lives to restore democracy and freedom to the world.

And American ideals of humanity and Christianity have received another shock from this war. That is the food blockade on 80,000,000 people in the occupied democracies. Even an experiment to prove whether or not the children could be fed without advantage to the enemy was denied. Millions of them who have sacrificed everything on the altar of democracy are condemned to die. The denial of food to the children of allies is a weapon of this war. If we enter this war we subscribe to it. Then we have taken that blot on our own national soul.

Now let us explore the practical side of an ideological war. I agree that the world would be vastly better if the whole totalitarian idea were extirpated. But those who still cling to this as the mission of America should ask realistically how much of a job it is, especially in the face of this revolution in military weapons and this actual military situation.

Such a war means that Hitler must be defeated; it means Mussolini must be defeated; it means the war party in Japan must be defeated; it means that Turkey, Spain, and Portugal must be defeated; it means that unless Hitler first disposes of Stalin we must defeat him also. Does any sane person believe that by military means we can defeat two-thirds of the military power of the whole world in even years and years? It would be another children's crusade.

We cannot slay an idea or an ideology with machine guns. Ideas live in men's minds in spite of military defeat. They live until they have proved themselves right or wrong. These ideas are evil, and evil ideas contain the germs of their own defeat.

Hitler's real weakness would be in peace. His invasions have won not the loyalty but the undying hate of two-thirds of the people under his control. They have known self-government and liberty for centuries. They are people of great spiritual and intellectual resistance. They cannot revolt in arms against tanks and planes but they will never accept a new order based on slavery. And these aggressions have won the fear and hate of all the rest of the world. Conquest always dies of indigestion.

The whole Nazi ideology and the Nazi economic system are based upon coercion of the individual, the group, or the class. Those coercions can be held in preparing for war or during war. They cannot be held in peace. Even if Hitler got peace, the Nazi system will begin to go to pieces. Therefore, we do not need to despair that these evil ideologies will continue forever on this earth.

CAN WE LIVE WITH DESPOTS IN THE WORLD?

And there is the fourth argument that America and the Western Hemisphere cannot live with despotism in Europe. It would not be pleasant, but it can be done. The strong men of this Republic carried this democracy in the weakness of its infancy through a whole world of complete dictatorship, a world of imperialism, a world of aggression. Have we less stamina, less courage, than they?

WHAT OF OUR ECONOMIC LIFE?

And there is the fifth argument that if dictatorships continue in the world, our economic life will be strangled and die. I have expounded this subject at great length elsewhere. I may say here that this country is 93 percent self-contained. While I do not relish it and do not believe in any event it will be needed, if it is needed then we can make it 97 percent self-contained. And the cost of it would be less over 20 years than 1 year of war.

I suppose even totalitarian Europe would want to trade. At worst, we would have to set up defenses so that they do not take advantage of us. But totalitarianism will die of its own false principles, and that storm will pass.

THE INCIDENT OF THE "ROBIN MOOR"

Some groups seek to represent the incident of German sinking of the *Robin Moor* as a casus belli. If that ship had started for a German port with that cargo Britain would have rightly seized her as contraband, according to Britain's own definition of contraband. If British captors could not have taken her to port then, under international law, they would have the right to sink her. There is no freedom of the seas in trading with any belligerent. The difference here is the brutal treatment of the passengers and crew who, although finally saved, were left in jeopardy by the Germans. That was an outrageous violation of international law and humanity. The President is right to protest violently. But an incident of this kind standing alone is not reason for a calm nation to go to war. It can get satisfactions by patience.

MAKING PEACE IN EUROPE

The seventh category of arguments is that we must join in this war to impose permanent peace on the world. Suppose we join the war. Suppose we have victory over Hitler. Suppose we should march down the Unter den Linden. What happens then? It is possible to say right now what would happen.

Within a week after Germany is defeated each 1 of 20 nations in Europe will necessarily declare its national independence. Each one will set up a government of its own. Within another week each will begin to organize an army. They will occupy their utmost boundaries. In order to get revenue and to protect jobs for their own people, each one will again set up their tariff walls. And these nations will at once coagulate into groups and combinations for power politics, intent on increasing their strength at the peace table. There will be reparations and territory to divide.

All this is what happened before the Peace Conference in 1919, and it will automatically happen again. Moreover, many nations will have suffered greatly. Hate and revenge will sit at that peace table again.

No responsible statesman on the Democratic side has yet stated how or by what plan this inevitable result of victory is to be molded into permanent peace. We are asked to go in blind as to the ultimate purpose of this war.

If we stay out and retain our economic and moral resources we will be able to contribute to the rehabilitation of the world, and we may be able to make an affirmative contribution to a method to end war and bring about a better world.

DICTATORSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

And what happens in the United States during and after a war that must take years and years even if it were won? We must at once establish further centralization of authority amounting to practical dictatorship in the United States. We will disguise its name, but total war cannot be won without it. We must bring about unity by force. We must regiment industry and labor. Intellectual life and civil liberty must be shackled to the war machine.

The necessities of war organization require vast taking over and operation of industry by the Government. War organization creates vested personal power, vested economic interests, vested habits, and vested ideas. We have a taste of all this already in organizing preparedness only.

It is easier to regiment a people than to unregiment them. They can be deprived of their liberties by a ukase, a command, or by administrative order. It is a long and painful climb back to freedom. Does any American believe that these vast powers vested in Government will be restored to the people if we join in World War?

When we came out of the last war our national debt was about 10 percent of our national wealth. Instead of that we will have a debt equal to 50 percent of our national wealth if we ever go into this one. The only answer is to inflate wages and prices by huge amounts in order to make it bearable. That would rob every present life-insurance policy, every savings-bank deposit, every college endowment of its buying power. That would be the ruin of the saving classes in the United States. No such event has ever happened in history without moral degeneration and the wreck of the whole form of government.

After this war is over it is certain that the forces pressing for continued economic dictatorship would be stronger than ever.

Lord Lothian in his last impressive address wisely remarked as to the dictatorships in Europe that these world evils "grew out of the despair * * * from long years of war, inflation, * * * unemployment, and frustration." What profit to us is it to destroy totalitarianism abroad and create it at home?

AMERICAN PREPAREDNESS

There is a reason for keeping out of this war that the proponents of war constantly ignore. We are not prepared. A cool-headed people would first prepare themselves before they rush to battle. We do not yet have 50,000 mechanized troops. Our planes could repel attack on this side of the Atlantic, but most of them are obsolete for fighting in Europe. And we would likely be fighting a two-ocean war with a one-ocean navy. Can we not listen to the experience of France and England in launching unprepared war?

The administration of our preparedness program is not yet efficiently organized. Over a year ago I expressed the hope that we start such organization with the experience we had gained in the last war. I recommended that some capable citizen be placed with full responsibility for our whole armament program. That has not yet been done. We are still confused in a mass of committees, boards and commissions.

If anything calls for us to keep out of war now it is just this unpreparedness. And we should arm to the teeth. When we are armed, then the voice of America will be heard, and it will be listened to.

THE SUM OF ALL

Now what sort of conclusions does this all add up to? For the situation as it stands today we should hold to our undertaking to be only the arsenal and engage in no shooting. But watch and arm. The reasons are:

Because we can be of more service to Britain if we stay out of this war.

Because these two continents, the one that Hitler now commands or would even command with Japan in, and the other which the United States possesses, are unable to reach each other's throat—that war can be ended only after long, long years of exhausting strain.

And the end of exhaustion may be compromise peace; it certainly means misery, poverty, frustration, and possibly revolution.

Because the moment we begin shooting in the Atlantic then Japan is under obligation to begin shooting at our interests in the Pacific—if she carries out her contract with Hitler. She cannot win, but it is usual to build up one's reserves before taking on two wars.

Because we cannot impose the four freedoms unless we can win military victory over not only Hitler and Mussolini, but Stalin, Matsuoka, Franco, and several others. Joining in a war alongside Stalin to impose freedom is a travesty.

Because even supposing there were victory over Germany, there is no declared war aim or method that assures the bringing of permanent peace to the hates and diverse interests of Europe.

Because of necessity we shall be compelled to set-up practical dictatorship in America. We shall be compelled to go on with it for years after the war is over. Freedom would return to America, but this generation would not see it again.

Because we are only partly prepared.

Because if we prepare, as we must prepare, there need be no fear in the American heart that the Axis one-and-all will ever conquer this hemisphere. The whole shift in these weapons of war adds to our defensive strength.

A PROGRAM FOR AMERICA NOW

No man can see what the future may bring. Whatever that future may be, only one defeat can come to America. We have no need to fear military defeat if we are prepared. Our only defeat would be if we lost our own national freedoms and our potency for good in the world.

There is no course we can pursue amid these stupendous dangers that is perfect, or without risks, or that may not require change. But let me propose for reasoning people a course for us at this time which avoids the most destructive forces and holds fast to the most constructive forces. And that program is neither defeatist nor isolationist nor interventionist.

1. Give every aid we can to Britain and China, but do not put the American flag or American boys in the zone of war.

2. Arm to the teeth for defense of the Western Hemisphere, and cease to talk and to provoke war until we are armed.

3. Uphold Congress steadily in assuming the responsibility to determine peace or war.

4. Stop this notion of ideological war to impose the "four freedoms" on other nations by military force and against their will.

5. Devote ourselves to improving the four freedoms within our borders, that the light of their success may stir the people of the world to their adoption.

6. We can hope a peace table will assemble some day, whether it be the result of stalemate or victory. The world will be glad to have America sit in at the peace table.

When that day comes the other nations will be sufficiently exhausted to listen to the military, economic, and moral powers of the United States. And with these reserves unexhausted, at that moment, and that moment only, can the United States promote a just and permanent peace.

7. We should go to that peace conference without the hates which come with war. We should go with a plan thought out and matured. We should prepare a new concept of human relations that will give the world some hope of permanent peace.

FINALLY

Here in America today is the only remaining sanctuary of freedom, the last oasis of civilization and the last reserve of moral and economic strength. If we are wise, these values can be made to serve all mankind.

My countrymen, we have marched into the twilight of a world war. Should we not stop here and build our defense while we can still see? Shall we stumble on into the night of chaos?

Bureaucratic Spending Must End If We Are to Have Anything to Defend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in a newspaper release which came across my desk today the Department of Labor Statistics announced that the cost of living has increased 50 percent during the past 12 months. The Department's daily index of 28 basic commodities reached a new high peak on June 27, the release stated.

What does this mean?

It means that the hard-earned income of the wage earners and farmers of America is being depleted, is being rendered less valuable, is being depreciated, if you please, and these wage earners and farmers have no way to protect themselves.

This means, further, that a sort of predatory raid is being made on the pocketbooks of the people that does not have even the questionable merit of the desperate sort of recklessness that characterizes the bandit who sticks a gun in your midriff and takes your purse. The poor people, the wage earner and the farmer, have not the vestige of chance except through this Congress or, through the bureaucrats in the executive branch of the Government, to protect themselves against this sort of thing.

While the cost of living has thus been rising, the airways have come to throb and pulsate with appeals to the people for this, that, and the other so-called defense activity. The people are being beseeched to buy defense bonds. They are being beseeched to "bundle for Britain." They are being beseeched to donate and to buy in every direction—all in the name of national defense.

In addition to practically every known method of taking the dollars from the peoples' pockets, this Congress is now getting ready to pass the most gigantic tax bill that was ever lifted to the shoulders of our overburdened people. We now have the greatest national debt any nation in the world ever staggered under. And we are told by Mr. Stacey May, research director for the Office of Production Management, that besides aiding Great Britain we can expect to spend $40,000,000,000 a year for some years to come if we are to build an adequate defense. No man can even hazard a guess as to what the national debt will be before the present wars are over and our national defense has been built.

It is in view of these multifarious drafts upon the pocketbooks of the people that I was shocked when I read in the Washington Times-Herald of June 29 of a new bureaucratic set-up in connection with our "good neighbor" policy which is going to create 282 new high-priced jobs; which is going to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to print books containing the President's speeches to be given away. Why, Mr. Speaker, if these were the speeches of anybody other than the President, such a project would be characterized by the name of propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read into my remarks at this point the Times-Herald article, written by George D. Riley, showing some of these new high-salaried jobs that are to be passed around like seeds in the field to sprout a new crop of debts to be paid for by the bended backs and the sweating brows of the farmers and wage earners of the Nation. The article is as follows:

NELSON ROCKEFELLER TO BRING LATIN AMERICANS TO TAKE OVER JOBS IN UNITED STATES CITY GOVERNMENTS—282 HIGH-PRICED JOBS TO BE FILLED; MAGAZINES AND BOOKS WILL BE FREE

(By George D. Riley)

Nelson Rockefeller is going to hire an assistant coordinator at $9,000, a liaison officer at $8,000, an executive assistant at $8,000, 2 Latin American consultants at $8,000, and a host of others who will get big pay. In addition he is going to engage 36 $1-a-year men. There will be a total of 282 new jobs.

He will add a director of music at $5,600, a publications section chief at $8,000, a director of public cultural relations division at $8,000. Here are some others:

Director, art section, $6,500; director, education section, $6,500; director, languages, $8,000; director, welfare-health, $6,000; director, communications, $9,000; director, radio section, $9,000; director, movies section, $8,000; director, news section, $8,000; syndicate specialist, $6,500; director, travel section, $6,500; director, sports section, $6,500; director, commercial development section, $8,000; director, special division, $8,000; director, finance division, $7,000; director, natural resources, $7,000; general counsel, $8,000; director, public education division, $8,000; director, projects direction division, $9,000.

And a long list of other titles. The messengers will continue to get $1,080 (4) and $1,200 (6). The secretaries to all these big shots will get only $1,800.

Mr. Rockefeller will spend $195,000 to print 60,000 copies of a book containing the President's speeches. A magazine, 80,000 copies of which will be printed monthly, will be issued. Forty thousand will be circulated free.

Three hundred thousand dollars will be spent to import young men from South America to give them jobs as administrators (Rhodes scholarship level) in the city governments throughout the United States and "other similar agencies." News scribes will be brought in from Latin America and given free tours of the country. Wire services will be subsidized to give free pictures to South America.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Mr. Rockefeller or any of the rest of these bureaucrats ever stopped to figure out how many miles of hot and dusty furrows the farmers of Michigan, Illinois, and Iowa, and the other agricultural sections must plow under the hot summer sun in order to pay these $8,000 and $9,000 salaries, and in order to bring these young men from Central and South America and employ them at the expense of the American people.

I wonder if any of these bureaucrats ever took the trouble to figure out how many bushels of corn, or how many bushels of wheat, or how many pounds of butter, or how many dozens of eggs must be produced in the agricultural sections of the United States to pay $195,000 for 60,000 copies of a book containing the President's speeches?

How many American citizens, I ask, must labor from the early hours of dawn until the last faint hours of twilight on the farms of America to pay $300,000 which is to be spent to import these young men from South America to take nice high-salaried jobs in the various cities of the United States?

A good-neighbor policy is all well enough in its way, but there is no such thing as a good-neighbor policy that requires one neighbor to work hardships and sacrifice on the part of his own family to be a good neighbor to the next family nearest to him. I, for one, am beginning to believe that this so-called good-neighbor policy is being carried over into a system of power politics in the Western Hemisphere that may become as dangerous as power politics have always been on the Continent of Europe. We are training the South and the Central American peoples to depend upon us for loans, for military protection, for markets, for everything that somebody in the State Department or in some other bureau of the executive branch conjures up as a possible bait that might be extended to these countries by Hitler or Stalin or Mussolini. I believe that these South and Central American statesmen are just as enlightened concerning the interests of their own nations as we are. We do not have to coddle them like new-born infants in order to win their loyalty and cooperation. They know just as well as we do that their only hope for continued independence lies in their strong neighbor to the North. They know just as well as we do that unless we do protect them, and unless they do cooperate with us, Mr. Hitler or Mr. Stalin will overrun them and reduce them to a state of slavery with no more compunction than they could expect from a rampaging herd of mad elephants.

There is something very subtle and very dangerous about this business of playing Lord Bountiful to other countries and other peoples. It is all very pleasant to be able to hand out millions to other countries and to receive the adulation, and the decorations, and the banqueting, and feasts, all of those pleasant things that come to a Lord Bountiful. It is easy, indeed, for these bureaucrats in Washington to play the Lord Bountiful to all these other countries; but I want to say right here that it is not easy for the wage earners and the farmers to toil and sweat and sacrifice to pay the enormous costs of this Lord Bountiful policy.

Now, I am calling attention to this situation at this time because this is just one of numerous bureaus and departments and boards and commissions that are ladling out the American people's money by the barrel. They act as though they believe—and in some cases I think they do believe—the pool of public credit is an inexhaustible reservoir from which can be drawn off, without end and without stint, a flood of money to be handed out to any and every country in the world that the President or some of his advisers may decide could use a few hundred million dollars.

We all know the bureaucrats who devised these schemes of spending the public's funds to create highly paid occupations for themselves cannot be expected to end these extravagant and insane methods of spending money. They cannot be expected ever to even want to end the waste of the public funds because bureaucracy thrives and stays in power by wasting the public funds.

This Congress must call a halt on this sort of thing. I believe it far past the time when the American people should have been told what is happening here in Washington and out over the United States, where bureau is piled upon bureau; where department literally elbows department; where board crowds board in the buildings of the Capital; where commission treads upon the heels of commission; where all of these agencies are multiplied and multiplied again in order to spend the taxpayers' money and to keep the farmers and wage earners of this Nation working for the rest of their lives, and to keep their children, and their children's children working to pay these debts so lightly created by these political Lord Bountifuls.

It may be of interest to the hard-working artisans and farmers of America to know that in this great city of Washington the Federal Government faces a shortage of office space at the beginning of the fiscal year of 1942. The swift expansion of all of these spending agencies has taken up every foot of available space in the Nation's Capital. We now know, by reason of information revealed in the second deficiency appropriation bill, that Uncle Sam will need 2,790,000 square feet of office space in addition to the 22,794,904 square feet already occupied in Washington. This will make a total of 25,584,804 square feet of floor space occupied. Every farmer knows what this means when it is pointed out to him that this equals 587⅓ acres of land, crowded, desk to desk, file case to file case, executive to executive, stenographer to stenographer, clerk to clerk, with these spending agencies, each one of which considers its function to be to spend all that it can get Congress to appropriate, rather than to try to save.

The trouble with this whole situation, Mr. Speaker, is that the bureaucracy that has grown up in Washington in the last 9 years is hell bent for spending the people's money because they themselves, with their fancy salaries in the upper brackets, consider spending to be their job.

It is time, if we are to avoid inflation and repudiation and utter economic chaos in this country, for Congress to take some account of these enormous, these inconceivable sums of money that are being so blithely spent but which must be so laboriously repaid by the taxpayers of this country.

Let no man fool himself. The cost of all these follies and extravagances and wastes will be paid by the poor people of this country, not by the rich people. Let me point out to my colleagues in this House, that if we confiscated every dime of all income of $5,000 a year up, the Government would not get enough revenue to pay by approximately $2,000,000,000 the nondefense expenditures for the year of 1941.

This Congress must bear the responsibility for the ruin which inevitably must follow such a headlong, reckless course of spending such as we are now embarked upon. There is not a vestige of excuse, there is not a shadow of justification for saying that because we contemplate war and because we are building a national defense, that we must abandon efficiency and economy. To the contrary, every tenet of justice, of good government, of sound finance, of patriotism, of good sense, tells us that we should achieve the greatest possible economy and efficiency in both our defense and nondefense expenditures. In Heaven's name, Mr. Speaker, what will we accomplish if we completely wreck and ruin this Nation, destroy our economy and our form of government by waste and inefficiency and corruption in trying to build a defense? What will there be left to defend if we keep spending at this rate?

We must awaken to this danger. We must stop waste. We must compel efficiency, and if we do not do it and do it soon, it will not be "God bless America," it will be God help America!

Refugee Children in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just had an experience that affected me most profoundly. Indeed, as I pen these words it is difficult for me to see to write.

For the past half hour I have listened over the radio to an exchange of greetings between refugee children in America and their parents in Britain—a program that stirred me to the innermost depths of my soul. As I listened to the eager and excited voices of the little kiddies, and to the restrained but loving and brave responses of the parents, a melancholy

came over me that brought tears to my eyes and dimmed the bright sunshine that came through the windows. Yea, it seemed that even the joyous songs of the birds out of doors were hushed.

All were brave, although I could detect a tenseness, an anxiety on the part of the parents, more especially the mothers. That is understandable, coming from those who had entered the valley of death to bring forth their loved ones.

As I sit in my office in Washington this peaceful Sunday afternoon it is difficult for me to realize that 3,000 miles away men are slaughtering each other and laying waste cities and hamlets, not because they hate each other—

Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die.

They are killing and destroying because their leaders have been stupid, blind, and selfish. Unfortunately, it is the inarticulate masses that must pay the price of their leaders' incredible follies.

"But what good came of it at last?"
Quoth little Peterkin.
"Why, that I cannot tell," said he;
"But 'twas a famous victory."

The thousands of refugee children in America, and in many parts of Europe, are innocent victims of a heartbreaking tragedy that has no parallel in modern times. They have been exiled from their homes to live in strange places and among kind-hearted strangers that they may be spared the harrowing experiences their parents are nightly undergoing; that their young lives might be preserved—preserved for what? That they may some day reenact the tragic and cruel roles that their fathers, uncles, older brothers and cousins are daily compelled to enact? God forbid.

The masses in all countries ask but to be permitted to live their lives in peace, to raise their offspring to become useful members of society. They are not concerned with lust of empire nor ambitions of politicians. One and all wholeheartedly abhor war with its bloodshed and destruction and misery, and if they could be heard in the councils of the chancelleries their vote would be for peace, and to outlaw war. It is they who must do the fighting and dying; it is they who must pay the cost in blood, in treasure, in suffering. It is anomalous that the masses are deprived of all voice when the time comes to cast the die for peace or war, yet it is so.

Happily, it will not always be thus. Some day the great body of common folks, like you and me, will demand a seat at the council table when the fate of millions is being decided. When that happy day comes the spears will be beaten into pruning hooks.

Control of government must be wrested from the hands of selfish, cruel, and lustful megalomaniacs who can see no farther ahead than the tip of their nose, and whose sole concern is self. Their day is drawing to its close. Then it will no longer be necessary to separate mothers and fathers from their loved offspring at a time when the little ones most need the loving and wise ministrations of the home to guide and direct their young and plastic minds.

I am but a humble being, by the grace of God an American citizen, but I would not change places with any of the war lords of Europe or Asia, whose hands reek with human blood. They have destroyed what it has taken centuries to build, and have sold unborn generations into bondage of debt and disease. Their names will go down in history with the barbarian conquerers of the Dark Ages; their souls will know no peace. An eternity of contrition cannot wash their sins away. They have left an indelible stain on the pages of history; they have caused suffering and misery that mere words cannot portray.

And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea.

Alonzo Dillard Folger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. KERR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake to fully review the life of my distinguished friend, Hon. ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, whose tragic death removed from this body and deprived the State of North Carolina and this Nation of a matchless service and an example of unselfish devotion to his State and Nation measured by his great intellect and his rare ability to grip the love and inspire the confidence of his fellow man. When Mr. FOLGER died the State of North Carolina lowered its majestic head in deep supplication and sorrow. From the mountains of this great commonwealth to its sand dune shores upon which beats the turbulent Atlantic every human soul who knew this public servant experienced and expressed a deep sense of sorrow.

It is fortunate for any man to be born in or at the foothills of the beautiful Blue Ridge Mountains. These mountains are nature's contribution to earth's beauty and glory and it appears that the Master of Art left out nothing when he created these sublime scenes. The panorama of these mountains will ever draw men to God and inspire man to attain those noble attributes which the Master of Men commanded when He walked this earth.

Born in or near these mountains were many men whose lives and service adorn the history of this Nation and the memory of these men will be cherished with pride inexpressible as long as this Republic survives. It was in this section that Andrew Jackson, Zeb Vance, Thomas L. Clingman, General Hoke, Daniel Boone, Thomas H. Benton, Thomas Ruffin, Richmond Pierson, and many others first saw the light of day and nurtured inpirations which lead them to unselfish service and proud achievements. The subject of this tribute, LON FOLGER, was born in that section of North Carolina which contributed a long list of noble men and women to this Nation, a few of whom I have just mentioned. His ancestors were among those Scotch-Irish patriots from Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia who destroyed the mighty British Army of Lord Cornwallis when he endeavored to subjugate the southern colonies and make secure the conquest of all the American colonies. Our deceased colleague was a fine lawyer, a good judge, a superb political organizer, a faithful trustee of the great University of North Carolina and a public servant whose life and acts were so upright that he was universally beloved by all who knew him and honored as few have been in our State in this generation. I asked his distinguished brother and successor here what was the noblest characteristic possessed by our deceased colleague; his answer was the answer I knew he would make to me, and the answer all others who knew him would have made; it was "his unselfish love for his fellow man and the sacrifice he readily made for those who needed his help and comfort."

The Saviour of man gave one commandment to those who would live after Him—this was the dying declaration made on Calvary, and on that tragic occasion He said to His faithful followers: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another; as I have loved you, that you also love one another," and then went away to His death and destiny.

LON FOLGER loved his fellow man. This was the touchstone of his life, the secret of his power and influence, and 5,000 friends came to look on his casket and pay a last tribute to their friend, and 5 times 5,000 were saddened as his spirit went to "that City which has foundations whose maker and builder is God."

He was buried in the sight of these mountains which gave to him the happy dreams of his boyhood and inspired his ambition, his love, his joy, and delight which neither gold nor power could buy. If you should analyze the character of Mr. FOLGER or most men who are loved by their fellow man, you will find that it is made up of the simple virtues of life; happiness, friendliness, patience, self-denial, industry, and charity. It is said of Abraham Lincoln that his simplicity was his chief charm. Everybody that knew him felt that he was a real man, a large-hearted, generous friends, always ready to help everybody out of trouble. He never covered up anything; never had secrets; the door of his life was always open so that any man could read his utmost thoughts. Theodore Roosevelt once said in a speech that he delivered to the people of Colorado:

If when I die the ones who knew me best believe that I was a thoughtful, helpful husband; a loving, wise, and painstaking father; a generous, kindly neighbor, and an honest citizen; that will be a far more real honor, and will prove my life to have been more successful than the fact that I have ever been President of the United States. Had a few events over which no one had control been other than they were, it is quite possible that I may have never held the high

office that I now occupy, but no train of events could accidentally make me a noble character or a faithful member of my home and community.

LON FOLGER was a noble character and a faithful member of his home and community. He was true to every obligation he undertook in this life and everyone who knew him knew this. His simple virtues endeared him to all and his reputation was coextensive with the boundary of the great State in which he was born and died. He was Nature's nobleman, a friend of man, and obeyed without equivocation the only commandment our Savior ever gave to this world. No verse was ever more adequate as a tribute to the life of LON FOLGER than those beautiful lines of Leigh Hunt entitled "Abou Ben Adhem and the Angel":

Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase)!
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace
And saw, within the twilight in the room,
Making it rich like a lily in bloom,
An angel writing in a book of gold.
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
And to the presence in the room he said,
"What writest thou?" The vision raised its head,
And with a look made of all sweet accord
Answered, "The names of those who love the Lord."
"And is mine one?" said Abou. "Nay, not so,"
Replied the angel. Abou spoke more low,
But cheerily still, and said, "I pray thee then,
Write me as one who loves his fellow men."
The angel wrote and vanished. The next night
It came again with a great wakening light,
And showed the names whom love of God had blest;
And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest!

America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the wonderful address given by that fearless and unambitious American, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, in the Hollywood Bowl on June 20 to a crowd that overflowed to high up on the mountainside. This modest hero has an infinity written on his brow and has a majority of our people with him.

We who oppose America's entrance into this war have one great advantage over the interventionists. We will be successful if we can bring the true facts and issues of the war clearly before the people of our country. They can be successful only by confusing our people in regard to these facts and issues. We fight with the blade of truth as our greatest weapon. They use the bludgeon of propaganda. We ask you to study our statements since this war began. They dare not ask you to study theirs. Time lies with us, for knowledge cannot be permanently suppressed, and every fact that is learned sharpens our weapon.

Possibly the most ominous and deplorable development of the war, as far as the United States is concerned, has been the deliberate attempt to misinform and confuse our people. Some day, in the not distant future, the men who are responsible for this will be called to account by an aroused and enlightened nation. The attempt to involve our country in war by subterfuge and propaganda is not a crime to be passed over lightly. Public opinion will bring the charges, and history will be the judge.

But there is time for that in the future.

Now we have a more important mission to accomplish. Our first mission is to stay out of this war, and all of our effort, for the present, must be directed toward that objective. After the war is over, we can turn to reforms. Reforms must come, but they must come with tolerance and not with war.

Tonight I shall try to cut through some of the propaganda and misinformation which has entangled public thinking in recent months. It is impossible to cover everything in a single address, so I shall hold my discussion primarily to two of the greatest fallacies which have been advanced by the groups who want to get us into war. They claim, first, that the developments of modern warfare make this country more vulnerable to foreign invasion than before, and, second, that the best way to defend America is by defending England. I will try to show you conclusively tonight why these claims are false, and why the exact opposite is true. The fact is that the developments of modern warfare make America less vulnerable to invasion than we have ever been in the past. The fact is that the surest way for us to lose a war is by trying to defend England or any other part of Europe.

A general principle cannot be laid down, the importance of which I cannot overemphasize. Our entire national policy should be wound around it. It is that while the developments of modern warfare have increased the vulnerability of nations within a hemisphere to each other, they have decreased the ability of one hemisphere to attack the other successfully. For instance, the development of aviation made France and England much more vulnerable to Germany than they were before. But aviation makes it more difficult for Europe to attack America, or for America to attack Europe, than it has ever been in the past.

The interventionists have been telling you that aircraft have removed the safety we once had in our isolated geographical position—that the barriers of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans no longer exist. But just the opposite is true. Aircraft alone could not carry more than a small fraction of an army large enough to invade America. They could not begin to carry the supplies for such an army. An invading army would still have to come to America by sea, and aircraft make a sea invasion more difficult than it has ever been before. In fact, the edevelopments of this war indicate that aircraft may make it impossible for an enemy force to land on our American coast, regardless of how strong that force may be.

It has been shown time and time again that warships suffer heavy losses whenever they come within striking distance of enemy aviation. The British Navy was unable to remain in the Skagerrak under the bombs of German aircraft. It was forced to retire from the coast of Norway. It could not withstand the attack of the dive bombers at Sicily. It had heavy losses in the Aegean during the campaigns of Greece and Crete. Additional instances of the effect of air upon sea power were given in the British attacks on the Italian fleet and in the location and disabling of the German battleship *Bismarck*. But possibly the most significant of all is the fact that neither the Germans nor the British have attempted to land forces by sea on any coast adequately protected by air.

When we analyze the situation carefully, we find that nearly all of the developments of modern warfare would be to our advantage in the defense of America, and to the disadvantage of any foreign enemy attempting to attack us. This is obvious if you stop to realize that an enemy would still have to come by sea, and that ships have changed very little in recent years. Their speed is not much different today than it was in the last war. We would have plenty of warning of the approach of a hostile fleet, and—here is the significant point—almost all the developments of modern warfare that our enemy was bringing would be safely boxed up in the holds of his ships. Aside from the relatively small number of planes he could release from aircraft carriers, and possibly a few long-range bombers, his modern equipment would be useless unless he could actually unload it and assemble it on our shores. But while our enemy was still in midocean on board his ships, we could concentrate our air force, our coast artillery, our tanks, and our mechanized divisions with a speed and effectiveness that has never been known in the past. The advantages of modern warfare would be ours, not his.

I ask you to visualize an enemy convoy headed toward America, a thousand miles off our coast. The picture is not a great deal different than it would have been 25 years ago. The battleships would be a little larger, and there would be a number of aircraft carriers; but otherwise the convoys of today have not changed much in appearance from convoys of the last war.

Next, I ask you to visualize the preparations in America for the reception of that convoy. Our sky would be full of long-range bombers. Our concrete highways would be lined with tanks and mechanized divisions. Reconnaissance planes would keep us informed by radio of our enemy's exact position. About the only thing that would appear the same as in the past would be our Navy steaming out to sea. And like the enemy, it, too, would have aircraft carriers and larger battleships.

With these pictures in mind, you can see why I say that the developments of modern warfare are to our advantage in defending America, and not to an enemy's advantage in attacking us; you can see why it is more difficult than ever before for the armies of one hemisphere to attack the other hemisphere successfully. You can see clearly how false and misleading the interventionists' claims have been. Even if the British Fleet itself should turn again us, we will still be able to defend ourselves. That fleet would be no more able to meet the challenge of air powers in America than it has been able to meet the challenge of air power in Europe. Aviation, if we use it intelligently, will make American shores impregnable to attack.

Now, let us turn to the interventionists' second claim. They say that the best way to defend America is to defend England. But when you pin them down by asking what the defense of England means, they tell you that in order to defend England we must crush Germany and restore all the territory Germany has occupied since the war began. If you ask them whether we must also restore the territory occupied by Russia and Japan, they usually look the other way and make some vague statement about supporting the four freedoms throughout the world. And if you ask exactly how all this is to be done, you seldom get any reply at all. I have yet to hear anyone who advocates our entry into this war outline intelligently where we would attack or how we could win. They simply shout "fight," and usually they are not the people who would do the fighting.

To understand why the best way to defend America is not by defending England, it is necessary to study Europe and the position in which England finds herself in this modern

era. Of all the nations in the world, England is probably the most adversely affected by the developments of modern warfare. This the interventionists do not tell you, but it becomes obvious when you stop to realize that English life, strength, and Empire have been built upon control of the seas. In generations past, Englishmen could live in security on their islands as long as they maintained the strongest navy in the world. But the submarine and the airplane have broken that security. It is no longer enough to control the surface of the sea, and it is no longer possible to control it within effective bombing range of enemy aircraft. For the first time in history England cannot protect her shores with her navy. For the first time her cities and her industries can be attacked regardless of how many battleships she has.

The geographical advantage of the British Isles in an age of ships does not exist in an age of aircraft. England is actually at a disadvantage from the standpoint of aviation. The area, the terrains, and the climatic conditions of Great Britain are not advantageous for flying. Enemy air bases on the continent of Europe curve around her in almost a semicircle. No matter how many fighting planes we build in America and send to England, it is not possible to base enough squadrons in the British Isles to equal in striking power the squadrons that Germany can base on the continent of Europe. English cities and industrial areas are within easy range of enemy bombers, while British bombers must fly much farther to reach similar enemy objectives. Fuel, food, and other supplies must be taken to England by sea, in ships which can be bombed and torpedoed by her enemy. I repeat again that the very developments of modern warfare which have strengthened the position of America have greatly weakened the position of England, and I challenge anyone to prove otherwise.

Now, let us consider what we in America would have to do in order to defend England. As I have said, the interventionists admit that by the defense of England they really mean the defeat of Germany. England herself has so far refused to reconsider the terms on which she declared war, and since they involve the restoration of Poland, it might be necessary for us to defeat Russia as well as Germany if we enter this war. But there are still more complications. We find that Spain is friendly to Germany, and that France has come to an agreement with the Axis. Even Japan has formed a military alliance with the Axis Powers. So when we translate the English of the interventionists into plain American language, we find that what we are really being told is that the best way to defend America is by attacking the rest of the world—by sending our soldiers cross the Atlantic Ocean and across the Pacific Ocean, to overcome the armies of Germany, Italy, Japan, and possibly Russia, France, and Spain as well.

Now, suppose we are foolish enough to attempt this. Let us see what we must do. If we enter war, we must be prepared for all eventualities. We must be prepared to fight Japan in the Pacific at the same time that we are convoying our troops and supplies across the Atlantic. And since the allied armies no longer hold any territory on the continent of Europe, we must be prepared to force a landing on a hostile coast against the same German Army and air force that broke the Maginot Line and routed the British Navy whenever it came within bombing range of their bases.

We would have the same problem in attacking Europe that European armies would have in attacking us. But in that case it would be our problem to transport our Armies on ships, and try to land on their shores under the bombardment of their aircraft, the torpedoing of their submarines, and the fire of their coast artillery and mechanized divisions. Yet the interventionists tell you that the best way to defend America is by defending England.

Let us face the true facts as they appear before us in plain American wording.

First. We are still unprepared for war, and it would take us years to prepare adequately for the type of war we now consider entering. It would mean turning this country into a military nation that exceeds Germany in regimentation. Life as we know it today would be a thing of the past.

Second. Even if we were fully prepared at this time, we would face the superhuman task of crossing an ocean and forcing a landing on a fortified continent against armies stronger than our own and hardened by years of war. It would probably mean the loss of millions of American lives.

Third. We in America have the best defensive position in the world. No foreign power can invade us today, and with reasonable preparation on our part, no combination of foreign powers will ever be able to invade us Since they cannot invade, it will be only a question of time before they desire to trade with us. And I have full confidence in American ability to hold its own in a trade.

Men and women of California, I have tried to show you tonight why we can defend America, and why it is difficult, if not impossible for us to wage war in Europe successfully. I would like to leave with you one more thought, and that is what we are doing to Europe by encouraging and prolonging this war. England and France were never in a position to win this war. Those who urged them to declare war were not true friends. They have pushed two great nations to disaster. Those who urge that the war be continued are pushing all Europe into chaos. I have said since war was declared, and I say again, that with every month that passes, England will be in a worse position to negotiate peace terms than she was before. With every month her suffering and her hardships will increase. But suppose I am wrong. Suppose we in America throw all of our people, and all of our resources—throw the entire future of this country into the greatest war of history. Suppose that by some miracle of fate, after 10 or 20 or 30 years of struggle, after losing many millions of lives, that we were at last able to bring Germany to her knees in the midst of a devastated, starved, and prostrate Europe, what would we have gained? What would be the result for England, for France, for ourselves, except the downfall of all European civilization, and the establishment of conditions in our own country far worse even than those in Germany today? Who would be the winner of such a war except Russia and Japan?

I ask you to face the facts of war as they are, to consider them carefully, and then to put your support behind a negotiated peace in Europe. I ask you to consider the alternatives to a negotiated peace, and see if they are not worse. The alternatives to a negotiated peace is either a Hitler victory or a prostrate Europe, and possibly a prostrate America as well. I tell you that the only way our American life and ideals can be preserved is by staying out of this war. I tell you that the only way European civilization can be saved is by ending it quickly. If anyone tries to tell you otherwise, make them outline clearly their alternative. Make them tell you not what they think should be done, not what they wish could be done, but exactly how this Nation is going to accomplish what they advocate. Make them tell you how many ships and how many men their policy will require; how many dead and how many wounded our country will suffer; how many years of war we must go through. After that, the decision is up to you as the free citizens of the greatest democracy left on earth. As I said at the beginning of my address, we who oppose this war ask only that the true facts and issues be placed openly before the American people. This is a democratic country. Its direction is in your hands not in the hands of any one leader or group of leaders. Your leaders are not elected—as in the totalitarian states—to dictate to you. They are elected to represent you. You have the right as a free people to demand that representation. It is your right and your duty to decide the direction your country takes—to peace or to war. Your decision is final, and in your decision we have confidence. All we ask is that you be given the truth with which to judge, and the opportunity of expressing your opinion.

Interests Opposed to St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DULUTH (MINN.) NEWS-TRIBUNE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, hearings are now in progress before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House in connection with H. R. 4927. This is the legislation introduced in the House for the purpose of ratifying the agreement for completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project recently made between officials of Canada and the United States. It is interesting to note that the eastern railroads are actively opposing this legislation. An editorial in the Duluth News-Tribune for June 24, 1941, in discussing this situation is very interesting. It is as follows:

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune of June 24, 1941]

THE SEAWAY AND THE RAILROADS

From the National Seaway Council comes a leaflet discussing the attempt of the eastern railroads to make it appear that the St. Lawrence waterway would be a threat to all the railroads of this country.

The seaway council shows, to begin with, that the western railroads would benefit immensely by hauling seaway-shipped goods to and from the ports of the Great Lakes. On top of that the lowered shipping costs would contribute to the growth of Midwest industry, and as these industries grew, railroad business in this part of the country would increase, too.

Then it shows that the maximum possible tonnage moved over the seaway could not exceed 11,500,000,000 ton-miles, or about 3.4 percent of the entire railroad tonnage moved in this country. Since there will probably be nowhere near this tonnage on the seaway, and since all of the tonnage there would not come from the railroads, much of it being new, seaway-created business, the injury the eastern roads would suffer would be comparatively slight—perhaps none at all if they were alert enough to get their share of the fast freight business which the development of Midwest industry would create.

As to the savings and benefits of water transportation, the seaway council finds an example in the ore movement from the

Mesaba Range to Pittsburgh. Of transportation charges of $3,265 a gross ton, the railroads at both ends of the haul get $2.075, and the railroad-owned docks $0.39. The water carriers get $0.80 for 815 miles of haul.

In an earlier, free day, Midwest railroad men spoke strongly in favor of the waterway. The figures make it clear that they would be doing so today if eastern control of these railroads did not prevent them from doing so.

Courts Recognize Necessity of the Automobile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

NEWS RELEASE OF THE NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a release of the National Automobile Dealers Association, an article setting forth the fact that court decisions have fixed the status of the automobile in the Nation's economy as a necessity, which once was considered a luxury.

The news release follows:

COURTS RECOGNIZE NECESSITY OF THE AUTOMOBILE

Court decisions generally fix the status of controversial subjects and one of these has been the controversy over the status of the automobile in the Nation's economy, the National Automobile Dealers Association points out in the ninth study of its series to acquaint the public with the function of the automobile in national defense.

The study quotes the case of Nelsen against Tilly, December 20, 1939, in which the Supreme Court of Nebraska held that "it cannot be seriously disputed that the motor-vehicle industry has grown to huge proportions in both the State and Nation. Motor vehicles, once luxuries, are now necessities."

In commenting, National Automobile Dealers Association says, "The more than 40,000,000 drivers in this country will heartily agree with that decision. The truth of it has been brought home to most of them whenever their cars have been laid up temporarily for repairs. Ask any service manager and he will tell you how urgent each repair job is that comes into his shop, how impatient the owner is about getting his car back in good running order, and how often he has requests for loaners if a customer's car is to be tied up for a day or so.

"For further convincing evidence, ask any of the many thousand industrial workers who have no other way of reaching their jobs, or, if they have, are forced to lose precious time in walking, making connections, and transferring. Note the jammed parking lots surrounding factories. Watch the streaming traffic into and out of business districts each morning and evening. Without going further, try to imagine the inconvenience that would be caused by unnecessary restriction on the availability of private motor vehicles—the loss of personal efficiency. It is hard to think of anything that would so upset our whole mode of living.

"In England, at the outbreak of the war, the notion still persisted that the private passenger car was a semiluxury. So they put their cars in storage. Then, under the disorganizing effect of air raids, mass transportation was slowed down and crippled, with serious effects on the efficiency of thousands of workers.

"The British soon discovered that their private cars had become a necessity. Through Government encouragement, automobiles were brought back into use, lapsed licenses renewed, and a plan launched whereby motorists who agreed to carry a certain number of passengers to and from work were given a large increase in the gasoline allowance.

"So, in the United Kingdom, where car ownership is only 1 to 19 persons, the private passenger car had made the transition from semiluxury to necessity without the British realizing it. In the United States our dependence upon private transportation is much greater. Ownership is 1 car to every 5 persons."

Dedication of Post Office at Clyde, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the dedication of the post office at Clyde, N. Y., on June 28, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is refreshing to get away from the Capitol and to be here with you today. I am honored to have a part in the dedication of this handsome Federal building. Its modern facilities will be enjoyed by all of the citizens of Clyde and of the surrounding neighborhood.

This month the Clyde Post Office observed its one hundred and twenty-first birthday. That takes this office back to 1820, 9 years before the name "Clyde" was designated for this community. It had formerly been known as Galen, then a part of Seneca County.

What vast progressive steps have been taken since those early days!

This new Post Office Building which we dedicate today is, in itself, an evidence of Clyde's forward progress. You will agree, I know, that this is an edifice in which the community may take deep civic pride. It cost over $44,000 to construct this building, but it has been an investment in efficiency, culture, and civic betterment which will, in the end, pay rich dividends.

You have here an attractive public building of colonial design constructed with superb workmanship and equipped with up-to-date appurtenances and conveniences. You are going to enjoy this building and you are going to point to it as a useful and aesthetic contribution to your community.

While this building is laid on a strong, material foundation, its real foundation is in your hearts. You made this building possible. It was built by virtue of your patronage, your cooperation, your ideals. This is, indeed, your building. Its doors are open to you. Its purpose is to provide you a better postal service. Soon it will become as familiar and as welcome to you as an old friend.

I need not tell you that the Post Office Department conducts the largest single business in all the world. It grew out of a postal system established by the American Colonies prior to the War for Independence. Benjamin Franklin served as our country's first Postmaster General. He first served under the British Crown and later under the Continental Congress. He laid the foundation for this great service of government which was to expand through the years as new Territories and new States were pioneered and settled.

The Post Office Department has kept apace with advancements in industry and science. Today the United States mails speed across the continent, fly across the skies, and sail across the seas by almost every known means of communication.

By train, plane, automobile, ship, horse, motorcycle, subway—by dog sled, skiis, and snowshoes—by foot and bicycle—rapid and efficient delivery of the mail has become an accepted and commonplace fact.

We enjoy this best of all postal services at low rates of postage, and we place complete confidence and trust in the sanctity, secrecy, and certainty of the mails.

Today, in a world that is ablaze with chaos and warfare—in a world that seems to offer little of security, stability, or sanity—we can, as Americans, view practical accomplishments like this building in the light of human progress. It represents a material translation of that symbolic quality that we call Americanism.

Its foundations are laid in the free soil of the Republic; its superstructure reflects the dignity and prestige of our democracy.

History may record that these days through which we are now living are among the saddest the world has yet endured. History may also record that America stood by her historic principles heroically and stemmed the tide of world domination by despots who sought to subjugate the human race. We hope, we pray, that history will record our current efforts as an unexcelled defense of human liberty.

We will surely be judged through future generations by the effectiveness and the justice of the course we now pursue. More and more it becomes evident that we hold in our hands the destiny of free men.

The world is a flaming sphere of death and destruction. We witness the spreading aggression in the Orient, the ceaseless attack on Britain, the sharp clashes in Africa, the new and bloody war in Russia, the attack in the Near East, the Battle of the Atlantic. The contagion of warfare is on our every side. The Western Hemisphere stands as a great bulwark of freedom in a world blacked out by this spreading holocaust.

Our task in this crisis which engulfs the world and blankets civilization, even in the most remote recesses of the globe, challenges the effectiveness and the vitality of democratic Government. This new world—this dynamic, imaginative, and productive land of hope and opportunity—was pioneered and built up by men and women who possessed a passionate devotion for the cause of individual liberty. We became a great melting pot into which poured the oppressed and the persecuted and the desperate and lonely of all the nations of the world. This hodgepodge of nationalities—this incredible collection of soulful but oppressed peoples—this awkward combination of many tongues and many colors and many creeds—some way, with the help of Providence and with an inspired determination, bound themselves together in a monumental effort to build a

new world which would be strong and enduring because it was free.

Yes, this Western Hemisphere is the miracle of civilization. It breathes and progresses by sheer will power, driven ever forward by the dynamic force of independent self-governing, God-fearing, peace-loving citizens.

This is the world in which we are favored to live. This is the system that is our heritage. This is the existence that is ours to protect, to preserve, and to defend.

Today, let no one tell you otherwise, there are calculating madmen loose in the world who covet our success, our resources, and our wealth. These are tyrants who succeed only with the instruments of force and treachery. Their promises are worthless; their motives are despicable; their ambitions are brutal.

The mechanized might of their military machine has rolled over virtually all of Europe. It has crushed to earth the wealth and liberties and aspirations of millions of defenseless and peace-loving people. Nation after nation has been betrayed, invaded, conquered, occupied, and subjugated. The list of victim nations is a lengthening role of Axis dishonor. Today, these gangster rulers of Europe fight among themselves for the spoils of military conquest. But the only encouragement we can expect from that carnal campaign is the knowledge that we have just a little more time to prepare our own defenses and to strengthen our own arms of resistance.

We have determined that the only manner in which force can be repelled is by the provision of an equally irresistible force. We are providing that defense and, when we have completed our program, we will be a nation strong enough to meet any invasion even from the strongest aggressor, or combination of aggressors.

America has been engaged in an exhaustive and prolonged national debate on our role in this world upheaval. The debate has been conducted in almost every home, in our newspapers, on the radio, in our great public forums, and in our legislative chambers. Out of this discussion has come a solidified public policy. This country has decided that there is only one course it can honorably pursue, and that is to strengthen our own defenses and to lend every possible measure of assistance to those democracies who fight our common cause, to those who resist with inspired heroism and with an unshakable devotion to human liberty, the attacking Axis Powers.

Adolf Hitler can now well see that his fiendish ambitions have been challenged and he must know from a standpoint of realism that in the end despotism can never triumph over democracy.

But let us not for one instant tolerate overconfidence or a spirit of false optimism with respect to the magnitude of our efforts. We have new and graver responsibilities, more burdensome and less pleasant tasks, and increased and unhappy sacrifices directly ahead. To meet these new requirements we need a new and bolstered morale, a new and inspired spiritual and moral rearmament. We need an unassailable unity; a unity of purpose, effort, and production; a unity that encompasses 130,000,000 Americans is our need.

To the successful completion of this all-out program of production we must unstintingly pledge our wholehearted and uncompromising cooperation. We need more ships, more planes, more tanks, more guns, more instruments of defense and preparedness. We need more pilots, more technicians, more skilled workers. In a word, we need more production, more training, and even more cooperation.

This does not in any way reflect on the masterful beginning which we have already made, but it indicates the route we must follow if we are to effectually satisfy the demand for an invulnerable defense. In this unity which we must achieve to a greater and greater degree, we can tolerate no half-hearted, halfway measures. Neither can we afford to tolerate and to harbor those who are within our shores for the avowed purpose of weakening our united effort.

The "fifth columnists," the Communists, the bundists, the saboteur, the traitor, and the spy are the mortal enemies of America. Every success that they achieve is a victory for the aggressors. We will stamp them out wherever we find them. We will make this an unwelcome place for them and for their sympathizers.

Furthermore, we will reject the advice and the counsel of those who would confuse and mislead and divide our people. We will permit no petty grievances, no paltry partisanship, no fatalistic policy of appeasement to divert us from this declared objective to preserve the American system. No desire for selfish reward will tempt us to impede the progress of our national program. Strikes and lockouts in defense industries will yield to the democratic processes of arbitration. These things must happen and these domestic victories must be won. To fail in any respect will threaten our national effort.

This Republic requires a complete unanimity of effort on the part of all sections, classes, races, religions, and political parties. It requires speed and more speed, courage and energy, faith and cooperation. It requires a solid phalanx of all of our citizens in support of the leadership of our President and of our elected and chosen officials.

I cannot too strongly impress upon you what I consider to be the acuteness of our circumstances today. I cannot too fervently plead with you to lay aside every other consideration in the performance of this momentous task.

I cannot too earnestly appeal for your cooperation. I realize that my attitude may not agree with yours in every details, and I realize that there are trivial disagreements among us with respect to some details of this great program, but in the over-all effort we must be in agreement.

An appreciable division among our people in this grave hour would be an appalling calamity in this land made safe and free by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Such a division would be an open invitation to those abroad who hope they can weaken us by such a division.

Every time we falter and every time we take serious issue with our leadership, we play into the hands of the Axis program. And so, the demand for our unified effort is indispensable.

Our devotions must be to God and country. We hope that the pathetic and chaotic circumstances of the world today may, by some stroke of fortune, dissipate and that, at an early date, the clouds of war and hate and aggression may disperse. We hope that the sun may shine again upon a world at peace, for that is the kind of a world that meets our aspirations.

But we will not let our love for peace, nor our reluctance to question the motives of others, nor our tolerance of the weakness of others, to thwart or dim or impede this fateful program of aid and defense into which we have been unhappily forced.

We hate this business of war, and we despise those who insist that there is no other recourse to the settlement of international disputes than that of military conflict. We abhor and shudder at the ruthless bombings of civilian populations. Our hearts are filled with sympathy at the plight of women and children, starving and dying across the seas. We can see no justification for these unspeakable atrocities. We hold the Axis leadership responsible. We are determined that we shall not send our young men into the holocaust abroad where the diving Stukas and the armored might of the Panzer divisions reduce human life to a paltry consideration.

We want none of that horrible experience. We will, however, protect the Western Hemisphere from the "isms" that poison the Old World. We will resist every step that is taken to menace these shores. We will not bow to the dictates of any tyrant, nor will we sacrifice our rights to the freedom of the seas or of our peaceful pursuits at the intimidation of those who despise our favored system.

We are succeeding in our program, and, in the end, America will be a stronger and happier and more prosperous Nation. But to reap the reward of peace and security, we must uphold the leader of our Republic—the accepted spokesman of democracy everywhere, the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HAMILTON FISH OF NEW YORK

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech made by me over the National Broadcasting Co.'s blue network on Monday evening, June 30, 1941.

National unity in the present crisis is highly desirable, and easily attainable. All American citizens are united for national defense and want to expedite the production of war supplies and defense articles. The Congress in adopting the lend-lease bill has provided for a program of all possible aid to Great Britain consistent with our own national defense. That is the law of the land and it should be upheld and maintained.

All loyal Americans are bitterly opposed to the activities and sabotage of the "fifth columnists" and our enemies from within. We are a united people in demanding that all alien Nazis, Communists, and Fascists, and all un-American groups should be seized and deported if possible, and that their seditious propaganda and activities should cease.

There should be no partisanship in national defense. Partisanship must give way to patriotism during the national emergency. However, that does not mean that free speech should be curtailed or constructive criticism abandoned—that is the doctrine of the dictators and a function of the totalitarian systems.

If President Roosevelt really wants national unity, I urge him to repeat the assurances that he gave the American people before the election that he would keep this country out of war unless attacked, and in case of any cause for war—casus belli—to submit a war resolution to the Congress for its determination.

If war is to be declared in the future the President must, in an honest, honorable, and American-like way submit the issue to the Congress where, after a great national debate, a war resolution would be voted up or down.

If the President will accept this challenge and give these assurances, I would gladly stop making speeches over the radio and elsewhere against our involvement in war.

I believe the America First Committee and all antiwar organizations would stop their activities immediately.

Of course the President should also muzzle the fire-eaters in his own Cabinet, who would destroy America by bringing bankruptcy, poverty, chaos, and revolution here through involvement in European and Asiatic wars.

The war makers who are trying to get us into war are not so much the President, but a comparatively small group of 10 percent of the American people, who are particularly well represented in the Cabinet. The worst offenders are former Republicans—Messrs. Stimson, Knox, and Ickes. Every speech these interventionists make is not only warlike but that we must get into the war now. Secretary of Agriculture Wickard is just as militant although he was in his twenties during the World War and did not serve a day in our armed forces then. He now spends most of his time going around the country trying to excite the farmers and to persuade them to send their sons to war. Messrs. Ickes and Wickard, our two most pronounced fire-eaters and war makers, are invincible in peace but were invisible in war.

The declaration of war by Hitler against Stalin, or nazi-ism against communism, has had a tremendous effect on American public opinion, and has definitely decided for us the greatest of all issues—that we will not go into the European war.

To fight for democracy, the four freedoms, and against dictatorships has an appeal to all liberty-loving Americans, but to participate in a war between two aggressors and two dictators, both opposed to the "four freedoms." leaves us icy cold. The attitude of most Americans is a plague on both their houses.

I am opposed to nazi-ism, and can think of nothing too bad to say against its aggressions and ideology; but there is one thing worse, and that is the bloody hand of communism. American mothers will not willingly sacrifice their sons to make the world safe for communism or to fight and die for the "red" flag, Joe Stalin, and world revolution under the guise of democracy.

Let the war makers rave and gnash their teeth, but the day Hitler went to war with Stalin the American people decided to keep out of the rotten mess in Europe and let the Nazis and the Communists fight it out to their heart's content.

We may be able to save America, but not if we try to force the four freedoms on Asia, Africa, Soviet Russia, and Nazi Germany with American blood and treasure.

The talk of imposing democracy on China, India, and Africa by armed force, where it never has existed, was the height of American hypocrisy from the beginning.

Dictator Joseph Stalin has played a dirty trick on Comrades Stimson, Knox, Wickard, and Ickes. Pal Joey, by leading the fight for democracy and religion, has stolen their thunder and their clothes. Now these fire-eaters propose to turn the lend-lease bill into a Lenin-lease bill and send our money and defense articles to Soviet Russia in the name of the four freedoms. What a travesty! Oh, Democracy, what crimes are committed in thy name!

I wonder where the great Catholic church will stand when the issue becomes clear? I wonder whether it will want to help build up communism, world revolution, and atheism, not only in Russia but throughout the world.

The following is an extract from a letter I received from a constituent, dated June 25:

"It is my desire to retract what I said in my recent open letter to you, and I hereby apologize for same. That was written and mailed before I knew about the German action against Russia.

"Having often said that I would prefer to live in a democracy headed by the vilest specimen of man than be the subject of the most virtuous dictator, I do not hesitate now to add that as between Hitler and Stalin I should rather a hundredfold be enslaved by Nazi Hitler than by "red" Stalin. That our leaders should want to give aid to Russia is utterly repugnant and reprehensible and merely indicates their insincerity of purpose in this entire mess."

Let me say to my constituent that we free Americans propose to make this Nation invincible and impregnable on land, sea, and air, and that no nation or group of nations will ever dare to attack us or even get the chance to enslave us.

I do not believe in making the Bug River or the Volga our first line of defense for communism, or substituting the Internationale for God Bless America.

If I had my way, I would have the Congress provide free transportation to Soviet Russia for all American Communists—alien and native-born—who want to fight for Dictator Stalin, with his hands still dripping with the blood of millions of his own people, priests, women, businessmen, farmers, and wage earners, and for the red flag and world revolution. They have been talking that way for 20 years; now let them make good, and let Congress provide free transportation with a one-way ticket.

I would do the same for the Nazis, Bundists, Fascists, and all others who seek to undermine and destroy our free institutions.

In the remaining time I want to discuss the results of the poll taken in my district, which shows as of noon today, a total of 30,461 postal ballots cast. Of these, 27,423 voted that the United States should stay out of war and 3,038 voted that the United States should enter the war now. This is almost exactly 90 percent opposed to war, being two one-hundredths of 1 percent above 90 percent, or 9 to 1.

I had anticipated a 2 or 3 to 1 majority against war, but am utterly amazed at the final 9 to 1 majority. The first day's poll showed a 6 to 1 majority against war, but when Hitler declared war on Soviet Russia the poll jumped to over 9 to 1, and has maintained the same average for the past week.

The poll has done what I hoped it would, by exposing the hypocrisy and virtual conspiracy of the war makers who, representing only 10 percent of the American people, have tried through the sheer weight of hysterical propaganda to bulldoze, frighten, and force 90 percent of the people into a foreign war against their will.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of my constituents, in her column My Day complains that the poll is unfair, but if the various qualifications and evasions that she suggests were incorporated the poll would have been of no value.

Every American knows, including Mrs. Roosevelt and the Cabinet, that we are on the brink of war. In my letter accompanying the postal ballot, I said that "I was conducting the poll to find out the sentiment of the people of my district on the greatest issue with which the American people have been confronted since the birth of the Republic. It transcends all political, social, and family affiliations."

It is plain evasion of the issue by Mrs. Roosevelt or anyone else to add "in case of attack." Every American would be in favor of defending America and going to war in case we were attacked, including the 90 percent who voted against war.

I confess that I have discounted Mrs. Roosevelt's war propaganda statements ever since she deliberately stated that President Roosevelt did not promise to keep this country out of war during the last campaign. The English language is still our customary method of conveying information. When the President said, "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas, except in case of attack," it meant to the American people and to the President precisely what he said.

The moving finger writes; and, having writ, moves on. Nor all Mrs. Roosevelt's piety nor wit shall lure it back to cancel half a line. Nor all her tears wash out a word of it.

I have enjoyed seeing the New York Herald Tribune, that arch interventionist newspaper, twist and squirm editorially at the 9-to-1 majority in my district and try to build up an alibi against such an overwhelming vote in opposition to our entrance into the war now. Why the New York Herald Tribune has for months been clamoring for war, yet when a clear-cut vote on that issue is taken and the result is against its views it starts to bellyache and whimper like a spoiled child.

The trouble is that the simple truth is the most disagreeable thing to face in the world. If the result of the poll had gone to suit the Herald Tribune, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and the interventionists and war makers, do you think they would have rushed into print with excuses, alibis, and evasive and red-herring arguments?

No; Mr. Editor of the Herald Tribune, Mrs. Roosevelt, et al, there have been no complaints from these who voted to stay out of war—they did not insist on details and specifications that might have only served to confuse the single greatest issue since the Declaration of Independence. They did not have to be told through qualified questions that aid to Great Britain and China was the accepted policy of the United States under the lend-lease bill. They did not have to be told that if we were attacked, or even Canada or South America, that we would defend this continent.

Mrs. Roosevelt and probably the President, my No. 1 constituent, ought to be interested in the poll at Hyde Park, which was 220 to stay out of war to 26 to go into war, or 89.5 percent. Garrison, my home district, was 205 to stay out and 24 to go in, or 89.4 percent. The Millbrook vote was 261 against 39, or 87 percent, Cornwall 138 to 23, 85 percent, and Tuxedo Park 179 to 44, the lowest, at 80 percent.

There were 137 persons who returned their ballots without marking them, or who wrote to me personal letters criticizing the poll. In answer to them, Mrs. Roosevelt, and the New York Herald Tribune, I will merely read an editorial from the Newburgh News, one of the largest daily newspapers in my district:

"Attack of Orange County town meeting on Representative HAMILTON FISH'S poll on the issue of peace or war takes the form of a charge that the ballot is unfair. We would say, instead, that the attack is unfair. Colonel FISH has made the issue simple and direct. His critics would make it complex, and bring in qualifications, with the result the poll would be of no merit at all."

The various pro-war groups in the district made a concerted campaign during the conduct of the poll over the radio and by holding meetings to get the voters to write in these protests. but since there were only a total of 137 who did so this campaign had very little effect on the people and their desire to keep out of war.

We are not in this war, and we are not going into this war, unless attacked. We are not going into any undeclared war, either. Congress alone can declare war. In spite of the fact that Capt. James Roosevelt says we are in the war now, I would, as an old veteran of the last war, remind him that war means shooting and killing and mud and blood, and so far there has been none.

It is preposterous to think of America being alined with Soviet Russia and Joseph Stalin as our pal and comrade, with his hands dripping with blood of murdered priests and nuns and the same dagger in his hand which he plunged into the backs of

Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and our friend the little honest Republic of Finland.

The issue of war or peace affects the security, safety, and destiny of America, and it must be decided by one yardstick and one yardstick alone, what is best for America.

I leave tomorrow for 4 weeks' military training at Fort Bragg, N. C., with full confidence that the destiny of America is safe in the judgment of the people who are 90 percent against war and in their elected Representatives in the Congress, and that America will not participate in any undeclared war or any foreign war without the approval of the Congress.

Present World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ADDRESS BY EDWARD J. FLYNN AT DENVER, COLO.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Edward J. Flynn on June 14, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I wish to speak to you briefly about organization, politics, and their relation to our present world crisis.

It has always been my contention that a large part of my job as chairman of the Democratic National Committee is to do what I can to increase the efficiency and, incidentally, to increase the responsibility of the local organizations of the various States. We can do a lot of planning in Washington, but the actual work must be done by the State committees and county committees.

I do not know that it is the case here, but in certain other States we have found that our national committeeman and the local leaders sometimes get at cross-purposes. It is not because these political officials are not equally anxious for the success of the party, but differences arises, ambitions clash, strivings for prestige sometimes complicate things, and some of the effort that should be directed to organization work is dissipated as a result of these comparatively unimportant party divisions.

This trip of mine is largely to thoroughly familiarize myself with the status of Democratic affairs in a number of States. It is not for me to decide who is right and who is wrong in intraparty controversies, nor can I issue orders that one group or one individual have precedence over another. What I am striving to do, however, is to sit down as an impartial observer with representative Democrats and see if among us we cannot iron things out so that the Democracy of each State shall be thoroughly united and therefore capable of the best efforts in the next campaign.

It is no part of my function to lecture the Democrats of any State. You know better than I can know what differences exist and what steps are necessary to compose these differences. I hope that none of you will take my statements here as expressing criticism. There is no personal application, but there is an appeal for party loyalty and party unity.

And now I want to talk as an American. The welfare of the country is the paramount issue. What should we do in the distressing situation that confronts the world today? Some few years ago, at the start of this second great World War, people in this country felt that it would never spread to this country. They listened to Hitler and believed him when he told us that he did not want conquest, but wanted sufficient expansion for the German people so that they might be able to live. There was probably very little quarrel with his ideas along these lines. The American people believed that Germany was entitled to fair expansion in order that its people might have more security and contentment. Our President even suggested that a conference be arranged for this purpose, but his good offices were spurned.

If the war had stopped when Hitler obtained the expansion that he originally stated was necessary, the American people would probably not have been concerned with the great World War today. But it did not stop at that point. We who have watched have seen him destroy the freedom of Denmark, Poland, Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, and of Greece, not counting the domination of the Balkan countries and the nations along the Baltic Sea.

When that situation developed it was time to review our position insofar as the aims of Mr. Hitler were concerned. We then looked back, as we should look back, to a perusal of the aims that he set forth for the German Nation under his leadership. No one can dispute that in his book Mein Kampf, without equivocation, he stated that the German people were ordained to rule the entire world. It was at that point and at that point only that we, as Americans, knew that we must view with great alarm the doctrines that he set forth in his book. Nazi-ism and fascism are without doubt the most vicious forms of government that have yet been devised by man. They are molded from the one central idea, and that is that the state is supreme and the individual is merely a creature of the state, to be used in whatever manner the state decides to use him. To Americans who believe that the will of the people is the supreme law of the land this philosophy is so foreign to our form of democracy that the two can never come to agreement.

When we come to this conclusion insofar as our American way of life is concerned and insofar as our democracy is concerned, we must then—and we did again—review the situation and endeavor to find out what would be the best way of maintaining our democratic form of government.

Let us for a moment consider Germany. Let us see what happened to the various industries in Germany. Does anyone consider for one moment that our industries could exist under a form of nazi-ism? Certainly we know by actual fact that industry has become the creature of the state in Germany. It is no longer possible for individuals there to exercise their free right of business adventure. They must do what the state tells them to do—they must plant what the state tells them to plant—they must, in all things, hold themselves subject to the will of this overpowering monster: the Nazi state. Certainly there is no one in America who would be willing to live under that system of government.

There are those who say that this can never happen here—that we, within ourselves, are so constituted that we can isolate ourselves from the rest of the world and still continue living under the same conditions that we have in the past.

The most dangerous situation that confronts America today is not the invasion of this country by a foreign foe—although that may be possible—but the real danger and the real menace that we are facing is a world dominated by the Fascist and Nazi philosophy of government. Can we, with all of the advantages of living that we have in this country, compete with a world dominated by the Nazi philosophy—not only in Europe, but also in Asia and Africa?

This, in my opinion, is the crux of what we are fighting to maintain in this country. Combining the fear of invasion by troops with the greater menace of the invasion of Nazi philosophy we must protect our democratic way of life.

Now, let us be logical and let us face facts. I have no love for England. My forebears were of Irish ancestry. They suffered at the hands of England. That, however, does not deter me from believing that our first line of defense is England and the British Empire. At the present time, Britain is fighting a great fight. Her cities are in ruin; her civilian population has suffered the greatest privations that any nation has suffered in the history of the world. They are standing there as a solid wall against the philosophy that would defeat the very things that we hold dear in America.

From the physical standpoint, the defeat of Great Britain would mean Axis control of the industries, the agricultural resources, the shipbuilding facilities, and the armament plants of the entire world outside of the Americas. Against these resources, backed by the imposition of the totalitarian philosophy and economic system upon other continents, how long could we resist? How much faith could we attach to treaties or trade agreements with a nation without honor—a Nazi state that believes treaties and agreements are made only to be violated?

It amuses me somewhat to hear men who are opposed to the present policy of the President of the United States, but announce with great fervor their desire to prepare this country for any eventuality and to give all aid to Britain, term themselves "isolationists." This is an incongruous situation.

Certainly we are not isolationists, for we believe in preparation against a foe that might attack us—and certainly we are not isolationists when we believe in assisting Britain in the great fight she is waging.

I am not trying to appeal to the emotions of my listeners here tonight. I am trying to give a factual presentation of the situation that this country faces. I am trying to bring home to you in this great Middle West, the danger that lies ahead for our beloved country.

In this land men and women have come from every nation in the world. They have come here for a better way of life—they have come here for freedom of speech and for freedom of religion—rights and privileges that were very often denied them in the country from which they came. There is undoubtedly a spark of affection—and probably more than a spark of affection—for their lands. However they came here—they have become Americans and, in my opinion, they are Americans—first, last, and all of the time. Their feet are firmly planted on American soil—their hearts are filled with love of this great Nation, and when they are awakened to the personal and national peril occasioned by a tyrannical group of men who have subjected millions of individuals to their wills, they will forget nationalities and remember only that we are all citizens of a common country—believers in a common cause. The ambitions and the courage of men and women who braved the hazards of distance and privation to build new lives in a new country will inspire them to give their maximum support to the preservation of Americanism.

It is wise to approach this subject without rancor. It is wise to divest ourselves of whatever feeling that we might have for our lands of origin. We must approach this subject as Americans, and consider what is best for America. Is it better for America that the

entire world should be dominated by Hitler's philosophies of force and of slavery? Is it better that the world should be dominated by an economic philosophy that does away with the rights of individuals to labor and to live as they will or is it better that throughout the world democracy, as we understand it, should triumph? That is the primary consideration insofar as America is concerned.

The President of the United States does not want war—no one wants war—but the President of the United States and the people of America want the honor and integrity of this country respected—and so we are arming to the teeth—we are arming so that in any eventuality that might confront us we will be ready and able to meet whatever force is directed against us.

Next year we face, perhaps, the most important session of Congress ever held. World conditions are such that no man knows what 1941 may bring forth. We do know that decisions of the utmost consequence to our country must be made. The Nation has entrusted these grave responsibilities to a Democratic administration. We can thank God that we have in the White House an experienced, courageous, and intellectually brilliant Chief Executive. He, with the support of Congress, must determine the course of this Government in a period of vital crisis.

The dictator powers have a distorted view of the significance of our elections. They convey to their populations that our party controversies and rivalries are evidences that a democracy cannot be united, and that the minority party's attitude constitutes a revulsion, if not a revolt, against President Roosevelt. Their controlled press never fails to stress this point of view, and the readers of those newspapers are permitted access to no other information.

It is our democratic belief that this sort of thing ought to be answered by an overwhelming endorsement of our President, through the election of Members of Congress and other officials, of the President's own political faith. That would be notice to the world that our country has confidence in its Chief Executive and applauds and approves his policies.

In my capacity as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, I urge the men and women of our party to put their organization in the best possible order. To forget whatever differences may have arisen in their own ranks and to make a supreme effort to elect Democratic Congressmen next year.

This is not because of any doubt that Republicans are as patriotic as the rest of us with respect to the emergency. The President testified to the same import when he named to head the martial departments of the Government two eminent Republicans, as well as when he drafted into the defense service leading figures from the industrial world without any inquiry concerning their politics. It happens that most of these men are Republicans. What of it?

Politics ceases at war, but not short of war, particularly in Congress. It is no mere coincidence that with a Democrat in the White House a majority of the Democrats uniformly vote for the various defense steps and, in most cases, a majority of the Republicans vote the other way.

The G. O. P. has not folded up. On the contrary, it is concentrating upon mending its fences, and laying the foundations for next year's elections. Politican organizations exist just for one purpose—and that is to win elections. Our minority party friends hope to get a majority of the House of Representatives. They will be disappointed, but that is not going to hinder their efforts as a prelude for regaining control of the Government 2 years later. Meanwhile it is their strategy to be as troublesome as possible. So they insist on debating on everything that is recommended by the administration as long and as bitterly as they think the country will stand it.

Let me make clear, however, that a few of the most influential of the minority leaders have turned their backs on such tactics. They know that whatever power Congress grants Congress can take away, and they place patriotism ahead of party.

The net result of opposition tactics is that it is likely to take many times as long to get things done in Congress as is needful, even allowing full time for complete consideration of every measure.

Therefore I insist that while it is obviously in the minority's interest to get as many of their people into Congress as possible, it is to our political and patriotic interest to see that as few of them get there as we can manage.

It is on this ground especially that I am asking Democrats to organize; to strengthen their clubs and start new ones; to avoid the party peril that lies in divided lines begotten of thwarted ambitions or personal hostilities or too bitter rivalries.

We need the help of every able party worker—even if we don't happen to like the color of his hair. Here, as elsewhere, no enrolled party membership is great enough to carry an election alone. To win we must have the adherence of a multitude of voters whose party ties are flimsy or even nonexistent. To get their support, systematic campaigning is necessary. Yours, like every other Middlewestern State, is progressive—liberal, if you prefer the term—and naturally belongs in our company. Give us the independent vote and with the ballots of enthusiastic regulars of our own order, victory will be ours. Our President has wrought well for our country. Now I call on you to reward him by making easier his even graver tasks. With maximum legislative assistance from a Democratic Congress, and with our supporting strength, he can lead us along the road to security and peace. Trusting in Divine Providence and with faith in our leadership, our singleness of purpose can make us invincible.

As Americans we love this country—as Americans, we believe in democracy; and when the issue is finally brought to the forefront and finally calls for a decision, I am convinced that the American people will think as Americans and act as Americans—and so preserve for our own children and our children's children a great heritage: the democratic way of life.

Air Power or Gold Braid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered on the American Forum of the Air, Sunday, June 29, 1941, broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System:

Aside from those who have been raised in the stodgy traditions of the Army and Navy, almost everyone favors a separate and unified air force. Why? The average citizen is not thinking of war in terms of Hannibal's elephants crossing the Alps, Pickett's sabers at Cemetery Ridge, the Battle of Jutland, or the taxicabs of Paris at the Marne. Instead, when he is thinking of the future of his country and the safety of his home, his mind turns to the Battle of France, of the Atlantic, of Britain, of Crete, of fire bombs, incendiaries, and parachutists.

My advocacy of a separate and unified air force is the result of a firm conviction that without real air power the future safety and integrity of our country and its citizens is in serious jeopardy.

Frankly, does America's danger lie in an attack by enemy navies or land forces, or is our danger essentially and solely from the air?

The men charged with providing us with air power have failed to do their job. The Army and Navy brass hats still regard an air force as an auxiliary with which to support land or naval operations. Exactly the opposite is true. No operation in modern war can be conducted until a nation has obtained control of the air over the combat zone. Every battle of the present war proves that. How long would England last if she lost control of the air over the Channel? What would happen then to her gallant home defense?

If we are lucky, we shall have a two-ocean Navy in 1945. In several years we may have a modern Army, although serious question has been raised as to its fundamental concept. Secretary Stimson's recent order consolidating the Army's air forces is merely a sop to rising public opinion and indignation.

To our everlasting discredit we have ridiculed and cashiered those few hardy and farsighted prophets who saw the reasons for a separate air force after the first World War. We have turned over this vital arm of our national defense to gold-braided philosophers in ivory towers. No military machine can rise above its leadership, and the ceiling we have placed on our air force threatens our national integrity.

In some measure to counteract that, I am introducing on Monday an amendment to my bill for a separate air force and a department of air. It will create a United States air academy so that the air officers of the future will be steeped in the traditions of the air force as those of West Point and Annapolis are steeped in the traditions of the Army and the Navy.

A typical constituent of mine said to me the other day: "I like your bill for a separate air force and a department of air, but I do not think it goes far enough. Air power is ruling the world. Make the Army and the Navy subordinate to the air force."

Now, I do not subscribe to any such complete housecleaning. We shall always need a land Army and a strong Navy. Obviously we cannot defend this hemisphere, or invade Europe, Asia, and Africa as some would have us do, without a strong separate and unified air force commanded by airmen. Great Britain's defense best illustrates that. That being so, why place our defense in the hands of men who think in terms of bulk armies and giant dreadnaughts like the *Bismarck* and the *Hood*? That is just like placing a man who used to run a livery stable in charge of a modern garage.

The vitamins A, B, and C of air power are the planes, the men, the leadership. We have the men. We can build the planes. We must supply the leadership.

Committee for Reciprocity Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

STATEMENT BY E. P. THOMAS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. E. P. Thomas, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with the negotiations for trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay at a hearing held in Washington, D. C., on June 25, 1941.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Foreign Trade Council filed on June 12, 1941, briefs with the Committee for Reciprocity Information relative to the trade agreements now under consideration with the Republics of Argentina and Uruguay. When the subject of a trade agreement previously was considered in the case of the Argentine Republic—in October of 1939—the council likewise filed a brief and I had the honor to appear before this committee.

In view of the material currently or previously filed with the committee, I will refrain from repetition and from entering into details regarding the proposed agreements.

It was a matter of keen disappointment to all foreign trade interests represented by the council, that the previous negotiations for these trade agreements were not consummated following the hearings in October 1939. Whether this failure was due to the unwise opposition of sectional or political elements in this country, or for other reasons, it created a most unfavorable impression.

Coming several months after the outbreak of the present World War, when the economy of our Latin American neighbors—particularly that of Argentina and Uruguay—was so severely disrupted by the loss of European markets, this failure to bring about a reciprocal understanding with Argentina had a profoundly unfavorable effect not only on our political and commercial relations with that country, but a reactionary effect on our trade relations with other countries. It was damaging to the prestige internationally of the Hull trade policy, and particularly in the Latin American countries which had agreed to adhere to that policy. It meant a continuation of exchange discrimination against us in Argentina and other detrimental obstacles, to which we have referred in our brief, filed on June 12, 1941.

At a time when it was becoming so necessary to Pan-American solidarity to reinforce our political and economic relations with the other Americas, to insure mutual adherence to our reciprocal trade agreement policy, the effort to bring about these improved relations met with an unfortunate setback. It is now proposed to undo the harm and the wrong then done by our failure to achieve such better relations, which would have been insured had trade agreements then been effected.

The National Foreign Trade Council is an advisory and coordinating body whose functions are nonpolitical. It represents trade interests of the whole country on a purely national and nonsectional basis.

The National Foreign Trade Council and the annual conventions held under its auspices have given unswerving approval of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act from its inception. It was annually endorsed by them as the most effective means for counteracting the unilateral, bartering, and compensation methods of totalitarian powers, which already had affected our trade disadvantageously in many world areas and had seriously affected the economy of a number of American nations.

Now, and in all the Americas more than ever, it is necessary to insure solidarity and mutual cooperation for purposes of hemispheric economic defense. The obvious and logical process for attainment of these aims is through reciprocal concessions, which is the basis of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The keystone of pan-American reciprocity is the River Plate area. In the opinion of the foreign traders which the council represents the trade agreements now under consideration by your committee are the most important of all such remaining agreements. On the satisfactory negotiation of these agreements rests the future cohesion of the Americas, both economical and political. They will prove to be a boon to United States industry as a whole, and, by strengthening the economic positions of Argentina and Uruguay, leave them less vulnerable to economic, and consequent political, pressure from totalitarian powers.

The remarkable feature of the agreements under consideration is that they can be operated effectively without financial sacrifice on the part of the United States and, in fact, with distinct benefit on a national basis. Even those regional interests who consider that these trade agreements would constitute a threat, theoretical or otherwise, to their sectional and exclusionary objectives, could be assured of reasonable safeguards under such agreements and still retain in the agreements all of the mutual benefits. Any broad condemnation of the agreements, or demands for extreme protection for special production in which the United States is not self-contained, would be tantamount to a reopening of the whole question of reciprocal trade agreement policy and the neutralizing of the law which has reiterated and confirmed it.

Legitimate objections to concessions, which can be substantiated as harmful to American economy as a whole, can be satisfied by the exercise of governmental controls, without resort to, or continuance of, exclusionary procedure, which in the past has been so detrimental to our trade relations by import restrictions that vitiated the vaunted good-neighbor policy.

Prohibitive tariffs, on a product of which the United States production is insufficient, is nothing but a direct charge and hardship on the American consumer and the foreign producer. The latter is called upon to supplement the insufficiency without adequate compensation, and the exchange available to purchase United States goods and services is thereby reduced. This results in decreased employment in United States factories, and on farms which otherwise would benefit by the increased buying power from factory employees arising from increased exports. Insistence on prohibitive tariffs is poor economics and bad politics. The effective exclusion of a product, on the theory that it would bring contamination of disease, is too evidently a sanitary subterfuge refutable by conclusive evidence of a scientific character.

I am convinced that nothing but the national interest as a whole, and the need at this time for hemispheric solidarity, should be permitted to affect the carrying out of the trade agreements under consideration. Having regard to the economic benefits to be derived by the United States—not only during the present period of stress, but on an increased scale as a long-term policy looking to an era of peace—there would appear to be no sound reason for deferring the completion of these agreements. When this consideration is coupled with the obvious desirability and, in fact, absolute need, for solidifying the pan-American economic and political fronts, all specious arguments for isolationist protection of production insufficient for national needs, should yield to this war-time emergency.

The post-war return of the world to normal, multilateral, reciprocal trading on the most-favored-nation basis is predicated on a reaffirmation of our adherence to this policy by the consummation of these trade agreements as outstanding evidence of our good faith, and of our firm intention to aid these and all other American nations in the most practical form at our disposal, and one of mutual advantage.

I thank you.

Prospective Entry of United States Into European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY LARRY RUE

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Times Herald of Washington of this morning entitled "London Forecasts United States Entry Into War Almost Any Day."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

LONDON FORECASTS UNITED STATES ENTRY INTO WAR ALMOST ANY DAY—HITLER'S DOOM SEEN IN AMERICAN ACTION; LONE VOICE RAISED AGAINST AID TO REDS

(By Larry Rue)

LONDON, June 29.—"United States Troops May Go Overseas."

This headline on the front page of the Sunday Express over a Washington story stating that the United States administration has "decided to ask Congress for a formal declaration of a national emergency in order to give President Roosevelt a free hand in defense moves," is one of the many press intimations that America may throw her full military and naval force into the war.

Such a declaration from Congress, the story explains, "would lift restrictions on the President's power to order troops to points outside the Western Hemisphere and would give him the powers lacking under the national emergency proclamation which he has already issued without formal concurrence of Congress."

The Sunday Times, reporting the same story, captioned "Roosevelt asks for new powers, free hand urged," refers readers to a story on the editorial page under the caption "United States," and informs them: "Intervention in every way the aim."

The New York correspondent cables how President Roosevelt succeeded in establishing a policy of aid to Russia without encountering "congressional opposition of much consequence" and adds that the "wide concensus" in America is that the time now is ripe for her to strike.

SMASHING MOVE FORECAST

The Sunday Empire-News front pages a story by its diplomatic correspondent stating, "Important moves forecast; swift and bold." The forecast reads:

"Within a very short time, probably within the next few days, we may expect an important declaration which may definitely turn the tide of war. It will make a vast impression throughout the world and demolish any hope Hitler might have concerning his Russian onslaught. More cannot be said at the moment, but I am convinced the move is imminent."

In the meantime, the diplomatic correspondent promises that Britain can be depended upon to develop the offensive against Germany and strike crippling blows at her war industries, her Luftwaffe, her Army, and, equally important, her morale.

He says the German attack against Russia, instead of lulling the United States into lethargy, has only spurred them on to greater efforts.

HITLER'S DOOM PREDICTED

The tabloid Sunday Graphic editorializes: "Russia, America, and Britain fighting together can hold Hitler until winter comes and spell his impending doom," and predicts that the "reaction of the American people can be only one thing, 'Very well, we will show him.'"

It thinks that Independence Day is a good time for the United States and Britain to celebrate, "not with firecrackers, but with the boom of guns and the crash of bombs making war upon the enemy."

"America can play a tremendous part in insuring the survival of Russia," writes Editor John Gordon in the Sunday Express, suggesting that "even without declaring war America could mobilize her best technicians and pour them through Vladivostok into Russia."

He urges that "our business now is to kill Germans and Italians ruthlessly and remorselessly wherever they are" and advises that "even if we regard Italy so tenderly that we are loath to do the bombing ourselves, borrow a few squadrons of Russians to do it for us. It would pay big dividends."

The London Times suggests the manner in which the United States might extend naval aid. "There are sites, for instance," it points out, "in British Gambia, no more than a day's motor run from Dakar, which might be leased to the United States, similar to the West Indian bases, and provide facilities for effective patrol of important routes.

"The possibilities of this new use of a small British possession now nearing its centenary as a crown colony might well be further explored."

Committee for Reciprocity Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

STATEMENT BY MRS. HARRIS T. BALDWIN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mrs. Harris T. Baldwin, vice president of the National League of Women Voters, before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on June 23, 1941.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National League of Women Voters wishes to express support of trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay. Through the already proved methods of the trade-agreements program, long supported by the league, we believe it possible further to reduce trade barriers on a nondiscriminatory basis in the Western Hemisphere. In addition to the economic advantage from these trade agreements, they would be a demonstration of economic cooperation among free nations, strengthening democratic government everywhere. They present an alternative to totalitarian trade methods in other parts of the world. Failure to negotiate these agreements would be most discouraging to inter-American cooperation at this juncture of world affairs.

By our tariffs of 1922 and 1930, particularly the latter, we dealt severe blows to Argentine and Uruguayan exports to the United States, thereby curtailing their purchasing power for United States goods and cutting off our exports to those countries. Our own tariff policy prior to 1934 thus turned these countries away from the United States market to Europe and gave Europe an advantage in their markets.

This situation was undesirable in peacetime, with serious effects on our general as well as on our trade relations with these two countries. In the present critical circumstances it is of utmost importance to bring about a change in this situation—to attempt to correct by economic cooperation the damage done by economic warfare.

Trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay would be of immediate benefit to the three countries. We need many of the products they have available for export, particularly strategic and critical materials required in carrying forward our defense program—our battle of production for defense at home and aid abroad. They need increased purchasing power with which to buy goods which we are in a position to supply, including articles they have normally bought from Europe. The economic situation in the other American Republics generally, particularly in South America, has become critical by reason of the loss of European markets, shortage of shipping, and other disruptions growing out of the war.

In order to prevent social and political instability in the Western Hemisphere, sound economic conditions are essential. While under our good-neighbor policy and as a part of our defense program we are extending loans and credits to Latin American countries, including Argentina and Uruguay, continental solidarity can be permanently developed only on the basis of mutually beneficial trade relations. The long-time defense of the Western Hemisphere therefore requires the negotiation of trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay.

The National League of Women Voters has addressed this statement to the Committee for Reciprocity Information as evidence of public support of the trade-agreements program.

Maine Is Still Mother of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD MATTHEWS HALLET

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on shipbuilding, published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 28, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 28, 1941]

MAINE IS STILL MOTHER OF SHIPS

(By Richard Matthews Hallet)

The legend of the Old Man of the Sea is accurate. He can take many shapes. He can take the shape of a playtime idol, redolent of springtide glories, and the full-summer regattas of small sailing craft crowded with "golden boys and girls." And he can take the shape of national extinction, as he did for the modern Americans' predecessors in the Western Hemisphere, the Aztecs. The sea is not a shield, but a sword, a naked blade for the nation that can fit a handle to it. And that handle is, and always has been, ships.

Overnight—and not for the first time overnight—the people of the United States have perceived the fact. Lately in Congress it was pointed out that in the World War a baker's dozen of German submarines had worked mischief on our shores. A hundred modern submarines could do incalculable mischief with torpedo, gas, and mine. We must have a defense, a patrol against mine-laying submarines. We must have mine sweepers.

At once $400,000,000 was appropriated for these mine sweepers, and, since a shortage of steel was foreseen, $300,000,000 of that sum was earmarked for wooden hulls. From the floor of the Senate, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, announced that these hulls would be built mostly on the Great Lakes.

Instantly Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, of Maine, was on his feet. He was new to the Senate. This was his maiden speech there, and he drove it in like a wedge to break up

this great raft of an appropriation drifting toward the West. Had the Senator from Maryland forgotten that Maine was mother of ships, that for three centuries she had built wooden ships, and that these ships had showed a clean pair of heels to anything afloat? Maine still had the skills, the art was not lost there, though the shipyards were empty and the chips in them were gray.

Senator TYDINGS receded from his position, and shortly naval officers made a survey of these Maine shipyards, checking skills and equipment. The builders were asked to submit proposals for 97-foot and 135-foot wooden hulls. Contracts followed. Boothbay region yards alone now have more than $3,000,000 in these contracts. Rockland and Camden total still more. The industry, at the point of extinction, has been revived again. Good judges of trees are in the woods, marking oak for keels and cutwaters, and in the boat sheds keels are on the ways.

An art or craft, it seems, can never be quite lost so long as men still live who have practiced it. Old hands on the Maine coast are showing young hands how to go to work. The other day at East Boothbay I saw a young apprentice dubbing away with a paring adz at a balk of oak timber. The old adzman at his side, who knew how to take a shaving no thicker than rice paper, chuckled and cast a sidelong look.

"Little and often is Jim's motto here," he said. "He goes at it to make a hole like a wood pecker, and that's a strain on a man's neck. But he'll learn."

The master builders are "down on their marrow bones" in the mold lofts, laying down the ships' lines from Navy blueprints. In the old days they took these lines from models. They whittled out their ships in little, and held them first in the hollow of their hands. If you wanted a 200-foot ship, you made a 4-foot model; and when you risked your reputation on that model, you had to have an eye for ships. The least error in design on that small scale and the ship herself would sail "like a crab."

J. J. Wardwell, Rockland master builder, who has designed 150 ships and built 83 under his own hand, says that in shipbuilding the end is implied in the beginning, just as with any other work of art. He likes models better than lines, blueprints. He tells of building a pogie steamer for a famous Boston ship designer.

"That fellow worked from lines," Wardwell says a little disdainfully. "He came down here when the hull was shaping up, and I said to him, 'She's too sharp forward. I think she'll bury.'

"That Boston designer didn't think so. He had got the lines worked out to satisfy him; so we went ahead with her. When she put to sea she buried herself so deep she washed the anchor off her fo'c'sle head.

"So the designer said, 'You don't like lines. Try it your way. Build a model for the next one.'"

Wardwell built a model and lugged it up to Young's Hotel in Boston. The ship designer took one look at it and confessed the folly of his ways.

"I didn't want to make feeling, but I do set a lot of store by models," Wardwell says. "That fellow gave in. 'Take her from the model,' he told me. I did, and that ship carried 1,000 barrels more fish and was only a knot slower than the first one, for all her blunter lines. Well, why not? You look at a model and you can see what you have got. You work from lines, and you have got to reason it to yourself whether she will sail or not. You can't just look and see."

But if you are going to just look and see—and know forthwith—you have to start young. Wardwell was 12 years old when he went to work under his father at Stockton Springs. At first he tended the steam box, where the planks were steamed for bending. Soon he was strong enough to drive the reaming irons ahead of the deck calkers, opening the seams to receive oakum. Later he worked with adz and broadax. It's a cruel thing to get the hang of.

Wardwell got two pine-tree shillings a day for his work, so you can see it wasn't yesterday when he first had the smell of sour oak in his nostrils. He's 88 now, and makes a true part of Maine's shipbuilding legend.

You begin a ship, of course, by tipping up her keel; and for keels you must have oak. "Nothing like oak," most builders say. "It's the natural underwater wood." Wallace Goudy of East Boothbay, one of the best judges of standing trees, says that oak, when cut, should first be dropped into a pond, or into salt water, for, say, 6 weeks. Gray oak sinks at once, and the water draws the acid out of it. Many Maine builders have supplies of oak already soaking. If a man knows where good ship oak is, he keeps it dark—like the fellow who won't tell you where mayflowers are springing. An average oak tree sells for $10. Lately, a 90-foot stick sold for $36; but such a stick is almost too big to be handled by the cant dogs.

Once the keel is tipped up, the builder sways the stern frame into place. The frames—the ribs—are bolted together on a staging at the ship's prow, slid down greased planks laid on top of the keel, and tilted up with tackles. These frames, when in place, give the ship's form.

"How do you know the ship is true? How do you fair her up?" I asked one master builder. "How do you fix it so she doesn't bulge on one side more than on the other?"

"In the old days," he said, "they used to fair her up by eye."

"The master builder took his stand at the prow, and had axemen and adzmen on either side. He waggled his port flipper and the adzmen dubbed a little on that side. He waggled his starboard flipper, and then the starboard adzmen dubbed a little."

That was rule-of-thumb with a vengeance. Later builders carried up a center line, and from that measured out to each side every little while "to see how she was running." Usually she didn't vary a half inch either way.

Once the ship is in frame, the planking goes on; and all agree that the planks must be "wedged snug." Wood to wood. If you can see daylight between the planks, then later in a seaway, the ship will have some play there. She'll "work like a basket," and maybe "spew her oakum," in the trade jargon. And then in all likelihood she'll "pop a plank," and if the cargo happens to be paving stone, as it was in plenty of Maine schooners, why, down she'll go.

In former days, the plank fasteners were wooden trunnels—tree nails—except for the butt bolts. The pod auger men dipped their augers in grease, and bored the holes; and then the trunnelmen sledged home the trunnels, and drove little wedges in their heads to spread them and make a true fastening. This made all one wooden skin, and had more flexibility than iron, which, if it once bends, stays bent. But these mine-sweeper hulls, with smaller planks, must be spiked and not trunnelled.

Masts are no great problem on a mine sweeper, and can be stepped easily enough. But in the old schooner-building days of Camden, Rockland, Bath, and Boothbay Harbor, masts and spars were already hard to find. Maine forests as early as the seventeenth century supplied masts for the British Navy and the King's broad arrow on the straight pine marked it for its destiny. Straight trees, even in a virgin forest, were few and far between, even by the nineteenth century. Now it is harder than ever to find tall spars growing in the woods. But mine sweepers need only stumpy spars.

The sparmaker gets his "eights" by snapping chalked string down against the peeled round of his spar; planes it 8-sided with a wooden plane; turns the 8 sides into 16; and so approaches roundness, mingling the smell of pine resin in the yard with the smell of the ship's sour oak. By now the hull, too, is planed to a satin finish; and the masts are stepped by purchases hanging from giant shear poles which straddle the mast holes in the deck.

It was an old custom for the owner to drop a $5 gold piece into the step before he stepped his mast; and there is a tale of one such owner, "tighter than a miser's dream of heaven," who substituted a bright penny for gold—but the sea gods marked this treachery, and the ship, coming from New Caledonia with a cargo of nickel ore, hung her forefoot out over a wave, broke open amidships, and went down.

Launchings are ticklish. The sea is called the ship's native element, but the ship sometimes holds herself aloof, and will not feel "that thrill of life along her keel." Sometimes she sticks, and Tom Walker and high water together can't slide her overboard. Then the builder must shore her up, dig out the ways, and build them up for a second launching. Once at Searsport, they had to take the ways out three times from under a cantankerous ship. According to Kit Marlowe, there was once a "face that launched a thousand ships." That was the face of Helen of Troy. On the Maine coast, beef tallow is considered better—tallow, with a smear of lard on top of it. But even tallow has been known to stick.

"I remember when we launched the *John B. Prescott* at Camden, Maine," says J. J. Wardwell. "It was a winter morning, 14 below zero. We had greased the ways with beef tallow, same as always; but it froze hard. The *Prescott* didn't seem to want to go. We split out the keel blocks, and still she couldn't quite make up her mind. When she did start, she was 20 minutes going just the first 3 feet. You could see her inch along, and that was all. H. M. Bean, the builder, was fit to be tied. Says I, 'Mr. Bean, don't you tear your shirt. You get me a couple of dishes of thin oil, and I'll see what I can do.' * * * I had left a couple of feet between the bilgeways, and I poured the oil in there, and away she went, smooth as a smelt, and left the ways smoking."

The song of a bird can start an avalanche, and a dish of oil can launch a ship. But it takes elbow grease to build one. Likewise it takes art, and the art can never be lost while the Maine legend lives.

Shortage of Oil and Gasoline in the East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DECATUR (ILL.) REVIEW

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a short editorial entitled "Realizing the Situation," printed in the Decatur Review of May 31, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Decatur Review of May 31, 1941]

REALIZING SITUATION

Because the East is short on gasoline and oil, gasless Sundays may be imposed on the entire country. It sounds somewhat like New York going on daylight saving time and the broadcasting companies subjecting the entire country to a change in broadcasting hours.

The shortage of oil and gasoline in the East is due to transfer of tankers to the British. When one-fifth of the tankers that have served Texas gasoline to the Atlantic seaboard began delivering their loads to Britain the East was pinched. Oil lines reach up into the Middle West, one gasoline pipe line ending just north of Decatur at Forsyth.

The threat of gasless Sundays may be more than a threat. For weeks there have been hints of what would have to be done, but the country continues to go along and here and there you hear that most of the talk is an attempt to scare people into a warlike frame of mind. Others say the people are being eased into the situation. Even the big tax bill that has been talked about will not get through Congress before August.

Perhaps gasless Sundays, a sudden stop because of priorities, new and heavy taxes, will awaken the people to the situation that Washington says exists.

Twenty Years of Forestry Progress in the Lower South, 1921–41

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

REPORT BY E. L. DEMMON

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an interesting and informative report which describes the magnificient work and achievements of the Southern Forest Experiment Station at New Orleans.

Entitled "Twenty Years of Forestry Progress in the Lower South, 1921–41," this report was compiled by E. L. Demmon, director of the station. I commend it to the Members of the House for their study.

TWENTY YEARS OF FORESTRY PROGRESS IN THE LOWER SOUTH, 1921–41

(By E. L. Demmon, director, Southern Forest Experiment Station)

On July 1, 1921, as a result of congressional action, the Southern Forest Experiment Station was established, with headquarters at New Orleans, La. This was 1 of the first 3 such regional stations to be organized; others were set up later and at present there are 12 regional forest experiment stations in continental United States.

Now, after 20 years, it seems appropriate to review briefly the progress of forestry in the lower South (that section within the boundaries of the Southern Forest Experiment Station territory, including the States of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, as well as southern Arkansas, eastern Texas, and eastern Oklahoma), during these last two decades and to appraise the important forestry tasks immediately ahead, giving particular consideration to the role of forest research in these concerns.

Although definite progress has been made since 1921, the 1941 situation is not one to cause great exultation. Over 50 percent of the forests of the lower South still lack organized fire protection, with the result that about 20 percent of the total forest area is burned over each year. Most of the present forest stands are greatly understocked and are producing but a fraction of their potential capacities. Too much cutting is still done in disregard of silvicultural principles, especially in the operations of the thousands of small portable mills in this region. Many millions of acres of southern forest lands are in need of planting if they are to grow timber crops within any reasonable period and adequately safeguard soil and water resources. Markets are lacking for great quantities of low-grade material and of little-used tree species and for the potential production of naval stores (turpentine and rosin). All in all, southern forest lands, under good management, are capable of providing continuous employment and hence higher standards of living for at least double the number of persons they now support. The idleness or only partial use of many millions of acres of southern forest land, unsuited to or not needed for farming, represents a great economic loss to the region and to the United States. To take full advantage of the opportunities offered by its forests, the South needs additional forest industries and remanufacturing plants, effecting a higher degree of processing, and the production of more goods for the consumer market.

The South also needs, now more than ever before, an outlet for the surplus of labor resulting from the decline of its main source of cash income, cotton. Not only did the cultivated area of cotton in the 13 southeastern cotton-producing States decline from a peak of 46,000,000 acres in 1925 to less than 25,000,000 acres in 1940, but the recent losses in export markets caused by the war will undoubtedly result in further reductions in cotton planting. This displacement of land and labor from the chief cash crop of the region points to a tragic need for readjustments in land use and for additional opportunities for employment. In any such readjustment, the South's forest lands, occupying 6 out of every 10 acres of its present land area, should be utilized to the fullest extent. Application of such a program, however, is not simple; it involves cooperation by many agencies in the careful drafting and execution of such plans as will insure that both the land and its resources are utilized conservatively and for the greatest good of all the people.

Prior to 1921, forestry had made little headway in the lower South, although some significant work had been begun. A few timberland owners had initiated simple forest-management practices following surveys of their holdings and the preparation of detailed management plans by the United States Forest Service, but most of those efforts were sporadic and shortlived. In 1921, there were only two States in the lower South with active forestry departments, Texas and Louisiana, whose departments were established in 1915 and 1917, respectively. Only one forest school in the lower South was in operation in 1921, at the University of Georgia, having been established there in 1906. The Southern Forestry Congress, organized by a public-spirited group of foresters, lumbermen, and conservationists, played an outstanding part in stimulating forestry development throughout the South, from its inception in 1916 until its final (12th) meeting in 1930.

In 1921 there were but few national forests in the lower South. These totaled only about a million and a half acres net and were made up largely of unappropriated portions of the public domain, supplemented somewhat through purchases made under the Weeks law of 1911.

Organized forest-fire protection in 1921, which consisted mainly of seasonal patrol, existed only on the national forests and on somewhat less than 8,000,000 acres of private forest land. The lumber companies providing forestry measures other than fire protection could be counted on the fingers of one hand. A few industrial forestry pioneers, among whom Henry T. Hardtner, of Urania, La., and Col. William H. Sullivan, of the Great Southern Lumber Co., at Bogalusa, La., were outstanding, had begun to practice conservative cutting, including the leaving of seed trees, and had undertaken some artificial reforestation, but the general run of timberland owners were still unimpressed with the possibilities of growing another crop of timber. What finally sold a number of lumbermen on forestry was the realization that some of the trees they were cutting had grown to maturity since their sawmills were first established.

FORESTRY DEVELOPMENTS, 1921–41

A number of significant actions have stimulated forestry progress in the lower South during the last 20 years. The study of the national forestry situation made by the United States Forest Service pursuant to Senate Resolution 311 (66th Cong., 2d sess.), introduced by Senator CAPPER, was published as Timber Depletion, Lumber Prices, Lumber Exports, and Concentration of Timber Ownerships, June 1, 1920. Interest was aroused as a result of the hearings held in the South by the committee on national forestry policy of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States during 1922, and also the hearings of the Select Committee on Reforestation of the United States Senate (S. Res. 398, 67th Cong., 4th sess.), of which Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY was chairman, held in Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana in March 1923, which were followed in 1924 by the passage of the Clarke-McNary Act, broadening the provisions of the old Weeks Act of 1911 for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in fire protection, planting, forest-extension work, and forest tax study and reform.

Stimulating influences during the latter part of this period were the national forestry picture presented by the Forest Service in its comprehensive report "A National Plan for American Forestry" (Copeland Report) in 1933; the greatly expanded program of Federal acquisition of land for national forests and of increased fire protection on Federal, State, and private lands as a result of the establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1933, and of other emergency relief organizations which furnished labor and materials for forestry programs; the formulation of minimum forest conservation practices under Article X of the Lumber Code (under the National Industrial Recovery Act) in 1933 and 1934, and the setting up of conservation agencies by the trade associations representing the pine, hardwood, and cypress industries in the South; the voluntary adoption of specific forest conservation practices by the representatives of the southern pulp and paper mills in 1937; and the open hearings before the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry held in Jacksonville, Fla., in November 1938, and in Mobile, Ala., in November 1939. Of outstanding importance in the southern forestry movement has been

the work of three Federal foresters: Dr. Austin Cary among lumbermen and turpentine owners, W. R. Mattoon among the southern farmers, and W. W. Ashe in the national-forest acquisition program. Their efforts combined with those of other public-spirited men and groups bore fruit in the establishment during this period of State forestry departments in the six remaining States in the lower South—Alabama (1924), Georgia (1925), Mississippi and Oklahoma (1926), Florida (1928), and Arkansas (1933). The work of these State forestry departments has contributed in no small degree to the advances made in forestry during the past 20 years. Other notable contributions have been made by the work of the State extension foresters. Georgia was the first State to appoint an extension forester (1924), followed by Alabama and Texas (1925), Louisiana and Arkansas (1926), Mississippi (1927), Florida (1933), and lastly, Oklahoma (1940).

The last 20 years has witnessed the establishment of two additional professional forestry schools in the lower South, at Louisiana State University in 1925 and at the University of Florida in 1935.

With the growth of the State forestry departments, great strides were made in fire protection, which has been the chief activity of these organizations. In 1940 there were over 57,000,000 acres of forest land in Federal, State, and private ownership under organized protection in the lower South. Notwithstanding this progress, over 50 percent of the forest land in this region is at present without organized fire protection.

Rapid expansion of the national-forest program in the South made a new regional administrative office necessary. Regional headquarters were established in July 1934 at Atlanta, Ga. Aside from administration of the national forests, which had increased to 6,716,188 acres in the lower South by June 30, 1940, one of the most important activities of the Atlanta office lies in the stimulation of private forestry practice through its Division of State and Private Forestry.

Private forestry has advanced notably since 1921, largely as a result of the increased opportunities for organized fire protection through cooperative Federal and State funds that became available for that purpose. With gradual cutting out of the original virgin forests and the increasing acceptance of the value of second growth, everywhere there have been signs that timberland owners and operators were beginning to realize the potentialities of forest growth. Leaving of seed trees, cutting to a diameter limit, protection from fire, and in some cases artificial reforestation have appeared as significant steps toward good forestry.

Some of the stimulation given southern forestry during the last few years has come about as a result of the phenomenal expansion of the pulp and paper industry in the South. In large part, as an outcome of the pioneering research work of the United States Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., and the stimulating influence of Dr. Charles H. Herty, this industry has not only taken national leadership in the production of kraft paper and board, of which it now produces 80 percent of the United States requirements, but has also branched out into the fields of white paper, newsprint, and rayon. The capacity of wood-pulp production in the 11 Southeastern States has been increased rapidly; in 1941 it will probably reach 4,000,000 tons, using about 6,000,000 standard cords of wood, and accounting for over 40 percent of the total United States production of pulp.

Appraising the progress of forestry is not an easy task. Undoubtedly, much forestry is being practiced, respecting which no records are available. The latest data on the area of land under good forest management, compiled by the United States Forest Service in 1938, indicated that over 13,000,000 acres of commercial forest land in industrial and other private ownership (not including farm ownership) in the lower South was being managed with the objective of continuous production. Many of these large forest-land owners have hired technically trained foresters; their holdings, along with the National and State forests, are serving as examples of good forestry practice. A few municipal forests have also been established.

RESEARCH AND FORESTRY PROGRESS

Little has been said thus far of the place of research in the progress of forestry in the lower South. Research contributions have been made by some of the State forestry departments, the forest schools, the forest industries, and such organizations as the United States Forest Products Laboratory, but the discussion here will be confined to Federal forest research at the Southern Forest Experiment Station. Although at first glance southern station contributions may seem more or less obscure, because they have not been especially spectacular, they have unquestionably helped to prepare and smooth the way for southern forestry progress.

These contributions have been made in a number of ways. The Southern Forest Experiment Station staff has prepared and distributed a great number of timely reports containing current findings based on its studies, thousands of letters of advice and guidance have been written in response to inquiries, numerous talks and addresses have been delivered before a variety of different groups, many conferences have been held with people desiring forestry information based on research findings, frequent demonstrations on the station's nine experimental forests and at other centers of station work have been arranged, and cooperation has been extended to public and private forestry agencies throughout the South, all of which taken together must have exerted a real influence on the development of better forestry practices. Many station contributions to the knowledge and techniques of southern forestry are now in wide use throughout the region.

Starting in 1921, with a handful of forest technicians, new to the job of research, the station has gradually expanded and carried through a definite program aimed at determining the scientific basis for sound forest management. Since the station was established it has gathered and disseminated much preliminary information, but because timber growing is such a long-time enterprise, and because of the great diversity of soils, forest types, land uses, and economic conditions in the station's territory, embracing as it does over 120,000,000 acres of forest land, much vital information essential for permanent, successful forest-land management is still lacking.

A LOOK AHEAD

The past two decades have seen substantial and encouraging growth in the practice of forestry in the lower South. This progress, however, has been only a start toward the goal of intensive use of the 120,000,000 acres of forest land in this region. But 20 years, after all, is a relatively short period in the life of a tree or a forest, and shorter still in the life of a nation. Let us be encouraged, therefore, by the substantial progress made and the visible results obtained. Certainly, with increased forestry practice in this region vital to its future economic security, with such an enormous area of land available and apparently suitable for no more intensive use, and with so much to be learned about the technique of timber growing, there can be little question about the need and urgency of an adequate program of forest research.

There seems no doubt that the South will continue to show progress in forestry practice, unless our whole world is turned topsy-turvy. In the present national effort toward defense southern forests are playing an important part, contributing much-needed lumber, naval stores, paper, and other products, as well as sites for Army camps and training maneuvers.

This increased demand for forest products has been particularly great during the last year, when the demand for lumber and timbers for defense construction work, added to normal requirements, has undoubtedly led to an excessive drain on southern forests. The fact that much of this cutting is done with no regard for the future and to the serious detriment of our forest resource should give us cause for concern. The situation emphasizes the need for adopting conservative cutting practices that will provide all the material essential for the emergency, but will leave the forest in optimum condition for future productivity, so that southern forests will contribute fully to the Nation's social and economic welfare. The enforcement of minimum cutting standards by legislative enactment has been recommended recently by the United States Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry, the latter in a report, "Forest Lands of the United States," submitted on March 24, 1941. The proposed cutting standards would vary with local conditions, and would be largely based on the findings of forest-research agencies such as the Southern Forest Experiment Station.

Contributions of southern forests in the period of adjustment that will follow the present emergency should be great, through providing a backlog of employment for the million or more workers whom they are capable of supporting under conditions of full productivity and use. Their value for control of floods, for public recreation, and for wildlife should not be overlooked. In all projected forestry programs, forest research can stimulate and promote a better understanding of the part forests can contribute to the better security of the people of the lower South and of the Nation.

National-Defense Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

CREED BY WILLIAM LINDSAY YOUNG

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following creed by President William Lindsay Young, of Park College, Missouri:

CREED

I believe in national defense against racial antagonisms which weaken that social solidarity essential to a healthy nation.

I believe in national defense against the persecution of minorities, because such persecution is detrimental to the preservation of our democratic heritage.

I believe in national defense against State coercion of the individual's conscience, because such coercion destroys the character foundations of our Nation.

I believe in national defense against those who use patriotism as a cloak in order to reap profits from the present tragic world suffering.

I believe in national defense against an economic system which lacks sufficient opportunity for the young, makes possible an army of

millions of unemployed, and lacks adequate security for the old.

I believe in national defense against political demagogs and all vested interests which tamper in any way with those rights of freedom of speech, press, and assemblage as guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I believe in national defense against the futile faith that a strong army and navy is all that is needed to preserve and perpetuate that cherished freedom for which our forefathers so valiantly struggled.

I believe in national defense against any "ism" harmful to human personality, which, under God, is sacred.

—President William Lindsay Young, Park College Missouri.

War and the Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY ROSENMAN

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in behalf of my colleague, Mr. WAGNER, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dorothy Rosenman entitled "War and the Housing Problem."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Liberty Magazine for April 26, 1941]

WAR AND THE HOUSING PROBLEM—GHOST TOWNS—OR HOMES? WHICH WILL WE GET FROM OUR BUILDING FOR DEFENSE?

(By Dorothy Rosenman)

America is rushing to build up its defenses; as a result, there are communities swelling like gouty feet. Six thousand and two hundred inhabitants of Radford, Va., watch 11,000 men build the Hercules Powder Co. plant in which from 4,000 to 6,500 will work. Defense workers in Paso Robles, Calif., live in auto trailers. In San Diego, 50,000 new people absorb all vacancies within commuting distance and require additional housing. Twenty to thirty thousand people pour into Hampton Roads, Va., to work in the Navy operating base.

Rub your hands with glee because employment rises, but scratch your head hard at the housing problem which this very work creates. Machines must be housed, so factories are built. Machines must be worked by men and women. These men and women and their families must be housed, so homes must be built.

Hospitals, as well as homes, are overcrowded, and chicken pox, flu, etc., have full opportunity to grow into epidemics. Laborers, clerks, stenographers, and technicians travel miles to and from work each day because they can find accommodations no nearer. It is fatiguing and does not make for efficiency. It cannot go on; neither can 10,000 persons continue to huddle where 4,000 belong.

Our people have risen to face a defense emergency; obstacles are hurdled; hardships are endured; things hum. Those who make them hum must be adequately housed in properly planned communities—communities that will not waste into future blights and slums.

"Three hundred thousand homes for industrial defense workers required immediately," says the United States Defense Housing Coordinator." "Two and a half million new homes, exclusive of those for farm and defense operations, are needed to fill the immediate demands of the country," says the National Resources Planning Board. Take away the emergency and you still face the lack of 2,500,000 dwelling units to rehouse those families living in downtrodden old houses, shacks, and tenements. It's not a new prob'em; it's one that has been accumulating.

A nation that required 2,500,000 new homes—even before this new defense emergency—could absorb the 300,000 that it now requires for defense workers when the crisis is passed. It could, if those dwellings were constructed and located with this purpose of absorption in mind. And why should they not be?

Understand the problem, and understand that since the last war we have learned much about the mass production of housing units. In 1917 we had no public-housing experience or program; in 1917 we had not begun to recognize our peacetime housing needs; in 1917 we made many errors in building homes for the emergency. These errors proved expensive and wasteful.

Thoughts of future "ghost towns" now make us shudder. We had them after the last war, when the particular industries around which they had sprung shut down. It is not sensible to build more permanent housing than a community can absorb in normal times. This does not mean that we should build shacks. Removable or prefabricated houses are practical for this purpose. They can later be trekked to town, village, or farm in need of permanent housing.

Another practical solution is being made by the Federal Farm Security Administration. Rural housing is notably sorry. F. S. A. has been striving to replace thousands of decrepit insanitary farmhouses with adequate modern dwellings. With its well-developed organization it has started (Radburn, Va.) building new houses for new defense workers on farms within a radius of their work. The farm owner agrees to buy the house at a depreciated price and tear down his own old house when the defense tenant for whom the house was built is no longer needed in the community.

By these methods defense workers can be brought into new communities and they can be sheltered. The community suffers no housing afterpains. At the same time the permanent need for housing is being fulfilled.

Two and a half million families who need decent homes must serve as a constant reminder that the 300,000 units for defense workers should be built so that they can still be used after the emergency. There are few cities in the United States that do not need to rehouse a large proportion of their population—the lower-income groups that have inhabited old unfit homes.

This is an all-time need that can be well served by wise administration of the defense-housing program. Homes built in or near cities with a housing problem can be planned for siphoning of slums and poor housing after the emergency.

"You cannot do that. Speed is necessary. To build for future use, much planning is necessary."

You can. A house and a community well planned is as quick to construct as a new slum. Experience has taught this.

"What experience?"

The experience of the United States Housing Authority, which has constructed defense housing in 85 days, and has in the last 3 years, through local housing authorities, built 514 large-scale construction units in all sections of the Union for the lowest income groups.

Robert Moses, the public-housing skeptic, said in his Liberty article of December 16, 1939, "The Federal Government can do little more than blaze the way to housing improvements." Trail blazing in itself is a contribution not to be belittled, especially when it has already built 162,000 low-rent housing units, which will house 572,000 people, in 256 different communities of the United States. Contrary to Mr. Moses' expectations, about 52 percent of these projects have been on cleared slum sites, and 47 percent have been built on vacant land, and will drain 572,000 people from poor housing

Trail blazing—in lowering construction costs; in planning sites so that sun and light reach all apartments, and children have a place to play; in setting coverage and density standards so that our cities and the real estate leaders have begun to think of land in more realistic and useful terms; in contributing an incentive to the rebuilding of neighborhoods of foreclosed and tax-delinquent properties.

Trail blazing in rebuilding human beings!

As a way of progress, this is an achievement; as a way of facilitating the mechanism of defense construction, it is a godsend, for experience is a great teacher.

The U. S. H. A. by February of this year was constructing 19,585 units for defense workers. In defense areas houses being completed for the lowest income group are being turned over to defense workers; after the emergency they will be returned to the purpose for which they were built. In like manner, houses built by the Government for the emergency should be constructed with the thought that after the emergency they should, wherever feasible, be turned over to the local housing authorities for the use of the low-income tenant.

Many sincere advocates of a public-housing program swept from their purpose by the surge of the spectacular emergency at hand, cry "Build for the crisis now, and defer building for the lowest income group to the slack days that are bound to follow a resumption of normal times." The answer to that is that there will be plenty of bad housing left for public attention and to supply employment when that time comes. Since the over-all need is so great, it would be sensible to build these emergency houses not with abandon but with purpose—the purpose of using them for public housing later on.

There are, of course, those who say that the whole public-housing program is wrong and should be scotched. It is argued that subsidized housing is costly. To those it must be said that no inexpensive wand waves in any other social improvements, like parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, or parkways. The taxpayer pays heavily and gets value received. Eradication of slums—rural or urban—will not be accomplished by wishful thinking or fairy wands, or bad words aimed at so-called social upliffers. It will cost the U. S. H. A. the net sum of $11,840,000 or $73 a family a year to subsidize these homes.

Granting all that public housing has accomplished, there are those, like Mr. Moses, who search for other reasons for condemning it. It does not cure all of our social problems or the political ones either. He wonders about color washing out; he wonders about it, not in respect to the pools and parks under his jurisdiction, but in respect to public housing.

Of course, prejudice against the Negro has not been eradicated by housing projects—and will not be. But over the country different communities have tried to meet the

problems in various ways. In New York City there are Harlem River housing project, which is all Negro; Red Hook housing project, which has 2,502 white families and 31 Negro families; Jamaica housing project, with 312 Negro families and 135 white families—all living peacefully.

No solution to the complex economic problems that beset this country, as well as the world, is found in public housing. But an attempt and a beginning is made to better the way of life of those of the lowest income group. Should wages rise so that the wide discrepancy is eliminated between what the human market seeks for housing and what it can afford to pay, then subsidies can also be eliminated.

Subsidized housing is not expected to compete with that constructed by private funds. It is, and should continue to be, erected for those families whose income is so low that they can afford to pay so little for rent that to build for them is unprofitable and presently impossible.

However, both in the defense and low-cost housing market there is an important role for private enterprise. It cannot construct for the lowest of low-wage earners, but it can build for those just above that level who are still within that "one-third of a Nation ill-housed," if it were willing to build for investment rather than speculation. The market cries for attention.

Investors are not answering the call. Speculators are. And who holds the bag? Government at one end, and the man of little income and uncertain security at the other. In the defense crisis private enterprise is being encouraged to construct homes. The Federal Housing Administration guarantees 80 percent, and it is now proposed that they shall guarantee 90 percent of the investment. The great business entrepreneur whose risks are thus rendered nil usually bolsters his chances against a loss still further by refusing to rent his houses. The defense worker's job may be temporary, but he must buy his home. There is no assurance of profit to the great real-estate entrepreneur after the emergency is over, so he up and runs—with the loot.

Private enterprise must face this issue squarely. So must government. There is plenty of real investment money to be had. Where investment is warranted, it should be urged to invest; where private investment is not warranted, government must spend public moneys to bring the necessities of living to those who need them—both in times and conditions of emergency and in normal days.

Fancy cupboards of money piled in banks and insurance companies, ready to pour forth at the slightest encouragement. Read Mr. Moses' plea for "the only possible solution of the financing problem"—to have loaning agencies supply cheap money to stimulate construction of houses; and get thrilled thinking that he, too, has found the way to set the ball rolling. Unfortunately, Mr. Moses, since writing these words, has experienced the pangs of disappointment in working with insurance companies and banks in an attempt to build limited-dividend houses. This redounds not to Mr. Moses' discredit but to that of those institutions so rock-bound by tradition that their boards of directors can but bewail the passing of an era and contribute nothing to the foundation of its successor.

Whether there be a crisis or not, a democracy must provide the necessities of life for its people. Housing is such a necessity that private enterprise and government must marshal their forces to provide adequate homes.

Let us therefore plan our defense housing—both that built by the Government and that built by private enterprise—so that it can fit into the larger permanent program in the days to come, to house that third of the Nation now living in housing below the American standard of life.

Prospective Development of International Law in the Western Hemisphere, as Affected by the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY WILLARD BUNCE COWLES

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the 1941 prize-winning essay in the national legal competition of the American Bar Association. The award, which is considered one of the high honors of the legal profession, is made annually under a $100,000 bequest of the late Judge Erskine M. Ross of California. The prize was $3,000. The committee of judges consisted of ex-Justice William L. Ransom of New York, Mr. Justice William O. Douglas of the United States Supreme Court, and Dean Joseph A. McClain, Jr., of the law department of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

The winner this year was Mr. Willard Bunce Cowles, a well-known international lawyer engaged in the private practice of that branch of law, who is also a special assistant to the Attorney General. He has served the Government in international law cases before national and international tribunals and was formerly associated with the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, and Hope and the faculty of Columbia College in New York.

The significance of this activity of the Bar Association, and especially of this year's competition, appears in the following excerpt from an editorial in the June issue of the Bar Association's Journal:

> At a time when the future of free institutions in this hemisphere seems likely to depend on the soundness and the solidarity of the actions taken by the republics of North and South America, the Ross Essays for this year deal appropriately with the "Prospective Development of International Law in the Western Hemisphere as Affected by the Monroe Doctrine." Such a subject naturally produced notable essays, more than a few of them. Nearly all of the essays revealed an awareness that the grave dangers confronting the Americas compel a reconsideration of the traditional concepts of neutrality and nonintervention, in favor of a broadening accord of action based on the rationale of self-defense.
>
> The winning essay * * * brings together in an impressive manner the developing precedents which are implementing the concept of unity for defense. It deserves study and thought by every lawyer who is trying to help his community or his circle of friends to think, speak, and act wisely on current issues.

The complete essay, which is documented, and other references to the competition appear in the June 1941 issue of the American Bar Association Journal at pages 342, 386, 363, and 331. Space limitations prevents its being printed in full in the RECORD. It is stated in the Journal that the essay was submitted on February 15, 1941, and that the views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of any agency of the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE, AS AFFECTED BY THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(By Willard Bunce Cowles)

The present world situation is bringing about a realization among the American states that the normally applicable rules of neutrality and nonintervention are inadequate to cope with existing conditions. Under the leadership of the United States, they are taking the position that the principle of self-defense is applicable. This principle, which underlies the whole international system and is more fundamental than normally applicable principles and rules of international law, may be invoked when the peace and security of a state is threatened by the action of another. Under such circumstances, the menaced state may take extraordinary defense measures, limited only by their reasonableness in the light of existing conditions or those to be anticipated. Precedents, particularizing and implementing this rule of reason, are now developing in the Western Hemisphere.

I

In the Declaration of Panama (1939) the Inter-American Consultative Meeting declared that the American states, as neutrals, had an inherent right to have the waters adjacent to the American continent kept free from hostile acts "as a measure of continental self-protection." The Declaration defined the limits of a security zone, stipulated that the American states will consult on measures for its observance whenever they consider it necessary, and provided for patrolling the area, if deemed necessary. The following recommendations of the Inter-American Neutrality Committee on the effects of the institution of the zone, were accepted at the Habana Consultative Meeting: The zone areas are not to be regarded as territorial waters, but open sea; belligerent activities should not be undertaken within the zone; measures of self-defense are not proscribed there nor are belligerent operations begun outside the zone and continued within it, provided they are continuous; and the American states should adopt regulations to prevent contacts of merchant vessels in their ports with belligerent warships; a belligerent should not be penalized merely on the ground of being the aggressor nation in the war, inasmuch as all belligerents have a right to use the high seas for peaceful purposes and to defend themselves from attack; penalties should be imposed on the local aggressor in the zone, that is, against the belligerent which initiated hostile acts there. It was further recommended, in the case of a violation of the zone, that the American governments should make a joint investigation to decide which belligerent was the local aggressor; in the light of the determined facts, make a collective protest to the government whose warship is believed to have initiated the action; deny admission to their ports of the warship or aircraft deemed guilty of such violation, or all warships of that belligerent.

After the *Graf Spee* incident the American states jointly protested to the belligerent governments for violating the zone and threatened to prevent belligerent vessels from using American ports if they committed further hostile acts in the zone. The belligerents * * * taking the position that they

were not bound by the Declaration of Panama, pointed out that it had not received such general assent as to modify the existing laws of neutrality which, in their opinion, had not been violated.

The Inter-American Neutrality Committee reached the conclusion that general consent to the declaration was not necessary. Its legal justification of the zone is a remarkable document. It is a mixture of the law of neutrality, self-defense, and the * * * Kellogg Pact, involving two interpretations of aggression—an aggressor government, and aggressive action in any specific case within the zone. The committee's reasoning is having a decided influence on the current implementing of the principle of self-defense. * * * An aggressor under the Kellogg Pact has no right to make war anywhere; it has no more right to wage it on the high seas than on land; the high seas are, however, open to all vessels (including those of an aggressor country) for peaceful purposes, but not to make war, except in self-defense; neutral interests are paramount to belligerent interests by inherent right implied from the principle of self-defense and from the renunciation of war; the neutral can accordingly treat a belligerent unit on or over the high seas, within a reasonable distance from its shores, as a trespasser if it initiates hostilities, and the neutral can use reasonable force to prevent belligerent activities there which might affect its peace or the peaceful pursuit of its commerce.

This is new doctrine. Its effect on the development of the law remains to be seen. * * *

II

The hemispheric stage is set for several other developments on the basis of self-defense. * * * The Consultative meetings at Panama and Habana passed resolutions concerning foreign subversive activities tending to jeopardize democratic institutions. As an apparent result of the Nazi diplomatic incident in Uruguay, the Habana meeting recommended that the American governments adopt legislation and administrative regulations for the effective prohibition of "every" political activity by foreign persons "no matter what form they use to disguise or cloak such activity." If the American governments are to attempt to prohibit every political activity of diplomats and consuls by legislation and regulation, we may expect to see some carefully drawn documents defining the limits, on the basis of self-defense, of diplomatic and consular functions and privileges. Perhaps a rule of reasonableness will be developed respecting the number of such officers which will be received by any American government.

At the Habana meeting the American states asserted that they had the right, in self-defense, to set up provisional regimes in American regions now in non-American possession, if a forced change of sovereignty should be threatened. An emergency committee, to administer such regions, has been in existence since October 24, 1940.

There is a difference of opinion among international lawyers whether the German control of property, held by its nationals at home and abroad, is merely a high degree of police regulation or a virtual transfer of ownership to the German state with only the title and limited rights of use reserved to the national. If German assets in the American States are the public property of the German state, their freezing would presumably be justified on the ground of self-defense against propaganda, espionage, and sabotage. Such action (if ownership is in the German state) would imply a limitation on the scope of the international rule that the public property of a foreign state is immune from interference.

The so-called right of angary is a belligerent right to appropriate and use urgently needed neutral property within belligerent territory during the course of hostilities, provided just compensation is assured the owners. * * *

A press dispatch of February 3, 1941, states that the Argentine Government is studying the possibility, under the right of angary, of requisitioning idle Dutch shipping in her ports. According to this report, the Argentinian position is that the states not at war have a right to use idle shipping in their harbors "urgently needed to meet national emergencies." * * * Whether or not the law should be developed in this direction depends to a large extent on how it is applied and on hemispheric defense needs. Under any such interpretation of the right of angary, owners of vessels would receive just compensation. If Argentina acts upon this basis it may be that other American governments will follow suit. * * * This would seem to be more desirable than having the vessels unproductive.

A neutral government, under general international law, is required to refrain from any participation in an existing war. * * *

By contrast, the lend-lease bill will permit the United States to manufacture, or procure, any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and to sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of any such article to any such government and to place any defense article in good working order for such a government. * * * The Senate report and the House majority report justify the bill both on the principle of self-defense and also under the Kellogg Pact. * * * The same self-defense considerations, which "emasculated" the Kellogg Pact through numerous reservations, are now in effect being used to enforce the principle of nonaggression which underlies the pact.

III

The Monroe Doctrine has important effects on inter-American relationships today. The doctrine is a policy of the United States, not international law. * * * It has two aspects. The first, which stems from self-defense, is that the United States will prevent or redress external aggressions against the territorial integrity or political independence of Latin-American states, as any such action is "dangerous to our peace and safety." The second is that the American Continents are not subject to colonization by any European power.

The doctrine was gratefully received at first by the Latin Americans. Doubts of its value to them were expressed later. Latin Americans understood the basic desire of large states to influence the affairs of nearby states; they believed, with Disraeli, that nonintervention was impossible, in the long run, for a great power; and they knew that similar pledges by European states to maintain the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire were but a prelude to its partition. The association of the Monroe Doctrine with imperialism still has a considerable effect on inter-American relationships. The so-called Roosevelt corollary, Olney's fiat, the big stick, and manifest destiny are still remembered.

Such fears have been partly dispelled by the application of the good-neighbor policy, the continentalization of the Monroe Doctrine, and the nonintervention protocol. * * *

The trend now in Latin-American countries is to regard the Monroe Doctrine as belonging to them as much as to the United States—each is now bound to guarantee the territorial integrity of the others. They are collectively developing international law and have jointly expanded the noncolonization principle of the Monroe Doctrine by providing for the contingent administration of European colonies and possessions in this hemisphere. Consultation is thought of as a continentalized Monroe Doctrine in action.

IV

But consultation in reality means much more than this. * * *

The American governments are committed to consult without delay when the following occasions arise: Threats of aggression from outside the hemisphere (including "fifth column" activities); threats to change, or actual changes of, the sovereignty of any geographic region of America, now subject to the jurisdiction of non-American states; failures to observe the security zone; threats of hostilities between two or more American states; and interventions of one American state in the affairs of another. Indeed, the initiation of consultation is justified by any act susceptible of disturbing the peace; or (upon agreement) any important economic, cultural, or other question, in which the American states have a common interest.

Under the Declaration of Lima a consultative meeting, if unanimous, has enormous power: It can take any measures it deems advisable under the circumstances of a particular case to preserve the peace and it was assumed at Lima that the consultative procedure would be adequate for the American states jointly to determine the aggressor in particular cases and to decide upon appropriate inter-American sanctions.

Though consultative meetings have thus far dealt chiefly with external problems, they may shortly become important in intrahemispheric relationships. An intense boundary dispute is now in progress between Ecuador and Peru; the relations between the Dominican Republic and Haiti have been severely strained since the massacre of several thousands of Haitians on the Dominican frontier in 1937; and Bolivia still aspires to Arica (Chile) as an outlet to the sea. The American states have agreed not only to consult in all matters between themselves which affect the peace of the hemisphere, but not to have resource to hostilities or take any military action whatever for 6 months while consultation is in progress. * * *

The implications of such mediating functions were expanded in the Declaration of Lima: The American states declared that "in case the peace, security or territorial integrity of any American Republic is * * * threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation, * * * using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable." The prospective development of precedents and rules in the field of mediation in the Western Hemisphere can best be seen by comparing this declaration with Article 11 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Article 11 declares that "any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations."

The terms of the two provisions are substantially the same. Both declare that a threatened breach of the peace is a matter of common concern; that the parties may, in jointly attempting to keep the peace, take such action as may be appropriate thereto under the facts of particular cases; and both are applicable, irrespective of whether or not third states are directly affected by the threat. The main differences, apart from phraseology, are that the declaration of Lima is in the form of a declaration and limited to threats of war against inter-American peace, whereas article 11 is in treaty form and applies to a threat anywhere.

The League's practical application of article 11 to concrete cases contributed to the tech-

nique of the prevention of war in the case of disputes between small states. Article 11 was the League's mediating provision, under which a provisional remedy known as the cease-fire practice developed. * * *

Under the cease-fire practice the following things could be done by the League Council immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities or a serious threat thereof: Issue warnings to the disputants reminding them of their treaty obligations to settle disputes by peaceful methods; order them to cease firing and to withdraw their armed forces behind their own borders; make a temporary armistice, pending a decision on the merits; use neutral military attachés on the spot to carry out its orders, who could give specific directions implementing the council's orders and personally supervise the cessation of hostilities.

The inter-American consultative system carries the same implications. Less drastic procedure would presumably be applied, at first at least, in settling inter-American disputes. * * * Nevertheless, if an American disputant were recalcitrant, and if there were unanimity on the part of all the American states (other than the disputants), a consultative meeting, in the name of all the American states, could bring great pressure to bear on the disputants to settle the dispute on its merits in accordance with the inter-American peace machinery. * * *

V

It is realized in the United States that the free flow of commerce is a highly important factor in the economy and unity of the country. There is not equal unanimity in respect of free international trade, even as regards the American states. International law and organization are far less advanced in the economic field than in the political. The existing principle of international law is that states are free to decide for themselves whether or not they will grant favors to other states or groups of states, and there is no international counterpart to the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Trade Commission.

Secretary Hull's unconditional most-favored-nation trade agreements policy is a concrete program for the reciprocal moderation of excessive trade barriers. The inter-American conferences since 1933 have approved this policy, but the American governments have not always applied it in practice. The basic problem is the same in Latin America as in the United States. Powerful protectionist interests exist; customs unions are being considered; exchange controls, quotas, import licensing arrangements, regional preferences, and other discriminatory measures are being applied.

Much continuous uphill work will be required to persuade the American governments to apply the unconditional most-favored-nation principle on a hemispheric basis. The Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, established at Panama, was created with this purpose in mind and to cope with the perennial economic and financial problems of Latin America which had become acute with the outbreak of the European war. * * *

Certain Latin American states have been attempting for some time to limit, even to abolish, the diplomatic protection of property abroad. The matter is of great importance to United States investors. The position against such diplomatic protection is as follows: The prospective foreign investor must take into account the hazards which are common to business in the country; if he invests he identifies the destiny of his capital with the social trends in the country; if he suffers a deprivation, he must charge it to profit and loss; he cannot invoke the aid of his government in demanding compensation through the diplomatic channel, and especially he must respect the terms of a Calvo Clause.

The basis of the argument is expounded as follows: Diplomatic protection of property is intervention, which is now inadmissible; as states are equal under international law, governments cannot claim, for their nationals abroad, more property rights than those of nationals of the country; as a breach of international law cannot take place in relation to the property of a national, neither can such a breach take place in respect of a foreigner; as denials of justice are few, diplomatic protection is unnecessary, as property claims involving a breach of international law can be arbitrated.

Althought there are cogent arguments in answer to these points, the argument cannot be wholly ignored. * * * Not all governmental interferences with property are confiscations. An international law counterpart of the doctrine of substantive due process of law may develop. * * *

Any possible agreement to displace the diplomatic method of protecting property by the use of arbitration would, however, require a system of compulsory inter-American arbitration. No such system exists, but a plan for an inter-American compulsory system, limited to types of pecuniary claims which would include property claims, has been suggested and is now being discussed by a few interested persons, including some Latin-American diplomats in Washington. The plan is to do away with the obligation to pay awards in cash if the American governments will agree to settle their claims on the basis of international law. The primary purposes underlying the idea are that, through the development of judicial precedents, the body of international law will be increased and the foreign office claims dockets cleared up. As awards are made, credits will be placed in special arbitral accounts. As great a portion as possible of the balances due will be canceled by a clearing-house process. The remainder will eventually be settled by the delivery of surplus products. To avoiding upsetting the domestic economy of the sending or the receiving state the deliveries will be made in small annual amounts over a long period of time, or by other diplomatic quid pro quo's such as port dues, trade agreements, or water rights. * * *

A large body of international law precedents would result from a thoroughgoing application of such a program.

The international rule that the courts of one state will not inquire into the validity of the acts of another state, while still generally upheld, is under much stress in the United States at present because of alleged confiscatory acts of foreign governments. In situations where foreign states ignore international law, as by confiscating the property of aliens or attempting to give extra-territorial effect to confiscatory decrees, the courts of American states may change this rule and refuse enforcement on the ground that such acts are contrary to public policy or international law.

VI

The inter-American conferences are progressively making use of multipartite international instruments. Although these are frequently designated as "declarations"—in one instance as an "Act"—they have been spoken of officially as "agreements" and as "understandings reached." Three declarations have been set forth by Under Secretary Welles in an official publication as being part of the "juridical framework" of the system of consultation and the Habana Consultative Meeting officially considered the Declaration of Panama to have "juridical effects." * * *

International lawyers are in disagreement as to the legal effect of international instruments not made in conventional form. The binding force of the formal declaration is still an open question.

This inter-American development is challenging. The chief reason for the use of declarations by the American states is that Latin American governments, too, have legislative difficulties related to ratification.

It may be observed in this connection that the form of an international obligation, whether conventional or declaratory, is not determinative of its effectiveness. Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, in terms, purports to extend the territorial integrity policy of the Monroe Doctrine on a world-wide basis, but it was never really applied, though adopted in treaty form. The declarations contained in the Monroe Message, on the other hand, were not in treaty form but have been applied with telling effect by the United States, and it is difficult to believe that the "continentalized" Monroe Doctrine will be less respected by Latin American governments because it is based, in part, on the Declaration of Lima. In the final analysis the efficacy of any international instrument depends upon the will to effectuate it. * * *

This development may have important implications for the future development of the law, and should perhaps be considered in relation to the difficulties involved in the adoption of well-stated codifications.

VII

The key to the prospective development of international law in the Western Hemisphere lies in the continuation of the practical statesmanship recently exhibited in the institution of consultation. The spiritual effect on Latin Americans of the "continentalization" of the Monroe Doctrine, and of being dealt with as equals, is tending toward an inter-American solidarity, different from the Pan-Americanism of the past. * * *

The importance of the consultative system is reflected in the viewpoint that consultation fulfills, or can fulfill, all the vital inter-American needs, and that consequently an American League of Nations is not needed. * * *

In contrast to a generally chaotic outside world where law in international relations is to a large extent being replaced by force the American hemisphere may conceivably become the repository of the primary principles of international conduct considered as binding on states for the past three centuries. The American governments and peoples seem to be progressively realizing this; and while they are aware of the need for reexamining certain fundamental postulates they are also conscious that if the current developments of law by the American states are ultimately to contribute to the growth of an orderly world the rules they initiate must be designed to operate not only to the advantage of some of the American states, or all of them, but to the world at large.

Wanted—For the American Army: Youthful Leadership and Promotion by Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. ROSS COLLINS, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to extend my remarks

by including therein an article appearing in the Reader's Digest of July 1941, prepared by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS]. I consider the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] to be the outstanding military authority in the Congress on national defense and one of the outstanding military authorities of the country.

The article follows:

[From the Reader's Digest for July 1941]

WANTED—FOR THE AMERICAN ARMY: YOUTHFUL LEADERSHIP AND PROMOTION BY MERIT

(By Ross A. COLLINS, Member and for many years chairman of the House subcommittee in charge of War Department appropriations)

(Congressman COLLINS contributed to the Reader's Digest last month an article of sensational importance, already widely quoted and discussed. In it he asked why we are drafting young men by the millions out of productive civilian life into an old-fashioned mass-army, larger than we can train or equip—or even need—for modern war.)

(This month, Congressman COLLINS discloses another grave defect in the organization of our Army, and urges specific steps to correct it.)

(Representative COLLINS is known as the outstanding military expert in Congress. Of him, Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen wrote in The Washington Merry-Go-Round: "During 20 somnolent years after the World War, when the U. S. Army was unworried over modern military trends which were to make Europe a shambles, the chief thorn in its side was Congressman ROSS COLLINS from Mississippi, who refused to let it sleep. He kept taunting it with the fact that what was needed was more tanks, armored cars, and airplanes—and fewer horses. He kept vainly goading it to adopt the type of weapons with which Hitler is now sweeping Europe. Today the Army, a little late, admits COLLINS WAS right.")

As the Nazi tide of world conquest surges ever higher the American people are coming to realize that, by contrast to Germany's mechanized might, the American Army is pitiably old-fashioned. As I pointed out last month, we not only lack a truly modern military force but no plans for getting one have been made public to date (May 25). Despite our huge Army camps, swarming with draftees, our state of unpreparedness is positively frightening.

Why is it that the military leaders to whom in the past we have entrusted American defense have failed us so often and so deplorably?

A military command that has lagged so far behind the progress of military science as to subordinate the dominant role of coordinated tanks and dive bombers is as absurd as would be a business house that still clung to kerosene lamps and used messenger boys instead of the telephone.

There is one primary reason, I think, that explains why our Army is old-fashioned:

Its peacetime leadership has always been old-fashioned.

It is still mainly officered by old men, too many of whom have been stodgily planning for yesterday's wars. They have seemed determined to keep unbroken our Army's long record of last-ditch resistance to every new weapon, to every new method, to almost all progress and originality.

If most of the men in our Army command are at fault, is there not something wrong with the way those men are chosen?

I think there is.

In nearly every other branch of American life, a premium is put on enterprise, vision, aggressive, and creative efficiency. In the Army, largely because of the method of promotion of officers by seniority, those qualities are penalized—and the plodding, backward-looking conservative comes to the top.

There are two distinctly disastrous consequences of our system of peacetime promotion by mere seniority:

1. The conservative, elderly officers who emerge into higher command have little sympathy with audacious progress.

2. The officers who must lead our young men in actual battle are untested in ability for such leadership. They are captains or majors or colonels just because they've been in the service a certain number of years, and not at all because they have ever been drastically and competitively rated on their ability to do the jobs they'd have to do in war.

From the Germans we ought to have learned again the lesson that it takes young men to win wars. To conquer and enslave all Europe, they have relied on youthful command, plus a diabolical ingenuity in the use of new weapons. They took our own American inventions—notably the plane and the caterpillar track—and with them reshaped their entire military, air, and naval establishment to a formula of destruction that has revolutionized warfare.

This formula, which even I anticipated repeatedly in the House before and after 1932, was one which our own dominant military figures could not, or would not, accept. The oft-told tale of their subordination of aviation—their opposition to its full military use and full development in an Air Department—is a matter of record. So, too, is their neglect of tanks. When today's crisis came we found ourselves with utterly inadequate air strength, with only a few tanks, and not one panzer division. We found ourselves without modern antitank guns, without enough antiaircraft guns to protect a single city.

Let me say at once that, though I think Congress should be better organized to do its part in military defense, it is utterly unfair for the Army to blame Congress for our present military dilemma. At no time, even before the Roosevelt administration, has our Appropriations Committee denied the War Department budget for experimentation with new weapons, for modernizing our Army, or for buying new matériel. (We have often increased such appropriations.)

The record proves, it seems to me, that things are not right in our Military Establishment as a whole and particularly in the War Department—which has never been overhauled.

Our desperate situation is doubtless far too involved to be charged wholly to any single factor, but if there is one factor more than any other it is—I repeat—that our dominant military policy makers have been chronically old, too old to anticipate and apply new ideas. As a result of their conservatism our soldiers will go on maneuvers this summer without sufficient tanks and other modern weapons—with only slight training by a few in plane-tank teamwork.

The skilled handling of a tank, especially at night, with all lights out, over rough terrain, with other vehicles driving ahead on all sides, is one of the sternest tests of modern soldiery. Many of our younger officers agree that it is silly to attempt to train a 1-year draftee for tank work. Yet an even sterner test of skill is the intimate, minute-by-minute coordination between these land battleships and dive bombers traveling 5 or 6 miles a minute.

It took German officers—handpicked young officers and long-term competitively chosen soldiers—6 or 8 years to train their plane-tank teams. What was our Army doing during those years? We had as much time, as much mechanical skill, as the Germans. And we knew what they were doing. But our military leaders did nothing. They were still thinking about past wars.

Goering has boasted that there is no mystery about German success. It is based on "modern and plentiful weapons, intensively trained young officers, and a high quality of leadership."

Here in America, where we have unequaled productive capacity and countless young men of inventive and mechanical turn, our military policy makers have been too old (in years or in point of view) even to make a pretense of keeping up with the Germans. Yet we might have been several jumps ahead of them had our Army encouraged youthful initiative and daring action in the way that American industry does.

In the World War, General Pershing "for the good of the service" restaffed the A. E. F. with young commanders. He cabled to Secretary of War Baker:

"Both the British and French higher officers emphasize in the strongest terms the necessity of assigning younger and more impressionable men to command brigades and divisions. General officers must have 'go' and initiative if they are to fill positions fraught with momentous consequences to the lives of thousands of our men."

Disregarding seniority, Pershing saw to it that his five chiefs of section in France were all young men. In the summer of 1918, Brigadier Generals Dennis E. Nolan and Harold B. Fiske were only 46, W. D. Conner only 44, Fox Conner and George V. H. Moseley, 43. Frank R. McCoy was made a brigadier at 43, and Douglas MacArthur and B. D. Foulois (Chief of the Air Corps) at 38. At 36, General Marshall's ability was recognized.

Compare our present situation: According to the Baltimore Sun published May 17, of 16 major generals on the permanent list 5 will be retired for age this year, 2 next year, 3 in 1943, and 4 in 1944. Of the 2 remaining, the younger, chief of General Headquarters, will be 58 years old next week. On the permanent list we have 41 brigadiers, with the youngest past 50. Twenty-five of our 62 temporary major generals—including staff generals—have passed the age of 60.

This condition, to my notion, is simply awful. We must do something about it.

During peacetime promotion in our Army is discouragingly slow. A second lieutenant can hope to become a first lieutenant only after serving 3 years, a captain after 10 years, a major after 17, a lieutenant colonel after 22, a colonel after 28—when certain to be 50 or older. Often there are long intervals when even this slow promotion is delayed lest the Army be top-heavy with officers. Still worse, during peacetime it is only after our officers become colonels, at 50 or beyond, that they are subject to selection, rather than automatic promotion, for higher ranks. The inevitable consequence, as General Pershing emphasized, is that men well along in years shape and dominate Army policies and plans right down to the moment of crisis.

What all this means to any alert, imaginative, ambitious, and able young officer can easily be imagined. He may know that he is a better man than many ahead of him. He knows that even high schools nowadays have different classes for the quick and the slow. He knows that corporations could not survive if their junior executives had to abide wholly by seniority. Nevertheless he must wait, years on end, through the best years of his life, for promotion to rank where he can reflect his ideas in Army policies or get large experience in handling men.

To correct so discouraging a condition, I make these recommendations:

1. Lower the age of retirement for all Army officers to 55.

2. Abolish the seniority rule altogether, all the way down into the ranks, and make promotion dependent wholly on merit. Merit should be demonstrated by exacting physical and competitive examinations and by competition in the field, with due emphasis on brains, initiative, imagination, resourcefulness, and all that it takes to be a leader of men.

3. Eliminate the bottom 5 percent, every year, of officers of all ranks. Why should the Government be the great white father of everyone who has obtained a commission? The Government discharges civilian employees for incompetence. So does every corporation. Nothing, I believe, would do more to get our officers on their toes than the everlasting threat of discharge.

4. Give up calling retired officers back to service even in times of crisis. This would be an aid toward discarding outmoded policies and training.

5. Extend all these recommendations to the National Guard, which represents an important part of our military defense and should be kept just as modern, provided with just as modern weapons and training, as the Regular Army.

6. Apply these recommendations to the Officers' Reserve, since about three-fourths of our present officers are drawn from this important reservoir.

7. Study the promotion methods of some of our most alert corporations with a view to bettering methods in our Army. The wise corporation leaves as little as possible to chance or favoritism. It bases advancement of distinctive young men largely on the recommendations of trained personnel experts who keep tabs on every junior executive from the time he enters the company's employ. This system would give the imaginative, inventive, and hard-working young officer a chance. It would help to discover born leaders—one of the Army's greatest needs.

Besides these seven innovations—none of which the oldest inhabitant of Capitol Hill has ever heard our military policy-makers propose to Congress—I would go further I urge that we:

8. Relieve Army officers and troops from all activities which civilians can do as well or better, at less cost. About one-half of our officers and men usually are concerned with other things than combat training. Their time should be spent in battle practice.

9. Abolish the arsenals and get the Army out of research and manufacturing—for too many valid reasons to be set down here.

Finally, as a direct aid to the morale and quality of officers and men and, even more important, as an imperative requirement of a modern army:

10. Eliminate the traditional barriers between the different branches of the Army, such as the lines separating the Infantry from the Air Corps, the Artillery from the Engineers, and so on.

There is a supremely important and conclusive reason for this if we are ever to get a compact, fast-moving, hard-hitting Army with the new plane-tank combination as its spearhead. In such an army no single branch can go it alone successfully. The modern commander must be able to coordinate in action two or three or all branches—tanks, planes, engineers, artillery, etc. In the formation of our triangular divisions—poor substitutes for panzer divisions—the War Department admits the need of the simultaneous movement of different kinds of troops, each with its special tasks. The time may rapidly be approaching when, to defend a port or a base, we shall need to call into action our total strength, naval as well as air and land. Meanwhile the least we can do is to prepare our Army as a whole to do its part as a unit, not piecemeal.

These innovations are, no doubt, the most radical in the long history of war.

There have been but few.

The most revolutionary innovations have appeared, and caught us unprepared, during the last year.

These will not be the last we shall see. Even now the number of ships crippled and destroyed by planes has mounted until it exceeds the number destroyed by submarine. Before long it may well be that the plane will dominate the sea and the land of this whole tortured planet.

To safeguard America and adapt our Army to the swiftly changing scene radical action is necessary. And it cannot come too soon.

Plan Is Made To Improve Physical Condition of Men Rejected in Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AND THE LEGISLATIVE OFFICER OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

MAY 19, 1941.

Brig. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Deputy Director, National Headquarters, Selective Service System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: I appreciate your letter of May 16, in which you express interest in the comments which Members of Congress might desire to make on the operation of the selective-service system.

It shall be my purpose to contact certain officials of the draft board in my congressional district and get their reaction to the operations of the Selective Training and Service Act. I shall be glad to forward constructive suggestions to Captain Keesling, whom you have appointed as assistant operations executive.

It has been brought to my attention that 43 percent of the men examined for military training have been found ineligible for service due to physical disabilities. I believe that the large proportion of these have had trouble with their teeth. It would seem to me that a definite program should and must be undertaken to correct these physical shortcomings just as soon as possible. It is not enough to find the trouble, but attempts should certainly be made to improve the physical condition of these refused men. That procedure would seem to me to be the part of a good national policy, vital to our continued preparedness program.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1941.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: I am writing to you pursuant to our telephone conversation of this date.

In your letter of May 19, 1941, and as supplemented in our conversation of this date, you have pointed out that a great many of the men examined for military training have been found ineligible due to physical disabilities and that some program should be established to improve the physical condition of these men and remedy the situation.

We have been greatly concerned about this situation, and over a long period of time have been giving careful consideration to it toward the end of developing a satisfactory and workable plan.

We have attempted and will continue to attempt by publicity, and otherwise, to encourage the registrants themselves to prehabilitate themselves prior to taking their local board physical examinations by familiarizing themselves with our physical standards, consulting their own physicians, and taking such corrective treatment as may be necessary to correct any physical defects and deficiencies that are disclosed.

In addition to this prehabilitation endeavor we have also been giving considerable study and consideration to a rehabilitation program in connection with those who are found to have remedial physical defects or deficiencies in the course of the local board or induction station examination. We are working in close cooperation and coordination with the War Department and with other governmental agencies who are also well aware of the necessity for establishing a satisfactory plan to remedy the situation. It is our hope and intention to proceed in this manner as rapidly as possible toward the end that a satisfactory and workable plan will be agreed upon and put into effect at the earliest possible time.

We believe that in addition to the War Department there are a number of Federal, State, and local agencies which may be effectively used in such a program. However, there are many problems and details which must of necessity be solved before any plan can be put into effect. Of such problems, one of the most troublesome is the problem concerning compulsory rehabilitation of men who have failed to pass their physical examination.

For your information I am enclosing copy of an address given by Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Acting Director of the Selective Service System, at the National Nutrition Conference for Defense on May 27, 1941. This is the address referred to by the statements in the newspapers, with which you are familiar.

I shall keep you informed of the status of our endeavors in connection with this most important problem. If you desire further information concerning this matter or, from time to time desire information concerning any other matter pertaining to selective service, please let me know and I shall furnish it to you.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,
FRANCIS V. KEESLING, JR.,
Captain, Specialist, Legislative Officer.

Bernard Ades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

LETTER FROM NATHAN STRAUS, FEDERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY,
Washington, June 30, 1941.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'ALESANDRO: This is with further reference to your concern

about the case of Mr. Bernard Ades, an employee of the United States Housing Authority, which has led to your discussing this matter with me, at which time you pointed out certain facts contained in his record prior to his employment by the U. S. H. A.

As soon as it was called to my attention earlier this month that Mr. Ades had run for Governor of Maryland on the Communist ticket in 1934, I promptly asked the Department of Justice for a thorough investigation of the whole situation.

Pending the results of this investigation, I asked a special committee composed of three members of the United States Housing Authority staff, including the Deputy Administrator, Mr. Keyserling, as chairman, to hold hearings in this case on my behalf and to summarize for me the facts as disclosed by these hearings.

While I do not believe that I ought now to take final action in this case without awaiting the report from the Department of Justice, which I expect by the middle of this week, the facts disclosed thus far and the findings and recommendations of the committee just referred to justify some immediate action. Therefore I have decided to suspend Mr. Ades without pay, beginning today, and to take such final action as will seem proper as soon as I receive the Department of Justice report.

Needless to say, there was nothing in Mr. Ades' file at the time he applied for and was placed in a position as a $2,000-a-year auditor with the United States Housing Authority in 1939 to indicate facts in his former record which have so recently been revealed to me.

Faithfully yours,

NATHAN STRAUS, *Administrator.*

Pat Harrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

STATEMENT BY JACK KYLE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Jack Kyle, national educational director, the Regular Veterans Association:

No group mourns the death of the late senior Senator from Mississippi, the Honorable PAT HARRISON, more than the Regular Veterans Association. Senator HARRISON was perhaps our chief recognized authority on tax legislation. He was universally respected for his independent judgment, and he never failed to offer opposition to anything contrary to his homespun philosophy.

While PAT HARRISON was making history in the field of Government finance he was further demonstrating his statesmanship by actively championing the cause of the veterans of the Regular Services, a then forgotten minority.

Back in the dark days of the depression and incident economy acts Senator HARRISON—though not a veteran himself—alined himself with the cause of this neglected group.

PAT HARRISON took the lead in pushing the now famous Andreas Berger case to a satisfactory conclusion.

In 1935 only those disabled Regulars discharged for disability could be hospitalized under the law. Berger, with one foot in the grave, came to Washington and applied to R. V. A.'s then national commander, Walter Johnson, who immediately went to work with Senator HARRISON to correct the situation through legislation.

It was to the sympathetic PAT HARRISON that undisputed credit belonged for legislation that was enacted to remove this cruel discrimination. By the attachment of a rider on another bill, almost overnight the hospitals were again thrown open to literally thousands of former sailors, soldiers, marines, and Coast Guard men disabled while in the service of their country.

Later Senator HARRISON made a thorough investigation of the treatment being given our disabled Regulars. He was to have sponsored the 1936 bill—Public, No. 788—but, due to illness, he was obliged to leave the management of the bill to the Senate Pensions Committee. This understanding committee acted in full accord with PAT HARRISON'S recommendations, with the result that Public, No. 788, became more than a number—it was law.

The Nation can ill afford to lose such statesmen as PAT HARRISON.

Church Schools Closed in Nazi Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON DAILY GLOBE

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Daily Globe, of June 27, 1941:

[From the Boston Daily Globe of June 27, 1941]

CHURCH SCHOOLS CLOSED IN NAZI TERRITORIES—DISPATCH TO THE PILOT SAYS FAMOUS ABBEYS CONFISCATED

(From the Current Issue of The Pilot)

ZURICH, June 26.—The Nazi Government has directed harsh and oppressive measures against Catholic educational institutions in Germany, Austria, Sudetenland, and the Protectorate of Moravia and Bohemia, according to word reaching here from highly reliable sources.

Transformation of state Catholic elementary schools into nonsectarian schools has been widespread, and the suppression of private Catholic schools is almost complete. In all elementary schools religious instruction has been notably curtailed, and in the secondary schools there has been a general effort to replace religious instruction with lessons in the National Socialist doctrines. Crucifixes have been removed from the schools, and every means has been employed to keep members of the clergy away from the institutions.

Using the war as a pretext, Nazi officials have closed many major and minor seminaries. Numerous Catholic colleges and academies have been subjected to the same treatment. In some instances, where the colleges and academies were not closed by direct action, they were subjected to uses and placed in conditions so incompatible with the principles of Christian education that the school authorities themselves could do nothing but discontinue classes.

World-famous abbeys and a very large number of religious institutions—both the monasteries of priests and the convents of sisters—have been confiscated, together with all their appurtenances. The communities of religious men and of religious women were dispersed.

In Bavaria and Austria, the Nazis have abolished the financial obligations which the state and local authorities had to the Catholic Church. They have also seized religious properties, including funds, lands, and buildings.

Over and above all these repressive measures on the part of officials themselves ecclesiastical properties have been subjected to acts of vandalism without the authorities making any attempt to apprehend or to punish the guilty parties. In the press and in virtually every organ of publicity, grave insults are leveled against religion, against the person of the Sovereign Pontiff himself, against the Catholic Church in general, and the Catholic clergy in particular, without an opportunity being given to Catholics to defend themselves.

Even religious services are arbitrarily curtailed. The pastoral letters of bishops to their flocks, and even papal documents, are forbidden to be disseminated. There have been instances of the arrests of priests.

Subversive Influences in Labor Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, the introduction of H. R. 5148 and H. R. 5149, which, in truth and fact, are one and the same bill, or contain the same substance, inspires me to make certain utterances.

I have said before, and will repeat that Hitler is the greatest immediate threat to American democracy; he has pushed himself forward as the potential conqueror of the world. I have further said and will repeat that the most definite threat our democracy is, and has been subjected to, is the forces of communism and fascism that have been boring and gnawing into our body politic like poisonous worms. Hitler stands up before us a disclosed enemy, and these other forces crawl and roll around amongst us as serpents trying to stay within our confidence until they have eaten the sinews from the body of our national life.

These forces are directed and sponsored, one by Hitler and his lieutenants and the other by the highlights of the Communists. They have for years worked hand in hand in our midst, seeking a common cause, each assuming that when they got us ready for the knockout blow, their country would prevail in the Old World and take us over. They have constituted such a harmonious team through the last several months until it has been very noticeable. They have worked hand in hand with Charles A.

Lindbergh and John L. Lewis, who seem to have established themselves as the most outstanding proponents of the two "isms" we are now called upon to deal with.

They have been, and by necessity must be, very shrewd and cunning, for they must fly under false colors to be at all effective. Unfortunately, they have chosen labor organizations as the medium through which to do their destructive work. I have warned my people of John L. Lewis for years and of Charles A. Lindbergh long before I entered the National Congress.

The bill I referred to in the beginning of these remarks, in my opinion, embraces some of the most far-reaching and important legislation that has ever been before this body. I feel there is no legislation we could pass that will bespeak more protection to the future of our democracy than is provided by this bill. In substance it provides:

First. That to hold office in a labor organization one must be a citizen of the United States.

Second. That such officeholder must have actually engaged in the trade represented by such organization for at least 3 years.

Third. That any officer handling the funds of such organization must be adequately bonded.

Fourth. That such organization shall render to each member an annual financial statement of the organization.

Fifth. That such organization shall submit to arbitration without stoppage of work jurisdictional and representation disputes.

Sixth. That the charter and bylaws of such organization shall bind its members to postpone strikes in any labor dispute for at least 60 days upon securing agreement that settlement of such disputes will be retroactive.

There is no man who is fair to labor and our Government that can oppose these provisions. The Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., recently in convention assembled passed a resolution embracing the provisions of this act. It comes from the bosom of labor, an organization that is truly American and sincerely endeavoring to promote the best interest of American workmen and not sow seeds of discontent among a class to promote savage ideals of any foreign dictatorship.

Let us analyze the merits and prospective effect of this act.

Subsection 1 bars aliens from holding office in the organization. If this had been done in the past most of the gangsters would have been eliminated from labor—for one example, Harry Bridges. Labor would have been spared many deserving criticisms which have been thrust against it on account of acts of a foreigner who was at the head of the organization. This is the type of leadership that has exploited labor and made it possible for ex-bootleggers and ex-convicts to build and maintain large and expensive estates at the expense of honest American workmen whose wives and babies were, in many instances, living in shacks, with improper food.

Subsection 2 provides that to lead an organization one must be experienced in that special trade, which insures a leadership of understanding of both the problems of labor and management. I have always contended that there was not much harm in a man who was willing to work and who did work. This clause would prevent gangsters and racketeers who have no interest in the workingman obtaining control of the organization and through selfish exploitation enriching themselves at the expense of labor. This type of leadership seeks confusion between labor and management to further its own cause and to impress those whom it represents or its usefulness to them.

Subsections C and D go directly to the protection of the masses of the organization and need no comment for the value of their provisions to be at once recognized. Please be assured that no honest man minds to be bonded and to account for his handling of any funds entrusted to him. Furthermore, the bond requirement would itself prevent racketeers and those of questionable character from seeping into control. When application is made for bond, the company from whom the bond is sought will go fully into the record of such applicant and through this medium his record is disclosed. In fact, the bonding company would constitute a detective bureau for the membership of the various organizations.

Subsections E and F plainly by their own language justify themselves. When strikes over jurisdictional and representation disputes are controlled one of the greatest weapons of the racketeers at the head of labor organization is destroyed. No one can oppose the 60-day postponement as written in this bill, its retroactive provision fully safeguards the rights of those concerned.

I feel honored to know that I was one of the first to confer with the representative of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., with regard to the advisability of sponsoring the referred-to bill I worked with the railroad 7 years with the various crafts and have throughout my life been associated closely with officers and members of labor organizations; but I thank God that they were organizations that were not only led by, but the membership of which was made up of, true, patriotic American citizens. I think I can safely say that the American workingman, when not beguiled by the poisonous elements hereinbefore referred to, represents as true a patriot as America has. I see as much danger to the rights of labor coming from these subversive sources as I do for our cherished democracy. They would have you believe that they are masquerading in labor colors and are labor's friends. Through this disclosure it can clearly be seen that they are representing other forms of government and not ours. I only ask the workingman of America, who cherishes his fireside and receives joy from the gleam radiating from the tender eyes of his babe, to reflect for a moment and consider what the workingman gets in Russia and Germany. This will answer the question of what labor will be subjected to if we do not stop the monstrosity of this well-planned and direct attack on our system of government.

The conduct of one wing of those who are desperately trying to uproot our Government, in recent months has been amusing. John L. Lewis has exerted every effort to break down our program of national defense. A bunch of foreign-born whose loyalty to communism cannot be questioned has disgraced the dignity of our White House by patroling it 24 hours daily with placards designed to establish their loyalty to America, when they knew their sole purpose was to destroy what our forefathers have wrought through the years, and take from your babes and mine the privilege of living in a free land. One hour before we had notice of Hitler's march on Stalin they abruptly withdrew and vanished to destinations unknown and now from every side we hear what great Statesmanship the lend-lease bill bespeaks. Within a few hours Lewis requests the coal miners not to strike as it would greatly impair defense preparedness. When they thought Hitler and Stalin were breathing together they cooed together as love birds when they were then by deceitful means pushing their venom into the vitals of our democracy. The minute they saw their standard of government attacked they become very strong for aid to the Allies and quickly come to the parting of the ways with Lindbergh's so-called America First Committee. We will be simple recipients of the blessings of a free land if we cannot see through the light of their "right-about face," their true colors. We will be unworthy soldiers of the great cause if we do not awake and enact laws that will forever bar their nefarious attempts to bore into the heart of our beloved democracy and force them to at least obey the rules of patriotism to and respect of our Government. This bill is a long step in this direction, and I hope it will have the full support of the membership of this great body.

In the face of the seriousness of the matter I find humor in the thought of what Lindbergh is going to do for an audience now to scream and holler for him when he is trying to build Nazi sentiment throughout our land. A great portion of his audiences in the past have been of communistic sentiment, and, true to form, they will drop him like a hot brick since Hitler and Stalin have thrown their military forces against each other. He will have his Fascist left, however, and will at least feel a little more at home in their company.

Will the people of America refuse to mark Lewis and Lindbergh and their ilk by the unquestionable exposure of their kind and purpose? I am confident not.

In conclusion, I want to appeal to the patriotic, peace-loving people of the United States to become awake to this great threat and appeal to their Representatives in Congress to support this measure. They are your only means through which you can speak your sentiments; ask them to help in this great forward movement to rid ourselves of the poison that seeks to drive freedom from our land. When liberty and freedom have perished from the earth you will be a slave without right of an opinion, to say nothing of expressing it. Let me ask

you to act while the Stars and Stripes yet float triumphantly in free air over a free land.

Wire-Tapping Evidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the present bill brings squarely before us the doctrine that the end justifies the means. I have always considered that doctrine a most dangerous one. It is the doctrine upon which vast delegations of authority to the executive branch of the Government have been predicated. It is the doctrine which has provided the excuse for repeated encroachments on constitutional limitations and restraints. It is the doctrine which has encouraged those who delight in ridiculing a regard for the rights of the citizen as their ambitious program of the supremacy of the state has whittled away at the sovereignty of the citizen. I repeat, the doctrine that the end justifies the means is a dangerous philosophy to adopt by those who cherish the rights of freemen.

I have listened attentively to the debate on this measure. I have sensed an apologetic approach by the proponents, tantamount to an excuse that they are found as supporters of the bill. It is evident that they themselves are apprehensive of the probable consequences which are invited by this legislation. They appear to realize only too well that the extraordinary means which they are advocating would under no circumstances be tenable were it not for the ends which they seek.

But even this dangerous justification has no practical basis upon which it can be rested. We have heard much of wire tapping today for the purpose of discovering espionage and sabotage. The fact of the matter is, this practice, which has been resorted to in many instances for the purpose of persecution rather than prosecution, is not barred at this time. Is it reasonable to suppose that any extended efforts by spies or saboteurs or even the most amateurish attempts by enemies of our Government would be carried on with a complete disregard of the means now available for their detection? Suspicious individuals can be brought under surveillance by the methods now at hand—and every opportunity is open to Government agents to secure factual evidence thereafter which would be admissible in a court of law.

The purpose of this bill is to open the door for the admission of evidence which would otherwise be barred from the consideration of a jury. Were we at war such procedure might be considered as a necessity. But, let it be remembered, we are still at peace. That which might be justified as a war measure cannot be justified as necessary by those who insist that the decision of peace or war must be determined by the Congress. We have taken no such action. Until that momentous issue comes before this body for debate and ultimate decision, a war measure such as we are now considering has no place.

I need not dwell at length on the possible abuses to which this legislation would open the door. My fear is that it is only a beginning. So much can easily follow in its wake. One step can so easily follow another. As the rights of the sovereign superstate becomes the more powerful by the enactment of legislation of the character now before us, the safeguards and protection afforded by established rules of procedure and by rights long recognized as essential are weakened and impaired. We have already traveled into dangerous territory by the inroads which have been made on the rights of the citizen. To approve and support, without justification and needlessly, another step in the same direction is a hazard which I cannot endorse. To me the sovereignty of the citizen is a possession which I am challenged to defend.

Some reference has been made to the endorsement of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I have studied carefully that endorsement. I fail to find in it the enthusiastic endorsement which I am convinced would have been forthcoming from the distinguished Director of the F. B. I. had he really felt the bill was necessary for the detection or prosecution of criminals. At best, the statement seemed to me to be a weak-hearted effort—more in the nature of a lukewarm approval than anything else.

The temptation in times such as these, Mr. Speaker, is to indulge in excesses. Restraints are easily set aside under the plea of urgency and emergency. Cool, deliberative processes are threatened by the passions of the moment. A government of men is advocated as a necessity by the exigencies of the moment. With this pressure present, an even greater duty than usual devolves upon us to consider cautiously suggestions as now appear before us. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, our duty demands a regard for principles which have afforded protection to free men against the invasion of totalitarian methods, and the compelling commands of all-powerful forces of Government. I am persuaded, to use the words of Justice Brandeis, that—

> In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. * * * To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means—to declare that the government may commit crimes in order to secure the conviction of a private criminal—would bring terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine, this Court should resolutely set its face.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the warning sounded by the brilliant and distinguished jurist to whom I have referred, when he said:

> The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding. As for myself, I shall oppose at all times the insidious encroachments which may endanger liberty.

Dentistry and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

EDITORIAL BY DR. PAUL H. BELDING, OF WAUCOMA, IOWA

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Dr. Paul H. Belding, of Waucoma, Iowa, has furnished me considerable material dealing with the dental status of the American people. He points out in the monthly journal, entitled "Dental Items of Interest," of which he is the editor, that dental defects and diseases are a complicating factor in the national-defense program and that the physical well-being of our people is in jeopardy. The following is an extract from one of his editorials under the head of Dentistry's Status Must Change, which appeared in the issue for June 1941:

> The editorial, "Preparing for Eventualities," which appeared in the January issue of this publication presented statistics which revealed that 23 percent of the total rejections for military service from the Southern New York District of the Second Corps Area was due to dental defects.
>
> This editorial drew considerable comment, and there was a consensus that as the population group referred to was small and essentially limited to individuals from congested industrial areas the figures could not possibly be representative of the dental status of the potential national soldiery.
>
> It is, therefore, of interest to note that recent figures of a more representative nature not only substantiate the preliminary observations but also indicate that if there was any error, actual conditions were minimized rather than exaggerated.
>
> At the present time reports are coming in from widely separated geographic areas, and there is a relative constancy in the number of rejections due to dental defects. For example, the Selective Service Board of the State of Iowa recently reported that 27 percent of their total rejections was due to dental diseases, and a report dated March 7 from the director of the New York selective service indictates that up to the date of the release of the information 23 percent of the total rejections for military service was due to dental defects.
>
> It should be understood that the rejection percentages as released apply exclusively to the local oral conditions produced by dental diseases. It is true that these percentages are appallingly high; however, they are in no sense indicative of the actual number of rejections that can in all probability be attributed to these diseases in their totality.
>
> Due to the many intangible factors associated with dental pathosis, it would be hazardous to attempt to state in numbers, the total rejections that might be basically due to dental diseases. However, the opinion that disabling remote disease may be secondary to dental pathosis and would add considerably to the totality of dental disease, is supported by the opinion of many eminent authorities. For example, Charles Mayo stated: "The future of medical science rests with the dentist who can stop or kill the germs as they develop in the mouth.

* * * In America there has recently been a tremendous increase in heart disease and infections, and post mortem examinations seemed to show that much of this was fundamentally due to the teeth."

Dr. Edward C. Rosenow states: "It has been proven through innumerable experiments that various toxins or poisons originate in hidden abscesses around the roots of nerveless teeth, and find their way into various parts of the body, attacking the nerves or blood and causing long illnesses and even death attributed to other things." Too often, doctors (physicians) lay the death to heart disease and forget the teeth.

Sir William Osler, perhaps the greatest physician of the twentieth century stated: "The problem of mouth hygiene and the care of the teeth is the most important of any public-health measure. Most of the diseases which cause death in middle life are developed from conditions which begin in childhood, and the neglect of the mouth and the teeth is responsible for more loss of life than that of the use of alcohol in all its forms. * * * There is not a single thing in preventive medicine that equals mouth hygiene and the preservation of the teeth."

Dr. Weston A. Price, an American dentist, who incidentally is recognized by the Pickett-Thomson Research Laboratory of England as being one of the world's great scientists, has for years consistently emphasized that dental disease could not be divorced from general health.

The Declaration of Independence and the Republican Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY WILLIAM TYLER PAGE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Mr. William Tyler Page and the introduction thereto at a home-defense program, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Virginia, over station WWDC, June 29:

Mr. BURTON. I do not feel capable of introducing the next speaker. He has started each one of our programs by proxy with his composition that I am sure everyone is familiar with, The American's Creed. Mr. Page came to Washington 59 years ago and has been a servant of the people in the House of Representatives ever since. Mr. Page entered into competition with more than 3,000 contestants during the World War to write in 100 words the best summary of the political faith of America, and his The American's Creed won the prize of $1,000 offered by the city of Baltimore, the birthplace of the Star-Spangled Banner. Mr. Page bought liberty bonds from Charlie Chaplin, Mary Pickford, Douglas Fairbanks, and Marie Dressler with his prize money. I could talk about Mr. Page for an hour and not even begin to tell you of his many accomplishments. If you enjoy Mr. Page's talk call the studio and let him know that you do; I am sure he will appreciate that compliment. Ladies and gentlemen, may I present a real American, the Honorable William Tyler Page, minority clerk of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. PAGE. Fellow Americans, happy am I and privileged to speak here tonight under the auspices of that patriotic organization of Americans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Virginia.

These men went overseas to save the Republic of the United States for the world. I repeat, to save this Republic. The one truly representative system of government on earth, representative of the majesty of the people. These veterans did their honorable part to preserve civilization and to make this Republic the only safe place in all the world whereon the dove of peace might find a resting place—a home.

They were willing to make, as many did make, the supreme sacrifice for the safety, the honor, and the perpetuity of the American Republic. They were the embodiment of democratic nobility, the living emblems of American genius.

They sought neither fame nor renown, but only their country's justification and to uphold its honestly acquired rights upon the high seas.

Such has been the idealism of all of our soldiers and sailors, worthy of the best traditions and valor, the world over and in all time. It was an idealism that recognized a Supreme Being, that planted religious liberty on our shores, that overthrew despotism, that established a people's government, that wrote a Constitution setting metes and bounds of delegated authority, that fixed a standard of value upon men above gold, and that lifted high the torch of civil liberty along the pathway of mankind.

Tonight I am especially pleased to be the guest of the Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars. My forebears were Virginians, and I am justly proud of the part they took in the Colonial and constitutional history of our country. One was a signer of the Declaration of Independence, one a Governor of the Old Dominion, others were members of the House of Burgesses, of the Continental Congress, and of the Virginia Legislature, and contemporaries of Patrick Henry and of Richard Henry Lee.

In a few days we shall celebrate Independence Day, the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the immortal Declaration of Independence. Well might we exclaim on that day: "This is the day which the Lord has made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." For under the favor of God was the beginning of American history, in every crisis of which His oversight is indelibly impressed.

American independence was long in coming. Preparation for it was by slow processes. It had a long prolog. One event after another led to it inevitably. Tyranny could not hold sway over a liberty-loving people always. The American Colonies waited long and patiently. At long last independence was declared on July 2, 1776, by the resolution of Richard Henry Lee, followed by the form of Declaration on July 4, and a new nation was born. God set this event in a mighty framework of preparation.

Yonder historic river flowing by the seat of government on its way to the sea had its origin in the little hidden springs far up in the hills, and as its waters break upon the uncomplaining ocean shore the force that drives the mighty wave may have received its momentum in some cataclysmic eruption thousands of miles away. The shocks of newly cut wheat must lie in the sunshine and the rain for a long time before it ripens into golden grain for the use of man.

The little colony at Jamestown had implicit faith. Doubtless, some of them were descendants of the Barons of Runnymede, in whose breasts burned the unquenchable fires of liberty. "Doubt not," they wrote, "God will raise our state and build His church in this excellent clime."

It was this far-sighted group of people who, over 300 years ago, declared that it was their purpose "to erect a free popular state" in the New World, whose people were to have "no government putt upon them but by their own consente."

This doctrine, then originally laid down by the English founders of Virginia, the first Colony, was restated in the Declaration of Independence 169 years later, or 165 years ago, the anniversary of which we will observe next Friday.

"For more than a year Richard Henry Lee had openly advocated a declaration of independence." And, doubtless inspired by him "the Virginia convention of May 17, 1776, acting upon this line, instructed its delegation in Congress to move for absolute independence."

Lee was in Williamsburg at that time, where, he said in a letter to John Adams "the exultation here was extreme."

In pursuance of these instructions Mr. Lee brought forward on June 7, 1776, the following resolution:

"Resolved, That these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

It was the opinion of the members that he who first moved for independence would certainly be exposed to personal and immediate danger. John Adams seconded the resolution but neither his name nor that of Richard Henry Lee appeared in the Journal, the entry which was simply "certain resolutions respecting independence being moved and seconded," etc., indicating that the action was considered as one of fearful hazard and awful responsibility. Lee's resolution was referred to a committee, and debates followed from June 7 to July 2, on which latter date Lee's resolution was agreed to by a large majority, "and the adoption of the form of declaration on the 4th of July was a secondary matter."

Lee's resolution "was really the vital point, the crucial juncture."

It has always been a cause of wonderment to me why we celebrate July 4, the date of the Declaration instead of July 2, the date on which Congress actually agreed to Lee's resolution and declared then and there the independence of the Colonies. But custom has so decreed.

Tradition has it that Lee supported his own resolution in an eloquent speech, which he concluded in these prophetic words:

"If we are not thus wanting in our duty to our country the names of the American legislators of '76 will be placed by posterity at the side of Theseus, of Lycurgus, or Romulus, of Numa, of the three Williams of Nassau, and of all those whose memory has been, and forever will be, dear to virtuous men and good citizens." And they were so placed.

After presenting his resolution Lee, on June 10, left for home. It has been stated that he had learned of the dangerous illness of his wife. This may have been so, but it appears that while away he went to Williamsburg to assist in the creation of a new government for Virginia.

Had Lee remained in Philadelphia he, as author of the resolution for independence, undoubtedly would have written the Declaration for which he was preeminently qualified, but which honor fell to the lot of Thomas Jefferson as chairman of the committee.

Jefferson's draft was changed considerably from the original, a copy of which Jefferson sent to Richard Henry Lee with the remark, "You will judge whether it is the better or the worse for the critics." To which Lee very graciously replied, wishing "that the

manuscript had not be mangled as it is"; "but," he added, "however, the thing is in its nature so good, that no cookery can spoil the dish for the palates of freemen."

Thus the vision of the first colony at Jamestown was translated into reality, that "a free State" whose people were to have no government "putt upon them but by their own consente" was consummated after long travail and self sacrifice in the cause of liberty.

Victory at Yorktown was followed by an attempt to establish a stable government, but the Articles of Confederation were as a rope of sand and proved inadequate. Then, in order to form a more perfect Union, wise and illustrious men designed the Constitution of the United States therein establishing the American Republic, a standard or pattern form of government.

The young Republic then began to make material progress unparalleled in history. It solved problems, secured fundamental privileges, stood the strain of a great civil war, and advanced step by step, stage by stage, "from the wooden spade to the steam plow, from the oxcart to the freight train, from the blacksmith shop to the manufacturing plant, from the flail to the steam thresher, from the cradle to the self-binder, from the needle to the sewing machine, from the spinning wheel to the great textile mills, from the stage coach to the Pullman palace car, from the messenger on foot or horse to the telephone and telegraph, from the prairie schooner to the automobile and the airplane."

This and much more was accomplished within the pale of the Constitution which created the best form of government mankind ever knew. The people had constitutional morality. This truly became a land of the free and we could rightfully exclaim:

This land of the free is for thee and for me,
Live in it, love in it, work in it, weep in it,
Laugh in it, sing in it, die in it, sleep in it;
For it's for thee and for me
The fairest and rarest that man ever trod,
The dearest and sweetest 'twist the sky and the sod,
And it's thine and it's mine, thank God.

This Republic then had character. It had a soul. For what would we exchange it? For communism, for fascism, for nazi-ism, for socialism? What could this Nation get that is better in exchange for its own soul? In exchange for its constitutional system, in exchange for its freedom, in exchange for our starry flag? Let those answer who are dissatisfied.

Let me ask:

Is this still the Republic our forefathers bequeathed to us under which this Nation developed and prospered for 150 years?

It is said that Benjamin Franklin was with a European friend when the news of the ratification of the Constitution reached him. "Is it a monarchy or a republic?" his visitor eagerly inquired. "A republic—if we can keep it," was Franklin's prompt rejoinder.

Yes. If we can keep it. That is the question. And it becomes the duty of every real American to see that it is kept. But in order to keep our republican form of government it is absolutely essential that we know why it was established and what it means and not confuse it with the radical ideologies of the Old World nor the socialistic tendencies within our own borders.

Men do not live apart from their fellow men. They live under some form of government. Governments are necessary. It is a question of what kind or form of government they choose to live under, whether of autocrats or a government of their own, through chosen representatives. We in America have the form of self-government. We make our own laws. Each of us is a part of the Government. To think of government as something apart from ourselves, as many well-meaning people do, is erroneous and dangerous.

Either we control ourselves or we are controlled by others. Public opinion is a great power. Intelligent use of the ballot and respect for the law make for righteous freedom and the general welfare.

First of all, the great discovery that the people might be protected from any danger to their liberties, from the legislature or the courts as well as from the Crown, even from that Federal Government they were going to create; second, the great principle of the separation of the powers of government, which first appears in the Virginia Bill of Rights of 1776, just 1 month before the Declaration of Independence; and again in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, in the famous words of the closing paragraph of their great bill of rights: "In the government of this Commonwealth the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them; to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men." These last 10 words, you remember, Daniel Webster said were the greatest words contained in any written constitutional document.

The one end and aim, therefore, of a constitution is to protect the people's rights, both the rights of the whole people, or any part of the people, or even of one man as against the people, in such cardinal rights as by our constitutions he is declared not to have given away; to protect them against either king or legislature. This is constitutional government. The object of republican government is to enforce the will of the majority; the object of constitutional government is to protect the rights of the minority; to guarantee to each and every man, to every class, the essential rights that he must never part with.

James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, leaders among the wise statesmen who, in the light of experiments and failures of the past to establish permanent popular government, knew the kind and form of government they desired to create in America, and they also knew the difference between an autocracy and a republic, and the difference between a pure democracy and a republic, and they succeeded in erecting a republic, and were jealous to call it a republic, in which, as Madison said, "The scheme of representation takes place."

Hamilton believed, with Madison, "that the political principles of the people of this country would endure nothing but republican government." And these two founding fathers and their compatriots were not only instrumental in creating a republican form of government for the Nation, but they also aided in guaranteeing in the Federal Constitution that form to each of the States of the Union. So that each of our States is a lesser republic, so to speak, and the republican form of each is guaranteed by all.

One of our statesmen over 100 years ago said: "A monarchy is a man-of-war, stanch, iron-ribbed, resistless under full sail, but a single hidden rock can bring her to the bottom. A republic is a raft hard to steer, your feet always wet, but nothing can sink her."

We can take courage, therefore, and face our problems unflinchingly, however bad the outlook, knowing that we are on a safe craft, even though it is uncomfortable, as we pass through the cross currents into which we may have drifted far from our course.

We have ever been in all our national life ready and in a strong position to extend all proper aid and encouragement to less fortunate peoples groping their way from the darkness of autocracy into the light of liberty. And in this work we can better engage as a national entity with all the vigor and powers of a self-reliant people, and exercise greater influence for good upon the world's affairs independently of other nations, whose speech, habits, and government are foreign to our own, than to kill the spirit of the American Republic, discard its glorious emblem, abrogate its Constitution, forget its holy traditions and be lost in the maelstrom of world politics.

In yonder shrine in the Library of Congress are deposited as in a safety deposit box our securities, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the visible evidence of the faith of our fathers, security against tyranny, security of persons and property, security of our natural rights, and a reminder of our responsibilities.

Every real American is a receptacle of the faith of our fathers. In us, as in a safety deposit box, are those securities.

Let us, therefore, be true to the sacred trust and resolve to "keep the securities of the faith intact." Then, in all sincerity we can say—

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic, a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

Lest We Forget—Why Aid Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the European war began I counseled that we should be very careful of what we said and did officially. I counseled we should remember the advice of Washington to avoid all foreign entanglements and to avoid favoring any one nation as opposed to the others. At the same time, realizing that aggression was rampant in the world, I advised that we should so strengthen our own defenses as to make us invincible against aggression from whatever source. Do you not think that advice was sound in view of recent developments in Europe?

The first thing we did was to lift the arms embargo in order that legally we could drain our own meager reserves of arms, ammunition, and aircraft and give them to the "democracies" of Great Britain, France, China, Finland, Greece, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and so forth. Also, we opened our purse strings to all those nations, who were then friends of Britain and hence our friends, and who were resisting invasion by the aggressor dictator nations of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia. Furthermore, our official spokesmen heaped words of abuse on the dictator aggressor nations and words of praise on our friends, the "democracies."

Today the picture has changed completely. The Low Countries have been

conquered and forced into complete submission by the Nazis, yet American food for these conquered "democracies" is denied by Great Britain primarily because the English common people have great faith in the blockade as a measure of bringing Germany to her knees and hence official England will not permit any breach in the blockade. Furthermore, Britain feels it is up to the conqueror, Hitler, to feed these peoples, realizing that every trainload of food he furnishes creates that much additional strain on the German economic system.

Greece has been knocked out because she relied too much on promises of aid made to her by Britain and the United States which they could not fulfill; and knew they could not fulfill in time.

France has been knocked out because she placed too much reliance on a 1918 mass ground army equipped with rifles and bayonets behind antiquated stationary fortifications and without an adequate air force which could withstand the assaults of Germany's modern mechanized mobile army supported by a strong air force. Some feel that we are committing the same folly in our own preparedness today.

However, France is now forced to resist aggression in Syria and Africa by the democracy of Britain and, therefore, has now alined herself with Hitler and perchance may be using some of our own American-made airplanes which we rushed to her aid long ago—despite the fact that she had not paid her last World War debts and had no intentions of so doing.

Then our hearts bled for brave little Finland in her valiant stand against the overwhelming hordes of atheistic, dictator, communistic Russia. We rushed her a few airplanes, considerable money, and far more promises of additional aid, which we knew we could not fulfill in time. Today, Finland is again defending herself against being ruthlessly bombed and invaded by communistic Russia; but, today, Russia has been accepted as a friend by England and, therefore, accepted officially as a friend of ours. And so, now, possibly some of those American-made airplanes are being turned against our own friends, though Finland is now alined with Hitler.. Shall we now regard honest, debt-paying Finland as our enemy and order her consulates closed in this country? Shall we now furnish Russia with planes to bomb Finland?

Lest we forget: Over two and one-quarter million Christians have been slaughtered in atheistic Communist Russia. Has she now become Christianized?

Lest we forget: For more than 20 years the openly announced program of the American Communist Party, operating under orders and supplied with funds from Moscow, has been to bring about dissatisfaction, chaos, and eventually revolution in this country. Does the party now take the oath of allegiance to our flag, our principles, our cherished traditions? To my mind, the only essential difference between Hitler and Stalin is that Hitler is the more efficient.

Lest we forget, it was Stalin's economic alliance with Hitler in 1939 that encouraged Hitler to begin hostilities. Since then the Dies committee has uncovered countless reams of evidence to prove that many of the strikes in our defense industries have been started by Communists designed to stifle our own defense program and delay aid to Britain.

Now the tables have turned. The hungry wolves of dictatorship and aggression have fallen upon each other and the shaggy Russian bear has been greeted by Winston Churchill as an open ally. Churchill has promised that Britain and ourselves will give all possible aid to Russia. Our President and the Congress have refused to invoke the Neutrality Act, which would prohibit our shipments of war materials to either of these two dictator nations—Germany and Russia. I want to leave these questions with you: Has Russia overnight suddenly become a democracy in which Mr. Roosevelt's "four freedoms" prevail? Have we suddenly determined upon a policy that the only difference between the Nazis and Communists in America is that the Communists may now work for the Government and hold key positions in our defense industries? Are we now to hail each other as "comrade"? Are we now to take the Communist, who yesterday would bring about the overthrow of this country, and pull him to our bosom as a friend?

But, after all, supposing the administration is sincere in its promises to aid Russia, just what is it going to give her and just how is it going to get it to her in time to do any good? Why mislead the Russians as we did those in the Low Countries—in Yugoslavia, in Greece? After all, is not honesty still the best policy?

Personally, I think our best policy in the future should be to "keep our powder dry and our mouths shut and, in addition, let us make a lot more powder."

Daylight Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. HAROLD L. ICKES, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Secretary of the Interior:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 27, 1941.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In response to your inquiry over the telephone, I have no hesitation in saying that I am in favor of daylight saving on a national scale. In fact, I have expressed myself to this effect on several occasions recently, particularly since it became apparent that we not only had a present shortage of electric power but that this shortage would increase as time passed.

It does not seem to me that daylight saving in any particular region would meet the situation. Moreover, it has always been confusing for some area to have daylight saving for certain periods, during the summer while others observe it for different periods, and a vast section of the country not at all. It will be good for all of us to feel that we were doing even this little to economize on power. It would add to the sense of unity.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

A World War Veteran Expresses Himself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

LETTER FROM OWEN O. MORRIS, ORTING, WASH.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a letter from a resident of the old soldiers' home at Orting, Wash., in my congressional district, which expresses in blunt language the deep emotions of the World War veteran author. At his request, I am reading it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This veteran, who is a student of economics and social reform, and who takes a deep and abiding interest in current national and international affairs, wanted all of the House of Representatives to know how he felt about current tendencies toward war, and legislation which has been passed in connection with so-called national defense. But here is the letter. Let it speak for itself:

OLD SOLDIERS' HOME,
Orting, Wash., June 8, 1941.

UNITED STATES CONGRESS,
Imperial Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Twenty-two years ago last February Gen. John J. Pershing wrote the following form letter:

G. H. Q., AMERICAN A. E. F.,
France, February 28, 1919.

GENERAL ORDERS No. 38–A.

DEAR FELLOW SOLDIERS: Now that your services with the American Expeditionary Forces are about to terminate, I cannot let you go without a personal word. At the call to arms the patriotic young manhood of America eagerly responded and became the formidable army whose decisive victories testify to its efficiency and its valor, with the support of the Nation firmly united to defend the cause of liberty, our Army has executed the will of the people with resolute purpose. Our troops have faithfully fulfilled their trust; and in a succession of brilliant offensives, have overcome the menace to our civilization.

As individuals your part in the World War has been an important one in the sum total of our achievements, whether keeping lonely vigil in the trenches or gallantly storming the enemies' stronghold; whether enduring monotonous drudgery at

the rear or sustaining line at the front, each has bravely and efficiently played his part; by cheerful endurance of hardship and deprivation, by vigor, strength, and idomitable will, made effective by thorough organization and cordial cooperation, you inspired the war-worn Allies with new life, and turned the tide of threatened defeat into overwhelming victory.

With concentrated devotion to duty and a will to conquer, you have loyally served your country. By your extraordinary conduct a standard has been established and maintained, never before attained by any army. With minds and body as clean and strong as the decisive blows you delivered against the foe, you are soon to return to the pursuit of peace. In leaving the scenes of your victories, may I ask that you carry home your high ideals and continue to live as you have served: an honor to the principles for which you have fought and to the fallen comrades you leave behind.

It is with pride in your success that I extend to you my sincere thanks.

Faithfully,

JOHN J. PERSHING,
Commander in Chief.

Every soldier of the A. E. F. was supposed to have received one of these letters. I have always cherished this letter very highly all of these years. It has inspired me to carry out our high ideals. I have this letter framed and hanging on the wall in my room. I have always considered it a receipt for a task well done. But, since the Senate munitions investigation, I have learned to my sorrow that instead of saving the world for democracy, we saved it for autocracy and plutocracy by creating 22,000 new millionaires from war profits alone, and by this process created 23,000,000 paupers.

Ever since the first World War we have been traveling the road of the ancient nations. All we have to do is to read history to see our destiny if we take part in this European conflict.

President Roosevelt warned us in 1938 that the fabric of peace on the continent of Europe, if not throughout the rest of the world, is in immediate danger. The consequences of its rupture are incalculable. Should hostilities break out, the lives of millions of men, women, and children in every country involved will most certainly be lost under circumstances of unspeakable horror. The economic system of every country involved may be completely wrecked. The United States has no political entanglements. It is caught in no mesh of hatreds. Elements of all Europe have formed its civilization.

You gentlemen know that the President was speaking the truth in 1938.

I will not take time for his many other statements. Only one more. Our President was supposed to have said at Chautauqua, N. Y., in 1936, "industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men—for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster."

You gentlemen who voted amendments to our neutrality law and who supported the conscription bill, the lend-lease bill, stand convicted and should be impeached. You had no right under the Constitution to grant our President powers which are not prescribed by that document.

The Wall and Downing Streets are planning on immense profits out of this legalized murder. This will be settled some time around a council table, after they have slaughtered and maimed our young manhood.

Tyrants throughout the ages have forced their enslaved peoples into battle. Likewise President Roosevelt thinks he will force the slaves of Wall Street to fight for their slavery. I say, "No." I am protesting out of respect for my ancestry and my fallen comrades whom I left on Flanders' Field. Their sons are not going to be sacrificed on the field of battle to increase the fortunes of the same group of plutocrats whom their fathers put on the throne.

It is time for the people to stand on their constitutional rights. I know if we refuse to cooperate with our slave masters we are considered traitors. The people will either be traitors to themselves and the country or be traitors to Wall Street. Before this war is over, as the President said, our economic system will be completely shattered. Our debt will be over $100,000,000,000, and the coming generation will be born into slavery and they will be taught to love, cherish, and to fight and die on the battlefields to defend it.

I must add that our economic system is already shattered. We have approximately 52,000,000 shrunken bellies in this country to prove it. It is certainly not worth fighting for.

"IN FLANDERS FIELD

"(By Lt. Col. John McCrae)

"In Flanders Field the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our places, and in the sky,
The larks still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

"We are the dead! short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders Field.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe.
To you with failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
On Flanders Field."

"OUR ANSWER

"Sleep on, brave pals, where poppies grow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark the places where ye fell
Amid the flaming fires of hell
In Flanders' field.

"Ye may be dead, but still ye live.
Your courage unto us ye give
To drive the barbarous foe to flight,
Till none remain to cast their blight
In Flanders' field.

"Take up your quarrel with the foe?
'Tis taken up, brave pals, for lo!
The torch ye threw, we hold it high,
We break no faith with ye who die
In Flanders' field."

Gentlemen, in closing, I promise not to break faith with those who died on Flanders' field.

OWEN O. MORRIS,
Served in Company I, Three Hundred and Sixth Infantry, Seventy-seventh Division.

President Roosevelt Should Keep His Promise to American Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

PROTEST BY 120 REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS TO THE NEW DEAL ADMINISTRATION OPPOSING ANY REDUCTIONS IN TARIFF DUTIES ON FARM PRODUCTS IN THE PROPOSED TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH ARGENTINA AND URUGUAY

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, acting under instructions from 120 of my fellow Members in the House of Representatives, I appeared, on June 23, before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in opposition to any reductions in the tariff duties on farm products in connection with the proposed trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay.

In my oral argument to the committee, I opposed any reduction of tariff duties on farm products raised in the United States and demanded full protection to the home market for American producers of dairy and meat products, flaxseed, vegetables, fruits, furs, hides, wool, and other competitive commodities.

In addition to my oral argument, I read and filed with the committee the following protest which was signed by 120 Members of this House, as their names appear on this significant document in behalf of American producers:

To the Committee on Reciprocity Information:

In re proposed trade agreement with Argentina and Uruguay.

We, the undersigned, Members of the House of Representatives, strongly oppose the proposed negotiation of trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay. Our reasons are:

1. International trade is chaotic. Europe is cut off from normal world commerce. No one can foresee the future pattern of international trade; whether it will again be unrestricted, or be limited by great blocs or groups of countries trading freely within themselves but walled off from the rest of the world. A few large nations may control international trade for their own purposes. Therefore, any foreign-trade commitments are dangerous at this time.

Although right of termination of agreement upon notice by either party may be provided, such right has never been exercised even under greatly altered circumstances. Agreements with Holland, France, and Belgium-Luxembourg have never been even suspended despite German subjugation of those countries.

2. The principal avowed purpose of the reciprocal trade agreement policy, according to Secretary of State Hull, has been the promotion of world peace. Its complete failure to achieve that end is overwhelmingly evident.

3. All concessions granted in either of these two proposed agreements would be generalized to all countries under our unconditional, most-favored-nation treaties. Even Japan, Italy, and Russia would be included. Germany would be the only nation excluded. Generalizing such concessions would dissipate our bargaining power. When conflicts cease we must have that power as "a club behind the door" to reestablish our world-trade position, and command for American producers full equity in world commerce.

4. The trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay are supposed to promote hemispheric defense. We believe hemispheric defense cannot be advanced by piecemeal bargaining between the United States and individual countries.

Hemispheric defense must be considered in the light of the relations of these countries with other nations of the world. Great Britain has by far the largest foreign investments in Argentina and Uruguay. Consequently, the trade of those two countries is tied most strongly to the British Empire. To secure the bulk of this trade we would have to take over such investments. We could accept these in payment for lend-lease loans. But, we would have to accept our interest in large quantities of competitive products, mostly agricultural.

5. By acreage restrictions, loans, food stamps, and export subsidies, the Government has, for 5 years, undertaken to raise farm

prices, and control surpluses, which have become embarrassing notwithstanding. By price raising, it now encourages increased production of certain foods. When the present emergency is ended, we will face (as after the first World War) unmanageable surpluses, and price disruptions. It is, therefore, illogical to lower duties on competitive agricultural products.

6. Current shortage of ships for Latin American trade would make of the agreements merely a gesture now, but the agreements would become fully effective at the close of the war, when we will be undergoing the convulsions of internal readjustments and collapsed farm prices.

7. Concessions to Argentina and Uruguay are contemplated on plums, prunes, pears, and tomatoes. The Department of Agriculture states these commodities are even now being produced in surplus quantities in this country. It has been expending public funds in surplus removal operations to raise their prices. Reduction of duties on such commodities would directly negate those efforts.

8. The Department of Agriculture, by various devices, stimulates production of other crops on former surplus crop lands. For instance, flaxseed is being grown on acreage formerly planted to grains. Dairying has increased tremendously in the South, replacing cotton. These proposed trade agreements include flaxseed, cheese, casein, and lactrine among the commodities on which concessions may be granted. The dangerous inconsistency is patent.

9. Various Federal social policies have increased the cost of producing meat products. Nevertheless, in the proposed agreements, the concessions include extracts of meats, preserved and prepared meats, corned beef hash, hides, and wool. Here again is glaring inconsistency. Distress to cattle producers would result.

10. The current policy of the administration is to raise wages, increasing production costs. Such a policy cannot possibly be integrated with still another trade policy of admitting to the American markets the farm products of low wages, long hours, and low-living standards. The American farmer must share the social gains.

11. These proposed trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay certainly will contain concessions detrimental to large groups of our population. Fear of potential injury from such trade agreements will impair that national unity so vital in the present emergency.

In conclusion, we join in the specific protests filed with your committee by farmers, farm organizations, and others, opposing reduction in the duties on casein, meat products, cheese, flax seed, grapes, plums, pears, grass seed, tomatoes, asparagus, wool, furs, hides, and other competitive products in connection with the proposed trade agreements. We hold that American producers are entitled to full protection in their domestic market.

The farmers of the United States properly expect President Roosevelt to keep his promise to them when he solemnly declared:

"I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived."

We, the undersigned Members of Congress, insist the President keep this pledge to American farmers.

We respectfully submit our protest to your committee:

August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Earl C. Michener, Michigan; Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; Harold Knutson, Minnesota; N. M. Mason, Illinois; Bertrand Gearhart, California; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; John Taber, New York; Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; George W. Gillie, Indiana; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Bartel J. Jonkman, Michigan; Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; W. A. Pittenger, Minnesota; Leland Ford, California; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; John W. Gwynne, Iowa; J. W. Wadsworth, New York; Robert F. Jones, Ohio; Frank Fellows, Maine; Stephen Bolles, Wisconsin; Ross Rizley, Oklahoma; Francis Case, South Dakota; John M. Vorys, Ohio; James V. Heidinger, Illinois; Forest A. Harness, Indiana; Charles L. Gerlach, Pennsylvania; Albert G. Rutherford, Pennsylvania; Harve Tibbott, Pennsylvania; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; Joseph J. O'Brien, New York; Daniel A. Reed, New York; Albert J. Engel, Michigan; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Benjamin Jarrett, Pennsylvania; Frank B. Keefe, Wisconsin; Charles S. Dewey, Illinois; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Raymond S. Springer, Indiana; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Oscar Youngdahl, Minnesota; James W. Mott, Oregon; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Jessie Sumner, Illinois; Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; John Z. Anderson, California; Melvin J. Maas, Minnesota; A. D. Baumhart, Jr., Ohio; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; U. S. Guyer, Kansas; Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; Richard P. Gale, Minnesota; Frank Carlson, Kansas; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Anton J. Johnson, Illinois; W. H. Wheat, Illinois; William N. Stratton, Illinois; Evan Howell, Illinois; Harry L. Englebright, California; Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Fred C. Gilchrist, Iowa; K. M. LeCompte, Iowa; W. P. Lambertson, Kansas; Noble J. Johnson, Indiana; William S. Hill, Colorado; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Karl Mundt, South Dakota; Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Thomas E. Martin, Iowa; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; Thomas Winter, Kansas; Earl Wilson, Indiana; William H. Blackney, Michigan; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Joseph L. Johns, Wisconsin; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; Karl Stefan, Nebraska; George A. Paddock, Illinois; Philip A. Bennett, Missouri; Walter C. Ploeser, Missouri; Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Massachusetts; George H. Bender, Ohio; Donald H. McLean, New Jersey; Dewey Short, Missouri; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; Oren S. Copeland, Nebraska; James C. Oliver, Maine; C. W. Bishop, Illinois; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; John M. Robsion, Kentucky; Ward Johnson, California; Hamilton Fish, New York; Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; George A. Dondero, Michigan; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; L. C. Arends, Illinois; Lewis D. Thill, Wisconsin; Robert A. Grant, Indiana; Jeannette Rankin, Montana; Margaret Chase Smith, Maine; Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania.

In Tribute to William E. Borah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

TRIBUTE BY HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, OF IDAHO

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at Fairfield, Ill., the birthplace of the late Senator William E. Borah was dedicated as a shrine, and many thousands of people paid their respects to his memory by attending the ceremony. In connection with this event, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my sincere tribute which was forwarded to the dedicatory committee:

IN TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM E. BORAH

(By COMPTON I. WHITE, Member of Congress)

At a time when the United States of America girds for defense, while the greatest upheaval of governments in the history of the world shakes the very foundations of civilization, it is fitting that we pause to reflect on the philosophy of that beloved national and international personage, the late Senator William E. Borah, and pay tribute to his memory.

To us he left for guidance the heritage of his faith in representative government, his hope for comity between all nations, and his love of social justice.

We do well to honor him whose intense patriotism, independence of thought, courage of conviction, and fearless leadership need emulation in these troubled times. He exemplified his ideals of citizenship by sacrificing a lucrative legal career to serve his country as a Member of the United States Senate for 36 years; he refused to adopt ideas and practices simply because they had been established by usage or were orthodox in theory but ever sought knowledge and truth from the highest authorities of history and literature and from his contemporaries; his conclusions he announced with calm conviction when he knew excoriating criticism would be his lot; if the mantle of acclaim fell on his shoulders after his ideas had been tested in the crucible of debate and public opinion, he brushed it aside with the simplicity and serenity of a great soul.

Senator Borah once said, "Time and time alone, unerring and remorseless, will give us each our proper place in the affection of our countrymen and in the esteem and commendation of those who are to come after us."

The affection of the people of his native State of Illinois is attested by the preservation of his birthplace so that posterity may visit the spot and reflect upon the American concept of equality of opportunity. It was at the close of the Civil War that Senator Borah was born in the simple surroundings of an average American home; his childhood days in the environment of a Christian household, his education without the panoply of

wealth, his determined effort to establish himself as a citizen of worth in his adopted State of Idaho, and his rise to national fame and international importance exemplify the American way of life.

Before the sands of time had run their course in the life of Senator Borah, the people of Idaho bestowed upon him the honor of having the most majestic mountain within its borders named Mount Borah. They honored him for the better part of half a century with the highest office the State could bestow, a seat in the United States Senate. He sleeps in hallowed ground in Idaho.

The name of Borah the Nation over connotes a brilliant intellect, an illustrious record, a polity of justice. He bears the esteem of countless masses in this country and abroad. As it has been said of another great man of Illinois, so it may be said of Senator William E. Borah, "He belongs to the ages."

July in American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, with Independence Day only a few days away, we should rededicate ourselves to the principles of our founding fathers and the freedoms which we enjoy. Freedom is our heritage; to defend freedom is our duty.

We are all proud of American history, and there have been many events which will long remain in our memories. I am herewith submitting to the people of America historical high lights that occurred in our Nation's history during the month of July. I intend to submit further historical high lights periodically throughout this session of Congress.

The article follows:

July 1. The Battle of Gettysburg began in 1863; in 1898 during the Spanish-American War the Battle of San Juan was fought.

July 2. Sherman antitrust law passed in 1890; first elevated railroad opened to traffic in New York City in 1867.

July 3. George Washington assumed command of the Continental Army at Boston in 1775; Battle of Santiago fought during Spanish-American War in 1898.

July 4. In addition to the signing of the Declaration of Independence this day is celebrated for (1) the opening of the United States Naval Academy at West Point in 1802; (2) the birth of President Calvin Coolidge at Plymouth, Vt., in 1872; (3) the completion of the first Pacific cable in 1903; (4) the birth of the great novelist, Nathaniel Hawthorne, at Salem, Mass., in 1804; (5) the birth of the immortal composer, Stephen Foster Collins in 1826; (6) the enactment of the first tariff law in 1789; (7) and the death in 1826 of Presidents John Adams and Thomas Jefferson.

July 5. David G. Farragut first United States admiral, born in 1801, and P. T. Barnum born in 1810.

July 6. Republican Party organized at Jackson, Mich., in 1854; John Paul Jones, naval hero of the Revolutionary War, born in 1747.

July 7. Columbia University established in New York City in 1754 as King's College.

July 8. Birth of John D. Rockefeller in 1839; Jacob Barsimson, first Jew, reached New Amsterdam in 1654.

July 9. Elias Howe, inventor of the sewing machine, born in 1819.

July 10. Wyoming admitted to the Union in 1890; James Abbott McNeill Whistler, one of great American painters, born at Lowell, Mass., in 1834.

July 11. United States Marine Corps established by Congress in 1798; John Quincy Adams, sixth President of the United States, born in 1767.

July 12. Henry David Thoreau, great naturalist and philosopher, born at Concord, Mass., in 1817.

July 13. Congress passes Northwest Ordinance of 1787, first law for government of territory outside of Original Thirteen Colonies, which provided government for area out of which were carved States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

July 14. First international industrial exposition opens as Crystal Palace World's Fair in New York City in 1853.

July 15. World War battle of Chateau Thierry begins in 1918.

July 16. Birth of Mary Baker Eddy, founder of Christian Science, in 1821.

July 17. Congress passes act authorizing acquisition of District of Columbia as seat of United States Government, in 1790.

July 18. Horatio Alger, noted author, died in 1899.

July 19. First woman's rights convention met at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in 1848.

July 20. Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States became part of the law of the land in 1867.

July 21. First battle of Bull Run began during War Between the States in 1861.

July 22. Pilgrim Fathers leave Holland for America in 1620; first patent for color photography granted to Frederick E. Ives in 1890.

July 23. First workable typewriter patented in 1829.

July 24. Brigham Young and the Mormons arrive on site of Salt Lake City in 1847, a day now celebrated as Utah's Pioneer Day.

July 25. Smokeless powder used for the first time in the United States in experiments at Sandy Hook, N. J., in 1891.

July 26. William Jennings Bryan died in 1925.

July 27. First successful Atlantic cable completed in 1866.

July 28. Ballington Booth, founder of the Volunteers of America, born in 1859.

July 29. Pittsburgh Gazette, first newspaper west of the Alleghenies, published in 1786; BoothTarkington, noted author, born in Indianapolis in 1869.

July 30. First Colonial legislature—Virginia House of Burgesses—meets at Jamestown in 1619; Henry Ford born in 1863.

July 31. First patent issued by the United States Government granted to Samuel Hopkins in 1790.

What Promises Will Mr. Roosevelt Honor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN A. DAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO SUNDAY TRIBUNE

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of June 29, 1941:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of June 29, 1941]

WHAT PROMISES WILL MR. ROOSEVELT HONOR?

The way the ball is tossed from Downing Street to the White House and from the White House to Downing Street, from British ministers to American Cabinet officials and back again would indicate preconcerted teamwork and probably does.

Mr. Roosevelt had asked for suspended judgment on the *Robin Moor* incident. His calm disappeared in his highly dramatized message to Congress in which he virtually said that American battleships would speak the next word.

It is just possible that Mr. Roosevelt had heard from London that the Hitler move against Stalin was to be expected momentarily and knew that if he was to make anything of the *Robin Moor* incident he had to get in before it was completely forgotten. He had waited for the public to get out ahead in demanding war. The public remained calm, and if the incident were to be made a part of the war propaganda Mr. Roosevelt had to move quickly. London accepted his message as something just preceding a declaration of war.

We have Mr. Roosevelt's own words for it that the things he is doing would put the United States in war. To draw the conclusion is only logical. He can be called as a witness against himself to prove that he has intended to bring about a situation which he thought would make war unescapable.

When he was a candidate for the second term in 1936 he made a speech in Chautauqua, N. Y., in which he said he hated war, and warned the country that if it should break out in Europe there would be a tremendous pressure exerted in this country to tear down our neutrality. He then said it would be clamor of greed and that to resist it would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. He added: "The effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State."

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull continue to occupy those offices, partly because the second-term candidate was not talking and acting as the third-term President does.

In 1939 the war of which Mr. Roosevelt had been talking was on. The clamor and the pressure for abandonment of American neutrality also was on. Mr. Roosevelt, about to become a candidate for the third term, appeared still to be a man of peace, as he would have to be if he was to be a successful candidate, but he wanted some changes in the neutrality law. He didn't want to destroy the law which he had predicted would be attacked; no, he wanted to improve it.

People who saw through his intentions were convinced at the time that if he got what he wanted neutrality was out of the window. But Mr. Roosevelt said "No," all he wanted was power to keep American ships and American citizens out of war zones. "This means less likelihood of incidents and controversies which tend to draw us into conflict, as they did in the last World War. There lies the road to peace."

That was a part of the program. It was the part which was used to justify the other part, which opened American markets to belligerents who could send ships with cash to buy munitions.

Cash and carry was safe—safe, no doubt, if guarded by the wisdom and determination of the men who happened to occupy the offices of the President and Secretary of State. "Our acts," said Mr. Roosevelt to Congress, "must be guided by one single, hard-headed thought, keeping America out of this war."

The third-term candidate asking for votes made more promises. There would be no foreign wars. Your boys are not going to be sent to war. All this, and more, again and again. When the third-term candidate, through the misjudgment of the American people, became the third-term President, the first thing he did was to throw his neutrality law into the ashcan and push the lease-lend bill through Congress. Now he presents to Congress the case of an American ship, carrying American passengers and goods, bound for a belligerent port, sunk as an act of piracy by an outlaw nation, one of "the incidents and controversies which tend to draw us into conflict, as they did in the last World War."

As a second-term candidate and as a third-term candidate Mr. Roosevelt deceived the people. To secure his election he declared for peace. As soon as he was back in the White House he took steps for war. We do not know yet what promises he was making all the time to foreign governments. We don't know what promises he made to France or what promises he has made to Great Britain other than the public pledges that all the resources of the United States were at their disposal. Secret commitments are unknown. They would seem to exist. The time for their disclosure will come later.

Mr. Roosevelt's promises to the American people have been to keep them out of war. All his actions are leading them into it. He is endeavoring to make war inescapable.

Mr. Roosevelt's words to this country have not been trustworthy. The British think that his word to them can be trusted. To act in good faith to them he must act in bad faith to his fellow countrymen. Which promise is he about to honor?

World Situation Has Undergone Far-Reaching Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. BRECKENRIDGE LONG TO THE CHATTANOOGA (TENN.) ROTARY CLUB

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, to the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Rotary Club on June 26:

An amazing aspect of the world of today is the speed of international developments. In less than 2 years the world situation has undergone far-reaching change. Since that fateful morning in September 1939, when Hitler's legions swarmed into Poland, the march of events has proceeded with awful suddenness and in unforeseen directions. Many nations which enjoyed freedom and independence have been crushed by the onrushing tide of aggressor armies. Peoples who yesterday knew the blessings of liberty today live under the tyrannical rule of conquerors who impose upon their victims brutal methods reminiscent of the darkest ages of history.

Sadly enough, the peoples of these countries which have gone down before the totalitarian armies are partly to blame for the tragedy which has befallen them. They closed their eyes to the dangers about them. They refused to believe that the powerful military machines which were being constructed by the dictators would be used against them. They would not be convinced that the dictators were preparing a program of world conquest. They allowed themselves to be hypnotized by promises that the dictators had no designs on other nations. As a consequence, they neglected to prepare adequate defense against the critical dangers confronting them.

Meanwhile the totalitarian nations geared their entire economies for war. Year after year they followed this policy relentlessly. They regimented their peoples. They trained great armies. They darkened the skies with airplanes. They produced a huge volume of military equipment and accumulated tremendous supplies of war materials. They directed their entire national effort to preparation for aggressive warfare.

When the storm broke the totalitarian armies with their superior training and equipment were able to overrun nation after nation. One by one the smaller peoples fell. The brutal invasion and ruthless extinguishment of the independence of many countries are still vivid in our minds.

Each step in the conquest of the totalitarians has been the destruction of a nation. Each step has been used in preparation for the next—the subjugated people, the area acquired, the resources taken—all have been used immediately to support new advances. In addition to being equipped with powerful arms, the totalitarians make use of every weapon of subversion, deceit, corruption, and assault. In carrying on their operations they are not restrained by considerations of generally recognized law or principles of humanity.

The totalitarians have no fixed limit for their program of conquest. They are desperately struggling to get control of the seas as an essential means of achieving and maintaining their conquest of other continents. If they should succeed in this, the danger to the United States and to the other nations of the Western Hemisphere, great as it is today, would be many times greater. Under modern conditions of warfare the open oceans can become a highway for, rather than a barrier against, an attack on this hemisphere.

The danger before us is as great as or greater than any we have ever experienced in our entire history as a nation. We in America must be fully aroused to this patent fact before it is too late. I hope that we can profit by the experience of the peoples who have felt the full force of the Nazi military machine and who are now enslaved under a merciless, tyrannical rule. If we can really profit by their experience, we will drive with increased intensity to build our defense strong enough to insure that the war shall not reach this hemisphere.

The task of defense of this Nation is of tremendous proportions. Safeguarding our heritage requires the full and continuous efforts of each and every one. The single effort of one individual may seem small. But we have 130,000,000 individuals in this country, and each one of us has a real stake in the outcome of the effort in which we are now engaged. Each must work with a sense that what he does is important in determining whether this country shall be secure. The members of the armed forces have their particular field of activity. The worker on the farm or in the factory or in the mine can make a definite contribution. Each of us can contribute in some way, directly or indirectly, to the national-defense effort.

The days and weeks and months ahead will be strenuous. Sacrifice in some degree will be necessary for all of us. However, we can be assured that the sacrifice will be of some privileges and not of fundamental rights. We must realize that the end in view is the preservation of our national existence, our free institutions, our way of life. It is to insure that the lamp of liberty, lighted in this country a century and a half ago, shall not be darkened. For that end, no sacrifice is too great.

I often think that in this country we are too prone to take our liberties for granted. We forget that they were brought about through the struggle and sacrifice of the founders of this Nation. We assume, as a matter of course, the perpetual existence of individual freedom, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. We do not realize that unless we watch our ramparts there may be a black-out of these freedoms. With our country surrounded on both sides by vast expanses of water and far from the scene of battle, we would like to enjoy our leisure and luxury and trust to the future to take care of itself.

Meanwhile, other peoples lie prostrate under the invader's heel. Their liberties have been taken away. Starvation is rampant among them. Children are suffering mentally and physically. Families are torn apart. The firing squads regularly take their toll. Terrorism is the order of the day.

It is all very alluring for us to sit complacently in our comfortable homes and think in illusory vein that war will not come to us here—that the stories we hear of Europe and of Asia and of Africa are, after all, happenings thousands of miles away—that it cannot happen here. It is all too easy to be deceived by stretches of fertile fields which run out beyond horizons and to feel that no danger from abroad could carry this far. So thought Poland. So thought Norway, stretching way up into the Arctic circle. So thought Greece, bathed by the warm water of the Mediterranean. So it was thought on the tropic sands of Africa, in the distant recesses of China, far Indo-China, and old Siam down near the Equator.

We must not be beguiled by such thought. We must understand that distance measured in miles has been reduced to inches, that time has been decimated and space rendered of no protective value. We must understand that the actual waging of that thing called war has changed. There was a time that it commenced when the shooting began. But now it has predecessors the consequences of which are worse if possible than the devastation of actual military combat. There is the insidious infiltration of whispering agents casting doubt upon the justice of our own position, faintly praising the qualities of the intending intruder. Then come agents of trouble and discord, inciting opposition at home, making trouble in centers of mechanical production. Then the saboteurs to throw monkey wrenches into the machinery—all with the object of creating discord and dismay and of rendering nugatory efficient organization. The radio becomes the instrument of insidious voices. Doubt is cultivated. Fear is propagated—fear, the worst of our foes, the ally of threatening force.

Another predecessor is economic penetration, to destroy existing markets for your goods, to gain footholds in the territory of your neighbors, and, when economic and financial conditions have been sufficiently cultivated, to institute political control over some not distant country. Once political control is established, then the military armies, through the air, on the water, by land, and from the new base the cowering inhabitants become servitors, even unwilling partners of mechanized military autocracy in preparation for its next plunge, with a history of suffering in its wake and a promise of sorrow for the next victim—unless stopped in its mad career.

We must determine that these things shall not happen here. They cannot happen here

if we unite in carrying forward a mighty and sustained defense program; if we build our defense swiftly, efficiently, and adequately.

In this dangerous hour, we should prepare for every possible contingency. We must prepare to meet a challenge from whatever direction it may come. We must continue to increase the numbers and efficiency of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Corps. We must build great fleets of airplanes. We must launch increased numbers of merchant ships. We must step up the production of every weapon necessary for self-defense. All these should be done with the utmost speed, for speed is the vital need of the day.

As a part of our national-defense effort the people of the United States have approved overwhelmingly the policy of extending assistance to Great Britain, China, and other nations which are endeavoring to turn back the advance of the aggressors. It is clear that our own interests justify fully the furnishing of weapons necessary for use in the heroic resistance of the British people. This is but the exercise of our inalienable right of self-defense. In accordance with the policy expressed in the Lend-Lease Act, we are determined to continue to send to Great Britain in ever-increasing quantities food, airplanes, guns, ammunition, and other necessary supplies.

Another direction in which our defense preparations are being made is through cooperation with the other nations of this hemisphere. An attack by an aggressor power against any nation of this hemisphere obviously would menace the United States. Our system of national defense, therefore, is part of a hemisphere defense system in which we are cooperating with the other American nations. We are advising those nations of our defense preparations. We have received military missions from them and, in turn, we have sent military experts to them. It is our purpose to encourage a frank interchange of information and plans. The naval bases which we have acquired from Great Britain are for the protection of the entire Western Hemisphere. The unity of the American nations was shown when these bases were promptly made available by the United States to the other American republics for cooperative use.

Your Government is fully alive to the situation confronting the United States. Each of the three branches of our National Government is aware of the needs of that situation. Each officer of your Government is on guard. We only hope that each citizen for himself realizes the significance of the situation as it actually exists and the consequences for his own self and for the members of his family and for their joint peace unless we all of us join in a magnificent effort for defense.

President Roosevelt has proclaimed a full emergency. That fact alone should bring realization to every man and woman in America that the danger is direct and will be imminent unless we all join in a united effort. In making that declaration the President said:

"I call upon all the loyal citizens engaged in production for defense. * * *

"I call upon all our loyal workmen as well as employers. * * *

"I call upon loyal State and local leaders and officials. * * *

"I call upon all loyal citizens to place the Nation's needs first in mind and in action to the end that we may mobilize and have ready for instant defensive use all of the physical powers, all of the moral strength, and all of the material resources of this Nation."

The call has gone forth. We beg of you to heed the call—and to do each one his bit in the mightiest effort of all time.

A Woman of No Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 20, 1941. I recommend it to every American:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 20, 1941]

A WOMAN OF NO IMPORTANCE

"Mrs. Robert Wood, wife of the State Communist Party secretary, was convicted last night of criminal syndicalism by a district court jury, which recommended the maximum punishment of 10 years' imprisonment and $5,000 fine." So runs a laconic news dispatch from Oklahoma City.

For what was Mrs. Wood convicted? Stripped down to its bare essentials, she was convicted because she adheres to a political philosophy—namely, communism—that is hateful to most Americans, including this newspaper. Mrs. Wood did not murder anyone. She did not commit sabotage. She did not steal. She did not cheat on her income tax. She did not violate any of the basic laws of the land.

What she did was think thoughts, read books, and express ideas which the Ku Kluxers of Oklahoma did not like. For that she is to spend 10 years in prison, more years than many of our foulest criminals have served.

Mrs. Wood, of course, is a woman of no importance. In the eyes of some Americans, particularly of the Ku Klux type which they breed in Oklahoma—and this goes for some of their judges, prosecutors, sheriffs, and other public officials—the fact that Mrs. Wood is a Communist places her beyond the pale. It places her not only beyond the pale of social respectability, but also beyond the pale of law, of justice, of the fundamental rights for which Americans have died and for which they may soon die again.

We want to ask a question. Since when has it become a crime in the United States—in the land of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and Oliver Wendell Holmes, yes, and in the land of Franklin Roosevelt, who has expressed his determination to carry the four precious freedoms of America all over the world—since when has it become a crime to think, to read, and to talk?

But let us explain in clear, simple language about Mrs. Wood. Her conviction is one of a series of prosecutions being conducted in Oklahoma as part of a "State-wide witch hunt," described in detail in the Post-Dispatch of January 25, 1941, in an article by F. A. Behymer. Last December, a District Court convicted Alan Shaw, 22 years old, of being a Communist and sentenced him to 10 years in prison and to pay a $5,000 fine. In the preceding October, Robert Wood, husband of Mrs. Wood, received an identical penalty, as did Eli Jaffee last April.

John Eberle, assistant county attorney, announced after the Shaw conviction that it meant that any member of the Communist Party faced like conviction and penalty in Oklahoma. The evidence upon which these people were convicted consists largely of copious extracts from books and pamphlets seized at Wood's book store, including standard works on economics to be found in all libraries. If the F. B. I. should raid the St. Louis Public Library, it could establish the same kind of case against Librarian Compton and his staff.

The Oklahoma crusade has not been confined to Communists, but has been directed also against the religious sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses, against university professors, and everyone else who does not fit into the Ku Klux pattern. Oh, it may be said that the Communists deserve what they get and the Jehovah's Witnesses are crackpots and the university professors are this and that. Perhaps so.

But the Ku Klux spirit, once it gains the ascendancy, does not stop there. Let us not forget the three principal targets of Ku Kluxism in its heydey. Its objectives were Catholics, Jews, and Negroes. Not only Catholics, Jews, and Negroes, but anyone who, because of his belief in American principles of justice and freedom, sympathized with the victims of the Klan. Once the Ku Klux spirit runs amok no one is safe from the midnight raiding parties, the floggings, the maiming, and the killing, to say nothing of concentration camp and penitentiary. Once terrorism prevails, it is not alone the hated Communists, the despised Jehovah's Witnesses, and such minorities as the Catholics, Negroes, and Jews who are in jeopardy, but anyone who stands for the Bill of Rights and the American way of life.

Mrs. Wood is nothing. Joe Doakes, the Jehovah's Witness, is nothing. Tom Murphy, Isadore Goldstein, and Mose Jones are nothing. Just unfortunate human beings who pay the penalty for their beliefs, their religion, their color. Let us not deceive ourselves. Mrs. Wood, Joe Doakes, Tom Murphy, Isadore Goldstein, and Mose Jones are everything, because once they are persecuted with impunity, the whole philosophy of American freedom and justice is turned to dust, ashes, and blood.

We mentioned Thomas Jefferson. We have at our elbow a thick volume containing the sayings of this great Democrat, this celebrated lover of liberty, and every page of it breathes scorn and contempt for the Oklahoma spirit of Ku Kluxism. Said Thomas Jefferson when he first stood up to take the oath as President:

"Bear in mind this sacred principle, that the minority possesses their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression."

We mentioned the sainted Abraham Lincoln. In his first inaugural, he said:

"If by the mere force of numbers, a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution—certainly would if such a right were a vital one."

We mentioned Oliver Wendell Holmes. This revered Justice of the United States Supreme Court said:

"If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate."

"The thought that we hate." Mrs. Wood's thought. The Jehovah's Witnesses' thought. Even the Ku Kluxer's thought. If we cannot tolerate thoughts in this democracy, it has ceased to be a democracy, and Mr. Roosevelt's "four freedoms" are a sham.

In contrast to the Oklahoma decision, based on an old criminal syndicalism statute, we had from the Iowa Supreme Court the other day another opinion in a case based on a

similar old criminal syndicalism statute. The high court of Iowa reversed a decision against William Sentner, a St. Louis labor leader, in which it said that the charge made in the trial that Sentner was a Communist was "immaterial, incompetent, and irrelevant." The court held that Sentner was not being tried for his belief in communism but for syndicalism, and it held him not guilty of that. That was an American decision, not a Ku Klux decision.

We had better pause in this moment of our history to decide whether or not we are going to throw away our liberties, scrap the Bill of Rights, throw our cherished judicial traditions into the discard, and engage in a hysterical Nation-wide witch hunt, or whether we are going to preserve the principles on which this country was founded. We are not yet at war, yet Britain, which is in the midst of a desperate war, still permits Communists to sit in the House of Commons, still permits its citizens and newspapers to speak freely, still recognizes differences of thought, still—in short—practices democratic principles.

Is the United States to scrap freedom, democracy, and justice at a time when the dictators of Europe and Asia are attempting to destroy them?

We mentioned Franklin D. Roosevelt. Only yesterday, in accepting a degree from Oxford University, the President said:

"In days like these * * * we rejoice that this special convocation, in breaking all historical precedent, does so in the great cause of preserving the free learning and the civil liberties which have grown stone upon stone in our lands through the centuries. That is why I am proud to be permitted to have a part."

These words can be clothed with meaning only if, in the days ahead, the people of Oklahoma, Missouri, Texas, Wyoming, and the other States observe the civil liberties "which have grown stone upon stone." They can be clothed with meaning only if the case of Mrs. Wood, the woman of no importance, is merely a savage exception to the principle of free thought rather than a forerunner of a Nation-wide witch hunt.

Communism and the Complicity of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull have taken into their arms that most bloody aggressor, the homicidal Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the destroyer of democracies, and a dictatorship of unparalleled cruelty.

American money and perhaps American blood are to be used by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull for the perpetuation of communism in Europe and the rest of the world. They have publicly promised credits and materials to the Soviet Union.

This action by them is the result of their optional use of the fantastic lend-lease bill. This bill established a preposterous foreign policy for the United States. Whereas it was alleged to be a measure to keep the United States out of war it quickly brought the United States to the brink of war in Europe and Asia, and whereas its declared purpose was to defend the so-called democracies, actually it has resulted in the United States underwriting communism in Europe and Asia and undertaking to assist the communistic Soviet Union in its war against Finland, one of the most democratic countries in Europe.

The support of communism by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull has even led them to refuse, illegally, to apply the Neutrality Act, with its combat-zone provisions to prevent the sinking of American ships, to the war now being waged by the Soviet Union.

There should be a thorough and fearless investigation by a committee of the Congress of the policy of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull in relation to communism and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, beginning with the recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933. This recognition, given in the face of powerful public protest, gave official standing and encouragement to communism in the United States and led to its present commanding position in the affairs of our country.

There should be investigated also the alleged continuance in important Government positions of persons already disclosed to be Communists by a congressional committee, and the degree to which domestic and foreign policies of the United States are being influenced by communistic thought and philosophy.

Accordingly I have prepared and have introduced in the House a resolution providing for such an investigation by a select committee of the House.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas in 1933 the United States Government recognized the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics over powerful public protest, thereby giving official standing and encouragement to communism in the United States, and thereafter, despite the most flagrant violations by the Soviet Government of the pledges to this Government upon which our recognition had been predicated, the President resisted repeated demands for withdrawal of recognition; and

Whereas many of the Government policies adopted during the last 8 years show characteristics of communistic philosophy and thought; and

Whereas it has been disclosed by official congressional investigations that Communists have been appointed to important positions in Government circles and are being allowed to continue to hold such positions; and

Whereas President Roosevelt has just offered assistance to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics now at war by way of credits and materials, thereby attempting to guarantee the continuance of communism in Europe and Asia, and

Whereas the President has illegally refused to apply the neutrality act, with its combat zone provisions to prevent the sinking of American ships, to the war now being waged by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in order that the Soviet Union may receive supplies from the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a select committee is hereby created, to consist of five Members, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to investigate the foreign policy of the United States in relation to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the extent to which the domestic policies of the United States are being influenced by communistic thought and philosophy, and the extent of the employment of Communists in the Federal service and the responsibility therefor; and said committee is authorized to send for persons and papers, to compel the attendance of and to administer oaths to witnesses, to conduct such inquiries at such times and places as the committee may deem necessary, and to report its findings and recommendations to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date.

Arizona Mining Men Protest Recent Restrictions of Mining Activities on Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

STATEMENT OF ARIZONA SMALL MINE OPERATORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include a statement of the Arizona Small Mine Operators Association, I wish to show why the Nogales Council of that very spendid organization is wholeheartedly supporting my bill, H. R. 2675.

The statement in the form of a letter is as follows:

NOGALES, ARIZ., *June 20, 1941.*

Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Herewith we send you resolution passed by the Nogales Council of the Arizona Small Mine Operators' Association and also accompanying statement in support of your bill, H. R. 2675, which would open the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument to prospecting and mining. We hope that these will be useful in your efforts and that you will read them into the RECORD.

We leave it to the good judgment of the House of Representatives to determine who is best able to evaluate the mining possibilities of this vast territory—parlor conservationists and an ecologist from Oklahoma, or these near resident groups of our association, composed of prospectors, miners, and mining engineers, many of whom have personally traveled over the ground in question. This is too important a matter to be sidetracked by the unsupported statement, "I object."

The statement has been made by a Representative that he has been informed that the ground has no mineral value because it has been prospected for the 400 years since Coronado and no mineral found—as if that settled the matter. The activity of the New Cornelia mine at nearby Ajo, Ariz., is the best answer to that statement. The statement also shows a complete ignorance of prospecting on the part of both the Representative and his informant. No ground is ever completely prospected. Nowadays a mineral prospect is not standing wide open, waiting for any chance passerby to locate it. After every rainy season every arroya in our

country again becomes virgin prospecting ground. A miner may travel hundreds or even thousands of miles hunting for a mine that will repay him for a lifetime of labor, and then after a rain and a little landslide locate a mine in his own dooryard. This has happened, not once, but many times.

In seeking the passage of H. R. 2675 we do not seek to establish a precedent, but to correct an error and a grave injustice. We object to the star-chamber method by which the monument was created in the first instance. Had there been due notice given and a public hearing for the interested parties the monument never would have been set up in its present form except by arbitrary, dictatorial action.

The manner of establishing this monument is a sample of what we in the Western States have to face all the time. In Arizona over 62 percent of our land is administered by different Federal bureaus and departments—in 1 county that percentage rises to nearly 90 percent under public ownership. In the Government there are over a million civil servants (would-be masters). Work must be found for them to warrant keeping them in their jobs. Hence the constant reaching out by these bureaus for more territory and more power. A bureaucrat is a bureaucrat, regardless of his party label—Democrat, Republican, Bull Moose—it is just the same. He always itches—for power. We grant a certain administrative ability, but it is an ability which, if allowed to continue its present rampant course, will administer the mining industry clear out of existence. In Arizona we have seen the number of operating mines drop as much as 467 in a single year. The constant restricting of the right of mine means that we will soon be dependent on foreign nations for the major portion of our strategic metal needs.

There are in Arizona over a billion tons of proven low-grade ore that could be extracted and added to the national wealth if we could reduce the cost of extraction 50 cents per ton; but with every lowering of cost by technological improvement we have faced other cost increases that have more than canceled out the economies, and with a fixed selling price we are further away from recovery of that metal than before. How can that low-grade ore be considered a national resource? What value will you put on it?

Every debate of this kind brings up the old, old question: What is conservation? It also shows the folly of making general rules to cover all natural resources. As cited above, hidden mineral buried in the ground cannot be rated as a national resource. Metals taken from the ground and placed in use become a visible resource. They are a permanent addition to the national wealth. Please note that "permanent addition to the national wealth." If any Representative doubts that assertion let him look up at an electric light, and think of the power plant back of it. The copper in that whole utility system will serve the people—in some form—so long as the country shall last. Every other metal object about you, even the new beams for the ceiling, also proves the truth of our saying. But the idealistic, theoretical conservationist will seek to set himself up as Deity for future generations, overlooking the fact that a million years ago a kindly Providence has already provided, and stored up, the mineral essentials to supply every need of the changing economic scene. The unknown and valueless mineral of yesterday becomes the favorite utility of today. We cite only four out of many of these: Arazonite, bentonite, ferberite, vermiculite. How many Representatives can state the nature of these minerals, and give their uses? Yet within the year the Arizona Department of Mineral Resources has been instrumental in opening up operations or has negotiations under way on all of them. In this progressing world who can say what metals your grandchildren will need or even use? Once on a time King Solomon made silver as common as stones in Jerusalem, but today silver has become so precious that, on occasion, Congress will use $100,000 worth of time merely to talk about silver.

Here in Arizona one group of good citizens is spending $25,000,000 to open up one copper deposit at Morenci. By their private enterprise they show their faith in the future basic stability of the country in undertaking to create this new national wealth for national use. Does anyone for a moment think that the Legislature of Arizona would spend $25,000,000—nearly 10 percent of the total assessed value of the State—to develop such a property? What Representative would introduce a bill in Congress to use $25,000,000 of Federal funds to develop such a property and expect its passage? Only development converts hidden mineral into a national resource. The development of any mine is a job for private enterprise—we do not forget R. F. C. loans with their high administration costs when we say that—and we miners are glad to take the risk when we are not hampered by restrictive laws and regulations that make success impossible.

Arizona miners are proud of the fact that our mines give employment to more than 10,000 people. We furnish 86 percent of all the pay carload freight originating on Arizona railroads, and a large part of the trucking also. We have contributed largely to the building and prosperity of all our cities like Phoenix, Tucson, and Prescott. We have had a hand in the building of every college, school, and church in the State. We have furnished our farmer friends with their best market—the home market. Last year one mining company alone spent over half a million dollars for our home State farm products. We have given a beneficial touch to the life of every resident of Arizona and to those of untold millions throughout the Nation.

The same is true of every other mine throughout the whole United States. The mines of the Nation originate 51 percent of all the pay carload freight carried on every railroads in the country and every year millions of other tons carried by boats.

We are glad to be called Coronado's children, but we refuse to be classed as wreckers and scions of Old Nick, as some conservationists would have the public think. We are true conservators of the national welfare by development. Mining is the real primary industry of the Nation, and is entitled to consideration as such. Mining supplies the first requirements of every human activity. If it were not for the miners, Tubal Cain and his successors, the farmer would still be plowing with a crooked stick.

We earnestly pray the speedy passage of H. R. 2675, or that of its similar companion measure that has already passed the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

NOGALES COUNCIL, A. S. M. O. A.,
HUGO W. MILLER, *Chairman.*

NOGALES, ARIZ., *June 18, 1941.*

Resolution adopted by the Nogales Council of the Arizona Small Mine Operators Association in regular meeting held June 18, 1941

Whereas the present emergency has demonstrated that the United States is not self-sufficient in the production of necessary elements for national defense, but must depend on foreign countries for even such a basic essential as copper; and

Whereas the Federal Government now owns and controls 45,155,000 acres of land in Arizona, being three-fifths of the entire State, which is administered in an arbitrary and bureaucratic manner with little thought as to the welfare of the State in which the land lies, nor legitimate mining development in accordance with national needs; and

Whereas of the above amount 19,566,339 acres lie in Indian reservations where there are many mineral deposits of proven value, but there is not a single mine in operation on any reservation in the State, entirely administered by the Indian Bureau, due to restrictive regulations made by officials who know little about, and care less for the mining industry; and

Whereas the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument was created on April 13, 1937, by Presidential proclamation when 464 square miles of land directly south of Ajo, Ariz., were withdrawn from the public domain so that rights of mining and prospecting were thus prohibited. When, as a matter of fact, the organ pipe cactus grows on only about 15 percent, or approximately 80 square miles, of this vast tract; and

Whereas this national monument was segregated by star-chamber methods without notice and without a hearing being granted to interested parties; and

Whereas experienced, competent mining geologists have reported that the district thus withdrawn shows every evidence of having mineral values, and this conclusion is supported by the fact that one of the largest copper operations in the world, that at Ajo, Ariz., employing hundreds of men, is located immediately north of the monument: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nogales Council of the Arizona Small Mine Operators Association register its approval of H. R. 2675, which would allow prospecting and mining on the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, and ask its speedy passage; and, further, that laws be enacted that will prohibit the withdrawal of any further lands from the public domain except upon notice and with public hearing and upon passage of specific laws by Congress authorizing the withdrawal.

ARIZONA COUNCIL,
HUGO W. MILLER,
Chairman.

Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

The word "defense" has been made to cover a multiplicity of peculiar sins during the past few months, but I believe there have been few more fantastic ideas advanced in the name of defense than the proposal that the farmers of America should give up their home markets for the benefit of foreign producers.

American agriculture is now, and has been for many years, the scapegoat of an unfair and unwise tariff policy. Our farmers have suffered enough and are being penalized as it is, without throwing trade scales further out of balance against them, and asking them for still further concessions which would permit an increased flood of farm imports to come into this country from South America in direct competition with our agriculture.

As the representative of a great farm State, and on behalf of the people of that State, I am unalterably opposed to any further reduction in the tariff on imports of competi-

tive farm products from Argentina, Uruguay, and other South American countries. These nations have already received tariff concessions which are working to the disadvantage and hardship of our own farmers, and any further concessions can only result in greater hardship.

Speaking with particular reference to flaxseed, North Dakota for many years has been the major producer of this crop. Any reduction on the present tariff on flaxseed from South America will have the effect of forcing our farmers to reduce their own domestic acreage. As a matter of fact, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has taken further steps to bring about such a reduction in acreage by prohibiting the use of sweet clover as a nurse crop. Where is the consistency, therefore, in forcing our own farmers to reduce acreage, and then permit the foreign nations who inflict no such regulations upon their own farmers to increase their imports of this crop to the United States? We were told by officials of the A. A. A. this spring that our flax production in this country was reaching a point where there would soon be a danger of having a surplus. How, then, can there possibly be any justification for lowering tariffs that would increase imports of flaxseed from Argentina? Such a reduction in the tariff will not only encourage Argentina to dump a still larger proportion of their crop on the American market, but will also let down the bars for increased imports of Canadian flax.

Instead of reducing the tariff on flaxseed and thus further threatening our own domestic producers, it seems to me we should be giving our own farmers greater encouragement to increase production and meet the needs of an expanding market resulting from our defense program. We all know what happened in the last World War when an acute shortage of flaxseed and linseed oil drove prices to unprecedented high levels. We are assured by the A. A. A. that there is little danger of this happening again, but at the same time it seems rather foolhardy to set out on a deliberate program of handing over American markets to foreign producers and forcing our own farmers to cut down their acreage. This is especially true at the present time, with existing uncertainties in the ocean freight situation brought on by the war.

Certainly there is no one, not even the most ardent of those who advocate the so-called good-neighbor policy, who would deny the fact that American farmers should have first claim on the American market. This applies not only to flaxseed but to meat products, wool, hides, and other farm products which compete directly with similar products grown in the United States, and which not only force our own farmers to reduce production, but also tend to decrease the price which they receive for their own crops. The goal of all the farm programs we have had in the past 25 years has been to achieve parity prices for agriculture. During all those years the farmers have been at a disparity with industry and labor. Now, when the prospects for receiving parity are the best in years, it is a violation of every pledge made to our agricultural industry to permit an increased flood of foreign farm imports, which would threaten that prospect of finally attaining parity prices. It is my hope that this committee will not be an instrument to further disadvantage the farmer by permitting foreign nations to dump their surplus on the American market.

Statistics show that the imports of agricultural products for 1940 represented a total paid value of nearly $2,500,000,000; that these imported products displaced those that could have been grown on 118,510,007 acres. In other words, we turn over to the foreign farmers American markets equivalent to what could have been produced on 581,000 American farms of 174 acres each.

All these years we have had a tariff policy under which the farmers of America have been asked to "take the rap" in order that American manufactured articles could be exchanged for these foreign farm imports. I realize the importance of promoting increased trade among the Americans, but at the same time, I see no justification why the farmers of this country should be asked to make all the sacrifices and all the concessions on the specious plea that such farm imports lower the cost of living for the American worker.

Labor and industry for years have been able to erect tariff barriers which largely keep out the manufactured products of foreign nations which are in competition with American industry. This has been done, and I think rightfully done, on the ground that American industry and American workers should not be forced to compete with the low-wage labor and industry of foreign countries. I think it is high time the same principle is recognized in behalf of the American farmers. Why should he be asked to compete with the low-wage agriculture of other countries? The farmers are entitled to the same protection which has been granted labor and industry since the beginning of our protective-tariff program.

On behalf of the men and women out on our farms—the men and women who are fully capable of producing all the grain, meat, and fiber that will make this Nation strong and self-sufficient—I respectfully urge this committee to oppose the granting of any further concessions discriminatory to American agriculture and to oppose any reduction in the tariff rates and import levies now existing against such imports of foreign farm products.

America's Danger Is America's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 26), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on June 28, 1941, under the auspices of the Committee to Defend America, on the subject America's Danger Is America's Opportunity.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hitler's mechanized divisions are now pouring into and over the last country with which he had a negotiated peace. Another people with whom Hitler had a nonaggression pact are now also the victims of Hitler aggression. In fact Hitler has not invaded a single country to which he had not given, expressly or impliedly, solemn assurances of security and nonaggression.

But this last assault of the Nazis came as no surprise to the world. That strategy of lies, the national policy which makes solemn covenants of nations mere scraps of paper (or rather an opiate to lull the unsuspecting into false security), the national policy which ignores every human right, which crushes every fragile sentiment, which scorns every restraint which decency, morality, or law imposes, the whole world knows now as Hitlerism.

One who looks back over the course of eight and a third years wonders if it is a hideous nightmare he sees. Can it be possible that the world we knew eight and a third years ago, even five years ago, is no more? In this twentieth century are there real concentration camps in which men, wrung from their families and homes, are tortured into the grave, or a living hell? Is it true that preachers are driven out of their pulpits and a political leader commands that he be worshiped like God? Is Jesus Christ actually denounced by the heads of a great modern nation as a contemptible, hated, despised being? Does any race really claim that it has the quality of divinity?

Does a whole people actually claim that there is no right but might? Does a world power actually scoff at the dignity of man? Could it be that whole races are being destroyed by the separation of men and women? By persecution? By transplanting? By starvation and murder?

Is it true that nations and people which offend no one, which seek naught except the right to be free, to be a part of the world, to worship their own God, in their own way, to live with the race of men, suddenly find themselves invaded, their homes bombed, their fields destroyed, their children killed, their land taken over by a cruel conqueror and a hated secret police hunting them down like wild animals, slaughtering and imprisoning them like trapped beasts?

Can it be that one man now has his heel upon the whole of Europe? That another foot is raised to crush Asia while he flourishes his sword above Africa? That his bloodcry echoes across the oceans to chill the heart of every land and every people? Can one believe that the world is an armed camp? That the energies of all mankind are being poured into the maelstrom of war, or preparation for war? That every economy, every factory, every man's labor is being geared to make the tools of war?

We sadly lift our eyes to the horizon. We see men die. We see streams of human blood. We hear the crash of bombs. We hear the blood-curdling sirens of the dive bombers, the roar of cruel guns. We see millions of men on their mission of death, riding grim monsters of steel crushing everything before them. We hear the plaintive cry of the orphan, the wail of the widow, the mutterings of the crazed, and the dull sobs of the crushed. It is not a nightmare. It is a horrible truth. It is our world which has come to this.

Above and behind it all is the arch fiend, Adolf Hitler. No savage ever persecuted as he has. No mad monster of history was ever more cruel. No tyrant more unfeeling. In no breast ever beat stronger the pulse of harsh ambition. No genius ever passed his evil greatness.

Hitler marches on. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen nations now are his. Russia, to whom he pledged his troth, is but the victim of the moment, the one upon whom his capricious sword has fallen this particular time.

Long ago most men, most women, saw Hitler in all his hideous raiment. They saw what he was; what he had done; what he was doing. They knew at what he aimed. The world, therefore, has fallen largely into two parts—those who are for Hitler, and those who are against Hitler; for Hitler is the evil which every man and woman must today embrace or renounce. There is no halfway. Hitler recognizes no divided loyalty. He scorns a divided foe.

And for those who aline themselves with Hitler there is no partnership. There is but obeisance. For in the lexicon of Hitlerism there is no equality. The Nazi principle that the German is the superior race and there must be a superior class leaves no place but the slaves' dungeon to be occupied by those who grasp Hitler's hand.

I say that all men must answer "Yes" or "No" to Hitler's call. There have been some, there are some in every country, who speak the language of patriots but serve Hitler's cause. The fact that they do it unwittingly changes not the nature or the truth of their aid. That they are misguided, the blind crying out to lead the blind, diminishes not their danger. Even the child which plays with dynamite is a menace to the safety of all roundabout. There are times when the man who is reckless with his words is no less inimical to the public welfare than one reckless with a loaded gun.

What responsibility, what fearful responsibility, lies upon the shoulders, upon the consciences of those men in public life in every nation which saw Hitler grow more and more menacing and counseled their people not against him. How responsible, I say, they are for the devastation which lies across their prostrate lands, the heavy yoke which now galls their people's necks. What shall men say of them? What shall their people say of such false watchmen? Of such blind leaders? Of such cowardly defenders?

America has not been free of those influences which have divided, and in so many sad instances, destroyed brave people, mighty nations in other lands. There have been some, taking advantage of our hospitality, who have turned their weapons upon us from within. They have gained our confidence only to betray it, and made our democracy but a stepping stone by which to destroy our freedom. Yet others under the guise of free speech, protected by democratic institutions and sentiments, have whispered and cooed poisoned words of propaganda. Others yet, while claiming the rights of freemen, have sabotaged our machines, dammed up the streams of our production, curtailed our efforts to create the tools of defense, and thereby served tyranny. Still others, mouthing democracy, really cherish in their hearts the sentiments of dictatorship, because they have the vanity to think that in such an order they would be the privileged few, immune from all the vexations and harassments of the democratic way of life.

Poor misguided ones. You business giants of America who harbor such delusions, go look at Thyssen and Stinnes, who poured their money into Hitler's treasury to make him what he is, and are now hunted like wild beasts across the face of the earth by Hitler's relentless hand.

Yet another group, some of whom are in the Senate of the United States, spend their time denouncing dictatorship, warning the people against danger, crying out against a menace, but the dictator whom they attack is not Hitler but Roosevelt; and the danger against which they hurl their shafts is not that of Hitler but Roosevelt; and the menace against which they warn the people is not Hitler but Roosevelt. I fear there are still some in America who would rather lose their country than help Roosevelt save it.

They are those who said there would be no war in Europe, if Roosevelt did not cause it. They are those who denounced Roosevelt when he said at Chicago that the aggressors must be quarantined. They are those who refused to repeal the Arms Embargo and incited Hitler to unloose the dragons of war. They are those who opposed the Selective Service Act; those who fought against the lend-lease bill; who have thrown every possible obstacle in the path of the President, the Congress, and the people who have thus far, thank God, made some contribution to the cause of stopping Hitler.

Now, this group has given their song another name, but it is the same old song. They now cry out against Russia, against communism, against irreligion, against Stalin. They wrap their pretentiously holy robes about them and scorn this Churchill and this Roosevelt who would keep such bad company.

But one never hears them utter more than mild rebuke to nazi-ism. They never raise their mighty voices to denounce the paganism and the persecutions of the Nazis. Their wrath never rises against Hitler.

A little bit ago it was the same, but the name they then used was British imperialism, undemocratic England, the roaring British lion.

The record shows, therefore, that they did not want to help Britain to stop Hitler any more than they now want to help Russia stop Hitler. Neither do they want to help China, or Greece, or Yugoslavia to stop Hitler.

In fact, if their record alone is to be made the test, if their utterances are the criterion, some of them have not made any great effort to stop Hitler anywhere and with anybody.

Maybe we have been at fault in our terminology. Too often I think we have used or let our friends use the phrase "Aid to Britain," or "Aid to China," or "Aid to Greece," or "Aid to Yugoslavia," as an expression of our policy. What we should have said was, we swear to stop Hitler from conquering the earth. We shall now throw every obstacle in his path, materials, money, our moral forces, our diplomatic power, all we possess but our men. We pray these mighty forces will hold him back. But if he shall break over every barrier, if he shall trample down every obstacle, everyone who stands in his path, and all that we have built against him, and leap at our land, then our men shall meet him in midair.

We are not thinking, therefore, about helping anybody. We are Americans thinking about defending America. We see this deadly menace creeping, crouching, step by step toward us. We hand weapons to those who stand in the front lines and shield us. We put in their hands the tools with which to build the barriers of defense. Food, clothes, medicines, our prayers, too, we give, for they are our heroic defenders.

Those men who fall in front there, fall where Americans might be falling. The least we can do is to help them and to honor them. If those bombs are not stopped there, they might fall here sometime. Were those millions of Hitler men, those tanks, those planes, those guns of Hitler not turned against the steady defenders of other lands, their mighty strength could be devastating South America, Central America, or maybe Mexico, or Canada, or us.

We are often unconsciously deceived about geography because we usually see the world upon a flat map rather than as a globe. If we see it as a flat map, Russia seems far across the Atlantic, beyond the borders of Europe, far in the fastnesses beyond the Urals; but if we see it as a globe, if we look not to the east across the Atlantic but to the west, not across the wide Pacific but just across the few miles of the Bering Straits, there is Russia. You can see it from Alaska, and Alaska is America and American.

It is in our hemisphere. It is just off here to the northwest in our own continent. It lies against Canada, and Canada lies against us. Looking this way, as you lift your eyes across the globe, there is Hitler just on the other side of Russia, and coming this way as fast as his steel horses will bring him. His millions of men are pouring over the borders hundreds of miles inland this way. Between Hitler and his heretofore invincible army and us stands Russia, 160,000,000 people, with great resources, rich in everything a greedy conqueror would want. With those resources all the ships in the world cannot starve out Hitler, cannot cut him off from the materials with which to wage his expanding conquest, cannot squeeze him to collapse. With those 160,000,000 added to the 200,000,000 of Europeans he now dominates, over a third of a billion of human beings will wear his yoke.

A great railroad runs across Russia. It runs this way. It could bring Hitler's men, Hitler's tanks, Hitler's guns, Hitler's flame throwers, Hitler's Gestapos. Those are Russia's fortifications just off the coast of Alaska, within sight of Alaska. If Hitler crushes Russia, German Nazis will be in those fortifications. They will not have to cross the Pacific. They are already within sight and America's rising sun will every day lift America's glory and wealth before their greedy eyes.

If Russia falls, if the Nazis march across this ancient land, they will have thwarted British ships, British planes, British sentinels; they will have broken out of Europe; they will have reached us in spite of all the heroic Poles, British, and French, and Greeks, and Yugoslavs have done to hold them back.

Then who will be between Hitler and us? Then whom will we have a chance to help? What other mighty nation will rise up to hold Hitler off for us? What other heroic people will rise to spill their blood for America's defense, as well as their own?

You and I know there would not be anybody else between Hitler and Alaska, and with Alaska taken, only Canada, a nation the size that Belgium was, will stand between Hitler and us here in continental United States. I often wonder if some of our Senators, or Colonel Lindbergh, would then say it was too late, that we should try to get on with Hitler, that we should offer the hand of appeasement. I wonder if some of our statesmen would still spend most of their time and strength warning the people against Roosevelt, against the danger of dictatorship in the United States, against the tyranny of democracy? I wonder if even then ambitious men would throw off the cloak of ambition and join their chosen leader to defend America in unity and cooperation? I wonder if even then men would forget petty jealousies, selfishness, profits, small gains, and make a solid front against so great and so near a danger?

They did not in the Scandinavian countries; they did not in Belgium; they did not in France. Would they do it here?

But if Hitler conquered Russia, his bloody hand would hang over China. It would clasp the dripping yellow hand of Japan across China and India. Then more than half, much more than half, of all the race of men would be within the grasp of these clutching hands. All the rim of the western Pacific would lave the lands of Hitler and Hirohito and the gigantic shadow of Adolf Hitler would tower over every human head.

Does it take much stretch of fancy to see these things come true when our burning memory tells us that so much more has come hideously true in the last 2 years? Is it impossible for a Hitler who has crushed all Europe to crush Russia, and with Japan, to crush China and India relatively weaponless as they are by Hitler's standards?

Can any honest patriot, therefore, say that those of us—Churchill, Roosevelt, you, or I—who want to keep Hitler behind the Urals, beyond the steppes of Russia, really are thinking only about helping Stalin or communism, or somebody else, or something else?

They do not believe that. They did not really believe that we were just trying to help the British Empire when we resolved to give all aid to the British and their allies who were holding back the flood of Hitlerism in Europe and on the Atlantic.

Some of these critics who seem so horrified about our wanting to stop Hitler beyond Russia are lawyers. I wonder if they have ever seen the state allowing a criminal to turn state's evidence in order to help convict another criminal without any thought of embracing the criminality of the criminal turncoat.

Some of these critics must have seen forest fires. In the absence of modern and adequate fire-fighting equipment, I wonder if they have ever seen a fire built to stop a fire?

Some of these critics must be great admirers of Andrew Jackson. I wonder if they remember that old Andrew Jackson at New Orleans, more than a century ago, gladly welcomed the pirate Lafitte, upon whose head hung a price, and Lafitte men and guns to hold back the invading Pakenham with his redcoats.

We no more have to embrace those who help us than they have to embrace us. This is not the first time that men of many faiths, or many races, of many origins, of many lands have fought a common danger which menaced them all.

To those who have open minds (and that is the vast majority of the people of America), it has been apparent that if Hitler wins this war he must crush Britain this year. He must crush every foe in reach of his marching men before he is drowned in the flood of American materials. Yet he dares not make his final assault upon Britain—upon the powers of the west—without first striking down mighty Russia, which lies on his flank to the east. Hitler is therefore, fighting the battle of Tannenberg all over again, trying to knock out Russia before he hurls his last devasting attack upon the west.

This very necessity, however, has forced him to do what he had so assiduously tried to avoid—fight a war on two fronts. We know not what may be Russia's strength. There are many of us who estimate more highly than others her power, the courage of her soldiers, her preparation, the determination of her men who defend their homes and ancient lands. We do know that Hitler now struggles with them, with almost his full strength—that he is now clutching with them in a death grapple. Does not therefore common sense dictate that we hurl every help we can, save our men, against Hitler? Should we not, then, search our factories, our own storehouses—yes; even what our own forces possess—for every plane, every tank, every gun which might be thrown across Hitler's path to impede his progress? Should we not take advantage of this moment when Hitler is mightily engaged to say to General Weygand, "We will give you the weapons needed if you will swear that Hitler shall not have the West Coast of Africa and Dakar. Moreover, we pledge our faith that Britain will not, when this hideous struggle shall have ended at last, retain one meter of the empire of France."

If we could give these assurances to General Weygand, might it not raise in him new hope and new resolve to set his face against this cruel Hitler who destroyed his fair French Army and put his ruthless heel upon the breast of prostrate France but to serve his lust for power?

And meanwhile might we not address ourselves to Japan and hold up to this doubting member of the Axis the betrayal of those who have pinned their faith to Hitler's sword; point out to Matsuoka and the war lords of Japan what at least has happened to all those who have for a time been Hitler's partners in crime?

While Hitler wrestles with Russia, would it not be well with the British and all others who would help, or acquiesce, to occupy those islands which lie across the exits of the areas Hitler holds and are the stepping stones for assault upon our continent and country, occupy them upon sacred assurances that they were held only against Hitler, held until that happy hour when every voice on earth and in the heavens above cry out with joy that Hitler should, like Lucifer, have been hurled to his destruction?

And would it not be timely now for America to see to it in whatever way our experts advise that every instrument which will stop Hitler shall find an open road across the seas from its origin anywhere to the hand of him who will use it against Hitler?

People of America, we have done much in the last year. Even against determined and relentless opposition we have done much; but the danger grows greater instead of less; Hitler's power more and more ominous. Day by day and step by step it draws nearer and nearer to us.

Our people still are not aroused to the danger. Our Congress is still not aroused to the danger. We are still divided in counsel, split in spirit, pulling against one another, throttling the hands of our President and leader; blind to this hideous thing which is already peering with its green eyes above the horizon at us.

America's strength is not great unless it is a united strength. Our power is not determining unless it is mobilized. America's will is not decisive unless it is one irresistible will against which nothing can stand. We cannot be united unless we all look at a single object, scorning any petty distractions, and concentrate upon it with all the vigor of our being.

Who, therefore, would destroy us with detractions, would raise up petty jealousies to divide us, would throw screens of prejudice and hate across our visions to blind us to what strikes at us from beyond?

A great opportunity still dangles before us to save America's blood, even uncounted billions of America's treasure; and, above all, the cause of honor and godliness for which America has ever stood, if we but like Americans now embrace it.

A New Caesar and a New Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

LETTER FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Boston Herald of June 20, 1941:

[From the Boston Herald of June 20, 1941]

THE MAIL BAG

A NEW CAESAR AND A NEW WORRY

To the Editor of the Herald:

There is no question where the great majority of Americans stand in this war. They stand squarely with Britain against Hitler and all that his name, cruelty, and power imply.

Who put the heel of oppression on the peoples of Belgium, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Austria, and Czechoslovakia? We know now from authentic accounts, and not propaganda, that men, women, and children were bombed and machine gunned on the roads of France. What happened in Rotterdam and Warsaw is well known and needs no elaboration.

In this war against the dictators a victorious England, aided by America, means life and independence to many peoples, as well as to the English people themselves. A victorious England will remove the heels of the oppressor from the throats of the peoples of all countries now enslaved by Hitler. Time marches on and Hitler has marched on. Any American who ponders over the statements made by other German leaders and who is not concerned with the result of this war has his head in the ground like the ostrich.

Let us remember that the people who have been taking a terrific scourging in Britain with their chins up and with fortitude and courage are English, Scotch, Welsh, Irish, and their Canadian, Australian, and American blood brothers who have gone over to help them. Also fighting the battle of freedom with them are Poles, Hollanders, Norwegians, French, Czechs, and others—brave men who prefer the risk of death or death itself to life in a slave world.

Do we wish to see these people, now fighting for life and liberty, notwithstanding the mistakes made in the past by some of their Tory leaders, devoured by Hitler and his associated group of sadists seeking world domination—the kind of domination desired by Goebbels, one of Hitler's lieutenants, who declared a few years ago: "The Government is resolved to institute German order throughout the world; the world will have to reckon with German business, with German soldiers and cannons."

These German leaders have convicted themselves through their own actions, their own words, and their own writings. They have convicted themselves of their intentions by direct evidence and not by circumstantial evidence.

A victorious England means a great deal to the people of these United States; to the people of Canada, and to the people of South America. An eminent son of Boston, the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, of Georgetown University, and an acknowledged authority on international affairs, summarized the situation not so long ago when he said: "If Great Britain falls, we shall be faced with a new worry and a new Caesar."

This new Caesar and his gang have cunningly prepared, through the rule of the gun, to destroy freedom throughout the world, and the world includes the United States. The Nazis, the Fascists, and the Communists in this country are unworried about this situation. You will find these people attending meetings throughout the country, mixing with Americans having honest differences of opinion, making noisy demonstrations, but their minds and their hearts are not with the United States of America.

Actually, they are the enemies within our ranks who need constant watching. They are part and parcel of the new worry and the new Caesar, referred to by Father Walsh as confronting the United States. There are Americans who have dislike for England for various reasons, but these people are overlooking the fact that Hitler and all that he stands for are an existing world-wide menace.

The President of the United States has warned the people in unmistakable language not to be deluded and to beware of the foulness and craftiness of the German propaganda machine. If Britain loses this war, and the writer believes that she will not, America must become an armed camp for a period of years, the length of which no individual can predict or visualize. The President and the Congress must decide the course for America to pursue at a time when a brute force has been held back only by the bravery and enduring spirit of the people of Britain.

ALEXANDER M. SULLIVAN.

BOSTON, MASS.

Unfortunate Delay in Action on 28-Year Amendment to Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during the colloquy with the

majority leader this evening, I expressed regret that those in charge of the legislative program had deferred until July 8 consideration of the 28-year amendment to the Selective Service Act, leaving in a state of uncertainty, the legal status of registrants between 28 and 35 and the probable rate of call for those below 28. Tomorrow, July 1, is the date for new registration. I referred to an editorial in the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Gazette, on the subject, written by L. W. Robinson, a local board chairman, which I now offer for the RECORD under permission previously granted by the House.

It should be understood, of course, that the reason for the delay in action on the bill is the fact that some Members are opposed to any consideration of the questions involved in the stoppage of work in defense plants and that proposition has been made a part of the May bill which deals with the deferment of service for men past 28.

Personally I think both questions should be settled as quickly as possible, and I regret this delay. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and myself spent a great deal of time today trying to secure an agreement to have the 28-year section worked into the deficiency appropriation bill, but that required unanimous consent in another body which we were unable to arrange. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], ranking House Members of the deficiency conferees, and several leaders in the other body, including the junior Senator from my own State, expressed themselves as personally favorable to the proposition, but it was impossible to secure the unanimous consent necessary.

Consequently the matter is going over. I submit herewith the editorial to which I have referred:

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Gazette]

CONGRESS SHOULD SPEED UP ACTION ON SELECTIVE SERVICE

On several occasions the Gazette has commented on the loyal and patriotic spirit exhibited in the first selective service registration, in the quick return of questionnaires, and the ready response to service on the part of the men placed in Class 1A.

It is a loyalty and a response which deserves more consideration from Congress than is being given registrants, and thousands of selective-service board members, lawyers, physicians, and others who are giving of their services without remuneration. We are thinking of the delays, in Congress, on the enactment of legislation governing the application of the selective service law. These delays add materially to the work of the volunteer boards, and create a prolonged and unnecessary uneasiness on the part of men subject to the selective service law.

Two cases in point will illustrate: Nearly 3 weeks ago the Senate passed a measure giving the President authority to defer all men listed in the first registration who have attained their twenty-eighth birthday. Immediately selective service boards in every county in the Union were besieged with questions as to how and when the new plan would be put into operation. Many jumped to the erroneous conclusion that with passage of the measure in the Senate it became immediately operative. As stated above, that was nearly 3 weeks ago, but because the House of Representatives has failed to act on this measure it has not become a law. Even if the House had passed it, it is indecisive in that it does not definitely settle the question of deferment of men in the older-age groups, but leaves that decision to the President.

If the House had immediately followed the Senate in taking action on this measure, and the President had given his endorsement, thousands of selective service boards throughout the Union would have been saved the unnecessary burden of detailed examination of the questionnaires returned by men in the older-age group, and hundreds of thousands of the men in that group would have been removed from the ranks of those citizens who will never feel well settled again until they are classified into some selective service rank.

On the other hand, if the House does disapprove the Senate bill, it should have expressed that disapproval immediately, and then cooperated with the upper Chamber in formulating a measure on which there could be agreement.

Another case in point is that concerning the position of young men come of age since last October 16, who are to register on July 1, as related to those included in the first registration. Are they to be placed on the end of the old list, as far as order or call numbers are concerned, or are they to be integrated with those already classified?

To individuals not acquainted with the operation of the law, this may not appear to be a vital point; but to those who have the task of putting the law into operation, and to the young men who will register next Tuesday, it is an exceedingly important one.

Selective Service boards have already classified from hundreds to thousands in the first registration list, the number depending on quota demands. But whether hundreds or thousands, each of these men has not only an order number, but in case of class I-A men—those selected for service—they have been numerically realined as to the order in which they will be selected from their own top-ranking group. If, after fussing around another month or two, Congress finally decides that the new registrants must be mixed in with the old, it is easy to see that it will add a very considerable extra burden on the volunteer boards who are administering the Selective Service Act.

And the young men who are going to respond so loyally to the registration next Tuesday have a right (this being a democracy of which they are a vital part) to know something about their probable placing. Many thousands of them hope to go back to school, or to seek new jobs. If Congress decides that the new registrants will be added to the end of the old one, they will have some degree of assurance that they will have from 6 to 9 months' leeway, while the list of first registrants is being exhausted. If they are to be mixed in with the first list, and therefore likely to more immediate call, they are entitled to know it.

This is all written with the highest regard for the selective service law. But we also have the highest regard for the lives and work of the young men who are so vitally affected by it. In the text of this law selective service boards are urged to avoid as far as possible a disruption of the normal flow of life and business; and yet Congress drags along with indecision on vital points in such manner as to upset what local boards may do to sustain that normality, and at the same time to materially increase the burden which thousands of volunteer members of these boards in all parts of the land have so willingly assumed.

Congress should act promptly and definitely on every question involved in the selective service, and not leave millions of citizens guessing as to their status. If Congress cannot take prompt action on this question, it should leave decisions to the national selective service headquarters, which is constantly on the job and always in touch with State and local boards.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and in connection with the thought in the closing paragraph of Mr. Robinson's editorial, I call attention to the remarks by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has urged local boards to recognize the probable passage of the 28-year amendment and delay action accordingly. I understand similar suggestion is being sent by the selective-service officials. It is regrettable that their suggestions can only be suggestions until the House takes formal action.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of HON. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, words are such clumsily poor media with which to express the emotions that engulfed me on hearing the news of the passing of a kind friend, a venerable scholar, a statesman among statesmen, a truly great leader, and one of the finest American gentlemen I have ever known, the late beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD.

Apart from my share in the public loss to the Nation and the Nation's Legislature of its lamented leader, I feel a personal regret that, I feel, qualifies me to speak right from the heart.

The very words of the time-worn address to the Chair—"Mr. Speaker"—conjure for me each time I say them, and especially as I say them today, the spirit of the man who looked down so encouragingly as I said them here for the first time some 4 years ago; the man who had a few months before unprecedently stepped down from the chair to pay inspired and ringing tribute to my beloved brother and your late colleague, "Billy" Connery; the man who personified in my esteem the full essence of official probity, benevolence, dignity, and honor.

The more intimate relationship that followed my first contact with our late Speaker leaves me with even more affectionate memories of the charm and old-world courtliness that belied an outlook so ultra modern that it was not only abreast of the times but ahead of them, leaves me with affectionate memories of the quiet, effortless good fellowship and the proverbially fair squareness of purpose, synonymous to all who knew him, even slightly of the very name of BANKHEAD.

With us who worked with him here will live these memories, as well as the recollection of his patient forbearance as presiding officer of this body during stormy session, his sound impersonal decisions, his constant awareness, his gentle consideration, his consistently absolute impartiality.

What will never pass from these halls are his precedents, introduced, proven, and practiced by him, and now become traditional. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD has endowed the chair of the House of Representatives with some of his own justice, integrity, sincerity, and decency. Congress will never be satisfied with less. In him lived the veritas, auctoritas, and dignitas lauded by Cicero in ancient Rome and found all too seldom before, during, or since his time.

WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD has passed from us. He was truly one of those few destined to find during his short span on this poor universe of ours a wisdom that transcends it. While he lived, it crowned his every endeavor, it gathered in his fellow man. When he passed, it did not pass with him. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD'S mark is on America.

Cheese for Mr. Wickard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the unwarranted request of Secretary Wickard in asking the American public to reduce its consumption of cheese—the poor man's meat—has caused a rather general resentment in Wisconsin, where one-half of the Nation's Cheddar cheese is produced.

The people of Wisconsin, as well as the Members of Congress from that State, hope that Secretary Wickard will take immediate steps to correct this uncalled for request. The normal domestic consumption of this incomparable product cannot only be still further increased but ample cheese can be provided for export. Let us ask that he make the necessary adjustments in fairness to the cheese producers of this country.

At the same time let us ask that he be cautious in regard to the domestic per capita butter consumption. Butter has not enjoyed the per capita increased consumption that has taken place in the per capita consumption of cheese and condensed milk during the past 10 years. Fair dealing to all groups within an industry and between industries should be expected from any administration.

The wisdom of disrupting the cheese industry at this time is to be questioned.

The Agriculture Department has sent out a circular to the innumerable agricultural employees scattered all over the United States to "sell" the war to the farmers of the Nation.

There was, on June 1, 1941, in storage 102,768,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese, with a 5-year previous average of only 67,000,000 pounds. There is a total of 119,628,000 pounds of Cheddar and foreign-type cheese in storage in the United States, 15,000,000 pounds Cheddar cheese in storage in Canada, 35,000,000 pounds in storage in New Zealand, and 44,000,000 pounds of foreign-type cheese in storage in Argentina. This makes an available supply of 214,000,000 pounds of cheese.

Legislation and programs should be based on common sense and common justice. This program is not based on either of these premises.

The cheese people have spent millions of dollars and years of time making this country cheese conscious. It is the "poor man's meat." This increased production can be obtained and still have American consumption maintained, or increased, if the producer is given a price incentive for so doing.

The following editorials, from three of the leading newspapers of my district, are indicative of the attitude of these fair-minded papers:

[From the News Herald of Marshfield, Wis.]

MR. WICKARD'S CRACK

Last week Secretary Wickard, of the Department of Agriculture, asked the American people to consume less cheese because, he said, he foresees a shortage due to the fact that heavy shipments are to be made to England.

This unfortunate crack from Mr. Wickard has brought down upon his head the maledictions of Wisconsin cheese producers and the press of the State. Because if there is one thing Wisconsin desires most it is the greater increased per capita consumption of cheese in these United States. Wisconsin cheese is a wholesome food of which more should be eaten by the American people.

And when Mr. Wickard, to support his plea for less consumption, declared cheese is not an essential food he damned an industry that has suffered depression since the mid-twenties, and which only now, under the stimulus of Government buying, is beginning to recover from the 15 or more years of adversity it has suffered.

One wonders at the loose talk emanating from Washington. Surely, say Wisconsin cheese producers and dealers who know the industry from the inside out, there is no danger of a cheese shortage. Our farmers have been urged to produce less for so many years they have not yet begun to unlimber their ability to produce cheese. And this without building new factories.

Like his Cabinet colleague, Secretary Ickes, who shouted of an impending oil shortage which did not exist, Mr. Wickard is talking through his hat. He may be a successful hog raiser, but he doesn't know the cheese industry. Like Mr. Ickes, Wickard ought to keep his mouth shut until he knows what he is talking about. Farming from Washington never was successful.

[From the Wausau Record-Herald, Wausau, Wis., of June 17, 1941]

WHAT! NO CHEESE AT THE WHITE HOUSE?

Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, D. C., perhaps sought publicity by declaring that because Americans do not take their cheese seriously, this dish should be reserved for the English connoisseurs.

Wisconsin's cheese industry, rising in arms over the blunt statement of the Secretary, has asked whether the Secretary has not read the papers, including the double-page advertisement in the Saturday Evening Post, extolling Wisconsin's dairy products? Why should Governor Heil have toured the country on a cheese mission only to have Washington ridicule the thought that Wisconsin's cheese industry has progressed beyond the primitive stage?

The English may boast provincially of their cheddar, saying that no cheese can compare with this English delicacy. Here in Wisconsin, cheddar cheese is just ordinary "American cheese," according to label, and Secretary Wickard's contention that "the English cannot live without their cheddar and that Americans will not miss their cheese" is at least amusing. Nothing could have awakened Wisconsin's cheese industry to a higher pitch of resentment. Some may ask whether the White House has been serving cheese during the past 6 years other than an English cheddar. Incidentally, we note there is a strange silence about reciprocity. We ponder whether the national emergency will allow us to even long for our cheese—just as we longed for our pork when Washington curtailed pork production. But we dare not think what will happen to our Wisconsin cheese production after peace returns. We may well hope that the war will last forever.

Butter production, too, is to be curtailed, we are told, by diversion of milk to condenseries, with creameries serving as receiving stations for their big brother plants. Oleomargarine is a good food, we may be told by Federal decree—as to ice cream, the popular dish may become scarce as gold. The erstwhile underestimated skim milk may also be denied to us. From where will come the vitamins that we have been told are contained only in milk. Where is preparedness in all this?

[From the Shawano (Wis.) Evening Leader of June 26, 1941]

WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN FACE A CRISIS

Secretary of Agriculture Claude W. Wickard seemingly will not back down on his proposal that the people must eat less cheese, and Wisconsin's representatives in Congress and elsewhere are standing by their guns that this principal dairy product shall not be pushed down from the high ground it has acquired with great effort and expense over a long period of years.

We assume that Secretary Wickard doesn't want to hurt the dairyman. He probably doesn't want to hurt anyone. But as we prepare for war and the many years it may last, we must become accustomed to tumults and disorders and the revolutionary processes it will work in our lives. It has always been thus and it always will be.

The Wisconsin dairyman is not the only businessman who will be confused and befuddled, seduced with bloated prices on some articles and benumbed by lost markets with others. The havoc will be general. But the example gives us a side glance at the future for all those not too short-sighted to see it.

The American people in years past have eaten much less cheese per capita than any other civilized nation. The process of creating a demand for cheese has entailed huge expenditures of money. You will remember that the campaign to educate people on the health and nutritional value of cheese was carried on last fall by the Evening Leader and the Northeastern Wisconsin Cheesemakers and Buttermakers Association. It was effective and over 2,000 pounds of cheese was sold through local retail stores during 1 week.

And now that the fruit of all this toil and expense is beginning to bud upon the tree, war makes its sinister appearance, and in crisp clipped language issues orders, counter-orders, and reverse orders. That is its nature.

The food front changes to the food administrators just as the battle front changes to the generals. As more artillery and dive bombers are ordered at one spot so more meat may be advanced or retreated at another.

The best argument for the dairyman at this time is that if cheese is treated on a par with other foodstuffs, the injury done the farmer will be much more lasting than to others, particularly if carried over a period of a year or more.

The campaign to extend the use of cheese was doing well and making splendid advances. To become firmly entrenched, such a campaign would have to be carried on for a generation. Even the recently adopted methods

of putting cheese into a prominent place on the Christmas gift list has returned surprising dividends in consistency of orders.

It is for these reasons that the secretary's order is painfully unjust although that gentleman may not realize it.

For this is sure; after the war Wisconsin cheese will not be wanted in Britain. It will not sell for $1 per pound.

And worse, the most important part of the American market will have been dried up.

Mr. Speaker, one out of every 100 cows in the United States can be found in the district I have the honor to represent. Where 85 to 90 percent of the farm income is from livestock and livestock products, any legislative or economic influence on livestock or livestock products is quickly reflected on the income of the farmers of this territory.

This administration is now considering the possibilities of again lowering the tariff on cheese coming from Argentina. This is the picture at this time—lower domestic consumption—increase domestic production—lower the bars for more imports.

I asked the Secretary about these imports and if he favored them, but he declined to answer, saying this was a matter for the State Department. The American farmer sorely needs someone primarily interested in the producers of this country. Too much sympathy is being extended to the consumers of this country and foreign lands.

Dr. George Gallup Volunteers Plan for Checking Accuracy and Integrity of Polls by American Institute of Public Opinion

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, over a period of time there has been an increasing interest in the matter of public-opinion polls with some citizens and Members of Congress expressing concern about their effect upon public opinion, others lauding the polls as highly effective devices for probing and reporting public attitudes, and some proposing that Congress investigate the whole conduct of established public-opinion polls to determine for the public record what safeguards are taken to protect the public against the use of such devices as an instrument to mold public sentiment rather than to measure it. Unquestionably this analytical discussion of public-opinion polls had done much to create increased interest in the whole program of measuring public opinion, to stimulate thought about their usefulness and responsibilities as one of the devices of a free functioning republic, and to cause the operators of legitimate public-opinion polls to redouble their zeal in checking and double checking their methods so as to eliminate every possible hazard of inaccuracy or insufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago I published in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence which I had with Dr. George Gallup, whose American Institute of Public Opinion is recognized as the leading institution which is continuously engaged in the measurement of public opinion. At that time I made what I hope were some constructive criticisms of some of the questions which were at times asked by the Institute of Public Opinion and stressed the importance, if these polls were to serve their maximum usefulness and their announced purpose, of exercising extreme care that the editorial text reporting the results of polls and the conclusions derived therefrom be kept in strict conformity with the nature of the question itself. I found Dr. Gallup to be very receptive to constructive suggestions and very courteous and cooperative in his determination to free his polls from all possible cause for legitimate criticism. Because of that correspondence and because of the growing public importance placed upon these polls, I have continued my survey and study of public-opinion polls ever since and have at times been in correspondence with Dr. Gallup and others in an effort to be helpful in aiding these polls to serve a legitimate and important public interest.

PROPOSED SENATE INVESTIGATION OF ALL PUBLIC-OPINION POLLS

When Senator NYE introduced Senate Resolution 111, asking for an impartial and nonprejudiced investigation of public-opinion polls, I made the statement on the floor of this House that I was sure Dr. Gallup and other operators of established fact-finding institutions would welcome an opportunity to tell Congress with complete candor the methods by which they analyzed and reported public opinion. Dr. Gallup has since vindicated my predictions in that regard by asserting his willingness to appear before any congressional committee to answer any and all questions regarding the scope and significance of his findings of public opinion and the purpose and philosophy underlying his procedures. It is quite possible that a little later in the present session of Congress the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee will give Dr. Gallup and other operators of fact-finding polls an opportunity to demonstrate the integrity of their methods in public and official testimony.

DR. GALLUP SUGGESTS A CHECK ON HIS OWN POLLS

Mr. Speaker, about a month after I last addressed the House on this subject I received a letter from Dr. Gallup expressing his eagerness to cooperate in every way to inform the Congress about his methods and to work with any impartial group to devise questions which would be free from charges of ambiguity and devoid of any possibility of being construed as "leading" or "loaded." I replied that I appreciated the continuation of his cooperative spirit and hoped that a method might be developed for providing Congress with complete and unchallengeable information on the most important questions dealing with the public attitude toward the vitally significant aspects of America's attitude toward the international situation.

I shall now include with these remarks a recent letter received from Dr. Gallup indicating progress in the direction of safeguarding both the public and the polls in the universal desire to provide as accurate information as possible on the most vital questions of our times:

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION,
New York, N. Y., June 19, 1941.

Congressman KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUNDT: I am enclosing a copy of our release for Friday, June 20, which contains a statement as to how a bipartisan committee of Congress might go about testing public sentiment on war, convoys, aid to Britain, and other matters.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE GALLUP.

[Enclosure.]

With Dr. Gallup's letter of June 19 was enclosed a reprint from his release for June 20, which is self-explanatory and which I now reproduce as a part of this record:

GALLUP POLL PROPOSES METHOD BY WHICH CONGRESS CAN CHECK WAR ATTITUDES

On highly controversial issues, the methods and findings of the American Institute of Public Opinion are attacked by both sides, and particularly by the side which is reported at the time to be in the minority. This, of course, is natural and, in a democracy, even desirable. Criticism is needed as much in the field of public-opinion measurement as it is in any other field.

If there is any desire on the part of congressional leaders or others in the country to test Institute findings on the attitude of the people toward war issues, it is possible to do so in a very quick and inexpensive way.

Let a bipartisan committee of Congressmen, or a committee of political scientists, select at random (or by lot) one or more communities of proper size from each area of the country.

Let all the eligible voters of these communities vote in what might be described as an advisory referendum. The bipartisan committee can word the questions in any way which it thinks will most accurately reflect the true attitudes of the people toward the various issues concerning defense and foreign policy being debated today—issues such as whether the United States should enter the war, whether it should convoy, and whether it should give aid to England, and how much. Local election boards in these communities can count the ballots and make known the results.

Although the Institute does not believe, from a scientific point of view, that this is the most reliable way to measure Nation-wide sentiment on any given issue, it stands ready to have any or all of its findings put to the above test, provided that an impartial committee has charge.

Dr. GEORGE GALLUP,
Director,
American Institute of Public Opinion.

On June 25, I replied to Dr. Gallup's letter, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1941.

Dr. GEORGE GALLUP,
New York City.

MY DEAR DR. GALLUP: I thank you for your letter of June 19 calling my attention to your proposal indicating how a bipartisan committee of Congress might go about testing public sentiment on national and international issues while at the same time providing an opportunity for the American Institute of Public Opinion to vindicate the accuracy of its findings. For one Member of Congress, I want to say that I think that your proposal is definitely fair and I hope that you will follow through by inviting such a committee to join you in selecting a topic and an area in which to make such a test.

For myself, I have never doubted the reliability of those who take your polls, nor have I doubted the accuracy and honesty with which the count is faithfully reported. My own source of concern has been with (1) the manner in which your questions are sometimes phrased, especially on international issues, and (2) the editorial conclusions which you sometimes provide or promote in the explanatory matter which you print as the findings of these polls are released.

For example, in a recent poll you sought to analyze public sentiment on the subject of convoys by a question which contained the word "convoys" in parentheses, only, whereas you used a rather involved and wordy sentence as your question which sought to describe the process of convoying without naming it as such. In reporting the findings of that poll, however, you again spoke specifically about convoys. It would seem much more matter of fact and confidence inspiring were the subject matter of your question and your editorializing kept in closer harmony.

Perhaps if you were to conduct a poll on the simple question, Do you favor the United States entering the war now? or on the question, Should the United States declare war on the Axis Powers now? it would eliminate all criticisms since your question would then be to the point, timely, and perfectly clear cut. I am sure that Congress and all the country would be interested in the findings of such a poll, and I feel that you would be rendering a true public service in collecting this information for us all. It would also be interesting to note possible changes in public sentiment from week to week or month to month as the American public registered its attitude on this all-important question at the specific time described by the word "now" as the periodical polls are taken.

Assuring you of my continued desire to protect the integrity of the legitimate polls of public opinion in America and likewise to protect the public against any illegitimate useage of the public opinion probing devices, I am, with all good wishes,

Cordially yours,

KARL MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

DR. GALLUP AGREES TO ASK DIRECT QUESTION ON "WAR OR PEACE NOW"

Mr. Speaker, indicative once more of Dr. Gallup's cooperative spirit and his desire to help both Congress and the country make an accurate analysis of public sentiment on the question of whether America should remain at peace or project itself into a shooting war, I received the following letter from Dr. Gallup under date of June 27 in which he agrees to ask my proposed question of, "Do you favor the United States entering the war now?" in the ballots which are presently being circulated by the individuals comprising the fact-finding agents of the American Institute of Public Opinion.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION,
Princeton, N. J., June 27, 1941.

Hon. KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUNDT: I am glad that you like the suggestion which I proposed for testing public sentiment on national and international issues. I have today suggested to Prof. Harwood Childs, editor of the Public Opinion Quarterly, that he name a committee composed of the outstanding professors in the field of public opinion to carry out tests of sentiment in selected areas of the country. The committee would select these communities and would word the various questions as they see fit.

Incidentally, I think your question, "Do you favor the United States entering the war now?" is a very good one, and we shall add it to the ballot this coming week.

In our interpretation of the results on the question dealing with convoys we felt free to use the word "convoy," because we found in running this question on one form of our ballot and the word "guard" on the B form of the ballot that there was no important difference. In short, in the case of one cross-section we used the word "convoy" with "guard" as an explanatory word, and in the other cross-section we used the word "guard" with convoy as the explanatory word.

I shall keep you informed on the progress of the experimental work to be conducted by the Public Opinion Quarterly.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE GALLUP.

THE ROAD TO NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Speaker, there is much talk of unity in this country and every right-thinking American is desirous of expediting unified action on the part of the full force of this country in carrying out domestic and international policies in conformity with the real will of the people of America. Both the proponents of war and the proponents of peace are now claiming that those who disagree with them are "the disrupters of unity and the fomenters of disunity." The answers received to the direct question now being asked by the American Institute of Public Opinion, "Do you favor the United States entering the war now?" should provide irrefutable evidence as to which group it is in America—the war crowd or the antiwar crowd—which is in fact entitled to urge that America attain unity by following the road to war or the path toward peace. The American principle is that unity is always something to be attained by the minority viewpoint merging with the majority viewpoint; it is never a thing to be attained by an obstinate minority of willful men trying to make up in noise and influence what they lack in numbers.

We now have national unity in our program of extending all aid short of war to Britain, in making an all-out effort to build our own defenses and those of the Western Hemisphere, and in eliminating from the American scene the subversive agents of nazi-ism, fascism, and communism. Only on the question of war or peace are we disunited. And on this all-important question neither the people nor the Congress has spoken. On this question, the people or the Congress must speak before there can be any serious thought of this country's actually entering a shooting war. It means comparatively nothing that a few members of the President's Cabinet are making fire-breathing speeches urging that America enter the war now. It does not commit this country to a policy of entering the war, even when the President shouts derisive innuendoes at certain foreign powers and pledges his every effort to defeat their nefarious policies. Wars in a free republic such as this are not entered by the oratorical offering of a few individuals in high places or low; national policy, in the realm of peace or war, is not determined by the dictatorial device of a few men deciding when America shall be at peace and when America shall be at war.

Only Congress, in this free republic, can declare war. Only Congress can transfer the United States from the status of a nation at peace to that of a nation at war. As representatives of the people, the Members of Congress desire to know the people's attitude on the question of war or peace for America. Real unity will come to America when once the public attitude is fully and finally known, the Congress—and I hope the President and the Cabinet, too—reassures the people, to whom this country belongs and whose sacrifices and security is most involved in determining its international policy, that it will conform with their demands in the matter of going to war or protecting and preserving our peace.

OTHER POLLS WILL ALSO CHECK ON DR. GALLUP'S FINDINGS

Mr. Speaker, if there be some who still doubt the integrity and accuracy of Dr. Gallup's methods, additional opportunities are now available to measure American public opinion on the question of peace or war. Apparently spurred on by the growing interest in the mechanics and men who operate our established polls, a large number of special public-opinion polls are now being taken to sound out American public opinion on the international situation. The honorable HAMILTON FISH, Jr., Representative in Congress from the home district of President Roosevelt, has just announced the findings of a poll of over 100,000 voters of his district, giving the country the surprising information that in the President's home congressional district, just outside the city of New York, the people are 90.1 percent opposed to entering this war at this time. While this poll covers only one congressional district, and is not conclusive proof that the people of America, as a whole, are determined to keep out of this war, it is highly significant, since it comes from a section of the country which editorial writers and radio commentators carelessly refer to as "overwhelmingly in favor of intervention in this war."

NEW YORK AND CHICAGO PAPERS ANNOUNCE STATE-WIDE POLLS

Mr. Speaker, apparently aroused by the unexpected and over-whelming vote

against war in President Roosevelt's own congressional district, the New York Daily News has just announced a State-wide poll which it is taking by direct mail to check the validity of Congressman FISH's poll and of the findings of the American Institute of Public Opinion. The results of this poll will soon be made available on the direct question of war or peace—with no trick language, no camouflaging of the issue, no sugar-coating of the problem—just the simple, blunt question now confronting America, Shall we stay out of the war or send our soldiers overseas to join in the fighting?

This week, also, the Chicago Tribune has announced it is taking a State-wide poll on a similarly direct question to explore public sentiment in Illinois on this all-important question. These results will also be available to check against other less inclusive polls than those which are mailed to every qualified voter in an area.

PRESIDENT HUTCHINS, OF UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, DR. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK, AND OTHERS ANNOUNCE NATION-WIDE POLL ON WAR OR PEACE

Mr. Speaker, in addition to all these other polls, and the direct question on war or peace with which Dr. Gallup is now taking a Nation-wide referendum on America's attitude to the war, a special Nation-wide poll has just been announced by a committee of leading educators and clergymen in America. I call your attention to the accompanying news article which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the Chicago Tribune:

UNITED STATES EDUCATORS AND CHURCHMEN PLAN WAR POLL

A group of prominent educators and churchmen Friday announced plans for a survey of public opinion on America's relation to the war. Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, spokesman for the group, said the object is "to discover answers to questions not hitherto asked or not adequately covered by other agencies."

Six questions will be prepared by the group, and the survey will be conducted by Samuel E. Gill, head of a professional public-poll organization in New York. The survey will be independent. It is financed by an unconditional grant from the America First Committee.

Members of the group besides Dr. Hutchins are the Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick, of New York; Alan Valentine, president of the University of Rochester; Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University; Henry Noble MacCracken, president of Vassar College; Raymond Kent, president of the University of Louisville; and the Reverend Albert W. Palmer, president of the Chicago Theological Seminary.

From all of the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming evident that the whole country will soon know whether it is really the war crowd or the antiwar crowd which is in harmony with American public opinion, and which is therefore entitled to call upon the rest of the country to join it in a program of real national unity based on the overwhelming sentiment of the rulers of America—the people. This is as it should be in a republic where under God the people rule and where officials in both the legislative and executive departments of government are elected to facilitate rather than to frustrate the functioning of majority rule.

A Curious Aspect of the Kellogg-Briand Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN A. DANAHER, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on last evening before the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] delivered an interesting address, entitled "A Curious Aspect of the Kellogg-Briand Pact." I feel that the subject and its treatment are such that I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in full in the RECORD for the information of the Congress and the public.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Perhaps the most startling phenomenon visible to the Congress in these times appears from the mail which reveals that thousands of our citizens feel that our status in international affairs is akin to a game which anyone can play. Perhaps I may not seem presumptuous on that account if I address myself to this subject. People who wouldn't make the slightest personal legal commitment without consulting an attorney are quite sure they are fully competent to decide our Nation's course. That they do not know either the extent or the nature of the intricacies of our diplomacy or even the objectives ultimately to be sought by our policymakers affords no deterrent. Probably that is all to the good in the last analysis, for our people at the very least thus indicate how public opinion is formed and, ephemeral though they may be, cumulatively their decisions each day constitute the chief, and practically the only check on the President in his execution of American foreign policy.

Thus, there is all the more reason for a continuously candid and frank exposition by our Chief Executive of what he really has in mind. It is my belief that far greater advantage is to be had in keeping Americans fully informed than will come from suppressing the real aims and purposes of the administration for fear of some unfortunate diplomatic impact. In the first view of it, if the President's objectives when analyzed and explained to our people find favor with them, the President will achieve that "unity" we hear so much about but which is certainly lacking, and thus he will achieve popular support without which his policy will never be appreciated and may fail. In the second case, foreign governments will act as their interests dictate anyhow, no matter what drum beating and cymbal striking we go through, and they certainly are not nearly so likely to react as we wish to our mere bombastic utterances, no matter how stentorian, as they would to direct representations to their proper authorities.

I know there is ground for sharp difference of opinion in this particular, and that more experienced and time-tested diplomats follow, the second, rather than the first course, is apparent. I venture to suggest these are new times. Weighing the comparative approaches, I feel the American people should be the first to be apprised of our intended plan and our true course, and their very unwillingness to endorse in blank a policy of whose ultimate ends they are kept in ignorance establishes the truth of this premise.

Let me illustrate, by what seem to me appropriate proofs drawn from our recent doings, just how the American people react.

From time immemorial down to the World War we had pursued rigorously in the main a policy of complete neutrality, no matter what wars engaged other countries. Our people knew that and understood fully that our productivity constantly could be devoted to the enhancement of our own lives and that we enjoyed the blessings of peace to work out our destiny while other nations wasted their substance and the lives of their youth in the destruction of war. They knew that other governments fell and that their people staggered for generations under the burden of war-incurred indebtedness. Finally, as they watched the World War for nearly 3 years, for reasons which seemed sufficient and after a welter of debate, our people supported our entrance into that war. They then heard it said that if Germany prevailed, "our turn would be next," that the Allies were "fighting our battle," that only the British Fleet stood between the Kaiser and us, that the countries to the north and south of us would be easy prey to the militarism of Prussianism, that we must fight to "make the world safe for democracy."

Bitterly disillusioned after the war, Americans firmly rejected the League of Nations. They resolved once more to adhere to our historic principle of neutrality. They saw the representatives of other nations as they argued for years in their efforts to define "aggressors" at the League sessions at Geneva. We watched the gathering storm clouds in Europe and determined to go the length of imposing by domestic legislation a series of limitations upon the activities of our own people in an effort to avoid those incidents which might lead to involvement in a "shooting war" should war eventuate. All these things were open and obvious; the people understood them. Those charged with administering a foreign policy which reflected American thought along these lines found a united people supporting them.

In short, our people were willing, without giving up our rights under international law, to refrain from asserting them. We were desirous that war, if it occurred, be limited so far as possible to the area in which it appeared, without our exhibiting partisanship for one belligerent or the other, without taking sides in our national status, no matter what we might be free to think as individuals. In this spirit the Congress overwhelmingly adopted the Neutrality Act and the President approved it.

Then the President, in September 1939, told the Congress that the people's efforts in this direction must yield to a program he outlined. He told the people's representatives that while repealing the embargo on arms and undoing what had previously been thought to be protections, American merchant vessels should be restricted from entering danger zones. He said American citizens must be prevented from traveling on belligerent vessels or in danger zones. He said that foreign buyers must take in this country transfer of title to commodities purchased by belligerents, and, moreover, we must prevent war

credits to belligerents. After outlining this four-point plan, he said:

"To those who say that this program would involve a step toward war on our part I reply that it offers far greater safeguards than we now possess or have ever possessed to protect American lives and property from danger. It is a positive program for giving safety. This means less likelihood of incidents and controversies which tend to draw us into conflict as they did in the last World War. There lies the road to peace."

The American people accepted and relied upon such representations, and the Neutrality Act was amended to implement the President's position. But then the American people, with growing dubiety, watched what has since been happening. If that was the road to peace, as the President said, the people now ask, "Why aren't we following it?" The people certainly feel that if our national interests could best be served by following the President's own program as he explained it, any other steps in a different direction must inevitably lead, not along the road to peace but to war. Yet there has never been a frank, full explanation to the people of why the President abandoned his own plan, and unity of acceptance of his newer course is far from achievement.

Another phase of the evidence I offer relates directly to the outcome of the war. Our people are told that Hitlerism must be destroyed and that we will never "acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers." Passing the obvious point that there certainly must be a peace some day, where do we stand and why? If we say that we can't let Britain fall, but also say we will simply aid her short of war, what are we to do if it appears that she will fall without our active participation? Is it then to be our position that we have merely been buying time, and that we have been talking only for diplomatic effect, taking part only in a war of nerves? Or is it really the American plan that we intend to aid Britain, not short of war, but enough to guarantee victory? It should be obvious to all of us that either we intend to win this war or in the alternative we should stay out of it. We just can't compromise. Honesty with and to ourselves and before the bar of history demands that we formulate a policy, that it be fully canvassed with our people and thoroughly understood in the light of our own national interests. At the same time we should know, if we decide to enter the war, why we are doing so and what we ultimately seek to accomplish. Vague talk of destroying Hitlerism is no answer. The American people have already demonstrated by their attitude that the questions I pose are of the very essence of their doubt. I need not tell you, I'm sure, may I say collaterally, that I have felt right along that the President's seeming policy of opportunism in making the decisions of each day has been mistaken. Without explanation, without candid exposition, without a definition of objectives, without the sure guide of recognized principles of general acceptance, our course might better be described as apparently lacking policy.

I use the "apparently" advisedly, for I would now respectfully suggest to you that there is more of substance to the President's plan than is commonly believed. The rationale need not be obscure, as analysis will show, but the matter has never adequately been analyzed by the American people, there is no common understanding, much less acceptance, of the basis upon which we are proceeding, indeed there is a startling disparity of acquiescence within the administration itself if the position of Mr. Hull be considered. It is not without significance that it was not our Secretary of State who interpreted our position at the Inter-American Bar Association meeting in Habana on March 27 of this year, but the Attorney General, Hon. Robert H. Jackson, as I will later point out in detail. Why there should be reticence about responsible discussion of the subject by the President who, under our Constitution, is the executor of our foreign policy, we may know some day, but for now let us consider together some of the little mentioned factors which underlie our present attitude.

Let us turn to the so-called Lease-Lend Act, which authorizes our Nation, as an entity, to manufacture in our arsenals and to transfer any defense article, including weapons, aircraft, and warships to the government of any country whose defense the President "deems vital" to the defense of the United States. The bill was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. There wasn't a member of that committee who failed to realize that under international law the United States had no right whatever to sell or transfer munitions of war, vessels, or money to a belligerent government. Private citizens as distinguished from the Government itself, have long been permitted under international law to do these things, the turning point being whether such acts were public or private in nature. In order to justify the course they were recommending, the committee turned to the Pact of Paris. They told the Senate, as I quote:

"The Kellogg-Briand Pact is recognized by eminent scholars of international law to give any signatory the power, where the pact's provisions are violated by another nation, to cease to abide by the neutrality laws which govern in normal times, and to supply the state attacked with financial or material assistance, including munitions of war."

Immediately we are challenged to ascertain what "eminent scholars of international law" recognized the Kellogg-Briand Pact to confer any such power, and when, and under what circumstances the decision was agreed upon. We are at once driven to the Kellogg-Briand Pact itself to ascertain what it said that such an interpretation could be read into it. We might also properly inquire what, if any, similar interpretation was placed upon the pact by any other nation signatory to it, and even what representatives of the United States, if any, there were who agreed to such a holding. That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was now accepting such an opinion as justification for what the committee itself recognized was ceasing "to abide by the neutrality laws which govern in normal times" becomes of gravest importance. There are two operative provisions of the Kellogg-Briand Pact which read:

"ARTICLE I

"The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations to one another.

"ARTICLE II

"The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

When the Kellogg-Briand Pact was before the United States Senate in 1928 and 1929, the Senators in the debate preceding its ratification expressly denied that if a nation violates the treaty the United States would be under any obligation, express or implied, to apply coercive or punitive measures, or that our Nation might do so with impunity. Whence, then, came these interpretations upon which the Senate committee purported to rely that in this treaty we could find justification for a program to "supply the state attacked with financial or material assistance, including munitions of war"? The only reference to the subject by any of the proponents of the lease-lend bill is to be found in the arguments submitted by Senator CONNALLY, who purported to dispose of this question in a hundred words, from which I quote:

"Prior to the war now raging, a council of distinguished international lawyers met in Budapest. In considering the Kellogg-Briand Pact, that council of international lawyers found that under the specific provisions of that pact any nation could supply arms and munitions to any other nation when it was attacked by a signatory to the pact. Italy and Germany were signatories to that pact. They agreed that they would not employ war as a national policy, and when they agreed to the terms of that pact, they agreed that if they should attack any other nation in violation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, any other nation which was a signatory to the pact might supply arms and munitions to the nation attacked or invaded. So, Mr. President, under international law—if international law still survives—we have a right to enact this particular measure without infringing upon international law."

In Budapest these lawyers met, Senator CONNALLY said. The group was unofficial; our Nation was not represented by any accredited delegates, but they were international lawyers, of that you may be sure. They had met at Oxford in 1932, and the Right Honorable Lord Blanesburgh appointed a committee on conciliation consisting of—

Prof. James L. Brierly, Chichele, professor of international law, All Souls College, Greensward, Headington Hill, Oxford.

M. A. Caloyanni, late judge, Native Court of Appeal, Egypt, 2 Rue de Lyon, Paris.

J. C. Colombos, advocate, 10 King's Bench Walk, Temple, London.

C. G. Dehn, 85 London Wall, London.

Francis Temple Grey, 2 King's Bench Walk, Temple, London.

Mr. Campbell Lee, 1 Brick Court, Middle Temple, London.

Dr. Arnold Duncan McNair, professor of international law, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

G. M. Palliccia (legal adviser to the Italian Embassy, London), 1 King's Bench Walk, Temple, London.

Sir John Fischer Williams, K. C., Bowling Green House, Headington Hill, Oxford.

Wyndham A. Bewes, convener, 2 King's Bench Walk, Temple, London.

These 10 lawyers drew up the interpretations. When the Conference met at Oxford in 1932 they were reminded that Secretary of State Stimson, speaking a few days earlier, had called upon the international lawyers to examine into the subject matter and the content of the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Mr. Stimson had said:

"War between nations was renounced by the signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. This means that it has become illegal throughout practically the entire world. It is no longer to be the source and subjects of rights. It is no longer to be the principle around which the duties, the conduct, and the rights of nations revolve. It is an illegal thing. Hereafter, when two nations engage in armed conflict, either one or both of them must be wrongdoers—violators of this general treaty law. We no longer draw a circle about them and treat them with the punctiliousness of the duelist's code. Instead, we renounce them as lawbreakers. By that very act we have made obsolete many legal precedents and have given the legal profession the task of reexamining many of its codes and treaties."

These international lawyers undertook their task earnestly, we may have no doubt, for when the committee met in Budapest between the dates of September 6 and 10, 1934, Mr. Wyndham A. Bewes submitted a report containing proposed articles of interpretation of our treaty, adding to our language new matter and new thought which had been expressly rejected by the United States Senate when the pact was ratified. Mr. Bewes said, in part:

"In the event of a violation of the pact by a resort to armed force or war by one signatory state against another, any signatory state, not being a party to the original dispute, may, without thereby committing a breach of the pact or of any rule of international law, do all or any of the following things:

"(a) Assist with armed forces the state attacked;

"(b) Supply the state attacked with financial or material assistance, including munitions of war."

Notice your Senate Committee on Foreign Relations did not quote Mr. Bewes' interpretation that the United States might "assist with armed forces the state attacked," but it is an inherent part and was the first item of the interpretations upon which the Senate committee relied when it said, as I previously quoted to you, that we might "supply the state attacked with financial or material assistance, including munitions of war."

The conference at Budapest, through these international lawyers, then sought, and by their language it is now sought, to bind the United States to their sanctions and their commitments. Mr. Campbell Lee told the conference that—

"The pact is a part of the supreme law of the United States, on a par with the Constitution itself, which says, 'This Constitution and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land.'"

I ask you to recall that the United States of America had expressly rejected the League of Nations.

Mr. Llewellyn-Jones told the conference that—

"It was rather curious that 2 or 3 days before our meeting at Oxford the American Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, had uttered what I believe was in the minds of most of us, if not of all of us, at that time, and that was this: That there could be no place for neutrality in the future history of the world. I know that the word 'neutrality' has rather been banned from the discussion today. The term 'nonbelligerency,' which perhaps is not such a provocative term as 'neutrality,' has been used. But I am not certain, in the new order of things, if the Briand-Kellogg Pact is going to mean what it meant in 1928. Is there going to be room for nonbelligerency? Are we not coming to a point when all the states of the world will have to combine to see that the state which is the aggressor is prevented from upsetting the international equilibrium? The aggressor in the world of states is the lawbreaker. He is the breaker of the laws which exist or should exist between states and, difficult as it might be, it is in the interest of the community of states to see that some system is devised whereby the aggressor or even the state which proposes, which contemplates aggression will realize that any attempt at aggression is going to meet with formidable opposition from all the other states. We have not merely to try to set up an organization through the League of Nations or otherwise which is going to take action in order to prevent war when war is contemplated by this state or by the other state. We have got to go a step further. We have got to remove the causes of war. How can we eradicate the difficulties referred to? By the putting into operation of the Briand-Kellogg Pact."

Mr. Bewes thereafter told his confreres that—

"When a nation has assumed obligations to other states, it should put the necessary internal laws in order without delay. It is a matter of public faith."

Then Mr. James A. Petrie took the floor. He said:

"I feel very strongly that all foreign engagements to which a country has pledged itself should be made part of its municipal law. Respect for the statute book is absolute in most countries, and the citizen of any country will realize what his government's international duties are much more clearly if they are embodied in the municipal law than if they are merely left as the executive concern of the minister entrusted with the conduct of foreign affairs. It is high time, in my opinion, that our association should emphasize the principle that when a state enters into obligations to another state, its municipal laws should associate themselves with and reflect its position from the point of view of international law."

After adopting the articles of interpretation, the international lawyers at Budapest passed one final resolution calling upon all states which were signatory to the Kellogg-Briand Pact to make the treaty "a reality" in accordance with their interpretations. In fact, the language of their resolutions specifically alleged as to the signatories that it was "their duty without delay to enact domestic legislation to implement their treaty obligations."

Mr. Manley O. Hudson felt that the interpretations constituted a "development of a twentieth century international law to correspond to the needs of a twentieth century international society." Said he:

"I believe the acceptance by this association of the legal consequences of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the statute of the Court, and the Briand-Kellogg Pact means throughout the world a larger, a wider recognition of the tremendous significance of those documents."

Note the interrelationship Mr. Hudson gives to the several pacts he mentioned. The climacteric remained to be stated by the Right Honorable Lord Blanesburgh, who was the presiding officer of the Conference, when he said:

"These discussions make it clear that the signatories had signed something far more binding upon them than they had perhaps suspected."

Certainly, the Members of the United States Senate ratifying the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1929 never "suspected" the result later to be claimed from our adherence to the pact. Certainly, the people of the United States had never heard presented to them any such interpretations.

You could have read the article by Sir John Fischer Williams, one of the committee, writing in International Affairs, London, 1935, in which he said:

"It may be argued that * * * the pact has changed the law in a manner not contemplated by the signatories; and, indeed, it must be admitted that it may well be that some or most of the signatories did not realize that such a change was the necessary consequence of their action. * * * The signatories must be taken to have intended the necessary consequences of their own acts."

Again he pointed out:

"Although the President and Secretary of State might say * * * that they would carry out the view that the signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Pact were absolved from the ordinary duties of neutrality, there was no guaranty that the President would be there 2 years hence, and that this would be the view of his successors. It was essential that his statement should be endorsed in some way by the action of the Senate."

Perhaps you can see some explanation for the third term; perhaps you begin to see how the lease-lend bill reached the Senate.

The House of Lords debated the interpretations in February 1935, when Lord Howard pointed out:

"It may well be argued that these neutral rights as between cosignatories have been actually abolished by the pact itself, if we are to accept the view of such an authority as Mr. Stimson, former Secretary of State of the United States. * * * According to Mr. Stimson, therefore, and, indeed, according to many authorities, the whole conception of war and neutrality since the pact has been revolutionized, because any country using force against another for a national purpose is a violator of the pact, and therefore of the new law of nations, and so becomes an outlaw who may legally be treated as such. * * * This ends, once and for all, the principle of international law established hitherto and generally strictly followed, that neutrality implied impartiality towards both belligerents—the open door, so to speak, to both sides. Now this ruling, which has, I believe, also been agreed to by the United States, makes it clear that a state, without becoming an ally or associate in a war, may establish, in the interests of peace * * * a condition of exclusive dealing as against one of the belligerents, thus cutting at the very roots of neutrality as formerly understood."

How different was all this from our understanding when our Senate debated the ratification of the Kellogg-Briand Pact. On January 14, 1929, the Committee on Foreign Relations reported that this treaty "pledges the nations bound by the same not to resort to war in the settlement of their international controversies, save in bona fide self-defense, and never to seek settlement of such controversies except through pacific means."

Senator Borah, reporting for the committee, further set forth:

"The committee further understands that the treaty does not provide sanctions, express or implied. Should any signatory to the treaty or any nation adhering to the treaty violate the terms of the same, there is no obligation, or commitment, express or implied, upon the part of any of the other signers of the treaty to engage in punitive or coercive measures as against the nation violating the treaty. The effect of the violation of the treaty is to relieve the other signers of the treaty from any obligation under it with the nation thus violating the same.

"In other words, the treaty does not, either expressly or impliedly, contemplate the use of force or coercive measures for its enforcement as against any nation violating it. It is a voluntary pledge upon the part of each nation that it will not have recourse to war except in self-defense, and that it will not seek settlement of its international controversies except through pacific means. And if a nation sees proper to disregard the treaty and violate the same, the effect of such action is to take it from under the benefits of the treaty and to relieve the other nations from any treaty relationship with the said power.

"This treaty in no respect changes or qualifies our present position or relation to any pact or treaty existing between other nations or governments.

"This report is made solely for the purpose of putting upon record what your committee understands to be the true interpretation of the treaty, and not in any sense for the purpose or with the design of modifying or changing the treaty in any way or effectuating a reservation or reservations to the same."

Secretary of State Kellogg had testified "that I was not willing to impose any obligation on the United States. I knew that was out of the question."

Then Senator Walsh, of Montana, a great lawyer, said to Secretary Kellogg:

"Assume that Germany invades Belgium, claiming she does so in self-defense. Let us assume her claim is a perfectly just one, that she is acting in self-defense. Then, of course, the other nations that come to the aid of Belgium would be breaking, not only the Locarno Treaty but breaking this treaty. But what difference does that make to us?"

Secretary KELLOGG. "None at all."

Senator WALSH. "Supposing some other nation does break this treaty, why should we interest ourselves in it?"

Secretary KELLOGG. "There is not a bit of reason."

Senator Borah, later in argument to the Senate, said:

"If a nation violates the treaty, are we under any obligation, express or implied, to apply coercive or punitive measures? I answer, emphatically, 'No.'

"It will certainly not be contended that the language of the treaty itself makes any such provision. The language of the treaty refutes the proposition. The philosophy of the treaty is not that of preventing war, but that of organizing peace, which is a wholly different thing."

He continued:

"Not only is the language of the treaty, as I have indicated, clear and unmistakable, but at no time in this voluminous correspondence, coming up between 15 nations originally, and the correspondence laying the basis for adherence, has there been an indication or an implication that any nation conceived that there was any implied obligation upon the part of the nations to enforce the treaty or to punish an aggressor. At no time has that ever been suggested."

Senator Borah pointed out that the shrewd and discerning statesmen of 60 nations signing the pact had wholly failed in any instance even to suggest that there was an obligation implied to enforce the treaty. He told the Senate further:

"But I find nowhere in the language of the treaty or in the correspondence any reference to this matter, or any language which would indicate that it occurred to any of the governments that such implication might arise."

Nor was Senator Borah alone in his interpretation of the treaty. Senator Swanson said:

"The treaty contains no sanctions for its enforcement. No obligation, moral or legal, is assumed by the signatories to use punitive measures against any nation that may violate the treaty."

Senator McLean argued:

"I think the American people and the rest of the world clearly should understand that this treaty attempts to do nothing more than express a mutual and sincere desire for peace; that it contains no obligation to use force or refrain from the use of force; that it does not and will not entangle or disentangle anybody or anything."

Senator WAGNER, of New York, said:

"In the event of violation no machinery of enforcement is provided. No sanctions are established. A breach of the treaty does not bring upon the violating state any consequences springing from the treaty. There is no obligation whatever upon any signatory state to punish a treaty-breaking state. * * * The discussion of sanctions under the treaty reveals more clearly than anything else how debatable are even the most elementary factors in a plan for a world free from war. The treaty has been ridiculed because it provides no sanction and no machinery or method of enforcement of the promises to refrain from war. It has likewise been challenged because it is said to impose upon the United States the duty to punish, by force of arms if necessary, a treaty-breaking state. This latter criticism is absolutely without foundation. There is no language in the treaty proper upon which the most astute of lawyers could pin an affirmative obligation to do anything."

Little did Senator WAGNER know that only 5 years later an astute group of 10 lawyers appointed at Oxford would meet at Budapest to write a series of interpretations which have since been accepted as the basis for our law and our international conduct.

While I can call as witnesses many others of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations who in 1929 told Americans of the significance to be attached to the treaty, it will suffice that I present the view of Senator BARKLEY, now our distinguished and able majority leader. Senator BARKLEY said:

"Mr. President, I am unable to read into this treaty, or into any of the correspondence preliminary to it, or into any possible interpretation of the treaty, any obligation on the part of the United States or any other nation that is signatory to this treaty to interfere in the internal affairs of any other nation in the world. If all the colonies of Great Britain should on the day following the universal ratification of this treaty rise in revolt and seek to establish their own independence as independent nations of the world, there is not only nothing in this treaty which obligates the United States to interfere with those colonies or nations in their efforts, but, on the contrary, I think the plain implication of the treaty is that we would not have any right to interfere in any such conditions or circumstances."

When the United States, in 1929, voted to ratify the Kellogg-Briand Pact it did so without interpretations, and on the unequivocal understanding that it was agreeing simply to an instrument of peace.

The Budapest interpretations have never been expounded by the President to the American people, yet since last June he has constantly pursued a course in the execution of our foreign policy which is related to and based upon these interpretations. The Secretary of State, so far as can be perceived, has never made public reference to the acceptance of these interpretations. That Secretary Stimson has felt otherwise becomes apparent, not only from his testimony in connection with the Lease Lend Act, but from his recommendations and his conduct with reference thereto over the past year. It remained for the Attorney General at Habana on March 27 of this year, to make assertion of the new international law which is said to be the basis for our Nation's policy. He argued that the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, in which Germany, Italy, and Japan covenanted with us, as well as with other nations, to renounce war as an instrument of policy, made definite the outlawry of war and of necessity altered the dependent concept of neutral obligations. He said that "the United States and other states are entitled to assert a right of discriminatory action by reason of the fact that, since 1928 * * * the place of war and with it the place of neutrality in the international legal system have no longer been the same as they were prior to that date." He argued that the pact had destroyed the historical and juridicial foundations of the doctrine of neutrality. While conceding that the difficulty with the proposition lies in the lack of means for determination of the fact of aggression, the Attorney General argued that Germany, Italy, and Japan had violated a right and affected the interests of the United States.

"No longer can it be argued that the civilized world must behave with rigid impartiality toward both an aggressor in violation of the treaty and the victims of unprovoked attack. We need not now be indifferent as between the worse and the better cause nor deal with the just and the unjust alike.

"To me such an interpretation of international law is not only proper but necessary," continued the Attorney General, "if it is not to be a boon to the lawless and the aggressive. A system of international law which can impose no penalty on a lawbreaker and also forbids other States to aid the victim would be self-defeating and would not help even a little to realize mankind's hope for enduring peace. The principle that war as an instrument of national policy is outlawed must be the starting point in any plan of international reconstruction. And one of the promising directions for legal development is to supply whatever we may of sanction to make renunciation of war a living principle of our society."

How far this new pronouncement of international law spelled out of the Kellogg-Briand Pact coincides with the understanding of the United States Senate in adopting the treaty I leave to be considered in the light of the record. Whatever the full implications of the new program may be, certain it is they have never been canvassed by the American people. Whatever the full extent of the commitment to which we will be bound, once having chosen to act in adoption of the Budapest interpretations, has never been explained. However far other nations may go in acceptance of what we are now making our interpretations, no one knows. Suffice it to say in postulating the problem, all action so far taken in reliance upon this enlarged concept of our treaty has been taken by the United States alone. We are at the very least in the unenviable position of having made a unilateral assertion of rights under the pact. As the lawyers meeting in Budapest resolved that we should do, we have purported to implement the pact by domestic legislation, whether wisely or unwisely. It may yet develop that our Nation will be found alone in its promulgation of the new order in international law, surely a curious aspect of the Kellogg-Briand Pact.

So, my friends, here at the home of Thomas Jefferson, in your beautiful State of Virginia, may I ask in fairness to the American people whom he loved so well that we be told what is planned, and why? Americans, do not fear the truth.

War-Sentiment Poll by Representative Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE POUGHKEEPSIE (N. Y.) EAGLE-NEWS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Eagle-News of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., of June 30, 1941, entitled "Quiz for FISH."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 3, 1941]

QUIZ FOR FISH

(The following dispatch is reprinted from the Poughkeepsie Eagle-News of June 30)

Turning the tables on Congressman FISH, after receiving one of his postcard-poll ballots, which Mr. FISH is sending to his constituents, B. W. Frazier, Garrison, sent a series of 12 questions to the Congressman, asking for "yes or no" answers.

Mr. Frazier, whose business is doing over old houses in the Hudson River Valley and adjacent territory, said that in marking Congressman FISH's ballot before returning it to him, he replied in the affirmative.

Mr. FISH was asking whether the United States should enter the war.

The questions asked by Mr. Frazier follow:

1. Do you still believe as you stated in Berlin in August 1939 that "Germany's claims are just and that all can be settled if Hitler

is given Danzig, the Polish Corridor, and anything else he wants"?

2. Do you still believe as you stated after the publication of the German "white book" that "I cannot conceive of the German foreign office fabricating or forging the document"?

3. As you are now an isolationist, do you believe that you could still mediate the European conflict as you attempted to do when, as an interventionist, you flew to Oslo from Berlin in Von Ribbentrop's private plane, bearing a peace proposal?

4. Did you have an audience with Rudolf Hess while in Berlin?

5. Do you still believe as you said in Congress on March 12, 1940, "Just how we can use more than 2,000 planes in America I cannot understand?"

6. Do you still believe as stated in a radio address on March 5, 1939, that "If we are arming merely for defense, we are spending far too much and wasting money as no nation thinks of attacking us?"

7. Do you still believe as stated on February 11, 1938, in a radio address "The proposed $800,000,000 additional expansion to our Navy is unnecessary to our defense and inconsistent with our foreign policies?"

8. Do you believe as you stated on September 3, 1940, when you, fought the Selective Service Act that "Peacetime conscription is un-American, undemocratic, and unrepublican, and is subversion of the ancient and first principles of a free people?"

9. Do you still believe that the German Day rally at Madison Square Garden where the platform was decked with the Nazi swastikas and the Nazi marching song, "Horst Wessel Lied" was sung and before which you were the principal speaker, was composed of loyal Americans of German origin as you stated in defense of your appearance?

10. Do you still favor a congressional investigation of opinion polls (although at the present time you are conducting one yourself) as stated in January of this year when a poll taken in your own district revealed a majority of 5 to 1 against your obstruction to the Lend-Lease Act?

11. When you were in grave danger of defeat during the last campaign and in an effort to be reelected you tied yourself to Willkie's coattails, you made the following statement in a page advertisement, "I agree with Mr. Willkie 100 percent on his foreign policy." As Mr. Willkie has not changed his stand on foreign affairs, was your statement merely made for political expediency?

12. Are you still unashamed, as you stated on March 28, 1941, that you wrote an article for the Nazi propaganda publication, Today's Challenge, the editor of which has been indicted by the United States Government as an unregistered Nazi propagandist?

Mr. Frazier said he would appreciate "yes" or "no" answers to these questions with the same promptness with which he answered Mr. FISH's request for his opinion on the war poll.

Tribute to the Late Senator Harrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by Horace C. Carlisle on the late Senator Harrison, of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAT HARRISON

Pat Harrison, Senator-statesman, is dead—
A recognized leader in Congress for years—
He's meeting with friends that have gone on ahead,
Where there are no vexatious problems nor fears—
He fought a good fight for the truth and the right—
His was a life full of exemplary deeds—
He's gone to the land of unending delight,
Where there are no sorrows, no worries, no needs.

Pat Harrison was a true friend to his own—
He loved Mississippi with all his big heart—
In all his vast dealings he never was known
From principles based upon right to depart—
His own conscience was his infallible guide,
Whose voice he religiously ever obeyed—
In State and in Nation he took growing pride,
And walked among men, unfeared, unafraid.

Pat Harrison will in the Senate be missed—
Here his high esteem as a statesman was won;
For here he stood ready always to resist
Whatever was mentioned that should not be done—
He loved to agree with his Nation's great Chief,
But firmly opposed what he thought was unwise—
Aweary with labor, he longed for relief,
And God, in His mercy, closed gently his eyes.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

How the 1941 Wheat Quota Works, and Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ARTICLE BY CLIF STRATTON IN TOPEKA DAILY CAPITAL OF SUNDAY, JUNE 29, 1941

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, one of the matters of great interest and current discussion among the wheat farmers of this country is marketing quotas. It is natural that on such a controversial subject there should be differences of opinion and some misunderstanding. The following article by Clif Stratton, Washington correspondent of the Topeka Daily Capital and one of the best-informed agricultural writers if the country, presents a fair, candid, and very informative discussion of the subject:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital of June 29, 1941]

HOW THE 1941 WHEAT QUOTA WORKS AND WHY—NONCOOPERATORS COMPLAIN ABOUT 49-CENT PENALTY

(By Clif Stratton, of the Capital's Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON, June 28.—In the past 2 weeks mail of the Kansas Senators and Congressmen has been fairly heavy with letters and telegrams from those opposed to the A. A. A. farm program, protesting against the "crime" of the marketing quotas for wheat, and especially against imposition of the 49 cents a bushel penalty on wheat marketed from excess acreages.

In the interest of fair play, it should be stated that there is much more involved in the wheat program right now than just the matter of excess penalties. Also that for several years past farmers cooperating in the national farm program have made certain sacrifices from which the noncooperators have received the immediate advantages. Now that the farmers in the program are apparently getting a better deal (though not nearly so much better as is being claimed by opponents of the program) the protests are coming in thick and heavy. Everyone is "mad" anyway these days and looking for someone to be blamed for the most unpleasant position in which the whole world finds itself.

The following is an attempt to shoot straight on the national farm program as it affects wheat, including marketing quotas and penalties for marketing production from excess wheat acreages.

INCREASE MARKETING PENALTY

In the same bill which provided mandatory Government loans (to cooperators in the national farm program) on basic commodities at 85 percent of parity, it also was provided that the marketing penalty on "excess" wheat be increased from 15 cents a bushel to 50 percent of the established basic loan value. In the case of wheat the established basic loan value is 98 cents a bushel on the farm; that means the penalty on wheat from excess acreage is 49 cents a bushel.

Incidentally, that means loan value on No. 2 Hard Winter wheat at Kansas City is $1.10; No. 2 Red wheat at St. Louis, $1.15; No. 1 Dark Northern Spring at Minneapolis, $1.15; No. 1 Soft White at Portland, Oreg., $1.05. The 98 cents is figured the average loan value at the farm.

FOR COOPERATORS ONLY

Now under the old law the penalty was 15 cents a bushel, but the loan value (farm) established and in effect was 56 percent of parity, or 64.4 cents at the farm. This loan value was for cooperators only; noncooperators were eligible for loans on excess wheat at 60 percent of the cooperators rate, or approximately 39 cents a bushel, but only if marketing quotas were in effect. That was so much lower than the market price (sustained as it was and is by Government loans) that no noncooperator would consider taking a Government loan with loan value at 56 percent of parity. And likely few of them will under the new act, except some very big operators for purely speculative purposes. Aside it might be mentioned, not all the wheat gambling is done on the Board of Trade.

Even before the outbreak of the World War, there was no market for Unted States wheat in Europe, except by payment of subsidies by the Government. With the war blockade in effect, and Britain getting its wheat from its own dominions and from Argentina, there was no market abroad for United States wheat. With a surplus of some 400,000,000 bushels this year (1940–41), the market price in America, unless sustained by Government loans, would have dropped down toward 30 cents a bushel.

"The amount that current prices are now above the export price levels is indicated by the export indemnity which would be required to export to Europe," the Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports in the June 18 issue of the Demand and Price Situation. Computed on the basis of export values, this would be about 36 cents from the Gulf and 27 cents from Pacific ports.

SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY MILLION BUSHEL EXCESS

On the basis of June 1, indication of a crop of 911,000,000 bushels and a carry-over of about 400,000,000 bushels—a total supply of 1,310,000,000 bushels—is indicated (from 1941–42 marketing year). With domestic disappearance estimated at 650,000,000 bushels, there would be about 660,000,000 bushels available for exports, shipments, and carry-over. (Shipments means shipments to our own Territories outside continental United States—about 3,000,000 bushels a year.)

In other words, under existing world conditions, the United States will have on hand next month and for the marketing year enough wheat to supply market demands for the United States 2 whole years—and no foreign market in sight. Canada has on hand, without any allowance for production this year, enough wheat to supply her own and Britain's needs for 2½ years.

Under these conditions, it is hard to see any but a very low price for wheat the coming year—probably 30 cents a bushel is a fair estimate.

Ten or twelve years ago, faced with a similar but not nearly so serious (numerically) a situation, Uncle Sam tried high loans without production restrictions through the Farm Board "stabilizing loans." After 2 years of that we got 23-cent wheat in Kansas.

THE SURPLUS

The penalties for excess marketings is an attempt to prevent a duplication of the Farm Board fiasco. If the Government guarantees 98 cents a bushel on the farm for all the wheat grown, with a surplus above domestic needs for the coming year of better than 600,000,000 bushels, well, there would be a great temptation for everyone to grow wheat. And the surplus would be something to worry about.

Now, let's get back to the new 98 cents a bushel Government loans, and the 49 cents a bushel penalty for marketing excess wheat.

Farmers in the program presumably have not planted excess acreage, beyond a 3 percent tolerance. Farmers outside, some of them, have planted every acre they own to wheat. They are producing the unmarketable surpluses that will drop the bottom out of the market once the Government loans as a sustaining factor are removed.

INCREASED PENALTY

This session of Congress, to protect the wheat growers' market in the face of rising farm costs, provided for the mandatory 98 cents a bushel loan, for cooperators. In the same bill, to discourage planting of excess acreages, Congress increased the penalty of excess marketings from 15 to 49 cents a bushel.

This has been a great help to the farmers inside the program. Those outside feel they have been terribly discriminated against. Actually, their position is not so much different from what it would have been any time marketing quotas were voted.

Under the old law, the Government loans now in effect were 56 percent of parity, or about 64 cents a bushel. The penalty, if placed in effect, would be 15 cents a bushel. Noncooperators, if the loans made the market price, would get 64 cents less 15 cents penalty, or 49 cents a bushel. Under the new program, if the loans make the market price, they get the market price (98 cents on farm) less 49 cents, or 49 cents.

SACRIFICED EXCESS ACREAGE

In practice, it doesn't work out exactly that way, of course. Before the marketing quotas were voted in, the noncooperators were getting the benefit of the price-sustaining loans, and producing all they wanted to. They could gamble to their heart's content on a rising market, having the assurance that the Government would not permit the market to go below a certain point. The cooperators, on the other hand, had to plant their allotted acreages only; they sacrificed their excess acreage in order to help stabilize the market by holding down overproduction.

Since the marketing quotas have been voted, however, the cooperator now has a tremendous advantage. He gets the high-loan value, pays no penalties. The noncooperator gets the benefit of the high-loan value through the artificial market price, but on his allotted acreage only. He practically is barred from selling his excess on the market except at a loss on that excess. Also the noncooperator cannot sell any of his wheat—if he has planted more than his allotted acreage—until he has either placed the excess in storage under bond satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture, or has paid the penalty upon it. If he wants a Government loan—which if he is conscientiously opposed to Government aid he should not ask—it will be only 58 cents less the 49 cents penalty, or a net of 9 cents. He can sell at the market price, now about 14 cents below full-loan value, and net perhaps 35 cents a bushel on his wheat. But, of course, he will see his neighbor in the program getting 98 cents—and he can't be expected to like that.

Also, his cooperating neighbor, in the program, will be getting about 18 cents a bushel in conservation and parity payments, bringing his total to approximately parity price of $1.16 a bushel.

But, on the other hand, the cooperator through years past, has surrendered his right to plant all the wheat acreage he wants; and plants only his allotted acreage.

Generally speaking (and this is only a rough average) the cooperator plants only about 60 percent of his potential acreage, compared to the noncooperator's 100 percent. On paper, at least, this could be figured this way:

Say a cooperator and a noncooperator each has 200 acres of wheatland, the acreage based on what they planted in the period before the A. A. A. was started. The cooperator plants his allotment, 120 acres, to wheat. The noncooperator plants his 200 acres; allotted acreage plus 80 acres.

On a normal yield of 20 bushels to the acre, the cooperator harvests 2,400 bushels. He elects to take his loan, 98 cents a bushel, instead of selling on the market, which on June 15 was about 14 cents below the loan value. He also gets approximately 18 cents a bushel in conservation payments, or a total of $1.16 a bushel for 2,400 bushels; 2,400 times $1.16 equals $2,784.

If the noncooperator's allotted acreage is 120 acres and he has planted entire 200 to wheat, he will have a harvest of 4,000 bushels, of which the yield from 120 acres is not subject to penalty, also is not eligible for a loan. He can sell this at the market without penalty, provided he has paid the penalty on his excess or stored it under bond On basis of mid-June, that would be 84 cents a bushel on 2,400 bushels, or $2,016. He can elect to sell the balance of 1,600 bushels on the market at 84 cents, less the 49 cents a bushel penalty, or 1,600 times 35 cents or $560. Add $2,016 and $560 and you get $2,576 from his wheat.

In other words, the noncooperator, in theory, could get $2,576 wheat income, compared to the $2,784 for the cooperator in the program. Of course, the cooperator has not had the seeding or labor expense on the additional 80 acres; also the cooperator is further ahead from having 80 acres for planting nondepleting crops. And in fact the noncooperator may not have obtained quite as large an allotted acreage as the cooperator.

But looking at the whole picture, the marketing quotas do not begin to make the difference against the noncooperator that some of the statements made by A. A. A. opponents in mail received at Washington would indicate.

Expenditures for 1941, the Budget for 1942, and Fiscal Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker:

Yes, this year we are planning; and why not? After all, that is one of the things that Government is intended to do, to think not in terms of just this year and the next, but for the good of the people, to think for many long years ahead.

Thus spoke President Roosevelt on October 13, 1936. President Roosevelt has repeatedly boasted that he has been a stanch adherent of planning and that one of the fundamentals of the New Deal is planning for the future. However, the record of expenditures for the fiscal year 1941 as compared with the Budget for that fiscal year, and the present estimated expenditures for 1942 as compared with the Budget for that fiscal year as originally submitted 6 months ago, does not give evidence that the New Deal is in line for high praise for its ability to plan, especially relative to national defense.

The Budget for the fiscal year 1941 as submitted to Congress on January 3, 1940, by the President provided for an expenditure for national defense for that fiscal year of $1,800,000,000. Concerning that item in the Budget for the fiscal year 1941 President Roosevelt remarked:

In these headings, for example, I do not believe that the majority of the people in this country want to reduce the budgeted estimate of $1,800,000,000 for national defense. This is an increase, of course, over the current year, but it is far less than many experts on national defense think should be spent, though it is, in my judgment, a sufficient amount for the coming year.

* * * * *

National defense: These estimates represent expenditures needed to develop and maintain our normal defense preparations. They also include, in view of the current world situation, the emergency expenditures required for the War and Navy Departments, the Coast Guard, Department of Justice, and the Panama Canal.

In order that these emergency requirements may be clearly shown I have segregated them for both the fiscal years 1940 and 1941. They call for supplemental appropriations of $272,000,000 in the fiscal year 1940, and appropriations of $302,000,000 in the fiscal year 1941. Expenditures are estimated at $160,000,000 and $300,000,000 in these 2 years. This segregation will, I hope, help to focus attention on our emergency defense expenditures, and the problem of financing them. It will also facilitate the return to a normal defense program when the current emergency has passed. (Pp. 8, 9, Budget for 1941.)

The Budget for that fiscal year carried an estimated total expenditure of $8,400,000,000 for all purposes. Government receipts were estimated at $5,547,000,000, and the net total deficit was estimated at $2,276,000,000. As was previously shown,

the President believed that emergency national-defense expenditures for 1941 would be about $302,000,000, that is, defense expenditures in addition to the so-called normal defense expenditures. The only reference to increased taxes in this message is contained in the following quotation:

National-defense taxes: I am convinced that specific tax legislation should be enacted to finance the emergency national-defense expenditures. Although these expenditures appear unavoidable, they will not increase the permanent wealth-producing capacity of our citizens. I believe that it is the general sense of the country that this type of emergency expenditure be met by a special tax or taxes. Moreover, this course will make for greater assurance that such expenditures will cease when the emergency has passed.

I strongly recommend to the Congress, therefore, that additional taxes be imposed to yield in the fiscal year 1941 at least enough to cover the emergency national-defense expenditures in the fiscal years 1940 and 1941. In seeking additional sources of revenue, I hope that the Congress will follow the accepted principle of good taxation, of taxing according to ability to pay, and will avoid taxes which decrease consumer buying power. (Budget for 1941, p. 13.)

Thus the only additional taxes that the President would recommend would be for additional national defense. These taxes, it was estimated, would total about $400,000,000 a year. It should be remembered that the President made no recommendations as to where this additional revenue was to be secured.

Let me once again point out that the President, in January 1940, believed that $1,800,000,000 would be all that would be required for national-defense purposes in 1941. The need for additional funds must have struck the President's mind like a strange and sudden light in the night, for even on May 14, 1940, our farsighted President, who placed so much emphasis on planning, asserted that anyone who believed in a two-ocean navy was stupid. Thus the New York Times reports a press conference of President Roosevelt on May 14, 1940, as follows:

Mr. Roosevelt brushed aside as utterly stupid suggestions that developments in the European struggle and their implications in the Pacific strengthened the arguments for a two-ocean American Navy. If it ever had any merit, that theory became outmoded with the acquisition of California in 1847, he said. Such a conception of the Nation's floating defenses was just plain dumb, he added. (New York Times, May 15, 1940.)

Two days later the President saw fit to ask Congress for more than a billion dollars additional for national defense, and 2 months later he himself signed an act of Congress authorizing the creation of a two-ocean navy.

On May 16, 1940, our farsighted President came before us and requested additional funds for national-defense purposes. In that memorable message the President asked for $1,182,000,000 for national-defense purposes. Above everything, the President desired to have a fleet of 50,000 airplanes in 2 years and to have facilities that would produce 50,000 planes a year by that time. It would appear that he himself believed that $1,182,000,000 would be all that was needed at that time to accomplish this result. In that memorable message the President made no reference to where the funds for the additional expenditures were to come from; no suggestion concerning any additional revenues were made; nor was any proposal set forth in his fireside chat to the Nation on May 26 of last year.

On May 28 a statement was issued concerning the total cost of the defense program and the method to be used in financing it. The total so-called emergency-defense program would cost about $4,000,000,000 during the course of the next 5 years. To finance this the debt limit was to be raised $3,000,000,000, or from $45,000,000,000 to $48,000,000,000; this added borrowing power was to be used solely for national-defense purposes. To finance this new debt income taxes and certain excise taxes were to be raised about 10 percent. Such increases were to continue for a period of 5 years. These new taxes, it was estimated, would yield between $650,000,000 and $700,000,000 a year. This program was formulated in a statement that was issued after a conference between Democratic congressional leaders and Treasury experts. The statement was as follows:

Chairman DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, chairman of the tax subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee; Senator Harrison, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, have been in conference since 9 o'clock this morning with Secretary Morgenthau and with Mr. Bell, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Helvering of the Treasury, and with the joint congressional committee expert, Mr. Stam, and they have agreed to ask Congress at this session to consider legislation to provide funds for the payment of the national-defense program. Chairman DOUGHTON and Senator Harrison stated that they will convene their committees immediately to formulate a plan.

They will propose an increase in the national-debt authorization by $3,000,000,000 to provide for the issuance of national-defense obligations to be sold with maturities not to exceed 5 years, and they will also propose the levy of additional taxes, the details of which are to be worked out by the committee. These proposed taxes will yield between $600,000,000 and $700,000,000 annually over the 5-year period, which will be sufficient to liquidate the national-defense securities.

The Secretary of the Treasury communicated to the President the conclusions reached by the conferees and the President expressed his approval of the program.—New York Herald-Tribune, May 29, 1940.

It should be noted from the last paragraph that the President acquiesced in this program. But the President was not really interested in how defense was to be financed. He was more intertested in making certain that the defense program did not cause displeasure and discomfort to a large measure of the electorate. To put additional taxes upon these people would have caused them displeasure, and the third-term election was still ahead. On the very day that this tax program was formulated the President stated at a press conference, according to the New York Times:

The President said that there was no reason for the country to become "discomboomerated" in apprehension of what may come to pass. The women of the country would not have to give up their cosmetics, lipsticks, and chocolate sodas in consequence of the preparedness program. It was the intention not to upset the normal trends of American life any more than necessary.

Mr. Roosevelt underscored his observation that the present defense program was not to be compared with that of 1917, when the Nation was attempting to raise an army of 4,000,000 men. There was no thought in government today to revive the draft system, whether of men or money.

The whole idea was that the present troubled state of international affairs called for an outlay of about a billion and a quarter dollars over and above the $2,000,000,000 that was being spent on the military and naval establishments, and it was necessary to set up an organization to supervise the expenditure and make it effective.

What the administration was undertaking now was nothing like a complete national mobilization, the President explained. (New York Times, May 29, 1940.)

Emphasis was placed by the President on "business as usual" and on the fact that this was just a small program and would not cause us any trouble.

On May 31, 1940, the House Ways and Means Committee commenced hearings on the above-mentioned program for financing national defense, yet on the very day that the Secretary of the Treasury testified that the defense program would be adequate for a period of 3 years and would cost only about $4,000,000,000, the President submitted another message to Congress asking for additional funds for national defense. This time he asked for $1,277,000,000. This would seem to have completely upset the previous estimates that the emergency defense program would cost but $4,000,000,000 in no less than 3 years. No one in the White House seemed to be disturbed about this incongruity.

On June 3, 1940, a new revised Budget estimate had been prepared. According to this the estimate of expenditures during the fiscal year 1941 would be $10,001,000,000; national-defense expenditures would be increased from $1,900,000,000 to $3,250,000,000. As was previously indicated, the revenue for 1941 was estimated in January 1940 to be $5,548,000,000, but by June 3 the estimate had risen to $5,652,000,000. The President's first estimate of the deficit for the fiscal year 1941 was $2,276,000,000, but 5 months later it had increased to $4,348,000,000.

Late in June 1940 the financing program that was proposed on May 28, 1940, was enacted. It was not until July 1 that we heard anything directly from the President concerning additional taxes for national defense. But do not be too encouraged merely because we did hear from the President on the subject on July 1—he was not interested in revenue, he was more interested in an excess-profits tax that would be punitive in nature rather than revenue producing. On July 1 he sent to Congress a message which read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

We are engaged in a great national effort to build up our national defenses to meet any and every potential attack.

We are asking even our humblest citizens to contribute their mite.

It is our duty to see that the burden is equitably distributed according to ability to pay so that a few do not gain from the sacrifices of the many.

I, therefore, recommend to the Congress the enactment of a steeply graduated excess-profits tax, to be applied to all individuals and all corporate organizations without discrimination.

Ten days later the President sent to Congress another message asking additional funds for national defense. This time his request was for $4,848,000,000 in appropriations and in contract authorizations, but in the message the President made no suggestions how these additional national-defense expenditures were going to be financed. Before the summer was over Congress had appropriated for national defense in the fiscal year 1941 more than $10,000,000,000 in direct appropriations and in contract authorizations.

Early in August we had another revised budget estimate for the fiscal year 1941. The estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year had increased to $12,058,000,000. This was $3,600,000,000 more than the estimate that was presented to Congress 7 months earlier. Defense expenditures were estimated at $5,000,000,000. The revenue estimate was for $6,367,000,000 or about $800,000,000 more than the January estimate. The deficit, of course, grew apace. It was estimated in August at $5,791,000,000, only about $3,000,000,000 more than the January estimate. Early in the autumn of 1940 Congress passed the excess-profits tax law which was believed at that time would yield $350,000,000 in the fiscal year 1941, and probably $700,000,000 per year thereafter.

When the President submitted the Budget for 1942 in January of this year, 1941, a revised Budget estimate for 1941, of course, appeared. The estimate of expenditures had now increased to $13,202,000,000 and the estimate for national defense was increased to $6,463,000,000. Revenue was estimated at $7,012,000,000 and the deficit was estimated at the tidy sum of $6,280,000,000. It would appear that at the end of the fiscal year we have not quite reached these new high estimates. During the fiscal year we have spent $12,774,000,000, slightly less than the revised Budget estimate of $12,202,000,000. National-defense expenditures were $6,047,000,000, revenues yielded $7,607,000,000, and the deficit for the fiscal year was only $5,103,000,000, not quite double the original estimate of the deficit that was presented by the President to the Congress in January 1940.

On the basis of the experience we have had in 1941 with our farsighted, planning President and his Budget, we can look forward to a similar experience during the course of the fiscal year 1942. In the Budget message that President Roosevelt submitted to us in January 1941 he stated that the cost of national defense for the current emergency would be about $28,000,000,000:

These expenditures must be seen as a part of a defense program stretching over several years. On the basis of the appropriations and authorizations enacted for national defence from June 1940 up to the present time, plus the recommendations for supplementary appropriations and authorizations for 1941 and the recommendations contained in this Budget for 1942, we have a program of $28,000,000,000.

This is a vast sum, difficult to visualize in terms of work actually to be done. If we can prove that we are able to organize and execute such a gigantic program in a democratic way, we shall have made a positive contribution in a world in which the workability of democracy is challenged.

Expenditures for the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1942 are estimated by the President at $17,485,000,000. Expenditures for defense alone would be $10,811,000,000, the revenue is estimated to yield $8,275,000,000, thus leaving a deficit of only $9,210,000,000. As the President submitted his Budget last January it would appear that we could expect that taxes would yield less than half the total expenditures of the Federal Government. But yet the President said merely that we needed some new taxes. He did not mention any specific amount, he did not suggest any specific sources. His attitude was that we did need to rely especially on taxes.

Tax policy: There is no agreement on how much of such an extraordinary defense program should be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis and how much by borrowing. Only very drastic and restrictive taxation which curtails consumption would finance defense wholly on a pay-as-you-go basis. I fear that such taxation would interfere with the full use of our productive capacities. We have a choice between restrictive tax measures applied to the present national income and a higher tax yield from increased national income under less restrictive tax measures. I suggest, therefore, a financial policy aimed at collecting progressive taxes out of a higher level of national income. I am opposed to a tax policy which restricts general consumption as long as unused capacity is available and as long as idle labor can be employed.

We cannot yet conceive the complete measure of extraordinary taxes which are necessary to pay off the cost of emergency defense and to aid in avoiding inflationary price rises which may occur when full capacity is approached.

However, a start should be made this year to meet a larger percentage of defense payments from current tax receipts. The additional tax measures should be based on the principle of ability to pay. Because it is the fixed policy of the Government that no citizen should make any abnormal net profit out of national defense, I am not satisfied that existing laws are in this respect adequate.

Taxes are unpleasant.

From January through June 1941 the President continued to send additional requests to Congress for appropriations. Only 2 months after the President submitted his budget, in which he stated that defense expenditures during the next 3 years would be $29,000,000,000, he requested an additional $7,000,000,000 of appropriations to be expended under the Lease Lend Act. The first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress has already appropriated for national-defense purposes more than $27,880,000,000 in 6 months. If we add to this the $10,000,000,000 appropriated last year, the total appropriations and contract authorizations for national defense that have already been made amount to about $37,000,000,000. This is interesting, for first the President said, on May 16, 1940, that the emergency defense program would cost about a billion dollars; by the 28th of May 1940 the cost had gotten to $4,000,000,000; by the end of the summer of 1940 the appropriations had gone to $10,000,000,000. In January 1941 the estimate was $29,000,000,000, and already by June 30, 1941, we have made available in appropriations and contract authorizations $37,000,000,000. Various officials of the New Deal defense program have stated that this program will cost in excess of $40,000,000,000.

And already we have commenced to have revised Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1942. On May 31, 1941, the Director of the Budget presented a new revision wherein the estimated total expenditures would be increased from $17,485,000,000 to $22,169,000,000. In the original Budget estimate defense expenditures were set at $10,811,000,000; but after 5 months the revised estimate had increased to $15,500,000,000. The revenue estimate had increased from $8,275,000,000 to $9,402,000,000 and the estimate of the deficit had also increased from $9,210,000,000 to $12,767,000,000.

I understand that a committee of this body is now considering a revenue bill that is hoped will yield $3,500,000,000 in added taxes. If this bill should be passed and if it yields this estimated revenue, the deficit will be reduced unles estimated expenditures continue to rise. From our experience gained under the Budget for 1941 and with the actual expenditures for that year, one should not be surprised if expenditures increase in 1942, if it is physically possible for the New Deal to attain such an end.

Our experience with the Budget for 1941, as well as our experience with the Budget estimates for 1942 to date, would be disheartening to any student of budgetary science. When the Budget and Accounting Act was passed some 20 years ago it was believed that a great step forward in fiscal management had been taken. But in the hands of President Roosevelt and his fellow planners this instrument of sound administation has failed to accomplish the results that one could hope for. This experience also makes it painfully clear that President Roosevelt is not the great farsighted planner that he would like us to believe him to be.

Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, OF KANSAS, TO KANSAS BANKERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me at

the annual meeting of the Kansas Bankers' Association in Kansas City, Kans., on May 16, 1941:

I am happy to come back to Kansas after being away since last November and to have the opportunity of getting the western viewpoint and hearing a little talk of weather, crops, and prices. During the last 2 or 3 years, every Member of Congress has been so busy with his work in Washington that he has had little opportunity to spend any time in his own State and district. I have missed the rich association which comes from meeting and visiting with the home folks and also the opportunity which such association gives to learn the views and desires of my constituents. Washington is a beautiful city and a busy and interesting place just now, but I am tired of the atmosphere of war and politics and bureaucracy. Coming to Kansas from Washington is like leaving a sultry, miasmic swamp and getting up into the free fresh air of the mountain tops.

Several weeks ago, when your secretary was making up this program, he asked me to advise him of the title of my remarks. I didn't know just then what I might discuss or what might be of interest by the time this convention was held, because of the rapid changes which are taking place in this country and the world. So I suggested the title "Today and Tomorrow." I thought this would give me quite a wide range, both in time and space, and would not tie me down too closely to anything specific. It occurred to me afterward that it might have been even better to have said "Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," which would give an opportunity not only to cover the present and the future, but to range backward a few thousand years into history.

I think I can tell from the mail which I have received in recent months and from what I have heard since I have been here, what questions are in the minds of Kansas people at this time. I know that they are disturbed and that they are wondering what is coming, not only immediately, but in the future. I wish that I could paint a bright picture of the coming months and years. I don't believe, however, that anyone can conscientiously do that. I think that we can be certain of but one thing and that is that there are trying times ahead and that our country and the world face months and years which may be among the darkest in history. Perhaps you have heard the new definition of an optimist as one who believes that the future is uncertain. Surely there are many of us who wish we were not so certain of what is ahead.

I wish I could give you an answer to the questions which are in your minds, particularly as to what the immediate future holds with respect to war and peace and how existing conditions are going to affect us from a business and economic standpoint. I don't believe there is anyone who can give you definite answers to those questions. We are living now from day to day, tremendous ventures are in the making in all parts of the world, and there is no one wise enough to fully foresee either the present or ultimate effect.

I am not going to try to cover too much territory. I am making this talk to Kansans and it is about our problems and our conditions that I want to speak. Nevertheless, the whole world is tied up so closely today that happenings even in the most remote parts of the globe definitely affect our welfare. Something that takes place tomorrow in Singapore or Syria or Greenland may affect our lives for years to come.

Just what is our situation today? What do we know for certain? Well, in the first place, we have had a domestic revolution in this country during the last 10 years. During no decade in our history has there been such a change in our thinking with respect to social and economic questions. Never during a similar period of time has there been such a change in our governmental institutions. Now on top of all this has come a world war which has already had tremendous repercussions in this country, notwithstanding the fact that its full effect is just beginning to be realized and felt.

Today the defense program overshadows everything else in a business and economic way and it is only in its infancy. As yet the American people have no conception of the immensity of this program or of the extent to which it is going to absorb our national energies. This is going to be true whether we get into the war as an active belligerent or not. As long as the war lasts our defense efforts must be expanded. We dare not let up on them as long as there is a possibility that Hitler may win, no matter whether our role is finally to be that of an arsenal or a belligerent.

Are we going to get in as a belligerent? The only answer I can make to that is to point out that every month since the repeal of the Neutrality Act in the fall of 1939 we have moved nearer and nearer to actual participation. I can't tell you what the final result will be, but just now we are moving mighty fast in the direction of war. The vast majority of our people undoubtedly want to stay out of war and yet judging by the votes in Congress and by public information polls a majority of them are willing to support steps which, if continued and expanded, will surely bring us into the struggle as a belligerent.

But whatever our role may be it is certain that this national-defense effort will profoundly affect our lives and our economy for many years to come. What is this new activity going to mean to this country and particularly to Kansas during the next few years. Well, it will mean a great many things. First, it is going to mean the end of the more abundant life, or at least what has passed for the more abundant life during the past few years. Eventually we can't have both guns and butter in this country any more than they can have them in Germany. In other words, if our defense program is going to amount to anything it must be an all-out effort with our entire energies concentrated on defense. Unfortunately, the national administration has not made this clear to our people as yet. Until quite recently, at least, the President and his coterie of immediate advisers were still talking about maintaining social gains and at the same time carrying on a great defense program. Sooner or later our people are going to find out that defense costs money and effort and that all of it cannot be passed on to succeeding generations or paid for out of the accumulated wealth of past generations. Perhaps the first real awakening along this line will come when Congress passes the three and one-half billion dollar tax bill now under consideration. Can you think of any new taxes that you would like to pay? If so, I am sure that the Ways and Means Committee will be glad to hear from you. This committee has been holding hearings for several weeks but has had very few suggestions as to what should be taxed. Practically all of those appearing before the committee have been there to plead that certain things be not taxed. Writing a tax bill which will raise three and one-half billion dollars on top of the taxes we are already paying is no summer outing, and before the committee gets through it is going to find that the only way to raise this much money is to tax everybody and everything.

What are some of the other things we can expect as this program proceeds? Well, to mention another unpleasant subject, there is our national debt. Perhaps you remember that no longer than a year ago we were worrying because the national debt was approaching the $45,000,000,000 limit. There were earnest debates in Congress and in the press as to what might happen if that limit were reached. Now high Government officials are calmly discussing the possibility of a $100,000,000,000 debt. If the war lasts as long as some authorities expect, it will go higher than that. This increase, of course, is in spite of the great increase in taxation.

There is the matter of rising prices with possibe inflation in the offing. Efforts are being made to control prices—that is, to hold them down—not only because of the fact that price increases now will greatly increase governmental costs and taxes and bring about inflation, but because deflation after the war will make the great debt doubly hard to pay. I am for these efforts to hold down prices, but our experience in every great war shows what a difficult proposition it is. Furthermore, we will have to go at it in a more effective way than is being done at present if the scheme is to work. While ceilings have been suggested on certain prices, yet up to date nothing whatever has been done with regard to the price of labor. Wages are increasing and under the policies of this administration will probably continue to increase. Wages are an important part of the cost of most products. Temporarily perhaps they can be increased and the price of the product remain the same, as recently happened in the steel industry, but in the end wage increases are going to be translated into price increases. General price increases are going to result in demands for higher wages, which will bring further price increases, and thus the vicious spiral of inflation is on its way. I do not know whether it is possible to hold down prices. If it is done, it will have to be done all along the line. Labor and industry will each have to contribute.

Then, of course, there is this which must be expected, and that is the moment we enter the war as an active belligerent we will be under a dictatorship in this country practically as effective and as rigid as exists in the totalitarian countries today. We already have a tremendous centralization of power in Washington. This has been built up in time of peace. I do not need to point this out or to cite specific examples to those who are in the banking business. You know how the application of the wage-and-hour law has affected your routine. You know how other policies and legislation have materially changed the character of your business. You know what Government competition in the loaning of money has done to you. That is only typical of what has happened to industry in general. Perhaps the business of banking will not be affected by a war economy to the same extent as some other businesses; but, frankly, I do not think that any of us have seen anything so far compared with what is coming. Most of you remember the last war. You remember the control which the Government exercised over your lives and activities, the restrictions upon the use of certain commodities, and that sort of thing, and yet as compared with what would have come had the war lasted a little longer those controls were nothing. They were nothing as compared with what we are going to experience this year and in succeeding years as our defense efforts expand.

I have already mentioned what we may expect if we enter the war as an active belligerent. It is no secret that the plans for industrial mobilization in that event have been drawn up for many months. These plans may be put into effect before we actually become a belligerent, and it would not surprise me at any time in the near future for the President to ask Congress to give him blanket powers to mobilize the entire country on a war basis.

Keeping all of these things in mind, what seems to be the best course for us in Kansas to follow? We want to cooperate in every way possible with the national-defense program. We want to carry our part of the burdens which the present world situation may impose upon our Nation. At the same time, we want to follow a course which will leave our State and its people in the best position to carry on when peace finally returns to the world. In recent years we have heard much

discussion along the line of industrializing our State. We are interested particularly at this time in securing our share of the industrial expansion due to national defense. Yet I think that we would be kidding ourselves if we didn't admit that Kansas is primarily an agricultural State and will remain so. This is not only because of the fact that our rich soil and equitable climate make great agricultural production possible, but because our geographic position and our lack of low-cost transportation will always handicap us when it comes to industrial development. With such exceptions as to be negligible the industrial areas of this country are located where there is easy access to water transportation. The Panama Canal has further handicapped the interior sections of this country by providing transportation by water between the two coasts. I am in favor of securing all the industrial development which we possibly can, but it is my contention that good agricultural prices and a sound agricultural development mean more to Kansas and its future prosperity than all the industry we can possibly bring into the State. We are interested in getting our share of the defense program, but a 25-cent-per-bushel increase in the price of wheat and 2 cents more for cattle and hogs will mean more in the way of real permanent prosperity for Kansas people than all the war industries we can ever have any hope of getting. Furthermore, good agricultural prices will do more to establish sound industrial development in this State than anything else. It will give our people buying power, thus building up our local industries and expanding our mercantile institutions. It should result in an expansion of agricultural processing. It should bring in local distribution plants for commodities manufactured outside of the State. It will create a market for industrial products which will provide an incentive for the establishment of plants to manufacture them.

All of this should result in a normal, natural, healthy industrial development suited to our needs and of a permanent nature.

In our efforts to secure war industries I think that we should keep firmly in mind the thought that as far as possible these industries should be of a character which can be made to permanently fit into an agricultural economy. If we can do this, there will be fewer headaches, fewer busted communities, and a much smaller relief problem in the future than will otherwise be the case.

Yet in reviewing the efforts which have been made in recent years to secure better prices for agricultural products I find that in many instances they have been opposed by businessmen even in strictly agricultural communities. A part of this opposition has been inspired by those engaged in businesses which they felt were adversely affected by the methods used to increase farm income. Processors and distributors who had for many years done business in certain traditional ways naturally opposed any change in those methods which might be made necessary through efforts to increase agricultural prices. I do not criticize those who may have felt themselves injuriously affected for opposing these changes. But surely there is no reason why businessmen generally in agricultural communities should oppose practical efforts which are made to increase the most important source of income in their communities through legislation or otherwise.

There are some who have conscientiously opposed efforts to assist agriculture through legislation on the ground that the methods used set up an artificial level of prices and interfered with natural economic laws. These objections might be sound from an academic standpoint. They might be tenable if all of our present-day business and economic activities followed natural economic laws. We must realize, however, that today very little business is conducted on a free and natural basis, and that the price of almost everything which the farmer buys is wholly or partly fixed either by law or by practices in the nature of monopoly; in other words, artificially. Many of these disadvantages to the farmer have been brought about by legislation enacted to benefit other groups of our population. The price of practically everything that the farmer buys is higher than it would otherwise be by reason of the fact that the wages of labor have been increased tremendously in recent years. This is due in a large part to the enactment of legislation by Congress which has not only in some instances directly increased wages and decreased working hours, but has given labor all of the advantages of monopoly prices through unionization. Many of the farmer's costs such as transportation rates, utility rates, and livestock commission rates are fixed by virtue of legislation enacted by the National or State Governments. The cost of many things which the farmer buys has been increased by the tariff. In spite of our antitrust laws, the prices of many things which farmers buy are fixed by monopolies. To sum it up, agriculture has been in the position of operating on a free and competitive basis in a world which is very largely operating under a controlled economy.

There are too many people who look upon low farm prices as something which simply affect the individual farmer. That, however, is only a small part of the picture. Low agricultural prices mean not only distress and poverty to individual farmers, but mean a maldistribution of national income which prevents a free exchange of goods commodities and services between the different groups of our population. At its worst it means business stagnation and depression. In discussing the fairness of agricultural prices as compared with the prices of the things which farmers have to buy we commonly use the 5-year period of from 1909 to 1914 as a basis of comparison. This is because the relationship between farm prices and other prices during that period is generally considered to have been on a fair and equitable basis. During that period we had a well-balanced economy in this country. Since then, except for the World War period when all prices were high, agricultural prices have been at a disparity with prices of other commodities. Since the 1909 to 1914 period practically everything has gone up excepting farm prices. For a good part of the time in recent years farm prices have been lower and in some cases much lower in dollar value than they were during the 1909 to 1914 period. On the other hand, nearly eevrything the farmer buys has increased in price. Industrial wages have increased tremendously. During the period between 1913 and 1939 hourly wages in the leading manufacturing industries practically trebled. Weekly earnings do not show quite so much difference but in 1939 they were almost 2½ times as much as in 1914. Since the defense program began all wage levels in industry have been further materially increased. That, of course, is bad for the individual farmer, but it is bad as well for all who reside in agricultural communities and States because it means a reduction in buying power felt by all. It is bad from a national standpoint because, as already stated, it prevents that free interchange of goods and commodities which is the foundation of business activity under a capitalistic system. For many years the farmers' share of the national income has been declining. During the period from 1909 to 1914 the farmer received on an average about 15 percent of the national income. In 1925 he received 10 percent. In 1929 he received 8.5 percent. In 1940 he received 5.9 percent plus Government payments which when added give him 6.9 percent. That is bad from the farmers' standpoint, but that isn't all. It means that the relative income in every agricultural State and community has been declining.

Does this mean anything to businessmen in an agricultural State? I think it does, and I think further that it is a situation which demands correction and one which every one of you should be interested in correcting.

There are some, mostly in the consuming sections, who want to treat the agricultural problem as a relief problem. They want to buy farmers' products at the lowest possible price and if this leaves him without an adequate income then they want to treat him as a relief case and give him a dole. Certainly this should be resented and opposed by everyone who has the interests of agriculture at heart. Agriculture does not want relief. It does not want a dole. What it wants is adequate income and fair prices from those who consume its products.

Unless those who live in agricultural areas are willing to fight for the right of the farmer to secure a fair price for his products those sections are permanently doomed to poverty and economic subserviency. Even if it were possible, industrialization would not solve the problem. It would simply complicate it. Let me say again, the greatest contribution which we can make toward a sound and substantial industrial development in Kansas is to put our agriculture on a paying basis.

Why shouldn't Kansas businessmen stand by the State's greatest industry and insist that it receive its proper share of the national income? Will we not gain more for the State and for ourselves and for Kansas industry by doing this rather than chasing the will-of-the-wisp of expanding industrial development alone?

Let us remember also that a stable and prosperous farm population is the hope of this country, that from it have come our great leaders, and that it offers political and social stability such as can come from no other group of our population. Let us support every movement to make agriculture prosperous and to keep those who are engaged in it here in Kansas to furnish the leadership we need for the future. An impoverished agriculture means that our boys and girls will be forced to leave the State to go into more prosperous communities and into other industries. Come what may, nothing except our own neglect can destroy our rich Kansas soil. If we conserve it, it is ours for untold generations to come. Nothing can take away our sunshine, which combined with the fertility of this soil makes Kansas one of the greatest agricultural areas on the face of the globe. The world will always need our wheat and our meat. It should pay a fair price for them. We can well afford as citizens of this great State to make it our business to see that our farmers do not labor in vain, and that those who eat our bread shall pay a price therefor, which will enable those who produce it to prosper on an equal basis with those who make commensurate contributions to the common good in the office and the factory.

Former President Hoover Presents Case Against Participation by United States In European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, no greater service to the American people has been tendered in many a long day than that performed by the

distinguished former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, in his broadcast of Sunday evening, June 29.

So rapidly have the people been swept along on the flood of war propaganda loosed by the interventionists, there was a great necessity for a clarion call to America to return to clear thinking and sane consideration of circumstances and conditions. This call was issued by Mr. Hoover in his Sunday night broadcast.

No more complete demolition of the fallacious arguments which have been advanced by the war propagandists for our participation in a shooting contest has been wrought by the logic of any speaker in the past several months. Mr. Hoover met fearlessly, calmly, dispassionately, and logically each of the eight favored arguments of the protagonists of war, and with unanswerable logic showed the complete fallacy of each of these eight arguments. The former President then proposed a line of action—rather basic policies upon which should be predicated a line of action—that ought to be and will be the chart for the Republican Party. If the country is fortunate, it will be the chart for the Nation's course as well as for the course of the Republican Party.

It is significant that immediately following this powerful, quiet, and logical discussion by former President Hoover several administration spokesmen broke out with the usual clamor for our immediate participation in the shooting. These spokesmen again did what they have always done in the past, disregarded the logic of the situation, closed their eyes to the real welfare and security of this Nation, brushed aside as of no consequence our woeful lack of a trained and equipped army, and our woeful lack of airships and seacraft adequate for our participation in a shooting war, and blindly demanded as loudly as before that we get into the war. These spokesmen not only ignored without answer the logic of Mr. Hoover, but they simply refused to consider our almost total lack of preparedness to engage in even a one-ocean war, let alone a probable two-ocean conflict.

It is significant that in spite of an unparalleled volume of propaganda, and in spite of the most frenzied efforts of the greatest, most highly financed, most cleverly managed propaganda organization the world ever saw, the American people are still 85 or 90 percent against our participation in a shooting war.

There is no question in the minds of Washington observers but that the Hoover broadcast crystallized and solidified the overwhelming opposition of the American people to our getting into the conflict. The address came at just the right time and in just the right way to meet the renewed onslaughts of those who are determined to get us into a shooting war if possible. Undoubtedly some Member of Congress will insert the Hoover address in the RECORD, and it will stand as a complete answer under all circumstances to those who want to urge our participation in the war.

It is being hinted around Washington that already there have been incidents which would have led to a shooting war if Hitler and Mussolini wanted to risk war with us at this time. Whether or not these reports are true, and whether or not the conflict between the Nazis and Stalin's hordes proves to be bloodier than is expected by American military experts, three propositions cannot be obscured by even the propaganda of the pro-war forces.

The first is that the United States cannot trust Joe Stalin and his ruthless Soviet gang any further than we can trust Hitler and his Nazi gang. The second is that Britain is perfectly ready to make common cause with any sort of government, anywhere, at any time, in order to save herself, so that the high-flown talk of carrying the four freedoms to everybody everywhere in the world is now shown up to be entirely absurd. And, third, that the only course for the people of the United States to follow is to make America strong and keep America strong in a world which, whether the war ends quickly or extends for a much longer period, will be a disorganized world. We will have to depend upon ourselves and no one else, not only for our military but for our economic security.

It was an excellent thing that Mr. Hoover pointed out that whether Hitler subdues Russia or not, the seas will still be just as wide as they were before.

The comment among the Members of Congress has been that former President Hoover presented unanswerable arguments for America keeping out of a shooting war, building up an impregnable defense, and preparing to meet economic and sociological problems after the wars are ended and the defense is built, which will be as dangerous to the future security and welfare of this Nation as the conflicts now raging possibly can be.

Tabulation of War Poll in Twenty-sixth Congressional District of New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tabulation of ballots received up to noon, June 30, from a postal-card poll of my congressional district on the questions, Should the United States stay out of war, or Should the United States enter the war?

Ballots cast in Twenty-sixth New York Congressional District as of June 30, 1941

	The United States should—	
	Stay out of war	Enter the war
Orange County:		
Arden	6	0
Blooming Grove	25	0
Bullville	39	2
Burnside	1	0
Bellvale	13	0
Central Valley	155	14
Chester	171	20
Circleville	36	9
Campbell Hall	79	3
Cornwall-on-Hudson	138	21
Cuddebackville	32	10
Cornwall	139	23
Florida	112	23
Fair Oaks	13	0
Fort Montgomery	77	4
Goshen	495	59
Greenwood Lake	107	17
Godeffroy	36	0
Harriman	108	7
Highland Mills	156	4
Highland Falls	488	41
Hugenot	46	31
Howells	22	3
Johnson	24	4
Middletown	2,572	260
Millbrook	261	39
Meadowbrook	7	0
Monroe	375	33
Montgomery	273	37
Maybrook	126	5
Mountainville	21	3
Newburgh	3,825	362
New Hampton	51	11
New Milford	10	0
Otisville	145	24
Port Jervis	1,117	109
Pine Island	108	44
Pine Bush	185	4
Rock Tavern	10	0
Ridgebury	12	4
Rio	17	0
Roseton	28	17
Salisbury Mills	29	0
Slate Hill	7	5
Sugar Loaf	13	2
Sterling Forest	6	0
Southfield	42	4
Sparrowbush	62	3
Tuxedo Park	179	44
Thompson Ridge	18	0
Unionville	93	11
Vails Gate	28	0
Walden	684	38
Wallkill	51	5
Warwick	497	86
Washingtonville	132	19
West Point	36	4
Westtown	39	2
Firthcliffe	2	0
Total	13,579	1,470
Dutchess County:		
Amenia	76	34
Beacon	1,357	122
Billings	11	0
Barrytown	17	3
Bangall	23	10
Clinton Corners	107	6
Chelsea	13	2
Dover Plains	160	22
Fishkill	108	17
Glenham	44	2
Hyde Park	220	26
Holmes	63	4
Hopewell Junction	209	33
Hughsonville	50	0
Hope Farm	5	4
Millerton	178	43
Madalin	52	12
LaGrangeville	115	8
Pawling	204	35
Pine Plains	173	12
Pleasant Valley	206	15
Poughkeepsie	5,838	618
Poughquag	79	3
Red Hook	354	34
Rhinebeck	450	41
Rhinecliff	80	1
Salt Point	73	6
Staatsburg	116	27
Stanfordville	113	7
Stormville	83	9
Tivoli	25	3
Verbank	30	6
Wappingers Falls	601	57

Ballots cast in Twenty-sixth New York Congressional District as of June 30, 1941—Con.

	The United States should—	
	Stay out of war	Enter the war
Dutchess County—Continued.		
Wassaic	65	16
Wingdale	113	16
New Hamburg	37	4
Annandale	6	3
State School	5	14
Moore's Mills	1	2
Castle Point	2	0
New Hackensack	5	0
Total	11,467	1,257
Putnam County:		
Baldwin Place	4	0
Brewster	414	61
Carmel	238	22
Cold Spring	360	26
Garrison	207	24
Mahopac	228	24
Mahopac Falls	120	3
Nelsonville	60	7
Patterson	117	10
Peekskill	27	15
Putnam Lake	10	1
Tilly Foster	6	0
Manitou	1	0
Towners	4	0
Total	1,796	193
Total (3 counties)	26,842	2,920
Ballots received from points not determined, absentee voters, etc	781	118
Grand total	27,423	3,038

Mr. Speaker, there were 698 not included in the tabulation who qualified their ballots, with the result that they could not be recorded as voting either to keep the United States out of war or for going into the war. Of these, 93 voted to stay out of war if possible, or unless it becomes necessary, and 119 voted to enter the war if necessary to stop Hitler, or if there is no other way to save Britain. Ninety voted to stay out of war unless attacked, or unless Congress declares war, and 54 indicated that they would want the United States to enter the war if attacked, or only if forced to do so. I would favor war, as I have repeatedly stated, if this country is attacked or invaded.

Others in this group qualified their votes for staying out of war and added, "send no A. E. F." or "all aid to England, except men." There were 71 who voted this way, and 39 voted to enter the war if necessary to get supplies to Great Britain, or if our ships are sunk, or with our Navy, but no A. E. F., some even saying that we should give all aid to England except our Army, Navy, and air force, which we are already doing.

In addition, there was a total of 238 persons who returned their ballots without voting one way or another. Of these 86 left it to the Congress to determine, saying they had no opinion or felt their Representative in Congress was better prepared to act for them; 53 stated they had confidence in the President to keep us out of war and would depend on his judgment. The remaining 99 take various positions without voting one way or the other. These ran in tenor from convoys only, 22; awaiting developments, 23; be prepared but do not enter war now, 15; and all material possible, after we have supplied our own needs, 24; to we are already in the war, 16. One who voted for war now facetiously stated, "We should send our boys across the water to save those two dear democracies—the British Empire and Communist Russia."

In addition to the votes above tabulated there were a total of 236 cards and letters that were mailed to me from persons in the district, not on the official ballot form, who stated they had received no postal cards but were registered voters and entitled to cast a vote in the poll. While these could not be included in the final tabulation, they have been counted separately as follows:

The United States should—	
Enter the war	17
Stay out of the war	219

There were 166 ballots that were unmarked, or that were spoiled by marking both answers, and 137 persons returned their ballots and refused to vote, criticizing the poll as unfair. Since the close of the poll at noon on June 30 over 500 more postal ballots have been received.

Independent Bankers the Bulwark of American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, My colleague, Mr. GORE, of Tennessee, has pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee, a proposal requiring branch banks to publish their individual statements of condition. Any proposal to aid independent bankers and to curb the growth of branch banking, other than provided by State law, meets with my enthusiastic approval and, I am sure, with the approval of a majority of this House.

Credit is the lifeblood of this Republic. To allow any individual, or group of individuals, to control credit is to place in that group's hands the powers which, if abused, could wreck our national economy. In this connection I should like to state that, in my belief, independent bankers constitute one of our strongest bulwarks for the protection of a free economy. Independent banking, then, must be protected by Federal legislation wherever and whenever such aid is required for their continuance.

Independent banking is more to the advantage of the general public than branch banking. I do not believe that statement can be gainsaid. That statement is almost an economic platitude and too obvious for discussion. However, in these days of proposals to expand branch banking it might be well to bear it in mind. Independent banking is synonymous with competitive banking, leading inevitably to consumer benefits, notably in the fields of loans and discounts.

Independent banking is the foundation stone upon which we built this great Nation. Independent bankers, and not branch bankers, are responsible for the great economic, industrial, and agricultural growth of this country in its early days of financial pioneering.

Let us follow the notion of branch banking to its logical conclusion. What would we then have and what would be the effects on our credit and economy? We would have an economic dictatorship and a financial monopoly, distinctly contrary and repugnant to the American way of doing business. We should then have one national bank controlling the resources and the credits of this country. I do not have to point out the dangers inherent in such a trend. For this reason, then, the independent banker, and the industry as a whole, can justify their existence and the role they are playing in our financial set-up. Under a system of free enterprise, such as we witness under independent bankers, our credit control is not vested in the hands of anyone individual or group. Congress, to protect the national social and economic gains we have striven to acquire and maintain, should make every effort to protect the independent banker against unfair and death-dealing inroads of the giant branch-banking industry controlled as it might be from New York or Washington.

There is something personal about an independent banker which is simply impossible for the branch to match. In the first place, the depositor when dealing with an independent banker is dealing with the principal. When dealing with a branch banker he almost invariably is dealing with an agent stripped of powers and lacking authority to make quick, definite decisions. The independent banker, too, clearly is more interested in the welfare of his community and more cognizant of its needs than some far-off principal office where decisions for the branch unit usually are made.

In this connection I should like to point out the splendid achievements of the Independent Bankers' Association of the Twelfth Federal Reserve District. Under the aegis of Mr. R. F. Hollister, prominent Portland, Oreg., attorney, and executive manager of the association, its membership has ever been on the alert to protect its interests and to bring before the public the great need for the development and continuance of independent bankers. I think they have done a good job in bringing their problems before the public which they so ably serve. Mr. Hollister and his group are well thought of in Washington financial circles and they have made every effort to cooperate on all occasions with the Congress in the enactment of Federal legislation involving banks.

Mr. Hollister and his association are a credit to the country and to the independent banking fraternity as a whole. Through their efforts independent banking is thriving and will continue to thrive. Their leadership and integrity have combined to focus national attention on the

need for the maintenance of independent banking. So long as we have associations like this, plus militant leadership, the evils of branch banking will be curbed. Without independent banking in this country we should be led inevitably down the road of economic dictatorship and chaos. Independent bankers constitute one of our strongest bulwarks against the possibility of a crack-up of a democratic economy.

Situation and Outlook for the Lemon Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

REPORT FROM THE UNVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, at the time of my remarks concerning farmers and labor, I referred to a report from the University of California College of Agriculture, which concerned the lemon industry.

Under leave extended me, the report is as follows:

SITUATION AND OUTLOOK FOR THE LEMON INDUSTRY

This report presents in brief form the situation and outlook for the lemon industry. Emphasis is on grower costs and returns and the effect of anticipated production on these items.

Data upon which this study is based are from official reports of the United States Department of Agriculture and records of the California Citrus League and the California Fruit Growers Exchange. Some calculations are based upon studies previously made by the university.

SITUATION IN 1938–39

The latest year for which costs of production and handling lemons are available is 1938–39. Table 1 is based upon that year's cost, production, utilization, and prices.

TABLE 1.—*Production, prices, returns, and costs of lemons for the crop year 1938–39*

CALIFORNIA—EIGHT DISTRICTS

Yield per acre (48-lb. field boxes)	475.6
Yield per acre (78-lb. packed boxes)	293.0
Fresh lemons packed out (packed box equivalent)	193.8
Percent pack out	66.2
F. o. b. price (packed and loose basis packed box equivalent)	$2.89
Costs for picking, hauling, packing, selling, and advertising (packed and loose fruit on packed box equivalent)	$1.33
On tree return for fresh fruit (packed box basis)	$1.56
Return on product lemons basis packed box weight	$0.57
Costs for picking, hauling, and handling of product lemons basis packed box weight	$0.51
On tree returns for product lemons basis packed box	$0.06
On tree returns all fruit basis packed box weight	$1.05
Total return per acre	$307.00
Cost of production, per acre, to harvest	$300.00
Net profit or loss per acre	+$7.00

The yield per acre shown in table 1 is the average for 387 orchards reporting costs. This yield is considerably above the average for all bearing orchards in the State, which in 1938–39 was 216 boxes packed equivalent. In general, lower-yielding orchards have somewhat lower per acre costs, but they have higher costs per box.

Charges applied against fresh and product lemons for 1938–39 season are averages for all districts in the State, as reported by 43 lemon-packing houses, over one-half of the total number in the State. Selling and advertising costs are California Fruit Growers Exchange charges. All costs applying to fresh fruit have been weighted so as to represent both packed and loose lemons shipped into fresh-fruit markets.

TABLE 2.—*Harvesting, packing, and selling costs for lemons*

	Fresh fruit		Product fruit (packed box equivalent)
	Packed	Loose equivalent packed	
Picking	$0.3229	$0.3228	$0.3000
Hauling	.0469	.0468	.0436
Packing	.8138	.6219	.1655
Selling	.0700	.0700	----------
Advertising	.1000	----------	----------
Total	1.3534	1.0615	.5091

Of the total fresh shipments in 1938–39, 93 percent was sold as packed fruit and 7 percent as loose fruit. The weighted average of the total costs is $1.33 per packed box equivalent.

Total cost of production includes the actual operating outlay for labor, management, materials, taxes, and other cash overhead costs, and a computed interest and depreciation. For a number of years, the California Citrus League has obtained actual expenditures in a large number of lemon orchards, and these records may be used as an indication of current costs. A summary of the cost of production records for the 1938–39 crop year is presented in table 3. In addition to the actual costs shown by the citrus league, a charge for interest at 5 percent on a conservative investment has been included as shown. The investment used is $450 an acre for bare land, $700 an acre for trees, and $150 an acre for other facilities and equipment, making a total investment per acre of $1,300. Bare land value is based upon current earnings from alternative crops. Tree value is based upon current net cost of growing trees. The $150 for other facilities is based upon inventories of necessary pipe lines, heating, and other equipment.

TABLE 3.—*Lemon production costs for 1938–39*

CALIFORNIA—8 DISTRICTS

Number of records	387
Acres included	8,934
Total yield per acre, field boxes, about 48 pounds	476
Total yield in packed boxes of 78 pounds	293
Cultural labor and material cost per acre	$158.58
Cash overhead cost, taxes, insurance, repairs, etc	$55.33
Depreciation on buildings and equipment	$20.81
Interest on investment at 5 percent (explained above)	$65.00
Total on-tree cost of production per acre	$299.72

A separate summary of the California Citrus League cost records for 26 orchards in the Ventura-Santa Barbara district show a cost, exclusive of interest on investment, of $315 an acre, compared to an average of all districts of $235 an acre. On the basis of current earnings from alternative crops a reasonable value on lemon orchards in this district is $1,500 per acre. Interest at 5 percent on this value would give a total cost of $390 per acre.

On these 26 orchards yield per acre in 1938–39 was 20 boxes, packed equivalent, less than the average for all orchards included in the State-wide citrus league study.

The Ventura-Santa Barbara district normally ships a larger proportion of its lemons during the summer months than the average of all districts. In 1938–39 the average f. o. b. price during the summer months was $0.55 a box higher than during the winter months. But even after allowing for a higher average price on fresh fruit shipments, it appears certain that these 26 orchards had a substantial net loss per acre. The figures show that a somewhat larger percentage of their production was sent to product plants than the average of all districts.

In 1939–40 the Ventura-Santa Barbara district did not benefit significantly from the fact that a larger proportion of its shipments are normally made during the summer months, because in that year prices during the summer months were only 5 cents per box higher than in the winter months.

SITUATION IN 1939–40

Production of lemons in 1939–40 amounted to 11,963,000 boxes, of which 30 percent was sent to product plants. The average f. o. b. price for fresh shipments was $3.02 a box. Assuming that the cost of picking, hauling, packing, selling, and advertising was the same as in 1938–39, the average on-tree price per packed box equivalent for lemons sold as fresh fruit would be $1.69. Returns from byproducts will probably be about the same as in 1938–39, namely, $0.06 per packed box equivalent on the tree. The on-tree price for all fruit in 1939–40, therefore, is around $1.20 per packed box equivalent.

Cost of production data for 1939–40 are not yet available, and consequently no precise figures on actual costs can be given. However, it is believed that the total cultural costs per acre and per box were not greatly different in 1939–40 than in 1938–39. Average yields per acre for the State were approximately the same in both years.

On the basis of the foregoing evidence it seems reasonable to suppose that on the average growers' incomes in 1939–40 were very similar to those of the previous year.

PROSPECTIVE SITUATION FOR 1940–41

From the standpoint of growers' returns, the prospects this season are less favorable than in either of the past 2 seasons.

Using the official February 1 estimate of the 1940–41 crop and the production costs for the 1938–39 season, 2 projections with respect to prices and returns to growers are shown in table 4. Projection I is based upon an average on-tree price for fresh fruit of $1.66 a box packed equivalent and total shipments of 8,100,000 boxes. Projection II is based upon an average on-tree price for fresh fruit of $1.17 a box and total shipments of 8,700,000 boxes. While either of the situations indicated by these 2 projections is possible, it is quite likely that they represent reasonable

upper and lower limits of fresh-fruit prices and shipments. It is probable that the actual average returns to growers will be somewhere between the net profit of $20 per acre and the net loss of $58 per acre shown in table 4. If the final outcome should be at the midpoint of these 2 figures, there would be a net loss of $19 per acre.

TABLE 4.—*Prospects for 1940–41 lemon season*

	Projection I	Projection II
Total production, 1,000 boxes	13,588	13,588
Fresh shipments, 1,000 boxes	8,100	8,700
Percent of crop shipped fresh	60	64
On-tree price, fresh fruit, dollars per box	1.00	.17
On-tree price, product fruit, dollars per box	.06	.06
On-tree price, all fruit, dollars per box	1.02	.77
Yield per acre (cost records) boxes	314	314
Gross returns per acre, dollars	320	242
Cost per acre, dollars	300	300
Profit or loss per acre, dollars	+20	−58

Discussion of the prospects this season must of necessity be based upon certain assumptions. Four assumptions are employed throughout this appraisal, namely: (1) That the money incomes of consumers in this country in 1940–41 will average 6 points higher than in 1939–40; (2) that temperature during the summer months of 1941 will be normal; (3) that exports of lemons to Europe will be negligible; and (4) that production costs per acre will be the same as in 1938–39.

The index of nonagricultural income payments in the United States in 1939–40 averaged 97.3 as against an average of 91.6 in 1938–39, an increase of 5.7 points. In November 1940 the index stood at 101.5 as compared with 95.9 a year earlier, an increase of 5.6 points. According to the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, a continued but more gradual improvement in the conditions affecting the domestic demand for farm products is in prospect during 1941.[1] It would appear, therefore, that an allowance of a 6-point rise in consumers' incomes in 1940–41 over 1939–40 is ample.

Summer temperatures vary considerably from year to year and there is no way to determine what they will actually be in 1941. The most reasonable assumption to make is that they will be about normal. During the summer of 1940 daily maximum temperatures in 14 cities of the United States were about normal, being just three-tenths of a degree above the long-time average.

Cultural costs per acre in 1940–41 are assumed to be the same as the average for all districts as calculated by the California Citrus League for the 1938–39 season. As already mentioned, the average cost per acre for all districts was substantially below that on the 26 orchards in the Ventura-Santa Barbara district. Costs in 1940–41 are not likely to be lower than in 1938–39 and may be somewhat higher.

In addition to consumers' incomes and summer temperatures, the average price at which lemons are sold will influence the volume of lemons which can be moved into consumption. Two assumptions with respect to the average price for 1940–41 are made: (1) That it will be the maximum permitted under the proposed Federal marketing agreement, namely, $1.66; and (2) that it will be the same as that obtained during the first 4 months of this season, namely, $1.17.

The results secured from a statistical analysis covering the years 1921–22 to 1938–39 indicate a domestic movement of lemons in 1940–41 of around 7,600,000 boxes, at a price for fruit on the tree of $1.66 a box, an index of nonagricultural income of 103.3, and normal summer temperatures. This volume, if realized, would be 3.6 percent larger than the record movement of 1939–40.

If the European markets for our lemons remain closed as now seems probable, total exports in 1940–41 are not likely to exceed 500,000 boxes. This figure added to the calculated domestic movement of 7,600,000 boxes would give a total movement in 1940–41 of 8,100,000 boxes. On this basis, 60 percent of the estimated crop of 13,588,000 boxes would be shipped for fresh consumption and 40 percent would go to products. With a price of $1.66 per box for fresh shipment and $0.06 per box for byproducts fruit, the average on-tree price for all fruit would be $1.02 per box.

The average f. o. b. price obtained for lemons sold from November 1, 1940, to February 22, 1941, was $2.50 a box. Deducting the 1938–39 cost of picking, hauling, packing, selling, and advertising of $1.33[2] leaves $1.17 a packed-box equivalent for fruit on the tree. Sales of lemons by the California Fruit Growers Exchange from November 1, 1940, to February 22, 1941, have been 11 percent larger than during the same period of 1939–40.

Despite higher incomes of consumers, large advertising expenditures, and a widespread influenza epidemic, this increase in sales has been possible only at a material reduction in prices. F. o. b. prices to February 22 this season have averaged 25 percent below those of the corresponding period last season.

On the assumption that the total movement, domestic and export combined, for the entire crop-marketing season of 1940–41 will be 11 percent larger than in 1939–40, the volume shipped as fresh fruit would amount to 8,700,000 boxes.

Instead of assuming that the average f. o. b. price for the entire season will be 25 percent below the 1939–40 average of $3.02 a box (which would be $2.27 a box), we shall assume an average f. o. b. price of $2.50 a box, and its equivalent on-tree price of $1.17 a box. A movement of 8,700,000 boxes at an average f. o. b. price of $2.50 a box may be large if consumers' incomes and summer temperature are no higher than those assumed. The results of the statistical analysis mentioned previously indicate a total movement under the conditions specified of only 8,400,000 boxes. With shipments of 8,700,000 boxes the proportion of the total crop moved as fresh fruit would be 64 percent, and the proportion sent to product plants would be 36 percent. With on-tree prices of $1.17 a box for fresh shipment and $0.06 a box for byproducts the average on-tree price for the entire crop would be $0.77 a box.

Unless some coordinated program of shipment regulation such as that envisaged in the proposed Federal marketing agreement is operated in 1940–41, there is, of course, no assurance that the average price can be maintained as high as that secured thus far this season. The volume of lemons available for shipment is far in excess of the quantity that can be moved as fresh fruit even at prices much below the current level. Without some form of industry control, the pressure of packing houses acting individually to ship all of their lemons as long as they bring anything above handling costs would tend to force the general level of prices in eastern markets close to the cost of getting the fruit from the tree to those markets.

If the proposed Federal marketing agreement is approved by growers and put into effect, it seems reasonable to suppose that an effort will be made to raise prices above the current level. While an increase in price would tend to restrict consumption somewhat and thereby increase the percentage of the crop diverted to product plants, it would nevertheless tend to raise total returns to growers.

Unless summer temperatures in 1941 are above normal, it may be questioned whether the maximum price permitted under the proposed Federal marketing agreement can be secured. Lemon shipments last season were regulated under a voluntary marketing agreement of the California Fruit Growers Exchange, and the average on-tree price for the 6 months May through October when summer temperatures were approximately normal, was $1.71 per packed box equivalent. In view of the low prices received thus far this season—$1.17 on the tree—it is evident that the price for the remainder of the season and particularly during the summer months when shipments are normally heaviest must exceed those of last year in order to provide an average on-tree price of $1.66 a box for the entire season.[3]

LONG-RUN OUTLOOK

The trend of lemon production in California is sharply upward, and for some years to come returns to growers are likely to be distressingly low.

During the 5 years 1934–35 to 1938–39, production averaged 9,316,000 boxes a year, 30 percent larger than the average of the previous 5 years. In 1938–39 production amounted to 11,106,000 boxes, in 1939–40 to 11,963,000 boxes, while the 1940–41 crop is now estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture at 13,588,000 boxes, 90 percent larger than the 5-year average ending 1933–34 and 46 percent larger than the 5-year average ending 1938–39.

Consumption of lemons in the United States has failed to keep pace with the increase in domestic production. Annual average consumption of lemons in this country was less than 1,000,000 boxes larger during the 5 years 1934–35 to 1938–39 than during the 5 years 1924–25 to 1928–29, whereas annual average production was nearly 3,000,000 boxes larger. On a per-capita basis consumption of lemons in the United States remained virtually stationary from 1920–21 to 1933–34 at around 3.7 pounds per person. Since 1933–34 per-capita consumption has averaged somewhat higher, approximately 4 pounds.

During the past two seasons, average f. o. b. prices received for lemons shipped as fresh fruit have been relatively low, $2.89 a box in 1938–39 and $3.02 a box in 1939–40, as against an average of $3.66 a box for the 5 years 1933–34 to 1937–38 and an average of $4.18 a box for the 5 years 1928–29 to 1932–33.[4]

Even to maintain the relatively low prices of the past 2 years, it was necessary, despite rising consumers' incomes, to divert large quantities of merchantable lemons to the product plants. In both 1938–39 and 1939–40, 30 percent of the total lemon production of the State was unable to find a market as fresh fruit.

In the coming years, crops of from 13 to 15 million boxes are likely to be the rule rather than the exception, unless low returns to growers lead to widespread neglect of orchards. As of 1939, the latest year for which data are available, less than one-half of the

[1] U. S. Department of Agriculture Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Demand and Price Situation, February 1941.

[2] The advertising assessment of the California Fruit Growers Exchange in 1940–41 is 2 cents a box higher than in 1938–39. Hence an on-tree price of $1.15 instead of $1.17 may be more accurate.

[3] Normally 36 percent of the lemons are shipped during the 6 months November–April and 64 percent during the 6 months May–October. If on-tree prices during the remainder of the winter months average the same as from November 1, 1940, to February 22, 1941—namely, $1.17 a box—and if 36 percent of the annual shipments are made during the winter months, then the average on-tree price for the summer months would have to be $1.94 a box, or 23 cents a box higher than last summer, in order to bring the seasonal average price up to $1.66 a box.

[4] F. o. b. prices are for both packed and loose fresh fruit. Loose fruit has been converted to a packed box basis.

69,300 acres of lemons in the State was in full production, while one-fifth of the total acreage was of nonbearing age (table 5).

TABLE 5.—*Acreage of lemons in California in 1939, by age groups*

Age of trees in years	Acres	Percent
Under 6	14,403	20.3
6 to 10	18,325	26.4
11 to 15	4,593	6.6
16 and over	32,345	46.7
Total	69,306	100.0

As the nonbearing acreage begins to produce and as the young bearing trees increase in yield, a further marked rise in the trend of lemon production is expected.

In the past, two factors have assisted materially in relieving the pressure of increased California shipments upon the domestic markets, namely, reduction of imports and increased population. But during the coming years they will have less influence. There have been no imports during the past 2 years, and population growth is slowing down. In the future, any substantial increase in the market for fresh lemons in this country will have to come from increased per capita consumption. While it is anticipated that per capita consumption will improve, the increase, judging from past experience, will probably be slow and will not likely keep pace with the upward trend in production.

There is no assurance that prices of lemons would respond to even a strong inflationary movement in this country. During the first World War, lemon prices failed to rise along with prices of nearly all other commodities. From 1916–17 to 1919–20, f. c. b. prices of lemons averaged almost the same as during the 5 years 1909–10 to 1913–14, whereas the index of wholesale prices of all commodities was almost twice as high.

As long as the European war continues, our exports of lemons are likely to be largely limited to the quantity that Canada will take. Exclusive of Canada, the 1939–40 exports of lemons from the United States amounted to 31,000 boxes as against 398,000 boxes in 1938–39 and 371,000 boxes in 1937–38. Even when Europe is again at peace, it may be questioned whether we will be able to ship as large a quantity of lemons across the Atlantic as we did during the 2 years preceding the outbreak of war. In those 2 years Italian and Spanish exports of lemons were short, but even then our lemons had to be sold in European markets at prices considerably below those prevailing in this country.

Against Pegging the Price for Agricultural Commodities

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that Mr. Leon Henderson is contemplating and threatening to peg the price of cotton, cottonseed, and cottonseed products. I do not know what Mr. Henderson's intentions are, but it is clear to me that the publication of his alleged gestures is harmful and detrimental to the farmers at this time.

Not only would such an action be detrimental to the agriculture industry but would be discriminatory in that we have not heard of his threats or desire to peg the price of the commodities the farmer has to buy.

I say to Mr. Henderson that his alleged threatened action is now retarding the price of agricultural commodities when it seems that this is the first time in several years that the farmer stands a fair chance to receive a price for his products commensurate with the price he has to pay for the commodities he has to buy.

I want to suggest to Mr. Henderson, and I believe I speak the sentiments of this Congress, that he should be fair to agriculture, and instead of hindering this basic industry, he should use his position to help it, and in so doing he will be rendering a service in behalf of national defense.

ABILENE, TEX., *July 2, 1941.*

The Honorable SAM RUSSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence in putting stop to Henderson's agitation of ceiling for cotton prices. We farmers are just now in position to market our cotton at near-parity prices in line with present living cost. Have not we sold enough 5-cent cotton to entitle us 20 cents, if possible, without some new authority trying to keep us in poorhouse?

A. C. PRATT.
MORRIS AYLES.
L. M. HINDES.
J. S. EDMUNDSON.
BILL HART.
C. L. BROWN.
J. B. ACTON.
MURRAY COX.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 30, 1941.*

Hon. SAM M. RUSSELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have just wired Leon Henderson in protest against his action threatening drastic reductions in prices of cotton and cottonseed. We are sure we will have your full and active cooperation in this effort to prevent arbitrary tampering with price structures of agricultural commodities we urge that you make every effort to have this action by Henderson rescinded and that you insist upon some reasonable price-fixing procedure such as suggested in our telegram which follows:

"Representing a united and an organized raw-cotton industry, including every interest from farmer to spinner, we strongly protest recent action in which you undertake to set an arbitrary price ceiling for certain cotton textiles and threaten a price ceiling on cottonseed oil and other agricultural commodities. We recognize that in connection with our national-defense program price fixing may be or become essential to prevent inflation and to protect the consumer public. So long as cotton, cottonseed, and other agricultural commodities are selling under a proper parity with nonagricultural commodities and with wages to labor, we insist that price fixation is unnecessary and inequitable when applied to raw or processed cotton, cottonseed, or other such agricultural products. When and if price fixing becomes essential in this field we insist that proper price levels be determined only upon and after appropriate conferences with representatives of producers, processors, and consumers of cotton and cottonseed and their products, and that price levels be fixed with due regard to the interest of cotton and cottonseed farmers, handlers, processors, and consumers. The action taken by you does not even pretend to protect ultimate consumers against unreasonable and extortionate prices. On the other hand your action definitely means lower prices to cotton and cottonseed farmers, a lower consumption of those agricultural raw materials, and utter absence of protection for the consumer public. Your threat to fix an arbitrary ceiling on cottonseed oil is premature, has already resulted in drastic decline in prices, and if put into effect will mean continued low prices for cottonseed. We ask and urge that your action with respect to cotton textiles be rescinded and that you withdraw threat you have hung over the cottonseed producer. If in the judgment of the administration it is essential that we resort to price fixing, we repeat the demand that the entire subject matter be referred to an appropriate, representative, and qualified commission or commissions with authority to fix price ceilings only after appropriate hearings; due notice, and a scientific investigation. We further insist that price fixation be upon a basis that will insure at least parity prices to farmers, appropriate and equitable returns to both industry and labor, and protection of the consumer public against extortionate prices for finished products."

NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
By OSCAR JOHNSTON, *President.*

Memorial Day Services at Chatham Square Cemetery, New York

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day of this year I had occasion to address a distinguished gathering at the Old Chatham Cemetery in the city of New York, one of the oldest burial grounds in this part of the country, which contains the graves of the first Jews who came to the United States. Many Jewish soldiers and patriots of the Revolutionary War are buried there.

From the rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, Dr. D. de Sola Pool, I have obtained a list of the Jewish soldiers and patriots who are buried in this cemetery. This list is as follows:

JEWISH SOLDIERS AND PATRIOTS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR BURIED IN THE CHATHAM SQUARE CEMETERY

Solomon Myers Cohen, 1745–96: Merchant; born in 1745, son of Abraham Cohen: private in Capt. Isaac Austin's Fifth Battalion, Upper Delaware Ward, Pennsylvania Militia; also private in Capt. Andrew Geyer's Company, in Col. William Will's Third Battalion, Pennsylvania Militia. Died February 15, 1796.

Jacob Hart, 1746–1822: A learned merchant; born in Germany in 1746, son of Jacob Hart, a mason. In 1781 advanced money to General Lafayette to clothe and feed his troops; thanked by the Nation through the Continental Congress May 24, 1781. Died May 18, 1822.

David Hays, 1732–1812: Merchant; born in New Rochelle, N. Y., in March 1732, son of Jacob Hays. His house and store were destroyed by Tories while he was away in Long Island with Colonial troops. He also served in the New York Militia at Braddock's Field in the French and Indian War. Died at Mount Pleasant, N. Y., October 18, 1812.

Benjamin Jacobs, 1737–1811: Merchant; born in Curacao, West Indies, in 1737, son of Jacob Jacobs. Signer of bills of credit for Continental Congress. Died in New York City December 15, 1811. (Was a member of the Continental Congress in 1776.)

Eleazar Levy, merchant: Son of Moses Isaac Levy. Private, Capt. Samuel McLean's Company. First Battalion, Pennsylvania Militia. Had an extensive interest in 1,800 acres of land at West Point, and was never compensated by the Government for the ruin that was brought to him by the conversion of West Point into a military fort. Died February 12, 1811.

Hayman Levy, 1721–89. Born in Hanover, Germany, January 25, 1721, son of Moses Isaac Levy, merchant. Vigorous, effective public-spirited man of rare integrity, trusted absolutely by Indians and white men alike. Private in Capt. Adam Foulk's Company, Fourth Battalion, Pennsylvania Militia. Signer of Non-Importation Resolutions of 1770. Died in New York City August 20, 1789.

Isaac Moses, 1742–1818. Born in Germany, son of Moses David. Private in Capt. Andrew Burkhard's Company, in Col. William Will's Third Battalion, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Militia. Owned and outfitted privateers for preying on British shipping; advanced to the United States $20,000 in specie in exchange for Continental dollars to finance the Canada expedition, for which he was thanked by John Hancock; pledged pounds in 1780 toward forming the bank in Philadelphia to create credit for purchasing food and clothing for the American soldiers. Benjamin Franklin called him "My friend of austere culture and true knowledge." The first president of the reorganized Philadelphia community. One of the founders of the Bank of New York. Died April 16, 1818.

Myer Myers, 1723–95: Son of Solomon Myers; silversmith. Contributed lead for making bullets. Died in New York City in 1795.

Simon Nathan, 1746–1822: Born in Frome, England; son of Judah Nathan; merchant. Private in Capt. Andrew Geyer's Third Company, Col. William Will's Fourth Battalion, Philadelphia, Pa., Militia. At the risk of his life supplied the United States with canvas and powder; was thanked by Jefferson and the Council of Virginia for his substantial advance to the State; voluntarily provided $300,000 (Continental) for clothing for the soldiers at Fort Pitt, which he was repaid only in ruinously depreciated currency; his advances to the State of Virginia amounted to £320,000. Brother-in-law of Gershom Mendes Seixas. A Mason. A founder and president of Philadelphia congregation. Died September 8, 1822.

Manuel Noah, 1755–1822: Merchant. Born in Mannheim, Germany, in 1775. Son of Noah. Private in Capt. Thomas Willis' Seventh Company, Lt. Col. John Shee's First Battalion, Philadelphia, Pa., Militia. Gave $20,000 for the support of the American Army. Died in New York City January 22, 1822.

Jonas Phillips, 1736–1803: Merchant. Born in Busick, Giessen, near Frankfort, Germany. Son of Aaron Uriah Phillips. Private in Capt. John Linton's Company, Col. William Bradford's Battalion, Philadelphia, Pa., Militia. Signer of nonimportation resolutions of 1770. Died in Philadelphia, Pa., January 29, 1803.

Benjamin Mendes Seixas, 1748–1817: Merchant. Born in New York City, N. Y., on January 28, 1748, son of Isaac Mendes Seixas. Third lieutenant in Fusiliers Company, First Battalion, New York Militia. Signer of the nonimportation agreement. One of the founders of the New York Stock Exchange. Died August 16, 1817.

Gershom Mendes Seixas, 1745–1816: Minister of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue. Born in New York City, N. Y., on January 14, 1745, son of Isaac Mendes Seixas. Preached the American cause in the Revolution; closed the synagogue and removed the holy scrolls to Stratford, Conn., when the British occupied New York City; was one of the clergymen present at Washington's inauguration in 1789; an incorporator of Columbia College and for nearly one-third of a century a trustee of the college. Died in New York City July 2, 1816.

Solomon Simson, 1738–1801: Merchant. Born in New York City, N. Y., son of Joseph Simson. A Mason. Vice president of the Democratic Society of the city. Supplied cannons to New York Colonial troops; contributed lead for making bullets. Died at Yonkers, N. Y., January 17, 1801.

Mr. Speaker, on that occasion an address was delivered by Sol Masch, department commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, which I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TEXT OF SPEECH DELIVERED AT MEMORIAL SERVICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK OF THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES BY SOL MASCH, DEPARTMENT COMMANDER, AT THE CEMETERY OF THE CONGREGATION SHEARITH ISRAEL, NEW BOWERY AND CHATHAM SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY

We are gathered here at these hallowed graves of American Jews who served in the Revolutionary War to pay our tribute to our comrades who have made the supreme sacrifice for American ideals.

Whenever the call has come Americans of every race and creed have marched forth and have gladly laid down their lives upon the field of battle because they have been imbued with a love of those principles from which this great Nation has sprung.

Americans of the Jewish faith may well be proud of their contribution to the armed forces of this country in time of war. They have fought in all the wars of the Republic with honor, valor, and distinction.

In the Revolutionary War, although Jews formed but a mere handful of the population of the country, they served on the staff of Gen. George Washington in positions of trust and command, as well as privates in the Continental Army, and they take their place among those immortal patriots and heroes who fought and bled in order that this Nation might be born.

Eagerly they participated with their fellow colonials in combatting British oppression. Many Jewish merchants signed the non-importation acts of 1765 and 1770. When the call to arms was made an aged Jew, Gomez by name, was told that he was too old to enlist. He replied, "I can stop a bullet as well as a younger man." Col. Isaac Franks, of Philadelphia was aide-de-camp to Gen. George Washington. Col. Solomon Bush of the Pennsylvania militia, after being wounded and captured was thanked by the Colonial Board of War for his services. Major Lewis Bush was mortally wounded at the Battle of the Brandywine. Manual M. Noah, besides contributing $20,000 toward the support of the Continental Armies, served on the staffs of Generals Washington and Marion. Benjamin Nones, a French Jew, was inspired by the same lofty ideals and sentiments which impelled Lafayette to offer his services to the Colonies. He enlisted as a private under Pulaski, and rose to the rank of major under Baron De Kalb.

Well do I recall my history book during my school days which contained a picture of General De Kalb being carried mortally wounded from the field at the Battle of Camden, S. C., by three American officers. Everyone of those American officers were Jews. They were Major Nones, Captains de la Motta and Jacob deLeon. And what authentic history of the period can overlook or forget Haim Solomon who came to the rescue of the Continental Congress in the darkest days of the war, and who gave every cent of a large fortune to maintain and equip the armies which were fighting for our independence.

In the War of 1812, Uriah P. Levy, in command of the brig-of-war *Argus*, successfully ran the British blockade with our Ambassador to France on board. After sinking 21 ships he was finally captured in the British Channel. His services extended beyond the War of 1812, and he died in the year 1862, after having achieved the highest rank in the Navy at that time, the rank of Commodore. To his everlasting credit let it be recorded that it was through his efforts that the lash as a means of punishment was abolished in the American Navy.

Jews were represented in the War with Mexico, and Gen. David deLeon was twice publicly thanked by Congress for gallantry in action and ability.

In the Civil War 10,000 Jews served with honor and distinction in both the Northern and Southern Armies. Entire family contingents enlisted, and I give you these Jewish names: The 6 Cohen brothers of North Carolina, the 5 Jonas brothers of Mississippi, the 5 Moses brothers of South Carolina, the 4 Moses brothers of Georgia, the 5 Wank brothers of New York, and Ferdinand Levy and his 3 sons of New York. For the Confederacy Judah P. Benjamin was Secretary of War, David deLeon was Surgeon General, L. M. Harby was Commodore of the Navy, and A. C. Meyers was Quartermaster General. In the Northern armies Frederick Kneffler was a major general and Leopold Blumenberg and Philip Jacchison were brigadier generals. Leopold C. Newman was handed his commission as a brigadier general by President Lincoln as he lay dying of wounds received at the Battle of Chancellorsville. Captains J. B. Greenhut, Mayer Frank, and Edwin Wertheimer were repeatedly mentioned in dispatches for bravery under fire. Leopold Karpeles, Abraham Cohen, and Benjamin B. Levy were 3 of 7 Jews who received the Congressional Medal of Honor for continuous acts of bravery during the Civil War. Perhaps one of the most outstanding acts of heroism during the entire war was performed by Lt. Max Sachs, who single-handed and alone held off an entire Texan company while he endeavored to rally his own men. Captain Ullman, of the Pennsylvania Cavalry, who fought through the entire war, met his death with General Custer when he and his brave band of troops were massacred and wiped out by the Sioux Indians in Custer's Last Fight.

In the Spanish-American War many thousands of Jews answered the call of President William McKinley. Fifteen Jews went down with the *Maine*. The first enemy standard lowered in the Philippines was captured by Sgt. Morris Cohen. Jacob Wilensky, a mere lad of 16, was killed in the very first charge of the Rough Riders. The first American soldier to fall at the Battle of Manila was a Jew—Sgt. Maurice Joost.

In the World War a phalanx of 250,000 American Jews served in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. Although forming but 3 percent of the total population they furnished between 4 and 5 percent of the armed forces of their country; 10,000 held commissioned rank, no less than 1,100 received citations for valor, and the rare Congressional Medal of Honor was won by 6. The Jewish wounded numbered 12,000, and 3,500 made the supreme sacrifice.

How did these thousands of Jews in the American forces measure up as soldiers, as comrades, and as men? The volume of evidence as to the high quality of Jewish courage, loyalty, and devotion on the battlefield is most impressive. No men were better qualified to speak of Jewish heroism than those American non-Jews who fought side by side with Jews, commanded them as officers, stayed with them in the trenches, shared with them the miseries of war, and rejoiced with them in the glories of victory.

General Pershing, the A. E. F. commander in chief, said that "When the time came to serve their country under arms, no class of people served with more patriotism or with higher motives than the young Jews who volunteered or were drafted and who went overseas with our other young Americans. I well remembered in my inspections of New York divisions seeing so many patriotic, well-disciplined, well-behaved young Jewish soldiers, whose commanders spoke of them in the highest terms."

Lt. Col. Douglas Campbell declared that "The Jewish boys of the Seventy-seventh Division were the best soldiers on earth. They participated in the greatest battles and emerged sound. The Seventy-seventh Division, of which 40 percent were Jewish young men, was the only American division to reach the Aisne, after having penetrated farther into the German lines than any other division." Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, of the Twenty-sixth Division, said "The Jews made an enviable record. I remember instances where formerly intolerant Gentiles asked that Jews be made officers, in order that they might be made leaders." Captain Harrigan, of the famous Three Hundred and Seventh Infantry, declared "Too much cannot be said for the boys who went across from the East Side. They stood out for conspicuous bravery and utter disregard for self when they went up against the Germans in France."

Time does not permit a detailing of the heroism of all who were decorated, but the gallantry of a few should be recalled.

The six Jewish men who won the Congressional Medal of Honor were Sgt. Sydney G. Gumpertz, of the One Hundred and Thirty-second Infantry, Thirty-second Division; Gunnery Sgt. Charles F. Hoffman, of the Fifth Regiment, United States Marine Corps; Sgt. Philip C. Katz, of the Three Hundred and Sixty-third Infantry, Ninety-first Division; Sgt. Benjamin Kaufman, of the Three Hundred and Eighth Infantry, Seventy-seventh Division; Corpl. Samuel Sampler, of the One Hundred and Forty-second Infantry, Thirty-sixth Division; and Sgt. William Sawelson, of the Three Hundred and Twelfth Infantry, Seventy-eighth Division, who was killed while performing the act for which he was posthumously decorated.

One of the brightest pages in the entire war was that written by the Lost Battalion, of which 40 percent were Jewish men. Cut off from the main body of troops, they were under fire from their own as well as the enemy's artillery. With ammunition and supplies running low, one messenger after another was sent in an effort to get through the lines to carry word of their predicament. Finally it was a little Jewish tailor from the Bronx named Abraham Krotoshinsky who got through and succeeded in getting word to the American headquarters of the plight of the Lost Battalion.

At these memorial services we pay our tribute to our honored dead—and to all of those who have lived and died for democracy. We of the Jewish faith who have fought before stand ready and willing once more to make any sacrifice which may be demanded by our country in the present emergency.

Mr. Speaker, while the gathering at the Chatham Square Cemetery was primarily in the nature of paying tribute to the Jewish veterans of the Revolutionary War, the Revolutionary War is not the only war in which Jewish soldiers participated, nor are the patriots, whose graves adorn this cemetery, the only Jewish soldiers or sailors of the Revolutionary War.

In addition to those whose names were just read, there were many who participated with the rest of the colonial Americans in fighting against British oppression and for the independence of the United States.

Many Jewish merchants signed the Non-Importation Acts of 1765 and 1770, which were such an effective boycott of British goods, and helped to create an all-American merchant marine.

One of the aides-de-camp to Gen. George Washington was Col. Isaac Frank, of Philadelphia. Another prominent member of the Pennsylvania Militia was Col. Solomon Bush, and his cousin, Maj. Lewis Bush, was mortally wounded in the Battle of Brandywine; nor can we forget the contribution of Haym Salomon, whose skillful financing of the Revolutionary War was responsible for its success. It was Major Noah who at one time acted as American consul to Tripoli, and who contributed $20,000 toward the support of the Continental Armies, and himself served on the staff of General Washington; and there are many others whose names are legion who did their share for the success of our aims and the establishment of the American independence.

The Jewish race can well be proud of its record of patriotism. While I do not think that any American citizen should be singled out for his patriotism, and all of us are willing to share in the blessings of liberty and at the same time perform our duties as American citizens of the United States, in these days when there is so much confusion, and when many people take it upon themselves to criticize certain racial groups in this country, I take more than ordinary pride in showing to Congress this official record of Jewish patriotism and devotion to American principles.

All of us who love America, all of us who believe in fair play, and all of us who place the interest of our country above the interest of any class or group rejoice in the spirit of devotion manifested by all sections of our population, and pledge ourselves forever to keep the torch of liberty alive.

Should the time come for the supreme sacrifice which any human being can give, I am sure that there will be no one here who will not echo the sentiment which Nathan Hale, the great American patriot, uttered back in 1776:

I regret that I have but one life to give for my country.

The Bible—Our Bulwark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ROUND-TABLE BROADCAST OVER WWDC

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Bible round-table broadcast over WWDC Monday, June 23, 1941, entitled "The Bible—Our American Bulwark." The speakers were the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; the Honorable A. LEONARD ALLEN, of Louisiana; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas; and the Honorable LUTHER PATRICK, of Alabama:

The announcer, Mr. WILL GOFF. Presenting the Bible round table, a regular feature heard over this station each Monday evening. This program is under the direction of Evangelist Dale Crowley, who will at this time announce the theme of the evening, and also the participating members of tonight's round table. Mr. Crowley.

Evangelist CROWLEY. Thank you, Will Goff, and good evening, friends. Many of you are familiar with the plan of our Bible round table. From week to week we call together the various groups from the churches to discuss Bible subjects in round-table fashion. From time to time we have groups of ministers, of laymen, and of Christian young people who give their own views on Bible topics of general interest.

Tonight we have a most unusual group, and I think you will regard it, as all of the Washington newspapers have, an extraordinary feature. Seated around this microphone are four Members of the United States Congress—the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; the Honorable A. LEONARD ALLEN, of Louisiana; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas; and the Honorable LUTHER PATRICK, of Alabama. These men are outstanding Christian laymen, not merely because they are Members of Congress, but in their own home communities they have been for many years recognized as faithful laymen in the churches of which they are members. The subject chosen for the discussion tonight is The Bible—The Bulwark of America. And now I know that you are as anxious as I am to hear what they are going to say. Suppose we start with the gentleman first on my right, Congressman BRYSON. You won't mind opening the discussion, will you, Congressman BRYSON?

Representative BRYSON. Before the time of Christ the Jews relied upon the Old Testament as the codification of their laws. The sacred writings were oracles of God. Of course, there were predictions in the Old Testament of the coming of a Messiah. The New Testament is an authentic record of the sayings and teachings of Jesus Christ.

Representative ALLEN. If one looks on the surface alone he might be prone to accept the view that the Bible today has not the strong hold upon the nations of the world that it once had. All around us we see a trend toward dictatorship with its suppression of Christianity and most other forms of religion. All will agree that the Bible is not having much influence on Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini, and they are now the heads of three great nations.

But this question should be viewed in its broader aspect. We should consider what may be called the indirect influence of the Bible on the nations of the world. I do not believe anybody would question the fact that the Bible still wields a tremendous influence over the people of the United States, over Canada, the British Isles and possessions, and over South America, as well as other nations. Up to this moment, these nations are free nations. The spirit of liberty which dwells in them is bound to be an inspiration to the subjugated peoples of other nations. If these subjugated people are liberated, it will be done as the result of the influence of the Bible operating directly and indirectly through the free nations of the world. So, while we may freely admit that in this tragic hour the situation is dark, I believe there is enough power in the world emanating from Holy Writ to finally assist this crazy world in righting itself. The same Omnipotent Power that led the peoples of old through sacrifices, privation, and toil will, in God's own time, again accomplish the same end.

Representative MAHON. What you say, Mr. ALLEN, is very interesting. The Bible has had a long and eventful history, and it seems almost incredible, if we look at the picture from a nonreligious viewpoint, that the Bible, this little, black-bound book, could have such a profound influence on the history of the world. Not long ago I was reading a little poem about the flag. It ran about like this:

"It's only a small bit of bunting,
It's only an old colored rag,
But thousands have died for its honor,
And shed their best blood for the flag."

So it is with the Bible. It is only a small, black-bound book, but it is the hope of the world. It has been the greatest single influence in the history of our Nation. It brought the founding fathers to this country. It has sustained us in every worthy undertaking of the past, and it is our only hope, I think, for the future. It is regrettable that we have written "In God we trust" on our money and have failed, too often, to write it in our hearts. But we must resolve to give the Bible a greater place, a bigger place, the place that it is really entitled to in the hearts of our American citizenry.

Representative PATRICK. Well, Mr. MAHON, of course we never get to where we wish to go in life. Basically we started with that sort of an idea. You know in the basic American documents the teachings of the Bible are in common living. I just got hold of, today, a print of the *Mayflower* compact, which is the forerunner of more than one, especially the Declaration of Independence, and noticed how that started off: "In the name of God, Amen, we"—and so on—"having undertaken for the glory of God and the advancement of Christian faith and honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern part of Virginia, do by these presents solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and of one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic for better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid," and so on. It was almost a prayer, that certainly was in keeping with the faith they had in coming over here. That was signed, incidentally, by some men that still live in our literature and minds. There was John Carver, William Bradford, William Brewster, Miles Standish, and John Alden—by the way, their names are right together as signers of the *Mayflower* compact; they were together for once, anyway. Well, you remember how it started off in the Declaration of Independence itself, "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary," and so on, you know, to which the laws of Nature and Nature's God entitles them—a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that they shall declare the causes which impel them to the separation. I think the entire life of America is basically set forward as an ideal in fine shape so far as our life and its connection with the Bible is concerned, and, of course, fundamentally we try to live by and think of that.

Evangelist CROWLEY. Its the inspiration, then, of our Declaration of Independence. Now, I'm thinking about the Bible influencing our Constitution. What would you say about that, Congressman BRYSON?

Representative BRYSON. Well, I believe that Columbus was prompted to seek the discovery of a new world, not from his knowledge of science, but from his reading and interpretation of the Bible. Our colonial forebears had but few books. The Bible in most instances was the only book to be found in the early settlers' homes. It is natural that our founding fathers read the Bible, and when our organic laws were written they were predicated upon the Bible. The Declaration of Independence recognized the Supreme Judge and further recognizes the protection of Divine Providence. It declares all men to be free and equal before law and in the sight of God. Our United States Constitution is the product of the brain of men who believed in a Supreme Being and relied upon God for divine guidance. All through our Constitution the Lord's Day is recognized in providing that certain things may be done at given time except Sundays.

Representative ALLEN. The coming of Christ brought a new day It was hard for humanity to break away from its exclusiveness. It took the Christ to set the example. One day He wanted to make a trip. All the traditions and teachings in Judea forbade intermingling with the despised people of Samaria, but that is exactly what the Master did. He broke down that barrier and tore down the social and religious wall of hate. Equality of man before the law and before God, liberty of thought and action, all so forcefully brought out by the Master, are cardinal principles of democracy. The Bible, therefore, is directly the inspiration for democracy. As the knowledge of and belief in the Bible is received by the people, the spirit of democracy increases. To kill democracy, you must close the Bible. Spiritual liberty will bring political liberty. Paul says, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

I believe it can definitely be said that democracy is the result of Christianity. Democracy can and must look to Christianity for its very existence. In the coming days Christianity and democracy both will be tried.

Now, Mr. MAHON.

Representative MAHON. Well, Mr. Allen, I think you are right in saying that you have got to tie democracy and Christianity together, for democracy is not going to get very far without its tie—without an anchor being provided—and the Bible provides the inspiration; it provides the channel through which men may achieve the thing that we call democracy. A kite won't go very high unless you've got a string tied to the kite to direct it, and democracy won't go very far unless it is directed by the teachings of the Bible. Freedom of conscience is all right, and freedom of speech is fine, but freedom of conscience, if misdirected, and freedom of speech, if misdirected, will not produce a good world; will not produce a world at peace; will not produce liberty, equality, fraternity; will not produce democracy. We've got to link the Bible and its teaching with our living in a personal way—in a national way—if we are going to see the full fruition of what we call freedom of conscience and freedom of speech. Do you agree with me there, Mr. PATRICK?

Representative PATRICK. Oh, yes; of course I agree with you. The first thing we did when we got the Constitution of the United States—our forefathers, when they started out, they probably thought they had something in a pretty complete form, but within a little while they found that it didn't embrace the Bill of Rights. Now, the English had gotten old King John hemmed up in a cow pasture at Runnymede and jarred him loose from a bill of rights. We hadn't even got that out. Well, they started out in the first part of the first amendment:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

And Government's entirely two separate kinds of work. One is given to the promotion of our general good by positive action, such as is brought forth by all good and successful humanitarian legislation, becomes a very helpful part of our social life. The other is given to preventives, and prevents certain negative action. One is produced by our just desires and needs; the other is produced by our evil or wrongful acts, or maybe erratic acts. One is blessing and the other a necessary evil. And this that is necessary evil must be watched that it be not overdone. But the first is by very nature a kind and beneficial growth. Yet man is such a creature that he is always drifting into things that bring him to need of discipline. Even in his worship he got to the place that he was tyrannical toward those whose feelings toward worship led them to conclusions different from his. So the Christian religion has been the inspiration of the crusade, with insane wars and losses; and to the purge, with its inquisition, with its rack and its screw and wheel and even hot oil. With this history back of us is it any wonder that its founders decided to found this Nation so that no matter what a man's belief might be, what his love of worship might lead him to, it should be full and free. Who would have dreamed that a people with the culture and the history of the Germans would have fallen back to the practices of brute force and torture and religious intolerance that Germany is practicing today? Mr. BRYSON, would you like to expand on that a little?

Representative BRYSON. Well, yes; there is every evidence that the American citizens, generally, are ready to fight, if needs be, to preserve, protect, and perpetuate to the generations yet unborn freedom of conscience and freedom of speech. We feel that we would rather die on our feet than to live on our knees. Congress, as powerful as it is, is prohibited by the Bill of Rights from enacting any law that would "abridge the freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, or freedom of the press."

Evangelist CROWLEY. Now, I think you gentlemen have very well covered the subject of the influence of the Bible on the nations of the world and also on our own Nation. You know, gentlemen, the Bible has some enemies in the world today. I wonder if you might comment on some of these enemies which are threatening the very vitals of our national life.

Representative ALLEN. Well, the greatest enemy of the Bible that I know of is communism. Karl Marx, the founder of communism, swung from a religionist to the extreme position of a hater of all forms of religion. It was he who said that "religion is the opium of the people." His modern followers have made hatred of religion one of the principles of their philosophy. In Russia they have burned and otherwise destroyed most of the churches, and the few remaining have been converted into picture shows. Bibles have been destroyed and the sale of them forbidden, and every effort has been made to root out the Christian religion.

The philosophy of communism is the very opposite of Christianity. The one teaches hate, the other love; communism teaches that the aim and end of man is service to the state; Christianity, service to God. The one is fatalistic, the other abiding hope. The one looks to the present, the other to the future. Communism destroys the sanctity of marriage, the beauty of the home, and relegates man almost to the level of the beast. It is unquestionably the most dangerous philosophy ever evolved by man. It is worse than the paganism that existed before the Christian era. It looks only to the materialistic side of life. It seeks to satisfy the present. It destroys the philosophy of eternal life. It merits condemnation by all free peoples who have faith in the Bible.

Now, Mr. MAHON, what have you got to say about it?

Representative MAHON. Well, now, Mr. ALLEN, there is a lot of truth in what you are saying here about communism.

Representative PATRICK. What about nazi-ism?

Representative MAHON. Well, I think you can say substantially the same thing about nazi-ism. We were talking here awhile ago about the great influence of the Bible. Communism is bad because it destroys the influence and power in the nation of the Bible; and nazi-ism is bad because it destroys the strength and vigor that the open Bible will

give a people. Whenever we destroy freedom of action, as is being done in Nazi Germany and in the conquered countries; and when we destroy the rights, the freedom of speech, and those fundamental, basic rights that we had felt were guaranteed to all the civilized people of this day, we are destroying the influence of the Bible; we are building up, as it were, false gods. We can remember, however, that we don't have to go to communistic Russia or Nazi Germany to find enemies of the Bible. We are all enemies of the Bible to the extent that we do not give it the part that it really ought to have in our lives and in our communities and in our own beloved country. I think, Mr. PATRICK, you share my contempt for communism and my contempt for nazi-ism, and also agree that we fall far short ourselves of what we ought to do.

Representative ALLEN. But let me say right here that communism and nazi-ism are both the biggest organized opposers of the Bible.

Representative MAHON. That's what we are getting at, the big, organized, powerful thing. That is more important than any specific individual.

Representative PATRICK. Well, godliness can organize the same as godlessness, and, so far as that's concerned, there's a wisdom of ignorance, you know. Of course, it's a kind of touchy point for discussion, because, you know, it's difficult for me to say successfully that I am wise and you are foolish. People will immediately abandon such a speaker, anyone advancing such an idea; but the wisdom of ignorance, when it is godlessness, is the cruel destroyer of faith. It's so cruel. It takes away the bread of life and gives nothing in its place, not even a crumb.

If I should take an example, I couldn't think of a better example than the godless leader of the Nazis, of this "new order," Herr Adolf Hitler. The most exalted object of affection for the heart, even for the soul, of man, is the state—that's what he says—the state is the thing; and what insufferable egotism that is in his case. He is a totalitarian dictator; thus he is the state. Now, isn't that something, the author of the major thing in the human life? A lot of comfort a religious soul will get from that source. A lot of spiritual repose to a sinner who desires to repent and turn to the hopeful life. Now this Hitler is my example of that school—a godless state worshiper, egotistic, cruel, ruthless; can't repent, for he is divorced from the grounds upon which one can repent. Hitler—not even married, nothing, no God, no wife, no hell, no heaven—all dressed up with his swastika, and nowhere to go.

Representative ALLEN. You would say, then, that he has committed the unpardonable sin?

Representative PATRICK. Well, give it that interpretation if you like. So far as I am concerned, I don't feel much inclined to pardon him for the way he is carrying on in the world right now.

Representative BRYSON. Because of the anti-American, anti-Bible influence, we are witnessing the breaking down of social standards. We are certainly facing most difficult times, to say nothing of the immediate past. It is now being suggested that America collaborate with socialistic Russia in order to preserve the Christian way of life. Russia, in whose broad lands millions of children have been born and have now reached maturity in a country denying the existence of God, is about to become our ally against the onrushing mechanized forces of Nazi Germany. Had the nations of the earth followed the teachings of the Bible, it is confidently believed that we would not now be facing the difficult days that are ahead of us.

Evangelist CROWLEY. Gentlemen, I think that what you have said about the enemies of the Bible will certainly strike a responsive chord in the hearts of all our listeners, and I would that this broadcast might have reached everybody throughout the Nation. Now, passing from that particular thought, there are certain institutions that we have in America that are honored and revered because of what they stand for, and because of what they have meant to our Nation. Now in these institutions, how can the Bible be made a bulwark? I'd like for you to discuss that in the few minutes that are left. What about it, Mr. Allen, won't you give us some word on that?

Representative ALLEN. The church was established by Christ. Faith in Christ is the very center and foundation of it. Paul spoke of Christ as "the Chief Cornerstone." Paul also said that the church was "in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ." In writing to Timothy, he spoke of "the house of God which is in the church of the living God," and he added the significant testimony that it was "the pillar and the ground of the truth."

We have here the definite statement of Christ as to the divine origin of the church, and the repeated statements of the greatest mortal preacher of all time to the same effect. No one could want more evidence that the church is a divine institution.

Our people recognized the church and accepted the view that it was a divine institution. The church, since the landing of the Pilgrims, has been the center of spiritual truth and power. It has been the great pulsating heart of the Nation. Its streams of mercy, of wisdom, of love have flowed through every artery of the Nation's life, giving hope, strength, and the will to carry on. The church has sent the message of the good news of the Bible into our American life. The Bible is the bulwark of our Nation, but the church has even been the great propagating agent of the eternal truths of the Bible. It is God's divine agent to convey His message to the world.

Now, Mr. MAHON, what about the school?

Representative MAHON. Well, I agree, Mr. ALLEN, with what you say with reference to the church. You know, it has been a delightful experience for me here in Washington to discover that wherever and whenever I go to church, I find a crowd there; I find in many of the churches that it is impossible to get a seat unless you get there early. I am glad that situation exists in the Capital City of my Nation. Now, you are right in saying that the church is important. The school is another important bulwark. Here in Washington the taxpayers pay around $45,000,000 a year, and the biggest item of expenditure is for the schools. About $13,000,000 a year is required to run these schools, but they are worth more than that to the people of this city. The school is essential, it is vital. The school is necessary to democracy. And the school itself has a very definite religious turn, too. My daughter, who goes to the Washington schools, came home several years ago and said to me, "Daddy, I learned a new little poem today." And this is what she said to me:

"Father, we thank Thee for the night,
And for the pleasant morning light;
For rest, and food, and loving care,
And all that makes the world so fair.
Help us to do the things we should,
To be to others kind and good;
In all we do, in work or play,
To grow more loving every day."

I think it is commendable that such a lesson as that is taught in the schools of Washington. The schools of our country must go forward under the influence of Christianity if we are to preserve our democracy—if we are to carry on the great principles to which our country has been dedicated; and I wouldn't say that the church and the school complete the picture. Mr. PATRICK, could you make one other suggestion about important institutions in which the teachings of the Bible must have a place?

Representative PATRICK. Well, let's see, the church, the school, and, you'd say, the home; I know what you have in mind. Well, now, I'll say this: This is about the homeiest discussion I've been in. I've been in a number of these round-table discussions and they always end in a debate, each time before it went off on a hot angle, but here we've all been able to get together, so there must be something homey about it.

Representative MAHON. We are fortunate in the selection of the subject.

Representative PATRICK. You know, the home is the first institution; had you ever thought of that? It's the original, the first, institution that man knew anything about. The Bible was greatly written about the home and the home life. You remove the parts of the Bible that have to do with the home, the home life, or connected with family association, you'll have a mighty small book left. Of course, we get the jitters when a man opens up on the subject of home and mother and old folks because we think he's going to do some demagoging. But we ought to be willing to do anything we can to build up the home life in this country, for, after all, the same is its unit, and the unit determines the structure—the structure of these ramparts we watch; and the Bible is that home book—the bulwark of America; and I'll say that I think the radio is a blessing to America. The home was about to be all broken apart—just a filling station where the young folks run in once in a while. Do you remember the man that faced Judge Ashley and he was asked if he didn't have three daughters at home, and he said, "Well, Judge, I do have three daughters at one place or another, but they are very seldom at home." The radio is giving something by which you may go to your home and get entertainment and really tends toward home life. I think there is a trend in that direction.

Evangelist CROWLEY. Congressman BRYSON, do you have another word? We just have a little bit of time left. I'd like to hear you say one other word.

Representative BRYSON. It was said of the Son of the lowly Nazarene carpenter that "He went about doing good." What a different world we would be living in if it could be said of each of us that, like Christ, we went about doing good.

"So many faiths, so many creeds,
So many paths that wind and wind,
When, after all, what this sad world needs
Is but the art of being kind."

Evangelist CROWLEY. That's a very fitting climax, Congressman BRYSON. Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have been listening to our Bible round table, as our announcer will tell you within a few moments. Heard on this discussion tonight were the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; the Honorable A. LEONARD ALLEN, of Louisiana; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas; and the Honorable LUTHER PATRICK, of Alabama, outstanding Christian laymen from the States and from the communities from which they come. Gentlemen, I want to thank you on behalf of our listening audience for your coming here tonight. You have made a real contribution to our Bible round table, and I thank you from the bottom of my heart, and hope that some day in the future you may be able to come back and be with us again.

FOUR CONGRESSMEN IN CHORUS. Thank you, Mr. Crowley.

Representative MAHON. It did us more good than it will do our audience.

Polls on Use of Convoys and Entrance of United States in European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

LETTER AND POST CARD OF HON. KNUTE HILL OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including a letter and post card sent to every registered voter in the Fourth Congressional District today, Thursday, July 3, 1941.

From time to time as the ballots are received, I will make a statement on the floor of the House so that not only may the Members thereof know how my constituents stand on these two important issues, but also the constituents themselves be apprised of the attitude of a majority of the voters in the Fourth Congressional District.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington.

DEAR FRIEND: The matter of our entry into the European war is so momentous and so serious that, in my opinion, the American voters, the only sovereigns in the United States, should decide this issue. For several weeks the convoy issue has been discussed daily. The President himself has declared that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

I have voted for every appropriation for the defense program, sincerely believing that the funds would be used only in the actual defense of the Western Hemisphere I shall do my utmost to prevent an actual invasion of Hitlerism in the Western Hemisphere. In the enclosed referendum the question of entry into war means definitely on foreign soil or in foreign waters. The question as to convoys and the Navy is also definitely in foreign waters.

I have my own convictions in these matters, but I want an honest expression from the fathers and mothers and the taxpayers of the Fourth Congressional District on an issue so vital to their welfare and future security.

Kindly mark your card and return it within 3 days. All that is necessary is to mark and mail the enclosed card. You do not have to sign the ballot; sign only if you wish.

Sincerely yours,

KNUTE HILL,
Member of Congress.

BALLOT

The United States should—

Send convoys or navies abroad------- ☐
Keep convoys or navies at home------ ☐
Enter the war---------- ☐
Stay out of the war---------- ☐

Name ----------

Address ----------

(Signature optional)

Please return this ballot within 8 days of receipt.

KNUTE HILL.

Our Latin American Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 1, 1941:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 1, 1941]

CLAIMS BRITISH SELL MATERIAL UNITED STATES GIVES THEM—WAR AID FINDS WAY TO SOUTH AMERICA

(By William Fulton)

NEW YORK, June 30.—A warning that the United States must not become so absorbed in its rearmament efforts that other countries will bottle up our trade channels with South America was sounded today by James S. Kemper, Chicago insurance man and former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. He declared the British especially are not letting the war cramp their style.

Arriving on the liner *Uruguay* after a 7-week visit in South America, Kemper said British firms, unworried by the war at home, were pursuing business vigorously wherever it could be found in this country's neighbor nations to the south.

WAR FEVER PUZZLES NEIGHBORS

"We certainly could take a lesson from the way the British are handling their commercial affairs these days in South America," remarked Kemper. "Their representatives down there are aggressive, keen for business, active in going after old accounts and getting new ones.

"It mystifies South Americans that people from European countries, which are right in the middle of the war, seem less excited about it than the United States. We should not get so wrapped up in this defense program that we lose our trade channels to the south."

Kemper was chairman of the United States Chamber of Commerce delegation to the Conference of American Organizations of Business and Production at Montevideo. All 21 South American republics were represented except Haiti.

PLAN COURT OF ARBITRATION

The conference decided to set up machinery for settling disputes between manufacturers, shippers, and buyers of the various countries through arbitration instead of in the courts.

Most startling of the reports which Kemper heard at the conference sessions and in his tour of the larger cities were:

First, that lend-lease materials given away by this country are filtering back into South America to compete with United States products; and, secondly, that censorship officials, opening the mails at Trinidad, are making American trade secrets available to British commercial agents.

"One representative of a large firm in the United States told me how he had bid for a large project which would take 3 years to complete," said Kemper. "The British came in and said they would do the job in 2 years. This American told me the British could underbid his concern because various materials were accessible to them under the lend-lease bill, but not to him.

FIREBRICK ORDER UNDERMINED

"Another story that came to me first-hand was about the South American concern which was planning an addition to its plant and negotiated with the representative of a United States firm for a shipment of firebrick. The representative sent an air-mail letter to his office, and 3 days later a British salesman was around calling on the South American company with an offer to supply the firebrick at a lower price.

"My friend learned his letter was intercepted at Trinidad and the censors relayed the information to their commercial attachés."

SHIP SHORTAGE HURTS TRADE

South Americans are eager to do business with the United States, Kemper declared, but are showing increasing concern over the transfer of merchant vessels under the United States flag from the trade routes to Government use for the Army or Navy. Cargoes are piling up on the docks for want of bottoms to carry them northward.

A case in point was the ship on which Kemper and his wife made their homeward voyage. Slipping into New York harbor through the sea haze, the Moore-McCormack lines' Uruguay was deep in the water with a cargo of 6,000 tons of hides, wool, manganese, coffee, and other products of South America. In normal times officials of the line said, the Uruguay carried between 2,000 and 3,000 tons of cargo.

Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM SAN FRANCISCO CALL-BULLETIN

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, entitled "Letter From a Soldier."

Mr. Speaker, when anyone is away he looks forward eagerly to receiving news of what is going on among the home folks.

At the present time thousands of young Americans are separated from their family ties and are serving our country in camps and stations at great distances from where they live.

They long for letters.

The idea has been beautifully expressed in an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin. The article quotes in full a letter from a young recruit and makes a number of excellent suggestions as to how we may all do our part. This article is most appropriate on the day before the Fourth of July.

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of June 23, 1941]

LETTER FROM A SOLDIER—IT'S ADDRESSED TO YOU—SO TAKE PEN IN HAND AND ANSWER PRONTO

We have received the most important letter ever addressed to this newspaper.

We have received letters on national defense, taxes, power problems, relief, and other weighty matters—but none of more immediate importance to all of us than this one.

It is written under the California bear and palm tree insignia of the Two Hundred and Fiftieth Coast Artillery and comes from Pvt. Kenneth L. Moehler, Medical Department detachment, Camp McQuaide.

Private Moehler's letter contains an appeal; both a general, and, as will be seen later, a specific one. We are passing it on here in hope that it brings a response not only to him but to others of the many thousands of young men making up our armed forces.

JUST A RECRUIT

"Dear editor," his letter begins, "whenever anyone asks me if I was drafted, I always throw out my chest and say: 'Who, me? I was selected.'

"I've been in our Army only for about 4 months, but I think I am kind of growing into it. You know, the way you do with an old chair, a fishing hat, or a pipe. * * *

"It seems to me that the collective morale of our Army is based largely on little things. Things like a little dust down the rifle barrel on inspection, beans cooked maybe on the carbon side, a few inches in the fit of your pants one way or another, an extra spot on the galloping ivories. * * *

"One of these little things is mail from home.

"If a soldier gets a letter now and then, gee, it makes a lot of difference! It doesn't take long to write, but you should see some of these soldiers when they get a letter. They're a lot easier to live with. And are they proud! It makes little sparks go up your spine.

"Mr. Editor, how about reminding the folks for us? We read the Call-Bulletin, but it can't quite take the place of a letter."

POSTSCRIPT

That's the general appeal in Private Moehler's letter.

The specific appeal comes later, 'way at the bottom of the page, in a postscript:

"P. S.—Maybe she'll see it in the Call. Maybe I'll get a letter."

Whoever she is (or, if she "isn't" yet, whoever she may be) the editor and the rest of the staff hope she does and he does.

If Private Moehler doesn't get a letter from her, he should at least get one from some of us.

"Aiding national defense" is an overworked shibboleth, but this is one real way in which everybody can help—aiding in maintaining the high collective morale of these young men by bolstering the individual spirits, by making a little more load for Uncle Sam's other marching men, the boys in gray on postal collection.

EVERYBODY "GIVE"

Three cents won't buy a defense bond, but a stamp will go a long way toward the same end by bringing cheer to the fellow you know down at camp.

Private Moehler isn't an isolated case, either.

Somewhat south of him, at Camp Roberts, the camp paper—the Dispatch—recently carried a cartoon by Phil Hustis, to the same effect. It showed a soldier shrugging as he turned away from the mail window empty-handed. The caption said the same thing as Private Moehler's letter, more cynically and succinctly:

"The Army shows you how many swell friends you ain't got."

It's a wrong that needs writing, right away.

So, fall in. You—parents, girl friends, uncles, cousins, aunts—and the pal at home still in a civilian job. Squads write.

(You, too, Miss Postscript. Give!)

The Place of Agriculture in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE PAYNE RATNER, GOVERNOR OF KANSAS

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable Payne Ratner, Governor of Kansas, Conference of Governors, Boston, Mass., July 1, 1941:

It is a delightful pleasure to be here with my fellow Governors to renew my acquaintance with those I am fortunate to know personally, and to meet so many others with whom it has been my privilege to work officially.

To Governor Saltonstall and his people, I would add that I am especially pleased to be in our host State of Massachusetts, the birthplace of much of the culture and progress of my own State of Kansas.

The Commonwealth I represent is a leader in agriculture, suggesting the topic I am about to discuss. Kansas, for example, grows more wheat than any other State. But at the same time, "hyacinths as well as biscuits have come to be essential to the Kansan's well-being." To an important degree this is true because of the influence of Massachusetts people in pioneer times.

When members of a New England emigrant aid society left Boston in 1854 to aid with the settlement of Kansas, they sang these lines from Whittier, which now appear beneath a painting in my office in Topeka:

"They crossed the prairie as of old
The Pilgrims crossed the sea
To make the West, as they the East,
The homestead of the free!"

The song expressed an ideal which these New Englanders put into practice through founding churches and schools, assuring the true freedom which lies in the spirit and in the mind. Yes; Kansas owes a debt of gratitude to Massachusetts for this early stimulation which helped lead to the best that is found in Kansas today.

Through her years of growth Kansas has also assimilated many progressive ideals and ideas from other States of the Union.

In the heart of America, Kansas has an especially advantageous position with regard to agriculture. She draws to her fertile land many of the varieties and types of products grown in the North and takes many from the South. She combines products of the East with those of the West. At the crossroads of the Nation Kansas is the melting pot of agricultural endeavor.

Speaking now, however, I am not concerned solely with Kansas but with the problems of all States with relation to preparedness and more especially with the place of agriculture in national defense.

If I seem to refer frequently to Kansas, it is because, obviously, I know most about Kansas, and because the Kansas viewpoint in agricultural matters is representative of the viewpoints of our other great farm States.

This is truly an inspiring conference. Here are represented the diversified resources of the richest country in the world. Here are found the varied interests of all sections of the Nation. What is more important, here is reflected the spirit of a people more free than any on earth—a people determined to maintain that freedom through unified action.

It was unity that held the Thirteen Original Colonies together. It was unity that made possible the vast expansion that resulted in the sisterhood of States which is ours today. Only through unity can we meet successfully the present crisis that confronts this Nation from abroad.

But no such unity can be achieved without a proper balance of agriculture and industry.

As a team, agriculture and industry can pull together effectively in the harness of preparedness. But if one holds back in the traces, speed and efficiency are sacrificed. In the resulting disharmony, all may be lost.

It is of vital importance now, as always, that the people of this country be adequately fed and clothed. America also calls upon agriculture for the food and the farm products necessary for defense. If we are to alleviate the sufferings and privations of the peoples in those democracies resisting aggression, they must have food and clothing, as well as weapons. Civilians, as well as soldiers, must be helped. Here again, America turns to her farmers for aid.

To understand the difficulty of adapting agriculture to changing conditions, it is necessary to realize that farming is still primarily a business of individualists. In our national agricultural plant there are many thousands of independent units, each with its own management. Programs designed to increase the output of these units—the farms of the United States—must appeal to the many, rather than to the few. On the other hand, in certain nonagricultural lines of industry, decisions made by a few men can and do determine production.

An increase or decrease in the production of automobiles, for example, can be brought about by the decisions of a few men. But a material increase in wheat production can be achieved only when our farmers, deciding upon the matter individually, cooperate to that end.

When a large share of industry decides to concentrate on the production of certain things—such as airplanes and munitions—the change can be made in a relatively swift manner. Many of the machines and tools of normal times can, when necessary, be converted to defense work. When required, new machines can be made and installed. Thousands of workers can quickly be adapted to change duties, and thousands of additional men can be trained speedily for industrial tasks.

Industry can undertake its contracts with the prospect of comparatively quick sales, carefully guarding against overproduction.

Agriculture, on the other hand, must look far in advance.

First, our farmers must be convinced of the necessity and desirability of stepping up their production. It should be remembered that the decision must be made by millions of individuals—not just a few men.

Second, it should be remembered that farmers can do little to hurry nature.

Farmers require at least a year, and usually longer, to increase hog production materially. With beef cattle it takes 2 to 4 years to bring about an important increase at the market. Raising dairy production requires almost as long.

The long period that must elapse before farmers can realize returns on new decisions make them cautious about changing their programs. For survival, farmers must be convinced that the need will not pass while they are working with, or waiting on, the processes of nature.

The farm labor supply must also be considered. Usually the work is done by the farmer and members of his family, with the occasional assistance of neighbors. For example, in Kansas, fewer than 50 percent of the farmers normally hire any labor. Even at a time like this most of the work will continue to be done by the farmer and his family for the reason that other labor is difficult to obtain.

Many of our young men have gone into military service or to industrial work connected with national defense. Some have gone from the farms, others from cities. This has decreased the natural labor supply of the farm. At the same time it has taken away many from the cities who would ordinarily be drawn into farm work on a temporary basis.

If our farmers increase their production greatly they risk being caught short. They risk a declining market. They risk having on their hands the necessary new implements required for great production. They risk undertaking a responsibility without assurance of adequate labor at a cost they can meet. All of these hazards are in addition to the chances farmers must always take with the elements.

Unwise expansion would be a stone around the neck of agriculture. Our farmers are therefore cautious about venturing too far. Their desire is an economic plane for agriculture comparable to that of industry. This is no selfish desire, for the economic balance of the United States, and the security of this Nation, depend upon its realization.

In April of this year, the Federal Government called upon American farmers to produce more pork, dairy products, eggs, and poultry. It takes corn to make pork. It takes feed to bring about an increase in poultry, eggs, and dairy products. This request of the Government can therefore be met only through a general stepping up of the farm program.

The Government proposes to buy pork, dairy products, eggs, and poultry on the open market to accumulate reserve supplies of food. It is announced that such supplies will be needed for transfer to the British and other friendly peoples under the provisions of the Lease Lend Act; for release upon the market in case of unwarranted speculative price increases; to meet requests from the Red Cross for shipment to war refugee areas; and for distribution to some of our own people through welfare channels. The need of such food for our own armed forces, and for the workers of industry, is also taken into account.

As an inducement to farmers to enter into such a program, the Government proposes to support long-term prices at these approximate levels: Hogs, 9 cents a pound; dairy products, based on butter at 31 cents a pound; chickens, 15 cents a pound; eggs, 22 cents a dozen. These prices are subject to the customary commercial differentials for market grades and qualities, existing price relationships, and seasonal-price variations.

As I understand it, these prices are not pegged. The Government only supports this level generally. Moreover, these prices do not represent fair exchange value to the producer. They are considerably less than parity.

What the farmer gets for his products is, of course, of importance only with respect to the prices he must pay for the things he must buy. If he is poorly paid for his products, his purchasing power is reduced. He can't buy the commodities of industry. A fair profit for agriculture means more money for industry, management, and labor.

There has been a great deal of misconception about benefit payments to farmers. These payments originated in an effort to help agriculture out of a depression which also affected industry. Measures had to be taken to insure a better national farm program—not just to help the farmers, but to help achieve an agricultural-industrial balance vital to all our citizens.

But this is only temporary assistance needed to help bridge an emergency. Benefit payments are not the final answer to agriculture's problems. The real answer is a proper balance of agriculture and industry. In the past our farmers too often have held the short end of the stick.

In these days of national-defense effort along industrial lines our agricultural States, especially in the Middle West, have shared too little in the industrial expansion. This raises a grave danger that agriculture will be thrown even further out of balance.

Most of the guns, airplanes, and munitions are being made in the already highly industrialized sections of the Nation. Agriculture is contributing important materials for these purposes, and will continue to do so. But as they are furnished, there is hope on the part of the farmers that more of these products will find use in industries located in agricultural States.

Every State has agricultural interests which could be vastly benefited by a proper decentralization of defense industries. There should be a more widespread distribution of industries within each State, as well as among the States of the Nation.

Since agriculture's great stronghold is in my own section of America, I should like to cite you the case of the Midwest with respect to the need for decentralization:

We know that elementary military strategy makes it imperative to place vital defense plants and supplies in safe sectors—and there are no safer places in the United States than in rural areas such as the Midwest.

We know that it is always desirable to have production close to the source of raw materials—and many of the raw materials of defense come from the Midwest.

Both for military and industrial purposes the products of agriculture have a variety of uses. From field corn, for example, can be produced more than 60 kinds of chemicals. From oats and barley vitamin tablets are made. Livestock means not only meat but leather, fats, and glue. Clothing from wool and cotton, linseed oil from flax, sugar from beets, and plastics from soybeans are all derived from agriculture. An endless variety of products essential to defense could be mentioned.

We know that uninterrupted production often depends upon loyal labor—and there are no more patriotic or intelligent workmen than those of the Midwest.

Our farmers are unable to understand why more people are being concentrated in congested areas when better living conditions for workers and their families exist in agricultural areas.

All of these things are vital factors in defense and in our national economy. A proper agricultural-industrial balance is of prime importance to every citizen.

If our great American family is to prosper, agriculture must not be forced into the position of living on crumbs from the bountiful table it helps spread. If industry goes forward, it must not be at the expense of "poor country cousins." If agriculture fares badly, it cannot support industry. Without the buying power of agriculture, industry would be poverty-stricken.

We also know that industry and labor must make fair profits in order to buy the products of agriculture. If industry and labor become poor, then everyone suffers. A well-balanced agricultural-industrial economy must therefore be our constant goal.

At no time since the World War, except for fleeting intervals, has the farmer enjoyed a parity with labor and industry. Industrial wages have gone up tremendously. If the farmer were paid in the same proportion, he would now be selling his wheat at $2 a bushel or more; his corn at about $1.50; his hogs at around $16. Instead, he is selling at approximately half those prices.

I hope that in presenting this realistic side of the agricultural situation I am not painting a picture too pessimistic. To do so would be unfair to the farmers of Kansas and to those of other States. I hope, too, that it will not be assumed that our farmers are unable or unwilling to assume their share of defense responsibilities.

Our farmers are willing. They are able. You can count on them. America can count on them.

Agriculture is mobilized. It is prepared. It was ready long before industry and it is keeping up to date.

Agriculture has proved its capacity, proved its ability. Back of it all lies a spirit of self-reliance and independence among our farm people that is America's strongest hope for the future. Whatever may occur, our farmers will stay on the job. They will not strike. With them patriotism comes first. They find in the freedom of America not excuses to abuse that freedom but reason to work for the preservation of their independence.

If the United States is the arsenal of democracy, then our Farm Belt is the great larder of democracy. The American farmer is today, as always, our source of life-giving food. In this critical hour he is vital to our national defense, and the principal source of encouragement to millions across the seas.

In the forefront of our military preparedness are the boys in uniform—and many of these have gone out from the farm. Working with them in this era of mechanized defense are those at the machines of industry. Back of them all is our patriotic army of farmers—men in overalls who find their service on the land that gives life to us all.

Without this army of farmers there could be no air fleet to spread protecting wings over America, no ships to guard against invasion by sea, no military or industrial defense of any kind.

Farming is not a dramatic business. We read daily of the exciting race for industrial supremacy—of how bombing planes are rushed through the assembly lines, of how the fires of industry glow day and night for the defense of America. We are proud of these miracles of industrial achievement, and of the men behind the miracles. But it is food and the products of agriculture that make these things possible.

You won't find much romance in plowing corn. There are no dramatics in combining wheat. It is not exciting to feed pigs or to pitch hay. But today these prosaic acts are the things that count.

Today our farmers are playing almost as vital a role as those who left their fields and took up muskets to defend their liberty at Concord and Lexington.

In this crisis agriculture faces its greatest responsibility. In the end it will be the steady hand of the farmer on his plow that will guide America safely to her destiny.

Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF KARL M. LeCOMPTE, OF IOWA

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a short address I gave recently over radio station WINX as a part of the Iowa Salute program:

Mr. Chairman, a distinguished Iowan once said, "in all that is great and good, Iowa affords the best." This statement is so very self-evident that scarcely any elaboration is necessary. Situated in the center of the richest agricultural region in the world, Iowa has more than 25 percent of all of the grade A 1 crop-producing soil of the country. Naturally, we are not surprised to discover that Iowa ranks first in the production of corn—that great product of the Plains States.

First again is our State in oats. Naturally it follows that the Hawkeye State is first in hogs, horses, and poultry, and yields only to Texas in the production of beef cattle, and indeed we are closely pressing even Texas in total value of cattle marketed annually. It has come to be axiomatic that the choicest prime corn-fed beef comes from the Iowa feed lots. Thousands of head of cattle from the ranges are brought into our State annually to be finished before shipment to the eastern and central markets.

The great Iowa hen annually produces more wealth than all the gold and silver mines of the Pacific coast States. In recent years the marketing of turkeys has reached colossal proportions. Many farms market twelve to fifteen thousand birds per year, while the high mark for one turkey raiser may reach fifty or sixty thousand. Iowa has never been considered a wool- and sheep-producing State of the first rank, yet late statistics from the Department of Agriculture show that the State sends annually to market nearly a million and a quarter head of sheep and lambs for a total value of nearly $10,000,000, and 10,000,000 pounds of wool.

Iowa's permanent place in the field of agriculture is not seriously challenged. We furnish one-tenth of the country's food supply. Our products normally go to every important market of the globe, and invariably attract the top prices.

Easily 95 percent of the State is tillable. Certainly no other State has so very little waste land.

While the per capita wealth for the entire country, according to latest figures, appears to be something like $2,685, it is notable that the same authority gives the per capita wealth of the Hawkeye State at somewhere in the neighborhood of twice the average for the United States, or $4,322 for every man, woman, and child. Iowa is known as the richest field for the auto salesman or the manufacturer of modern equipment of all kinds. In fact, motor vehicles owned within the State could transport the entire population to distant points between sunrise and sunset without any strain upon the carriers or the highways.

But the greatest contribution is the character of the young folks. In every emergency Iowa youth has come forward to the aid of the Republic. Iowa boys poured out their blood for liberty on every battlefield from Palo Alto to the forest of the Argonne. Right now thousands of Iowa boys are in training in the gallant Army this country has assembled for defense purposes—if the defense of our Nation becomes necessary.

In the organization of the great American Legion, Iowa men took a leading part, and it has become traditional that "Iowa leads the Legion."

At the National Capital, Iowa men and women stand high in the councils and administration of the Government, and throughout the length and breadth of the land Iowa supplies leadership in industry, education, art, labor, religion, finance, and even in the field of sports Iowa men hold top rank. Perhaps at this moment followers of baseball from Maine to California marvel at the achievements of an Iowa farm boy—the great Bob Feller, who has already won 16 games in the American League this current season. But he stands ready to report to an Army camp whenever his name may be called.

Iowa came to statehood in 1846, only 14 years before the outbreak of the Civil War, or the War between the States, as our beloved friends of the old South prefer to designate the late unpleasantness. The State was still sparsely settled, yet nearly a hundred thousand men responded to the call. Again in 1898 Iowa gave her full share and more, and in the World War the Iowa boys responded from every city, town, village, and rural community. And the folks at home oversubscribed every Liberty bond drive, every Red Cross campaign, and every Y. M. C. A. effort. Iowa citizens came forward promptly and oversubscribed without any questions.

From the days of the earliest pioneers to the present moment education has been emphasized and educational facilities have been provided from the single-room country school to the magnificent State University at Iowa City. In Grinnell College the State has perhaps the oldest institution of higher learning west of the Mississippi River, and it is recognized as one educational institution whose importance is measured not in large enrollments but rather in scholastic attainments. The Iowa State College at Ames is by all odds the first and foremost agricultural college in the United States. Elsewhere there are 25 or more outstanding colleges and universities. In addition there are top-ranking grade schools, academies, high schools, and junior colleges in every county in the State. This program over a long period of years reflects itself in the very notable fact that Iowa has the lowest percent of illiteracy in the entire Union. This is not a mere accident. It was not achieved in a day. It is the result of the long-range program of education laid down by the pioneers a century and more ago and supported cheerfully by taxpayers and public-spirited citizens over a long period of time.

The region that comprises the Commonwealth of Iowa became a part of this Republic through the Louisiana Purchase by President Thomas Jefferson, and Iowa became the first free daughter or free State carved out of the Louisiana Purchase territory. The country was explored by the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and one member of this courageous band (Sergeant Floyd) is buried in northwest Iowa. His grave is appropriately marked.

In the first engagement, or the first battle of the World War in 1917, Merle Hay, of Glidden, Iowa, was one of five boys who made the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields of France.

Less than 2 weeks ago the O–9, an American submarine, was lost off the New Hampshire coast, and Comdr. Howard Abbott, of Osceola, Iowa, and his 32 companions, true heroes, true defenders, are entombed at their posts where they died in line of duty.

Iowa boys are first in every war and always the last to leave the field of battle.

Nor must we overlook the industrial products of Iowa. Her mills and factories put out annually upward of $1,000,000,000 worth of manufactured products. The State has valuable mineral deposits of coal, gypsum, lead, and limestone, and these are only partly developed. A magnificent road system, as well as thousands of miles of railways, connect every town and city with one another and with the metropolitan areas.

The great State was named by the American Indians "Iowa," meaning "beautiful land." Between the Mississippi and the Missouri, Iowa is held in the strong embrace of two mighty rivers. May heaven bless her and her devoted and patriotic citizens. Her affection, like the rivers of her borders, flows on to an inseparable union. The motto on the great seal, "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain," is the watch word and the keynote as we point with pride to our glorious history and look with confidence to the future greatness of our Commonwealth and to the security of this Nation.

Dedication of Federal Building at Columbia, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WIRT COURTNEY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ADDRESS OF JUDGE WALTER E. KELLEY, AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF HON. WIRT COURTNEY, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of Hon. Walter E. Kelley, delivered recently at the dedication of the new Federal Court and Post Office Building at Columbia, Tenn., in my district, and the introductory remarks I made at the time:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, I am happy to escape from the stress of official duties in Washington for this brief visit to my district, Maury County, and Columbia. Before making the brief observations that I intend to make pertinent to this happy occasion, it occurs to me that you would like a short first-hand report on national and international affairs in which we are all so deeply concerned.

Until very recently, and for many months, some of us in Washington have fretted and been greatly disturbed over the inadequate aid that we are giving the embattled democracies of the world for their defense and, what in the last analysis is for our own necessary self-defense.

We have promised aid to China but that has been largely on paper and of little material benefit. At the same time we have been permitting shipments of war materials to go to Japan for cruel use against the very people we are pledged to help. Such a policy, in case of any nation with less patience and stoicism than the Chinese, would have turned friendship for us to hatred.

Our promised aid to Greece in her heroic resistance did not materialize and our country cannot escape some responsibility for the present plight of Greece.

As the vaunted arsenal to Great Britain, the munitions and supplies that have trickled

through were meager, totally inadequate, and wholly unworthy of our capabilities.

Much of this inefficiency and ineffectiveness was due to strikes in our defense industries throughout the country and to the weak policy of the Labor Department as administered by its present Secretary, Madam Perkins, who is totally miscast for her part in this time of peril and emergency.

I am happy to say, however, that within the past 10 days or so, the national labor situation has greatly clarified. The speeding up of appropriate legislation in Congress and the determined action by our President and Commander in Chief, spell, in my opinion, the end of strikes in defense industries during the emergency.

A few patriotic labor leaders, too, have set about vigorously to uproot the radical elements in the unions, and I believe that from here out we will show a solid front in this country and amaze the world at our mass production of war materials and the insurance of its delivery to the place where it is most needed. I even have a faint hope for the resignation of Madam Perkins, a consummation devoutly to be desired.

Our airplane production is now up to about 1,500 a month and steadily growing. Twenty-seven shiploads of war materials are on the high seas bound for the British front in the latest theater of war. Steps are being taken to give real help to the Chinese and to cut off war supplies to Japan, and all in all I report to you that hope, faith, and determination purple the east and a spirit of optimism pervades your Capital City.

It is refreshing now to turn from the tragic horror of war to the dedication of this building, for which purpose we are gathered today. As we stand here in this peaceful city, the misty haze of the quiet hills about us, the bluegrass carpeting the good, productive earth as far as the eye can see, unscarred by bomb hole or crater, it is difficult to realize that across the seas the world runs with blood as millions of men seek to maim and wound and kill their fellows. As we consecrate this building for the lofty purposes for which it is intended, let us reconsecrate ourselves to our country and to our common purpose of keeping the peace we now enjoy under God, but further to the firm resolution of helping with every power at our command the democracies of the world that now struggle almost on their knees for the things we so lightly enjoy—liberty, freedom of speech and press and action, and freedom to worship our Creator as our own hearts and consciences dictate and command.

Permit me now to congratulate this county and city, its chamber of commerce, and its many tireless civic leaders at this consummation of a dream of many years, the dedication of this beautiful Federal courthouse and post-office building.

I wish I could claim some credit for the appropriation, but, as you know, the project was authorized by reason of the determined insistence of Senator McKELLAR and my distinguished predecessor, Judge Clarence W. Turner.

Senator McKELLAR'S state of health prevents him from being here today, although I am happy to say he has convalesced from a serious operation and is back at his desk in Washington. Through me he sends you his heartiest congratulations and best wishes. Senator STEWART expected to come, but was detained by official duties. I am sure that Judge Turner, from his present abode yonder between that last opening in the hills and beyond the last horizon's rim, looks down on us today and is happy to see the full fruition of his efforts. This project was authorized by an act of August 25, 1937. The amount allotted was $398,000. When the contract was awarded to the nationally known firm of Henke Construction Co., of Chicago, a prompt and well-done job was assured. Work began February 28, 1940. The cornerstone was laid on April 1, 1940, and the building completed May 20, 1941.

You have here now a building of rare beauty and dignity, unexcelled in the South. Not a building of stone that would crumble perhaps in half a century, but of eternal marble that generation after generation, down the corridor of time, will wonder at and admire.

We dedicate this building today to the purposes of service, truth, justice, and freedom, the foundation upon which our common country rests. We dedicate it to the living and to the memory of those good men and true long departed who have made our country the citadel of freedom and liberty that it is. We dedicate it in the full belief that those yet unborn will preserve, protect, and defend the country that it represents with their blood and lives if need be. We dedicate it in the belief that the service rendered and the judgments passed within its confines will reflect always the true ideals of America, the land that we love.

On behalf of the people of my district I want to extend sincere thanks to our distinguished guest, who will now address you, for his presence here today.

His career should be an inspiration to every young man. Coming to Washington in his youth as a stenographer, he found time to attend George Washington University and the Georgetown School of Law, where he received his degree. Attached to the legal department of the Post Office in 1914, his advance has been rapid until he is now first assistant to the Solicitor and Acting Solicitor for the Department, in which capacities he has the confidence and esteem of all official Washington. I am happy to introduce to you Judge W. E. Kelley.

REMARKS OF WALTER E. KELLY, ASSISTANT TO THE SOLICITOR, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, UPON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW FEDERAL BUILDING AT COLUMBIA, TENN., ON JUNE 17, 1941

I hardly need to assure you that the present Postmaster General is no less interested in the completion and dedication of this new Federal building than his predecessor, Mr. Farley, who was here upon the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone. Due to the rapidity with which events are taking place in the field of government, it has not been feasible for Mr. Walker to be with you today. It is indeed a privilege for me to represent the Post Office Department upon this occasion, as it affords the rare opportunity to greet the public which will be served by this new structure and likewise to meet members of the postal personnel which carry on in the field the real work of the Postal Service with such efficiency.

While designed chiefly for use as a post office and as a Federal courthouse, within the walls of this building other activities of the United States will have offices. It may thus well be regarded as a symbol of the entire Federal Government. Although I am of the legal profession, it is fitting on this occasion that I speak to you for the most part upon the subject of the Postal Service. I observe from the program that later in the day there are to be special exercises in connection with the dedication of the Federal courtroom. We can all appreciate the individual viewpoint of the man who said, "I care not who writes the nation's laws if I may write its songs." Yet we all realize that the nature of laws that are enacted, and the manner in which they are administered, greatly affect the product of the song writer and also have much to do with the creation of a spirit essential to the singers. And while on this subject may I not digress a bit further to say that it appears to be not without significance that so many of our enduring songs have their setting in the South. There come to my mind My Old Kentucky Home, Carry Me Back to Old Virginny, Swanee River, and Dixie. I heartily second the thought expressed in the course of the remarks of Reverend Cantrell urging adherence to the true values of life. I think it was John Powys who asserted that more than half the misery in the world springs from stupidly placed values.

It is fitting on an occasion of this kind that I speak to you upon the subject of the United States Postal Service; and just what is the Postal Service in the minds of the American people? We all have, no doubt, a more or less definite idea of the Postal Service. However, I rather think that emphasis is laid by some on particular functions of the Postal Service. Thus, for business men and women the use of the Postal Service as an aid to their business looms large; the housewife is probably more impressed with the usefulness of the Service in social contacts; the man with a postal-savings account values most that facility; and then we must not forget the philatelist who gets much pleasure from his stamp collection. The best universal conception of it, in my opinion, appears above the portals of the City Post Office Building in Washington. There chiseled in the enduring stone is an inscription, the product of two of the best minds known to American history—a great scholar and statesman bearing the name of Woodrow Wilson and a great educator, former President Eliot, of Harvard University, collaborated in a sublime eulogistic description of the Postal Service in these words:

> Carrier of news and knowledge,
> Instrument of trade and industry,
> Promoter of mutual acquaintance
> Of peace and good will
> Among men and nations.
> Messenger of sympathy and love,
> Servant of parted friends,
> Consoler of the lonely,
> Bond of the scattered family,
> Enlarger of the common life.

Perhaps you will agree that the splendor of this sentiment lies in the fact that it recognizes the Postal Service, not only in the commonplaces of life, trade, and commerce, but as having a vital bearing upon the things of the spirit. Love, sympathy, fellowship, peace, and good will, enlargement of the common life, are all spiritual factors associated with our Postal Service.

It is no wonder that those two great scholars, Wilson and Eliot, whose keen intellects penetrated things earthy and spiritual with the efficiency of a surgeon's knife, found inspiration and insight to write this tribute to the Postal Service. Think how many heartthrobs there are in the nearly 26,000,000,000 pieces of mail that pass through the post office in each year. There is nothing else on earth so vibrant with all phases of life as this flood of correspondence. In the never-ending stream of letters that flows through our post offices there is encountered all the promptings of the human spirit that make for better or for worse; every emotion that thrills or stills the human heart.

Should we not, then, occasionally give thought to the words of Woodrow Wilson and President Eliot for the discernment and the truth reflected in them. Indeed, it would be well if we could have that legend above the portals of every post office under the American flag. It would stand as a perpetual reminder that the Postal Service is not only our largest business institution but our largest human institution.

The Eliot-Wilson description was written a generation ago, since which time the Postal Service has taken on numerous other activities. Indeed, it has become a sort of general factotum for the Federal Government. To name but a few instances, you will recall that it was through the Postal Service that the adjusted-service bonds were distributed and paid a few years ago. The most recent

extra-postal function was the fingerprinting of all aliens. At the time the Social Security Board began to function the Postal Service was entrusted with the work of distributing the cards and subsequently assembling the data on the cards. It may not be amiss to express my personal opinion that in the years to come the results of the Social Security Act and of the act regulating the sale and exchange of securities will throw more luster upon the present administration than will some of its more spectacular achievements.

As Congressman COURTNEY advised you, one of the functions of the office to which I am attached is to prepare reports setting forth the views of the Post Office Department upon proposed legislation which would affect it. The day before I started down here there came to my desk, by reference from the White House, a letter from a woman lauding the Postal Service and endorsing certain proposed legislation in the interest of postal employees. Although the communication was evidently from an intelligent woman, a sentence in it was slightly perplexing. She reported that recently a fire broke out in the basement of a neighbor's house and she dashed out to get assistance but the only man in sight was a letter carrier on his daily rounds. She stated that the carrier responded to her call and "distinguished the fire." I could not be certain whether she meant that the carrier had distinguished himself or extinguished the fire. Perhaps a newspaperman would say that the writer correctly stated the facts upon the theory that when a postman puts out a fire that fire is thereby distinguished from all other fires, thus affording a striking headline. But I only mention this incident as one illustration of how public servants, whether they be letter carriers, firemen, or policemen, do not in emergencies adhere to the strict metes and bounds of their jobs.

Perhaps you will not mind if I read you some details of postal history. As you know, our post office had its origin in colonial times. As early as 1639 a postmaster was appointed at Boston. The first post road was established in 1672—running between Boston and New York. In 1691, steps were taken for a unified postal system for all the colonies, under a postmaster general appointed by the British Crown. In the years before the Revolution, the system was gradually extended and improved. Post routes with regular schedules were established in all the colonies and mail boats were placed in service between American ports and the West Indies. In 1753 Benjamin Franklin was appointed Postmaster General. In 1774, just before the Revolution, he was dismissed by King George for insubordination, but when he left office, post roads were running from Maine to Florida, and from New York to Canada, and the mail was being carried to and from the British Isles on a monthly schedule.

Franklin well understood the value of an enlightened public opinion, and under his administration newspapers and pamphlets were carried in the mails free or at low rates of postage. The post office of his day was a tremendous factor in breaking down the isolation of the separate colonies, and it had a great deal to do with the creation of national sentiment leading to the Revolutionary War.

At the time of Washington's inauguration there were post offices in only 75 towns, and the mails were carried by post riders over 1,785 miles of post roads, consisting of one principal route along the seaboard and a number of cross, or feeder, routes servicing the inland towns. There were no envelopes and no postage stamps in those days. The sheet or sheets of a letter were folded and sealed and addressed on the back. Shortly after the Parcel Post System was established an attorney conceived the idea of making some money in the way of penalties by instituting a suit against an express company based on a violation of the law which gives the Post Office Department a monopoly over the carriage of "letters and packets." The attorney jumped to the conclusion that "packets" was synonymous with "packages." However, as the court pointed out in deciding the case, at the time the so-called private express statutes were adopted a letter composed of but one sheet was called a single letter, one of two sheets a double letter, one of three sheets a triple letter, and one that contained four or more sheets was designated a "packet." Thus all the attorney derived from the case was a lesson in history. Postage was paid in cash, the rate varying from 6 cents a sheet for distances not over 30 miles to 25 cents a sheet for distances greater than 450 miles. Franklin's policy of according low postage rates to newspapers still remained in effect, and during Washington's administration these were carried at 1 cent each, or a cent and a half, according to distance.

The efficiency and usefulness of the Postal Service was greatly increased under our early Presidents. Before the close of Washington's second administration, the number of post offices, the mileage of post roads, and the volume of the mails had all increased fivefold, and 15 years after Washington's death there were 3,000 post offices in the United States, the mails were carried over almost 50,000 miles of post roads, and there was scheduled mail service between the centers of population and all the new settlements which were springing up in the inland territory. Newspapers and pamphlets from the eastern cities were freely circulated in the West. Pioneers in the wilderness exchanged letters with their friends and relatives at the seaboard. Commercial and social intercourse was maintained among all sections of the rapidly growing country. The Post Office Department was a factor second to none in the settlement and development of our Nation during the period before the Civil War.

The post office of those times did not function alone in the matter of providing a communication service. It was through the post office that we laid the foundations of our national transportation system. First the stage coaches, and later the railroads and steamship lines, received contracts from the Post Office Department based nominally upon the expeditious handling of the mails, which had as their real object the creation of transportation facilities which were essential to our commercial development. Just before the Civil War, for instance, the Government was occupied in encouraging the settlement of our Pacific coast territory, and in those years a large part of the total postal expenditures was paid out on mail contracts covering ocean and overland services to California and other far-western States. In the year 1859, the Post Office Department spent $2,700,000 to provide mail service for the 650,000 people then living in the States of California and Oregon and the Territories of Utah and Washington, as against $12,300,000 expended to furnish postal facilities for the 30,000,000 people residing in the rest of the Union. It is not to be supposed, however, that this was in reality an expenditure for postal purposes. More than a million dollars was paid in 1859 to steamship companies and an equal sum to stage lines for carrying the Pacific and overland mails. The main purpose of these payments was to provide a transportation service which would accelerate colonization.

The fundamental objects were not postal—they were of much broader scope. They included the spread of our population, the extension of our commerce, and the development of our national resources. The post office was not in this instance functioning simply as a system for the transmission of private correspondence. In that period it was the great pioneering agent of civilization and progress. It functioned as the patron of trade and industry and labor to build up our great country and to lay a foundation for the security and prosperity of its future generations.

For 60 years after the adoption of the Constitution postage charges were paid in cash by the mail users. Stamps were first provided in 1847, for the greater convenience of patrons in mailing their letters and newspapers. Stamped envelopes were introduced 6 years later—in 1853. The registered-mail service was established in 1855. Railway postal cars for the distribution of letters while in transit were first used in 1863. As you will realize, this was a tremendous improvement in the Postal Service, permitting as it did the arrival at destination of pouches of mail ready for handling by a letter carrier assigned to a particular route.

Free delivery in the cities was authorized in 1863, and the money-order system was inaugurated a year later. Postal cards were introduced in 1873 and special delivery in 1885. These added facilities illustrate the policy which has always been pursued by our Government not only to employ the post office as an aid to the development of new territory and new national resources but constantly to increase the scope of its usefulness to the people in every community.

Four outstanding additions to our postal facilities have been made within comparatively recent years. Rural Free Delivery was inaugurated on an experimental basis in 1896, and by 1907 was in full operation in all parts of the country. My first assignment in the Post Office Department was in the Division of Rural Mails, and I was naturally interested to ascertain that the countryside about Columbia is served by 7 rural routes. Letter carriers now bring to 25,000,000 people in our farms practically the same house-to-house service which is available to those who live in the great cities. In 1911 the Postal Savings System was founded, and the post office of today is the depository of savings belonging to more than 2,000,000 people and aggregating more than $1,316,000,000.

The year 1913 saw the establisnment of the parcel post, largely for the benefit of the farmers and those who reside in small places not reached by railroads or express service. By weight and volume, parcel post now constitutes almost three-fifths of all the mail which the post office handles. The last important addition to postal facilities was the Air Mail System, which had its beginning in 1918, and at the present time embraces routes aggregating over 42,000 miles in length. Mails are now flown every month more than 6,000,000 miles.

There you have the background of the Postal Service, and, based upon 26 years of experience with that Service, it is my considered judgment that the Postal Service has reached its highest peak of efficiency.

In closing I wish to congratulate the committee responsible for the excellent arrangements for these exercises, and to express the hope that you will greatly enjoy the opportunity of using your fine, new building.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE IOWA PRESS WOMEN

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Iowa Press Women:

Whereas the women of the United States stand primarily for peace, but are nevertheless willing to share burdens of a war crisis: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we as members of the Iowa Press Women, in convention assembled June 21, 1941, at Ames, Iowa, proffer our services in bringing about full voluntary cooperation of women in all plans for national defense; that we urge every woman to volunteer her skill and her unusual abilities in preserving democracy to the Government of her country before an official drafting of such capacities be established.

ELLA C. TAYLOR,
of Traer, Chairman.
ALICE C. WEITZ,
of Des Moines.
ESTHER BELLE MACGUGIN,
of Ames.

Amendment: We believe an official draft of women both unwise and unnecessary.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 1, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE BUFFALO COURIER-EXPRESS AND THE BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, during the testimony at the hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway project before the Rivers and Harbors Committee last week, the opponents of the project presented some forceful and salient facts. The second witness to testify against the construction of this seaway was Chauncey J. Hamlin, of Buffalo. Mr. Hamlin is chairman of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board, and it was at his direction that this Board last year made a very comprehensive survey and report on this proposed waterway. Mr. Hamlin is a man of wide travel and interests, and among them he is president of the Buffalo Museum of Science, and chairman of the Niagara Frontier Committee for the Defense of America by Aid to the Allies.

Two editorials on his testimony have since appeared with reference to his testimony concerning the Canadian attitude toward the building of this seaway—one in the Buffalo Courier-Express, and one in the Buffalo Evening News—and under permission to extend my remarks, I include both of those articles. They follow:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of June 27, 1941]

SEAWAY BLACKJACK

The charge by Chauncey J. Hamlin before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee that the Roosevelt administration blackjacked Canada into the St. Lawrence project agreement evoked expressions of horror. One committee member interpreted it as an accusation that "the United States is playing traitor to a friendly nation," and another assiduously but unsuccessfully tried to make Mr. Hamlin weaken his statement.

It is to Mr. Hamlin's credit that he refused to be badgered out of his original charge, for his indictment has plenty of substantiation. The "traitor" interpretation is patently a silly twisting of what the witness actually said, for he merely pointed out that Canada has been forced to enter into the agreement because of her wartime position.

Committee Member CULKIN, of Oswego, who is perhaps the leading congressional advocate of the project, himself recalled that Premier Hepburn, of Ontario, several years ago was a strong seaway opponent. Then Mr. CULKIN read from a recent Hepburn speech in which the Premier approved the project.

The seaway carries no more economic promise today than it did when Premier Hepburn opposed it. The hydroelectric power phase of the project presents another question, for it does appear that the United States and Canada do need more electric energy for defense industries. Mr. Hepburn's overnight switch on the project, then, may be due to two factors, the need of electric power in his Province and the need of "playing ball" with the Roosevelt administration. Clearly, the seaway is extraneous to the power phase, except that Mr. Roosevelt wants the seaway. So as demonstrated by the Hepburn attitude, the Dominion has been forced into acceptance of the seaway to get its power.

Not only did the Hamlin testimony apprise the committee of the unfortunate position in which the Dominion has found itself. Mr. Hamlin also, by indirection, answered the harpings of certain seaway proponents, principally Maurice P. Davidson, of the New York State Power Authority. Mr. Davidson, pro-project spokesman No. 1 in New York State, has continued to accuse the Niagara Frontier Planning Board of representing selfish power utility interests by its opposition to the project.

Mr. Hamlin, as chairman of the planning board, told the House committee that the board did not oppose a public power development on the St. Lawrence. The board's opposition is and has been directed at the seaway portion of the proposed river development. He added that he would be sympathetic to the power plan alone "if it can be worked out equitably with Canada."

The Hamlin testimony should bear weight with the Congressmen as a recital of how the administration has illogically refused to divorce the seaway and power plans, and by virtue of its refusal to separate them, has used the power needs as a lever to pry acceptance of the whole scheme out of Canada's administration.

[From the Buffalo Evening News]

CANADA SILENT

Proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway professed to be outraged at the suggestion advanced by Chauncey J. Hamlin of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board that the government of Canada had assented to the project under duress—that the administration had pressed it on the Dominion more or less in terms of her obligation to the United States in relation to her war effort. They point to recent endorsements by Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King and by Premier Mitchell F. Hepburn, of Ontario, who formerly strongly opposed the project, as evidence that opinion in Canada is for the undertaking. But there is evidence that the Dominion regards it with strong misgivings.

Said the Montreal Star, some time after Canada's entrance into the war:

"It has been advanced again and again as a strong reason why Canada should embark upon this huge and expensive project that it would be a friendly gesture to the United States. The Montreal Star yields place to no one in its attitude of the supreme importance of maintaining the friendliest relations with the United States of America—but not at the expense of yielding any part of our national heritage. * * * It is difficult indeed to understand on what economic grounds any Canadian Government would venture upon an undertaking which would involve this nation in colossal expenditure without any compensating feature in sight."

One may believe that the opinion expressed by the Montreal Star, when it felt free to discuss the matter, is widely held in the Dominion. The people of Canada hold President Roosevelt in high esteem for his aid to the Dominion and Great Britain in their war efforts. Knowing that he is strongly committed to the project, one which he now urges in terms of continental defense, they refrain from any criticism of it while it is under review by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in Washington. But it is entirely proper for Americans familiar with opinion in Canada to discuss reactions there in such terms as Mr. Hamlin employed. It is proper, too, for them to discuss the method adopted by the administration, which ignores the treaty order formerly observed with respect to engagements with the Dominion, and to criticize the timing of the legislation, when Britain desperately needs more aid. In the circumstances the procedure is not altogether seemly.

Farm Cooperatives' Stake in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CLAUDE R. WICKARD

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard before a meeting of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Syracuse, N. Y., Thursday, June 19, 1941:

I welcome this opportunity of attending your annual meeting. In a world overflowing with hate and intolerance, we still are able to speak freely and frankly to one another. A meeting such as you are holding today is possible only in a democracy.

It is significant also that this meeting is under the auspices of a cooperative organization. True cooperative organizations don't do very well under the dictators. Almost without exceptions, cooperatives have been most successful in the democracies. Students of the cooperative movement are wasting time if they go to Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy.

In this country public opinion favors cooperatives and the law of the land gives them preferential treatment. As Secretary of Agriculture, it is my duty to favor true farmer cooperatives.

For me, it is a very pleasant duty. I have helped organize and operate at least two farmer cooperatives. They were comparatively small ones back in Indiana, but they have been very successful financially, and have served their members and the public interest well.

Today in the United States, some 3,000,000 members belong to about 10,700 agricultural marketing and purchasing cooperatives. My experience with the Indiana cooperatives

taught me that a successful cooperative means more than talking about the blessings of cooperation. It means work, hard work, and unselfish work. It means democracy on a practical basis.

Nowadays, I have more regard for farmer cooperatives than I used to have. This is not because I ever had a poor opinion of cooperatives. Quite the contrary. It is because I have a good deal more appreciation of all things democratic than I once had. In common with millions of other Americans I have always taken democracy for granted. Lately, I have realized that the blessings of democracy are privileges, not rights, and that these privileges must be guarded carefully if we do not wish to lose them.

The cooperative movement is a democratic movement and it has the weaknesses and strengths of democracy. Like other democratic institutions, the cooperative movement changes with the times. For example, the activities of cooperatives operating in certain fields have been altered by the bringing of public powers, such as the milk-marketing agreements, into this field. This in no way diminishes the need for true cooperatives. It simply gives the cooperatives new responsibilities.

In our democracy there will always be a place for voluntary group action. This place cannot be filled by individual action or by Government action.

The public interest is served when Government agencies and farmer agencies work together. Working hand in hand, the two supplement each other. Here in the New York milkshed, cooperatives were the spearhead for the agreement which enabled the stabilization of the milk market. Producers throughout the milkshed have shared in the gains from this program.

Every so often a democracy has to make certain that it is still a democracy. This test is a simple one—do the people still rule? And every so often, a cooperative has to make certain that it is still a cooperative. This test also is a simple one—do the members rule?

Finally, a cooperative, like a democracy, must meet the most important test of all: Is it in the public interest? Does it really serve its members and, through them, the general public? If a cooperative serves its members well, it is almost certain to serve the public interest well.

I sincerely hope to see the cooperative movement greatly strengthened in the years to come. For the cooperative movement flourishes with democracy, and it can help to keep democracy vital and dynamic. The cooperative movement in the United States is still young. It is still growing It has almost unlimited potentialities. But we might as well recognize that its future, like the future of so many of the institutions we love, is bound up with the future of democracy.

Today this country is deeply involved in the struggle to defend democracy. Some of this struggle is dramatic and spectacular. There are battles at sea like the engagement between the *Hood* and the *Bismarck;* the fight that followed the air-borne invasion of the island of Crete; fights on land, fights on the sea, and fights in the sky. But the greater part of this struggle is not fighting but work, hard work. It is nothing more spectacular than the digging of coal, the forging of steel, the building of ships, and the raising of crops.

The American farmer has a vital part in this struggle to defend democracy, a place that is likely to prove decisive, just as it proved decisive in the first World War.

Today Great Britain is even more dependent upon us for foods than she was during the days of 1917 and 1918. Then the French and Japanese Fleets helped with the task of keeping the sea lanes clear, the airplane was not a major menace to shipping, and England had access to much of the food supply of continental Europe. All this has changed now.

The British demand developed much more slowly than the demand during the first World War. It developed so slowly, in fact, that some persons only a few months ago felt it wouldn't develop at all. Then we began to hear that the British might need some of our pork, cheese, eggs, and other foods. They did need them, and in a hurry, too.

This development didn't catch the Department of Agriculture altogether unprepared. Early in April the Department announced that it would support minimum prices for hogs, dairy products, and poultry products. We wanted increased production, and that means making it profitable for farmers to produce more. At the time we made the announcement funds from the lease-lend bill were not available. But we anticipated events. In addition to the increased production, the Department wanted farmers to get the benefit of any price increases which would come eventually from British buying. Farmers have received the benefits of the rise in prices and it has meant millions of dollars to them, dollars that otherwise would have gone to processors or speculators.

And farmers have responded to the appeal to produce more. The production of dairy products, chickens, and eggs has increased over the corresponding levels for 1940. We also are going to have a larger supply of pork than we looked for early last spring.

But, so far as dairy products are concerned, our worry still is the worry of getting enough. Recently milk production has been about 5 percent higher than the corresponding period last year, and it would have been still higher had it not been for the spring drought. Even so, the British need all the dairy products we can furnish them—and more, too.

In particular, they want cheese. Not long ago I requested the American people to cut down on the consumption of cheese in order to supply the British needs. Some of the responses to this request were encouraging and gratifying; other responses somewhat disappointing.

Some people seemed to feel that we were picking on the cheese industry. It's just the other way round. As a nation the British realize the value of cheese better than we do. They know there is no better food, and if ever a nation needed good food at the present time, it is the British. They have taken a terrible beating and they have made real sacrifices. The British are not asking for luxuries. They are asking for necessities. They must have food—American food—to carry on the fight against Hitler.

I asked the people to reduce cheese consumption after a careful survey of the entire situation. Because of the feed reserves stored in the ever-normal granary we can produce food more quickly and more abundantly than we could during the first World War. Yet British requirements have been higher than we anticipated and the weather has been against us. For the next few weeks or months we are not going to produce enough dairy products to supply the minimum needs of Great Britain and our present rate of consumption. We'll produce almost enough, but not quite enough.

The British want cheese first of all. They eat a good deal more cheese per capita than Americans do. Of course, we could reduce our consumption of milk in other forms, but taking American food habits into account, that would be worse than giving up cheese. When I suggested a reduction in cheese consumption I tried to make it plain that we wanted our people to reduce consumption of cheese only in cases where substitutes are readily available. If a family, for example, relies upon cheese for proteins and does not have enough income to substitute meat, let that family continue to eat all the cheese it wants. But reducing our consumption of cheese won't hurt the average American. I think I know what I am talking about, for I like cheese very much, and I eat quite a bit more than the average person.

Cheese production may soon increase to the point where we'll have enough for ourselves and Great Britain, too. The Department will do everything possible to get this increased production. And once we have enough cheese the Department will do all that it can to increase the consumption of cheese in the United States. In the past we've done this, for cheese is one of our very best foods.

I am hopeful that this discussion about cheese will have a real advertising value for the product and that it will call the attention of our own people to the value of this vital food.

The majority of our people are willing, I am sure, to cut down on the consumption of cheese and to make any other sacrifices needed to help defeat Hitler. Just a day or two ago I talked to a delegation of Wisconsin Congressmen about the cheese situation. The discussion rambled a bit and got off onto the tariff and the Democratic and Republican Parties. But after the conference was over I felt that we understood each other's viewpoint a good deal better. Naturally, the Wisconsin Congressmen wanted to protect the cheese industry; and since I wanted to protect it, too, there was complete agreement on this point. Yet during the conference I heard nothing to change my conviction that we are going to have to cut down on our cheese consumption for a while if we are to supply the minimum requirements of Great Britain.

Your own section here is one of the great dairy centers. I am certain that you will be glad to produce more cheese and to eat less—if you feel that thereby you will be helping England.

This country has made up its mind about help to England. We are going to help her with all the means at our disposal. The people have decided, and there isn't any use arguing about it any longer. We are going ahead—regardless. We are going ahead because such a course is in our own selfish interests. When we fight Hitlerism, we are fighting for ourselves.

When Hitler falls, as he will fall, one of the big reasons for his defeat will be the farmers of the United States of America. Hitler is very vulnerable in two ways—food and oil—and his most vulnerable point is perhaps food. He may succeed in getting enough oil but, so long as the British blockade holds, he isn't likely to get enough food.

The German food situation is better than it was during the last war, but it is by no means good. Germany's wartime diet is not up to the peacetime standard. The persistent lack of fats is a problem that gets worse instead of better. As the war goes on malnutrition will become widespread in Germany.

Germany probably is better off, so far as food is concerned, than almost any country in Europe, with the possible exception of Russia. So far Germany seems to have been taking a good deal of food from her vassal, Italy, despite the fact that Italy's food situation is not as good as Germany's. The Italian diet is a pretty frugal one, ordinarily, and rationing has hit the poor people very hard. I am told by persons who should know that the Italians are sick of the whole mess and want peace, but so long as they have Mussolini and the tie-up with Germany they can't hope for peace.

The situation in the other European countries ranges from bad to worse, due largely to the fact that the conquered countries have been robbed to feed the German war machine. Unoccupied France is in a terrible condition. Belgium is even worse off than unoccupied France since Belgium basically is dependent upon imported foods and feeds.

In the Netherlands, milk production may decline one-fourth in 1941, and butter production about as much. Holland is not likely

to be able to supply more than half her normal consumption of edible fats. To a greater or lesser degree, these stories of shortages can be repeated for Norway, Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Finland, and so on through the list.

So long as this situation continues, Germany will be unable to organize and exploit the resources of her conquered countries. As the people realize that only the defeat of Hitler will restore peace and bring food, the people are likely to pray and work for Hitler's downfall. If the British and the United States keep control of the seas, Hitler can't win, and if Hitler can't win soon, he has lost.

Some farmers remember the beating agriculture took after the first World War and are afraid this may happen again if they produce more. They forget that we had no national farm programs in 1917 and 1918, nothing to prevent unbridled expansion and waste of soil fertility. Today farmers have the machinery to control expanded production of foods that are needed and to control marketing as well. There's no reason now to be afraid of burdensome surpluses of vital foods.

My fears are of an entirely different sort. I am afraid that we will not be able to produce enough of the foods we need. From some standpoints, food reserves are more important than reserves of guns, munitions, planes, and ships. We may never use these munitions, but we will use the food.

Just now we are trying to turn the feed reserves in the ever-normal granary into food reserves. For example, here in the Northeast the Department and your feed cooperatives have worked out a program to ship grain in from midwestern areas so that it will be available to help produce more dairy products and other food.

As time goes on, food reserves may become just as valuable a weapon as munitions themselves. If the war continues very long, famine will spread over the earth like a terrible plague. The thought of food reserves in the United States will be in the minds of millions upon millions of people in the hungry countries. The knowledge that the United States can supply food will reinforce our arguments about democracy. This struggle may finally come down to the issue—who can feed the people, the democracies or the dictatorships? In this case, the answer is—the democracies.

These food reserves will not be wasted even if peace comes just as they are put in storage. After peace, we must continue our efforts to strengthen democracy. The challenge to our system will not end with the defeat of Hitler. The real test of any system is—does it work? Forty-three percent of our people are undernourished in one way or another. One way to meet the challenge to democracy is to give our people enough of the right kinds of food. As I said a little while ago, I am not afraid of burdensome surpluses of food. I am afraid we won't produce enough of the foods we need and that Britain needs.

Before it is over, the challenge to our democracy is going to require more sacrifices than moderate reductions in cheese consumption. The people will make these sacrifices gladly—provided they feel they really contribute to the defense of democracy. But they don't want sacrifices simply for the sake of sacrifices. They want protection where protection is possible. Farmers know that we have the machinery to prevent the breakdown which followed expanded production during the first World War. They want assurances that we will use this machinery. I think they should have them.

If the Government urges the farmers to increase the production of a commodity, I think the Government should support prices for this commodity at at least 85 percent of parity—if this support is possible. Furthermore, I think the Government should assure the farmers that it won't let the bottom fall out of the market after the defense effort is over. Government should help out until farmers have had time to get things back to normal. These assurances to farmers are fair and right. They are embodied in legislation that is pending. I hope this legislation is approved.

I am for parity for agriculture. I want to repeat here today what I have said many times in the past—parity is not only simple justice to farmers; it also is essential to the strength of our whole national economy.

If government and the people are fair to farmers, farmers, in turn, should be fair. The temptation to get while the getting is good is a strong temptation. Arguments can always be found to justify an effort to charge all the traffic will bear.

Generally speaking, farmers and farmer groups have pursued a statesmanlike course during the past few years. As a result, they have public favor. Let us conduct ourselves during this crisis so that we will retain it. Once lost, it will be very hard to regain.

Farmers learned a lesson during the first World War. The inflation bug bit them and they had the speculative fever. That fever is one of the worst financial diseases and its effects are felt for a long time. In this second war farmers want prosperity, but they would like to make it a permanent thing instead of something to talk about between wars.

Fair prices, I well realize, will not solve all our immediate farm problems. Other things enter in. I am told that the labor situation isn't too good in some areas. In some cases farmers are finding it difficult to compete with industrial wages and the draft may be taking some men that are needed in agriculture.

This draft situation has been brought to the attention of selective-service officials by the Department. As a result, careful consideration will be given to the deferment of farm workers needed for the production of foods vital to the defense program. We are working on other phases of the farm-labor problem, too.

Much of this defense effort comes down to a question of production. Can we produce ships, planes, and other munitions quickly enough and in sufficient quantities? Can we produce enough food? I shall let someone else answer the first question, but, so far as food is concerned, the answer is "Yes." There may be temporary shortages, but on the whole front agriculture will win its battle of production.

After this war we are going to find ourselves with an industrial plant and farm plant bigger than ever before. We shall have all the resources for a national income of $100,000,000,000 a year. What use shall we make of this productive capacity? Shall we allow it to choke us, as it did in the 1920's, or shall we use it to feed and clothe and house our people? Shall we use it to make all America healthier and happier? On the answer depends the fate of democracy in the United States and in the world.

Iowa Farmers Subsidize Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST, OF IOWA

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, radio station WINX, of Washington, puts on a program every 2 weeks for the purpose of saluting the States. On last Tuesday evening the salute was to the great State of Iowa, and I thank this radio station for the opportunity it gave me to make a short speech about the farmers of my State.

Mr. KARL LECOMPTE, the distinguished Congressman from the Seventh District, joined in the program and told us about the resources that we have out there, and then I was given 9 minutes to speak of her agricultural interests.

I append what I then said, to which I have given the title:

IOWA FARMERS SUBSIDIZE CONSUMERS

In talking about Iowa, we must not minimize the great production that her factories fetch into her economic life. For example, in 1937 they had an output of a sum approaching $2,000,000 a day in value, which included, of course, the value of agricultural products that went into this manufacture and formed the major part of it.

Nor should we forget that the traveler in the Tall Corn State will pass by a schoolhouse almost every 2 miles. These have given us the right to proudly boast that there is less illiteracy in Iowa than in any other State in the American Union. Such a wayfarer will see a church every 8 or 10 miles of travel with its spire rising upward into the sky and pointing the way heavenward to eternal life and teaching our people the blessed doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

I want to talk about Iowa agriculture. Bread is the foundation of all security and happiness. We cannot be morally minded on a chronic dyspeptic, empty stomach. A lean and hungry man looks into the dark places and sees plots, seditions, and devilry. A full dinner pail is always associated with a happy mind and a contrite heart. A country is peaceful only when it is well fed. Then the arts flourish and contented and happy homes abound and men and women live in harmony with each other and with God. Hungry men break forth in dissent and rebellion; but no one ever saw fat men heading a riot, or herding together in turbulent mobs.

When I produce food, I contribute to faith, to religion, and to God. When I produce food, I protect the Republic. All of the great captains tell us that armies march upon their bellies—and farming is therefore patriotism in militant action. A study of history will bear me out in asserting that agriculture is the basis upon which is founded all great and enduring nations. Whoever gives bread to the hungry is lending to the Lord. Therefore, all hail to Iowa! Her crops alone add more than $1,000,000 to her wealth every time the sun goes down in her glorious golden western horizon. No area of like size in this world can compare with her in this; and that is why she stands first in the things that make for a greater and grander country, a happier people, a higher civilization, and a better spirituality and religious faith.

Do you know that Iowa's soil produces more each year than all of the gold mines of the United States and more than has ever come out of Alaska during the 60 years that she has been within the protection of our flag? We give the country one-tenth of its food. Our farms are worth more than the combined farms of 11 Eastern and Southern States that I could mention. I assert that her farmers are entitled to prosperity. They ought to receive at least as much for their food products as the cost of producing them plus a reasonable profit. But they do not, and they have been at a great disadvantage when compared to other industries because agricultural prices have been on a distinctly lower level than industrial prices for more than 20 years.

During these years thousands and thousands of farmers lost their homes, and tenancy

increased by leaps and bounds. We distinguish the years from 1909 to 1914 as being those upon which we base parity. When we give the farm dollar parity, then we give it buying force in the markets, so that it will buy as much of the things that farmers need and use as it did in those base years. Such things have nearly doubled in price, but bushels of grain and pounds of meat are about the same price as before. For example, a mower that used to cost $45 now sells for nearly a hundred dollars, and binders now cost $260 that once sold for less than half of that amount.

In asking for parity, farmers ask only for economic equality. They want neither alms nor charity, nor pity—they ask only for justice, a thing that the righteous pray for and the wicked fear. Why should they not be placed upon equal terms with other men? They work more hours per day and more days per week than does any other form of labor. They ought to be paid accordingly. They work as intelligently and as skillfully as anybody else does, and they have a right to equal returns for this skill and ability. Every laborer is worthy of his hire. Why should not agriculture be equal to other industries? Why should it not be at par? I affirm that society does not have the right to eat bread unless it is willing to pay the cost of producing that bread to the man who produces it. If society pays less, it is a cheat and a fraud and believes in sweatshops and scabs. No. The farmer and his wife and children have the right to live according to the best standards of comfort and culture that prevail in this twentieth century of Christian civilization.

But we find that there are a lot of calamity howlers who grieve because Congress has provided that the Commodity Credit Corporation should loan 85 percent of the value of corn as a basic farm commodity. But these calamity howlers aside from the right of it conceal the fact that such loans are nearly always repaid. They grouch and growl at the thought of giving to Iowa farmers any benefit payments because of or on account of the sacrifices they are asked to make in the conservation program. In 1939 agriculture's share was only 8.10 percent of the Nation's income, but 25 percent of our people were really dirt farmers and they were carrying 14 percent of all capital investment. And at no time since 1920 have the farmers of our State received any just share of this national income. Even now at the time that I am speaking and after the much-vaunted rise in farm-commodity prices on account of the war, I find that the prices paid by farmers for the things that they buy, including interest and taxes, are 130 percent of parity, and the ratio of the prices received by farmers to the prices paid by them, with interest and taxes, is only 91 percent of what it ought to be. These are the figures of the Department of Agriculture for June 15, this year. This is some improvement over previous conditions, but this is caused by the war inflationary trend. Congress has just passed laws which are intended to raise farm prices, but we met the determined opposition of plutocratic influence in passing such laws, although just arguments cannot be given to show that farmers should not have parity loans.

When calamity howlers speak of subsidies to Iowa farmers they are putting the cart before the horse, because during all of these later years Iowa farmers have been subsidizing consumers instead of receiving subsidies themselves. As proof of this, compare six great farm products and you will find that the farmers of Iowa have failed to get cost of production or parity, but have contributed to others what they lost themselves. The difference in milk prices between a just parity for farmers and the price received by them in 1939—the last year statistically available—was $37,000,000. On eggs we lost $29,000,000. Hogs represented a deficit of $106,000,000 in our State alone, and Iowa wheat, barley, and oats contributed another $43,000,000 of loss suffered by our Iowa farmers. In that one year Iowa agriculture got $215,000,000 less than it was entitled to have under a parity program; and received back in benefit payments only about $60,000,000, making a net loss so large that we were contributing to the consumers almost but not quite a half a million dollars per day on these six commodities alone.

The trouble has been that many of these industrialists have been supported all of these years by artificial schemes and devices that have increased the prices of the things which the farmer must buy, such as railway freight rates, tariffs, custom duties, quotas, franchises, patents, and all of the other things that bolster up manufacturing and trade and transportation and wages.

When the Congress or the country gets ready to repeal all of these artificial laws that grant benefits to a thousand different industries and groups of people, when the men from Massachusetts or New Mexico, or wherever they may live, are ready to repeal the laws that increase the prices which the farmer must pay, when they get ready to repeal the tariffs and all of the other factitious things referred to, then the farmers will not expect any sort of benefit payments. Then the farmer will take care of himself. Do not worry about that; he will feed himself and have a roof over his head. He will then be on a parity with the fellows who are constantly complaining about farm legislation, but this will be because the other fellows will be brought low and not because farmers will be brought up. It will be too bad. I am not in favor of doing this, nor of repealing these things that I refer to. I am in favor of them; they make a better America for all of us; but I do say to those who rail at Iowa agriculture that when you get ready to repeal these other things, then farmers might treat with you about repealing farm benefits.

Let everybody be on a parity basis. Special privilege for none and parity for all.

Samuel Chapman Massingale

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I first became acquainted with SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE when he entered this body as a freshman 8 years ago. One of his first assignments was to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which committee I have the honor to be the chairman. During his work with the committee he displayed a great degree of understanding and humanitarianism, and I enjoyed working with him.

Congressman MASSINGALE was a conscientious and painstaking public servant who gave every question that came to his official attention a thorough and unselfish study, who pondered deeply over all questions of public interest which required his care and study, and who, had he been with us longer, would have assuredly become one of the most prominent Members of the House.

Fate decreed otherwise. Stricken when his usefulness was at its height, Congressman MASSINGALE left in all of us a sense of deep conviction that in his death Congress lost a useful Member, and the country at large will long mourn his passing.

Lt. Howard Abbott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OSCEOLA (IOWA) SENTINEL

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago 33 brave boys of the United States Navy went to their deaths in one of the greatest submarine disasters of recent years when the *O–9* submerged off the coast of New Hampshire and was not able to return to the surface. Probably no one will ever know exactly what occurred, but we can say with assurance that Howard J. Abbott, of Osceola, Iowa, who commanded the submarine, and his 32 companions met death as courageously and as unselfishly as any defenders that this Republic has ever had. They occupy an unmarked grave on the bottom of the ocean beneath 440 feet of water. It seems probable that the *O–9* will never be raised and that for all time to come these men will sleep at their posts of duty.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a tribute to Commander Abbott from his home-town paper, the Sentinel, at Osceola, Iowa. This beautiful tribute by the editor, Hon. John M. Grimes, is paid to Commander Abbott, who was appointed to Annapolis in 1927 by my distinguished predecessor, Hon. Lloyd Thurston. It may apply equally to each and every one of his companions:

[From the Osceola (Iowa) Sentinel]

LT. HOWARD ABBOTT

The whole country mourns the loss of 33 brave lads who went down to their deaths in the U. S. submarine *O–9*, when it dropped 440 feet to the bottom of the Atlantic off the coast of New Hampshire.

The heartstrings of every citizen in Osceola and Clarke County were touched by the tragedy because the commander of that submersible was Lt. Howard Abbott, only son of one of the most prominent and well-known families in southern Iowa.

Howard was not born in Osceola but came here when but a child. This was his boyhood home and here he went through the grades and high school. His young manhood was spent here until his ambition to join the Navy took him to Annapolis, where he won high honors. Distinctions in that institution are recognized only when they are merited.

As a boy, as a young man in his teens, and all through life Lieutenant Abbott displayed

those traits of character that make a real man. His love of parents and home was idealistic. His early training instilled discipline, and it was the rule of his naval activity to recognize superior authority. He expected the same courtesy from those under his command. That he won recognition and rapid advancement since graduating from Annapolis is convincing evidence of the invaluable service he was rendering his country. His ability to climb to the higher peaks in the field of chosen activity was unchallenged till the fates decreed otherwise.

The Sentinel feels a personal loss in the death of this brilliant young man. Not so much because we knew him. Our acquaintance was only casual. He was in Annapolis when we came to Osceola to take over the Sentinel, having purchased it from F. M. Abbott, the father, who was the editor and part owner. Since his retirement from the newspaper field it has been our good fortune to know and to appreciate the fine qualities of this most estimable family. We feel the loss because the country is deprived of the services of an efficient officer and because we sympathize deeply with those whose grief is fathomless.

Lieutenant Abbott sleeps beneath the waters of the Atlantic with the 32 under his command. None came back to tell the story of the great tragedy. His rest is undisturbed by noise of engine or the boom of cannon. Careless alike of sunshine or clouds, his work is finished.

There are those of us who sometimes bemoan the fact that the burial ground is beyond the reach of the tender hands of loved ones; that flowers, the emblems of purity and devotion, must ride upon the turbulent and ofttimes violent waters of an unruly and relentless sea. Our philosophy of life is that it matters little where the "windowless palace" may be located; whether the dews of night, kissed by a morning's sun, may glisten on the blanket of sod, or whether the depth of water shuts out the light of a beautiful day. It's the life that counts.

The parents have with them always the picture of an obedient son, a fine scholar, a brilliant officer, as they, too, walk toward the evening star.

The bereaved wife and children have the comforting thought that the husband and father exhibited all the qualities of a real gentleman and a patriot.

And may we add that within the span of 31 years Lt. Howard Abbott wrote upon the scroll of time a life's work that will be remembered and serve as an example for others long after an epitaph on a tablet of marble is obscured by the icy winds of winter and the withering blasts of summer. "He sleeps well; life's fitful dream is o'er."

Wheat Farmers and the Battle for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CLAUDE R. WICKARD

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard, over Farm and Home Hour in Hutchinson, Kans., Monday, May 19, 1941:

I welcome the opportunity to speak with you today, and I only wish it were possible for us to spend the time comfortably discussing some of the ordinary problems of the world and of agriculture in particular.

Unfortunately, an ordinary problem is a luxury today. Before us are a whole set of extraordinary problems, born of a time as critical as any in all our history.

Overshadowing everything is the world crisis. The times through which we are passing will decide what kind of a future the United States will have. We are determining whether we intend to remain a great democracy and perhaps a great world power.

We must plan our lives and everything we do in the light of the world situation. What farmers plant and when they plant it is directly affected by the titanic struggle going on overseas. Here in this great granary region we must decide what to do about wheat in the light of the developments brought about by the war. And one important decision about wheat must be made very soon—the decision on wheat-marketing quotas on May 31.

This is a time of trouble and yet Americans have many things to be thankful for. One reason for thanksgiving is that the power of making decisions still rests with the people of the United States. When wheat farmers go to the polls on May 31 they vote their own convictions. They will say what is to be done. This is not true in many countries in the world today, and the number of countries in which the people speak and are heard has grown smaller and smaller within the past few years.

So while our problems multiply, let us remember that the privilege of saying what will be done about them is priceless. It is a democratic privilege. Let us use wisely this privilege so that it will be the heritage of our children. Nothing we can leave them will mean more to them, or more to the generations yet unborn over all this earth.

To make wise decisions we need to know the facts. What then, in view of the vote on May 31, are some of the facts about wheat? For one thing, we have a record amount of old wheat on hand and a bumper crop in prospect. That is something to be looked at with satisfaction on one hand and with alarm on the other. The huge stocks of wheat show that the country has an ample supply of one of our most precious foods. In this critical time the abundance of wheat should be a comfort to every person in America.

But farmers, by sad experience, have learned that large supplies can mean glutted markets, low prices, and hard times that bring almost as much suffering to farmers as scarcity of bread would bring to city consumers.

And, because of the world wheat situation, farmers this year have other reasons for alarm. They know that the usual world market for wheat has almost disappeared and that the world outside the United States has a record supply of wheat, too. From the standpoint of our exports, the wheat situation was never worse.

I spoke just a moment ago about our record carry-over of wheat. We are going into the new wheat marketing year with a carry-over of old wheat of around 400,000,000 bushels. The bins are bulging, the terminals spilling over. Another good crop is coming along. The estimates foreshadow a total crop of around 800,000,000 bushels.

Add that to the 400,000,000-bushel carry-over and we have almost a billion and a quarter bushels. What are we going to do with all that wheat? We have storage capacity for 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 bushels. Until the mills grind a couple of hundred million bushels some of this year's crop will be housed in temporary storage. Maybe some of it will be piled on the ground like Canada's 1940 crop.

We'll be lucky if we export 25,000,000 bushels during the season. To be liberal, let's say we consume 700,000,000 bushels domestically. That leaves 475,000,000 bushels to carry into the succeeding marketing year. Plain arithmetic tells us how badly we need a wheat-marketing quota.

Some farmers may ask why we need a wheat-marketing quota if we don't need a corn quota. Well, we have found a new export demand for corn in the form of meat, milk, and eggs for Britain. Bigger pay rolls in this country mean more meat consumed at home. We want to be sure there is no shortage of corn to produce this food that we need for the British and for ourselves.

Britain will need little of our wheat and we have seen to it that there will be no shortage, no matter what the demand. Because of the uncertain world situation we deliberately planted several million extra acres of wheat this year. Most of it turned out well. All danger of scarcity has passed and now the danger is the danger of glut. Farmers should not be penalized because they have provided insurance against shortages of food.

The Nation wants farmers safeguarded against unfair penalties. The Nation also wants other protection given agriculture. One expression of this wish is the national farm programs. These programs protect all farmers. Since the second World War began, commodity loans have stood between wheat producers and the economic blitzkrieg.

Without the programs, wheat prices would be threatening the low record of 1932 instead of being within striking distance of parity as they are now.

As you all know, parity is one of the most important objectives of the national farm programs and will continue to be a goal, just as soil conservation, for example, will continue to be a goal. We've been trying to reach that parity goal since 1933 and we've made a lot of progress.

This administration developed the parity concept and the President has worked for it all along. Had it not been for such setbacks as the Supreme Court decision, which killed the original triple A, farmers probably would have had parity long ago. The President is still working for parity, and in this connection I have some grand news. I talked to the President only a few hours before I left Washington. He told me he wants the basic crops to reach parity this year. He told me also that he thinks wheat farmers, taking loans and payments into account, will get parity on this year's crop.

This news is further proof—although none is needed—that Franklin D. Roosevelt is the best friend that farmers have ever had in the White House.

The President told me that he knew farmers want fair treatment and want to be fair in return. He said he was sure they did not want loans or money paid out of the Treasury to bring their prices higher than parity levels. He told me—and I use his exact words—"In this critical time, you can depend on it that farmers won't rock the boat."

If wheat farmers do get parity—and I'm sure they will—farmers should not overlook the work of farm organization leaders who have labored steadfastly for equality for agriculture. And, a lot of the credit must go to Congress. Only last week the Senate and House sent to the White House a bill calling for an 85 percent of parity loan for wheat and the other basic commodities.

But no wheat loan will be made unless wheat farmers vote for marketing quotas and without the loan there is no hope for parity on wheat in 1941. So parity for wheat is up to the wheat farmers themselves.

For all their difficulties, American farmers have the fattest pocketbooks of any farmers in the world. Take wheat farmers, for example. If we look around us a bit, we will soon see how well off, comparatively speaking, they are and how effective the wheat programs really are. We need to look no further than across our northern border at our good neighbor, Canada.

Average prices of wheat to Kansas wheat growers in mid-May were about 80 cents. This compares with about 45 cents to Canadian farmers (United States money). Leaving out Government payments, American producers probably will receive over twice as much for this year's wheat as Canadian growers.

Every wheat farmer ought to rejoice that he is raising wheat in the United States of America. I join in that rejoicing for I am not only a corn-hog farmer, I am a wheat farmer too. I hold Wheat Marketing Quota Card No. 1, and am proud of the honor. My wheat allotment is only 36.7 acres. This may seem pretty small to your Kansas people but in common with other small wheat growers, I want protection just as much as anyone else.

In return for this protection, wheat farmers must help protect themselves. Congress has said to us, in effect:

"You'll be given protection if you'll put your own house in order. You'll be given protection provided you're willing to keep the market from being glutted with surplus wheat."

The law provides that wheat loans will not be made if wheat growers vote down marketing quotas. This provision seems fair to me. If we aren't willing to protect our own farm programs, we can't expect them to protect us.

The continuance—or discontinuance—of Government loans on wheat is at stake in this referendum on May 31. To put it bluntly, no quotas, no loans. And, judging from prices in Canada, rejection of marketing quotas on May 31 would just about cut the price of wheat in this country in half.

Some other things involved in the decision wheat farmers are going to make on May 31 go beyond the wheat loan and prices for wheat. These things go to the heart of some questions that are being asked nowadays: Is democracy outmoded? Can we continue to make democracy effective? Can wheat farmers, for example, work out their economic problems through the democratic processes?

Now, of course, I am not saying that the continuance of democracy depends on the result of the wheat referendum. That would be going much too far. Yet in this period the world is looking at every move we make and how we meet every test. From these moves conclusions will be drawn as to whether our democracy has gone soft, or whether it is hard and packs a real punch, and whether it can do the job it must do to survive.

As a farmer, I know the necessity for higher prices for farm products. I know that parity prices are fair and just. But I want these parity prices to be put on a stable and lasting basis. High prices without adjustment of supply are certain to be followed by ruinously low prices. We know that from experience. We want fair prices now and fair prices later on. We don't want another Farm Board fiasco.

I wish that corn and wheat farmers were able to vote on marketing quotas before they plant their crops, instead of afterward as is the case now. Cotton, tobacco, and rice farmers vote on quotas before they plant and I see no good reason for denying this privilege to wheat and corn growers. I am sorry that the legislation authorizing loans at 85 percent of parity did not change the time for voting on wheat and corn quotas. This provision was recommended by the Department of Agriculture and we plan to recommend it to Congress again. Yet the fact that the referendum on wheat quotas comes after the crop is almost ready for harvest in no way alters the significance of the vote.

The wheat vote is significant but within the near future, farmers, and the American people, have other decisions to make that are far more significant. We must decide how the Nation is to conduct itself in a world that is on fire. Are we going to help put out the flames or are we going to wait and hope that the blaze doesn't reach us?

I know the war seems a long way off and here in Kansas a lot of us feel safe because we have the good old Atlantic and Pacific Oceans between us and the actual fighting. Perhaps some people rely also on Hitler's word that he has no designs on this hemisphere.

The ones who rely on Hitler's word must be a pretty small group after all. Chamberlain's England relied on Hitler's word. Poland relied on Hitler's word. Belgium and other conquered countries relied on Hitler's word. To Hitler a promise is something to be broken when the time comes.

"But what about the oceans?" someone may ask. They are very real things, thousands of miles wide.

Throughout our history we have been blessed by the existence of these oceans. We have been blessed by their existence, however, only because for more than 100 years they have remained in the control of friendly powers.

But if one or both of these oceans should fall under the control of powers unfriendly to us, then our friendly, protective oceans become highways of menace and invasion.

That is a simple fact, but it is of supreme importance to the future of this Nation.

For generations past the British Isles and the British Navy in the Atlantic Ocean have been friendly to us and have enabled us to keep most of our fleet in the broad reaches of the Pacific, there to protect our interests and our future. We do not yet have a fleet big enough to patrol two hostile oceans. Meanwhile, if we have the sense Yankees are traditionally credited with, we will do everything in our power to see that the British Navy remains intact and on our side.

Whatever may be said about past sins or present motives of Britain is beside the point in this present moment. What is to the point, if we are hard-headedly concerned about the interests of the United States, is our ability and determination to keep Britain and the British Navy afloat and in control of the Atlantic Ocean.

Accordingly it is plainly to our interest, let alone being a national pledge and commitment, to live up to the announced intentions of the Lend Lease Act. We agreed in that act, by an overwhelming majority, to provide Britain and other democracies with the armament and the food with which to carry on the fight against aggression and world conquest.

It is true that Hitler has not crossed the English Channel. Now, why not? We all know why. It is because he is held back, first, because of the courage and bravery of the people in Britain. Second, because he has respect for the English Navy and air force.

These obstacles stand between Hitler and the island of Britain. They also stand between Hitler and the United States.

I don't like to think of what would happen if the courage or endurance of the English gave out, and the English Navy, the French Navy, the Italian Navy, the German Navy were all under control of the world's most ruthless conqueror. Add to this navy the potential production of the shipyards in countries under German control. What does it mean? It means that men and machines could be transported to this hemisphere faster by the Atlantic Ocean than if that body of water were dry land. You could blow up railroads and their terminals and you could wreck highways. But you can't blow up the ocean and you can't wreck it.

The British Isles and the British Navy are our first line of defense. If they are taken over by any European country, our naval and air bases in the Atlantic and the Panama Canal would all be in a precarious position. If these bases fall into hostile hands, what then? You know the answer to that question as well as I do.

Together the United States and Britain can exceed the production of Germany and all the countries she has occupied from Norway to Greece. But if England goes down, Germany and her allies exceed us in productive capacity. Modern wars are won by productive power, the ability to make planes, tanks, and guns. Let those who advocate leaving Britain to her fate think about our situation if Britain should fall.

Let us not deceive ourselves. Some persons said Germany did not have the resources for a long war. She has them now, or seems to be well on her way toward getting them. Hitler is systematically exploiting the conquered countries. They are paying billions of dollars in tribute to the conqueror and millions of their citizens are working for him. Millions of French, Belgian, Dutch, and Danish farmers re working for the Nazis. They have to work for him whether they want to or not. Hitler has gained in strength from the time this war began. With Great Britain on her feet, the democracies still are stronger than the Nazis and Fascists combined. With Great Britain down the picture changes.

We are producing food and munitions for Britain as fast as we can. We will be producing in even greater volume a few weeks and months hence. But now we learn that quite a bit of this product of our sweat and toil is not reaching its destination. Some of it is getting no farther than the bottom of the Atlantic. Yet there are people who say all we have to do is produce and not bother about delivery.

But the Lease Lend Act was not merely a device by which we would increase production in this country; my recollection is that it was a pledge, a deliberate and carefully conceived pledge, to help the democracies of the world in their battle against nazi-ism. We made this pledge only after weeks of debate and careful consideration, with full knowledge that whatever the risks involved, this was the course best calculated to preserve and protect the interests of the United States.

There is no sense in producing for delivery at the bottom of the ocean. There can be only absurdity, anticlimax and danger in that course. I say, let's see that the goods are delivered. And I'm sure the people here in the Plains—you Kansans backed by the tradition of the Beecher Bible and rifle colonists of Fred Funston and his twentieth infantry—I'm sure you say the same. Your history proclaims that you will do what needs to be done in your own interests and in the national interests. It may have to be done the hard way, but that's a Kansas tradition also. Your State motto says "To the stars through difficulties."

The same spirit of determination runs through all these Plains States that are the great Wheat Belt of America. Kansans, Oklahomans, Nebraskans, Texans, Dakotans, and all the men of the Plains are ready to fight for the ideals they hold sacred. You will do what has to be done.

Some persons are saying that the odds against us already are too great; that we'd better pipe down and keep quiet. I don't think there are many of those persons or that they amount to very much. The events of recent days give new proof that the Nazis are deliberately trying to form a combination of nations to attack us. I know what the answer of the American people will be to that. The answer to any dictatorship combination aimed at the United States will be

something the Nazis understand and respect—armed might.

All over this world of ours humanity is watching the United States. We are the only hope of millions living in bondage. In Latin America many countries are watching us to see whether we will make good our promises, or whether we simply mean to talk and gesture. If democracy has grown soft and flabby, why perhaps other countries will embrace a way of life that, for all its terror, seems to have iron in its soul. In Britain millions are watching us. They have fought a gallant fight, but they can't go on unless our help is made effective. The Nazis and Fascists are watching us and every sign of indecision and division fills them with joy. If we simply talk, why the rest is easy. They'll rule the world and spit on democracy every day.

I don't think the American people want to live in a world run by the Nazis. I don't think they intend to live in a world run by the Nazis. A world run by the Nazis means the destruction of freedom and democracy in the United States. We'll do whatever is necessary to protect our freedom and our democracy.

Production for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BATON ROUGE PEOPLE'S WEEKLY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, all of us realize that the problem of production for national defense is the most serious problem confronting us. This question of production requires that management and labor should coordinate their efforts with the least possible friction.

One of the best expressions on this issue that I have read is that contained in an editorial in the Baton Rouge (La.) People's Weekly, a paper published in my home city of Baton Rouge, La., which paper usually expresses the viewpoint of organized labor.

The editorial in question is contained in the issue of June 13, 1941, and reads as follows:

[From the Baton Rouge People's Weekly]

NOW IS THE TIME

(By Ruth Taylor)

The editorial pages of every newspaper, the commentators whose voices ring out over the radio dial, all proclaim the same thing—management and labor must get together.

Prejudice or bias for one side or another often colors this clamor, but it still rises from both sides—and, far more important to both, from the great middle ground of the public, who are tired of the strife and are keenly conscious of their own danger if an agreement is not reached.

In this outcry for better understanding lies the golden opportunity for those who are honestly and sincerely trying to bring about better industrial relations. With the attention of all the people focused on this subject, there is opportunity for the forceful and accurate presentation of all the facts. No attempt of selfish interests to accomplish their own ends can succeed under steady public scrutiny. Therefore, at a time when the most important need of the country as a whole is unified action, there is a real chance for a fair and equable settlement of long-range industrial disputes.

To arrive at this solution, both management and labor must consider the problems concerned, not only from their own viewpoint but from the viewpoint of each other. The facts must all be put on the table and the arguments for each side given not in heat and anger, but with full knowledge and consideration of the common problems we are all facing.

Once they have arrived at the facts, then is the opportunity for a permanent solution. Both sides will have to be ready to give up something for the common good, for only when there is a real feeling of partnership can there be a relationship that will endure. This does not mean setting wages or hours on a permanent basis, but it does mean working out a system by which all disputes can be settled amicably and fairly.

Surely both sides have brains enough to work out such a system. All that is needed is the desire to do so.

The real leaders of labor have gone on record as to their wish for such a settlement. They are the articulate representatives of the rank and file of workingmen who make up the great mass of people throughout the length and breadth of this land. If public opinion were marshalled back of them in this effort, the day of peace in industrial relations would be far closer at hand. But they must have the support of every earnest and sincere member of union labor and the surety that their decisions will be abided by, their counsel heeded.

Now is the time for action.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, as the fog raises we see greatness in Hoover and Landon.

Shades of Doc Wirt—the welcome sign will be hung out for the comrades.

One might say that F. D. R.'s early pledge of aid to the Soviet was Russeveltian.

The HAM FISH poll of Hyde Park, N. Y., shows the people 8 to 1 against going to war.

Paderewski's body resting for the present in Arlington will add a sweeter requiem to taps.

The incongruous alinement with Russia has set our foreign war back, so Congress is planning on taking a recess.

The Government is going to tax pop and radios. After all, we were warned that sweat, blood, and toil were ahead.

Willkie and Knox have tried hard to make a donkey out of the elephant, while Great Britain easily has made a jackass out of the donkey.

The important thing about the Knox proposal to use our Navy now to drive the Nazis out of the Atlantic is, Was the President speaking?

Senator GEORGE, chairman of Foreign Relations Committee, spoke against undeclared war. This is, for peace, next in importance to the Russian situation.

The alacrity with which Cordell Hull and Sumner Welles embraced the Soviet was exceeded only by Hitler's discovery of Russian crimes against the German minority.

We pay tribute to the American people—they are no nearer to war themselves than they were 6 months ago, in spite of millions of Government money for propaganda.

According to present English and German standards and American standards of the last war, the *Robin Moor* was 75 percent contraband, yet that was concealed in the former chat.

Flood Protection in Northeast Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in the course of human events the group as well as the individual is sometimes made happy and at other times saddened, so this day brings new hope to my people. I especially want to thank the Flood Control Committee for agreeing to provide on pages 10 and 11 of the flood-control bill the following language:

The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway as well as the northward extension and the back protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project, adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned, and the provisions of said acts relating to the prosecution of work on said floodways and extensions are hereby repealed.

Not only do I personally thank you but as a Representative of my people, northeast Louisiana, I feel I am expressing their feelings when I say we all thank you for including an amendment that will eliminate the Eudora and Boeuf floodways.

WHY NORTHEAST LOUISIANA DOES NOT HAVE MORE INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT

May 3, 1937, I attempted to point out on this floor the many disadvantages and the costly results that would work on my section if either the Eudora or Boeuf floodways were constructed. Further, since 1928 northeast Louisiana has suffered a loss of industrial development, and certainly a loss of general business expansion due to the proposed Eudora and Boeuf floodways. Certain agencies of the Federal Government have refused to entertain an application for any recognition to be extended my section, and certainly a number of times private enterprise found my section desirable, since

we were blessed with the largest gas field in the world, developed electric power, skilled and unskilled labor, and an abundance of varied raw materials, but as soon as private industry learned of the proposed floodways they refused to locate in my section.

LEVEES

My people are happy that H. R. 4911 proposes to raise the fuse-plug levee in Arkansas that has caused so much fear in the Delta lands of northeast Louisiana. Further, we are pleased that the entire levee-line system of the Mississippi River will be improved.

FLOWAGE RIGHTS

The Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, left to the States or levee districts the function of providing rights-of-way and flowage easements required for set-backs on the main Mississippi River; however, realizing relocation of levee lines resulted in the loss of property to landowners, I introduced H. R. 6620 in 1937, which provided that the United States should pay for the cost of flowage easements and rights-of-way, including compensation for damages to improvements thereon. So it is with appreciation that section (d) of the flood-control bill provides:

The Chief of Engineers, with approval of the Secretary of War, shall reimburse local authorities for actual expenditures found by the Chief of Engineers to be reasonable, for providing at the request of the United States, in accordance with local legal procedure or custom, rights-of-way and flowage easements required for future setbacks of main-line Mississippi River levees.

However, I do not think we go far enough by only advocating the payment of lands hereafter taken, as a large number of landowners have been denied payment for damages done as a result of set-back or relocation levees on the Mississippi River and the Flood Control Committee of the House in 1935, after extensive hearings, came to the conclusion, as a matter of law and equity, that the payment of these lands taken from our farmers for set-back or relocation of levee lines rests upon the United States. Further, the War Department that year stated they had the utmost sympathy for an owner whose property was injured without compensation, so I contend all property owners who have been forced to furnish lands for flowage easements in the past should be paid.

RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA

I am happy an authorization of $6,976,000 for the construction of a levee and improvements from the main-line levee on the west bank of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Shaw, La., westward and northward to the vicinity of Newlight, La., for the protection of the Red River backwater area, known as the Tensas-Cocodrie area, is included.

I do not contend this provision will solve the Red River backwater question completely, but certainly it will materially help my section.

Up to the year 1927 this area suffered little from backwater. Since then the farms in the lower part of the area have been flooded at intervals as high as 7 feet.

It seems intolerable that this new, almost yearly, damage should be inflicted on a rich farming country, so I suggest that the intake on the new Morganza floodway might be lowered to take the minor Mississippi River floods before they back up on Concordia, Catahoula, and Tensas Parishes.

OUACHITA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

General Tyler has given us in part a favorable report on the Ouachita River and its tributaries or recommended three major improvements, namely: First, an enlarged ring levee around Jonesville, La., or a levee project for the protection of Jonesville and vicinity in lieu of the presently authorized project.

Second, that the channel of Big Creek and of Colewa Creek—Big Colewa Bayou—below Caney Bayou be improved; that a diversion canal between Big Colewa Bayou and Boeuf River be excavated, and that levees, and appurtenant drainage works for protection from Tiger Bayou floodwaters be constructed, provided local interests have organized and furnished satisfactory assurances that they will assume responsibility for all future maintenance.

Third, that channel improvement on Bayou Bartholomew and channel improvements and a new outlet channel on Deep Bayou be constructed, provided local interests have organized and provided satisfactory assurances that they will assume responsibility for all future maintenance.

I hope if the Flood Control Committee receives this report before the Senate finally adopts H. R. 4911 that you will agree to include the recommendations for works that have not already been provided, as my section is in desperate need of drainage.

Last year we had excessive rains in Northeast Louisiana to such an extent that the Federal Surplus Marketing Administration had to feed approximately one-half the people for several months; however, if we had the proper drainage improvements a large portion of this water could have been drained from the lands thereby saving our crops.

COMMENDATION

Brig. Gen. Max C. Tyler and the entire Mississippi River Commission, as well as Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, and his excellent staff, deserve commendation from this Congress in having submitted to Congress five alternative procedures that might be adopted in helping to solve the flood problem in the lower Mississippi Valley.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

WAR DEBTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, but for the brief press notice which appeared on June 15 the war debts resulting from the first World War and which are still owed to this country would have been entirely forgotten. It so happens that June 15 is a semiannual payment debt day which accounts for the brief public reminder that the debts still exist and are still unpaid. The moratorium on war debts which was imposed at the instance of President Hoover in 1931 has virtually killed all effort at repayment, and only scattered payments have been made by the debtor nations with the exception of Finland. This little country has made payment on every debt on which an installment is due. The aggregate debts with accrued interest now reaches the staggering sum of little over thirteen and one-half billion dollars. The remaking of the European map intrudes some rather interesting problems in connection with war debts. Armenia, for instance, still owes $25,000,000, but the status of Armenia at the present moment is almost unknown. Austria owes $26,000,000, but nobody seems to know how, when, or where payment will ever be made since Austria was taken over by Germany and the latter country refuses to acknowledge the debt. Similarly, Russia in the day of czar regime owed $405,000,000, but the revolutionary Russia of today refuses to acknowledge this obligation. Similar difficulties may arise in connection with the debt of Belgium, Hungary, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Rumania, who have been overwhelmed by the Nazi armies. Likewise, the Soviet influence in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania may make collection of this indebtedness virtually impossible. Thus the shadow of war falls athwart the interest of our own country.

A LESSON IN PUBLIC MORALITY

Some years ago Congress enacted a law under which payments are made to States for the purpose of conducting agricultural research. These payments aggregate $2,400,000 annually and are apportioned among the States on the basis of rural population. When the census figures for 1940 were disclosed it became manifest that some States lost rural population and would therefore lose a part of the funds under the above-mentioned law. In fact, 22 States and 1 Territory would lose a total sum of $63,708. Then began a hue and cry that, notwithstanding the census figures, these States should receive the same amount that they had heretofore received, and a concerted effort was made in this direction. The basic law still stands which provides apportionment of the funds on the basis of the rural population. But Congress was called upon by persons in such States to ignore its own enactment and provide the extra funds for the States involved. Would you call that a lesson in public morality?

THE WORLD'S GREATEST SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

The long-range program of the United States merchant marine, which was initiated in 1938, calls for the construction of 500 ships, to cost $1,250,000,000. Eighty-six of this number have actually been delivered. The second part of the ship-construction program calls for 200 cargo vessels, referred to as ugly ducklings because they will be of box-type design and render themselves to speedy construction. The third component in this

program calls for 222 ships to be built under the Lend Lease Act for transfer to Great Britain. In addition, 60 cargo vessels are under construction, which were ordered by the British Government, and 86 vessels are being built for private account without the aid of the Federal Government. There are 760 merchant vessels that are being built or that are on order in the United States today, and to carry on this construction program has required the building of 103 new shipways, either in existing shipyards or on new sites. This is by all odds the most colossal ship construction ever undertaken by any country at any given time.

PARADOX

The dictionary defines a paradox as something which appears contradictory. It is something which appears to be what it is not. Well, it would seem to be a paradox to say that the more money we spend on national defense, the more unemployment we are likely to have. That sounds unbelievable, but let's take a look. The list of items on which defense has priority seems to be growing larger with each week and is now as long as your arm. Take aluminum, for example. Suppose you were a manufacturer employing 500 men making kitchenware out of aluminum and suddenly you found that you could not get the material with which to work. You would have a choice of shutting down or using other materials or getting some defense contracts. But suppose your machinery was not adapted to other kinds of material and could not be used on defense contracts. Then what? Obviously, you would have to shut down. But what of the 500 men in your employ? They would be jobless. No less an authority than the Assistant to the Chief of the Defense Contracts Service stated recently to a meeting of the field officers of this agency that—

Already not less than 10 entire industries whose supplies have been drastically curtailed or completely shut off must either close down or enter a new line of production.

It is intimated that one-third of all American industry is confronted with the grim reality of lack of materials. The defense program is only now getting into high gear. What will the situation be 6 months hence? And what about the idle men and idle machines that will result? Did you say paradox?

Independence Day, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, 165 years ago this Independence Day the Thirteen Original Colonies unanimously declared:

When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

On this Independence Day our President has said:

As the birthday of American independence draws near it is altogether fitting that we should rededicate ourselves to defend and perpetuate those inalienable rights which found true expression in the immortal Declaration. Those words never had a deeper or more solemn meaning for America than they have in this hour of anxiety and peril.

Would that every American would read these words of our President over and over again and ponder well their meaning and their full significance. On this Independence Day 1941 the call goes out for men whose chief concern is not to cure all the ills of international society but rather to preserve the American system of government—a system that has secured to the people of this country more freedom and more of the physical comforts of life than the people of any other country in the world since the very beginning of time. Let us rededicate ourselves to its preservation and say again with Daniel Webster:

Thank God, I, also, am an American

Office of Civilian Defense Director LaGuardia has announced that following the President's address on Independence Day veterans and other patriotic organizations have planned to have all the people in the Nation simultaneously sing the national anthem at exactly the same time, wherever they may be.

I wish that following this singing of our national anthem the people might repeat in unison these words of George Washington, for they, too, were never more fitting than today:

If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

Many people have been asking questions as to what is wrong with our defense program, why our production program has not moved faster. The placing of men like Harry L. Hopkins, as Administrator of the Lease-Lend Act, over and above our production experts who have been summoned to Washington in this emergency has served to focus attention in this direction.

It has been charged that the defense organization, through constant change and the continued creation of additional agencies, has become confused with no responsible head. It has also been charged that such a program should not be under the control of the New Deal type of administrators, but instead should be under the guidance of a man or men with practical business experience.

The House Committee on Military Affairs has been studying several different aspects of the defense program. The committee has just released a most interesting report, which is particularly directed to critical and strategic raw materials needed for national defense. This is not a partisan investigation, but rather comes from this committee of 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Below are some interesting comments from the report of this committee:

It is a sad commentary on the wisdom, judgment, and initiative of the industrial and political leaders of this richest and most resourceful Nation on earth, that in the first year of her defense effort and nominally at peace, rationing of civilian supplies, priorities, price control, conservation and substitution are found necessary. * * *

Emphasis over the past few years has been made on the more immediate problem of recovery and social reform rather than national security. As a Nation we seem to have forgotten that without national security, social reform might well prove meaningless. * * *

It was painfully apparent through the testimony given before this committee that a lack of coordination and absence of a responsible head with authority and power to fix responsibility in this as well as in other matters, has been largely responsible for the deficiencies we now are experiencing all along the line. The administration has been too prone when difficult problems arose to easily dispose of them by creating another board, only to add to the confusion of the sprawling assortment of agencies we now have. We are now plagued with and will continue, evidently, to be harassed because of the absence of a coherent organization. We are overblessed with boards and committees and with a legion of liaison officers feeling the necessity of consulting first with this or that agency. All of this has resulted in a deadly consuming of time and in the end we still have a divided authority.

Our Government agencies are not amateurs in the methods of propaganda but they have failed in that they did not long ago begin educating the public as to the necessity of not squandering the materials used in our defense effort.

The entry of Communist Russia into the European imbroglio should settle once and for all any question about our entry into the war. The interventionists will most certainly not be able to induce the American people to go to war to make secure the four essential human freedoms for Soviet Russia.

A joyous Independence Day to you and yours. May we continue as a free and independent people that you may enjoy many more.

Federal Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, again I call attention of the House to the need

for more sympathetic consideration of the W. P. A. appropriation bill. The fact that many people now employed were unable to get employment previously is very fine, but we still have the question of taking care of those who, through no fault of their own, are unable to get jobs. I refer to that great class of our citizens who, just because they happen to be a little over 45 years of age, cannot get work in private industry.

The reduction in the appropriation bill has but little effect on the young men of our country, who are right now the idols of national-defense industries and corporations engaged privately in peaceful pursuits, but it is going to cause the hand of poverty and want to rest on many humble homes in America—unless those on W. P. A. are adequately protected.

18-MONTH LAY-OFF IN W. P. A.

Congress has modified the 18-month lay-off requirement in the W. P. A. to provide that such workers shall be removed only in the numbers necessary to provide employment for employable persons with the same or similar job qualifications who have been certified for a period of 3 months or more as in need of Work Projects Administration project employment and who have not in such period been given employment on work projects.

That is, in no case can a person who has been on 18 months be removed at the expiration of 18 months unless, first, there is a person with his same job qualifications available; that is, if a man who has been on 18 months is a bricklayer, you would not take him off and give the job to a piccolo player, if you would give a piccolo player a job at all. That is a wise provision. You would not take him off on account of the 18-month provision unless there are persons certified who have been waiting for 3 months with the same job qualifications.

MORE PROJECTS FOR THE TWENTY-FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

The Work Projects Administration has announced the allocation of $99,497 to the Southern Illinois Normal University at Carbondale for the purpose of improving grounds at the school in connection with the site for the new training school. At the same time it was also announced that $464,709 had been allotted to Randolph County to take care of the project sponsored by the county board of commissioners for the improvement of roads, streets, and alleys. The work in Randolph County is to include clearing, grading, ditches, construction of storm sewers, catch basins, and gutters. Provision was also made for the construction of sidewalks.

THE MARINES HAVE LANDED AND HAVE THE SITUATION WELL IN HAND!!!

The Navy Department has announced a United States marine detachment of 3 officers and 60 men has been sent to London to facilitate communications between the various United States offices located there. The marines will also assist as fire watchers to relieve the already overburdened embassy staff the Navy informs us.

SELECTIVE-SERVICE DEFERMENTS

Selective Service headquarters, in a memorandum to State directors clarifying national policy on dependency deferments, states all selective-service registrants with one or more dependents to whose support they make "any substantial contribution" should be deferred from military training. The only exception to this rule is that of a registrant married after the registration date who cannot prove this new status was acquired "in a manner consistent with the ordinary course of human affairs," Selective Service headquarters said. The ruling applies to both future classifications of married men and to the reconsideration of such cases already in class 1-A, the announcement said.

COMPARISON OF BRITISH DEBT TO OUR DEBTS

The total British debt, national and local, on March 31, 1941, was $63,788,843,000. On the same date, according to the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the total United States debt, Federal and local, was $67,056,094,169.

WE REALLY SPEND IT

Each minute, the clock around, the Government now is spending $23,000 for defense and Britain; by fall it is planned to spend $32,000 to $37,000 a minute; early next year somewhere between $46,000 and $58,000 a minute, perhaps rising to $69,000 a minute before the year is out.

TELEVISION IS NOW HERE

The Federal Communications Commission has announced visual broadcast service will be inaugurated on a full-fledged commercial basis July 1 when two television stations in New York will begin the new service. Three more stations, in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Philadelphia, expect to make the transition from experimental to commercial operation in short order, the Commission said, and 17 other stations in various parts of the country have announced their intention to begin commercial operations as soon as possible.

SHOWS FOR SOLDIERS

The War Department has announced a comprehensive program of stage shows for Army camps throughout the country and civilian contributions of various kinds to the comfort and convenience of soldiers in the camps will, when nationally organized, be coordinated by the Citizens Committee for the Army and Navy, Inc. The Citizens Committee is a subordinate body within the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation and its activities will not affect the initiative of local groups or individuals who wish to contribute materials or services to the camps adjacent to their own communities.

Outstanding men in the theatrical field have been consulted and arrangements made for five road shows to travel among the camps with stage equipment built into specially constructed trucks. Experimental shows have met with such wide approval that the committee is extending its activities and establishing regional councils, headed by prominent citizens of each section, assisted by paid executives.

F. B. I. ON THE JOB

F. B. I. Director Hoover has announced the arrest of 29 men and 3 women—24 of them German—on charges of conspiracy to undermine national defense by acting as spies to obtain confidential information that concerned many phases of national defense, including factories that produced munitions, planes, tanks, and defense materials, as well as latest military devices. Nineteen were arrested in the New York area, 5 were taken into custody in New Jersey, 1 in Michigan, 1 in Wisconsin, and 1 in Brazil. All will be brought to Brooklyn, N. Y., for arraignment, and the remaining 5 are already in prison for other crimes.

Some of the ring acted as couriers and traveled to and from belligerent countries on trans-Atlantic planes of the Italian air line operating to South America, as well as on United States flag steamships and on ships of other neutral countries. Of those under arrest 2 were born in the United States, 2 were naturalized citizens, and, besides 24 Germans, the prisoners are French, Austrian, and South African. He said the most important of the prisoners is Frederick Joubert Duquesne, whose record as a spy extends for more than 40 years.

WIRE-TAPPING BILL

The efforts of the administration to have the right to spy on citizens of the United States by wire tapping was turned down in the House by a vote of 154 against to 146 for it.

OFFICIAL VISITORS TO THE OFFICE

John H. Jones, Du Quoin; John Gruelmefer, Jacob; Jack Smith, West Frankfort; Mr. and Mrs. Henry Perkins, Benton; Circuit Judge Joe Hill, Benton; Robert Hill, Benton; George Hill, Sesser; Mary Layman and Grace M. Layman, Tamaroa; and Betty Ann Winegarner, of Anna.

Why Should Not the Treasury Department Collect All Gasoline and Liquor Taxes at Their Source?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS GAZETTE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have advocated the feasibility of the Federal Government collecting at their source all gasoline, liquor, and perhaps, other taxes on the commodities which are universally taxed by both the Federal and State Governments. In the first place, the collection would be much more efficient; in the second place, the Federal Government would deduct a small service charge and refund the State's portion to it.

Thus the people would realize much more from the tax which they levy upon themselves.

On June 14 there appeared in the Arkansas Gazette an editorial entitled, "With 48 States Collecting Varying Taxes" and in which the Arkansas Gazette endorses the idea. I quote it in full:

Secretary Morgenthau's suggestion that the Treasury take over the collection of gasoline, liquor, and certain other taxes now collected separately by Federal, State, and sometimes local governments is in line with what the Gazette has been saying on this subject for a long time past. This newspaper has, however, urged the advantages not only of Federal collection of all consumption and other taxes adapted to this method, but Federal levying of all such taxes at uniform country-wide rates, with distribution of due part of the proceeds among the States. Only in this way, it seems, could the administrative difficulties that arise when such taxes are higher in some States, and lower or entirely lacking in others, be eliminated once for all. Federal taxes would presumably be collected at the source, as the Federal cigarette tax is now collected at the factories. Collection expense and opportunities for escaping payment would be reduced to a minimum, and tax conflicts and rivalries among States would disappear.

In announcing that a group of outside tax experts has been brought in to assist the Treasury in making a detailed study of centralized collections, Mr. Morgenthau spoke of the saving that might be made in bookkeeping expense under such a plan. Bookkeeping is only part of the expense.

Last year the cost of running Arkansas' State revenue department amounted to more than $810,000. Of this total, more than $512,000 represented salaries, and more than $122,000 represented travel expense of the department's field force of agents, inspectors, and auditors. If the Federal Government collected sales taxes, income and inheritance taxes, tobacco taxes, liquor taxes, gasoline taxes, and motor-vehicle fees, a comparative handful of State employees could handle all the collections that would be left for the Revenue Department—chiefly such levies as oil, feed, and other inspection fees, in-transit vehicle taxes and severance taxes. And Arkansas is only one of 48 States now compelled to maintain large and expensive revenue organizations.

Connecticut's No. 1 Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD (CONN.) COURANT

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courant, of Hartford, Conn.:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of June 26, 1941]

CONNECTICUT'S NO. 1 PROBLEM

The coming to Hartford of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives on Migratory Labor provided an opportunity for a survey, however superficial, of virtually all the problems that have arisen in the State as the result of the boom in the defense industries. From the evidence presented, the people of the State can only reach the conclusion that unless the situation is wisely handled now it will produce conditions that will plague Connecticut not for a year but perhaps for a decade or more to come.

The salient facts would seem to be these:

First, although more than a hundred thousand workers from outside the State have come into it in the past 18 months, at least 50,000, perhaps a hundred thousand, more workers are needed if the plants now built or building are to be operated at maximum efficiency and if the normal business of the State, which has lost workers to the defense industries, is not to be undermanned. The need for agricultural labor promises to be especially acute.

Second, the influx of workers has produced a housing shortage of extreme acuteness not only in the urban centers but in the towns surrounding them. With this shortage has developed, in varying degrees, a shortage of essential services, from sewerage facilities to educational facilities. The shortages do not mean simply that hundreds of skilled workers, upon whom rests the primary responsibility for building a strong national defense, are compelled to live under conditions that impair efficiency, to say nothing of normal family life. They also mean that the whole community is faced with the dangers that ensue from crowded living quarters, inadequate health facilities, and unstable social conditions.

Third, despite the pressing need for trained workers, the industries of the State are not taking full advantage of the labor resources at hand. Evidence was adduced at the hearing to show that residents of the State who already have established homes are denied work on grounds both of their race and of their national origin. The result is that while workers from outside the State are being drawn here by the thousands despite inadequate living facilities, workers already on hand are unable to get work, with the result that they must not only stay on relief but in some cases give up their homes to workers from the outside because they cannot pay the higher rents that the boom makes possible.

No one solution for the problem exists. Rather, it must be attacked from many angles, from reconsidering the laws governing settlement through efforts to stabilize rents and to increase housing up to changing attitudes toward racial minorities. Not a little hard thinking has been done on the problem by many agencies, and more will have to be done. A point to be stressed is that neither the State nor the local communities can hope to shift the responsibility wholly to the Federal Government, as some of the witnesses seemed disposed to do. The Federal Government can probably do a good deal, particularly in the fields of housing and of providing for the extension of public services that local communities cannot afford to finance.

Yet most of the burden will have to be borne by the State and the local communities. A first step in the matter might be a greater coordination than seems yet to have been accomplished of the several agencies, public and private, that are willingly or unwillingly involved. Alone, they can do relatively little to meet the situation so graphically pictured in the Senate Chamber the other day. Together they might go far to alleviate a condition that, unless sanely dealt with in the near future, will produce consequences that will affect the State for years to come.

Fourth of July Address by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ADDRESS BROADCAST FROM THE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY, HYDE PARK, N. Y., ON JULY 4, 1941

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States at Hyde Park, on the Fourth of July, and also in connection therewith an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, in 1776, on the fourth day of July, the Representatives of the several States in Congress assembled, declaring our independence, asserted that a decent respect for the opinion of mankind required that they should declare the reasons for their action. In this new crisis, we have a like duty.

In 1776 we waged war in behalf of the great principle that Government should derive its just powers from the consent of the governed. In other words, representation chosen in free elections. In the century and a half that followed, this cause of human freedom swept across the world.

But now, in our generation—in the past few years—a new resistance, in the form of several new practices of tyranny, has been making such headway that the fundamentals of 1776 are being struck down abroad and definitely they are threatened here.

It is, indeed, a fallacy, based on no logic at all, for any Americans to suggest that the rule of force can defeat human freedom in all the other parts of the world and permit it to survive in the United States alone. But it has been that childlike fantasy itself—that misdirected faith—which has led nation after nation to go about their peaceful tasks, relying on the thought, and even the promise, that they and their lives and their government would be allowed to live when the juggernaut of force came their way.

It is simple—I could almost say simple-minded—for us Americans to wave the flag, to reassert our belief in the cause of freedom—and let it go at that.

Yet, all of us who lie awake at night—all of us who study and study again, know full well that in these days we cannot save freedom with pitchforks and muskets alone, after a dictator combination has gained control of the rest of the world.

We know that we cannot save freedom in our own midst, in our own land, if all around us—our neighbor nations—have lost their freedom.

That is why we are engaged in a serious, in a mighty, in a unified action in the cause of the defense of the hemisphere and the freedom of the seas. We need not the loyalty and unity alone, we need speed and efficiency and toil and an end to backbiting, an end to the sabotage that runs

far deeper than the blowing up of munitions plants.

I tell the American people solemnly that the United States will never survive as a happy and fertile oasis of liberty surrounded by a cruel desert of dictatorship.

And so it is that when we repeat the great pledge to our country and to our flag, it must be our deep conviction that we pledge as well our work, our will and, if it be necessary, our very lives.

[From the Evening Star of July 5, 1941]

KEEPING THE FAITH

For 8 solemn minutes yesterday afternoon America lived with its past. It was a truly stirring experience.

From the newly dedicated library at Hyde Park the President spoke briefly of the example of our ancestors, of the needs of the present, and of the perils of the future. A people who seem not yet to have comprehended the magnitude of their danger were cautioned once again that "the United States will never survive as a happy and fertile oasis of liberty surrounded by a cruel desert of dictatorship." When the President had finished, the scene shifted to far-off Estes Park in Colorado, where the Chief Justice of the United States led in reciting the pledge of allegiance to the flag. And then, in conclusion, Lucy Monroe sang one verse of The Star-Spangled Banner.

That was all—brief, simple, and yet so profoundly moving that millions of Americans must for the moment have been lifted out of themselves.

As they lived for a few minutes with the memory of the great men, the bitter sacrifices and the lofty ideals from which this Nation was forged, they must have sensed that today's threat is a deeply personal one. For freedom is a personal thing. We cannot lose freedom as a nation and yet retain it as individuals. And we will not keep it, either as a nation or as individuals unless we are willing now to make the sacrifices, great and small, that have ever been the price of liberty.

It was because this is true and proved by all of our experience that the President called upon the people for a pledge—a pledge of "our work, our will, and, if necessary, our very lives."

Upon this generation of Americans falls the necessity of keeping faith with the past by responding wholeheartedly to that appeal. But the time is short. We are in great danger of losing the freedom for which brave men in an earlier day worked and fought and died unless we act—and act now—to safeguard it.

After the War, What?—A. V. A. and Similar Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTHWEST AMERICAN, FORT SMITH, ARK.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most brilliant discussions I have seen of "What Shall We Do After the War?" appeared this week as an editorial by Editor Clarence F. Byrns, in the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark. I quote it in full:

[From the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark., of June 29, 1941]

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

There's a world of encouragement in the fact that many people are thinking seriously about what we'll do with this country when the war is over. We didn't think enough about that in the last war. Most of us seemed to assume that an armistice would usher in the millenium without too much effort on anybody's part. And it didn't.

In another column on this page, Peter Edson, Washington correspondent, tells about serious planning for the after-war future now going on in Washigton. There are plenty of other people carefully weighing possibilities of a more abundant economy when the shooting stops.

You have read quite a lot in recent months—if you read this page—about the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority proposal, now pending in Congress. It is a plan to create a Fedcral agency with the power and the finance to use the waters of the Arkansas, the Red, the St. Francis, and the White Rivers in the Southwest for flood control, for power production, for irrigation, and for aid to navigation.

If you have thought of A. V. A. as a defense project for this war, you have missed the timing. If you have thought of it as merely another Federal boondoggling project, you have missed the idea entirely. Fundamentally, A. V. A. is a project for building an after-war economy vastly more satisfactory than we have ever known in this area before.

It is not the purpose of the sponsors of A. V. A. to build a lot of dams and powerhouses immediately. The construction of the flood control and power dams now under way in the area certainly should be pushed to completion. That can be done and will be done whether A. V. A. is ever approved or not. These dams, such as Norfork Dam on the White River in Baxter County, are being built by the United States engineers with funds provided by Congress as a part of the general flood-control and power program.

Norfork is being built now as a flood-control project. Pending in Congress are proposals to appropriate $13,500,000 more to make it a power project, too.

Nimrod Dam on the Fourche La Fave River in Arkansas is being built for flood control, but with provision for making it a power project when the money is provided by Congress.

Blue Mountain Dam on Petit Jean River in Arkansas is a flood-control project only.

Denison Dam on the Red River between Texas and Oklahoma is a dual purpose project, for which the funds are already provided.

All these are being done by the United States engineers. Their completion does not depend on the approval of the Arkansas Valley Authority. They may be finished before the war emergency has ended. But the great majority of the projects which are contemplated in the A. V. A. proposal would follow the war emergency, and would be designed to remake the economy of the Southwest so that our people may have a higher standard of living than they have ever known before.

Every schoolboy knows that when this war is ended there must be gigantic and comprehensive plans for the use of the productive capacity of the Nation which will no longer be needed in military production. It is not difficult to conjure up visions of millions of men thrown out of work and millions of dollars of investment idle because there is no longer any demand for the products they have made in wartime.

But it's ridiculous to assume that there must be a long period of starvation and disintegration before we find out how to put those productive forces to work making things that people need to raise their standard of living.

We are proving just now that we can produce a great deal more than we were producing before the defense emergency arose. The Federal Reserve index of industrial production is up almost to 150, the highest in history. A great deal of it is going into armament production. It is possible, although difficult, to use that productive capacity for the improvement of the standard of living of our people, if we go about the job with intelligence.

Here in the Southwest our per capita income is low, and always has been. One reason is that there has not been enough industrial employment for our people. There has not been enough use of the resources which Nature gave us. The waters of our streams have flowed down to the sea, wasting tremendous power, devastating the productive fields in the lowlands. If we can utilize that power and prevent that destruction, we have a net economic gain for our people which can be translated into a higher living standard.

That, fundamentally, is the purpose of the Arkansas Valley Authority proposal. It proposes to create a Federal agency with the power and the finance to do what the States alone can never do—combine flood control, power production, aid to navigation, irrigation, and industrial development through construction of water-control projects over the entire drainage basin of our great rivers.

In the period when war demands slacken and work is needed for men, A. V. A. will provide the work. In the years that stretch out ahead A. V. A. will make possible a standard of living which we have never known.

Salute to Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by myself entitled "Salute to Kansas," which was broadcast as a part of the Kansas program carried over station WINX, Washington, D. C., on July 3.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Need I tell you I am very proud of Kansas, and of the Kansas people—after all, States are not great, except as men may make them. Kansas was born in the fierce crucible of the contest over slavery; it was the admission of Kansas as a State, followed by the election of Abraham Lincoln, that precipitated the fratricidal conflict.

John Brown, of Osawatomie, probably was the first Kansan to become nationally known. John Brown, they say, was a fanatic; he broke

the law; he defied his Government. But John Brown had convictions; he had the courage of his convictions. He was willing to die for his beliefs—and he did. There has been a strain of John Brown that has run through most of the history of my native State of Kansas. Puritan Massachusetts contributed much to the early settlement of Kansas, in territorial days. After the Civil War, Union veterans flocked to the State, taking homesteads by the tens of thousands. In the John Brown line I might mention two women who in their time swayed Kansas and electrified—or shocked—the Nation: Mary Ellen Lease, a great political orator, who advised the farmers to "raise less corn and more hell;" and Carrie Nation, who wielded her hatchet with devastating effect in her fight against the demon rum.

Not all the Kansans you have known or heard of have been John Browns and Carrie Nations. William Allen White, of Emporia, has been known to the Nation and beloved by Kansans for nearly a half century, and all that time I am proud to say he has been my very dear friend.

Amelia Earhart, first woman to fly the Atlantic, was a Kansan; Martin and Osa Johnson, who hunted big game with cameras and whose pictures and stories of animals in the wild stretches have intrigued millions of Americans, came from Kansas. Gen. James G. Harbord, of the Radio Corporation of America; Walter Chrysler, of the Chrysler Corporation; Glenn Martin, the world's greatest aircraft manufacturer—they were Kansas boys. A Kansan, Dr. Charles M. Sheldon, of Topeka, wrote In His Steps, a book of which millions of copies were sold, more even than of Uncle Tom's Cabin.

I speak as a Kansas publisher for more than 45 years when I say Kansas has more daily newspapers, and more weekly newspapers per capita, than any other State in the Union—and believe me, freedom of the press is freedom of the press out in my home State of Kansas. Some of the columnists you Washingtonians read daily are Kansans—Gen. Hugh Johnson and Raymond Clapper were born in Kansas; Ernest Lindley, son of the late chancellor of our State university, started his newspaper career on former Senator Henry J. Allen's Wichita Beacon. From John Brown to William Allen White, Kansas has helped the rest of the country to think, sometimes to act.

Why, do you know that Kansas right now has six United States Senators? Well, we do. Senator CLYDE M. REED and myself were elected to the Senate from Kansas by the people of Kansas. Senator CARL HATCH, born in Kansas, was elected to the Senate from New Mexico; Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, born in Kansas, represents Colorado; Senator JOHN THOMAS, of Idaho, is a Kansan; W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas, is from Kingman, Kans.

Walter Johnson, famous baseball pitcher, is a Kansan, also Glenn Cunningham, who broke records as a fast runner; Ina Claire, the late Jean Harlow, Fred Stone, Buddy Rogers, Marion Talley—these also came from Kansas, as did Dorothy Canfield, Brock Pemberton, and a number of other well-known authors. Swen Birger Sandzen, and John Steuart Curry, and Albert T. Reid, artists, are all Kansans.

I have no thought of making a political speech tonight, but just to keep the record straight I think I should tell you Kansas is a pretty good Republican State; has had 21 Republican Governors and only 5 Democratic Governors. It usually sends Republicans to Congress. Right now both Senators are Republicans, and 6 out of 7 Representatives are Republicans. Incidentally, I am proud of my Kansas colleagues in Congress—every one of them—and of our Kansas Governor, Payne H. Ratner.

This may be nothing particularly to brag about, but in the latest four presidential elections my home town of Topeka witnessed three notifications of presidential or vice presidential candidates of major political parties—though it is true only one of them "took," if I may use the expression: The late Charles Curtis was Republican nominee for Vice President in 1928 and 1932; Alf M. Landon the Republican nominee for President in 1936. Seems to me that Earl Browder, Communist nominee for President a time or two, also is a Kansan.

My friends, I could spend the evening telling you of the glories of Kansas, the resources of Kansas, the greatness of Kansas—and the peculiarities of Kansans. But you have not the time for all that. I must hasten on.

I could tell you that we furnish one-fifth of the wheat produced in the United States; and Kansas farmers' income from livestock is even larger than from wheat; we have tremendous resources of petroleum, natural gas, coal, etc. The winds blow cold in Kansas in winter; they blow hot in summer—always the wind blows. I could give you statistics by the ream, but I won't. In closing I just want to say a word about the Kansas people as I know them.

I have lived among these Kansas people for more than three-quarters of a century—I was the first native-born Kansan to be elected Governor of Kansas, and, incidentally, let me say I was born there at a time when it took some nerve to be born in that part of the country. You may travel all over this great country of ours without finding a finer group of American citizens; right thinking, clean living men and women; nowhere a people more anxious to meet every obligation of citizenship, and to meet it bravely, fairly, firmly, unselfishly.

I say there is no place in America where the average man and woman is taking a broader view of our problems, or is striving harder, or more unselfishly, to determine the merits of these questions on the broad standpoint of the greatest good to the greatest number. I know of no people striving always for better things, more prone to lead in movements to advance human welfare—and not afraid to blaze the way, even though the way be unpopular.

I love Kansas because of the Kansans who live there, and it is these whom I salute tonight in closing this modest tribute to the State which gave me birth.

Our Republic: It Must Be Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS BY HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AT ASHEVILLE, N. C.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on the Fourth of July, at Asheville, N. C., the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] delivered a very able and patriotic address on the subject, Our Republic: It Must Be Preserved. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens of the United States of America, as we enter upon the one hundred and sixty-sixth year of our independence, we must realize that the American people have, for a decade, been grappling with one of their severest domestic tests, and now must face another of a foreign character even more severe. We must labor under the difficulties of the one while overcoming the other. One is reminded of that early day when the Father of our Country, seeing its difficulties, declared that if our Republic should be so fortunate as to survive 20 years, its preservation and progress would be assured for many decades to come.

It did survive the tests of that period, and it has survived many others, showing to all the world the value of that new order which it expressed. In a progress without precedent, it has proved a blessing not only to all the increasing millions of its inhabitants—the best of governments in the best of forms in the best of lands—but also has proved a light to all humanity, lifting everywhere the aspirations of men and leading them forward to higher ranges of right of hope, and of achievement. One may pause a moment to ask, What sort of world would this be, had this Republic not existed?—and a more intimate question, What sort of life would any one of us live but for the blessings of our Republic? And what sort of future would there be for the human race or for any one of us, should this Republic cease to exist in its historic form and character?

Since that first 20-year period, we have assumed that our Republic could not fail, disregarding the fate of all its predecessors. Many today take for granted its continual existence, ignoring not only the menace of the economic collapse within, but also failing to appreciate the jeopardy in which it stands by reason of the menace of mighty conquering nations, well armed and unrestrained, save as they may be restrained by more than equal force, and overlooking no less the activities of disintegrating forces operating from within. We have been so secure and so happy that we have forgotten that while kingdoms may continue to exist by means of wealth or force or other factors material, republics by their very nature, live only by the will, the intelligence, and the devotion of the people who constitute them, for a republic is founded upon the spirits of men, and notwithstanding the outward appearance and equipment of its power, it is at bottom and essentially a creation of the spirit whose dwelling is the mind of man—the spirit of its people.

As we celebrate this anniversary, let us realize that we do so in an altered world, in the midst of swift and unsuspected movements, and of rapidly changing circumstances, the outcome of which none can foresee. Two events, predetermined by many lesser ones, but unforeseen, have brought about a far-reaching and perhaps a fundamental alteration in the constitution of human society, embracing every nation and affecting every individual. As the consequence of those events, we are in the midst of world revolution, social and economic. Vast change now suddenly confronts the human race—confronts us of this Republic no less than all others.

The first of those events is the break-down, the failure, of the economic order which, arising in more remote centuries, culminated in the economic system under which our country flourished for 130 years. For want of a better name, it is called the system of free enterprise, or capitalism, known to each of us as the individual profit system and free competition, and recognized as of the essence of the Republic itself.

We must recognize that the collapse in the United States, first realized in 1929, occurred under that system, and that while this collapse has been ameliorated since 1933, we have by no means established recovery from

it or remedy for its recurrence. We have softened its conditions but have found no remedy. Whether the method pursued was wise or unwise, or whether some other method would have served better are political questions and not for discussion on this occasion.

The fact of the break-down of our historic economic system stands out to threaten and to challenge us. It happened in our land last of all. It had failed in Britain and on the continent of Europe years before. And in its stead other systems had been erected on that continent—communism in Russia, fascism in Italy, and nazi-ism in Germany. These were in great measure consequences of the failure of the systems which they replaced. And they were the first political manifestations of that failure.

Since 1932 the Republic of the United States has been feeling its way to find recovery from this break-down and adjustment to its consequences in Europe and in the Orient. At the moment we continue only to feel our way while we labor under the necessity of dealing crucially with the other event causing fundamental alteration in human society. We cannot put aside our economic problem, however desirable that may be, while we face another that demands instant and undivided attention. We must endure its hardships and bear in mind its perils, until we shall have established our national security in a world in which anything may happen. Meantime we must hold to the faith that our form of government is not only not at fault but also that, insofar as a people may establish a sound and happy economy through their government, ours offers by far the most hope. There is nothing in the Italian, the Russian, or the German experiments to induce us to emulate them, and much to induce in us a fresh access of devotion to our historic institutions—much to warn us against the radical.

The other of the two events to which I have referred is the revelation in the summer of 1940 of the significance of mechanized warfare as employed by unrestrained nations. We saw the fortresses of Belgium and France fall within 30 days under the attack of bombing planes and tanks of the totalitarian Axis. We perceived with amazement, not yet fully expressed, that the stabilized defense of the great fortresses of Belgium and the Maginot Line, the great guns and ramparts manned by magnificent armies, amounted to nothing before the German lightning strike. Since then we have seen the pass of Thermopylae yield to the same forces, and even more recently Crete has shown that the warship cannot be relied upon to resist the bombing plane, and on the other hand, that by way of the air an invading army may cross a broad expanse of the sea, and overwhelm a well-defended island. The defense of the fortress and the defense of insularity have fallen together before the new weapons of war.

When the means of attack, by reason of the development of gunpowder and guns, became superior to the means of defense by moat and wall, feudalism's doom was sealed and way was made for nationalism, even for democracy. There was fundamental economic revolution. What will be the ultimate consequences of the new superiority of attack by air and tank remains to be seen. But the immediate consequences are plain enough.

We have a new sort of war, called total war—total in its effort and total in its consequences. Noncombatants are as fully exposed as combatants—the children, their mothers and the aged no less than the skilled men who bear arms. And total war has brought to full flower a new sort of government to carry on that war and that war's economy, called totalitarian. All of Europe is under its force; all of Britain is marshaled against it in desperate struggle; and all the peoples of the earth are face to face with its threats, its intimidations, its terror, its treacheries, and its manifest ambition to dominate sea and land, every nation, and every tribe.

It is with this tremendous fact that our Republic must instantly reckon in total effort.

In such a situation it is not enough to declare that this Republic must be preserved: it is imposed upon us to see to it that it shall grapple with these events and all that they predicate; incumbent upon us as individual living units of our Republic so to grapple with them, that as a whole the American people will come through not only unconquered but uncontrolled by any nation or power. It is our duty now so to overmatch their forces as to preserve all the rich meaning of our Republic to ourselves and to mankind—yea, to the God who brought it forth.

We must now give our attention to the place of our country amongst the nations, and particularly to its course, its duty, and our duty as its members, in the world situation, of necessity holding in abeyance the crucial and pressing economic problem, so far as we may. We can and we must proceed as a people at once to avoid the economic threat to our defense of overborrowing. That is, we must pay heavier and heavier taxes, we must buy our country's bonds, we must reduce the nondefense expenditure; and each of us must learn to live on smaller incomes. We must spend less, not only in order that our industrial energies may be geared to the demands of defense, but also to be able to pay taxes and buy bonds.

It is essential that the American people shall comprehend their situation. We must clear away a certain confusion. Disarmament and pacifism as a national policy passed out, under the influence of the Axis menace in the autumn of 1939, when the arms embargo was repealed. Isolation as a policy was ended in March 1941, when the lease-lend bill was enacted providing for all-out aid to Britain and other nations. Those debates are behind us.

The question now is, Shall the United States enter the war as a belligerent, and if so, will the young men go? It is this question that underlies the agitation now going on.

We must be candid. No one desires to get into a war. No one prefers to send men into battle. It is quite clear that the Axis Powers desire to avoid war with us—now. It is the Hitler policy to pick off the nations one after another—one at a time. He is the world's No. 1 isolationist.

But whether our Republic shall become a belligerent is not a question to be settled by our wishes. All agree that belligerency is the last recourse and ought to be avoided if possible. The question will be determined by events, by action, and not by debate. It depends to a great degree upon what Hitler shall do. If he takes a step that involves the security of our Republic, the decision will be made for us and by fate. For this Republic must be preserved; and we preserve it by defending its security. We are not agressors and do not intend to become agressors. We are not appeasers either. We will defend our country in our own way, in our own time, and ask no other nation how. This policy is the one policy best calculated to avoid involvement as a belligerent. For the Axis Powers are tempted by a show of weakness, but stand back upon a show of strength.

Whether we are prepared for the responsibilities of a belligerent is another essential factor in the present equation. I cannot here discuss this question. But I must make one remark: No nation is prepared for war under modern conditions so long as the right to strike against the national defense is recognized and exercised as it is now in this Republic. For full industrial production is as essential to a successful conclusion as ships and men. It is the day of the plane and the tank, the motor, the machine, their operators.

The second factor in the equation of war by this Republic is the common consent of its people. A divided Republic is beaten to begin with. Unity, not a mere majority vote, is indispensable to victory, and, therefore, to belligerency.

The other question is, In event of belligerency, shall our sons go forth to battle on the Old World continents? It does not now seem likely; indeed, there is even question whether that is possible. We have neither the ships to transport them nor the ports to land them. Every vessel is required for other purposes, and will be so required for at least a year to come. All the ports of the European continent are either in Axis possession or under the Axis guns. We do have a great Navy, but it is not equal to war in the two great oceans, east and west.

But we cannot assure Hitler that if and when we must fight we will not fight to the utmost of our power—to the last dollar, the last man, and the last day of our existence. For here, again, the show of strength is the one thing that will deter him and the show of weakness is the one thing that will invite him—and, let us remember, it is he and not us who will determine whether we fight or not. For while his motive is conquest and dominion, our motive continues to be peace and security. We are saying to him only that our Republic must be preserved, that we know that to preserve it we must preserve the means of its security. We prefer to do this without becoming a belligerent; but if he shall make it necessary, we have no choice, for we will preserve this Republic, come what may.

Moreover, we must realize that once in the war we cannot say how far we will go, for we must do all that is necessary to victory.

The theory of our policy is that by full material aid to Britain and other resisting nations we may confine the war to Europe and stop Hitler there; and, further, we are training our Army, building our ramparts, and enlarging our Navy to the end that if Hitler shall not be stopped in Europe we will be ready to resist any encroachment upon the Western Hemisphere that he may attempt. This we consider to be the policy necessary to our peace and to our security.

If this Republic shall now be preserved, its people must rise to every demand of its defense—and that without delay. This may or may not mean war; it means defense in our own time, in our own manner, and without asking the advice or permission of any other nation, whether friendly or unfriendly. This is the only means of our security, war or no war. We must defend and defend promptly and effectually, or take the risk of the most powerful menace in our history.

For the present we defend by way of all-out aid to Britain recognizing the value of her character, her courage and her fleet as a barrier between us and those who would otherwise drive us into a corner to our undoing. We defend by aid to China because she is a threat to the third arm of the Axis of total war. We will defend by aid to other nations so far as we can, if thereby we may help to arrest the Axis progress. And we will defend by appropriate action of our own the right of American ships under the American flag to go their ways on the free and open seas of the globe, because the freedom of the seas is essential to American freedom. If such defense means war, then we have no choice. For defend we must. And we know if war must come, it will come not by way of what we may do, but wholly by way of what we

fail to do—not by reason of our defense but whenever Hitler shall consider that he is strong enough to take us over.

At the moment our country is not a belligerant, and while all hope it may escape actual warfare, it ought to be realized that we are gravely affected by the world revolution and gravely involved by way of responsibility for the security of our people; we must know that at any moment we may, without departure from our present necessary course of defensive action, become involved as a belligerent and further, that once so involved the greater responsibility for a successful conclusion will devolve upon the United States. We must, even while hoping to avoid war, gird our Republic to the utmost and seek in every way to stay the hand of the would-be world conqueror until our power shall overmatch his—in which event he would not fight. Let us understand that we cannot provoke him by show of strength, but can tempt him by display of weakness.

Our President, in his recent address, drew the line of our defense, beyond which the Axis Powers may not step without war—giving necessary, timely, and plain notice—"Thus far and no farther." We will preserve, he said, our freedom of the seas, because our security is at stake in its preservation. We will not permit the control of the Atlantic or Pacific to pass to the Axis Powers, because with that control would pass also the security of our people and the destiny of their country. We will not fail in all our material aid to Great Britain, because to fail her seems to mean nothing less than surrender the seas to the Axis. We will not permit certain strategic island bases to pass into Axis control, because control of those bases by the Axis Powers would put our country in jeopardy.

Such is the notice given; and it remains only for the Axis Powers to bring on war by disregarding that notice. "We will not yield," said the President, in a more recent message to the Congress; and he meant what he said, and all America meant it with him. We will not yield. It is right that he gave this notice; it is wise that he gave this notice. And giving it for all concerned he gave it no less to the American people, in whose behalf and for whose interest he gave it.

It is time, high time, that every one of us fully realized the gravity of the hour. We are at the end of our first year of preparation for the crucial demands that the ordeal imposes. But there are lamentable evidences that few realize what confronts us. We have made only a start upon our program, and are far behind the Axis in armed force and in power to produce planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition. We are passing from the special depression economy to the defense-preparation economy, but we have not made the transition. We produced only 5,000 fighting planes in the year and only 1,000 tanks. We are short of ammunition. Our shipping program will not be adequate, so far as produced ships are concerned, within 18 months. We are struggling with the immense task of arming our Republic and other nations at the same time. On every hand we hear of bottlenecks, congestions, shortages, and delays. And, most regrettable, certain labor leaders and agitators are insisting upon the right to strike against the defense of their country, notwithstanding every possible assurance of just treatment. The subversive element, the saboteur, and the Communist are active; and it is of the gravest significance that the headmen of one great labor organization have declared against ridding it of its Communist members—that is, men who are committed to the overthrow of our Republic and cannot be trusted by it. It is no less perilous that we have so far departed from the spirit of our Republic as to encourage a system under which loyal Americans are not permitted to work unless they join an organization, pay its tribute, and take its orders.

Fully 80 percent of the American people are wholly loyal and desire to serve their country's need. The same ratio applies to the workers of America. As a rule, they are as loyal and true as their other fellow citizens. It is now for them to demand a leadership that puts the defense of their country above any class or personal interest or program, and the rights of men above class-struggle for power. It is not patriotic to seize upon a great people's distress to make profits or to advance one's interest—and this goes for all, rich or poor, capitalist and worker. It is not right to coerce men for any cause in this land save by the compulsion of law in due process.

We must find our unity now without delay—unity in the common sense that informs one that the security of one's country is indispensable to the welfare of every person and every class; unity in the will to defend our land at whatever the cost, unity in the example of the soldier's sacrifice to which he is bound no more than every other inhabitant, each in his own way, each in all that he has and is, each according to what he is capable of doing for his country. We must prepare to meet the challenge of the Axis powers with total American effort. We must show the ages how this Republic may put forth total effort without becoming totalitarian, and thereby win our title to lead mankind for 1,000 years to come. We may bend its structure, but we will not suffer it to be broken. We will strain it under the pressure of dire necessity, but in doing so we will so provide that once the pressure shall be removed, it will right itself, resume its normal character and proceed on its course as the Republic of liberty.

There is such a thing amongst men as that which is called Americanism—definite and distinguished, a blessing to all who share it, and known to its beneficiaries even though we have difficulty in defining it.

Perhaps it is not to be defined; but to attempt it today is not out of order. Politically it is government by representative democracy, restrained by a Constitution that defines the limits of the power of those who govern; that erects, as against the Government itself, a bill of inalienable rights in behalf of each individual; a Republic of States, sovereign in their spheres but united in one Nation, that finds its unity in the assent of its people rather than by force of law. It rests upon the power to serve rather than the power to compel. Its sources are moral rather than physical. Morally its purpose is to free the energies and the aspirations of its people. Its rewards are well-being and content, not power and riches. It recognizes the divine spark in every man and woman, every boy and girl, and gives each a share in sovereign right, sovereign power, and sovereign duty. It proclaims a liberty that demands tolerance of opinion, of race, of religion, of occupation; and in this liberty it finds the source of its most cherished aspiration—equality of right, equality before the law, equality in education, equality in religion, equality of opportunity to work, to save, to rise, to prosper. It proposes a justice that goes far beyond the courts, an economic and social justice for each and all, the weakest no less than the strongest.

This Americanism is the ruling spirit of a land in which no force is exercised save under laws approved by the people and by officers responsible to them; in which there is no compulsion and no coercion except the compulsion and coercion of law under due process, and not of men; in this land no individual nor any group may take the law into its own hands; here even the people themselves are bound to preserve the inalienable rights of every man; here there can be neither exercise of arbitrary power nor any sort of tyranny; here is, indeed, a land of liberty and justice, where every man may work out his destiny in the earth, only provided he support the Republic under which he enjoys liberties so full and privileges so great.

Of such was that new order of the ages which was set up in our land 165 years ago, and the reminder that it was conceived as a new order of the ages appears in the Latin inscription upon the great seal of the United States, reproduced upon our dollar bills. Favored by natural conditions, but favored more by the political, social, and personal climate of the principles of this new order, we have built here the greatest and richest, the most liberal, the most progressive, and the happiest of empires. Only 6 percent of earth's population, we do 40 percent of earth's commerce. We have had the benefit of the dynamic of individual incentive to the pursuit of happiness, of the self-reliance, and the self-respect guaranteed in our Bill of Rights, and also the sense of individual dignity in the realization of responsibility for our Government, and, in a wider realm, of man's relation to his Creator.

So greatly has this new order succeeded that wholly by example and emulation its influence has extended throughout the earth. The peoples of China and Russia, of Japan and Germany, of Britain and France would like to do things the way Americans do them. American liberty, American wealth, American industry, and American opportunity are the goal of the peoples of all nations.

Often have I thought these 10 years—often I think these present days—that our Republic is more than a mere government or form of order; that it is the flowering of the aspirations of mankind throughout the ages; the culmination of the prophet's vision and the reformer's hope, the product of that conception of man in his responsibility to his Maker which is written large in that Book of Books found in every American's home. Often do I think of it as a treasure in trust, and exceedingly precious, a priceless possession, a matchless heritage; not just because it is my Government, but because its character and form, its meaning and processes provide freedom and security for the minds and souls of its people, not less than for their property and their lives.

Such an institution of government is worth all that may be exacted to preserve it—to its inhabitants, to mankind, and to the Creator of men. No sacrifice is too great in such a cause. And, must I remind you, the instant of sacrifice is at hand. From now until the menace shall have disappeared, every citizen of this Republic must think and act not in terms of what he may enjoy for himself nor in terms of what his Government may do for him, but in terms of what would be his fate and his children's fate if economic breakdown should impair our Republic's character or the Axis Powers should gain any degree of dominion over it; in terms of what he must do to preserve the Republic in its true character and the blessings of its liberty to himself, if he shall be spared, and, at any rate, to his posterity—precisely the spirit which moved the fathers to bring forth the Republic.

And so, my fellow Americans, I summon you in this one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the best of governments in the most blessed of lands, as you desire security, as you love peace, as you cherish your homes, as you owe a heritage to your children, as you fear and would serve the God of Nations and of our fathers—to the defense of your country. The Republic of the United States—it must be preserved; and by no less than the sacrificial service of none other than ourselves.

The Late Senator Robinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS OF ARKANSAS BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD memorial resolutions adopted by the Arkansas Bar Association with respect to the late Senator Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas, which were presented to the Supreme Court of Arkansas on June 30, 1941, by J. F. Loughborough, Esq.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM—JOSEPH TAYLOR ROBINSON

MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE SUPREME COURT JUNE 30, 1941, BY J. F. LOUGHBOROUGH

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONORS:

During the summer vacation of 1937 the people of this State and of the Nation were shocked by word from Washington that Senator Joseph T. Robinson had been called from his important public work at the zenith of his career and would be with us no more. Thereby another vacancy in the roll of attorneys at this bar and the passing of one of its most distinguished members is noted. His associates of the State bar, through a committee of the State bar association, have adopted resolutions expressing their feelings on the occasion, and have added thereto a short biographical sketch of Senator Robinson's career, and appointed me to present a copy to this court, which, with your permission, I will now do.

RESOLUTIONS OF ARKANSAS BAR ASSOCIATION, JUNE 30, 1941

On July 14, 1937, after a strenuous day in the Senate, during which he was called upon to make a great effort, Senator Joseph Taylor Robinson laid down his earthly burdens and surrendered his spirit to his Maker; and thus came to an end, at the age of 64 years, a life filled with accomplishments, adorned with honors, and known by a reputation for sterling personal worth, great achievement, and remarkable public service that was appreciated, not only within but far beyond his own State and Nation, in nearly all of the civilized world.

Apart from the great loss to his devoted wife, the members of his family, and his host of personal friends, his State, his country, and other nations cherish his memory and mourn his loss as that of a great statesman who had earned and had the highest rank: Therefore be it

Resolved by the members of the Arkansas Bar Association, That in the death of Joseph Taylor Robinson the State of Arkansas has lost a great lawyer and its foremost statesman, whose counsel and leadership will be missed by all; be it further

Resolved, That in the loss of this distinguished citizen we recognize and acknowledge that the State has been deprived of her greatest leader in public affairs; be it further

Resolved, That the deepest sympathy of the members of the Bar Association of Arkansas be extended to the widow and other relatives of the deceased, and as a token of their respect for the deceased that a copy of these resolutions be sent to his widow and a copy thereof be presented to the Supreme Court of Arkansas.

That the outstanding achievements and events in Senator Robinson's career may now be called to mind in his memory and preserved for the permanent records of this court, the members of the committee appointed to present the foregoing resolutions add thereto the following biographical sketch:

Joseph Taylor Robinson was born in the rural community of Concord, in Lonoke County, Ark., on August 26, 1872. He was the youngest of 10 children of Dr. James and Mrs. Matilda Jane Swaim Robinson. His father was a physician, with a large practice. He and Mrs. Robinson were both sturdy characters with strong religious leanings. In fact, Dr. Robinson was a minister of the gospel as well as a physician. Their son, Joe, was brought up in surroundings where intrinsic worth was highly regarded, and where industry, proper self-denial, and wholesome living ruled in the upbringing of children and certainly were adhered to in the raising of Joe Robinson.

Joe was a strong boy and young man; he was a good hand at all kinds of farm work and proficient in the athletic games played by the boys of his day. He was naturally endowed with and his habits further developed a strong constitution that stood him in good stead in after life, when the very great strains of his public work made large demands upon his physical strength.

Joe early had a thirst for knowledge and was a very good student for a boy of his physical activity. He began attendance in the public schools at an early age and continued that attendance and his studies with unusual regularity and zest. At the age of 16 he was licensed to teach in the public schools of Arkansas and was given a first-grade certificate; and he began teaching at that early age. By nature he was deeply religious, and his surroundings in that regard were thoroughly congenial. He joined the Methodist Church when he was 12 years old, and later, when he began teaching in the public schools, he also taught a Sunday School class and served as a church steward. Information from his eldest sister, now living, is that he frequently led the family prayers and often assisted his older brother, who was a Methodist minister, in the preparation of his sermons. Her testimonial to him about those youthful days is that he was a splendid boy.

Joe early fixed his ambition to be a lawyer, and while he was still quite young he was known as a good speaker and debater. He was a student at the University of Arkansas, where he paid his way by working. He also attended the University of Virginia law school and completed a summer course there. He continued his study of the law in the office of Judge Thomas Trimble, of Lonoke, Ark., and was admitted to the State bar in 1895, and immediately formed a partnership with Judge Trimble for the practice of law, which continued until he moved to Little Rock to serve as Governor of Arkansas. A year previous to his admission to the bar he had been elected to the State legislature. He was admitted to practice in this court December 24, 1900. In 1896 he was married to Ewilda Miller. From 1895 until 1902 he devoted all of his time to the practice of law. In the latter year he was elected to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to which he was reelected for four successive terms. In those days the Congress was not in session more than half of the year, and during the vacations of that body Joe Robinson was busily engaged in court work and other duties of a practicing lawyer.

In 1912 he was elected Governor of the State of Arkansas while still a Member of Congress. He resigned from Congress on January 14, 1913, and was inaugurated as Governor a few days later. On January 28, 1913, he was elected United States Senator by the Legislature of Arkansas to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Jeff Davis. His election to the United States Senate was the last one made by a State legislature, as the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution providing for such elections by direct vote of the people was ratified on May 31, 1913. He continued to serve as Governor through the session of the legislature, resigning on March 10, 1913, to take his seat in the United States Senate. Thus, within a period of 10 days he was a Member of the National House of Representatives, Governor of Arkansas, and elected to the United States Senate—a unique experience, doubtless unequaled in the political history of the Nation. There was some criticism of his action in accepting the election to the Senate instead of serving his term as Governor, and, solely on that ground, his election to the Senate at the next election was opposed by a distinguished and worthy opponent, but Senator Robinson carried that election by a large majority. He was reelected to the United States Senate five times by increasing majorities, and finally, in the election of 1930, he carried every county in the State, and that without making a speech or sending out a circular letter to the voters.

Thus Senator Robinson served 10 years in the House of Representatives of Congress and 24 years in the Senate, a continuous service of 34 years in national lawmaking.

During that period, at intervals, he made campaigns for reelection, and in the recesses of Congress he made many speeches at public gatherings on various occasions in different parts of the State; and so he was in constant touch with the people all over the State.

From the traditions of the section of the country in which he was born and lived and by his own inclinations and beliefs as they developed with his maturity, he was a Democrat, and his loyalty to the principles and procedure of that party continued throughout his life, and all of his political races were for nominations to or election on the Democratic ticket. He was a delegate to five Democratic National Conventions—the one in San Francisco in 1920, the one in New York in 1924, the one in Houston in 1928, the one in Chicago in 1932 and the one in Philadelphia in 1936. He was chairman of those conventions in the years 1920, 1928, and 1936. He was the only man in the history of the Democratic Party who was made permanent chairman of each of three of their national conventions. He was minority leader of the Democrats in the Senate from the year 1923 to 1933, and was Democratic majority leader there from 1933 until his death. He was nominated by acclamation by the Democratic National Convention in 1928 for Vice President of the United States.

He was appointed by President Hoover as a delegate to the London Naval Conference in 1930, the other members of the delegation being Secretary of State Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Adams, Ambassador Dawes, Senator Dwight Morrow, and Senator Reed, of Pennsylvania. It was generally agreed that it was largely due to his tact, good judgment, and behavior that the dissensions in that conference were finally overcome.

In 1927 the Secretary of State designated Senator Robinson a delegate to the World Trade Conference in Rio de Janeiro, and from there the State Department sent him on a good-will mission to Argentina, Chile, and Peru. He was a member of the Commission appointed to set up a complete system of gov-

ernment in Samoa in 1929. The many legal questions involved in that work aroused his intense interest, and his services there were a great success. He attended the inauguration of the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth in Manila in 1935 as a congressional delegate and made many warm friends among the officials of that new nation. When he died their national assembly adopted touching resolutions expressing their grief and their sympathy with our Government in the loss of Senator Robinson and immediately adjourned as a token of respect for him. He was vice president of the Interparliamentary Union, a member of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, chairman of the Joint Committee on Government Reorganization, and a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The degree of doctor of laws was conferred on him by the University of Arkansas in 1922.

He continued his membership in the Methodist Church, and was a Scottish Rite thirty-second degree Mason.

He died in Washington on July 14, 1937, during the session of the Seventy-fifth Congress. His body lay in state in the Senate Chamber, and impressive funeral services were held there on July 15. The Senate was in special session for the occasion, and the ceremonies were attended by the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, representatives of the Supreme Court, the members of the diplomatic corps of other nations, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and Members of the House of Representatives in a body.

Preceding the adjournment of the House and the Senate in his honor immediately following the death of Senator Robinson, some 17 Senators arose and spoke feelingly of their sorrow and the Nation's loss on his passing. On April 20, 1938, the day for memorial exercises in the Senate for those Members of that body who had died during the preceding year, some 16 Senators paid other glowing tributes to the memory of Senator Robinson.

At the times of his funeral services and memorial services in Washington, 34 Members of the Senate, from 26 different States, eulogized Senator Robinson, all expressing deep feelings of personal loss and giving high praise to his life and work. Senator Lewis, of Illinois, was unable to be present at the time of the memorial services, and he delivered his eulogy in a nationally broadcast radio address. The proceedings and the remarks made on these occasions were ordered printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are permanently shown there.

His burial and the religious services therefor were in Little Rock, and more than 80 of his colleagues and Members of the National House of Representatives came here to be in attendance upon them. After simple impressive funeral services in the First Methodist Church at Eighth and Center Streets in Little Rock, the funeral cortege moved to the burial place in Rose Lawn Cemetery, a distance of about 3 miles. People, several deep, lined both sides of the street and road all the way from the church to the cemetery, standing with uncovered heads and sad countenances as the melancholy procession passed. This feature of the solemn occasion was so striking that it brought home to all who saw it the affection and the high esteem in which Senator Robinson was regarded by all classes of people. Their sorrow was beautifully expressed by the editor of one of the Arkansas daily papers, thus:

"It has been said of some beloved and honored men in history that when they died little children cried in the streets. There were literal tears when the sad news came that Joseph Taylor Robinson, Arkansas' beloved and honored son, had been taken away. The people of this State were moved by feelings so deep and poignant that it far transcended all ordinary public regret at the death of a distinguished public officer."

Immediately following his death it seemed there was a lament among all classes of people in all parts of the United States. A remarkably striking evidence of that was the editorial comment that was made upon the character, life, and accomplishments of Senator Robinson by newspapers in all parts of the Nation. A friend of Mrs. Robinson rendered her the service of securing clippings of these editorials from newspapers in different parts of the country and putting them in a scrapbook. That book shows some 650 editorials obtained in that manner. They are from all parts of the United States, many of them by editors who were ardent Republicans or who belonged to parties other than the Democratic Party; but in none of them is anything said of Senator Robinson that is not in admiration of his character, praise of his accomplishments, and sorrow over his loss.

In the House and in the Senate he was a loyal supporter of the Democratic Party's measures, and his leadership of the party in the Senate was marked by aggressiveness; but such was his candor and fairness and scrupulous fulfillment of his promises that at the time of his death it has been truly said he did not have an enemy in the Congress.

In addition to the testimonials from his countrymen, 18 foreign countries sent messages of condolence, either directly or through their embassies here to our Secretary of State, offering their sympathy to the Nation in its loss. Mrs. Robinson also received many personal messages of sympathy and regret from citizens of other nations. Of his reputation abroad the editor of another of our Arkansas daily papers stated:

"In Europe he was considered one of the few really outstanding statesmen this Nation has produced during the last three decades."

As minority leader, and afterward as majority leader in the Senate, Senator Robinson had occasion for many contacts with those who were Presidents of the United States during the time of his service in the Senate. In fact, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives his counsel and assistance there were sought by the Presidents of the United States much more than is usual from the membership of that numerous body.

The attachés in the White House related an incident that occurred during the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt. The Arkansas delegation, headed by Senator Berry, called on the President, requesting that he rescind an order he had issued that adversely affected some of their constituents. After impatiently listening to their plea, the President replied impetuously, "If you were not such estimable gentlemen I should say you were a set of asses." Senator Berry was very much taken back, and informed the President that he withdrew his request, and left the Executive offices, followed by nearly all of the delegation. Only Representative Joe Robinson remained. Turning to Robinson, the President curtly said, "Well, what do you think of it?" "I think, Mr. President," replied young Robinson, "that your treatment of that old Confederate soldier was a gross act of discourtesy to a fine old gentleman. You did not give him an opportunity to fully explain the case." The bold speech arrested the attention of the President, who then performed one of his characteristic acts—he stated positively to Robinson, "You are right, my boy," called his secretary, and dictated a telegram granting the request Senator Berry had made. Whereupon Robinson said that he felt he had used too strong language. But the President brushed that aside with the remark, "Don't apologize when you are right. You are right in this instance; I was too hasty." The acquaintance thus formed ripened into friendship, and the President often called on Representative Robinson for his advice and valued his opinions highly.

When Judge Trieber died and a vacancy was created on the Federal bench for the eastern district of Arkansas, the thought of nearly everyone was that certainly a Republican would be appointed to the place. Urged by some members of the State bar and because of his own wishes in the matter, Senator Robinson went to President Coolidge with the request that he appoint John E. Martineau to fill the vacancy; and such was the influence of Senator Robinson that President Coolidge made the appointment, over strong opposition from prominent members of his party.

After the World War Senator Robinson seriously considered retiring from public office and devoting his time to the practice of law. When the rumor that he would not seek reelection was reported to President Wilson, he wrote to Senator Robinson urging that he stand for reelection, and stated:

"It would be regrettable to lose your services to the country, for I consider you the moral and intellectual leader of the Senate."

It is well known that President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as well as the Democratic Members of the Senate, greatly relied on Senator Robinson's leadership. The President held him in the highest esteem and continually sought his counsel and advice. On his death, President Roosevelt immediately wrote and caused to be published a tribute to him, in which he said:

"In his going Joe Robinson has left a record as high in achievement as it was faithful in performance. He never temporized with principle nor bargained where the public interest was the issue. But, day by day, through long service in high office, he brought to the national councils the contribution of great learning and sound wisdom—a leadership inspired by courage and guided by consummate common sense and a devotion to duty given without selfish interest.

"And so death found him at the last with hope unfaltering, with vision undimmed, and with courage unafraid. Of him well may it be said: 'He has fought a good fight; he has finished his course; he has kept the faith.'"

There is no doubt that the President intended very shortly to appoint Senator Robinson to the vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States caused by the retirement of Justice Van Devanter. He was the choice for that appointment of everyone in the Senate; and the appointment would certainly have been made following the adjournment of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Thus the work, career, and achievements of Joseph Taylor Robinson were largely in the public service—and what an imposing array of accomplishments he has to his credit in that field! No man from Arkansas has had anything near equal to it.

Yet—and this is interesting to bench and bar and is well worth noting in our record of his career—during all of his public life his leaning was toward and his greatest professional interest was in the practice of the law. In his early manhood his interest in the law as a science was most noticeable, and in his more mature studies—in the public schools, at the University of Arkansas, in Judge Trimble's office, and at the University of Virginia—he showed those traits of devotion to the work of the advocate and the administration of the law that mark the lawyer. From the time he was admitted to the bar until he made his campaign for Governor and on his election moved to Little Rock, he was actively engaged in the practice in his judicial circuit and in other parts of the State as a partner in the firm of Trimble & Robinson. He moved his home to Little Rock in 1913 and lived here until his death. While

he resided in Little Rock, he still attended to such private practice as his time would permit during the vacations of Congress; and, contemplating retirement from public life, was associated in name but not in the partnership with the firm Coleman, Robinson & House from 1919 to 1926, and with the firm Robinson, House & Moses from 1926 until 1934. In the later years of his life his time was so completely occupied by his duties in public affairs that he retired entirely from private practice. But he was greatly interested in the law as a profession, took pride in the fact that he was a lawyer; he liked to associate with lawyers and talk about questions of law and experiences in the courts; he enjoyed a debate; and was a pleasing, efficient, and successful advocate. He was very industrious, and investigated his cases fully and carefully and took great pains that they were well prepared for trial. In examining witnesses and otherwise in developing the facts of a case, he was exceedingly good; and his arguments in the courtroom were clear, forceful, and convincing.

He had a well-knit body; a strong and pleasing cast of countenance; bright, flashing eyes; a strong and likeable personality; a clear, resonant voice; a gift for expressing himself clearly and in pleasing terms; and he could call on plenty of dramatic ability when its use was desirable to present his points and impress his hearers. In the debates in which he participated, whether in the courtroom or in legislative bodies or on the stump, he was candid and fair and his desire ever was to get to the real merit of any matter in dispute and present it clearly. His arguments were noticeably free from resort to quibbles or mere technicalities. His knowledge of parliamentary law was profound, and that, with his other fine qualities for such things, made him a presiding officer with few peers and probably no superiors during his time.

One of his outstanding characteristics, commented on by all who knew him well, was his high courage and his willingness to face any issue that arose. Again, his life was marked by a constant feeling and conduct of loyalty to all who had any claim upon him. His industry was so exceedingly great that few who ever came in contact with him did not wonder how he found the time to do the things he undertook; yet his disposition was such that things he undertook were never left uncompleted. His intelligence was high, his mind strong and independent, and he had the rare virtue of being a careful and interested listener to the opinions of others. His sense of humor constantly enlivened his conversation. He had a fund of good stories and anecdotes, and appreciated the stories of others, laughing heartily over anything funny. His feelings generally were most kindly, and if he came in contact with a person or situation where there was anything pathetic, his sympathies were immediately aroused and he was generous in his expenditure of time and trouble to aid those who needed help. His influence was so great that there were many occasions when his assistance was sought in securing offices and employment for friends, acquaintances, and many others. For really thousands of people he secured employment important enough to support them; and it was one of his greatest pleasures to be able to do so. He was beloved by very many, in all walks of life. In his political campaigns it was most noticeable how many people volunteered to help him, and were willing to stop whatever they were doing and devote their time and efforts to his cause. His manners were natural and unassuming, and his behavior on all occasions was characterized by becoming dignity. He liked company, and keenly enjoyed an evening with a circle of friends, where his wit, humor, and fund of good stories added greatly to the pleasure of the occasion. For recreation he liked hunting, fishing, and golf. He was a fine shot, particularly with a shotgun; he liked a good dog, and some of his happiest times were in hunting quail or duck.

As has been noted, he was married to Ewilda Miller in 1896. There were no children of this union, but, as is often the case in such a situation, the love and devotion of each to the other far transcended any other interest in life. Senator and Mrs. Robinson were together on all occasions. Each had supreme confidence in the other; their congeniality was perfect; their married life was beautiful.

As a leader, a trusted and beloved citizen, and in his many successive positions of power and influence, he was paid a great deal of homage, given much deserved applause, and doubtless was the recipient of a great deal of flattery; but with all of his power and all the homage that was paid him, he remained unspoiled. He was easily approached and had time and interest for the humblest matter that came to his attention; and this was completely so up to the very time of his death. It has been well said of him, that he continued to grow from the time he started in his young manhood until he died.

J. F. LOUGHBOROUGH,
Chairman,
HENRY M. ARMISTEAD,
J. R. WILSON,
Committee.

Addresses Bicentennial Celebration at Manheim, Lancaster County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on Saturday evening last at Manheim, Lancaster County, Pa., on the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of Manheim.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen; observances such as this help to give all of us a perspective upon our own history. I shall leave to others more qualified the pleasant task of tracing the rise of this community over the course of two centuries. Nor need I point out that while this fertile land was still being reclaimed from wilderness the artistry of Baron Stiegel of Manheim in glass was renowned wherever things of beauty are recognized and appreciated.

In coming here I am reminded that when my paternal ancestors passed through this countryside before the Revolution, en route over the Alleghenies to seek a home near Fort Ligonier in what is now Westmoreland County, the community of Manheim was already well established as the hub of a pioneering farm community. I feel a kinship for this countryside because my maternal forbears settled in Lancaster County, on Conoy Creek, and several of them are buried in the old Donegal Church Cemetery not many miles from here.

Two hundred years of the toil and perseverance of a hard-working, determined people have gone into the creation of a prosperous center of industry and agriculture out of the pioneering settlement erected by the founding fathers of Manheim.

We must necessarily feel, today, that this very history of struggle imposes upon all of us a duty to make certain that such sacrifice and toil was worth while, to carry forward the work of those who have gone before, to enrich the heritage we have received for the benefit of those who will come after us.

We know it was not an easy task to break the rich soil of this countryside to the plough, to clear away the woodlands, to fend off hostile savages, to erect civilized habitations and establish a government of law and order in the wilderness. We know it took fortitude, courage, and rare persistency. Those pioneers who undertook to conquer the soil could not have hoped in their generation to have all the civilized advantages enjoyed in the Old World. It was enough for them that they were free men, governing themselves in their own way, worshipping in their own churches without compulsion or persecution. It was enough that their government was their own, created by their own will and not forced upon them by the will of another. It was enough that they were free to speak and write as they chose. Their life was hard, but it was their own. The land they conquered with their rude farming implements took its toll in sweat and labor, but it repaid their efforts with rich harvests, and it was theirs, a living for themselves and a heritage for their children. We can guess what that freedom, that lordship of each over his own acres, must have meant to the many who were refugees from persecution in foreign lands.

In the years that followed those early beginnings the men of Manheim fought to make their new Nation independent, in order that their own independence might be assured. They fought still later to maintain the freedom of the seas, which was indispensable to their national life as the youngest member in the family of nations. When the time came to fight for preservation of the Federal Union upon which their free democracy rested, they were ready and quick to respond.

The years brought growth and change. Broad farm lands succeeded the forests, old communities grew, and new ones were started. More and better roads opened new fields for development of commerce and exchange of ideas. Even the most outlying settlements were brought closer in point of time to the centers of urban life and to the seats of State and National Governments. Out of this growth and this interchange came a unity of purpose—an expression in concrete form of the aspirations which had sent men and women into the wilderness to find "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Modern inventions, modern ways of life, the narrowing of horizons through swift communication and travel by land, sea, and air—all have contributed to make life more complex, and at the same time to make the application of the simple, straightforward principles of the founding fathers more difficult. Yet we have seen those principles woven into the fabric of our lives, and the more complex our problems the more those principles appeal to us as common sense, practical, honest, and just. As the years go on and as our national problems increase, we come to appreciate them the more because they stand up under everyday wear and tear. Often we don't think of them consciously. In fact, we rarely do except when they are threatened. Without even thinking about them, we use them as a yardstick in measuring both men and nations. If an employer mistreats and exploits his workers, we despise

him, for our judgments are guided by the principle that men were not made for either chattel slavery or wage slavery. If one man's right to speak and write as he chooses is threatened, we are up in arms, for we know that whoever challenges that right is challenging our own liberty as well. We never think in terms of religious persecution because for generations it has been entirely foreign to our thoughts, but when we see it practiced in foreign lands we condemn its wickedness. We accept it as a matter of course that no man can be deprived of his property without due process of law, and that everyone accused of crime shall have, as a matter of inalienable right, a fair and open trial before a jury of his peers. Habeas corpus and trial by jury are so much a part of our lives that we never think that they are not by any means universal, but instead are guaranteed under a form of government which must be maintained if they are to survive. We have enjoyed the blessings of liberty as naturally as we enjoy the air and sunlight, and it is only by searching back through history that we come to realize they are not gifts of nature but man-made creations, born of mankind's thirst for justice, won and maintained by our ancestors on many a bloody battlefield. How many of us, who indifferently neglect to cast a ballot on election day, realize that men died to win that right, and that millions in dictator-ridden lands today would give all they possess for such a mighty weapon.

If there is any truth in the repeated assertions of the European dictators that the democracies have grown soft, it lies in this, that we have so long enjoyed the fruits of democracy that we have lost sight of the principles upon which they rest. If it is inconvenient to go to the polls, we permit corrupt political machines to thwart our will. If someone expresses beliefs contrary to our own, particularly in times of anxiety and stress, we feel inclined to waive the principle of free speech and even to cheer when someone cracks down on him, even though we know, or should know if we thought about it, that we may also have need some day to speak out against the wishes of the majority just as he does. We are too often tolerant of the oppression of minorities without realizing that we, too, may sometime find ourselves in the minority and similarly oppressed.

This, then, is the real danger to a free America, the danger that without realizing it we will hold our own free institutions too lightly, and will blindly go forward with "business as usual" when they are threatened. There were peoples in Europe who had such institutions and did not appreciate them until they were gone.

We are too easily disposed to look upon our democracy as something in terms of history, of great sayings by our great men, of orations on patriotic occasions. If that were all, we could inter it in the Library of Congress and forget it except on ceremonial occasions. It is more than that, much more.

It is our right to live and breathe without fear, knowing we will not be carried off in the night to a concentration camp, knowing our lives are not being shadowed by secret police, knowing the race or creed of ourselves or our grandparents will not be called into question. It is our right to think as we please, say what we please, write what we please, worship as we please. It is our right to earn our living in our chosen calling, to obtain the rewards of our labor and enterprise, and to be secure in our right to our homes and our possessions.

These are fundamental natural rights, but not universal rights. They are denied to millions living in otherwise civilized lands in other parts of the earth. It is not inconceivable—in fact, it is highly probable—that we, too, would be denied them were we so unfortunate as to accept or have imposed upon us the philosophy underlying the dictatorships.

Let no one suppose that a determined effort is not being made to have us accept it. The attack is both direct and indirect, and in both cases it is constant and unrelenting.

The direct attack is an appeal to fear, ignorance, bigotry, and discontent. No effort has been spared to terrorize men and women in this country whose loved ones are under the domination of dictatorship abroad. No appeal has been too fantastic to make to those who, in their ignorance of the blessings of democracy, can be persuaded to believe that one-man government is better than government by the people. No means of encouraging class, racial, religious, or political bigotry has been overlooked. No opportunity to prey upon the discontent of the underprivileged has gone unnoticed.

Even more dangerous, because more subtle and insidious, is the indirect approach. Many otherwise patriotic but faint-hearted Americans, unmindful of history and unable to comprehend the meaning of democracy, counsel compromise. They forget the basic principle of Christianity, that there can be no compromise with evil. Some of them sincerely believe that in lending aid to the defenders of democracy abroad we are embarking upon an idealistic missionary adventure. Nothing could be farther from the truth. We are thinking in hard-headed, deliberately selfish, and calculated terms, in terms of saving our own democracy. We are thinking in terms of having other nations bear the brunt of the battle against dictatorship in order that our own young men may not have to march out on the firing line. It is as simple as that. Appeasers have contended all along that we were motivated by a desire to help Britain for sentimental or commercial or other reasons apart from our own defense. The latest turn of events, the outbreak of war between Germany and Russia, has shown how false and hollow that argument was, for we are now pledged to help Russia, and no one can possibly contend that we have any special interest in the defense of the Soviet form of government. We simply recognize that every soldier who bears arms against Hitler is defending us by helping to destroy a regime which has exploited and sacrificed the German people to a mad ambition on the one hand and oppressed millions of Europeans on the other. We know that if Russian soldiers were not fighting to stem the Nazi advance in the Ukraine, if British R. A. F. flyers were not bombing the invasion ports on the French coast, if Australians were not storming the Nazi strongholds in Africa, the so-called wave of the future would be even now rolling over us in full tide.

Can anyone doubt that Hitler desires the great riches of the American continents? The recent history of his conquests should leave little doubt of that. Can anyone doubt that he would fulfill that desire if he were able? No one who has read the daily newspapers in recent years could deny it. And can anyone doubt that if he were master of Europe, with the Asiatic part of his Axis under his control, and with no armies in the field opposing him, no British fighters and bombers disputing his mastery of the air, no British Fleet to disrupt his shipping, he would hesitate for a moment to prepare for new conquest on this continent? We would like to believe he would not. Many who blind themselves to facts have persuaded themselves that he would not. We cannot afford to deceive ourselves with such wishful thinking.

Every foreign soldier on the firing lines against Hitler, every foreign sailor harassing his raiders on the high seas, every foreign pilot bombing his supply lines, means one less American soldier, one less American sailor, one less American pilot needed to sacrifice for the defense of America. And if our help to those foreign soldiers and sailors and airmen reaches them soon enough, in sufficient volume, our own American boys will be spared. That is why I am for all-out aid to everyone who is fighting Hitler on land, on the sea, under the sea, and in the air. That is why I am for convoys. That is why I am fighting so hard for adequate aid to the defenders of democracy abroad, for if we are successful in that I shall not only have kept my pledge never to vote to send a single American soldier to fight on a European battlefield, but, what is even more important, it will not be necessary to send our boys out to fight and die on American battlefields for the defense of their homes and firesides against an aggressor.

As we meet here today we look back over two centuries of progress in this community, where the arts and sciences of peace flourish, where men are free and the orderly processes of self-government prevail. I think these things which Manheim has, and upon which it looks with such pride today, are worth preserving. When we look back upon those pioneering days some of us may wish it had been given to us to live in those stirring days, those glorious days when the foundations of our democracy were being laid by men of courage and vision. But we need not look backward, for to us also has been given a great historic mission—the preservation of our democracy against the flood tide of dictatorship which has already rolled over a great part of the civilized world. We, too, stand at Armageddon. Let us stand firm. Let us bear ourselves with courage and fortitude through this period of world upheaval, ready and willing to make some small sacrifices for those who are offering their lives to democracy on foreign battle fronts, and with the help of Divine Providence our democracy shall be preserved for this generation and generations yet to come.

Flag Day Address to Miami Lodge, B. P. O. E.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND, OF ARIZONA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and eloquent Flag Day address delivered at Miami, Fla., on June 14, 1941, by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Brother Elks, and fellow Americans, it is a distinct honor, which I very highly appreciate, that I have been invited to address this patriotic audience under the auspices of your lodge. I told Senator PEPPER when he invited me that I was a little embarrassed in coming to his State to speak where you are accustomed to hearing such distinguished speakers as he and Senator ANDREWS.

We are assembled to commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of the flag of the United States and to renew our pledge of allegiance. It is fitting and proper that we,

on this day, honor the flag of the United States. It was 164 years ago today that Congress met in Independence Hall in Philadelphia and adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

The words "13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation" are the very soul and spirit of the American flag. Like twinkling stars in the heavens, the stars in our flag signal to humanity the birth of the first Nation on earth dedicated to personal and religious liberty of mankind, a Nation founded upon eternal principles of fredom, equality, justice, and humanity.

Following the admission of Vermont to the Union in 1791 and Kentucky in 1792, Congress, by resolution, added 2 stars and 2 stripes to the flag. This was the design of the flag flying over Fort McHenry, Md., during the bombardment on the nights of September 13 and 14, 1814, that inspired Francis Scott Key to write The Star-Spangled Banner, but as other States were admitted into the Union it was decided that the flag must be brought up to date. So again, in 1818, Congress passed another flag resolution fixing the number of stripes at 13 to represent the Thirteen Original States and providing for the addition of a new star for each new State. Thus, today we have a flag of 13 stripes and 48 stars, my own State, Arizona, representing the forty-eighth star.

Our flag is beautiful, not solely because of its design and its colors, but because it is an emblem of a great Nation, a Nation founded in the Thirteen Original States by our forefathers who, for 6 long bitter years, struggled and endured hardships that we might have this land of freedom and justice. It is, therefore, particularly fitting that the 13 stripes symbolize those Thirteen Original States.

The red in our flag proclaims the courage which the men and women of our race have always shown; the courage which has inspired the men and women of our country to face danger and to do what was right. George Washington explained the white in our flag by saying "We take the stars from heaven, the red from the mother country, England, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty." The blue stands for loyalty, telling the story of thousands of men and women who have been loyal to their country through thick and thin, no matter how great the sacrifice.

Just as the 13 stripes represent the work of our revolutionary forefathers, each star stands for the work of their children who followed in their footsteps. Each star tells a story of struggle, toil, danger, and hardship in a state of the wilderness that presented to us the flag of this country.

Our flag as a symbol of our Nation is what we make it. If, through our aspirations, conduct, and achievement, we make this country great, then our flag is great. If our aims are not lofty, if our conduct and achievements as poor, then the flag of our country means little or nothing.

May I pause to tell you that recently I was happy to report for the Judiciary Committee Senator ANDREWS' bill which amended the legislation prohibiting the desecration of the flag and its use for advertisement, which applied to the District of Columbia, and extending this law to the whole of the United States. So we now have, for the first time, through the efforts of your own Senator, national legislation for the protection of our flag.

Our flag typifies the courage, the initiative, and the resourcefulness of an American people who have, through years of hardship and toil, established and perfected a kind of government which has so well answered our needs that it has proved a model for other nations seeking liberty and individual freedom. In us rests the responsibility of seeing to it that our Nation continues to be a nation of liberty and individual freedom.

I need not tell you that America faces one of the gravest crises in her history. We have men gone mad come to leadership in nations across the sea. We have seen these men strike down and destroy by brutal might and force their weaker neighbors. We have seen the lights of liberty and freedom go out one by one in the Old World, until there is left but the faltering flame that still burns in Britain. So long as we have madmen at the head of nations, we cannot know the future of America.

Very recently our President and our Congress were called upon to decide what we were going to do about the situation which we have been discussing—the future of America. The question presented itself in the form of the decision to be made on the lend-lease bill. It was a momentous decision for anyone to be called upon to make. The advocates of the easy way, the way of postponement and of hoping for the best and of appeasement, were organized in their effort and loud in their clamor that we adopt the policy of pretending that the dogs of war were not loose, as if by ignoring them we could escape their lust for blood and butchery. To differ with these people was to earn for yourself the name of "warmonger" and "king lover" and other names not nearly as flattering.

I am happy to announce that when our leaders answered they did so with courage, and Senator PEPPER was one of the leaders in the fight. They accepted the challenge fearlessly. They told the world in no uncertain terms that America stood with the cause of freedom and liberty and justice, and that democracy embattled in other parts of the world would have at its back the strength and resources of the most powerful nation on earth.

This means that we will be called upon to make sacrifices. Each one of us will have to give a little more than his accustomed efforts. Each will have to take a little less material gain than he has learned to expect. Those of us who have been quick to criticize must learn to be tolerant.

We are again testing whether this Nation, conceived in liberty and in justice, shall continue to endure. Today, as never before, do the American people need to be united in their efforts for national defense, in our efforts to see that we are able to produce the goods to aid Great Britain. Without a united effort we must necessarily fail.

We have seen what happened to France, Holland, and those other countries when their governments were undermined. Today we read in the newspapers, we hear over the radio, that Communists are responsible for delays in our national defense. At this time I want to compliment the people of Florida for having ruled the Communist Party off the ballot. I am proud that my own State was the first to take this action. It was the opinion of our attorney general, Joe Conway, followed by our secretary of state, Harry Moore, which first blazed a trail in ruling the Communist Party off of the ballot in the last election. We have no place upon the ballot in any State in the Union for such a party, one which would undermine our Government and does not stand for the principles of our Government. I say that it is time that we make the United States of America 100 percent American. I say that it is time we rid ourselves of those subversive interests in the United States of America. When we have done this and when we have adequately prepared our Nation, then, and then only, will we be safe from attacks from the other side.

We have no place for a party which stands for:

1. Hatred of God and all forms of religion.
2. Destruction of private property and inheritance.
3. Promotion of class hatred.
4. Revolutionary propaganda through the Communist Internationale, stirring up Communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed, and civil war.
5. Destruction of all forms of representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and trial by jury.
6. The ultimate and final objective, by means of world revolution, to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with the capital at Moscow.

These are the principles of communism. If the Communist Party in America does not stand for them, why don't they change their name? And may I add that we have no place in America for aliens who believe in these principles. If they don't like our form of government, let them take the boat back to the other side.

So today, when all of the "ism" nations would divide us by propaganda, we must recognize but one "ism"—Americanism. We must present a united front. We must and will prove to the world that a democratic nation can meet the test, for we see in Old Glory not only a beautiful silken banner with lovely, inspiring colors and insignia, but we see the symbol of a free and independent government standing for liberty and justice.

Our flag represents the highest ideals possible for a nation. It represents the ideals of our forefathers, who through hardship and work gave us this Nation. It is the flag which has never come down. The spirit of those who have gone before, from the blood-marked snow of Valley Forge down to those resting in Flanders Field, cry, "Long may Old Glory wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Address Before Commonwealth Club at San Francisco, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE DOUGLAS

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on June 20, 1941, Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States delivered an inspiring address before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Calif. I ask that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There probably have been but few generations which have felt as poignantly as ours the challenge in the poet's dictum that—

"Each age is a dream that is dying
Or one that is coming to birth."

We know that we are more than mere spectators on a world revolutionary scene. We know that those revolutionary forces are infections in the world blood stream and that we shall be profoundly affected even

though that disease will not ultimately triumph.

For these reasons we are all thinking deeply and profoundly about our responsibilities in this present world crisis.

Not so long ago I heard a professional group cheer the boast of a speaker that he had not mentioned once in his address the word "democracy."

Democracy, however, is no empty word, no mere shibboleth. It is a word to fill the heart with pride.

It reflects the faith of nations in the common sense of the common man.

It carries the precious cargo of equal justice under the law, the right freely to speak and write and to worship God, the right of free assembly, and equality of political and social opportunity.

It is the way of life which respects the dignity of man, which recognizes no special class of citizenship based on wealth or poverty, or color, race, or creed.

These are commonplaces to us. We are inclined to take them for granted as we are the sun, and moon, and stars. But in these days of world upheaval unguarded assumption of the permanency of any institution is hazardous.

For these reasons, now is the time for open avowal of our faith, not for silence. Now is the time to utilize vigorously our constitutional rights so as to preach and practice incessantly the truths of democracy.

As Francis Hackett has put it, "We, the democrats, have not supposed that we must assert ourselves aggressively. Our faith has been sapped because of that" (I Chose Denmark (1940)). Aggressive assertion of an unbounded devotion to this way of life not only replenishes the people's faith—it helps create the alertness in thought and action necessary to transform that faith into a work-a-day creed.

With the world on fire we know it is not enough for us to vote and pay taxes and earn a living. Fifty years ago the thought was current that the Nation could afford the luxury of having little skill in government because it required the use of its best brains and talents in the development of the country. But we know that we can ill afford any such diversions from active participation in this current campaign.

The needs of democracy cannot be filled merely by service within the normal orbit of our daily lives. Those needs must also be satisfied through civic, municipal, county, State, and national activities. And, somehow or other, our contributions must be made through those channels by devoting at least a part of our reserves of energy to public enterprises.

We have it in our power, by giving only a part of our lives, to provide a leadership in thought and action which will create a genuine—a spiritual—renaissance of the democratic faith. Those millions of Americans who have a real appreciation of the blood and sweat and sacrifice which through the centuries have ingrained into our present society the noblest ideals of mankind are the strongest sort of bulwark against those forces which would dislodge society from its moorings.

1. We must make sure that our citizens retain their old tradition of participating in the important decisions which affect their lives, their property, their ideals. The gap between local democracy and national representative government must not be allowed to widen. The people must remain part of an integrated national system, so that they feel an intimate contact with their Government, so that it does not become a thing apart—removed and remote from them. One of the ways of maintaining that bridge is through the many articulate but unofficial groups concerned with some aspect of our social, economic, or governmental problems. Through them many a citizen can become an active participant in the body politic and actually share in the decisions which affect his own welfare. Such groups help make democratic government the imperishable possession of each citizen. Hence they are strong underpinning for an aroused and alert democracy. May the leaders of community thought, devoted to democratic ideals, assume responsibility for making them effective agencies through which the people may undertake active daily roles of citizenship.

2. The function of democracy, unlike totalitarian governments, is to train men—little men as well as big men—not for subjugation but for independence. We know that therein lies the great strength of democracy. We know that only in that way can the great spiritual values of a whole people be cultivated and preserved. Yet we also know that that requires great skills in view of the complexities of a technological age. It means that every citizen must have a stake in his country adequate to justify in his eyes the sacrifices which any contingency may entail. It means that some way or other big men and little men must work as partners in our national endeavors. It means that powerful men and weak men must be joint venturers in preserving America in its own image. It means that government must serve a whole people—regardless of lines of wealth or poverty, strength, or weakness. And our endeavor must be not the detection of motes in each other's eyes but an objective, united assault on common problems.

To integrate the energies of little men and big men, share and share alike, into all local, State, and National undertakings is a task which requires continuous statesmanship. But success in that effort is a permanent achievement. It means that no caste system takes root. It means that equality and fraternity are given practical recognition. It means that men from all walks of life will find common adventure and thrills in serving jointly a great cause. It means that the eyes of men will be lifted from mean objectives to lofty ideals.

The sense of fraternity, the desire for service, the adventurous instinct are deep in the soul of America. They have been successfully appealed to before by offer of far less noble causes than the democracies now tender.

3. There must not grow up in this country any second or third or fourth class of citizenship.

There is only one class of citizenship in this Nation. There is no room for any inferior grade. Where one has been allowed, the result has been the downward spiral of disunity. Then hate and intolerance have been incorporated. Under those conditions the enemies of democracy invariably have risen to power. Under those conditions there is an insistence on a conformity which is the beginning of a disintegrating process.

Every nonconformist who is beaten, every practitioner of the right of free speech who is jailed, every unpopular exponent of a religious faith who is deprived of his constitutional rights bring every free man a step closer to incarceration or punishment, or discreet and frightened conformity. Infraction of the Bill of Rights knows no terminal points. We know from the experience of other peoples that what starts as suppression of an unpopular minority swings as easily to persecutions on the right or on the left, until few can afford to be nonconformists. Those who started as instigators of oppression of a minority often turned out to be the next victims. We know that the concentration camps of Europe are not operated on racial, economic, social, or intellectual lines.

We should ever be mindful that all the battles for freedom are not won in the courts. "Only a persistent, positive translation of the liberal faith into the thoughts and acts of the community is the real reliance against the unabated temptation to straitjacket the human mind." (Frankfurter, Law and Politics, p. 197.) Vigilant patrol of the domestic scene against infraction of these fundamental constitutional rights will guarantee that the American sense of fair play will carry the day.

4. A contemporary observer has said that as a result of the incredible sophistries and the brutal and ruthless attacks by totalitarian leaders on the democratic processes, "The Declaration of Independence may now be referred to without apology, and even policemen on the beat are becoming dimly aware that there is such a thing as the Bill of Rights."

Certainly, those assaults have made us all realize more keenly than ever before that there is only one liberty, and that is liberty within the law. Without that cementing element there can never be confidence in order—the real basis of all security. And without a common sense of security there can be no effective compact among men based on conceptions of equality and fraternity. That entails, as a practical necessity, a constant recognition of the responsibilities as well as the rights of citizenship. There will be some who will be willing to exploit the Bill of Rights in order to destroy or mutilate the system which makes the Bill of Rights possible. But the defense against them is vigorous assertion by millions of Americans of their constitutional rights so as to preserve our basic freedoms, not to defile them. It is to be found in an alert and aroused citizenry intent on making the democratic processes function in any and all crises and resolved not to permit the forces of discord, fear, hesitation, or inaction to paralyze the operations of government.

Those who appreciate the human sacrifices which have made our free institutions possible know that rights are accompanied by responsibilities. They know that recognition of those responsibilities is the certain method of preserving and nurturing those rights. When rights and responsibilities go hand in hand, there is the strongest guaranty possible that liberty within the law is not mere temporary luxury but a permanent necessity for a free people. When the energies of the people are absorbed in that common endeavor the whisperers of hate and intolerance loom no more important than the occupants of psychiatric wards.

Whatever may be the specific ways and means, whatever the effort, the pole star will always be the ingredients of the democratic faith. These have recently been stated by an eminent American, Carl Becker, as follows:

"To have faith in the dignity and worth of the individual man as an end in himself, to believe that it is better to be governed by persuasion than by coercion, to believe that fraternal good will is more worthy than a selfish and contentious spirit, to believe that in the long run all values are inseparable from the love of truth and the disinterested search for it, to believe that knowledge and the power it confers should be used to promote the welfare and happiness of all men rather than to serve the interests of those individuals and classes whom fortune and intelligence endow with temporary advantage—these are the values which are affirmed by the traditional democratic ideology."

In final analysis our individual and joint efforts must have as their end product the way of life which underwrites those eternal truths.

In 1775, when this Nation was uniting against the tyranny of that age, a great patriot said, "We are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the god of nature hath placed in our power."

Today those words ring as true as they did then.

The means which God has placed in our power embrace not only material resources but also great inner spiritual strength, an abiding sense of fair play, an abundance of common sense, a deep sense of fraternity, a great reserve of ingenuity, a desire for service. To evoke these qualities from all the people in times of peace as well as war will mean that our rich heritage of freedom will remain imperishable. Utilization of those tremendous reserves of strength will guarantee that this age is not a dream that is dying but one that is coming to glorious birth.

The Paderewski Testimonial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ADDRESS BY THE POLISH AMBASSADOR

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by His Excellency, Mr. Jan Ciechanowski, Polish Ambassador to the United States, over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. on July 3, in connection with the services for Paderewski. I hope every Senator will read the address paying tribute to this remarkable man.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Sunday the 29th of June, in New York, 1 hour before midnight, the heart of Paderewski ceased to beat.

The whole world knew and admired this indomitable Pole. He will always remain the symbol of a Poland fighting for freedom, justice, and legality.

The sad news flashed around the world and his personality was so great that for one tense moment the news of his death seemed to rise above the clash of arms and the hiss of burning hatreds unleashed by human madness.

It is impossible to define genius, especially when, as in the case of Paderewski, it embraces so vast a scale of accomplishment. One cannot speak of him as of the undoubtedly greatest musician of his time without saying that he was also an eminent statesman, a great diplomatist, a highly cultivated classical scholar, one of the greatest orators of his day, a marvelous linguist and especially a man, intensely human, noble, pure, full of simplicity, accessible, whose magnetic personality, powerful and brilliant mind and infinite charm of manner, allowed him to hold with sublime dignity a unique rank among his contemporaries on personal merit and distinction.

Such was Paderewski, whose untimely death deprives his beloved Poland, at this time, of her most dire need, unprecedented even in her so tragic history, of his unfailing courage, his ardent patriotism and his unerring wisdom.

I had the signal privilege of working under Mr. Paderewski's direct guidance as chief of his secretariat at the Paris Peace Conference and later in Warsaw. During those thrilling months I had the opportunity to observe day and night the versatility of his genius and his untiring activity in establishing Poland's restored independence on the basis of President Wilson's 14 points. History will undoubtedly determine in what measure Mr. Paderewski contributed to inspire President Wilson to declare the independence of Poland to be one of the basic conditions of European peace.

The generous and friendly gesture of President Roosevelt in offering the hospitality of the national cemetery at Arlington to Paderewski until Poland, once more free, can open her arms to receive the mortal remains of her great citizen—is an act of American friendship and sympathy which the Polish people will forever keep in grateful memory.

It appears to conform to tradition that the life of Paderewski, as that of Poland's foremost fighters for freedom, should have been so closely linked with this great American democracy.

Next to Poland, he regarded the United States as his spiritual homeland. This would seem quite natural because his outstanding qualities, his simplicity, his sincerity, his generosity, his accessibility are qualities so typical of the American people.

Through the death of Paderewski, music has lost one of her greatest masters. Poland has lost her greatest citizen and ambassador, and the world of beauty and culture is deprived of a soul which was the most perfect expression of the highest ideals of humanity.

Poland will fight on.

Independence Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL JACKSON

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a radio address delivered by Attorney General Robert H. Jackson in connection with the Independence Day celebration at Washington, D. C., July 4, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For nearly 2 years now many of us have been bewildered by the headlong course of events in Europe and not a few of us have been confused as to the course of wisdom at home. We have seen a nation which 20 years ago had been vanquished rise up with a ferocity seldom seen in the history of mankind. We have seen vaunted armies smashed as if they were so much paper. We have seen Europe overrun and England placed in grave danger. We have seen the dictator idea spread in the world. At first its two principal proponents, communism and fascism, appeared to be mortal enemies. Then, one day, they turned up as partners. Now they battle each other.

For nearly 2 years Americans have been asking each other which way safety and security lie. We have pondered the problem, weighing risk against risk and danger against danger. Now at last on this Fourth of July in 1941 the truth of our situation is coming home with increasing clarity to all Americans. We are learning the overwhelming fact that now, as in 1776, our Nation, together with our sister republics on this hemisphere, faces a preponderantly hostile and undemocratic world. Now, as in 1776, we can turn to the Declaration of Independence for the principles which should guide our action.

You are lifted and inspired, like generations before you, by the majestic cadence of the boldest, the noblest, and best known of all American writings. The Declaration of Independence speaks strong doctrine in plain words. It is the world's master indictment of oppression. The fervor of its denunciation haunts and challenges dictators everywhere and in every field of life.

But the Declaration of Independence does not stop with mere denials and negations. It sets forth great affirmations as to the permissible foundations of power and political leadership among freemen. It lays down a fighting faith in the rights of man—merely as man—a faith to die by if need be, or even more bravely to live by. It impresses upon all political power the high obligation of trusteeship. It established an accountability by the governing few to the governed many. That is why men abroad who wield dictatorial powers over subject peoples would silence the reading of the Declaration of Independence, would tear all mention of it from the record, and torture all recollection of it out of the minds of men. Even at home there are some who hope it will not be read too loudly.

But the masses of warm-hearted people are reared on its strong doctrines of equality and human rights. It has exceeded every other modern pronouncement in its profound influence upon our lives, our culture, and our relations to the world. When the Constitution of the United States was adopted, its foundations were laid in the democratic idealism of the Declaration. It has been the inspiration for every later recognition of broadened human rights and for the extension of justice and security to all men. We do not claim to have reached a perfect fulfillment of its high principles. But we have achieved the nearest approach among all the nations to a classless society, to equality of rights, and to a fair distribution of opportunity and prosperity. Whenever we reproach our own imperfections, as we ought often to do, we must not forget that our shortcomings are visible only when measured against our ideals, never when put beside the practical living conditions of the rest of the world. We have by Constitution, by legislation, and by judicial decision translated the Declaration out of the language of abstract philosophy into the idiom of everyday living. We have validated democratic principles by our success.

America's position in the society of nations is unavoidably that of a champion of the freedoms. The reason is aptly stated by Carl Becker, who says:

"In the Declaration the foundation of the United States is indissolubly associated with a theory of politics, a philosophy of human rights, which is valid, if at all, not for Americans only, but for all men."

When our national success demonstrated that freedom is an attainable goal, we made it the ultimate goal of all peoples everywhere. The "four freedoms" are not local nor transient incidents; they are universal and timeless principles if they are valid at all. A blow against their existence in Europe is a blow at their validity everywhere. On the other hand, the example of a great and powerful people governed by their own consent through lawmakers of their free choice is a standing incitement to overturn tyranny anywhere. Malevolent conquests by dictators are silently undermined by our confession of faith in democracy as stated in the Declaration. That carries hope to subject peoples in whom there would otherwise be a noble,

but unavailing fortitude. Overridden countries find a bid to insurrection in its assertion of the right of the people to alter or abolish an existing government that is destructive of life, liberty, and happiness. They read words of invitation in its statement of their right "to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." No wonder the Declaration of Independence is the nightmare of conquerors.

Some will say that the decision faced by the patriots of 1776 was an easier one than ours, since they had nothing to lose but their intolerable situation. Our task, some will argue, is to protect rather than to win our freedom and that for that reason we should be cautious.

But if the patriots of 1776 risked little by action, we risk much by indifference. Today we risk the loss of a physical, cultural, and spiritual heritage of freedom far beyond the most inspired visions of the leaders of '76. And the more of the world that ceases to be democratic, the greater our risk will be. We do not need to be imprudent or foolhardy, but we should recognize that no amount of cautious behavior, no amount of polite talk will earn for us the friendship and good will of dictator systems. Ultimately we must come to the day when we shall face their threats and their enmity for no other reason than that we persist in living the kind of life we live.

One fact emerges clear above all others. We Americans cannot cease to be the kind of people we are, we cannot cease to live the kind of life we live. We are not the kind of people the dictators will ever want in the world. They will never have any use for our kind of life, nor we for theirs.

Every American knows now, as he knew it in 1776, that there is nothing for him in that way of life.

There are those who shrink from the risks of standing for a forthright, practical application of democracy. They point to the striking power and efficiency of foes abroad. But the enemies of American democracy today cannot begin to assemble a force so relatively powerful and so encircling as were its foes that day when the signers of the Declaration pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors in its support.

The most strategic points in our own country were then in possession of the King's armies. Canada was a base for his operations. Florida, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the mouth of the Mississippi were occupied by forces of Spanish monarchy—no lover of democracy. And the unsolved problem of the Colonies along their whole precarious frontier was the Indian. American democracy then had no navy, only an empty treasury. Its army was composed of untrained volunteer backwoodsmen who could not get shoes, clothing, or substantial arms to fight the invading British regulars. There was no national unity. There were cabals against Washington, a "fifth column" of Royalists was powerful and respectable, and the States were jealous rivals who did not act, nor even think, as a unit. But in such an hour our forefathers who believed in freedom did not fear to stand alone and to become, as they continued for many years to be, the world's only real democracy. But the American forces had power—the unseen power of the earnest individual—the individual with what Mr. Justice Holmes called "fire in his belly." Only when these fires go out need we fear the lawless forces of dictatorship. Democracy's strength is in man-to-man measure. None other draws such initiative from its way of life, none invents, and none has so generally and fully mastered in its daily life the technique of handling modern machine transport and production. And we dwell among resources as incredible as acres of diamonds.

But there is at home and abroad an antidemocratic influence even more cynical and sinister and dangerous than Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin combined. I refer to those who think democracy is a fair-weather ideal—to guide us in soft times—but that when the going is tough we cannot save it without losing it. This doctrine has every base quality of fascism without either its candor or courage. Let us in America never forget that liberties trampled by conquest may be regained, but liberties abandoned by an indifferent people are never recovered. Nor are they deserved.

Let us not forget the example of our forefathers. They, too, heard the argument that time of external danger was no time to advance freedoms. But their answer was to give liberty a new birth not only in the midst of a war but in the very darkest hours of that war, because they knew that what wins struggles are the last ounces of endurance and the reserves of power that come to the common run of men on fire for a cause. Such men do not count costs nor watch the clock. We must keep our freedoms, keep them in face of foreign dangers even more tenaciously and jealously than in calmer times—keep them because it is our liberty that lifts our cause above material ends and anchors our efforts in timeless things. We know that in the unfolding book of destiny, just as in the closed book of history, it is written that tyranny and oppression bring forth their own downfall and that the irresistible moral forces of the world march always on the side of resolute men when freedom is their goal. We know that the spiritual strength and the moral power of our democratic tradition, authenticated by a century and a half of progress, will not long yield the field anywhere in the world despite the temporary devastations by enemies of the fundamental philosophy of our Declaration of Independence. As Kipling has said:

"Though all we knew depart,
The old commandments stand:
'In courage keep your heart,
In strength lift up your hand.'"

Americans Rededicate Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF COL. CHARLES H. RUTHERFORD

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address broadcast from station KTAR, in Phoenix, Ariz., on July 3, by Col. Charles H. Rutherford, civilian aide to the Secretary of War, speaking under the auspices of the Arizona Division, Committee to Defend America. The subject of the address was Americans Rededicate Themselves.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tomorrow will be the anniversary of the first dedication of the American people to the principles of democracy. More than a century and a half ago our forefathers, by their signatures to the Declaration of Independence, dedicated themselves and their descendants, their country and its future, their fortunes and their sacred honor, to set up and maintain a country where man and his freedom is supreme and the Government is his creature and servant.

Today the world is faced with the threat—yes; the imminent danger—that unless we defend ourselves with every ounce of our strength and resources our Government, our cherished liberties, our prosperity, and our high standards of living are liable to be swept away by the resurgence of barbarism revived and mechanized by the Nazi hordes.

Hitler calls his system of slavery the new order, but it is not a new order. The system of the Nazi dictator is merely a revival, in a more horrible form and with more terrible forces, of the oldest and crudest forms of despotism. Hitler has usurped the rights of his own people by stratagem and force, and trained a generation of them to enthusiastic subservience to himself. He has overrun and enslaved the peoples of more than a dozen nations, and has announced that he intends to overrun and dominate and enslave the world. He has specifically stated that democracy and his new order cannot exist in the world and that he will destroy democracy.

I regret the necessity of painting this terrible picture, but it is necessary to warn the American people of their imminent danger—that they may again dedicate themselves to the principles of human freedom, that they may again determine, as their forefathers did, that tyranny shall not rule them.

Tomorrow, the 4th of July, the anniversary of the first dedication of the American people to the principles and practices of democracy, it is especially fitting and appropriate for our people to rededicate themselves to the same ideals for which our fathers fought. For this purpose the Office of Civilian Defense, under the leadership of Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, has arranged a 10-minute program for 2 o'clock tomorrow, July 4, in which the people of America will again solemnly rededicate themselves, their country, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to every endeavor and every sacrifice that may become necessary in defending and the maintaining of human rights.

A few days ago the President of the United States issued this statement concerning the rededication ceremony for tomorrow:

"The approach of Independence Day this year will kindle in all American hearts an appreciation of the dark days that preceded and followed July 4, 1776. Those were the times that tried men's souls, even as are these times, in another crisis in American life.

"But these are also days of hope, and as the birthday of American independence draws near it is altogether fitting that we should rededicate ourselves to defend and perpetuate those inalienable rights which found expression in the immortal Declaration. These words never had a deeper or more solemn meaning for America than they have in this hour of anxiety and peril.

"The Fourth of July has always been a day of joy and exaltation in which all Americans have caught something of the spirit of liberty which the fathers of the Republic proclaimed to the world on that midsummer day in 1776.

"I am glad, therefore, to learn that the Office of Civilian Defense is to lead the Nation this year in the grand rededication to liberty on the Fourth of July. I commend this celebration to Americans everywhere, to the end that, in this solemn commemoration we may find renewed faith in the blessings which are ours because of the struggle and sacrifice, the courage and fortitude and vision of those who made this Nation a reality."

That is the President's statement on the ceremony of rededication for the people of America. And here is the plan.

The ceremony will commence at 2 o'clock. All radio networks will carry it. Tune in then as the President will speak for 5 minutes. Following, the United States Marine Band, in Washington, will play the national anthem, and bands everywhere will join and play with them, and the people all over America and her possessions will sing the Star-Spangled Banner. Then the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States will lead the people of America in repeating the Oath of Allegiance to the United States.

As an American you have a part in this rededication, wherever you are—at home, abroad, at the lakes, in the mountains, at a Fourth of July celebration, on a picnic, at the theater, or wherever you are, see to it that the radio is turned on at 2 o'clock and take an active part in this great and patriotic ceremony.

By thus rededicating themselves and their country to the principles established by their forefathers, the American people will tomorrow serve notice upon the ruthless exponents of force that, in the words of the immortal Lincoln—

"A government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Time and T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ARTICLE BY ERNEST L. MEYER

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Progressive of Saturday, June 28, 1941, entitled "Time and T. V. A.," written by Mr. Ernest L. Meyer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive of June 28, 1941]

TIME AND T. V. A.

(By Ernest L. Meyer)

One of the minor miracles of the hour is the shift in sentiment of the "big boys" toward the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Time was, and not so many moons ago, when the "big boys," contemplating Mr. Roosevelt's pet dream, jumped up and down in anguish, screamed "socialism," and offered voluminous and convincing proof that the Tennessee Valley was already supersaturated with electrical energy and that additional kilowatts would merely be sluiced into an economic waste pipe.

But today the "big boys," instead of slapping on a hundred injunctions against the great experiment, cry "Pax vobiscum," and all up and down the valley the same industrialists and newspapers who once branded T. V. A. a mad vision and a waste now clamor for expansion and more and ever more power, power, power.

The secret of the fantastic shift is, of course, defense. Not only has there been a tremendous expansion in the aluminum, powder, and aircraft industries in the area served by T. V. A., but the slogan of defense has been seized upon by the "big boys" as a handy and holy motive to explain their about-face. They have pulled in their claws as patriots, and thus add piety to whatever harvest in dollars they may reap.

T. V. A. IS REAL DEFENSE

Thus Mars has brought belated sanction to the President's pet dream. This is good, and yet it is also too bad. Because years before the present emergency and before the boom in war industries, T. V. A. was already launched on a vital program of defense. Real defense—the salvaging of vast acres of wasted soil and the reclamation of the lives of the stunted people who inhabit the backwoods.

What is too bad is that such a program fails to seize hold upon the imagination. To the "big boys" and to most of the "little boys," alack, defense holds meaning only when it is translated in terms of bullets and bayonets and battleships.

Yet T. V. A. dams and Navy dreadnoughts differ. A modern first-line battleship costs at least $75,000,000 and its useful life is about 20 years. Norris Dam in the T. V. A. chain cost $31,000,000, and its useful life at the very lowest estimate is 100 years.

And during their long lifetime T. V. A. multipurpose dams are productive. They not only create power for many uses, but they also regulate floods and drought and navigation, serve people at peace as well as industries in war, build up the earth of America instead of solely creating products to blast the earth of a potential foe.

IT IS DEMOCRACY, PLUS

What is just as important is the method through which T. V. A. operates. It is democracy, plus. T. V. A. has no power in a political sense. In its far-flung plans to raise the economic status of the region it cannot enforce compliance on the part of the inhabitants. No penalties are provided for noncooperation.

Yet by virtue of its vision and its accomplishments T. V. A. has gained vast and voluntary cooperation of land-grant colleges, of county agents, of farmers' cooperatives, and, what is most important, of the people of the sterile acres whom it seeks to reclaim from pauperism and pellagra.

Some months ago I took a long journey into the highways and byways of the great sprawling area served by T. V. A., an area as great as that of entire Great Britain. And I found a ferment, an articulate excitement of a once hopeless people now on the march toward a definite and attainable goal—security.

I attended meetings of farmer groups where not even the blistering Alabama heat could lessen the demonstration following the reading of a report that the electrical cooperative, through the magic of cheap T. V. A. power, had extended its services to a hundred more isolated farms, and that the cooperative treasury showed a sizable profit at the end of the fiscal year.

The communal high spirits on that occasion were matched by the individual elation of an ancient and lone lady a county agent and I visited in her Tennessee log cabin. T. V. A. meter and lights had just been installed, and the woman was trembling with delight at the sight of her electric lamp. When the county agent, in checking up, reached down to remove the floor plug, the old lady cried: "Don't you go pulling out that stopper. The juice will run out on the floor and be sheer wasted!"

TOWARD SOUND INNER DEFENSE

That journey left me exhilarated. I felt that if T. V. A. had been created, say, in Russia, or in Sweden, voluminous tomes would have been written of the gigantic experiment, and pilgrims and political junkets would hasten there and return with breathless reports. But here in America, until the recent cry of "defense," T. V. A. fought its way, at times almost hopelessly, against public inertia and political hatchetmen.

Especially at this time am I heartened by what I saw and learned. For people sometimes say to me: "You oppose armed involvement in the European war. You say that America must look first to her inner defenses. What, exactly, would you propose?"

The answer is easy. Revive the plan for 11 T. V. A.'s. If possible, have each under the direction of a man as able, energetic, and enlightened as David E. Lilienthal. That would be a step toward sound inner defense. Not the whole way, but what a gigantic stride.

Lesson for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ARTICLE BY PAUL G. HOFFMAN

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article by Paul G. Hoffman, president, Studebaker Corporation, entitled "Lesson for America," published in the Pathfinder of July 5, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Pathfinder of July 5, 1941]

LESSON FOR AMERICA

(By Paul G. Hoffman, president, Studebaker Corporation)

The outlook for China was dark. Shanghai had just fallen. Nanking, the capital, was threatened and, as subsequent events proved, doomed. It was hardly the time to expect a Chinese statesman to be viewing the future calmly and objectively. But my eyes more than my ears told me that the man to whom I had just put a question that was on everyone's lips at the time was completely confident. He was Dr. Hu Shih, who is now the Chinese Ambassador to the United States, and I had inquired if China could successfully defend itself.

"Certainly," he replied. "But it depends entirely upon the heart of the Chinese people. They must unite and develop that nationalistic spirit which knows no defeat." As I said, my eyes rather than my ears told me that Dr. Hu Shih was not disturbed. He knew his people, for while he qualified his answer his countenance was serene as he gave it. He has not been surprised by the events which history has recorded since that conversation took place.

Last July I was reminded of it. Hitler was ready to launch his invasion of Great Britain. Complete victory over the Allies was to be his by September 15, the world was unequivocally told. Recalling Dr. Hu Shih's simple but immortal diagnosis, I could not help but feel that those who envisioned the fall of Great Britain were calculating without a knowledge of the one vital factor.

Hitler's aerial blitzkrieg against England has been carried on relentlessly for almost 1 year. Great cities have been wrecked by mass bombings. Thousands of civilians have

been killed. Tens of thousands have been wounded. But England's determination to fight on to ultimate victory has never faltered. Why? Because the spirit of the people has not been broken—it has been strengthened.

For 4 long years Japan has waged a war on China with a brutality unparalleled in modern times. Three million Chinese—1,000,000 of them civilians—have been killed. Uncounted millions have been wounded, and because of lack of medical supplies thousands of major operations have been performed without anesthetic. Fifty million Chinese left their homes in the coastal areas and are refugees in the western provinces. Two million Chinese children have been orphaned. And yet, despite all these disasters. China fights on with dogged courage, confident that it will turn back the Japanese hordes, win the war, and maintain its independence. Why? Because the spirit of the people has not been broken—it has been strengthened.

What is the lesson here for America? It is clear and it is challenging.

As a nation, we are building a huge arsenal for defense of our democracy as well as others resisting totalitarian aggression. We are resolved to safeguard our way of life against those who would destroy it. We are preparing for any eventuality that may arise.

It would likely be fatal for us to be blinded by the synthetic prosperity which this policy will bring. There is nothing sound about an armament-produced prosperity. It is ephemeral and fleeting and serves no economic purpose although the necessity of it admits of no argument.

America's need lies in a resurgence of courage and self-reliance on the part of the individual and a rededication of leadership to the greatest good for the greatest number. The dominant characteristics of the American people always have been those qualities so requisite today, but for too long and for too many they have been allowed to lie dormant. The emergency of the times, as well as the record of the last two decades, calls for more inspired and unselfish leadership in government, business, agriculture, and labor. Too often, organized business, organized labor, organized agriculture, and bureaucratic government have pursued their own selfish objectives without giving thought to the general welfare of all of the people. But if we are going to have enlightened leadership—and have it we must—then the people must earn the kind of leadership which will safeguard their welfare, spiritually and materially, from attack within or without. Self-reliance and enterprise must take the place of bread lines and circuses. Group antagonisms and class jealousies must be throttled.

The character of a nation is but the composite of the individuals who comprise that nation. Our greatest hope for the future rests not upon the airplanes, battleships, tanks, and cannon which we are so fervently building at the moment but upon each and every one of us embracing a new attitude toward our country and its welfare. We can rightfully take vast encouragement from the statement made by William S. Knudsen, Director General of the Office of Production Management, who, when he was asked during a congressional hearing how he came to give up a highly remunerative position in industry to accept the very trying job of directing defense efforts, replied:

"I hope this doesn't sound sentimental. I've been here 41 years and this country has been pretty good to me. I was in a position to work without salary. I felt that if I could do something, I'd like to do it."

Not many of us can afford to work without wages. But every American should be able to extend his vision to include not alone the personal interests immediately ahead but also the lasting welfare of himself and the community. In the final analysis, only that which is good for the whole is good for any part thereof.

If that be our philosophy, then America can become not only the arsenal for democracy but the guardian of democratic ideals.

Farm Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

LETTER FROM M. D. LINCOLN, SECRETARY OF THE OHIO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, some time ago in a study which I was making of cooperative institutions as they appliy to farmers, and also as they apply to consumers, in preparation for an address I expected to deliver in the Senate on the subject, among other things, I had a letter from Mr. M. D. Lincoln, secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, in regard to the work of various cooperative farm organizations, particularly the one of which he was secretary, which is one of the largest in the country. I find, for instance, among other things, although not referred to in the letter of Mr. Lincoln, that this cooperative organization of farmers, feeling aggrieved at the price they had to pay for fertilizer, invested $275,000 in the building of a fertilizer plant, and the price of fertilizer immediately went down, so that the farmers for that year saved $750,000 in the price they had to pay for fertilizer; the investment they then made being only $275,000.

I had a very interesting letter at that time from Mr. Lincoln and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OHIO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
Columbus, Ohio, May 2, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR NORRIS: I have made some studies of the T. N. E. C. reports on the concentration of economic power in the insurance field. It seems to me that the Committee has done a splendid piece of work in making an analysis of the facts, but they did not include cooperative insurance as one of the solutions to the problem.

I think it is essential, to round out the picture, to present some of the facts with respect to the present accomplishments and methods of business of the cooperative insurance services, as well as the things which they can accomplish in the future in providing consumers with the most desirable kind of insurance service at reasonable cost.

Insurance companies have come to be one of the most important institutions in our economic life. The legal reserve life insurance companies have assets of 28 billions of dollars. Their annual income is almost as large as the income of the Federal Government.

In these few institutions is concentrated economic power over millions of people, over vast areas of economic life. The 26 largest companies alone hold 12 percent of all Federal Government bonds, 17 percent of railroad bonds, 18 percent of utility bonds, 12 percent of industrial bonds, 19 percent of the farm mortgage debt, and 13 percent of the urban real estate debt.

This is not economic democracy. It gives vast power to a mere handful of people to decide who shall and who shall not receive credit, to determine what businesses shall flourish and what businesses shall not, and to regulate interest rates, policy terms, premium costs in their own and not in the interest of policyholders.

Among the facts brought to light by the T. N. E. C. investigation was the situation that 13 families in America hold control over the Nation's 200 largest corporations, which in turn hold over half of all American business assets.

These 13 families own stock valued at almost $3,000,000,000. On the other hand, half the stockholders of America's 200 largest corporations own only 3 percent of their value. Five percent of the stockholders own 70 percent of the companies' value.

This is not economic democracy. This is economic autocracy. Its ramifications are as fine and as manifold as the famous "spider web" you described to the Senate sometime ago. What benefit is political democracy when we have autocracy in our economic life? Can a man be really free politically if his economic affairs are controlled by a few people far beyond his reach? Can economic dictatorship and political democracy long exist side by side?

The inevitable results of this control are evident in the underinsurance of farmers and wage earners, as well as the excessive costs of insurance and the high rate of lapsation.

The working population—farmers and wage earners—are not so adequately covered by life insurance as some publicity would lead us to believe. Eleven percent of the heads of these families have no insurance whatsoever. Those who are insured have small policies. One of every four wage earners either has no insurance at all, or a policy the value of which is less than $500; two out of five have policies of less than $1,000; and three out of four have policies of less than $2,000.

Fifty million wage earners paid almost $800,000,000 for so-called industrial insurance in a single year, equivalent to 5 percent of their income. These premium payments amounted to three times as much as they would have paid for an equal amount of ordinary life insurance. Thus does concentration of economic power exact its toll.

But the most tragic story of all is the story of the rate of lapsation of industrial insurance policies. Only a trifling number of such policies remain in force until their purpose is served. In the period from 1928 to 1937, 97 percent of industrial policies were lapsed or surrendered. Thus the great bulk of these policies never fulfilled their obligations.

At least the broad outlines of the insurance problem are being recognized. But the cooperative insurance movement which addresses its efforts specifically at the heart of the problem has not received the consideration or the recognition which its merits warrant.

Cooperation in all fields makes economics work for consumers in place of exploiting them. Cooperation changes the methods of business to democracy. Each member of a cooperative has one vote, and only one, in determining the policies of his organization.

Cooperation changes the ownership of business to consumers. Only by securing ownership can consumers control the business institutions that serve them. Cooperation changes the aim of business to service. Being owned by the people they serve, cooperatives are motivated by the desire to serve rather than the desire to make profits. When you do business with yourself there is no incentive to cheat yourself.

Cooperation is no beautiful but impractical theory. While it has brought vast benefits to people in all walks of life all over the world, it is best known for its benefits to farmers in this country.

Cooperatives have demonstrated that they can reduce the price levels of the things people buy, and without monopoly controls. They need to transact only enough business in any field—usually 10 to 15 percent of the total is sufficient—to set up standards of price, quality, and service.

This they have done with amazing effectiveness in a number of economic activities. Cooperatives have reduced the cost of automobile insurance to 46 percent less than the pre-war price; electricity, 50 percent; gasoline, 38 percent; farm credit, 33 percent; fertilizer, 20 percent; and feed, 4 percent. And remember that some of these commodities were 100 percent or more above the pre-war price several years ago. This cooperation has done, with the support and assistance of R. E. A. in electrification and of the F. C. A. in farm credit.

What they have done in these lines, cooperatives can duplicate in life insurance. To provide adequate life insurance protection for low-income groups, for example, the Farm Bureau Life Insurance Co. has just begun the writing of a low-cost policy in units of $500 each which costs only $6.22 a year at age 35 and gives pure insurance protection. This cost is only a fraction of the cost of conventional so-called industrial insurance. Its cost is so low that lapsation and surrenders should be infrequent, even in times of disaster and economic depression. In low-income families the margin between the amount of income received and the amount of money required to purchase the necessities of life is small. Consequently, we regard it of utmost importance that insurance costs be as low as possible.

Finally, the secondary function of insurance is to serve as a reservoir of finance. In conventional companies, investment funds are placed where they can make the greatest contribution to the few who are in control. Often these funds are invested in such a way that they work to the detriment of the very people who contributed them by payment of insurance premiums.

Cooperatives lend their funds, wherever possible, to the people who created them for the purchase of homes or farms, for investment in cooperative business, and for such other purposes as will benefit them which are sanctioned by law, by insurance regulation and sound business practice. The full import of such an investment policy can only be realized by those who have had loans called in time of stress, and who have lost farms and homes which they had labored a lifetime to create.

This is a brief summary of what cooperatives can do to alleviate some of the problems which are created by the concentration of wealth. We in the cooperative insurance movement believe that the people of the United States and their duly elected representatives should have this information. For this reason may we respectfully urge your careful consideration of this point of view.

With every appreciation of your many good works in the interest of the welfare of all the people.

Sincerely yours,

M. D. LINCOLN,
Secretary.

Awake America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF FRED B. TOWNSEND

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address broadcast from Station KTAR, in Phoenix, on July 3, by Fred Blair Townsend, vice chairman of the Arizona division of the Committee to Defend America. The subject of the address was Awake America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. I doubt if the Fourth of July, in all our history, has ever meant as much to Americans as it means this year of 1941. For this year we are very soberly aware of the differences between democratic liberty and totalitarian slavery; and we are definately and quietly determined to do whatever may be necessary to preserve the liberties for which our ancestors fought.

Tomorrow will be the anniversary of our independence, of the day when our forefathers served notice on the world that thenceforth and forever amen, our people would worship as they pleased, would have the right of free speech, would be judged according to law and not by the whims of autocracy, and that no one could tell them what to do or what not to do, as long as they acted within the laws they voluntarily enacted through their duly elected representatives.

All these blessings were secured at the sacrifice of the lives and the fortunes of those who willingly gave all they had so that a worth-while system of existence, a democratic way of life, if you please, could be handed down to posterity as a heritage and could live forever as an example and as an inspiration for all the people of all the world.

Today, more than at any time in all our national life, these institutions of human freedom are in jeopardy. Their very foundations are threatened. We have seen, in the past few months, many peace-living and peace-loving peoples reduced to practical slavery by the Nazi dictator, whose sole object and purpose is power and more power; power to subjugate the world and force its people to serve as slaves to a new order, in which man is nothing and the state is all-powerful.

Today, on the eve of our national birthday, we cannot afford to sit idly by and see the steady approach of the juggernaut that—unless we stop it—will inevitably take from us our blessings of liberty and impose upon our free peoples the shameful existence under which so many European peoples are living today. The time has come to speak plainly, to fully realize the dangers that confront us, and to consider realistically what we can do and what we must do if we want to preserve for our children the heritage our fathers instituted on the Fourth of July 1776. Thank God, we Americans have seen the handwriting on the wall and have sensed our danger. Today our whole country is seething with activities for national defense at home and abroad such as has never been seen before in this or any other country in the world. Americans have definitely determined to keep ablaze the torch of liberty, not only for themselves but as an example and an inspiration for the nations and the peoples now temporarily enslaved.

To meet this menace two things are necessary. Every American must do his or her duty to their fullest capacity; and every American must stand solidly back of our elected and constituted authorities in whatever measures are necessary to the successful defense of our country and its institutions. If it is possible, each of us should become so fully informed as to realize the necessity for each step in our program of defense; but, if this is impossible, we must nevertheless respond with every ounce of energy and loyalty to the program deemed necessary by those whom we have chosen as our leaders.

The time for argument is past. Our country, our hemisphere, our democratic way of life is in the gravest peril in all history. The forces of ruthless domination are on the march. Those forces have announced their intention of destroying democracy and enslaving the world. Each and every one of us, whether in the armed forces of our country or employed in a defense industry or on the farms, or carrying on the routine business and professions that make up the fabric of our national life, must regard ourselves as a part—an integral and necessary part—of the program of defense, and give all we have to the service of our country and to the cause of freedom of mankind.

Let us be realistic. Let us avoid confusion. Let us refuse to be tangled in a discussion of ideologies. Our course is clear. The danger to our institutions is nazi-ism. The man who has declared he will reduce our people to his domination and control is Hitler. Any man and any nation that fights Hitler is, during that time and for that purpose, our friend and deserves and must have our support.

We may not love England, but England has always been our first line of defense. We do not like communism, and we never shall, but Russia is bravely fighting our common enemy. The common problem is to defeat Hitler and to destroy nazi-ism and by doing so to insure to ourselves our continued liberty and to give to all the world and all its peoples the opportunity to secure liberty for themselves.

Our leaders are still hoping we can stay out of war, and so are we all. We all hope it will never become necessary to send an army to foreign shores. But we must realize that the only way to avoid that is to help defeat Hitler on his own ground, and to do that we must extend all aid to those who are fighting him, even if it takes the use of our Navy to sweep his pirates from the seas.

At this very moment our democratic brethren of the British Empire are fighting with their backs to the wall. Their workers are producing as they never produced before, with a solid front opposed to the enemy. In England, where labor is strong, traditionally strong, not a move or a murmur of labor trouble gets in the way of production for protection.

In our country, where our danger is just as grave as the danger to England—but where, thank heaven, we are still not being bombed—in our country, as in England, we have the right to expect that our workers will give the same loyal, trouble-free service to the defense industries, to the manufacture of the equipment and supplies that we must have for our own defense, at home and in the hands of our allies, as do the workers in Great Britain. Labor trouble, based upon any reason whatever, has no place in this time of world-wide danger.

No one can foretell whether, or when, we may find it necessary, in order to bring to an

end this terrible slaughter of women and children and aged people, that we become an active part of the defense of liberty and democracy, and help to stop for all time this dictator who has openly declared that nothing will stop him in his quest for world domination and absolute rule under his so-called new order—the old, old order of subjugation and slavery. Again I say, we are fighting for our lives, for our rights as free men, for the rights of our children and our children's children to have the blessings we enjoy; and whether we fight only as "the arsenal of democracy," or actually in the front lines, no personal motives can be permitted to interfere with the efficiency and speed of defense industry production.

Tomorrow will be the Fourth of July, the birthday of the greatest and most powerful nation the world has ever seen; the birthday of the one nation in all history that, through the wisdom of its founders, has given its people the greatest fields of opportunity, the greatest freedom to live, the highest standards of living, in all the world. What better day could we find to rededicate our lives to the great task ahead of us, of preserving democracy for ourselves and for the world? Each day, as the frightful results of the awful struggle come to our attention, we become more and more determined to protect our land from similar destruction, to protect the lives of our people from the ravages of the Nazi hordes—regardless of what we may have to do.

Fields of white crosses in France are mute evidence of the price we paid the last time in our effort to preserve democracy. Modern war is much more terrible in its methods. Soldier and civilian alike suffer its terrors and its ravages, and unless America awakens to her danger she may have to pay an even greater price in blood and sacrifice.

Awake, America, to your peril. Let every red-blooded American man and woman decide now to do everything in his or her power to help put down this growing menace to the happiness of free people throughout the world.

Already millions of our youth are preparing and training for the events that may come. It is certainly our duty to back them up, to give our full and wholehearted support, if we are to hope that we may keep our forms of government and freedom, in this land of plenty, where the days are full of sunshine and the flag is full of stars.

United States of America, tomorrow is your birthday, and the National Security League and the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies invite you to join the 130,000,000 Americans who this day pledge their renewed allegiance and who are resolved to keep the blessings we enjoy, and which have made the United States of America the greatest and finest country in the world.

The United States of America, intact, impregnable, now and forever. We salute you.

Keep Our Boys Out of Europe

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday General Wavell of the British Army gave out a statement to the effect that America was going to have to send an army to Europe in the present war. We have rendered all the aid we could to Great Britain short of war, but I think we ought to let the American people and the British people know now that we are going to stand by our promises to the American people and refuse to send our boys to die by the millions in the bloody hellholes of Europe. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

What the St. Lawrence Development Would Mean to the Light and Power Consumers in the Northeastern Section of the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER], I desire to discuss briefly the proposed power development on the St. Lawrence River, and to show what it will mean to the electric light and power users of New York, New England, and Pennsylvania, and all other States within its distribution radius.

One of the ablest men who has yet testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in opposition to this project was Mr. Bertram D. Tallamy, chief engineer of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board. He admitted that this power could be economically generated and transmitted 300 miles from the dam at from 4 to 4½ mills a kilowatt-hour, as the following testimony before the committee will show:

Mr. RANKIN. Then, you could generate this St. Lawrence power and transmit it within that 300-mile radius and lay it down for less than 5 mills (a kilowatt-hour), could you not, say for 4 to 4½ mills?

Mr. TALLAMY. Yes; we can.

Mr. RANKIN. I believe it was stated, I think the New York power authority stated they could lay it down within a 300-mile line for less than 4 mills; would that be about right?

Mr. TALLAMY. Yes; I think you are right.

Now remember that a 300-mile radius would cover almost the entire State of New York, nearly all the New England States and about two-thirds or three-fourths of the State of Pennsylvania. And if we should add the Niagara project, this radius would cover practically all the States of New York and Pennsylvania, nearly all the New England States and a large portion of both Ohio and Michigan. Then electricity could be laid down anywhere in that area wholesale for around 4 to 4½ mills a kilowatt-hour. Now let us see what that would mean. The people in that area are as intelligent and as capable of economically distributing electricity as are the people of Ontario.

Windsor, Ontario, gets power from Niagara Falls through the Ontario Hydro Commission, transmits it 238 miles and distributes it at the Ontario rates. There is no reason why electricity should not be distributed throughout this Niagara-St. Lawrence area at the Ontario rates. Let us see what it would mean to the people of that section of the country if this were done. Suppose we take the State of New York first.

NEW YORK

In 1940 the people of the State of New York, the ultimate consumers, used 15,613,493,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $349,872,269.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $147,355,209—or $201,517,060 less.

Think of it. The people of the State of New York, the users of electricity in that State, paying an overcharge for their electric lights and power amounting to more than $200,000,000 a year, compared with the rates paid in Ontario, just across the line.

But I know it will be said that the Ontario power system pays no taxes. Let us see what difference that makes. The record shows that all the taxes—including income taxes, both State and Federal—cash contributions and free services paid or rendered in the State of New York for 1 year by both privately and publicly owned electric utilities amounted to $48,140,714. Take that amount from the 1940 overcharges of $201,517,060 and it will leave a net annual overcharge of $153,376,346. That is the amount of the overcharges paid by the power consumers in the State of New York last year after allowing for all taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both privately and publicly owned electric utilities.

That net annual overcharge of $153,000,000 a year would amount to more in 3 years than the entire cost to the United States of this whole development.

But that is not all. Let us see about the other States. Suppose we take Pennsylvania next.

PENNSYLVANIA

During the year 1940, the people of Pennsylvania used 12,187,075,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $215,110,577.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $120,951,629—or $95,158,948 less. In other words, the people of Pennsylvania, the users of electric light and power, paid overcharges amounting to more than $95,000,000 a year, according to the Ontario rates.

The taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both privately and publicly owned electric utilities in Pennsylvania in 1 year amounted to $23,567,267. Take that amount from the overcharges of $95,158,948, and it will leave a net annual overcharge paid by the people of Pennsylvania of $71,582,681—after allowing for all taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both privately and publicly owned electric utilities.

Now let us take the New England States.

CONNECTICUT

In 1940 the people of Connecticut used 1,595,155,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid $42,954,245. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $19,625,883—or $23,328,362 less.

Taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both privately and publicly owned electric utilities for 1 year in Connecticut amounted to only $5,150,721—leaving a net annual overcharge of $18,177,641.

MAINE

During the year 1940, the people of Maine used 1,031,376 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid $15,429,352. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $7,276,050—or $8,153,320 less.

The taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both privately and publicly owned electric utilities for 1 year in the State of Maine amounted to $1,631,208, leaving a net annual overcharge of $6,522,094.

MASSACHUSETTS

In 1940 the people of Massachusetts used 3,394,517,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid $97,198,887. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $39,993,925—or $57,204,962 less.

All the taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both privately and publicly owned electric utilities in 1 year in Massachusetts amounted to only $16,580,357, which leaves a net annual overcharge paid for their electricity by the people of Massachusetts amounting to $40,624,605.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

In 1940 the people of New Hampshire used 353,537,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid $10,386,435. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $4,705,464, or $5,680,971 less.

Taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered in New Hampshire in 1 year amounted to $1,779,659, leaving a net annual overcharge of $3,901,312.

RHODE ISLAND

In 1940 the people of Rhode Island used 662,966,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid $17,102,401. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $7,552,870, or $9,549,531 less.

The taxes, cash contributions and free services in Rhode Island for 1 year amounted to $1,557,952, leaving a net overcharge of $7,991,579.

VERMONT

In 1940, the people of Vermont used 240,261,000 kilowatt-hours for which they paid $7,046,061. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $3,498,809, or $3,547,252 less.

The taxes, cash contributions ,and free services in Vermont for that year amounted to $1,281,784, leaving a net overcharge of $2,265,468.

OHIO

In 1940 the people of Ohio used 7,544,469,000 kilowatt-hours for which they paid $143,981,047. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $76,580,973, or $67,400,074 less.

The taxes, cash contributions, and free services in Ohio for that year amounted to $17,331,414, leaving a net overcharge of $50,068,660.

MICHIGAN

In 1940 the people of Michigan used 5,391,354,000 kilowatt-hours for which they paid $108,456,214. Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $53,298,969, or $55,157,245 less.

The taxes, cash contributions, and free services amounted to $10,647,660, leaving a net overcharge of $44,509,585.

CONCLUSION

Thus it will be seen that after deducting all taxes, cash contributions and free services rendered by privately and publicly owned electric utilities in the States lying within the distribution radius of this St. Lawrence project and Niagara Falls, the people of those States were overcharged last year $401,087,688, according to the Ontario rates.

I do not contend that there would be enough power generated on the St. Lawrence and the Niagara Rivers to supply the entire demand in these 10 States, but there would be a sufficient amount to furnish a yardstick that would force these rates down to their normal levels in that entire area.

Reduced rates always bring increased consumption, and increased consumption brings a greater use of those electric appliances necessary to relieve the drudgery and add to the comforts and conveniences of every home as well as the success of every business establishment.

If properly managed, this project would do for the people of that great northeastern section of our country what the T. V. A. has done for the people in the Tennessee Valley area. It would bring a new day of progress and prosperity for the great masses of the people of that area who pay the electric bills. Besides, it would conserve a great natural resource that is now going to waste.

The Power To Tax Is the Power to Destroy and To Keep Alive

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, fair and just taxation is the bulwark of democracy. Democratic principles cannot survive in a nation where inequitable tax burdens are imposed upon the people.

A study of history reveals that the democratic way of life has gone forward only when just taxation prevailed. The history of the rise of representative government in the world consists chiefly of the people's struggle for control over the public purse strings—the control of taxation and appropriation. Our constitutional form of government developed largely because transference of the source of governmental authority from the person of the ruler to the people brought about sounder principles of taxation. King John in accepting the Magna Carta at Runnymede in 1215 abandoned his authority for high-handed and unfair taxation, giving the barons more control over the levying and spending of taxes.

At the time the common people were not represented in the council, and the struggle was between the King and his barons. Between the granting of the Magna Carta in 1215 and the adoption of the Bill of Rights in 1689, the English people, from which our American stock has largely descended, and whose traditions guide us in our destiny, pressed steadily for enlargement of their control over taxation and appropriation. The Bill of Rights transferred the taxing power from the Crown to Parliament.

The American Colonies broke away from their mother country largely because of the unfair tax burdens that were imposed upon them through the arbitrary dictates of King George III. The colonists believed that democratic freedom could not exist and flourish under any system of taxation without representation. The American Revolution thus was brought about chiefly from unfair taxation policies.

As representatives of a democratic people, the Congress of the United States, therefore, in this critical time should examine carefully the guiding principles of taxation to be used in framing the levies needed to defray the cost of the national-defense program.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that my colleagues will be interested in the illuminating editorial which was published in Liberty magazine, July 5, 1941, entitled "We Cannot Recede One Inch." I am also republishing my brief speech delivered on the floor of the House on May 27, 1941, to which the editorial refers, and also the editorial which was published in Liberty magazine, May 24, 1941, entitled "Truer Words Were Never Spoken," to which I alluded in my speech. These constitute an interesting and instructive symposium of views in regard to this most vital and important subject of taxation, which is going to be before us for consideration during the coming weeks and months.

[From Liberty magazine of May 24, 1941]

TRUER WORDS WERE NEVER SPOKEN

"The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Thus spoke John Marshall, who more than a hundred years ago was Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. His warning on the peril of unwise taxation was uttered not to the lawmakers of his time alone but to all the future tax gatherers of history. Today his words ring out in solemn warning while the Congress sits in Washington and wrangles over the new tax bill.

A Niagara of words is flowing out of the Capitol, a torrent of flummery and flapdoodle, with here and there a little wave of common sense. Admittedly a grave task confronts the representatives of the people. They have to find cash to pay the bills. New taxes, more burdensome taxes, are inevitable. But, to hear some of these gentlemen, one would think that there is no limit to the patience of the average citizen, no bottom to his pocketbook.

Worse, some of our lawmakers seem determined to destroy the very basis of the American way of life.

Every schoolboy knows that our standard of living is the product of three basic factors—

high earnings, mass production, and low taxes. No country in Europe has ever known the blessings that are ours because of that threefold economic foundation. That is why the American standard of living surpasses the rest of the world.

Everybody also knows that low taxes played an immense part in this great development of our country. Before the last war, even when we piled State and local taxes on Federal taxes, the average for the entire country amounted to only about 7 percent per person. All argument to the contrary, this country, at least at this writing, is not at war, yet last year the average tax was well over 20 percent.

And today we hear our Washington lawmakers threatening to crack down on us with new taxes that may well frighten any citizen into expecting that before long we shall reach the British tax average. That will mean that 50 cents out of every dollar earned in this country will go to the Government.

But in all the hullabaloo does one hear any clarion cry for economy in fields other than defense? One hears a few courageous voices, but they are drowned out by the brattle and brangle of their fellows.

We do not have to wait until we reach the British tax average for a decline in the American standard of living. It is already declining. Prices are increasing rapidly, and so are taxes. After all, a dollar is only 100 cents, and if 30 cents go to taxes, only 70 cents are left for all the necessities and desires of life.

As prices go up, the purchasing value of that 70 cents must go down.

So the consumer—and that means you and me and everybody else—is forced to economize. The couple that went to the movies twice a week will see a picture only once a week. That means catastrophe for the motion-picture business, decreased earnings, decreased employment, and—mark this well—decreased taxes paid by that industry. It is a vicious circle.

The end of it all—distant and, let us hope, not inevitable—is the standard of living lowered to a mere subsistence level. For a thousand years after the fall of the Roman Empire, Europe lived at such a level. We called that thousand years the Dark Ages.

Have our lawmakers in Washington been too busy with their fantastic proposals to read history?

And, while we are asking questions, here is another. President Roosevelt is reported to have said that he believes in high taxes, not only because our defense program requires the money, but also to impress the Nation with the seriousness of the European situation so far as it affects the United States.

This is a cryptic utterance. The latest Gallup poll reports that 79 percent of the people of the United States are resolutely against American armies entering the war. Is it this 79 percent to which the President wishes to give such drastic instruction? If so, what is the lesson? What, specifically, does he fear that we do not understand?

A democracy calls for plain speaking. Before the gentlemen in the Congress carry out some of their fabulous tax schemes, before we endanger the very foundations of American existence, why not speak frankly, Mr. President, and tell us why we should tax ourselves to destruction?

[Speech of Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH, May 27, 1941]

"POWER TO TAX IS POWER TO KEEP ALIVE"—CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how a disjointed quotation and half truth can gain currency. How often do we hear it repeated that Chief Justice Marshall said that "the power to tax is the power to destroy"? Writers and speakers have vied with each other in repeating this statement until it has become a classic; and now that we are considering tax-revenue legislation, it is being worn threadbare. One of the latest uses of this half quotation is in the editorial columns of the usually accurate Liberty magazine, under the brilliant editorship of Mr. Fulton Oursler, in its issue of May 24, 1941.

What did Chief Justice Marshall really say? Let me quote, in the interests of truth and historical accuracy, his exact words. In the celebrated case of McCulloch against Maryland, decided in 1819, Chief Justice Marshall said:

"That the power to tax involves the power to destroy; that the power to destroy may defeat and nullify the power to create"—

But he also said, which is a part of the immediate context, but is strangely omitted from the quotation, and yet is the most significant part of his statement, to wit:

"The power to tax is the one great power on which the whole national fabric is based. It is not only the power to destroy but also the power to keep alive."

Mr. Speaker, I can conceive of no more appropriate time to make this correction and point out what Chief Justice Marshall really did say than at this present time. We are now considering a new tax-revenue measure to finance our national-defense program. We are levying taxes to defray the cost of protecting, maintaining, and preserving our Government and institutions against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Certainly there could be no more proper exercise of the taxing power vested in the Congress under the Constitution than this very power. This power Chief Justice Marshall declared to be "the power to keep alive," and clearly proves how true were his words, that—

"The power to tax is the one great power on which the whole national fabric is based, It is not only the power to destroy but also the power to keep alive."

[From Liberty magazine of July 5, 1941]

WE CANNOT RECEDE 1 INCH

On the floor of the House of Representatives the other day the Honorable MARTIN F. SMITH, from the third district of the State of Washington, arose and addressed the Chair:

"Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how a disjointed quotation and half-truth can gain currency. How often do we hear it repeated that Chief Justice Marshall said 'That the power to tax is the power to destroy * * *.' One of the latest uses of this half quotation is in the editorial columns in the usually accurate Liberty magazine under the brilliant editorship of Mr. Fulton Oursler, in its issue of May 24, 1941.

"What did Chief Justice Marshall really say? Let me quote in the interests of truth and historical accuracy his exact words. In the celebrated case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, decided in 1819, Chief Justice Marshall said:

"'That the power to tax involves the power to destroy; that the power to destroy may defeat and nullify the power to create—'

"But he also said, which is a part of the immediate context but is strangely omitted from the quotation and yet is the most significant part of his statement, to wit: 'The power to tax is the one great power on which the whole national fabric is based. It is not only the power to destroy but also the power to keep alive.'

"Mr. Speaker, I can conceive of no more appropriate time to make this correction and point out what Chief Justice Marshall really did say than at this present time. We are now considering a new tax-revenue measure to finance our national-defense program. We are levying taxes to defray the cost of protecting, maintaining, and preserving our Government and institutions against the enemies, foreign and domestic. Certainly, there can be no more proper exercise of the taxing power reserved in the Congress under the Constitution than this very power. This fact Chief Justice Marshall declared to be 'the power to keep alive' and clearly proved how true were his words that "the power to tax is the one great power on which the whole fabric is based. It is not only the power to destroy but also the power to keep alive.'"

Liberty is glad that Representative SMITH has seen fit to debate the point made by this editorial exactly where it should be debated—before the tax-levying power which is the Congress. We are sorry he did not read the whole article to the Congress.

On one point we are in absolute agreement with Mr. SMITH—if we wish to have a government, we must pay for it. No one has ever used the words of Chief Justice Marshall to suggest either that we should not pay for government or that we should have no government.

But Liberty cannot recede 1 inch from that editorial. We maintain that Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, took a long and deliberate step beyond the meaning Mr. SMITH has cited. Everybody knows that the need of taxation is primary, obvious, and fundamental; but the Chief Justice, in his great wisdom, foresaw the temptations that come to taxgatherers, and to point out the danger he used one of the strongest words in the English language—the word "destroy."

The dictionary defines the word "destroy" in these words: "To bring to ruin." Chief Justice Marshall did not use that word idly. He chose it precisely to warn America that while only by taxation can our Government be kept alive, the power to tax should never be used to ruin the people. Yet that is exactly what the Congress is in danger of doing right now. Liberty quoted his words aptly and realistically.

We all know that we must be taxed, and taxed heavily, for defense. At what point, then, do taxes become destructive? They become destructive when the taxgathering powers, as in the case of the very Congress of which Mr. SMITH is an able and patriotic Member, refuse to economize in other fields, refuse to throw out the pork barrel.

The American people want to be taxed to keep our country alive. They will not be taxed into destruction. They agree perfectly with all the words of Chief Justice Marshall as quoted in full by Mr. SMITH.

Relations Between United States and Canada a Worthy Example to World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINDER R. HARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN S. GIBSON, OF GEORGIA

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the Honorable JOHN S. GIBSON, Representative in Congress from the Eighth District of Georgia, delivered at the opening of the campaign for the sale of victory bonds in Canada. This address was delivered over the Canadian radio network

from the William Pitt Hotel in Chatham, Canada, on the occasion of the last meeting of the year of the Chatham Canadian Club.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of this great convention and to the people of the great Commonwealth of the Dominion of Canada, I greet you as neighbors and friends and bring to you from the great populace of the United States—my people—a message of love, confidence, and good will, and of deep sympathy for the heroic people of Great Britain.

In addressing your citizenry I am not unmindful of their love of liberty and freedom and devotion to democracy and of the high ideals of personal, as well as national life, that it has maintained through the ages.

I have always held your country and people high in regard and have for many years anticipated a visit to you. Such visit, of course, was expected when the world was in peace and your people reposed in contentment and love. I come, however, when the peace-loving Christian people of the world are seeing their darkest hour of their national lives, and are fighting and preparing to fight that their God-given freedom may be preserved, not only for themselves, but for the countless numbers yet to be born. However, if I can say one word that will cause the fires of patriotism and love of liberty to burn brighter in your hearts, a word that will bring encouragement to your souls, then my time will have been well spent.

I should like at this point to say a few words on the relations between the United States and Canada. Never have the relations between the two countries been better. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the unfended border stands as a worthy example to the world of the way two peoples can live generation after generation in peaceful relations. When I cross this border I am reminded anew of this significant fact and of the deep-seated friendship and cooperative spirit which are the fundamental characteristics of the relations between our two peoples. We have truly adhered to the Biblical injunction, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." We have cherished and sponsored the same ideals, we have worshipped the same God and bowed to flags that symbolized the same high ideals of sane government that guaranteed to her people the right to breathe free air, to live free lives, and enjoy the liberties that God intended his people should have. Why should there not exist between our citizenry a spirit of brotherly love that will insure through the ages a perfect understanding and peace between the two peoples.

It is hardly necessary to mention that the interests of our two countries are closely related. An outside danger to one would almost certainly be a danger to the other. In this connection I recall President Roosevelt's Kingston statement of August 18, 1938, in which he gave assurance that the people of the United States would not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil should be threatened by any other empire.

Since the outbreak of the European war the relations between Canada and the United States have become closer than ever. Cooperation has extended into many fields. I refer especially to cooperation in the matter of defense. It was just 2 years to the day after the Kingston statement that President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister of Canada discussed the mutual problems of defense in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States and agreed to set up a permanent Joint Board on Defense to commence studies related to sea, land, and air problems. For more than a year and a half the Joint Board has been dealing effectively with the problems for which it was created.

A little more than a month ago—on April 20, 1941—the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada again dealt with problems of mutual interest to the two countries. At Hyde Park they discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be made of the productive facilities of North America for the purposes of local and hemisphere defense and of the assistance which both Canada and the United States were rendering to Great Britain and the other democracies. They agreed as a general principle that in mobilizing the resources of this continent, each country should provide the other with the defense articles which it is best able to produce, and, above all, produce quickly, and that production programs should be coordinated to this end.

During the crisis through which the world is passing there are from time to time events which react unfavorably on the interests of the free peoples and which tend to bring about discouragement in the democracies. The fact must be faced that now and then the tide of the battle will turn against the free peoples. During these discouraging periods it should be kept in mind that the spirit of freedom cannot be blasted out by the heaviest artillery; that it cannot be demolished by the most destructive bombs; that it does not despair in the face of hardships, privation, and suffering; that in the end it will emerge triumphant.

I have no respect for a person who will accept the privileges of a democracy and then in the hour of trial and bitter conquest, when her very existence is threatened, forget the courage of the patriots of old and let their cowardice become master of their existence and become passive, and thereby, whether willfuly or not, lend momentum to the enemy and assist it in crushing the rights of free-born people.

In the present world conflict there are definite signs that when God decrees that civilized peoples of the world may breathe the air of peace again, there will be a new world order. In this important hour in our national lives, when destruction stands on the very threshold of democracy, were I to fail to lend every aid to your people, the people of Great Britain, and to all the democracies that have displayed courage enough to rise in opposition to the monster of totalitarian governments, I would feel cowardice creeping on my soul and that I was not worthy of the blessings of a free land.

If liberty-loving people of democratic faith are to mold this new order and reassure the God-fearing peoples of the world their right to live in peace with the courage of the statesmen of old, then the democracies of the world must prevail against totalitarian advocates in the present European conflict. God forbid that we should ever permit our posterity to become subjected to the terror of an age in which the damnable and maddened theories of government of the Nazi reign. I have said before, and let me repeat, that I had rather see my wife and babies buried and follow by their sides than to know that they had to live under the dictatorial powers of Hitler or others of his ideals of government.

Our burden and responsibility is too great to be treated lightly or to permit of delay or indecision, and demands absolute national unity. This is the individual as well as collective responsibility of every peace-loving person in the world. It is great to boast of the powers of the democracies to conquer, but please let me remind you that the democracies you see conquering any of her aggressors in your dreams of optimism is a united people, one and inseparable in thought, purpose, and action. The lives of our democracies are now calling for unity. The maxims of heroism found throughout the history of our great commonwealths, I remind you, were not wrought in a divided house. The Nazi onslaught against free and representative government was well planned in advance and is a dangerous one. Even the crazed and maddened by their desire to enslave the world, we must not discount either the military genius or purpose of those at the head of the Nazi regime.

Aside from our love for the cause for which Great Britain is fighting and our respect for her iron hearts and heroic courage, we must face facts as they exist. With a conquered Europe and strengthened resources, it is credulous to assume that Germany, with her allies, would not seek new fields to conquer in the Western Hemisphere. There is but one answer to the present international status, it is a death struggle between totalitarian and representative forms of government—one must prevail, the other must perish—there is no middle ground. Shall democracy, with all its heritage and glory, fade from the world, to leave as a marker of its lamented tomb, bought at the price of blood and tears, an enslaved people? My answer is "No."

How simple it is to say that if Hitler conquers Britain he will not secure by such means as are necessary the possessions of its empire, with all their resources, to conquer what the English mothers and babes suffered to protect.

We, as a strong and courageous people, cannot permit ourselves to be soothed into that dreamless sleep that would cause us to trust Hitler or any of his emissaries by the wild statements of the appeasers or those of pro-German faith who have set themselves up among us. We are so often told that we could not be invaded—accept this as true if you may. Let me remind you that England has not been invaded, but its land has been drenched with the blood and tears of helpless women, and its air terrorized with screams of horror-stricken babes—her national soul shocked from bottom to top.

Why and on what premise should we assume that we would be spared the fate of other peace-loving democratic people at the hands of a victorious Hitler in all of his mad lust for innocent blood? Power means more to him than God and all His love. Trust him if you must, and see the soul of man crushed and the liberties of man perish before his ever-increasing fire of hatred and destruction. If it takes my blood and my life to defeat his purposes and program of human slavery, let it go. If it takes aid to Britain, let it go.

My heart goes out to Britain—she is fighting the common cause of all the God-fearing, peace-loving people of all the world for that standard of peace, security, and liberty that was bought by the blood of our heroes through the ages. May God give her gallant people continued courage, hope, power, and might to hold the banners of her democracy above the mud and mire and dust of a lost cause and enslaved people. When you think of death at its worst, it cannot compare with life in an age in which all the heritage of liberty and freedom lie buried beneath a Nazi flag. I am young in my service in the United States Congress, but old in my faith in democracy and in the belief that nothing has ever been gained by bowing a head or a heart to a tyrant. I love peace and hate war, but hold national and personal honor above blood, and before I would appease a monster whose only purpose was to banish love from the earth I would give my blood with a smile. No tyrant has ever yielded to appeasement, nor will Hitler; he hears only the voice of force and will yield only to its demand.

Let me remind you, however, conquests are not won by words, but by deeds. Every victory has its price. The price of the greatest victory—that of life—is death. Which should teach us the greater the victory the greater the price. We are going to be the victors in this great struggle. We must be, but the price is going to be great. It is

going to demand self-denial, hardships, sacrifices, bloodshed, and toil. Time is of the essence, and is bound to be the determining factor. If we love our homes and our firesides, and to see happy children answering the call of the church bells on beautiful Sabbath morns, and the family circle sweetened by the chatter of free-born babes, we cannot wait but must put all our force to work at once. Our first and instant contribution must be our financial aid. Canada must have bombers, planes, airports, ships, destroyers, antiaircraft guns, munitions, and men. Your love for your sons will not permit you to suffer them to go before the enemy without full preparation for an ample and effective defense of themselves as well as your country. It will take billions to furnish the necessary articles of offense and defense. Your Government is no stronger than you make it. You, collectively, are your Government. You must tonight realize that you are a link in the great chain, if you permit yourself to be weak and not do your full part, then you have weakened the whole chain and it will not be able to bear its burden. Your defense will collapse, your country fall, your children and the children of your neighbors will become slaves of a tyrant—better that they had never seen the light of day.

In the language of the Holy Writ, "For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his own soul?" The soul of your country and your liberty is at stake. What will you gain if you withhold your worldly goods, deny your Government your full aid, and let its soul perish in the flames of despotism. Again in the language of the Bible, "Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterdus and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." When the blessed victory for the civilized peoples of the world shall come, please don't let your denial of your Government now in this perilous hour bring these words home to you and force you to bow your head in shame. I call upon every person in the Dominion of Canada to rush to the aid of your country and put at its use your full financial support.

Canada must borrow the great sum of money necessary to prepare the tools of war with which her sons must be armed to meet the foe; she must get this money from you—her people, there is no other source from whence it can come. She is offering a series of victory loan bonds which may be bought in denominations of $50, $100, $500, $1,000, and even larger denominations. Therefore, it is so arranged that citizens of small means may have a part in this great cause. I shall not attempt to discuss in detail the merits of these bonds further than to say that you must buy them liberally that your country may be saved and that they are backed by every resource of Canada. If conditions should arise whereby your bonds were not good then under the same conditions your money would be of no value. These bonds can be bought for cash or may be purchased on the installment plan. It is the sacred duty of every citizen to buy every bond that his means, present or prospective, will permit. When you go to make your purchase, before you decide the amount you will buy, pause and think what a privilege it is to live in a country where you are asked to lend your money to your government in a time of need; instead of in a country where your property is confiscated for government use without your consent and even over your protest; in a government where individual rights do not exist, but where you are just a unit in a mass of enslaved people.

I ask you to make full inquiry with regard to these bonds tomorrow, and make your purchase then. The loss of one day may determine the ultimate outcome of this great struggle. People of wealth should buy heavily, and those of meager means should be encouraged to go their full means by the biblical story of the widow's mite. It will be recalled that when the poor widow threw in two mites, which make one farthing, Jesus said, "Verily, I say unto you, that this poor widow has cast more in than all they which have cast into the treasury. For all they did cast in of their abundance, but she of her want did cast in that she had, even all her living." To you of smaller means who follow this beautiful lesson should go a hero's badge. I say with full knowledge of my words, "Cast thy bread upon the waters; for thou shalt find it after many days."

Remember you are not asked to give, but only to lend to your fighting son, and your neighbor's fighting son, who needs your help to defend himself. When you buy a $100 bond you have made it possible to outfit one soldier to march into battle to fight for you.

In the words of your own beloved Churchill, "next to cowardice and treachery, over-confidence leading to neglect or slothfulness is the worst of martial crimes * * * we shall not lag or falter, we shall not weaken or tire, neither the sudden shock of battle nor the long drawn trials of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. Give us the tools and we will finish the job." I ask you as loyal sons and daughters of a great commonwealth, yet, as patriots, to answer tomorrow the call of the great statesman, Winston Churchill, and pour your money in freely that your heroic brothers across the water may be prepared to meet the dreadful foe on equal terms. Do not deny them while they are fighting for us. He will keep the faith and bring back values fourfold for every dollar you lend your government.

We in the States are spending billions and billions for the defense of Britain, for your defense and for our defense. We expect to spend many more billions. Our people are rallying to the cause with gratifying generosity and freely placing their finances at their Government's command and I know that the people of the great Dominion are doing and will continue to do their part.

The responsibility is common to all our people, and likewise the glory of the great victory that is sure to come will be a common reward for our great efforts, which will rest in the memory of our peoples through the ages and make us all glad that we contributed our bit to the great cause of humanity.

I am happy that there exists the unity among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere that we now see. I could well say at this time that I speak to you as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America and do not speak as a representative of our great President or our State Department. I do feel, however, that I speak the sentiments of the great majority of our people.

When President Roosevelt delivered his radio address of May 27 to the United States and to the world there were present at the White House for the occasion the diplomatic representatives at Washington of the American republics and of Canada. To me this is significant in indicating the solidarity of the nations of the Western Hemisphere during this period of tremendous danger to the free peoples of the world.

The struggle going on in the world today is a struggle between two ways of life. The democracies stand for freedom of religion, freedom of speech and expression, economic freedom, individual liberty, and a peaceful and orderly world. On the other hand, the Nazis are endeavoring to destroy religion and everything that is dear to the heart of a free man. They have destroyed freedom of speech and expression. They have replaced economic freedom with regimentation. They have destroyed individual liberty. Instead of desire for peace there is lust for conquest.

The Nazis, by word and deed, have made it clear that they are embarked on a war for world domination. They would impose their way of life on the free peoples of the world. As a part of their program they are endeavoring to gain control of the seas. If they should gain control of the seas, the Nazis would be a great menace to the nations of this hemisphere.

From the outbreak of war in September 1939 the United States has been aware of this menace to the Western Hemisphere. We have taken and are taking many steps to meet every possible contingency. We are carrying out the largest armament-production program ever undertaken in the United States. We have enlarged our Navy. We have made substantial progress in building up our Army. We are increasing and perfecting our air force. We are making gigantic strides in stepping up the production of war materials of all kinds.

As part of our own program of national defense we early instituted a policy of assistance to Great Britain and other nations which are endeavoring to stop the world-wide movement of conquest. Two months after the war began we repealed the arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act in order that arms, ammunition, and implements of war might be sent from the United States to those nations. In June of last year, when Great Britain faced alone the Nazi menace, we furnished military supplies to meet her desperate need. In September we sent 50 destroyers to Great Britain in return for the lease of 8 naval and air bases in the Western Hemisphere. Early in this year the Congress of the United States passed the lend-lease bill. Under this act large supplies of military equipment have been sent to Great Britain. Day by day we are increasing the amount of these supplies for use of the British in their heroic battle. We are determined that Great Britain shall have supplies and assistance for carrying on her struggle.

In his address on May 27 President Roosevelt stated the national policy of the United States in the following words:

"First, we shall actively resist wherever necessary, and with all our resources, every attempt by Hitler to extend his Nazi domination in the Western Hemisphere, or to threaten it. We shall actively resist his every attempt to gain control of the seas. We insist upon the vital importance of keeping Hitlerism away from any point in the world which could be used and would be used as a base of attack against the Americas."

"Second, from the point of view of strict naval and military necessity, we shall give every possible assistance to Britain and to all who, with Britain, are resisting Hitlerism or its equivalent with force of arms. Our patrols are helping now to insure delivery of the needed supplies to Britain. All additional measures necessary to deliver the goods will be taken.

"The delivery of needed supplies to Britain is imperative. This can be done; it must be done; it will be done."

At this point I should like to quote a statement made in an address delivered a few days ago by our Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull. He said:

"For us, the task of safeguarding our security requires the full, continuous, patriotically inspired effort of each and every one of us. The energies of those who control the operation of our factories and their machines, together with the labor of those who

make and operate the machines, must be devoted to the attainment of maximum production. Each and all must work with a sense that what they do, or do not do, is important in determining whether this country shall be secure. Every part of our vast production machine that can serve to produce military supplies must be put to that purpose. The desire to continue ordinary ways of business must yield to the needs of the crisis. Individuals and groups have no right at this time to think or act primarily in terms of their personal interest to the detriment of the general national good.

"Although the task is huge, the time is pressing, and though the struggle may continue for a long time, I am confident that in the end there will come a better day. We are at work not only at the task of insuring our own safety but also at the task of creating ultimate conditions of peace with justice. We can help to lay a firm foundation for the independence, the security, and the returning prosperity of the members of the family of nations. I have absolute faith in the ultimate triumph of the principles of humanity, translated into law and order, by which freedom and justice and security will again prevail." I am justly proud of our leadership in the States. The fact that my position has permitted me to lend my cooperation to its policies in these crucial days will stand out in my life as my greatest privilege.

My people are proud of you as a neighbor and as an ally, and are proud to accept you as brothers in this common cause for suffering humanity. Let's be men, let's be strong men with never dying courage and determination to win—the cause is too great to lose, the victory too sweet to forfeit.

Among my last words let it be said again—let not your country call in vain, let your faith stand up and lend to it the full force of your resources. Buy your bonds now—let not your country stagger in the weakness of your failure. Let your generosity be a beacon light to others. Let tomorrow's sun set on you a proven patriot—one who has done his part to stop the flow of innocent blood.

Your people have been nice to me during my stay in the Dominion. Regardless to the shadows of a troubled world that was responsible for my visit I have enjoyed knowing your people. After seeing you and knowing you better my faith in democracy is strengthened and my confidence in a full and complete victory is reassured. Maintain your courage and you will see the sun of peace and love shine over your fair land again.

The deity of the Supreme Being is seen in his works and with you good people I pray to the everlasting God to guide our Nations through this hour of terror to a full and just victory.

When I behold on this earth for the last time, the beauties of love and nature, and when the sun sets in crimson hue the last time for me, let me behold a world in peace; a democracy intact, where love is king and hate is banished from the garden of life. Let me see the flags of our two Commonwealths hoisted high and floating proudly in peaceful air proclaiming the victory that is sure to come, and standing as tokens of the unbroken love and peace between our two countries.

With the words of Kipling, I bid you Godspeed:

"No easy hope or lies,
Shall bring us to our goal,
But iron sacrifices
Of body, will, and soul.
There is but one task for all—
One life for each to give.
What stands if freedom falls?
Who dies if England live?"

I say goodbye to the good people of the great Commonwealth of the Dominion of Canada.

The Church and Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

SERMON BY J. GEORGE BUTLER

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a serman by one of the foremost students of labor problems in our district:

THE CHURCH AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(Summerfield Methodist Church, New Haven, Conn., June 15, 1941. Scripture lesson: Luke 15)

(By J. George Butler)

This morning I am going to preach on a subject about which there is a vast difference of opinion. Because we are Christians, I am preaching on it. Christians are tolerant, and try to understand the others' point of view. Christians believe in free speech, free press, and a free pulpit, to deal with issues definitely controversial. One of the reasons Adolf Hitler is so despised is his failure to allow free speech in Germany. Surely we do not wish to copy his methods in our churches. Bishop McConnell, speaking at our forum last winter, said: "The function of the church is to take a stand on issues as they arise, and be a moulder of public opinion." The church, as an impartial seeker after truth, has something to say about an issue which affects the lives of us all in this community. So I have decided that this morning I shall preach on the Church and Collective Bargaining. Don't prejudge the issue before I speak. Come to it with an open mind. Hear me, and then judge.

Thirty years ago the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, representing the great Protestant communions in America, adopted the Social Creed of the Churches, in which the rights of both employer and employee to organize were recognized. Employers have long enjoyed the benefits of organization. Today there are 7,000 employers' associations, and over 1,000 international employers' associations. But the question of employees' organization has long been looked on with suspicion and distrust. America's industrial history contains a long record of brutal and bloody clashes. Blame has been on both sides of such struggles, though the La Follette civil liberties investigation did bring out the facts that employers have all too frequently resorted to labor spies, thugs, arsenals of gas, machine guns, and rifles to use on workers as they attempted to organize.

A new day is dawning in the history of industrial relations, a day when violence and discord are being supplanted by harmony and peace. Unions and management are learning to work together on a basis of mutual understanding and trust, rather than bitterness, suspicion, and hate. The average man does not know about these cases, because they are not news for the newspaper. The only labor relations that make the daily press are those where strikes and conflict occur. This morning, however, I earnestly desire your attention to point to you, not that labor and management have identical interests, but that their relations with each other can be carried out harmoniously and to the mutual advantage of each.

But some of you well ask, Why are you, a Christian minister, mixed up in affairs that are none of your business? Scrooge in Dickens' Christmas Carol said: "Mankind is my business." I know of a better way than the way of strife and hate—and I know that unions, however maligned by the press and public opinion, are part of our democratic process. If the church is to be a molder of public opinion, as Bishop McConnell said it should, I must not remain silent.

For the past few months I have known that the A. F. of L. machinists have been seeking to organize the Winchester plant, and in the last weeks, have seen C. I. O. sound trucks at the shop gates. Accordingly, I called on the works manager, Mr. Thomas I. S. Boak, and told him the position of the church on collective bargaining. The church is interested in it, because it believes in democracy—in the individual as of infinite worth before God, and that those who manage derive their powers from the consent of the managed. Politically, we believe in democracy—at least we are all but in another world war to preserve it. Because we believed it in 1776, we fought for our independence. We were not despotically ruled in the colonial period. Go back and read your history. When the Colonies objected to the tax program of the British Crown, the Townshend regime levied but light taxes on the Colonies, and dedicated their proceeds to the support of colonial government, just to maintain the principle of the right of Britain to tax her colonies. Yet, what did happen? Patrick Henry and the rest shouted: "Taxation without representation is tyranny!"

Lincoln believed in government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." That belief comes straight out of the scripture lesson this morning. Jesus told three stories in this great fifteenth chapter of Luke: The lost sheep—so valuable that the shepherd left the 90 and 9 safe in the sheepfold and braved the elements in search of the lost one—the lost coin—the lost son. "Ye are of more value than many sheep." Jesus is saying that individuals are infinitely worthful in the sight of God. God will go to infinite pains to save the individual. Translated into political language, you have Lincoln's Gettysburg speech—the greatest classic of our tongue. Individuals must have a voice in government. And now, in our day, we are seeing the concept supplied to industry.

The days of the arbitrary, autocratic management of men are slowly, surely passing away. The army is generally regarded as the stronghold of autocracy. Yet, in the early days of the World War, the Quartermaster General of the United States, Gen. Robert E. Wood, when supply was breaking down throughout the Nation, summoned individual quartermaster generals to Washington, and in substance said to them: "Just forget that you have any authority, and start thinking about your responsibility, and we will get ahead with our task." Industry, which so often operates under the illusion of final authority, would do well to heed General Wood's advice.

When the United States Constitution was adopted, there was economic democracy in America. Ninety percent of the free inhabitants of America owned the properties upon which they worked. A hundred years ago the proportion was 80 percent. Even after the Civil War, when machines were being used extensively, the typical shoemaking shop, flour mill, slaughter or packing house was a local enterprise, owned and managed by an individual or group of individuals residing in the community. The Winchester plant was just such a shop—it was founded in 1866 and carried on as a private enterprise until 1898 when it first became a corporation. Now it is a mere subsidiary of another corporation. Today corporations well nigh control our lives. All our railroads are run by them, nine-tenths of our mines and quarries, four-fifths of all our manufacturing is done by them, and in place of ownership

of one's tools, the average worker has become a mere hired hand with no voice in the control of the machine which he and his fathers created. A few of you may own stock in various corporations. Then, you either send your proxies in, or you don't; your holdings are so minute in proportion to the total stock you have absolutely no say in the enterprise in which you have invested your savings.

In the modern industrial scene, workers seize on the labor union as the only way they may organize to have some say in the machines that rule over them. In 1921, Chief Justice William Howard Taft said in the American Steel Foundries case:

"Union was essential to give laborers an opportunity to deal on equality with their employer."

A writer in the official organ of the United States Chamber of Commerce says:

"It is not likely that labor organization will weaken in the years to come. Rather it will grow stronger. * * * Under those conditions, is it not wise to work with that agency so that it may function as constructively as possible?"—Nation's Business, Industrial Peace Overseas, 67 Apr. '39.

Labor organization is not crammed down the throat of men, but a direct expression of their belief in economic democracy; that they should be represented by delegates of their own choosing to bargain collectively with management, which today, is always a collective agency. The law of the land does not recognize company unions as such agencies.

Some people say if a worker is dissatisfied, let him go elsewhere. That, he could do in the nineteenth century, when there was a need for labor in excess of the supply, when men were always pushing westward to the frontier—but the frontier is gone, and now, even with the war, we have millions of unemployed. The facts are that workers cannot go elsewhere—there is no elsewhere.

Many industrialists honestly believe that strikes are more prevalent with unions than without. On the contrary, the facts are the reverse. When unions become strong, there are no strikes. It is the weak union, seeking recognition, that all too frequently resorts to violence. The President's commission on industrial relations in Great Britain and Sweden reported, in 1938, the tendency to strike diminishes as the labor unions increase in numbers and strength, both because increasing bargaining power reduces the necessity for strikes, and because responsible leadership tends to check impulsive action. Sometimes, of course, strikes are the only recourse workmen have. While we deplore such strikes as the North American Aircraft Co. in California, the facts are that North American was violating the Wagner Act, and the men struck for redress. The financial page reveals some of the causes for discontent. Production workers were being paid 50 cents an hour, when in both 1939 and 1940 the company made 200 percent profit on its original investment. Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, stated that 89 percent of defense-industry strikes have occurred in firms cited for violation of the Wagner Act.

There are four steps in industrial organization, the first one where there is open hostility between labor and management; then the signing of a collective agreement; third, bargaining about wages, hours, and conditions of work; and, finally, labor-management cooperation. If there were time in the limits of a sermon, I should like to go into detail on the fruits of labor-management cooperation. Since I cannot, I can but indicate a few examples. Again, you say, you've never heard of a good union—I don't wonder in the least, because you don't hear of them—unions have worked for 30 years in peace and harmony, to the mutual advantage of both sides, and one never hears about them, unless you know where to read, because peace and harmony are not news. Even Jesus was not news in his day.

How many of you have Pequot sheets on your beds at home? These sheets are made by the Naumkeag Steam Cotton Co. The United Textile Workers Union, through its research committee, made suggestions which saved that company $230,000 a year, after granting substantial pay increases, and paying for all the research. The full story is in Collective Bargaining for Today and Tomorrow, by Henry C. Metcalf. Get it and read for yourself.

Has anybody ever accused Harvard University of being communistic because its banner was crimson? Well, the Harvard Business Review, spring 1940, has an arresting article: The Fruits of Industrial Peace, and the fruits are large. Instance after instance is cited of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee working together with management, in several cases actually saving concerns from going bankrupt. The English economist, Marshall, states that half the brain power of the world lies with the working classes, and bemoaned the fact that so little use is being made of this resource. When labor and management cooperate they begin to explore the possibilities of using this vast power.

In 1936 and 1937 the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation fought the union, and the union was forced to strike to gain recognition. The company then changed its policy, and embarked on a sincere experiment in labor relations. As a result, the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation is enjoying a period of harmonious labor relations, which have become a model for the entire industry. There are no excesses at the plants of this company.

In the spring of 1939, 30 steel executives met in Pittsburgh as guests of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee to hear and discuss an address by a nationally known economist. At the California plant of the Paraffine Companies, Inc., the process is reversed—the company sponsors a course for union leaders.

I must mention one other reason why I am interested in labor unions. Because I see that the roots of international war are economic, and the result of rival imperialism, I believe in labor unions as a way of helping to prevent such conflicts. Under capitalism, workers are not paid for what they produce. In 1939, far less profitable a year for operations than 1940, the Winchester plant, or Western Cartridge, made a profit averaging $565 per worker. Average wages I am told are between 45 and 50 cents an hour for production workers. Fifty cents an hour, 40 hours a week—$20, or on piece work, even $25, or $30 a week—how can men on such salaries buy radios, or refrigerators, or automobiles, and support a family? They can't. Similarly, if the same kind of conditions obtain among radio and refrigerator workers, how can they in turn buy Winchester rifles and shotguns? The answer is, they can't. Multiply these examples for all our industries, and the simple answer is, capitalism must depend on foreign markets to sell its surplus goods which cannot be sold at home, because capitalism fails to pay its workers for what they produce. Competition for foreign markets, however, means trade rivalries, conflicting nationalism, and imperialism, and imperialism breeds war. Enlightened industrialists understand these problems, but all too frequently industrial engineers have not been trained in international relations and the problems of distribution. According to the Wickenden report, sponsored by the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, in 1929, only 13 percent of the curricula of schools of engineering was concerned with nontechnical subjects. Engineering students, unlike candidates for law, medicine, the ministry, or education, go direct from high school to technical school. There they are highly trained in the arts of production, but with a meager introduction to the problems of distribution, consumption, and of industrial relations. Hence they are not aware of the grave international implications of their domestic wage policies. Higher wages at home increase purchasing power, which will do away with the necessity of seeking foreign markets, the competition for which makes for war.

Why do I, a Christian minister, become interested in these things? Because I am convinced that the way of good will is stronger than hate, that love can overcome evil, that labor and management can work out their differences around the conference table in a democratic way, loving mercy, and doing justly by all. The cure for dictatorship in our world is not less democracy, but more. Speaking at Buffalo before the ministers' association of that city, Dr. James Myers, industrial secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, said that where human misunderstanding and bitterness exist:

"It is the peculiar duty of religion to bring out the true facts and, more than that, to bring together representatives of these economic groups * * * to achieve brotherly understanding, and discover those common interests, which will be found to underlie all the superficial prejudice, misunderstanding, and strife which divide us."

Accordingly, because I believe in this, because I believe in democracy, because I believe in Christ, I shall seek to bring more democracy, not less, to New Haven. If this be treason, then make the most of it.

Independence Day Objectives Contrasted to Alien Sincerity of Allegiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY L. MOSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER AND ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles appearing in the Washington Post and the Star of July 4, 1941, apropos of Independence Day, contrasting loyalty of certain naturalized citizens to American principles and prerequisites notwithstanding oath of allegiance.

[From the Washington Post of July 4, 1941]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

OF ALIENS

There is not the slightest doubt that the people of this country have the right to close the books, and for any length of time, against the naturalization of aliens. This is our country and we make the rules of eligibility, so if we decide not to take in any more outsiders as full members until further notice no apologies are due anyone.

The question is whether it would be wise to do this.

As one who thinks it would be wise I would point to the fact, well known to all our practical politicians, that for a long time many of our naturalized citizens have voted by blocs and have turned important elections by their solidarity under the leadership of political colonizers or padrones. No election should be decided by any group which

is still conscious of segregation from the whole American community, but this does happen and doubtless will continue to happen as long as we confer citizenship on masses of people who simply aren't yet Americans.

However, that is water over the dam now. It is impossible to revoke the naturalization of such voters except by a laborious process in each individual case where it can be shown that citizenship was obtained by fraud, and the number who could be so denaturalized would be negligible. But it is easily possible to act on this experience now and thus put an end to the abuse within measurable time.

Our immigrants since the first World War have not contributed much to the peace and progress of the United States, wherein they have differed from the hordes who came tumbling ashore from the boats in the old free-and-easy days. True, those immigrants colonized and voted in blocs and politicians filling slates were careful to salt them with names which would appeal to the foreign-born. But they were, in the main, workers who elected to venture to the United States as a land of opportunity, whereas the newer immigration has largely consisted of people who sought only safety and regarded this country as a refuge and nothing else. There is quite a difference there

The newer immigration has included many presumptous ingrates with fixed ideas of government and economy which had made them unwelcome at home, who had no sooner set down their bags here than they began to lecture us on our faults and try to set things right, according to their notions. They didn't want to become Americans, but wanted to make Russians or Germans or, better say, Communists or Nazis of us. Some of them got into our Government in the guise of economic advisers and counselors on social reform, and in our cities and, worst of all, in some parts of New York an old-style American is practically an alien in his own home town.

There comes a time when the native American reminds himself that the alien and the naturalized but only slightly Americanized citizen are not, after all, the only persons for whom the United States exists. He is suddenly aware that for years he has been hearing about the rights and troubles of the foreign-born and is moved to assert that he who was born here is entitled to a little consideration, too, and not as a concession but as his right.

It offends the native American to be told, in effect, that the native population cannot produce men capable of performing important tasks, involving a call on patriotism, as well as individuals who came from the other side. He doesn't believe that this is actually so and suspects that such appointments are made with intent to appeal to blocs of alien-minded naturalized voters and to stimulate the growth of socialism, whether Muscovite or Nazi, in his native land.

The native Americans are divided on a thousand issues and never vote as a bloc, but if they could be consulted it would be found that they want no advice from any foreigner, naturalized or not, on the conduct of their country, and deeply resent political appeals to foreign groups voting their prejudices or instructions, which determine the outcome of American elections. The American has heard Americanism derided as something smug and contemptible, and ideas imported from the hell of Europe extolled as noble and progressive, although disaster struck wherever they were tried in the Old World. He gets not merely weary but pretty damned sore about that, too.

Once an alien is fully naturalized, he is a citizen equal in rights to the native American and may be a little superior in privileges, although he has only a smattering of the language and no affection for the Republic.

The Constitution says the President must be a native American, but with that single discrimination the newest naturalized Muscovite or Bundist is as good an American, under the law, as the native who has tried always to be a good citizen and never wavered in his Americanism.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 4, 1941]

NATURALIZED NAZI SPY ELEVENTH TO ADMIT GUILT

NEW YORK, July 4.—Erich Strunck, 31, German-born seaman, arrested in Milwaukee in the F. B. I. round-up of 33 men and women suspected of espionage activities, pleaded guilty yesterday before United States Commissioner Martin C. Epstein to a charge of conspiring to engage in espionage activities against the United States.

Strunck, a naturalized United States citizen, was the eleventh to enter a guilty plea. He was ordered held under $25,000 bail for grand-jury action.

A seaman on the liner *Siboney*, which made frequent stops at Lisbon, Portugal, Strunck was described by F. B. I agents as a courier for the alleged spy ring.

Inmates of the Women's House of Detention made such a fuss when they learned three women arrested in Sunday's counter-espionage were among them that the trio had to be moved to other parts of the prison. Richard A. McGee, acting first deputy commissioner of correction, said the other prisoners chanted "Heil Hitler" and "Sieg Heil" and offered the Nazi salute.

Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle:

PADEREWSKI

Paderewski, the marvelous, matchless musician,
Much admired for his talents in both hemispheres,
Has fulfilled upon earth his remarkable mission,
That has covered a number of mem'rable years—
He has left a rare heritage to generations,
Born and unborn, to live, long as memories last,
In the musical hearts of the peace-loving nations,
Who'll enshrine it within the archives of the past.

He not only stood first amongst master musicians,
As pastmaster-performer, but likewise he will
Be remembered for his much admired compositions,
That will grow, through the ages, more popular still—
And, although he stood second to none as a master
In the musical realm wherein lately he shone,
He both spent and was spent, in the days of disaster,
For the good of the nation that he called his own.

Paderewski made millions, and freely expended
Most of all that he made, to help others along—
His own people he willingly greatly befriended—
For humanity his love was tenderly strong.
In addition to being so great a musician,
Justifiably proud of his matchless career,
Although not recognized as a shrewd politician,
He was known as a statesman whom just men revere.

Paderewski has been a unique inspiration
To the musical talent of the artistic world—
He stands first in the musical sky's constellation,
In our land, where the Stars and the Stripes are unfurled—
In America, tho' it is sometimes retarded,
Oft, perhaps, through the will of Divine Providence,
Genius must be religiously, rightly rewarded,
Or else God's word will fail to fulfill His intents.

Because faith, hope, and charity sweetly were blended
In the great Paderewski's remarkable life,
That in merciful majesty silently ended,
When he said, "Farewell, trouble and sorrow and strife,"
He was known, far and wide, for the grandeur and beauty
That enriched everything that he purposed to do;
For his highest ambition was doing his duty
In a way to help God make his heart-dreams come true.

Until into eternity time's poured its ages,
And has emptied itself of the lingering years—
Till the last line has faded from history's pages,
And the dawn of the great final judgment appears—
Will live on Paderewski's unique contribution,
That is meaning as much to sublime music's cause,
As America's God-and-man-made Constitution
Means today to our Nation's and States' statute laws.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Ignace Jan Paderewski, the Polish patriot and first President of the Council of Ministers of restored Poland after the World War, departed from this life. I had the good fortune to know him, to work with him, and to aid him in the

cause which he advocated for the liberation of the people of Poland from the yoke of tyranny.

Mr. Paderewski was a most generous man, of whom it can be truly said that the cause of his people, for freedom and liberty, was nearer and dearer to him than life itself. A most accomplished musician, yet his aims for the cause of liberty excelled even his greatness as an artist, and therefor, I am indeed gratified that this country, in recognition of his valuable services in the common cause of democracy, has accorded his earthly remains a resting place in the Arlington National Cemetery.

Poland gave to America Pulaski and Kosciuszko, and American history which is replete with their courageous fight for American freedom, relates that "freedom shrieked when Kosciuszko fell," and I might add that America mourned when Poland fell, and grieves the loss of her foremost citizen. Ignace Paderewski was a real democratic humanitarian, for he not only spent most of the fortune he made by his concerts in behalf of the Polish people, but he also gave benefit concerts for various philanthropic purposes, all of his concerts during the World War were for the cause of Poland, and one of his last concerts was for the benefit of the widows and orphans of France.

Mr. Paderewski was elected Chairman of the National Council of the Polish Republic when the exiled Polish Government was set up, and upon his arrival from Lisbon in New York issued the following statement:

Everybody knows that my poor nation is being systematically exterminated, that millions have been robbed, expelled from their homes, or deported to die in concentration camps.

He was born on November 6, 1860, in the Province of Podolia, which suffered much from the oppression of the czars, and when a Polish rebellion broke out, cossacks killed his mother, imprisoned his father, and carried his maternal grandfather away to Siberia, from where he never returned and evidently perished as did so many Polish patriots, so that the infant prodigy's life was blighted by these tragic memories while he was only 3 years old. He worked for the cause of freedom for Poland at Washington, and upon his return to his native land was received with great acclaim by the Polish people.

It is to be regretted that his advice not to listen to the promises, assurances, and pledges on the part of Hitler was not heeded nor his warning to Beck that the Polish Government should not aid Hitler in dismembering that great little Republic of Czechoslovakia. His intelligence, experience, and foresight made it perfectly clear to him that although such action might temporarily get Poland a portion of Czechoslovakia, which it received by the Versailles Treaty, Hitler would not permit Poland to retain it for any length of time. Evidently he, like all those who knew that Hitler was out for world conquest, feared Hitler's aim first to grab the Polish Corridor and later on to wrest from the Polish people all of Poland and its freedom and independence. Let us hope that Mr. Paderewski's efforts in behalf of a free and independent Poland will not have been in vain, and that Poland will soon again attain the freedom which he originally aided in obtaining for the Polish people.

In that connection I have read with a great deal of interest many editorials on this great man. None of them appealed to me more strongly than the one which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on July 1, which I take the privilege of inserting as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 1, 1941]

PADEREWSKI

An era ended when Ignace Jan Paderewski died at 80 in New York. He belonged to a time which is gone, a civilization which has been destroyed. The majority of the more important of his contemporaries predeceased him. He lived to witness the final catastrophe of the epoch in which he had been a leading but unfortunately a futile actor. That was his tragedy.

Half a century ago, however, there was nothing to suggest that Paderewski was destined to such a disappointment. When first he came to America in 1891 he literally dominated any environment into which he chose to enter. Professional critics of music were not overfriendly to the passion of his playing, but the lay public accepted him as the supreme master of the piano. Merely to see him in that period of his life was a memorable experience. A glance into his face was sufficient to convince the average stranger that he was possessed of vast resources of personal power. The lightning in his eyes was prophetic of the rebirth of his country, "the knight among the nations."

What gift of his own Paderewski brought to music may be a matter of opinion. He studied under Raguski and Leschetizky, received from them all that they would convey to him before his debut in Vienna in 1887. But instruction could not make him the artist he was. It probably molded his technique to his advantage, yet there is no reason to believe that it controlled the fire in his heart. He carried to his instrument a blaze produced in his soul. No phenomenon comparable with it has been manifested by any other virtuoso of his generation. It will bear repetition that up to the last he looked the genius that he was.

The same idealism which made him the world's greatest pianist prompted his efforts in behalf of the resurrection of the Polish state. Germany's defeat and the Bolshevik revolution in Russia provided the opportunity for the creation of a constitutional republic of the variety he desired. Never a radical, Paderewski considered a stalwart central government necessary to the prosperity of the united national community for which he had labored so long. His strength, however, really was that of his popular following in America. He arrived in Warsaw in December 1918 as a representative of the liberal views of President Woodrow Wilson rather than as an apostle of a practical philosophy of native growth. The role he was required to assume was not altogether natural to him, and the difficulties which beset him included those of adjustment to demands which would have dismayed a far more astute politician. His coalition ministry, formed January 17, 1919, was recognized by the Allies, but it soon collapsed. The military group headed by Marshal Pilsudski joined in effect with the intractable Socialists to oblige him to resign from his office as premier.

Washington knew Paderewski well and esteemed him highly. His last appearance at Constitution Hall is not likely to be forgotten by those music lovers who were privileged to attend. The date was March 23, 1933; and the master at the moment was at the apex of his artistic career. In acknowledgment of generous applause, he played six encores; and then, as though reluctant to depart, added Schubert's impromptu, Opus 142, No. 2. The picture was profoundly impressive; the audience stood in grateful silence the while he wove his final spell of magic melody.

Now his hands are still, but he is assured of remembrance not so much for what he did as for what he was. Paderewski the artist is immortal. The time and the world and the civilization to which he belonged likewise may rise from death again.

Stop Foreign Enlistments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, a recent news article which appeared in the papers throughout the country carried the following statement "the United States probably will give formal, full-fledged approval within a few days to the enlistment of American men in the British or Chinese war effort, either for actual combat duty or for noncombatant technical work behind the lines." The casual observer may read this statement without realizing how serious and far-reaching the matter of foreign enlistments really is. What does it mean to have American soldiers fighting in the British Army? What does it mean to have American blood spilled on foreign soil? The best answer to those questions was given by Winston Churchill in his book The World Crisis. Churchill states therein, "Nothing will bring America in on our side quicker than some blood spilled in Europe." When Americans are killed in Europe the news of their death will be broadcast throughout the United States. That is just what the war promoters want for the purpose of stirring up feelings on the part of Americans so their emotions will sway them rather than their judgment.

We want American boys to defend this country and we know they will gladly give up their lives to preserve our liberties. To induce our youth to enter a foreign holocaust by means of false slogans and spurious appeals is a vicious act which borders on criminality. The following article from the Milwaukee Sentinel discusses the question of foreign enlistments:

EXPECT O. K. SOON ON FOREIGN ENLISTMENTS—DRIVE TO BE SANCTIONED AS SERVICE IN INTEREST OF NATIONAL SAFETY; PREDICT VOLUNTEERS WILL BE GIVEN DEFERMENT

WASHINGTON, June 26.—The United States probably will give formal, full-fledged approval within a few days to the enlistment of American men in the British or Chinese war effort, either for actual combat duty or for noncombatant technical work behind the lines.

The enlistments would be sanctioned officially as service in the interest of national safety.

Informed persons predicted this development would come with issuance by selective-service headquarters here of a memorandum to State directors directing deferment be given registrants who wish to volunteer for duty abroad.

A final decision to issue the memorandum has not been made, officials said, but at selective-service headquarters it was looked upon as a virtually inevitable step after President Roosevelt told his press conference Tuesday that any man who wants to enlist in Britain's or China's fighting forces has a right to do so.

The President explained the British no longer require Americans to take an oath of allegiance to the King, a procedure by which they would lose their American citizenship.

Previously the administration had approved a British drive in this country to recruit several thousand technicians to help manufacture and service Britain's new airplane radio-locator or to do other expert mechanical duty.

Those who are leading the drive toward war want you to turn your eyes away from the horrors of war, and they hope that you will act upon emotion rather than reason. War means loss of life, suffering, misery, and destruction of not only property but those principles which all liberty-loving Americans hold dear. Think of the maimed bodies and twisted minds of those boys who manage to survive the battlefield. Contemplate the financial ruin and destruction of democracy that war would foist upon our Republic. War today is fought in the totalitarian manner. Nations at war are regimented and operated under the dictatorship principle; the rights of the individual are crushed, civil liberties are stamped out, censorship of speech, the radio, and the press are imposed; the war lords take over industry; they kill labor's right to strike and viciously crush all opposition.

Lindbergh Urges America To Defend Own Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the complete text of the address delivered by Charles A. Lindbergh in San Francisco on July 2:

The longer this war in Europe continues, the more confused its issues become. When it started, Germany and Russia were lined up against England and France. Now, less than two years later, we find Russia and England fighting France and Germany.

Winter before last, when Russia was fighting Finland, the interventionists demanded that we send all possible aid to Finland. Now, when Russia is fighting Finland again, they demand that we send all possible aid to Russia.

OUR WAY OF LIFE

The murderers and plunderers of yesterday are accepted as the valiant defenders of civilization today, and the valiant defenders of yesterday have become the wicked aggressors of today.

Finland and France are now our enemies; Russia our friend. We have been asked to defend the English way of life, and the Chinese way of life. We are now asked to defend the Russian way of life.

I ask you, is the Russian way of life our way of life? Are we now to be responsible for the policies of Stalin as well as for those of Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek?

Two weeks ago, the interventionists were accusing the America First Committee of associating with the subversive influence of communism. Now I suppose it is our turn to ask whose meetings the Communists attend. The America First Committee has never accepted Communists or Fascists in its membership. We have never changed our policy in this respect. We accept no foreign way of life, and no foreign ideologies.

IDEALIST SHOUTING

We reject them all. But the idealists who have been shouting against the horrors of Nazi Germany are now ready to welcome Soviet Russia as an ally.

They are ready to join with a nation whose record of cruelty, bloodshed, and barbarism is without parallel in modern history.

ENTIRE WAR IS A RECORD OF HYPOCRISY; U. S. TOLD TO JOIN THIS SIDE, THEN THAT

The entire record of this war is a record of hypocrisy and confusion. When Germany was a republic France and England refused her simplest requests. But when she turned into a Fascist state they let her do as she pleased.

When German troops marched into the Rhineland France and England made no move; but after the Siegfried Line was built they declared war. We in America were then told that the future of civilization depended upon preserving the spirit of France. But the Christians and humanitarians who once called on us for aid to France now sit complacently by and watch her children starve.

One month we hear that England and France will fight to the death against gangster tactics of Germany. The next month we hear that the British Navy has turned its guns on the French fleet, and that French aircraft are dropping bombs on Gibraltar.

UNCLE SHYLOCK

One year a war is declared without consulting America. The next year we are told that America is responsible for that war. One year we are called "Uncle Shylock," and the next year we are asked for the loan of billions of dollars.

If we had gone to war a few months ago, France would have been with us, and Russia would have been on the other side. If we go to war now, Russia will be with us, and France may be on the other side. At the moment no one seems to be sure whether Japan would rather fight Russia or fight us. Some of our American interventionists want to fight Germany and some want to fight Japan.

Judging from Europe's record, if we enter this war we can't be sure whether we will have Russia or Germany for a partner by the time we finish. We don't even know whether we will end up with France or England on our side. It is quite possible that we would find ourselves alone fighting the entire world before it was over.

NATIONS OF ETERNAL WAR

The only sensible thing for us to do is to build an impregnable defense for America, and keep this hemisphere at peace. As long as our Government insists on interfering with the affairs of Europe, this confusion will continue.

It may be a new experience for our generation here in America, but confusion is nothing new to the nations of the Old World. Jefferson understood that when he said, "They are nations of eternal war."

CONFUSION WEAPON OF PROPAGANDISTS—PRESS, RADIO, AND THEATER FULL OF IT

Washington understood it when he warned us against European entanglements.

These European wars have been going on for centuries, and there is certainly no indication that they will stop now.

Every major country in Europe has fought every other major country in Europe time and time again. In one generation, England and Germany fight France. In another generation, France and England fight Germany. In a third generation, Germany and France fight England.

First, we hear that Napoleon is going to conquer the world. Then, Stalin constitutes our greatest menace. And now it is Hitler. But it is interesting to note that the only time this country was ever invaded, it was not by Germany, or Russia, or France.

Confusion is not an accidental fact in war. It is the major weapon of the interventionists. They have flooded this country with propaganda intended to confuse us—propaganda for the purpose of drawing us into war. Our press, our radio, our book stalls, and our theaters are full of it.

FIXED FORMULA IN NEWS

Our news is governed more by the formulas of propaganda than it is by the factual developments of the war. For instance, the news of almost every campaign of the war has followed a fixed formula. First, there are headlines of German aggression. Then unlimited aid is promised to the attacked nation.

Then for a few days we are encouraged by allied successes, and someone says it is the turning point of the war. Then if there are any allied forces present, they evacuate. Then the defending armies collapse. Finally, an announcement is made that the campaign was really a victory for the British because it upset the time schedule of the German Army.

This is no reflection on the British soldier. He has shown great courage, but he has been put in impossible situations and he has been appallingly equipped. Try this formula on the campaigns to date and see how many it fits. Try it on Poland, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, France, Yugoslavia, and Greece. Try it on the Russian campaign when it is over.

FACTS VERSUS PROPAGANDA

Here in America all news that will create support for England is exaggerated; all news that will not is suppressed. A refugee who steps from the gangplank and advocates war is acclaimed as a defender of freedom. A native-born American who opposes war is called a "fifth columnist."

There is another propaganda formula, a more fundamental one, that you can apply to all the news you read about this war. It is that the British position must be good enough to make us think that England will eventually win, and bad enough to persuade us to assist her. If the British position appears too good, we may not lease and lend with sufficient generosity. If it appears too bad, we may think it necessary to concentrate on our own defenses.

UNDERSTANDING OF FACTS MAY KEEP AMERICANS FROM ENTERING STRIFE

If these propaganda formulas are successful in misleading the American people, we will enter the war. On the other hand, if our people understand the facts behind this propaganda, our entrance into the war is unlikely.

Let us look at some of these facts. Let us take the salient facts in the latest turn of the war, the Russian-German conflict.

You remember that the relationship between Germany and Russia had been close to the breaking point for years before the

conference at Munich in 1938. Russia was not even represented at that conference.

When I was in Czechoslovakia in September, 1938, I saw Russian bombing planes on Czech air fields, bombers that had been sent to fight Germany if she invaded Czechoslovakia.

LACK OF INSIGHT

Have you ever stopped to think why war did not break out between Russia and Germany at that time? Have you ever stopped to realize that Russia and Germany would have been at each other's throats 2 years ago had it not been for the interventionist interference of England and France? This conflict between Germany and Russia which the interventionists all applaud now would have taken place then if only they had shown a little more insight.

The German armies were prepared to march eastward, but what happened? Did the interventionists welcome such a move then as they do now? They did not. They beguiled Poland into a futile war, and when Germany turned east they attacked her in the west. Instead of pushing her on to Russia they drew the German onslaught to their own countries. They postponed the inevitable conflict between Russia and Germany and forced instead a conflict between Germany, France, and England—a conflict for which France and England were completely unprepared.

Have you ever stopped to consider what interventionist leadership has done to this world, and how ineffective and disastrous it has been?

Intervention with sanctions in the war between Italy and Abyssinia did not save Abyssinia; it simply threw Italy into Germany's open arms.

INTERVENTION BY ALLIES IN POLAND LED TO FRENCH DEFEAT, ENGLAND BOMBING

Intervention by England and France in the war between Germany and Poland did not save Poland; it postponed the war between Germany and Russia and brought the defeat of France and the devastation of England.

The attitude of American interventionists toward Japan forced that country, too, into the arms of the Axis. If they had had their way, Germany would be fighting us today instead of Russia.

The record of the interventionists has been a record of abject failure. They cannot point to a single important instance of success in connection with this war.

I was in Siberia in 1931, and in western Russia in 1933 and 1938. I made a number of trips through Germany in 1936, 1937, and 1938. I lived for 2 years in England, and for 1 year in France. When I speak of Europe, I speak from first-hand knowledge of conditions there.

As you know, I have opposed a military alliance between the United States and England. If the question had arisen, I would have opposed even more strongly a military alliance between the United States and Germany.

But I tell you that I would a hundred times rather see my country ally herself with England, or even with Germany, with all of her faults, than with the cruelty, the godlessness, and the barbarism that exist in Soviet Russia.

An alliance between the United States and Russia should be opposed by every American, by every Christian, and by every humanitarian in this country.

READY TO FIGHT FOR UNITED STATES

The fundamental point is that we do not want to ally ourselves with Russia, or Germany, or England, or with any foreign power that seeks to embroil us in the quarrels and chaos of Europe. We do not want to fight for the Russian way of life, or the German way of life, or the English way of life, or any way of life except our own.

Men and women of California, why should the United States of America be divided by these eternal European wars? Why should the question ever arise as to whether we will fight for England, or France, or Germany, or Russia?

We in America descend from every one of these nations.

We will never agree among ourselves as to the right and wrong of their quarrels.

But there is one thing upon which we can agree, upon which we are not divided, and that is that we are ready to fight for America if the need should ever arise.

Why dissipate our unity and strength here at home in an attempt to force us into another European war?

Why give up an impregnable position in America for a hazardous and untenable position in Europe?

INTOLERANCE AND HATRED TO FOLLOW WHATEVER THE OUTCOME IS IN EUROPE

Why bring to this country the chaos, the intolerance, and the hatred that will inevitably come with a foreign war?

No one has attempted to attack us, and if we prepare ourselves properly, no one will be in a position to attack us. It is not a question of whether Hitler would like to invade America.

It is not a question of trusting promises that may be broken.

I never have, and I do not now recommend basing the security of our Nation on the promises of any man, or any foreign government.

Our security should rest on the strength, the character, and the arms of our own people.

The point is that if we prepare intelligently, regardless of promises, or treaties, or anything that may be done in Europe, this country is strong enough and able enough to take care of itself.

UNITED STATES AT CROSSROAD

We have taken care of ourselves when we were far weaker than we are today, and we can do so again. The real defeatist in America is the man who says that this Nation cannot survive alone.

The United States is at a crossroad in its history. The war party advocates that we give up the independence our forefathers won, and that we merge our destiny again with the nations of the Old World, taking on our shoulders all the wars and quarrels and problems that have been theirs for a thousand years.

We, on this platform, represent people who believe in an independent destiny for America.

We have banded together to form the America First Committee, which stands firmly in opposition to the war party and intervention.

Our principles are open and clear. We stand for a unified nation behind an impregnable defense, and an independent destiny for America. If you believe in these principles, we ask you to join our committee. The crisis is here, and we need your support, that we may pass on to our children the free, independent American heritage we received from our forefathers.

Marketing Quotas for Wheat

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the membership of the House a bill that I have today introduced to amend Public Law No. 74 enacted by this Congress pertaining to marketing quotas for wheat and certain other farm commodities.

The amendment is for the twofold purpose of reducing the penalty on wheat from 49 to 15 cents per bushel, and where the penalties have already been exacted to reimburse the farmer for the difference between 49 cents per bushel and 15 cents per bushel.

Mr. Speaker, during the wheat-planting season of 1940 many farmers planted more than their allotted acreage to wheat and many others who have never participated in the farm program planted their wheat, relying on the then-existing law that they would only have to pay a penalty of 15 cents per bushel on the excess wheat so marketed or upon which they might obtain a loan, as the case may be.

This Congress changed the rules in the middle of the game, so to speak, at a time when the wheat was practically ready for harvest, and the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 60 is in effect retroactive legislation. In many sections of Oklahoma and Kansas, in the greatest wheat-producing area in the United States, due to an excessive amount of rains, the production this year is far less and of lower quality than normally produced; and the wheat in many instances is not of sufficiently high test to permit marketing at the prevailing market price for standard test wheat or to obtain a loan.

In many instances in this whole area, the penalty equals or exceeds in amount the marketable value of the wheat produced, thus destroying the means of livelihood of the respective farmers affected by the penalty.

Even though the wheat is unfit for milling purposes, the farmer cannot feed it to his livestock without paying the penalty of 49 cents per bushel.

While it is true that according to the record more than two-thirds of the farmers at an election called for that purpose voted in favor of marketing quotas, it is quite apparent that the average wheat farmer little realized, and I think I might properly say the Congress little realized, how heavily this penalty would react. Of course, no one wants to exact penalties that amount to confiscation.

Other bills have been introduced to modify the act, and the chairman of the Agricultural Committee has called a special meeting of the committee tomorrow for the purpose of considering the various bills that have been introduced. I urge all who are interested in this matter to appear before the Agricultural Committee tomorrow to the end that something may be worked out that will remedy and correct the apparent injustice that has been done by this legislation.

Petition protesting farm marketing excess penalty on wheat

We, the undersigned, hereby represent that we, and each of us, are farmers in Noble County, Okla., and produced wheat for the marketing year 1941–42.

That we do hereby emphatically protest the excess wheat-marketing penalty that was purportedly authorized by the recent election pertaining thereto; and for reasons for this protest we state as follows:

1. That in the fall of the year 1940 during the wheat-sowing period we had no cause to

reasonably anticipate the application of said penalty on the excess wheat production as has been defined by the United States Department of Agriculture.

2. That the application of said penalty was not put into effect until after the wheat crop in this area had matured, and that the farmer had no opportunity to cut the excess wheat acreage at a time when the same could have been diverted for use as hay or pasture.

3. The average wheat production throughout this area for said wheat-production year is far less and of lower quality than is normally produced; and that said wheat is not, in many instances, of sufficiently high test to permit the marketing thereof at the prevailing market prices for standard-test wheat.

4. That it is our sincere opinion that a substantial percent of the farmers who voted for said wheat-marketing quota were not mindful of the condition that would result from said election.

5. That the application of said penalty provision wrongfully discriminates in favor of the wheat grower who had no excess wheat acreage as was recently invoked by the result of said election, as against the wheat producer whose acreage exceeded said allotment, which allotment limitation was not made effective until after said wheat crop had actually been produced.

6. That said penalty will in many instances in this area equal or exceed in amount the marketable value of the wheat produced, thereby destroying the principal means of livelihood of the respective farmers affected by said penalty.

We therefore urgently request that congressional action be taken immediately which will afford one of the following alternative remedies:

1. Removing the penalties for said crop year.

2. Sharply reducing the amount of said penalties.

3. Authorizing and permitting the respective wheat producers to use the excess wheat as feed for their domestic animals and poultry.

Assuring you that we shall expect immediate relief in this matter, we respectfully submit these petitions.

The resolution contains the signatures of 565 farmers.

Commencement Address of Justice Frankfurter at Radcliffe College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY JUSTICE FELIX FRANKFURTER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Justice Felix Frankfurter:

College commencements have long been more than local festivities touching only on the interests of local college communities. They have become a national occasion to celebrate and fortify the national spirit. In the recent past this great event in the lives of young men and young women was a symbol of hope in youth. The generations mingled to take heart, one with another, to promote the promises that lay ahead. But never before, I believe, have college commencements been so appropriate to the times, nor so symbolic of all that we hold dear. For events compel us to reconsider the significance of our history.

Circumstances which even the most ostrichlike can no longer disregard challenge the worth of our past, the validity of the faith that founded this Nation, and our power to vindicate it. This issue concerns the very basis of our history and the underpinning of our civilization. Of this view of our life and of the means for its pursuit, an institution like Radcliffe is the most emphatic expression. For our colleges and universities are the distinctive product of what we cherish as western civilization. They shelter and bring to fruit the purposes which must again be the ideals and the pursuit of the whole world if civilization is to maintain itself. The human spirit cannot here have that security and serenity essential to its dignity and achievement while the soul of man is everywhere else enclosed.

Thomas Jefferson understood this fully. And the epitaph which Jefferson wrote for himself cannot be recalled too often. Here was a man who held all the high offices of state. Yet when he came to commend himself to posterity this is how he wished to be remembered:

"Here was buried Thomas Jefferson,
Author of the Declaration of American Independence,
Of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom,
And Father of the University of Virginia."

In that epitaph Jefferson made clear the relation of Radcliffe College and every other college and university in the land to the awful issue that now confronts the world. Man is without dignity unless he has freedom. And there cannot be freedom without the right to pursue truth. The university which Jefferson founded in Virginia and the university which the builders of Massachusetts founded more than 200 years before, almost contemporaneously with the establishment of the colony, and all the other institutions of learning throughout the country, are the special instruments for the unremitting pursuit of truth. You, therefore, represent to a peculiar degree the trusteeship of civilization.

Just as colleges as we know them are at once the fruit and the necessary condition of a civilized society, so democracy is its indispensable political expression. Democracy is neither a mystical abstraction nor a mechanical gadget. In the long course of human experience it has proven itself the only form of social arrangement which adequately respects, and by so doing helps to unfold the richness of human diversity. All the devices of political machinery—votes and parties and parliaments—are merely instruments to enable men to live with one another with full respect for one another under conditions eliciting the maximum gifts of each for the amplest enjoyment of all.

Colleges and universities are the recognized guardians of the life of reason. Democracy furnishes the political framework. Within which alone reason can thrive most imaginatively on the widest scale least hampered by the accidents of personal antecedents and most regardful of the intrinsic qualities in man. Nature herself is democratic in that she plants gifts and graces in ways that defy the devisings of all of man's artifices. Therefore we must have political institutions which allow these mysterious gifts and graces their fullest outlet.

Until recently men were either too shy or too cynical to talk about these great simple themes. The pace of material development not only preoccupied the energies of men; it overawed their thought. The deficiencies of democracy became a favorite jibe of the worldly wise. And thus the faith that gave us birth and has maintained us was subtly undermined. Even those from whom better things were to be expected erected impatience with Congress into a political philosophy. A certain university president in the Babylonian twenties added his voice to the chorus urging the elimination of politics and gleefully reported that his students were turning away from sociological studies.

CIVILIZATION OUR BUSINESS

It seemed strange then and it seems appalling now that men should forget that politics is the free exchange of opinion regarding the wisest policy for the life of a society, and as such is the essence of a free people. These men forgot that in the last analysis we are governed either through talk or through force. Now at least they must realize that a dictatorship means precisely the prohibition of politics. So completely were the governing minds of America under the powerful illusions of materialism during this era that a President of the United States could say that "the business of America is business" and believe he was uttering a truism.

The business of America is civilization. Our professed realists had lost sight of the wisdom of the most hard-headed political realist of the ninteenth century. It was Bismarck who gave currency to the term "imponderable," for he, however unsympathetically, was alive to those spiritual needs of man which are the ultimate forces of an enduring society. The things not made by hand nor seen by eye are the things that rule. Beauty and truth, reason and justice—these unattainable but ever-to-be-striven-for longings of men are now seen to be man's most indispensable needs. By these needs the most gifted and the humblest are bound into a common brotherhood. I am unashamed to speak of these longings of mind and heart today. They are the only themes worthy of your concern.

These needs are so immediate that we take their satisfaction for granted until we are threatened with their denial. And the imagination is so narrow that too many of us are blind to threats that are wrapped in euphemisms. To acclaim the worth of democracy is not to deny the inadequacies and injustices of our society. It is merely to insist that in striving for the better we should not discard the good. The ultimate justification of democracy is that it affords the only opportunity for continuous social improvement.

What we have already achieved, what is ours to preserve and to defend, has been set out in words by one of the finest spirits of our time. It is the utterance of a great historian who has lived and not merely written about those aspirations of men which have found immortal expression in the Declaration of Independence, the French Rights of Man, and the Gettysburg Address.

What I am about to read was meant only for my eyes, but I am taking the liberty without his permission to read from a letter written by someone you all know who, in the autumn of his life became an American citizen of his own free choice.

"There is in this country," he wrote, "a wider area of generosity than in any other country—at least in Europe. It is this feeling that one is at home here that conquers you little by little. And one fine day you feel that you are no longer an exile but a citizen in your own country. When I took my oath, I felt that really I was performing a grand function. I was throwing away not my intellectual and moral but my juristic past. I threw it away without any regret. The Ethiopian war, the rape of Albania, the Spanish crime, and this last idiotic crime had really broken my connection with sovereigns, potentates, and all those ugly things which are enumerated in the formula of the oath. It is a wonderful formula. Your

pledges are only juridical and political. You are asked to sever your connection with the government of your former country, not with the people and the civilization of your former country. And you are asked to give allegiance to the Constitution of your adopted country; that is, to an ideal of life.

"Thus I took my oath with a joyous heart, and I am sure I will keep it with the whole of my heart as long as I am alive."

FREEDOM NEEDS EFFORT

Democracy, so conceived as the means by which man can best find his own good, is a subject for interchange of views and humble searching of hearts. The old convention of utilizing an occasion like this for uttering homilies and pronouncements of policy now seems as impertinent as it was futile. A commencement is really a common confessional. But the old should no more abdicate their experience than the young their ardor. Merely because you are young, you are not necessarily wise. Nor is Miss Comstock, because she is older, necessarily un-understanding.

We are enlisted, old and young, in a common enterprise—the bold experiment of freedom. It involves the most exacting collaborative effort. It demands the exercise of reason on the largest scale and self-discipline of the highest order. For it places ultimate faith for the achievement of the common good in the responsibility of the individual.

We are thus engaged in the most difficult of all arts, the art of living together in a gracious society. For this it is not enough to be literate; it is not even enough to be literary. Mr. Justice Holmes used to speak of the days preceding the Civil War when the eminent men of his father's circle indulged in "tall talk" and averted their minds from grim reality. The issues presented by slavery could not be settled by denying them. Iridescent phrases cannot make the most ancient of tyrannies into a "new order." While mankind is literate as never before, the environment for reason is least congenial.

Ours is a civilization of hub-bub, where raucous voice drown out the still, small voice of reason. We want to get rich quick morally and intellectually. We resort to short cuts and easy ways. But there is no short cut to reason, no ersatz for morality. The mechanical triumphs of the machine age cannot be transferred to the workings of democracy. All evasions of hard thinking are self-defeating.

One of the most paralyzing evasions of thought is what Lincoln called pernicious abstractions. Post-war teaching greatly suffered from them, and to them much of our recent bewilderment is attributable. This is not the occasion for didactic exposition. An example or two much suffice.

One of the most current of these evasions of thought is that "war never settles anything." The Civil War settled slavery. This war will settle the quality of your lives and your children's lives. It simply is not true that war never settles anything. I respect the convictions of a conscientious objector to war and I believe I understand the philosophy underlying Gandhi's nonresistance. But the relentless choice events may force on every individual cannot be met by such a fair-sounding pernicious abstraction as that "war never settles anything."

CONFLUENCE OF PEOPLES

Another favorite drug for the mind is the claim that a country at war is already under dictatorship. Democracy in this country has expanded despite four wars. And only those unfamiliar with what has taken place in Great Britain since September 1939 will deny that England is more democratic today than she has ever been. By that I mean very specifically that her present Government is more responsive to the common will of her people, although, to be sure, that will has imposed self-restraints not required in times of peace.

I recommend to any doubter of the alertness of British democracy a reading of the debates in the House of Commons since this war began. What is more heartening, with the enemy at the gates, than to find the Government proposing measures for the public security and, after free discussion, to have the representatives of the people rejecting or modifying them in the interest of "the liberty of the subject."

Life is an act of faith. Whatever destiny awaits you, the ultimate question for each to decide is to what unseen powers and to what dimly defined ends we dedicate our lives. The United State: has a special destiny because a unique fact gives it moral cohesion. This is the only country without a racially homogeneous population rooted to a particular soil. We represent a confluence of peoples who derive their bond of union from their common, intrinsic human qualities. This is your heritage, and in the confidence that you will maintain it this Nation was founded.

In days of trial and tribulation we go for sustenance to those few whose compassionate hearts and courageous minds lighted the way through past ordeals. Thus it is that Lincoln today lives perhaps more vividly than when he walked among men. A great man's wisdom is always contemporaneous. In addressing the Congress of the United States on December 1, 1862, Lincoln was immediately concerned with the problems of slavery. But the view of life which infused his utterance is just as relevant to the issue of freedom that now challenges the world. Familiar though these words may be, I make no apology for bidding you Godspeed with them:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We say we are for the Union. The world will not forget that we say this. We, even we here, hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL EMORY S. LAND

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief talk by the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, United States Navy, retired, to the shipbuilding workers of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss., Saturday, June 28, 1941:

The shipbuilders of the Gulf coast have launched today the first all-welded passenger-carrying ship in the history of the world. It is the steamship *African Comet* which will soon be put in service by the American South African Line. In normal times this would be one of the scientific achievements of the year. Today its scientific importance is far overshadowed by its importance to our national welfare in adding one more merchant ship capable of serving as a naval auxiliary.

I want to repeat and to stress the descriptions which our President has given of the insecurity of this country today, with a towering wave of ruthless aggression threatening to break over our heads.

The shipbuilders of the Gulf, the Atlantic, and the Pacific coasts and of the Great Lakes are pushing back that wave with every ship they launch, whether merchant or naval.

All hands are doing a splendid job here in Pascagoula. The Maritime Commission congratulates you. You are the shipbuilders of this country as well as the men who sit in the front office. The men in the front office are vital, but you are the actual "arm and hammer brand" builders. Ships are built by the men in the yards. They are built with cranes and welders' torches and paint brushes and hammers—built by loyal Americans.

Your employers and the Government have given you a genuine incentive for your best all-out efforts in the Regional Labor Wage Stabilization programs recently announced. Shipbuilders' wages are not increased by millions only but by hundreds of millions in the over-all picture.

We of the Maritime Commission have been told by the President to see that a vast fleet of merchant ships is built—and built while they can still be of some use, that is—built for this war, not—as were the Hog Island ships—for some other war. Time is the essence.

We have told the men in the front offices. They have told you. They know that we must build ships faster than we've ever built them before in our history. You know it, too. We want your cooperation. I have faith in you—I know we will get your cooperation.

You all heard President Roosevelt say in his last fireside-talk that:

"The blunt truth is this—and I reveal this with the full knowledge of the British Government: The present rate of Nazi sinkings of merchant ships is more than three times as high as the capacity of British shipyards to replace them; it is more than twice the combined British and American output of merchant ships today."

All hands in the yards are going to change that by joint effort.

The President said, "We can answer this peril by two simultaneous measures: First, by speeding up and increasing our great shipbuilding program; and second, by helping to cut down the losses on the high seas."

The President and the men of the Navy are working in partnership on the problem of cutting down losses. But to speed up and increase our shipbuilding program the partnership changes. In building, every workman in this yard and in every other yard is a partner in the enterprise. Without your partnership this Government cannot deliver on its promise to build ships fast enough to supply not only Britain and the other democracies with the vital materials they need to survive but also to make our commercial, naval, and military defenses impregnable.

Each man should do an honest day's work, and when he has finished it, should go home content in the knowledge that he has done a good job and can do another good day's work tomorrow. And there will be a day's work tomorrow. There will be jobs in shipbuilding for years, and the quicker we build the ships, the more jobs there will be. We need 300,000 more workers by 1942.

Our estimates, our promises, and our expectations depend on you—upon the productivity of labor.

Let's be frank about our situation. We are in a state of unlimited emergency, declared by our President. We are in a state of acute danger. If Hitler's Germany will overnight turn and attack a nation which has been on its side, it won't hesitate to attack us, a nation which is clearly playing on the other team.

Some of our fellow citizens are in positions where they will defend us directly against a direct attack. They are your brothers and cousins and friends in the Army and Navy and marines. But just as devastating, just as demoralizing, and just as destructive of our homeland is the indirect attack which is already under way in the attempt to wipe out the brotherhood of free, democratic nations.

This powerful "indirect" assault can only be met by an equally powerful indirect offense. That offense lies in the "all out" production of airplanes and tanks and guns—and ships and more ships.

Again let's be frank. When I ask for your cooperation I am asking that every one of you make it his own personal responsibility to build ships fast enough to defeat Hitler. I am asking that every one of you make "that little spark of conscience," which George Washington spoke of, his own guide.

I've worked in shipyards and drafting rooms long enough to know that you can greatly increase your output when you put your heart into the job. There are a hundred and one time-consuming practices which can be eliminated, from outright loafing when the leading man or quarterman is not around to asking questions of the foreman when you know the answer already. No supervisor can see all these and stop them. I wouldn't want him to if he could. We aren't going to defend ourselves successfully unless the workingmen of the country want to do the job. If you want to keep Hitler out of this hemisphere, you'll use that "spark of conscience" as your guide and make yourself build faster whether there is a straw boss around or not.

It's like the captain and chief engineer who for years argued bitterly over which was more important to the operation of the ship—the bridge or the engine room. Finally they agreed to change places. After about 5 hours the captain came up from the engine room covered with grease and sweating like a horse, "You win," he said. "I've been trying for 3 hours to make her turn over and I'm a failure." "Well, maybe that's partly my fault," said the chief, "about 3 hours ago I put her aground stern first."

No compulsion but the greatest could get me to ask that work be stopped for an appeal of this sort. But that great compulsion is here.

This is an appeal for loyalty—for loyalty of the greatest kind—loyalty to the British shipyard workers, too, loyalty which will preserve their freedom as well as their lives.

Loyalty to these United States. Loyalty to civilization.

And it is loyalty to your own soldiers and sailors and to your own wives, sweethearts, mothers, and children, too. Let no one think that this continent is not threatened.

President Roosevelt said, "Nobody can foretell tonight just when the acts of the dictators will ripen into attack of this hemisphere and us. But we know enough by now to realize that it would be suicide to wait until they are in our front yard."

We don't have enough ships today to meet our needs. In order to give the Army and the Navy auxiliaries like the *African Comet* we have had to cut our normal services and that, in itself, hurts the defense program. It is hurting and will hurt everyone of us. We must tighten our belts, we must distribute the burden.

So my plea to you and to all other shipbuilders is to do your jobs—to build these ships as fast as you can.

Very little humor ever crosses the path of the Maritime Commission, but occasionally there is a touch of humor in our official documents. The situation today is like that revealed in an action which the Commission took the other day. We were asked to approve the surrender of the marine document of a vessel known as the *June Bride*. The reasons given were a change in service and a change in tonnage as disclosed by readmeasurement. You workers likewise are concerned in a change of service and a change in tonnage—service for the defense of your country and increased tonnage to deliver the goods. I hope your answer will be given in the names of two ships which were recently sold to the British—*Don't Worry* and *Urge Me*.

Remember, in a Hitler world, if we don't hang together, we'll surely hang separately.

Being a sort of a sailor man, may I conclude by paraphrasing the immortal Nelson—The United States expects every man to do his duty. We know you will.

Let's go.

A Progressive Banker Warns the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ARTICLE FROM FORT SMITH (ARK.) TRIBUNE OF JUNE 27, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that presidents of national banks reveal a progressive attitude toward economics. However, in a recent issue of a southern newspaper there appeared a provocative and challenging article, the reading of which I recommend to all:

[From the Fort Smith (Ark.) Tribune of June 27, 1941]

SAVING PART OF BURDEN OF TAXATION AND ELIMINATING PUBLIC FROM BEING ROBBED BY WATERED-STOCK MANIPULATIONS

The greatest problem facing the American people today is the radio. While it is still in its infancy people do not realize and appreciate what it will mean to the public in time.

Let each and every one of us refresh our memory to the time when the telephone was first created, when the airplane was first created, and when the other inventions were first created. Prior to their creation, it was inconceivable that anything like that could happen. Who would have believed 20 years ago that 20 men could get in a plane and fly all over the world at the rate of from 100 to 300 miles per hour or faster?

By not being mindful and cautious, we have allowed monopolies to be created whereby they are owned by a few, when in reality, they should have been owned by the people; and if not by the people, by the Government.

The Government by so owning would have reduced graft that creates monopolies and it would have been a tremendous saving to the public by reason of the Government owning some of the valuable and profitable inventions.

But the Government has allowed only a few to own them, and by doing it is sucking the life and blood out of the public and allowing only a few to profit from them. The Government could have eliminated the graft and corruption, and by doing so, could have eliminated the burdensome load of taxes that is placed upon the masses.

To illustrate: The development that developed in the railroad watered-stock issues and others, hundreds of millions of watered stock were issued and sold to the public. J. P. Morgan admitted that he bought either forty or fifty million of some of the railroad's watered stock. I suppose part of it they sold to the public, and others likewise. Finally, it was a total loss to those who bought it.

That applies to the other corporations that issued watered stock; the public utilities that have millions and billions of watered stock, and the Bell Telephone Co., owned by J. P. Morgan, who is one of the largest manipulators in the telephone organization.

Are we going to allow the radio to be placed in the same position? Or are we going to recommend for the Government to get the benefit instead of the few speculators? After all, who is the Government? You and I and everybody else.

Some may say they are not in favor of government ownership. Neither am I, but I do believe certain utilities should be owned by the Government instead of some special interest; however, government ownership could be carried to an extreme.

The graft generally is created from the people and by the people, just the same as is honesty and justice. It is entirely up to us, but I would rather trust to the ballot than to a few corrupt corporations. I have heard, and so have you, that elections have been stolen in order to elect special ones. In fact, some have bragged of doing so. Those who did the stealing of the elections did not succeed very long; their downfall always came in time when it was least expected. It is like a thief in the darkness, in time he is caught. The person who takes advantage of the position he occupies is an ordinary thief. His downfall must, and will, come in time.

If we do not conquer the radio it will come to be owned by some special interest, and my guess would be the Bell Telephone; for the reason, anyone who has kept up with the Bell could see its claw. We must not depend upon our President to do everything. We, the people, must assist him, and each and every one of us write a letter to the President, and Congressmen, and the Senators conveying this thought to them, and recommending that our Government take over the radio, the phones, and public utilities; when the Government, by doing so, would eliminate the future losses that will be sustained by the public from their owning watered stock, and would mean an income of billions to the Government to pay the indebtedness of our Government that is now placed upon us, and that will continue to be placed upon us during this war.

The investors who are now buying watered stock should be educated to buy stock issued by the Government against railroads, telephones, and public utilities when the Government takes them over. The earnings would pay for itself, and in time the earnings would cause such a tremendous income that the Government could take the enormous burden off the taxpayer. The public will save in three ways:

First. Elimination of taxation.

Second. Their investments would be safe.

Third. They would get a fair return upon their investments, whereas now not only do they lose their interest but they lose the biggest part of their principal as well.

Each and every one of us should read this, digest this, think about this, and then take a little time to write a letter to our President

urging that a bill of this kind be passed. This is not my issue nor your issue. It is the issue for all the people and for the good of the country.

This is a rough outline, but this is the foundation from which some should be added and some deducted to make it 100 percent proof. The suggestion is so big and so profitable to the masses that each and every American citizen who reads this should give this his careful consideration. This could be made a saving to our public in many ways. The finances of our Government, or any individual, are our existence; therefore, whoever reads this article, do not read shallow but convey your own suggestions, if you choose. Remember, when you do, you are doing it to save the welfare and eliminate the corruption of our present condition.

I. H. NAKDIMEN,
President, City National Bank.

Analysis of the Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY OWEN L. SCOTT

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Owen L. Scott appearing in the Sunday Star of July 6, 1941, containing an excellent analysis of the international situation and its effect on the United States:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of July 6, 1941]

SEES TWO VICTORIES WON BY PRESIDENT

(By Owen L. Scott)

President Roosevelt today is able to get satisfaction from these facts:

Of all of the leaders of the world's principal nations, the President of the United States is the only one whose nation is not now engaged in an active war.

Yet, of the nations of major rank which have faced threats from Hitler, Mussolini, and Matsuoka—other than China—the United States is the one nation that has balked at attempted appeasement.

Mr. Roosevelt's opponents charge him with courting war. They insist that this Nation should go out of its way to make a deal with Hitler and Matsuoka. They insist that Britain is done for and that there is nothing to do but accept the "new order" and to prepare the United States to play second fiddle in the world. Their argument is that otherwise somebody is going to get hurt.

However, the United States is not at war. The United States has not surrendered and has not bowed to the threats of the group of conquering dictators. Nations which did deal with the dictators are either at war or are conquered.

The truth appears to be that President Roosevelt, by his policy of nonappeasement, has won two major victories for the United States and Britain.

For one thing, the President forced the Germans to turn to the east and thereby to give both the United States and Britain more time in which to prepare for any assault that may later develop in their direction.

For a second thing, the President forced the Japanese to swallow a defeat in their effort to intimidate the Dutch in the South Pacific, and he also forced the Japanese to face the alternative of strangulation through pressure from Russia and the United States or some check to Japanese ambition.

These are major accomplishments and have been achieved without bloodshed.

Two main contentions have been made by those who opposed President Roosevelt's policy of nonappeasement and who advocated a policy of attempted cooperation with the dictators. Those contentions are:

First, that if the United States would just induce the British to stop their fight and to make a deal with Hitler, the German armies could then be turned eastward to get entangled in a struggle with Russia that might result in destruction of both Stalin and Hitler.

Second, that if the United States would step aside and allow the Japanese to grab the riches of the South Pacific area it would make unnecessary the maintenance of a large naval force in the Pacific and still would leave the Japanese with no alternative but to sell the rubber and tin and other resources of that area to the United States, just as the British and Dutch now are doing.

As to the first of those contentions, Hitler now is engaged in his struggle with Stalin. He says he was forced into this struggle because he did not dare make an all-out assault on the British until he had removed any possible threat from the East. The reason he did not dare to make this assault on the British prior to an attack on Russia was that the United States made clear its determination to support Britain.

If Hitler now becomes bogged down in Russia it will be due, not to any theory of appeasement on the part of the United States, but to a firm policy by the United States of refusing to be intimidated. If Hitler does not become bogged down in Russia and makes a quick conquest, leaving him free to turn his attention to Britain, the group favoring appeasement no longer will be able to argue that the correct American policy is to try to divert Hitler's attention to Russia. Russia won't be there as an independent nation.

As to the second contention, Japan now has her bluff called by the Dutch. The Japanese had demanded control over some of the basic resources of the Dutch East Indies. Japan threatened dire consequences if her demands were not met. The Dutch, with tacit backing of the United States and Britain, turned a cold shoulder to the Japanese threats.

Faced with the alternative of trading with the Dutch East Indies on the same terms that other nations trade, or of trying to conquer that rich territory, Japan has hesitated. The reason she hesitated is that American bombing planes in the hands of the Dutch can outmatch the air strength the Japanese could send against them at this time. The reason also is that an American naval force of great strength remains in the Pacific in a position to move westward when the Japanese Navy moves south.

As a result, the supplies of rubber and tin on which the United States is vitally dependent, remain in the hands of a friendly power and are readily accessible to this country. In the hands of Japan they could be used as a strong bargaining weapon in any dealings with the United States.

President Roosevelt, in shaping American foreign policy, must deal with facts and not with theories. He must meet the threats of those nations which are open and avowed enemies of the United States. Many in Congress and in the country, who are side-line coaches, have insisted that the way to meet threats is to bow before them.

However, the President has taken his line of firmness. He has met threats from this country's enemies with threats of his own. He has refused to bargain with or to bow before any other nation, no matter how big its army or how loud its talk. And today the United States is further away from war than it was little more than 2 weeks ago. Instead of being in war, this country has impressive victories to show, and those victories gained without fighting.

Of course, there is no assurance that in the end the United States can avoid fighting. Many nations have sought to avoid fighting Hitler and yet have been attacked. Stalin would have paid almost any price in appeasement, even to permitting German control over some basic Russian industries, in order to keep Hitler's eyes turned toward the south and west. He wasn't given the chance.

It is probable that if Hitler wins a quick victory over Russia and then turns to an all-out attack on Britain it will be necessary to use the American Fleet and air force to keep supplies flowing to the British Isles. Whether this is called war probably would be for Hitler to say. It certainly would not be called appeasement.

Senator George

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS OF JULY 3, 1941

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial in the Washington News of Thursday, July 3, entitled "Senator GEORGE."

The honorable Senator, Thomas W. Hardwick, of Georgia, plead with President Wilson not to take us into the World War in 1917.

It is of great significance that again a Senator from Georgia has the understanding to oppose the entrance of this country into the present conflict.

Senator GEORGE reflects the sentiment of the people in his State who, like the people in Montana, see no advantage to civilization in having their men killed in an effort to settle the boundary disputes in Europe.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 3, 1941]

SENATOR GEORGE

In a war-threat emergency the most important official, other than the President, is the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. For our Constitution gives to Congress, and particularly the Senate, coordinate power with the President over foreign commitments. Only Congress has power to declare war.

The Nation is fortunate in having as that ranking Member of Congress in foreign affairs Senator GEORGE of Georgia. He rates that leadership not only by seniority, but by a sober patriotism, by ability, and by character.

Lesser men assumed that memory of the President's unsuccessful effort to purge Senator GEORGE in the senatorial election—for refusal to accept the Supreme Court packing plan—would color his conduct as Foreign Relations chairman. It has not. On the contrary, his selfless cooperation has saved the Roosevelt policy in the Senate more than once.

This record as well as the deep sincerity of his defense of the American constitutional method, explains the profound impression made by his Senate speech last Saturday. In the midst of war declarations by unelected Cabinet officers, and consequent widespread public fear that the President will start a shooting war without consulting Congress, Senator GEORGE reaffirmed his calm faith. He said:

"I recognize the necessity for all-out total preparation as strongly as anyone can, and I think a little more strongly, perhaps, than some of our friends. Because to my mind all-out total preparation never can be made by the American people, with the resolution which has characterized them in all their great undertakings, unless and until they feel that they themselves are a part of the great decision which brings on that effort.

"So when I was thinking of total defense I was thinking primarily of the strong spirit of unity, which will not exist if our people are possessed with the fear that great decisions and commitments may be made without any opportunity on their part to participate in making such decisions.

"I have tried to make it perfectly clear that in my humble opinion, but without anything to base it upon save my own conclusion and deduction, the President of the United States himself has fully recognized what is in my mind, and that he did not want to arouse the fear of the American people that he would make great decisions without their having an opportunity to pass upon the questions involved."

Or again:

"I profoundly hope this country will not become an active participant in the present war, or any other war. I have not yet accepted the fatalistic doctrine that our actual military or naval participation is inevitable."

Remember that the speaker is head of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the representative of Congress whom the President consults on these questions, and the old and close friend of Secretary of State Hull.

We are thankful that Chairman GEORGE is in that position of great responsibility.

Americanism and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OSAKIS (MINN.) REVIEW

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appearing in the Osakis Review, of Osakis, Minn., edited by Mr. J. Paul Kinney, has so much common-sense logic in it that I am taking the privilege of inserting this article in the RECORD.

The Osakis Review well expresses the attitude of the majority of the people of Minnesota, in my opinion, and I commend this to the attention of the House.

[From the Osakis (Minn.) Review]

There is a tendency on the part of some people to call those who do not support the President's foreign policy partisan and un-American. But, after all, this is a free country, or supposed to be, where freedom of speech, press, and assemblage are still being practiced, and this country is not yet at war. When war is declared, then the time for debating policies and ways and means is over and all the people must unitedly get behind the President's program and support it whether they like it or not.

But until war is declared the people have the right and the duty to discuss policies and debate ways and means for the conduct of this country without the interference or criticism of anyone for engaging in the exercise of those privileges which were won for us by the blood of forefathers. There is, of course, no use for the Government to allow any spy or espionage system to grow and develop in this country under the program of free enterprise that we foster and encourage in this country. That is something else again.

The Review editor along with many other sincere and loyal Americans believes that we have no business trying to settle the quarrels of Europe. We have not the power or the authority to establish peace in war-torn Europe for any length of time unless we are willing to join some super-state or confederation of countries, such as was to have been established by the League of Nations, which was frowned upon by the majority of the American people evidently.

In that case it appears that one war will follow another in Europe, whereas we of the United States have demonstrated that we can live peaceably together with our neighbors on the North American Continent. If it appears that some fanatic like Hitler in combination with some other greedy dictators is going to be a menace to our free institutions and our way of living then, all right, let us arm to the teeth.

Let us build an army and a navy that will give our shores and our country all the protection that it needs. Let us have a separate air corps independent and equal to either the army or navy. Let us have a citizen army made up of young men who each year give a year's service to their country so that in time of emergency they may constitute a force that cannot be overthrown by any invader.

We are not pro-British and neither are we anti-British. In fact we ardently hope for a British victory and the defeat of Hitler, but we do not believe that our fate is dependent upon the fate of the British Empire and that if England should be unfortunately defeated that we must also bow in humiliation to the demands of the dictator. Our first line of defense is made up of the American shore line and when that is threatened there need be no worry over the spontaneity that will then be evidenced by our people in the manner in which they will arise and strike down any threatening force, provided, of course, that in the meantime this country will have armed its forces and instructed them in the ways of modern warfare.

To say that we who differ with the President in his foreign policy and who openly charge the President with leading us down the path that inevitably leads to war are lending aid and comfort to the enemy is beclouding the issue, since we are not yet at war and will not be at war for a long time to come if some of us who are opposed to war will have the courage of our convictions and oppose strenuously and honestly those measures and policies which we believe will lead to war and our participation in it.

Are those who are so intent on waging war on Hitler now satisfied to be on the same side of the argument as Stalin and his Russian Communists? Do we Americans care to be a party to the overthrow and defeat of Finland, the country in Europe that has won more respect and admiration from this country than any other nation on that continent? What are we going to fight for? Are we going to try to establish a victorious Communistic Army in Europe? It is time for the American people to give the matter of warfare in Europe some sober, serious consideration, free from any prejudice, name calling, and bitterness. It is time to ask ourselves if we can accomplish in Europe something more than we did back at the time of the first World War.

Those who occupy places of trust and responsibility have an unusually grave task ahead of them right now. It is no time for them to indulge in name calling and questioning the motives and the patriotism of those who do not see the advantages and the necessity of participating in a foreign war. Rather it is their duty to lend their time and effort to the cause of peace. There will be those, we presume, who will fear being called appeasers, but if these appeasers are able to bring about a peace that is at all reasonable then we say power to them.

Let those who believe and maintain that war settles questions and promotes civilization, and helps maintain the democratic way of living lead the hosts of our young men into battle then we shall become more interested in the idea of this country going to war with the exception noted, of course, that a defensive war is an altogether different thing.

Gen. Robert E. Wood sums up the situation neatly when he says "the war party can hardly ask the people of America to take up arms behind the Red flag of Stalin."

"With the ruthless forces of dictatorship and aggression now clearly aligned on both sides, the proper course for the United States becomes even clearer," Wood said.

"We must continue to build our own defenses and take no part in this incongruous European conflict. This latest development gives dramatic emphasis to the obvious proposition that there can never be a place for the United States in Europe's everlasting strife, and its shifting alliance and enmities."

A Brief in Support of Government Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY IRVING BRANT

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Irving Brant has at various times been editor of the Iowa City Republican, the Clinton (Iowa) Herald, the Des Moines Register and Tribune, the St. Louis Star, and the Star-Times of St. Louis.

He is the author of the well-known books entitled "Dollars and Cents" and "Storm Over the Constitution."

One of his outstanding studies has been the constitutionality of government

monopolies. Because of the wide interest in this subject, I am asking unanimous consent to have an article by Mr. Brant entitled "Constitutionality of Government Monopolies" and which was printed in pamphlet form by the People's Lobby of Washington, D. C., printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The pamphlet is as follows:

GOVERNMENT MONOPOLIES ARE CONSTITUTIONAL

According to the American Liberty League, the United States Government has no power to control agriculture or industry along the lines attempted by the Roosevelt administration because these activities resemble the mercantile monopolies set up by European governments in the eighteenth century, and one of the purposes in writing our Constitution was to protect our country against eighteenth-century mercantilism.

"The fact is," said the Liberty League in a pamphlet discussing similarities between the New Deal and mercantilism, "that the colonists were the victims of economic planning, and the constitutional structure erected by the new nation was designed to furnish safeguards against economic experimentation conducted by a centralized authority." This was secured, according to the Liberty League, by reserving control of local commerce to the States.

The right to set up mercantile monopolies would, indeed, be a titanic power in the Federal Government. It would cover any degree of regulation of industry. It would permit the establishment of a completely socialized state.

That power exists. It is in the Constitution. The framers said it was there, and two of the leading delegates to the Constitutional Convention cited the existence of that power as a reason for refusing to sign the Constitution.

The subject came up on September 14, 1787, 3 days before the signing of the Constitution.

"As to mercantile monopolies," said Wilson of Pennsylvania (afterward Justice of the United States Supreme Court), "they are already included in the power to regulate trade."

How was this statement greeted? Did the framers rise as one man to cry out against such a power in the Federal Government? They did not. One man, George Mason, of Virginia, the most extreme State righter in the Convention, questioned it. Two days later he admitted that the power was there. He wrote on the back of his copy of the Constitution that he was refusing to sign because, among other things "the Congress may grant monopolies in trade and commerce." Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, listing his reasons for refusal to sign, said: "Under the power over commerce, monopolies may be established."

During these last days of the Convention these men were begged, implored, to sign the Constitution. But not one delegate challenged the correctness of Wilson's statement that mercantile monopolies were "already included in the power to regulate trade."

Now, what could be done under a power to establish Government monopolies in trade and commerce? Anything. The T. V. A., the N. R. A., the A. A. A., the Guffey Coal Act, and the Wagner Labor Act are modest exercises of Government power compared with what could be done through the establishment of mercantile monopolies.

We have here a startling, indeed a revolutionary, deviation from what we ordinarily hear about the attitude of the framers toward government power. Is there anything in the constitutional debates to support this view? For answer, read what Madison, the "Father of the Constitution," said when it was proposed—2 days before the convention adjourned—that the States be allowed to lay tonnage duties for clearing harbors and erecting lighthouses.

"Whether the States are now restrained from laying tonnage duties," said Madison, "depends on the extent of the power 'to regulate commerce.' These terms are vague, but they seem to exclude this power of the States. They may certainly be restrained by treaty. He observed that there were other objects for tonnage duties as the support of seamen, etc. He was more and more convinced that the regulation of commerce was in its nature indivisible and ought to be wholly under one authority." (Madison's notes were written in the third person.)

When one thinks of recent Supreme Court decisions and of the general belief that the framers were State righters, that's an almost incredible statement, coming "from 'horse and buggy' days." Let's analyze it.

The States have a reserved power of taxation, concurrent with that of Congress. Madison held that the power of Congress to regulate commerce included the right to invade the reserved power of the States in a different field.

Next, he said, the States "may certainly be restrained by treaty." That is, even if there should be doubt about the right of the Federal Government to invade the reserved powers of the States under the commerce clause, that right unquestionably exists under the treaty power. In saying this, Madison foreshadowed the Supreme Court decision upholding a law to enforce the Migratory Bird Treaty with Canada, even though, without that treaty protection of birds would have been a matter reserved to the States.

Madison said, "The support of seamen" was a legitimate object of taxation. What difference is there between a tax on shipping for pensions to seamen and a tax on railroads for pensions to railroad men; what difference between support of seamen and a general old-age pension system? Yet the Supreme Court in 1935 said railroad pensions were unconstitutional, and the 58 lawyers of the Liberty League say the Wagner Social Security Act is unconstitutional.

Finally, consider Madison's statement that the regulation of commerce is "in its nature indivisible and ought to be wholly under one authority." That, it may be said, is not a statement of what is in the Constitution, but of what ought to be. Very well. What that statement does beyond question is break down the theory that the framers were devoted to State rights, in the control of commerce. That theory breaks down still further when we consider the reply Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, made to Madison's remarks about control by one authority:

"The power of the United States to regulate trade, being supreme, can control interferences of the State regulations when such interferences happen, so that there is no danger to be apprehended from a concurrent jurisdiction."

Sherman did not divide "commerce among the States" into interstate and intrastate commerce. He treated it as a general subject in which the upward limit of State authority was fixed by the downward exercise of Federal authority. Federal power was supreme and could control interferences from the States.

Why do these powers, which the framers took for granted, seem so startlingly great today that the Supreme Court denies their existence? Because the objects, the problems, to which this power would be devoted have multiplied a thousandfold with the development of the Nation. The power exists, but its existence is denied because of the extent to which it could be used.

Make, for instance, a first step toward application of the power to establish mercantile monopolies. Even a law for Federal incorporation of companies engaged in interstate commerce, with Congress reserving the right to amend corporate charters, would open up a regulatory field of almost unimaginable vastness.

Or consider the treaty power, as defined by Madison and upheld by the Supreme Court in the migratory-bird case. That enables Congress to legislate on any subject which is a legitimate subject of concern between nations. What does that cover, or, rather, what does it fail to cover, in this age when nations go to war for raw materials—oil, coal, iron, timber—and when differing wage standards, differing standards of living, are weapons of international attack in the life-and-death struggle for world trade? Let the United States sign a treaty with any oil-producing country for the conservation of petroleum, and all constitutional doubt about the power of Congress to conserve the American oil supply will vanish. A treaty with Canada for the control of competitive surpluses in certain agricultural products would bring the control of those products as definitely within the powers of the Congress as if a specific clause were written into the Constitution. So, too, if the 40-hour week now on the agenda of the international labor body at Geneva, were made the subject of an international agreement.

Treaties on these subjects are coming. They will be forced upon us by world-wide economic disequilibrium if civilization is not to be destroyed by competitive greed.

Finally, we come to a power which once appeared to be the most powerful of all but which, on January 6, 1936, was almost driven out of the Constitution in the Hoosac Mills case—the power to raise and spend money to provide for the general welfare. Stated in a sentence, the Hoosac Mills case presented these two conflicting interpretations of the general-welfare clause:

1. Supreme Court majority: The power to raise money to provide for the general welfare involves no other powers.

2. Supreme Court minority: The power to raise money to provide for the general welfare involves the incidental power to make the use of that money effective.

What did the framers say on that subject? For answer, let us go to the author of the general-welfare clause, Roger Sherman. On the day he took his seat in the Constitutional Convention he said that the power most particularly needed by Congress was "that of raising money, which would involve many other powers."

What other powers did Sherman think were included in the money power? Well, for one thing, he thought it included the right to establish a national university. When President Washington proposed a national university the author of the general-welfare clause was the first man to arise in Congress to endorse it and assert its constitutionality. The Constitution gives Congress no power over education, so, under Supreme Court reasoning it must be a power reserved to the States. If the right to spend money for the general welfare includes the right to establish a national university, how can it be said, as it was said in the Hoosac Mills case, that the power to appropriate for the general welfare carries no power over the objects to which the money is to be applied?

In every great field of Federal power it has been shown the framers granted vastly more power than is now conceded by the Supreme Court, or than is generally recognized by historians. The genuine "State righters" in the Constitutional Convention refused to sign the Constitution. Yet we are told it was written to protect State sovereignty. Politicians, lawyers, and even historians say so. How can this conflict of ideas be reconciled?

The explanation is simple enough. First, men who don't want Federal authority exercised are eager to deny its existence. Second, circumstances after the Constitution

was adopted helped those who wanted to interpret it narrowly.

The debates of the Constitutional Convention, entrusted to Madison, were ordered to be kept secret, and were kept secret for 50 years. Madison himself, shortly after the Constitution was ratified, switched from the Federalist Party to the party of Jefferson (who was in France when the Constitution was being written). From a strong nationalist Madison became a violent "State righter." He interpreted the work of the Convention narrowly, and nobody could challenge him effectively because he alone had the notes.

Then, after Jefferson became President, the early Federalists, who had wanted a strong government and who had ruled the Constitutional Convention, switched around and became anti-Federalists. To keep power out of Jefferson's hands, practically all of the men who had written the Constitution in a spirit of nationalism joined in an interpretation of it contrary to the views they had held when they were writing it. But the only thing that counts in judging the intention of the framers is what they intended during the framing period.

Was the Constitution drafted by men trying to preserve equality between State and Federal sovereignties? That is what the American Liberty League says. That is what the Supreme Court seems to think. To judge what the framers really intended to do, read the following from Madison, written in almost the same words to Edmund Randolph and George Washington 1 month before the framers gathered to write the Constitution:

"Let the National Government be armed with a positive and complete authority in all cases where uniform measures are necessary, as in trade, etc. Let it also retain the powers which it now possesses. Let it have a negative in all cases whatsoeve: on the legislative acts of the States as the King of Great Britain heretofore had. This I conceive to be essential and the least possible abridgement of the State sovereignties."

Think of that proposal—a Federal veto over all State laws whatsoever. Were those the words of a man devoted to State sovereignty? Let us go further.

Alexander Hamilton said in the Constitutional Convention that the States as States "ought to be abolished."

Madison asked for a government "which would most approximate the States to the condition of counties."

Gouverneur Morris said of the States: "We cannot annihilate, but we may take the teeth out of the serpents."

Thus spake the founding fathers while they were writing the Constitution. We need no constitutional amendments. All we need is to go back to the founding fathers and learn from them what Federal power means. The power is in the Constitution.

Letter to John Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CROWTHER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY H. P. DONLON

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, H. P. Donlon, a constituent of mine, who writes for the Amsterdam (N. Y.) Evening Recorder, is one of the outstanding columnists of New York State. Gifted with an analytical mind and a keen sense of humor, his column known as Main Street is a source of joy and inspiration to its readers.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include his letter to Mr. John Hancock, as follows:

[From the Amsterdam (N. Y.) Evening Recorder]

MAIN STREET

(By H. P. Donlon)

Mr. JOHN HANCOCK,
Haven of Eternal Rest,
Beautiful Isle of Somewhere.

DEAR JOHN: I've had the feeling for a long time that I ought to write a letter to somebody, and tomorrow being the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, and you being the first signer of that grand and glorious old document, I have decided to write to you. Perhaps you and the 55 other signers have been hearing some rumors over on the isle, and while I don't want to cause worry, you fellows ought to know that things here are much worse than they were in your time. It's lucky for you that you left the country while the going was good, and while you were still popular. You wouldn't be if you were around here now. But, on the other hand, there are a lot of us who wish that we had some real leaders like you—men willing to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for an ideal of life.

The chances are that you wouldn't recognize this country if you were to come back tomorrow. It has changed a lot since July 4, 1776, when you severed the Colonies from "all allegiance to the British Crown" and from "all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain." You would recognize Europe, though. They haven't changed a bit, and at the present time the whole Continent looks like the Donnybrook Fair, with everybody taking a sock out of everybody else, palsy-walsy one day and blasting each other to pieces the next. That's the way it was in your time—remember? During the Revolution, England was trying to whale obedience into the wayward Colonies and at the same time to hold off France, Spain, and Holland, that had ganged up on her. That's the way it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be.

You'll notice, John, that I didn't put an "Amen" at the end of that. We aren't saying "so be it," like we used to. No; the present administration has reached the conclusion that you and the other Declaration of Independence signers, and George Washington, Jefferson, and the other founding fathers were all wrong in saying that America ought to mind its own business and let these perpetual battlers fight it out among themselves. The new philosophy is that we are duty bound to go over and mess into things every time the brawl starts. We tried the modern theory only a couple of decades ago and got a fine sticking. By the time we came back from Europe, disillusioned, disgusted, and several billion dollars poorer, we realized that you founders of the Republic were right when you said "keep out." But that was more than 20 years ago and a new crowd of internationalists has come into power since then.

And are they internationalists! Do you know what they are trying to tell us now? That we couldn't get along without England and the English Navy to protect us. Isn't that a darb? But wait, you haven't heard anything yet. They are pushing a "Union Now" campaign that would put us back to our former status as a British colony. Some of them are even suggesting a common postage stamp between the two nations. Oxford has opened a substation and is conferring degrees right on old John Harvard's campus. This country has now become the "arsenal of democracy," and every time we make a gun for ourselves we make one for some European country. Please don't ask if we get paid for the stuff. We're humanitarians now, and although the national debt is nearly $50,000,000,000, we aren't worried about money. You old-timers used to think of things as being either good or bad. Now, in the modern, streamlined philosophy the choices of life merely concern the lesser of evils. Sounds kind of paganlike, doesn't it?

I know what you are muttering to yourself, John—you are wondering what has happened to Congress. So are we. But Congress isn't as important as it used to be. The last time the President made a Nation-wide speech, he completely forgot to mention Congress. And, by the way, it is not considered polite to declare war now, and so they've junked that part of the Constitution. Under modern rules of warfare, one country starts to mow down another, and that is the official announcement that a belligerent state exists. Very un-American, to say the least, but only a few Members of Congress have the courage to say what they think about it—if they think. The best way to become a good American today is to memorize a verse, at least, of God Save the King. Otherwise, you are likely to be considered a Nazi—that's what the Germans are called now—or a Fascist—that's what the Italians are called. They're called some other names, too, but I've got to get this letter through the mails, so we won't go into that.

Yes, John, that's the way things are here. When they ask you who you're for and you reply, "I'm just an American," that isn't good enough. We're still celebrating the signing of the Declaration of Independence, but it is not considered to be in good taste to discuss what it was all about. It won't be long now before we'll have to get rid of the National Anthem—some people can't sing it because the notes are too high, while others choke at the words of the third and fourth verses, which sound rather high-spirited and are therefore vulgar. How you fellows ever had the gumption to think that you could found a country big enough and strong enough to stand by itself, to chase out the invaders as you did so often (we don't live far from Oriskany in this section), and to convince the world that you meant what you said about wanting to be let alone—that's what we can't understand. Perhaps it is because we have softened and wasted our precious heritage.

Don't get the idea for a moment, John, that I think things are going to continue this way, that your sacrifices have been in vain. These United States are not on the way out, by any means. There'll be an awakening and a comeback some day. But in the meantime we're going to have to struggle to recover that which we are losing. Our sacrifices will be as worth while as those made by you and yours 165 years ago. Kindly convey to them my sentiments of abiding esteem. I close with this, from the quotable part of the Star-Spangled Banner:

"Then conquer we must, for our cause it is just,
And this be our motto—in God is our trust."

Sincerely, your obed't serv't,
AN AVERAGE AMERICAN.

P. S.—If this letter should happen to fall into the hands of the enemy, I'm going to be out of luck. So-o-o-o, over there on the Beautiful Isle of Somewhere, if you should feel somebody nudge you and whisper, "Shove over, Bud," you'll know it's me.

The Trade Mirage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE RIPLEY (N. Y.) REVIEW

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. M. D. Conrath, editor, the Ripley Review, Ripley, N. Y., under date of July 3, 1941:

[From the Ripley (N. Y.) Review of July 3, 1941]

THE TRADE MIRAGE

It is generally admitted by the average interventionist that it will be impossible for Hitler to invade this country in a military sense for some years to come, even were he to win total victory in Europe. Uncle Sam has the most powerful Navy in the world, a deterrent to sending a huge army 3,000 miles across the Atlantic. Moreover, there are not enough ships in Europe to provide tonnage for such an invasion. There is a great deal of talk about bombing but this would have to be done by long-range bombers, of which Hitler now possesses few, if any. And we can build them faster than he.

But one excuse for our entering the war now given is that if Hitler wins we will lose all our foreign trade. For the past few years our foreign trade has averaged about $3,000,000,000 a year, or 5 percent of our national income. If we go to war to protect this trade, it will cost us perhaps another sixty billion before we are through, which is all the foreign business we could expect in 20 years. And this, of course, does not include the thousands of killed and maimed fine Americans probable from such a war.

No matter who wins this war in Europe, our foreign trade is not going to prosper much for several years. Europe is now engaged in bankrupting itself in one of the greatest wars of history. When the conflict is over the nations will be impoverished. There will be no compensating indemnities. This poverty will be general, even if Great Britain wins the war. If we enter too, some of it will spread abroad in our own land.

Now these disillusioned European people are going to have to work long hours at low wages to get enough to eat. They will not be in the market for any more of our produce than they actually must have. But they will be seeking to undersell one another and so will make any foreign trade highly unprofitable.

It is to be remembered, too, that the United States possesses the biggest market in the world. Even if Hitler should win for himself an empire in Europe, and many people still doubt that he can put such a political state on anything like a stable basis, he would still have to have somebody to do business with. And that is where Uncle Sam comes in. So long as we keep the American market we can always depend on our share of trade. It is only by destroying this vastly rich market, by impoverishing our people through war, that we may lose everything in an economic sense.

If there is any reason why we should enter the European war it certainly is not the protecting or extending of our foreign trade, 5 percent of our total income at best.

Tribute to Hubert F. Fisher, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

NEWS ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL FROM MEMPHIS, TENN., NEWSPAPERS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared on June 18, in the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which reviews rather carefully the distinguished life of Hon. Hubert F. Fisher, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who passed away on Tuesday, June 17. There is also included an editorial which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar, entitled "Lovable Character," which pays tribute to this splendid man.

Mr. Fisher represented for many years the Tenth District of Tennessee, which I now have the honor to represent as the Ninth Congressional District of my State. I knew Mr. Fisher intimately and looked upon him as a fine, personal friend and a gentleman of the highest character, integrity, and reputation. Since coming to the House, I have been impressed by the many strong friends he made during his service here. He was a man of quiet, strong intellect, who served industriously and well the needs of his immediate constituents. He had a broad, general outlook on life, and was a student of government.

We shall miss Hubert Fisher in our community, where he was respected and loved by a host of friends.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

HUBERT F. FISHER, SR., DIES IN NEW YORK—APPARENT HEART ATTACK FATAL TO MEMPHIAN—FORMER REPRESENTATIVE—ATTORNEY HAD GONE TO CITY TO ATTEND PRINCETON CLASS REUNION AND VISIT SON IN WASHINGTON

Hubert Frederick Fisher, Sr., former Member of Congress for the Tenth District, who retired from an active political and legal career to lead a quiet life among his flowers at his Germantown home, died suddenly at 2 o'clock yesterday morning in New York City. He was 63.

Mr. Fisher, who left last Thursday to attend a reunion of the Princeton class of 1901 and visit his son, Adrian S. Fisher, Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in Washington, apparently was stricken with a heart attack on Sixth Avenue in New York City, where he was making a brief visit. He intended to return home Friday. He was in good health except for deafness with which he had been afflicted many years.

RETIRED FROM POLITICS

The withdrawal of Mr. Fisher in November 1930 ended 14 years of service. The former Representative expressed no bitterness at the lack of support of his own candidacy, but donning his working clothes, announced his intention to "live among his flowers."

Before going to Congress he had been United States district attorney for the western district of Tennessee 3 years by appointment of the late President Woodrow Wilson, who was a member of the Princeton faculty when Mr. Fisher was a student there and whom he knew personally. He was a delegate from Memphis to the Baltimore Convention when President Wilson was nominated.

Mr. Fisher was born at Milton, Fla., the son of Frederick and Mary Ann McCarter Fisher. He spent his early life in Mississippi where the family moved, attending the University of Mississippi where he received his A. B. degree in 1898. He received his M. A. degree at Princeton, returning to Ole Miss for his law degree.

An outstanding football player at Princeton, Mr. Fisher was the University of Tennessee football coach for two years.

He was admitted to the Mississippi Bar before Judge Julian C. Wilson, at that time chancelor of the north Mississippi district and now a Memphis attorney. Coming to Memphis in 1904 he became associated with the firm of Carroll & McKellar, of which Senator MCKELLAR was a member. The firm name was changed to Carroll, Scott & Fisher after Mr. MCKELLAR entered the Senate, and was continued until Mr. Fisher became United States district attorney in 1914.

ADVOCATED MUSCLE SHOALS BILL

During his congressional career from 1917 to 1931 he was a member of the Military Affairs Committee and was a strong advocate of the Muscle Shoals bill, his political dreams having been centered for years around that project. He believed the bill would bring great prosperity to the South, and approved of governmental ownership of the Shoals because of the influence it would have on flood control and navigation. He defended Judge Harry B. Anderson in a speech before the House of Representatives when charges were introduced against him in resolutions by Representative LaGuardia, of New York.

During recent years he had consulted famous specialists in an effort to relieve his hearing difficulties and had made two trips to Europe seeking aid for the ailment.

He was an elder of Second Presbyterian Church.

He leaves his wife, formerly Miss Louise Sanford, of Knoxville, whom he married November 6, 1909; his son in Washington; another son, Hubert F. Fisher, Jr., of Memphis; a grandson, Hubert F. Fisher 3d; two brothers, R. M. Fisher of Bucatunna, Miss., and J. G. Fisher, of Electric Mills, Miss., and a sister, Mrs. Louise McLeod, of Moss Point, Miss.

Mrs. Fisher and Hubert Fisher, Jr., left last night for Knoxville.

Services will be conducted at Knoxville tomorrow morning in the Old Gray Cemetery. The E. P. Mann Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar]

LOVABLE CHARACTER

Ex-Congressman Hubert F. Fisher, Sr., was a star center on the Princeton team, making all-America material, years ago. He coached the University of Tennessee football team at Knoxville for 2 years. But more important than anything he may have contributed to sports history is the fact that Mr. Fisher played the game of life so valiantly. A man of strong character and firm conviction, a right-thinking man, as one put it, Mr. Fisher was described by a friend of long standing as a lovable character. It was a simple tribute to a man who had those qualities of character that men respect.

Mr. Fisher served Memphis well as Congressman and good citizen. And his worth was recognized not only locally but nationally. His distinguished career was marked by his selection, by President Wilson personally, as district attorney here. In other capacities, he was known for his mental and moral qualities; as a good mixer,

who enjoyed conversation; as a man who loved people. And when he retired from the limelight he found enjoyment in his beautiful rose garden and such simple things of life as helping to plant the azaleas which add to the beauty of Overton Park.

Thoughts on the International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY REV. DR. JAMES H. COTTER WHICH APPEARED IN THE IRISH WORLD, JUNE 28, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by the Reverend Dr. James H. Cotter, which was published in the Irish World, June 28, 1941. Dr. Cotter lives in Ironton, Ohio, and he is an author and writer.

The article follows:

[From the Irish World of June 28, 1941]

THOUGHTS

(Specially written for the Irish World by Rev. Dr. James H. Cotter)

If it were our war, the day of entrance thereto would be emblazoned on every front page of the world's press. If it were our war, we would have heard from the beginning the cannon's roar proclaiming the fact.

That "words, words, words" have to be twisted, turned, and distorted to make them fit the false and specious argument and the sophistry of the orator is of itself an absolute argument that it is not our war.

If it were our war, action, not words, would have long since demonstrated the fact.

To make it appear to the thoughtless that it is our war, Voltaire's counsel, "lie, lie, lie, and some of it will stick" has had the floor, hence we have nothing but the false in premise, the illogical in conclusion—an atrocious mass of the ridiculous and the deceitful, coupled with the tragic.

To establish democracies similar to our own in the countries warring against Germany is certainly a Utopian scheme. The word "democracies" was merely a cloak to cover England and hide singular interest in that land, where democracy is not in any way kindred to our own. There humanity is labeled first, second, and third class, a distinction unknown to free America and there heredity begets royalty and the Crown. These only indicate multitudinous differences. America would look like "Moses at the Fair" teaching the Turks democracy and the others who may yet draw the sword against Germany. Think of the languages our schools would have to teach and our diplomats would have to learn to let other lands know democracy—lands where language and race are foreign to its meaning. It is well for America to think of her own democracy and rectify its failures and perpetuate its blessings. There is such a thing as "biting off more than we can chew."

LIBERTY

In this troublous time, when words get varied meanings, from the minds that mouth them, the dear and sacred word liberty is not an exception. Used often, for ignoble purpose, its meaning for some is worn off, for others it is indistinct if not entirely effaced, while others scout its very existence. What is liberty? Liberty, briefly stated, is subjection to just law rightly administered. This subjection is not degradation, for, as we are all reasonable creatures, reason, of which law is a regulation for the common good, should guide our deeds. Wherein there are we free? We are free from injustice on the part of the law and from despotism in its enforcement and this freedom is a boon since so-called laws have often been inroads on human right—insults to human reason—and rulers, ignoring their high purpose, have acted as if laws were made to damn and not to save. It behooves us then to appreciate liberty—a a grand characteristic of our democracy and to no longer have our back to America and our face to England. "Lest we forget, lest we forget" America and its many and gracious blessings. Destroy law and you have anarchy, for man untamed, is a fierce brute indeed; exceed law, and shackled thousands groan curses on the legislator or ruler that forged their bonds. Legislate for the common good and ruler and people are alike yoked in fraternity—all rights are respected and men enjoy true civil liberty. This is our portion. We should then help our country to look to liberty with love, cherish it, and not endanger democracy of which it is the soul, by looking away from it and forgetting it in distractions that are no advantage whatsoever, but, on the contrary, are a certain danger of loss, or possible danger of death to our glorious Republic.

ENTANGLEMENTS

Some men have never been introduced to themselves, hence they are strangers to themselves. The same can be said of nations. If a mirror could be made large enough for nations to see themselves they would back indignantly away and, each in turn, declare: "That's not I." What a philosopher was Washington! How he knew men and nations and how wisely he spoke when he advised against foreign entanglements. Foreigners themselves don't know when they are in a tangle with themselves or with others. Only 23 years ago the Japanese, French, and Italians were our allies, and behold them today. They delight in execrating old friends as all lies.

Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Ignace Jan Paderewski is dead.

In his death the world loses a man who was gifted far above other men, and who, through a long and exemplary life, used those gifts for the benefit of his fellow man.

As a pianist who must be ranked among the truly great virtuosi of all time, he gave to millions the world over the benison which superlative music, superlatively interpreted, alone can afford.

As diplomatist and statesman, as the one-time Premier of tragic Poland, he fought for human liberty and dignity above all else. Indeed, his last years form a moving record of one man's endless struggle against the forces of darkness overrunning Europe; to the very end he contributed his fortune, his energies, his very life to the cause of a free Poland.

Musical genius, patriot, statesman, a man of princely attainments and princely generosity, Paderewski stood as a living symbol of his people's hopes.

The Father of Poland is dead, but his name will live on, and with it the dream of "Polska Powstanie." Poland Will Arise.

I also herewith submit an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, July 1, 1941:

[From the Washington Post of July 1, 1941]

PADEREWSKI

Ignace Jan Paderewski often said that his country came first; his piano, after. Yet to the millions all over the world who were enthralled by his art, his political life remained a thing apart. Perhaps this was because it was difficult to visualize a great musician as a statesman taking part in Europe's political councils. For all the apparent anomaly, Paderewski will long be remembered not only as the greatest pianist of his time, but also as the fervent Polish patriot who played a major role in the re-creation of an independent Poland. He resigned as premier in 1919, after less than a year in office. But he never let his differences with Marshal Pilsudski and other Polish officials affect his deep love and labors for his native land. As late as 1921 he represented Poland at the League of Nations. And, though he lived abroad during many of the years since, he continued to devote a sizable portion of his large earnings to Polish causes. Not since the present war began had he played in public. And when Poland was again overrun, and part of it split up between Germany and Russia, he became vice premier of the war council of the Polish Government-in-exile in London. It was clear in 1939, when he was forced to break off a concert tour of this country, that the great man was approaching the end. Sunday night, in his hotel room in New York, death came at last to the great man. In his service to humanity as an artist and statesman he was truly one of the great men of our age.

The Cheese Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WISCONSIN STATE JOURNAL, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis.:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis.]

RETREAT FROM AN ERROR

The convincing statistics that Ralph Ammon furnished the Department of Agriculture on the cheese situation evidently have been studied by the Federal officials.

In an address at Chicago, M. Clifford Townsend, Federal Director of Agricultural Defense Relations, modified considerably the recent laughable appeal of Claude Wickard, Federal Secretary of Agriculture, calling for a large decrease in the consumption of cheese by the people of this country.

The figures of Mr. Ammon showed conclusively that Wisconsin alone, by its increased production in 1941 over 1940, would be able to furnish 240,000,000 pounds of cheese over last year's output, and that this of itself would furnish one-half of the increased supply that Great Britain desires. Mr. Townsend said:

"It is conceivable, of course, that we might have to cut down on consumption of one or two commodities such as cheese for brief periods."

The Townsend message was a long retreat from the Wickard alarm cry. It is a safe conjecture that now the true situation in the cheese industry has been placed before the Federal officials that there will be no more propaganda cries from the Federal Department of Agriculture for the reduction of cheese for the American table.

Nelson A. Rockefeller's Important Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ARTICLE ON NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER'S IMPORTANT TASK, FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR OF JULY 4, 1941, BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, July 4, 1941, on Nelson A. Rockefeller's important task as Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics:

[From the Washington Evening Star of Friday, July 4, 1941]

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER'S IMPORTANT TASK—INTER-AMERICAN OFFICE CAN SERVE UNITED STATES WELL

(By David Lawrence)

More and more the attitude of South American countries toward the future policies of the United States is giving genuine concern. The theory that Latin America is wholly sympathetic with President Roosevelt's foreign policy is a bit outworn. European inroads into the thinking of governments to the south of us are such that the United States Government has reverted to the policy it applied during the first World War—an active educational campaign among the peoples of Central and South America with the hope of maintaining their cooperation, no matter what contingency may arise.

To carry on an educational campaign in Latin America, where Nazi agents are numerous and where newspapers and magazines are subsidized directly by Nazi funds, is a difficult task for the United States. Thus far the American Government has not resorted to such tactics. The plan rather is to make available information through legitimate channels with the hope that persons influential in the Latin-American scene will see that America's side gets a fair deal.

Certainly South America needs certain raw materials on which priorities have been established here. Financial aid for commercial transactions is also essential. Under such circumstances and with so many ramifications to the whole program, it was most natural that President Roosevelt should create an agency, now known as the Office of Inter-American Affairs, which is headed by Nelson Rockefeller.

RED TAPE MUST BE CUT

But as often happens in the case of an expanding government, the department which has hitherto handled all matters concerning external relations finds it necessary to take into account activities by other agencies of the same government which cannot operate under the strict rules of a foreign-office procedure. Red tape, for instance, has to be cut and the customary diplomatic machinery cannot be used sometimes to obtain action on various commercial matters growing out of an emergency.

For several months the problem of adjusting the office of Inter-American Affairs to the work of the State Department and its representatives abroad has been one of the challenges of the war emergency. But it can be stated that the integration of the two agencies has been accomplished, due especially to the tact and skill of Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, who is number one man in knowledge and background of Latin-American affairs covering the last quarter of a century.

SEPARATE STAFFS ADVISABLE

It is no criticism of our trained diplomatic officers in foreign countries to say that they are not technically familiar with all the problems growing out of attempts to improve public opinion in the countries where they reside. They are trained in the art of silences and cautious statement rather than aggressive combat against such bold and at times vicious opponents as the Nazi agents can be. The situation properly calls for a separate set of representatives who, while working with the embassies and legations, are not restricted by diplomatic etiquette in dealing with anti-American manifestations.

During the first World War, the United States Government, through the Committee on Public Information, headed by George Creel, established information centers in many foreign capitals and this proved an effective way to get the doctrines of President Wilson printed in the foreign press, to say nothing of the many tasks of counteracting attacks on the United States, which were likewise performed.

MAY OUTLAST EMERGENCY

The Office of Inter-American Affairs, which Mr. Rockefeller administers, has just received a small appropriation from Congress, which it will devote to the improvement of America's prestige abroad by educational campaigns. For the first time in many years, the United States Government formally has recognized that it was important to pay attention not only to commercial but cultural relations, and such splendid work has already been done by the hundreds of persons operating under the Office of Inter-American Affairs that it would not be at all surprising if this continued as a permanent institution long after the emergency had passed.

Mr. Rockefeller seems to have the organizing qualities which have brought to his side some able volunteers familiar with Latin American relations. His engaging personality has made him quite popular among the officials of the New Deal. The main reason is that he works night and day at the job of speaking for and to Latin American commercial and cultural interests insofar as they affect national policy here. This is something too big and far-reaching to be left as a side issue of a department which has to care for our diplomatic interests not only in Latin America but all over the world, and that's why the working arrangements between the State Department and the Office of Inter-American Affairs constitute a milestone in efficient progress.

Wire Tapping—The Rhode Island Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1941

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the 5 minutes allotted to me in general debate on last Monday, when the House was considering the Hobbs wire-tapping bill, H. R. 4228, was too short a period to permit me to do justice to my reasons for being so reluctant to support the bill. I therefore avail myself of the privilege extended to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and submit the following, which I trust may be taken into consideration in the future when and if the Judiciary Committee again takes up the question of wire tapping.

I informed the membership of the House on Monday that:

Wire tapping to the people of my district is about as repulsive a word as anyone can pronounce. I find it very, very difficult today to decide just how I am going to vote on this bill. I believe, however, that, in view of existing circumstances, I shall vote for it. The reason I find it so difficult is because of my knowledge of some things that were done in my district in 1939, and the evidence of which can be found in the hearings held by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on wire tapping.

The Hobbs bill limits wire tapping to four major crimes, namely, sabotage, espionage, kidnaping, and extortion, and then only upon a certificate by the Attorney General of the United States that he has reason to believe a crime is about to be committed, is being committed, or has been committed, and limits such authority to 2 years.

To vote against this bill was, to me, to vote to give comfort and convenience to criminals whose purpose it is to sabotage our defense program and to secure information for the enemies of our country.

On the other hand, I could visualize the great amount of abuse that can be made of such powers if they should fall into the hands of unscrupulous individuals. So long as the tapping might be done strictly in accordance with the law it would be fine. I have great confidence in and respect for J. Edgar Hoover and his Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as for the Intelligence Services of both the Army and the Navy. But, Mr. Speaker, I also realize that after men trained in such work for the Government return to private life there is no telling what they may do.

I base that last statement upon the wire-tapping episode in Rhode Island in 1939, to which I referred earlier in my

remarks. In that case wire tapping was only a part of a dirty plot by conniving Republican politicians and their tools, and one of the tools was a former F. B. I. man, Lee Edward Barton.

The plot in which wire tapping was used was concocted by a small group, of which the then Governor of Rhode Island, William H. Vanderbilt, a Republican, was the head. Governor Vanderbilt had been elected to office in a campaign in which the Republican Party had spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to insure their carrying the State election. It was generally accepted that there had been some irregularity practiced by both the Republicans and the Democrats on election day.

The Republicans, however, had failed to win in the two normally Democratic cities of Central Falls and Pawtucket, although they had carried another Democratic stronghold, Woonsocket. It was then that Vanderbilt and his fellow travelers decided to investigate election frauds, gambling, and municipal corruption, as they termed it. That sounded good, but developments proved that the real purpose of the so-called investigation was to persecute those who had prevented the Republicans from capturing Central Falls and Pawtucket.

The Senate hearings reveal that active in the plot were the following characters:

Governor Vanderbilt, who paid $15,500 out of his own pocket for the investigation.

Horace L. Weller, director of business regulations of the State of Rhode Island and the Governor's lawyer in private matters.

Matthew W. Goring, a young attorney who was appointed a special assistant to Attorney General Louis V. Jackvony at the Governor's suggestion and who later admitted that he was a plant in the attorney general's office, where he snooped on his boss.

Frank B. Bielaski, of New York, operator of the Seaboard Bureau of Public Relations, the man whose secret operatives invaded the State to tap wires, make dictograph records, and eavesdrop on officials after attempts were made to ensnare them into compromising positions.

The hearings further disclose that, unbeknown to the attorney general, Bielaski sent Vincent Flanders, a New York City fireman, to string wires, and Charles J. Brown, vice president of the Morelen Electric Co., Inc., of New York, to place taps on the home telephone wires of Mayor Thomas P. McCoy, of Pawtucket, and on the telephones of Attorney General Jackvony at his home, at his private law office, and also to so cross the wires of his telephone in the attorney general's office so that the plant, Goring, could listen in on his boss.

In addition to that, Bielaski, who held conferences with Vanderbilt and Goring at the Governor's home, in Portsmouth, had six operatives in Rhode Island; Lee Barton, who had rooms in the home of Edward Freeman, near the home of Mayor McCoy to listen in on that tap, and in the home of Frank Englebrook, near the home of the attorney general, to listen in on that particular tap; Basil A. Needham, who posed as a promoter, selling agencies for Coca-Cola, but who in reality was attempting to trap the mayor and the members of the Pawtucket administration; a man named Davenport, who posed as a writer for Collier's magazine, leaving the inference that he was the well-known writer by that name, and three other agents, two unnamed and one who operated under the name of Savoy and who was protected by the State police even though they knew he was a gangster of unsavory reputation.

After Vanderbilt had decided to foot the bill for this nefarious investigation he invited Sevellon Brown, editor of the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, into his office and told him of his plans. He inquired if these papers would care to share the expenses of it and, on a second visit to Vanderbilt, Sevellon Brown, according to the hearings, informed him that his newspapers would not do so.

The record proves, however, that the Journal and Bulletin, who are always posing as crusaders against crime, maintained complete silence on the dirty business that was being carried on by Vanderbilt and his fellow travelers, including the wire tapping, and broke their silence on the subject only after the tap on the McCoy home was discovered and Mr. Freeman had been taken in custody by the police.

At the request of his old friend, Harold Shippee, an insurance man, Freeman had rented a room in his home to Lee Barton, whom Shippee had represented as an adjuster for an insurance company. However, Freeman was arrested and charged with aiding and abetting in tapping the McCoy telephone wires. He was made to stand trial, which lasted nearly 4 weeks, and was exonerated. At no time, however, during the trial of this innocent man did Vanderbilt, Goring, or Sevellon Brown come forward to testify as to Freeman's innocence. In fact, Goring, who had been summoned as a witness, hid behind his constitutional immunity and refused to testify.

Rather than take that honorable step, these men let Freeman stand trial, and caused thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money to be spent by the United States Department of Justice in an effort to track down the perpetrators of the crime.

J. Howard McGrath, now Governor of Rhode Island, who was Federal district attorney at the time of the Freeman trial, questioned Vanderbilt on the wire tapping and the latter steadfastly denied that he knew anything about it until Mr. McGrath unearthed the evidence and showed how Vanderbilt had paid Bielaski by using a bank draft of the United States Trust Co., of New York, for a cashier's check on the Bank of Manhattan Co., with a request that that bank issue its check in a similar amount to the order of Seaboard Bureau, which is Bielaski. In another instance Goring, acting for Vanderbilt, purchased a check from the First National Bank of Boston and the First National Bank of Boston charged to the New York Trust Co. a check payable to the order of the Seaboard Bureau. On another occasion, Weller, acting for Vanderbilt, carried $3,000 in cash to Bielaski. Never were any payments made directly by Vanderbilt, who admitted these methods were used to conceal his part in the case.

Proof conclusive that all this dirty business, of which wire tapping was a part, was intended to be used against innocent persons as well as against guilty ones, if any were discovered, is shown by the following excerpts from the report filed by Bielaski with the Attorney General (see p. 272, hearings on wire tapping held by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Commerce):

> We do not think that the questions of morality have any proper place in an investigation in corruption, but some mention of certain conditions should be of great help and guidance in dealing with certain witnesses from whom a complete confession should be secured.

Then, referring to a certain individual, the report followed:

> Bearing in mind the character of such a man, it is felt that the threat of exposure through unmasking his true relation will undoubtedly cause him to make a clean breast of all transactions with which he is familiar.

Referring to certain dictograph records that Bielaski's agents had made, the report continued:

> There are certain parts of this record which have definite significance as concerns our general investigation, but we have always felt that their particular value lies in the fact that they can be used as a club over the head of young ——— to compel him to make a complete statement.

With reference to certain young women who were not charged with violations of law, but who might be in the possession of facts because of certain connection, they continued:

> These young women must be as anxious to maintain an appearance of morality, at least, and a good name in public as the ordinary young female. It is pointed out that if it is made known to them that their conduct has been under scrutiny they may well have statements to make which may be even broader than we anticipate.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is an admission of the intent to blackmail some innocent persons in an effort to reach others that were suspected.

I am sure that for the reasons I have stated it is easy for anyone to understand why I abhor wire tapping, and I entertain the hope that if ever again the Congress has occasion to consider the subject of wire tapping it will not overlook the Rhode Island case of 1939.

Hitler and American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 3), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix an address delivered by me on July 4 last at Buffalo, N. Y., on the subject Shall Hitler Destroy Democracy in America?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Townsend, Mr. Chairman, honored and honorable citizens of America, as your friend, one who is proud to be your friend, I greet you. With you I greet your leader, whom I proudly call friend, one of America's good and great men.

As you know, I have been with you. Dr. Townsend and your leaders know I am still with you. I shall continue with you until victory crowns our just cause. You can count upon my vote, my speech, my labor.

You deserve all that you ask. In time you will get it. I congratulate you upon what you have already accomplished, for through what you have achieved, you have made a happier and a stronger America.

I am happy to have been honored by the Vice President of the United States with membership on the Senate committee to make a study of pensions in the United States. In Senator DOWNEY and me you know your cause will have a friendly and earnest hearing.

It is about that America which you love that I shall speak to you out of my heart today.

I know that as one American to other Americans, in these crucial times, on this glorious Independence Day, you would not have me speak to you other than plainly, straightforwardly, and candidly about the future of our land, to which you have so largely contributed. I want to talk to you about peace and keeping America out of war.

I accuse the Herbert Hoovers, the Charles Lindberghs, the Roy Howards, the Senator Wheelers, Senator Nyes, and the General Woods, and those working with and through the so-called America First Committee with being those who are now and have been dragging America into war and are the real warmongers.

I accuse that little group of willful men who broke the heart of Woodrow Wilson and the world, who made America repudiate the blood of her fallen sons and the hopes of man everywhere for a better world, of being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those so-called isolationists who struck down, through prejudice, partisanship, and sometime for political profit, the hope of a lawful and orderly world, through the League of Nations and the World Court, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those provincial and shortsighted Americans, calling themselves isolationists, who refused to permit America to do anything, to give anything, to risk anything to make Europe militarily or economically safe in the years following the World War, who refused to help Europe break down its trade barriers, to stabilize its currency, to have any stability in its government so that democratic institutions might survive, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who built a tariff wall around America and tried to shut this Nation off in this modern age from economic contact with the world, so that our debtors could pay us neither in money nor goods, which led to the crashing of the European money systems and the collapse of the European and Asiatic economies, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who said it was none of our business, it was none of the world's business, when Japan started modern international brigandage by invading Manchuria in 1931, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who again in the name of isolation opposed this country and the civilized nations of the world stopping the next recurrence of international brigandage, when Mussolini invaded Ethiopia in 1935, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who, in the name of isolation, opposed this country doing anything to stop Hitler when he repudiated the Versailles Treaty; when he reestablished conscription and turned Germany into an armed camp for the purposes of aggression; when he took advantage of the world dissension, of Italy's unprovoked assault on Ethiopia, and invaded the Rhineland; when Hitler led the experiment in modern war and in modern knavery by flagrantly and unashamedly sending his so-called volunteers and arms into the Spanish civil war; when in 1938 he, profiting by Mussolini's assault on Ethiopia and Japan's unprovoked attack upon China, marched into Austria; when he mutilated and murdered courageous little Czechoslovakia; and when he finally, in 1939, let loose the dragons of this world-consuming war, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who denounced as a meddler and a warmonger President Roosevelt when he, seeing the hideous assault which Hitler was getting ready to loose upon the earth, the dread disease of war with which he was about to scourge the earth with another bubonic plague, called out to the American people, to the peace-loving peoples of the world, to cooperate in quarantining such a menace to the world safety, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who in 1935, in 1937, in 1938 opposed or failed to assist in building up America's land, air, and naval forces for America's defense, and to make her sentiments felt in the councils of the world, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who for 9 long months delayed the repeal of the arms embargo, and therefore by giving him reason to believe that we would not under any circumstances furnish implements of war to Britain, if he attacked her, encouraged Hitler to start this war in 1939, and delayed for 9 months the starting of our own war industries upon a large scale, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who in 1940 opposed the selective-service law and the training of America's men to defend America, and to make the world respect America and what we stood for, with being the real warmongers of America.

I accuse those who in 1941 delayed and obstructed the passage of the lease-lend bill and thereby delayed and since then have obstructed material aid to those fighting against Hitler, with being those who have dragged America closer and closer to the brink of war, and are the real warmongers of America.

Today two of the Senators who have been loudest in their charges of "warmonger," "interventionist," "bloodthirstiness" against Roosevelt and some of us who have tried to help Roosevelt to defend America in this crisis have been my friends, Senators WHEELER and NYE. These Americans have claimed the right to be the champions of peace, and everybody who differs with their method of keeping the peace they have denounced with all the epithets at the command of their eloquence and their fervor. In every nook and cranny in the country, on the radio, the platform, and in the press they have cried out to the people of America their warnings against Roosevelt as the real menace to the people of America. All America, to hear these able gentlemen speak, needed to do was to follow their counsel, to take their advice and America would be happy, prosperous, and peaceful. It is only fair, therefore, that the counsel they have been giving their country, the course they followed to defend America should be known and observed; then the people can determine, as in a democracy they have the right, yes, the duty to determine, whose counsel they, the people, shall follow.

In 1935 there was before the Senate on the 24th of May the appropriations bill to provide the funds—almost half a billion dollars—to start America's naval rebuilding program so as to give America a Navy which could defend her shores against an attack in either ocean.

Against that appropriation bill, H. R. 7672, Senator WHEELER and Senator NYE voted "No."

On March 8, 1935, there was before the Senate a bill providing funds for the War Department to increase the armed strength of America to defend America.

Senator WHEELER did not vote, but Senator NYE voted "No," saying at the time, as reason for his opposition: "We find ourselves engaged in mapping a larger program in preparation for war than civilization ever before knew in peacetime."

On the 11th of August in 1937 there was before the Senate S. 1567 to aid the national defense by preventing the exportation of helium gas, which Germany was very anxious to get, and the conservation of that critical material for the defense of the United States.

On that bill Senator WHEELER did not vote. Senator NYE voted "No."

On May 3, 1938, there was before the Senate a bill to increase by 23 percent the size of the United States Navy—the real beginning of the two-ocean Navy for the defense of America.

On that bill Senator WHEELER did not vote, but Senator NYE voted "No."

On March 6, 1939, there was before the Senate an amendment providing for the manufacture of 6,000 airplanes for the United States Army. This amendment was submitted by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate.

On this amendment Senator WHEELER and Senator NYE voted "No."

In the early part of 1939, seeing the clouds of war gathering over Europe and shifting to the horizon of every nation on the earth; seeing that Hitler was relying upon Britain and the other nations of Europe being unprepared for his gigantic assault; seeing that one of the things upon which Hitler relied particularly was the Arms Embargo Act which forbade this country to sell war materials to any nation engaging in war, and that the effect of that law was to help Hitler and hurt his enemies, President Roosevelt proposed to the Congress that this Government be permitted to sell, for cash, to belligerent nations war materials, such materials to be carried by those countries on their own ships. For weeks, for months, Senator WHEELER and Senator NYE were among those who delayed and obstructed this lifting of the embargo.

History will say that it was the defeat in the Senate of this recommendation of President Roosevelt that led Hitler to believe that the isolationist sentiment was so strong in this country that we would not help any country he attacked, that led Hitler, in September of that year, to unloose the dogs of war upon the world.

After Hitler had begun his march toward the conquest of the world in September, the President called a special session of Congress and renewed his recommendation that this Government, upon the principles of cash and carry, be permitted to sell our materials to those who were the pathetic victims of Hitler's murderous assault.

Again came weeks of debate, which Senators WHEELER and NYE lead, crying out against President Roosevelt—calling him and all who supported him warmongers and interventionists. Finally, the vote came, November 3, 1939—9 months after President Roosevelt had recommended this legislation—9 months in which American factories might have been established and put into operation—9 months in which to build up in the hands of those who stood against Hitler weapons of defense; and Senators WHEELER and NYE voted "No."

In 1940, with Hitler's iron heel on the neck of a prostrate Europe, his sword raised over the head of Britain, the Balkans, and the Near East, his hungry eyes roving the oceans and the lands of the earth for new conquests, his spies, saboteurs, and "fifth columnists" burrowing like moles in North America, Central America, and South America, with it clear to any unclouded vision that he aimed at nothing else than to follow the glamorous role of Alexander and Caesar to the conquest of the world, President Roosevelt, taking his own political future in his hands to do so, but confident of the response of a patriotic people, proposed to the mothers and fathers of America, through their Congress, that they send their sons to the training camps to defend America upon the democratic principle of selective service.

More protracted and impassioned debate, led by Senator WHEELER and Senator NYE.

Typical of the method Senator WHEELER employed in this attack is the following statement on page 15681 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, made August 13, 1940, while speaking on the selective-service bill: "Enact peacetime conscription and no longer will this be a free land, no longer will a citizen be able to say that he disagrees with a governmental proclamation or edict. Hushed whispers will replace free speech, secret meetings in dark places will supplant free assemblage; labor and industry, men and women, will be shackled by the chains they have themselves forged."

You know whether or not this prophecy of Senator WHEELER has come true.

Finally the vote came, on September 14, 1940, and Senator WHEELER voted "No" while Senator NYE did not vote.

It might be added that on the 27th of October of 1939, on page 973 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, after Hitler had conquered Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and his restless armies were waiting for the signal to dash over the whole of Europe, Senator WHEELER said, "I do not believe there is any crisis, and I do not think the talk about there being a crisis in the United States should be permitted to go out to the general public." You know whether that prophecy has been true.

In 1941, after Britain had borne the brunt of Hitler's assault for a year and a half, after she had used every available dollar of American exchange she possessed, and pledged to American manufacturers of war materials every dollar's worth of investment in any kind of property which any British subject had in the United States, and when she was approaching the time when she could not continue to buy and pay cash, at good prices, for war materials produced in the United States, Britain appealed to the United States for help in getting the materials by which she could hold off Hitler's vicious assault.

President Roosevelt, trying to save the blood of America's men, trying to keep this country out of war, hating war, as he has ever said, but knowing that the only way to keep Hitler and war in Europe and out of America was to keep the British Fleet around Hitler, to keep the Royal Air Force bruising his cruel head, to keep the British Empire with its brave face toward him, called upon the Congress for the passage of the lease-lend bill.

This bill was not to help Britain or Greece or China or Yugoslavia or Russia or anybody else; it was to protect and defend America; it was to save America's men with America's materials; it was to lay a barrier of ships and guns and airplanes between Hitler's ships and guns and airplanes and us, and to do so while there were brave men, supported by braver women, in some liberty-loving lands of the earth left to plead for the chance to man those ships and guns and planes from America.

Yet Senator Wheeler, Senator Nye, Colonel Lindbergh, ex-President Hoover, all this alliance who are the real warmongers of America, rushed to the platform, to the radio, to the columns of the press, to charge Roosevelt and those who stood by him, including the overwhelming majority of the American people, with trying to spill the blood of America, with being warmongers and interventionists—deceiving the people with false issues and false claims.

The wisdom, the courage of America prevailed, and on the 8th of March the lease-lend bill was passed by the American people's Congress, but Senators WHEELER and NYE voted "No."

Who has been the better defender of America—Roosevelt, who tried to stifle the beginning of Hitler's war and called upon others to help him from 1935 up until the very day when the war actually began, or the Wheelers, the Nyes, the Lindberghs, the Hoovers, and other Roosevelt critics, who struck down Roosevelt's hand with their criticism every time he dared to raise it in that holy cause of peace?

Who has been the better defender of America—Roosevelt, who began in 1935 to build a greater Navy to lie around American shores, or Senator WHEELER and Senator NYE, who opposed him?

Who has been the better defender of America—Roosevelt, who in 1939 tried to build a greater air force for America, or Senator WHEELER and Senator NYE, who opposed him?

Who has been the better defender of America—Roosevelt, who tried to put weapons in the hands of those who stood between Hitler and us, or Senators WHEELER and NYE and their allies, who opposed him?

Who has been the better defender of America—Roosevelt, who, after Dunkirk, when Britain was absolutely stripped of guns and shells for her own defense, let her have these guns and shells from our old war stocks, or the Wheelers and the Nyes and their allies, who denounced him for it?

Who has been the better defender of America—Roosevelt, who, when the battle of the Atlantic and Hitler's assassinating submarines had shrunken Britain's hard-pressed Navy, had let Britain have 50 old but reconditioned American destroyers, and got in return therefor naval bases to screen the eastern coast of America and the Panama Canal, or the Wheelers and the Nyes and their allies, who denounced him for it?

Where would America be today if she had followed the counsel of these critics, instead of the leadership of her President, who has dedicated his life to keeping both Hitler and war from our fair land?

Now, this alliance, masquerading behind a slogan which says, "America first," and means "America last" has found a new red herring to drag across the course of American public opinion—Russia. Their eloquent voices, their fervid passion, they have turned upon the people of America, seeking to divide them with hate, prejudice, and confusion. They would deceive the people about the real issue and play with their skilled hands upon whatever credulity they may find. They would have the people of America help Hitler by refusing to help Hitler's enemies. They would pretend that all those who oppose Hitler approve of Hitler's enemies. They would arouse the church and all those whom Russia has wronged, but they say nothing about Hitler, who has denounced God, desecrated the church, persecuted the ministry, ostracized Christ as a contemptible Jew, and by state decree, endeavored to break down the sacred vows of the home and make Germany's unmarried daughters produce cannon fodder for Hitler's conquest of the world.

I AM GLAD RUSSIA HAS GOT IN HITLER'S WAY

Who does not know of a case where the state has welcomed the aid of any criminal who would turn state's evidence to convict any worse criminal? Who has not seen in the forest a fire built to stop a fire?

Who does not see that Russia is not way across the Atlantic, beyond Europe, on the other side of the Urals? It is here—just off the coast of Alaska, its fortifications in sight of Alaska. If Hitler conquers Russia, he will be out of Europe. He will have escaped those alert British ships. He will have slipped out from under that heroic Royal Air Force. He will not have to cross the Pacific. He will be in what are now Russian fortifications; his greedy eyes every day gazing upon the rising sun, which discloses to him the wealth and the glory of our continent and country. When he shall clasp the bloody hand of his ally, Japan, they will tower above the Western Pacific and dominate the whole East, China, India, the Near East, and shortly thereafter Africa—Dakar. Then when their submarines, their raiders, their bombers shall lie within 1,600 miles of Brazil and within 3 miles of Alaska, America will have at last sadly achieved, through Hitler encirclement, the isolation which Senator WHEELER and others so eloquently seek.

I challenge these pretenders to the throne of peace for America to tell America at what price they want peace.

When the braggart of the Mediterranean drove his dagger in France's back, he proclaimed to the world:

"The hour of destiny has arrived for our Fatherland. We are going to war against the decrepit democracies."

"This revolution," he contended, "asserts itself against those who control the riches of the earth.

"It is a struggle of one century against another."

Continuing, he shouted: "This gigantic struggle is only a phase in the development of our revolution. This asserts itself against the stranglers, the rich nations. It is a struggle between young and progressive people as against the decadent people, the struggle of one century as against another century. The dies are now cast."

Listen to Hitler: "Two worlds are in conflict. Two philosophies of life. One of these two worlds must break asunder."

It is well known that the Nazi soldiers' marching song is Today We Own Europe, Tomorrow the Whole World.

Listen to these words from Carl Houshofer, one of Hitler's braintrusters, President of the Geopolitical Institute at Munich:

"A strong determined army of occupation under dynamic National-Socialist command can be recruited overnight in certain parts of the United States. The job of taking over North America will be comparatively simple."

Do you remember what Goering said in 1931, talking about America: "Absolutely unsuspecting people, whom we can fool more easily than any other nation. We will defeat Britain in the next war before the Americans realize that their only protection is gone."

Do these critics tell you these words from Dr. Goebbels:

"We don't worry about America. No military expedition is needed to subdue the United States and teach her humility."

Let these words from Hitler burn into your consciousness, go with you in your sleep:

"Latin America—we shall create a new Germany there. We have a right to this continent. * * * We require two movements abroad, a royal and a revolutionary one. Do you think that is so difficult? I think we are capable of it. We should not be here otherwise.

"We shall not land troops like William the Conqueror and gain Brazil by the strength of arms. Our weapons are not visible ones. It will be a simple matter for me to produce unrest and revolts in the United States so that these gentry will have their hands full with their own affairs. We shall soon have storm troopers in America. * * * We shall have men whom degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge."

Oh, people of America, what can awaken you to your danger? What whipcrack of warning can arouse you until this Nation shall throb with alertness, work, and prayer?

Has America lost the American dream?

Has America's heart become callous, insensible to wrong? Has courage been chased out of the American heart by cowardice? Are America's leaders no longer those long-visioned statesmen of an earlier day?

When God's people and God's Son are assaulted by pharisaical dictators, can they find no defense in America which God has so bountifully blessed?

When men talk of a better world, wherein people shall live happier and fuller lives, free from the torture of want and the shackles of poverty, wherein the mind shall break all prison walls and reach to the peak of the sky and the heart of the earth and to the end of space, wherein the soul, refreshed by the cool waters of overflowing fountains of the spirit, shall soar like birds outrunning sight, beyond time and distance, can they find no America to say "God speed your effort. I will help"?

Greatness carries with it terrific responsibility. You cannot escape it, my fellow Americans, what you think shall determine the kind of a world it is to be. God has a destiny for America. All these long years he has made us what we are. It is now America's time to keep her rendezvous with destiny. By timely and courageous action to keep war out of America I believe—I swear I believe—that America cannot only save the world but her own sons. Every passing day in which we delay cuts down our chance to save either America or America's sons.

God will continue to bless America with peace if we continue to deserve peace.

Pius Louis Schwert

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT did not serve in this body long, and as a result there are not many of you who had occasion to come into contact with him and learn to admire his personality as I did.

Representing the city of Buffalo, having previously served as the county clerk of Erie County, he came to us with very little experience in national politics, and, like all new Members of Congress, was obliged to lean on his older colleagues "to learn the ropes." I take great pride in the fact that I was able to guide him during the few years that he graced Congress with his presence.

Congressman SCHWERT is no more. His genial smile and pleasant personality has been forever removed from this Hall, and he has gone to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler ever returns. He will be remembered, however, and I am sure that the people of the city of Buffalo and the State of New York will always miss his unselfish services and the charm of his personality.

What Is the Situation in the World Today, and What Is Our Relationship to That Situation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in the St. Paul Auditorium, St. Paul, Minn., June 7, 1941:

I am very happy to be here in St. Paul tonight and to have an opportunity to speak to you all on the subject which must be of interest to every citizen in this country. What is the situation in the world today, and what is our relationship to that situation?

First, I would like to say that since arriving here this afternoon I have had a number of letters and one or two telegrams daring me to state their contents and read them. One or two of them I am going to mention to you later on, but I would like to say at the start that it is a perfectly natural thing when people in a free country are discussing points of view that there should be different points of view in many parts of their country.

You are a great audience, and you have listened to many other points of view. I am quite sure that whether you agree with me or whether you don't agree with me you will be willing to listen and tell me later in the question period of your disagreement.

And now we come to the consideration of what is our position today in the world. Most of the world is at war. We, very fortunately, are at peace. That means that our responsibility is probably greater than the responsibility of any other nation, and because we are a great democracy it cannot be the responsibility of any one man. It is the responsibility of every individual in a democracy.

Before we can really look at the situation that we are in today we must look back a little bit, because, while there is little value in looking back, you must know the background sometimes to understand the present, and it is valuable to look back if you are going to learn from what you find of facts in the past. Therefore, I think it is well for us to look back some twenty-odd years to another period of war.

It was a very different kind of war from what war is today. It was a war, perhaps, for different reasons, because in Europe at that time there were economic stresses at various points. There was an age-old tradition of the balance of power to be kept in Europe, and when that war was over there was a peace conference, and at that peace conference probably the only nation that was entirely disinterested was the United States.

Now many people today are wondering just why it was that we ever went into that war. I was in Washington then, and I remember a good deal about it. Underlying any action of any government there are always various reasons, and you have heard and I have heard that there were interests held by people who had money invested in different things abroad that were supposed to have forced us into that war. I think that is probably true of some interests, because at that time and in a number of years that followed the war the Government of our country even was much more under the control of financial interests of this country than it is today.

Then there were some people who went into that war entirely because they believed that there was righteousness on one side that they had to uphold. One of the people who felt that way very strongly was Theodore Roosevelt, who at that time was no longer a young man, but I remember very well when he came to Washington and tried to go into the war in active service.

The Army did not want him, but he did it because he really thought there was something at stake from a moral and spiritual standpoint. I know that, because I heard what he said not only to my own brother, who went into the service with his son, Quentin, but to all his sons. And there were many, many men who went into that war because they felt that something called democracy, which was important to them, was at stake, and they hoped above all that it was a war to end war.

And then there came a peace conference and a curious reaction in many countries. We weren't the only country that was tired of war. A lot of other countries were tired of war, too, and they felt just the way we felt, and they had made greater sacrifices in human lives than we had made, and also they had lost more materially than we had lost. Therefore they felt even more strongly than we did that they wanted to go back to their private business and look after the things that had been let slide in the time of war.

War has one thing about it which Theodore Roosevelt used to emphasize: It makes people rise to sacrifices. They do it willingly because something bigger than themselves is at stake.

But, once it is over, the reaction sets in. It set in in those countries, and they turned right straight back to the old political leadership and the old political intrigues, and the people who had interests in business went back to their business interests, and so did we. And each of us had so many similar experiences, and this is the part of the story I think we sometimes forget. In every one of those countries the economic situation was very bad.

They had a depression, and it was a bad depression before we began to have it. We had a period of wild prosperity, and then suddenly some parts of our country began to have a little less prosperity. We began to hear murmurs from the farming parts of our country. People were mortgaging their farms, and they were losing their farms and their homes. But in other parts of the country, the industrial parts, for a while the wild orgy of prosperity went on. Suddenly, because we had hardship in one part of the country, it began to react on all the country, and we had no longer any prosperity. We were suddenly like the other countries of the world in the depths of a depression.

Now that is something I want you to think about, because it is something perhaps we can learn from. First, the other countries of the world felt the results of a war. A long period of destruction was a contributing factor to this financial depression, but they also felt something that had been going on before the war actually—the result of a

changing period in industry, a period where machinery was displacing human beings.

That has happened before, and always it brings us a period of great difficulty, and we have not as yet learned how to meet it. We have learned this lesson before—we probably will again—but here it was added to the results of a long-drawn-out war, and it hit the countries that lost the most in human life first. Just as here in our own country, we couldn't prosper with one part sick and the other part well. So we eventually went down because we couldn't get on in a world where all of us were not prospering. When the rest of the world was sick, we as a nation couldn't get on, either, because we felt the results of what was happening in the rest of the world.

That is a lesson of the past 20 years that we must study. There is no use in studying history unless you recognize the facts of history and learn something from them. Now, it seems to me that these are facts that we must not forget, because they mean something to us.

We thought at the end of the last war that we could go home and attend to our business and let the rest of the world "go hang." We were sure we could prosper, and we learned we couldn't, and we learned twenty-odd years later that we were facing practically the same difficulties that we faced some twenty-odd years ago.

Now, that is something for us to think about. That is the condition that we must face in the world today. Now, what is our relationship to that condition? You know people, human beings, have to have a life that is worth living for. If they haven't, they don't much care what they do, and they become fairly reckless. They are willing to try anything if life isn't worth while, and, therefore, anyone who has a story to tell, something that gives them a hope, a new idea, that person can get a following. And that is just what happened in Europe.

The most miserable country became for a short time a democracy and then lost its democracy, and it followed someone who offered them a new solution. And because they were told that if they sacrificed, if they disciplined themselves, they could dominate the world, they were ready to listen. It couldn't be any worse than it was; it might be better. And to believe that you are a people that the Lord has directed to dominate the world is a pretty extraordinary thing to believe about your race. And so it is perhaps not so astonishing that they followed someone who would give them that particular thing to hold on to. You will cling to a hope of any kind if it is glamorous and you are miserable.

Well, that leader has continued to make that people believe that they could dominate the world, and even though he has said that he did not begin the war, that the war was begun by Great Britain, it is interesting to note that Austria and Czechoslovakia had lost their freedom before anyone else was on the warpath. And even as each nation was told by this leader that he had no further desire for aggression, the words were hardly out of his mouth when a new country found its freedom gone.

Poland fell, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, and now quite a number of others—that's quite a roster. And always beforehand there was the same pattern, no desire to acquire any more territory; no desire for aggression. And if you read the statements made by this same gentleman to Mr. Cudahy the other day, you will note that he stated that he had never been guilty of aggression, and that it was ridiculous to even think that he would ever dream of attacking the United States. How could such a thing be possible?

Well, I don't know whether it is possible. I only know that when that gentleman says that it isn't possible it makes one stop and think, because those are the words he has used rather often.

Now, the world has changed a great deal since that other war twenty-odd years ago, and war itself has changed a great deal. It isn't a war of great armies facing each other today. It is a war of navies, of airplanes, of mechanization, tanks, and guns. Armies, yes, but without the other things they are not very much use.

And then, back of everything else, it is a war of peoples, a war of morale of the citizens in their own homes. Who can stand up the longest against anxiety and death coming unexpectedly from the skies and loss of the things that you have lived with and known around you? Who can stoically accept this new kind of war? Today it is a war of the morale of peoples as well as a war of the military organizations of nations.

Now, I don't believe that the people of any of these nations, not even that particularly unhappy German Nation, really wanted to go to war. I think they accepted it because there wasn't really anything else to do, and I think that is so of every single one of the other nations. They defended themselves when they could, submitted when they had to, because there was no alternative but extinction.

No one in their sane mind wants to go to war. That is one of the things I was told to ask you tonight: "Do you want to go to war?" I think it is a stupid question, because I can't imagine any people in their sane senses wanting to go to war. Just the same, a lot of people that haven't wanted to go to war have met war in their country, and that is the question which is before us, and here comes again our relationship to the world situation today.

Where does the defense of a nation begin? Now, the President has said in the past, and I think he would say it again, that we want nothing from any other nation; that we only want to defend our own country.

It is open, however, for discussion as to what is the defense of your country, and that is where we must again think, and think a little bit further than the ends of our noses, because if you wait until war comes to you in your own country—that's what Denmark and Norway and Finland and all the other countries did—you may find you have waited too long for effective defense. There is something to be said today for listening to what the experts who study modern warfare have to say on this subject.

There is a great deal written by people in magazines and press articles on these subjects, but they are not all students and experts. There are many new things that are known today that we didn't know 6 months ago, and we know them because of the experience of other people. I will give you a good example:

I was in an airplane factory not long ago, and I saw some planes there and I asked what they were doing and they said, "Oh, they have come back to have the new tanks put in." A new invention to meet new needs.

Now it is all very well to read what all kinds of people say, but in our situation, in our relationship to the rest of the world I think we had better have in mind the fact that there are people who study the situation carefully, and we had better trust in these people rather than in those who think they know, but who may not have the opportunity to know all there is to know about our relationship to the present situation.

I think that in view of the facts that we have before us today there are many things that we ought to consider. We must clarify in our minds first of all what we think constitutes the defense of our country. Is it to wait within our shores until we are attacked, or is it to prevent if possible the opportunity of any country to obtain a footing which may endanger our safety in the future?

Now it is not only the military point of view that we have to consider because, after all, this military business, as I told you, is a business for experts. We can't know all the things that are going on in the war field today; neither can we know just exactly what production we have or how quickly it is growing. I am told that we are doing much better than we did before the previous World War even when we were in it, but I have no way of checking on that. You have no way of checking that. The newspapers have no way. I can only tell you that I asked my husband if he had a way, and he said he had just acquired a private statistician to try and find out just exactly what was happening. So on the technical military things we will have to take for granted that there are people who really have the interests of the country at heart and whose job it is to work on them.

There are other things, however, that we have to consider, and which I think we can all understand. What would happen if there was a Hitler victory in Europe? Quite aside from the military angle of it and from possible attack on South America or on ourselves, what would happen if there was a Hitler victory in Europe which would affect us?

We are being told every day that what we are being asked to do is to help Great Britain. Now, I am always interested in that, because I have an idea that no nation in this world has ever shown itself so unselfish and so disinterested that it helps another equally large nation without any self-interest being involved. So when that is said I at once begin to wonder just why we would, out of the kindness of our hearts, help Great Britain.

For a long while I have had people say to me, "Well, the British owe us money. Other nations owe us money. Why should we bother with Great Britain?" Why, indeed? The only reason we bothered about them in the last few years was that we needed their trade. Now, they tell you that all we have to do is use a little ingenuity and we could live to ourselves alone. Well, we haven't been able to do it in the past twenty-odd years or more.

When we don't sell our cotton, for instance, what happens? That little balance of trade is what gives us the chance to keep our prices up at home and to give us a higher standard of living than obtains today in any other country in the world. We heard at lunch today about the poverty of certain agricultural workers in Chile.

Now, I know just what the difficulties and the sore spots are in every part of our country, and heaven knows we have plenty. I know a lot of things I'd like to see changed. I know a lot of things that I don't think should exist in a real democracy. But I am going to give you one indication of the difference in our standard of living and the standard of living anywhere else in the world.

Since the war I have been asked to "adopt," or rather, just help to support orphans in other countries. I have at present a Chinese orphan that costs me $20 a year. Twenty dollars a year will feed a child in China today. I have a Polish orphan, a Finnish orphan, an English orphan, and I had a Spanish orphan. This last child has disappeared since they took them out of France back into Spain, so I haven't got that child any more. All those children require $10 a month apiece to feed and support them. Having those children, I decided that I should have an American orphan. I pay for my American child $6 a week. There is your difference in standard of living and what it costs to really do a thing in the most economical way possible because orphans aren't extravagant. They are supported on a restricted standard anywhere in the world.

Now, I want to point the moral to my tale by saying that I don't think when they come to us and say that we must help Great Britain that we are actuated by any desire just to be kind to Great Britain. We thought it over very carefully, and we decided that in the past we needed trade. In the future we were going to need trade.

We knew what freedom of the seas meant to trade under Great Britain's control of the sea. We could imagine what no freedom of the seas would mean if Hitler controlled the seas. Another thing to think about—we are not just being kind to Great Britain. Nations are selfish. I wish we were more intelligently selfish and looked far enough ahead to realize that somewhere along the line there has got to come a time when we will realize that the real good of our race, as well as the good of the rest of the world, depends in the future on cooperation. Selfishness—intelligent selfishness—may lie in thinking about what is good for the whole world, not just what is good for the United States of America.

However, at the moment, I think our relationship to the world situation is perhaps not yet quite prepared for that point of view. We have taken the point of view, however, that it is better for us, as a nation, to aid Great Britain, first of all, because we think about this question of future trade; and, second, because of the foreign economic situation which a Hitler victory will bring to us.

Now, this is no imaginary situation. This is very easy to forecast. Leaving the military thing out of it completely, they tell us, Why should you be afraid of competition with Germany when you have always had to compete with Great Britain? Well, I am not afraid of competition with any country, if it is fair and open competition. We had the intelligence to have the edge on almost any other country, but competition with a Hitler-organized Europe wouldn't be fair and open competition because a great area would be practically slave labor, and a great part of the skilled working group would be just as skilled as any working group we have in this country. It would also have the same advantages of advanced machinery and industrial plants which we have.

Shipyards, machine shops, and all the things that we have, besides a reservoir to draw from in Africa similar to what we have in South America. A population, if you take the whole of Europe and Africa and add in Japan—because Japan probably would be in the combination—of between four hundred and fifty and five hundred million people. Now, that is a sum in arithmetic which we want to remember.

If we had the United States, plus Canada and South America, which would have to be like Africa, a country which you draw on not for skilled labor but for raw materials, we would have between one hundred and seventy-five and one hundred and eighty-five million people. That is a sum in arithmetic that is worth remembering. Four hundred and fifty to five hundred million people on one side and a hundred and seventy-five million to one hundred and eighty-five million on the other.

So I think it is quite clearly the part of self-interest to try to prevent a Hitler victory over the whole of Europe. Those are all, I think, very simple considerations which in thinking about the position of the world and our relationship to it we have to face as a battleground. That takes care of the reasons why we face certain situations today.

It gives us a reason for our military preparation; it gives us a reason for our belief that it is well to help Great Britain while she fights, if we possibly can. It gives us a reason to consider where the defense of America begins, and I think that is something we must consider.

No President, I don't care who he is, wants to send his people to war. No President takes that responsibility without consulting his people, without trying to get the feeling of what his people believe is right and what they believe is in their interest. Therefore, it is an obligation on the people of a democracy to really look at the whole picture. I know you can't be military experts; I know I can't be, but it is possible to try to know and to understand the facts of a situation. It is possible to face what you can do and what it is up to you to do.

I think that it is up to us to make up our minds not only as to what our obligation is to defend our country but what our obligation is at home to make our country worth defending. While we are not at war we have that obligation which we cannot escape. Once you are in a war there is only one thing you can think about, and that is winning the war, because there is nothing else you can do until peace returns.

So every one of us has the obligation to study their own country, their own community, and realize their individual obligation to see that their community has everything possible done to make it a place worth living in. If we could do that over this country in every community, we would really see the progress which democracy must mean.

Our forefathers laid down a principle. They said we had a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have a right to it, yes; but it depends on every one of us on what we do with our citizenship, on what we are willing, all of us, to put into the common pot in cooperating together to make that possible for every individual citizen in our own communities. There is no use fooling ourselves. There are many people in this country who either because of race or religion or economic conditions do not enjoy either liberty or the opportunity to pursue happiness.

Now it is up to every single one of us in our own community to try to make our democracy move forward. Only as we do that have we the slightest chance to say to the rest of the world, "This is what we offer you. This is what gives people a chance."

I can't answer the boy who wrote to me the other day and said, "I don't know why I should fight for democracy. I am a strong, healthy boy, and I have had 2 years of unemployment. Now I have got a job at $15 a week making materials to kill some other kids that I don't know somewhere else in the world, and I don't think it is worth it." Well, I don't think it is worth it either.

I think we have only one thing that we can say to youngsters who have been through that, and that is this: At least in our country we as individuals have a chance to vote for our representatives and to see that they really do the things we want; to remove them if they don't. At least here it lies with us as individuals—not with any one person or a thing called a state, but with us as individuals—to take our part in the Government. Even that kid had his vote, and therefore he had the hope that some day he might join with all the other people in this country who care about what happens to human beings to make this country really meet their needs. You can't do it by standing still. Democracy is something that must move forward. It is not just a government—it is a way of life—and our representative has got to see that every individual citizen senses this personal responsibility. Only that way can you actually say we have something worth defending—a country that is growing in a realization of its obligations to all the citizens, to every human being; a country that is finding more and more that it is one great, unified nation.

We come from all the nations of the world. We have no reason for being a nation because of a geographical boundary, because of a racial background. The thing that makes us a nation is an ideal, and to that ideal we have given our devotion and our belief, our adherence, our work. We have learned to play together, to live together, and it is because we have learned that that I can't help having a feeling that now that the time has come for us to defend this idea that we are going to do it all of us together; that we are going to believe that it is worth defending. We have made a nation that is worth defending because it is growing; and if people will believe that, they will do everything they can for that defense.

We are going to be asked to take part in a program of civilian defense. That will mean something for every man and woman to do at home, to do for the defense of the country. It may not all be very spectacular, because the spectacular things do not come when a nation is at peace

Someone asked me the other day if all of the women were going to do the same things that were being done in England, and I said "Thank God, they don't have to at present." We can do things now that will make our country and community better places to live in, and they will be really definite things to do. They will deal with better nutrition; they will deal with more recreation for our youngsters; they will deal with better educational measures.

Yes; if you want to learn to drive ambulances, if you want to learn what you do in case of black-outs and bombings—well, it is a good thing to learn, but for the moment it isn't your obligation. You can go to the Red Cross, which offers you all kinds of training, valuable training both now and in case of need. You can go to the United Service Organizations and do definite work for them, helping in many ways to make life better for the boys moving to camps for training. There are any number of things that men and women will do besides the military things in their communities.

Then you have got here in this country one more responsibility. You have got to think what kind of a world you want to help build when peace does come. You have got to build in yourselves now the kind of character and the kind of fortitude which meets whatever comes and is able to cope with it once you have made up your mind as to the position that you take in the present situation. But no matter what your position is, you know that some day there will be peace in the world.

It may be the kind of a world in which you will have nothing to say, but if it is the kind of a world in which you can have something to say, then you have got to feel the responsibility of thinking very clearly how you want your influence to be brought to bear in making it impossible to repeat the mistakes that were made after the last war. We don't want to go to war every 20 or 30 years and live miserably in between. Let us think what we want to do in the world of the future.

Do you really want a world disarmament? Do you really want to sit down around a table and discuss a world economy in which you perhaps have to sacrifice something so that other people in the world may eat, too? That is a new thing for us to be thinking about. That is that unselfish selfishness that I was talking about. Something like that has got to be thought about if we are going to ever do away with war.

Some people say it can't be done, but, anyway, we have got to be thinking about it if we are going to try to do it. And no other nation can think as we think. No other nation is free to think as we are free to think. No other nation is free to discuss as we are free to discuss. No other nation today has the prosperity even to think that they will be able to help build a world in the future. Now, that makes for us a grave responsibility,

so grave that sometimes I think you must go to bed at night and wonder whether you are worthy of the responsibility that is yours today in being a citizen in this country. I go to bed night after night wondering if there is anything that I could do to help bear the burdens of the decisions that we as individual citizens have to be making in the next few years if we are going to be worthy of trying to bring a permanent peace to the world.

It is something, I think, that you and I and every other citizen of this country should pray daily to be given grace so that we may have wisdom, may have courage, may have fortitude to meet our responsibilities, to be grateful for the things that are ours, and to hope that some day we may bring to all the people of our Nation a realization that was the dream of our forefathers.

Wheat Marketing Quota Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, most Members of Congress from wheat-growing sections are recipients of many wires and telegrams from their farmer constituents protesting against the marketing quota program and particularly against the penalty of 49 cents per bushel which has been imposed upon the sale of excess quota wheat. I do not care to go into a discussion of the penalty provisions at this time except to say that I do not favor their repeal. If we are going to have artificial price fixing for wheat based upon Government loans higher than the market, it must be accompanied by the control of production or marketing, or both. Otherwise, the history of the Farm Board will be repeated. The imposition of the 49-cent penalty on the sale of wheat is not intended to be a revenue-raising measure. It is not intended as a fine on the noncooperator. Its purpose is to keep surplus wheat off the market until it can be absorbed without depressing the price. If the penalties go then I think the loans will have to go also.

However, I am much impressed with the justice of many of the complaints which are coming in relative to the administration of the quota provisions. I think a great deal of trouble can be avoided by some simple changes in the regulations. For instance, the regulations define "acreage of wheat" as seeded acreage rather than harvested acreage. Let us see what this means in actual practice. Here is a farmer who had an allotment of 50 acres. He plants 75; 50 acres are winter-killed; 25 acres are harvested. In other words, instead of producing over his allotment, the farmer actually harvested half of his allotment. He in no way contributed to the surplus. Is there any reason why he should not be permitted to sell all of the wheat from his 25 harvested acres without paying a penalty? Those in charge of the wheat program of the A. A. A. seem to think that there is. They say that before he can sell a bushel he will have to pay a penalty of 49 cents a bushel on the normal production of his seeded excess of 25 acres or come to the county committee and assume the burden of proving his actual production on the entire 75 acres. Even in that case he will have to pay a penalty of 49 cents per bushel on one-third of his proven production before he can sell as much as a bushel.

To me this seems an unreasonable and arbitrary ruling. Yet it is being applied to thousands of wheat farmers throughout the country who seeded more than their acreage allotments but who harvested less than their acreage allotments, due to winter-killing, insect damage, droughts, floods, and hail. Is it any wonder that farmers are holding protest meetings and demanding that Congress do something about the situation?

Occupation of Iceland

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt's order to the Navy to clear the Atlantic is a virtual declaration of war without the action of the Congress. I shall be very much surprised if the order does not lead to an armed engagement between the United States and Germany within the next few weeks.

The occupation of Iceland is relatively unimportant compared to the President's order to clear the Atlantic in sea lanes 2,500 miles removed from our shores, in a zone declared to be combat waters, and far from the scope either of the Monroe Doctrine or defense of the Western Hemisphere.

At this rate, the Azores, Dakar, and the Cape Verde Islands are also in the Western Hemisphere, and we shall soon be hearing that our first line of defense starts at the Dneiper.

As I understand the President's order, the Navy has been told to shoot at any Axis vessel, sea or air, venturing into the waters around Iceland or in the entire western Atlantic. If we shoot, we can be sure that those shot at will shoot back. If that will not be war, I do not know by what other name it can be called. All of this, of course, was told to the Congress after it had been done, so that the people or their Representatives had no opportunity to say whether they wanted war or whether they did not. The bald fact that the majority of the people still do not want war and that a declaration of war could not muster a handful of votes in Congress makes the President's order even more dangerous.

Secretary Knox, keeper of the keys to the back door to war, practically declared war all by himself, even while the occupation of Iceland was under consideration by the administration. General Marshall followed him by demanding provisions for another A. E. F.

What has happened to President Roosevelt's solemn pledge of October 30, 1940, to the mothers and fathers of America that their sons would not be sent to foreign battlefields? Or was that just campaign hokum? What has happened to the four freedoms for which the President has so eloquently pleaded? The only freedom we have left here is to answer "Ja" to the President's proclamations.

America, Keep Out of War

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, after the President notified the Congress that he sent the marines to Iceland, I picked up the newspapers the next day and I saw an advertisement by the Fight for Freedom Committee stating, "Now, it is up to you, Mr. Congressman. We have got to fight this war."

What war? Whose war? I want to know.

May I say to the people who put this advertisement in the papers that it is not up to me. I am not for war. I am against war. I am against sending our boys to Europe, and I am going to do everything I can to keep America out of war, and I want those people to know it.

I want to say to the people who are paying for these advertisements that America does not want to fight any war in order to settle the differences in Europe, Asia, or Africa. That is not our business, never was, and never should be. We have enough to do if we stay in the Western Hemisphere and attend to our own business, as we like good Americans should.

Now what is the situation today. We took one more step toward war Monday when the President of the United States notified the Congress that he is now taking over Iceland to protect it. What right has the President of the United States to assume that authority and responsibility? He says that he will convoy materials to Iceland. You remember what the President said, that to convoy means shooting and shooting means war. And that warning from the President of the United States is now being

disobeyed by the third-term President. We all remember the campaign promise made by the President on October 30, 1940, when he made this promise to the American people, and I quote:

> And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before and I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

And now the President of the United States has assumed the authority without the consent of Congress to send your sons to Iceland. Certainly Iceland is in Europe or in the Eastern Hemisphere. No one can deny it and the promise made by the President to keep your sons out of war—certainly the President knows that this is one more step toward entering the great world war and America should be very, very careful that it does not be the aggressor and enter the conflict and have to carry the burden of fighting Europe, Asia, and Africa when the whole world will be against us. God forbid that America get into this terrible orgy of fighting, but let us offer our good offices in every way possible to settle the terrible struggle that is now going on all over the world. Certainly we can cultivate the good-neighbor policy by kindness more than with bullets and we will not sacrifice the manhood of America and wreck our Nation financially by so doing.

Guerilla Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, America has set itself to the serious task of rearmament. It should be a single-purpose undertaking. It should command the attention and the ability of all citizens. It should be so all-consuming in its demands that personal piques and political prejudices would disappear. It should be a persuasive force upon those who in times past have felt that private enterprise was a convenient whipping boy for demagogic appeals, and also upon those who have hoped that the persecution of private capital was an easy avenue to some type of state socialism.

Unfortunately, those conditions which should be present have not materialized since the defense program was started. The contrary has been the case. Day by day evidence accumulates which proves that the failure of production to measure up to estimates is due, in large part, to the guerilla warfare which has been, and is being waged by political sharpshooters in the Cabinet against the leaders of industry. As the evidence is examined, one cannot fail but to be impressed with the idea that the brains of the industrial life of the Nation are grudgingly endured or subtly rejected by those in Washington who enjoy the favor of the administration and are permitted to wield its power. Doctrinaries of radical social philosophies and boastful exponents of the theory of state ownership insist that their pet hobbies and their choice hates must take precedence over the established ability of the executives of private enterprise. In the meantime, scheduled deliveries are eagerly awaited by thoughtful men who are alarmed as they see the fearful frustration and failure. That which should be a closely coordinated endeavor continues to be a palpably plain conflict of effort.

At no time in the Nation's history has a more wholehearted and sincere assurance been given to the call of the Government for assistance than that which was provided by the industrial leadership of the country when the rearmament program was undertaken. That assurance had about it, not only sentimentalism, but the all-essential qualities of substantial capacity and skill. To see that assurance ignored and to know that those who have tendered it are humiliated should cause real concern to everyone who is aware of our pressing needs. There have been some expressions of suspicion that certain champions of a new order, who stand in places of authority, would welcome the failure of private enterprise to measure up to requirements, so that Government ownership and operation would appear to be a necessity. It is to be hoped that such suspicion has no foundation, and that no enthusiast would stoop so low as to invite national disaster by peddling political wares at a time such as this. The job to be done is not huckstering, but the more serious work of hastening our production to the point where a sense of security will be ours.

Incidentally, it appears that the most vituperative antagonists of private enterprise are among the most bellicose members of the official family. To some men, warfare is a way of life.

The Consumer Credit Loan Condition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, over a considerable period of time I have been interested in the small-loan organizations that are operating in this country, and for the past year, with the cooperation of an outstanding economist, I have accumulated information on this subject which prompted me to file House Resolution 251 on June 27, and I am requesting the chairman of the Rules Committee to grant me a hearing on this resolution at the earliest possible moment.

Approximately 15,000,000 borrowers have mortgaged the future in their impatient desire to be freed from the anxieties of their present circumstances. In the aggregate, their indebtedness is something over $2,000,000,000.

This great number of people owing these billions does not sound like many people or much money in these days of billions; but it is obvious that, with such a multitude having bartered off a portion of their future for the present, it has and will have a dominant effect on the present and future economics of the whole Nation.

This social and economic condition is worthy of sober, objective thought. If it is a healthy one, it should be encouraged; if unhealthy, treated with a political and economic doctrine of common sense.

The political doctrines or laws governing the making of loans in small amounts have been based upon expected future human conduct and surmised economic trends.

The future activities of these two elements confound the tables of the mathematicians and the wishes of economists, sociologists, and lawmakers. Somehow or another, human beings just will not come out mathematically even unless the common proven and accepted doctrines of economic exchanges are applied.

The need of a small amount of money by an individual is, in the aggregate, no different from the need of any other object that produces human happiness.

What is money that is available to loan out to those who desire it for any one of the multitude of things that it purchases? It is so much stored value, the tangible representative of as much physical property as was given in exchange for it; in other words, a stock of money.

To the borrower, this stock of money represents the identical thing that his desire or need demands to fulfill his wants. He comes into possession of the wanted amount by selling a specified portion of his future earnings, to be delivered in the future to the owner of the stock of money. In other words, due to an impatient desire, he has swapped his future for the present.

The borrower's future that he trades off is his credit money that he issues. True, it is only his promise, and that which he traded it for was only a promise; but due to the fact that it is earned and stored value issued by the Government and legal tender for debt, it is greater in value than his yet-to-be-earned credit money given in exchange. The difference in value depends upon five main factors: First, the amount of cash and credit money exchanged; second, the time in which the credit money is to be delivered; third, the amount of credit money already issued; fourth, the reasonable expectancy of the amount of credit money that will or can be earned, and hence issued; and, fifth, the volume of business done by the firm with whom he executes his exchange.

Individual credit money is comparable to cash money to the extent that the integrity, physical assets, and production

capacity of the issuing medium determine its exchange value.

Ceiling prices on given amounts is the way that the law measures the difference in the value of these two different kinds of money. This ceiling rate varies generally in the various States from 1 percent per month on the amount owed each month to 3½ percent per month on the deferred balance owed each month. Usually these rates are limited to amounts of less than $500.

Under various plans and different schemes of lender operation, fitted into some 200 different laws and a thousand or so court decisions, plus volumes of administrative rules, these 15,000,000 borrowers issue their credit money. Consequently there is a literal babel of misunderstanding of what is economically good or bad in that branch of consumer credit that deals in small loans. As an example of this confusion, the States of Virginia and Maryland each have 3½ percent per month laws on amounts owed, whereas the present District of Columbia bill permits 2 percent per month on like sums.

In this enlightened age a consumer, under our present system of credit regulation, needs, or has been made to think he needs, some cash money. He has been hounded by all of the modern methods known to the advertising profession—direct mail, newspaper advertising, radio, and others. Of course, he needs money. Who does not? But an applicant for a small loan is not served in accordance with his economic needs, but is loaned an amount that is the most profitable to the lender under the rate provisions of the law in force in his respective State.

If the law is 1 percent per month or thereabouts, the high rate of 20 percent per transaction is charged usually for 2 weeks or 1 month. Reduced to dollars per transaction, this percentage is $1 for $5, $2 for $10, and so on, up to $5 for $50. Under this system of operation loans are not made for amounts in excess of $50, except in rare instances, but these loans are not paid off on the date that they are due. The lender lends the borrower an amount that he knows he will be unable to pay off on the due date; hence a forced renewal every 2 weeks for several months. The average time that a borrower stays on the books of a lender in this type is 2 years. In the jargon of the trade, this is called "high rate." It is estimated that over 5,000,000 borrowers are indebted on these oppressive contracts today.

In the States where the lending business is operated under the Uniform Small Loan Act, as sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation, and like laws, instead of deflating the borrower's credit by lending him a small sum, the lenders inflate it by loaning him more than he needs, and for the longest period practicable to them. This system of operation has the effect of keeping the borrower on the books for periods of time ranging from 4 to 10 years. Debt slavery of the borrower by this method is accomplished by many schemes and high-pressure selling methods. For instance, the lenders insist, regardless of the fact that the other debts are not pressing or in default, that all outstanding obligations be incorporated into one loan, and as soon as the obligation is reduced the borrower is, by some trick, induced to increase it to the original amount or more; again he is sold on the idea of putting the amount advanced to him in excess of his needs in a savings account for a rainy day, but when the proverbial rainy day arrives it isn't there; consequently he is loaned up to the limit again, and on and on. Over 10,000,000 borrowers are indebted under this plan of lending.

As a rule, lending companies do not exchange credit information with other creditors. This gives them many advantages, both over the borrowers and other creditors. These creditors are more apt to extend credit under such circumstances. The lender, due to this situation, and the fact that he usually has a better knowledge of the borrower's weaknesses, is in a much better position to enforce collection of his loan to the detriment of other creditors.

The commercial banks have been slow in engaging in the small-loan business. Their reluctance is attributed to three causes. With some it is the fact that they are loaning to those engaged in the business and have large sums on deposit belonging to lenders; with others it is the fact that in their minds the business is burdening people with unnecessary debt; and still others a fear of the stigma that is attached to the business. This last embargo is the present-day lender's best friend. It keeps out competition, and always has done so.

A gross profit of from 30 to 42 percent per annum on an outlay of many hundreds of millions is no mean war chest in influencing the right kind of social attitude and political thinking in reference to an economic problem that has been controversial, since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary—especially when the law is uniform in twenty-odd States, is sponsored by an outstanding social and economic foundation, the legal-aid societies of many of the States, and other circles of influence.

The Russell Sage Foundation does not sponsor the acts of the lenders under the law that it sponsors. This is best evidenced by the fact that the large chain lenders are directly and indirectly inspiring colleges to hold consumer-credit conferences which draw conclusions based upon cold, mathematical equations mobilized by lending institutions, and based upon the system of operation of those furnishing the data.

A characteristic instance of this instrument of propaganda is a recent conference held at a west coast university. One of the large chain loan companies had 11 of its most highly paid employees present, 9 of whom were from the far east. In addition to these, there was the secretary of an institute that specializes in statistics and surveys that have to do with what the large chain lenders hold to be sound lending policies. In company with the secretariat were several college professors from eastern colleges who are on the advisory committee of the institute. Then there were other institute heads and college professors that did not seem to have any means of getting to the conference without lender patronage, either directly or indirectly. Perhaps in an instance or two the schools may have paid the cost of the entrainment.

But if an economic structure that is designed to aid social and economic progress is good why does it take 25 years and several times that amount in millions of dollars to keep proving it?

Certified audits of selected States prove that the companies operating under the law make only a reasonable profit; but these audits do not show all of the ramifications of general headquarters supervision expense and exorbitant attorney's fees nor donations to nonprofit institutes.

At the outset of the adoption of these laws in the several States, the reason given for the high rate of charge was to the effect that the banks would not make loans to this social level. In a Western State one of its banks is making the identical loan to the same borrowers that the personal loan companies make them to, at 6 percent per annum, on deferred balances and in amounts of $50. This bank does not require the borrower to take more than he needs; nor does it encourage him to do so; or will it take the borrower "out of soak" when he has been overloaded by the other lenders.

Prejudicial thinking has always prevailed in the making of laws regulating the small-loan business. All of the prejudice of public opinion is focused on the rate of interest charged by the lender. It best serves the purposes of the lending fraternity to keep the public attitude fixed on the rate. The modern so-called legal-rate lender uses rate of charge as a smoke screen for all of the other sharp practices indulged in by him.

Following fundamental sociological axioms of crowd behavior has enabled the large chain lenders, directly or indirectly, to virtually dictate State regulation, law making, and lending practices throughout the Nation. With a few exceptions, all of the national chain lenders operate at legal rate in the States where the law permits and at higher rates elsewhere.

In the States in which the Uniform Small Loan Act is in effect high raters are operating clandestinely. An outstanding example of this fact is the New York City loan-shark exposé and successful prosecution.

In some 15 States which have not yet passed the uniform law the high-rate business flourishes. Some of the Southern States are in a worse condition than that with which the officials of New York State had to deal.

Such a national economic condition is worthy of national consideration. Whatever people use as a medium of exchange to meet their needs, be it shells, buttons, or their future expectancy, is their money.

There is no intention here to decry consumer credit buying or lending. It is as essential to our economic stability and social progress as our cash money that is coined, regulated, and controlled by the Congress.

Government must have some regulation of money, with practically every con-

sumer group in the Nation issuing its own credit money in exchange for its needs, some consideration must be given to this problem.

The need of congressional consideration is particularly true when this large group of the most needy is having their credit money inflated or deflated at the will or whim of a group of lenders, which, if allowed to go on, will ultimately control the credit money of the Nation. Interest paying is comparable to playing poker with a hole in the middle of the table. If the game goes on long enough, all of the money eventually goes into the kitty. Time cuts the pot for the money lender.

The financial regency now in control of the small-loan business got its start in World War No. 1. Twenty percent per transaction on an approximate $15,000,000 nest egg in 1915 has hatched a billion dollar financial structure. Unchecked in the present defense boom, what will it be? The lenders are buying up commercial banks and insurance companies, and in their spare time they are organizing discount companies to finance credit sales for small independent merchants.

The banks of the country are full of money. Surely the people who must borrow to live are entitled to some sensible efforts on their behalf. The borrower has ever been the slave of the lender. To solve the problem intelligently and effectively requires a comprehensive study and ascertainment of all the factors involved.

A complete exploration of this subject will result in a saving of hundreds of millions of dollars to the workers and common people of the country.

This period is one in which every source and avenue of conservation for the protection of our Government and way of life is required. The problem must be solved.

Address to Graduating Class of Public School 170, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS OF C. GORDON LAMUDE

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from speech of C. Gordon Lamude delivered on June 24, 1941, before the graduating class of public school 170, of the city of New York, Parsons Boulevard and Gilman Avenue, Jamaica, Queens County, N. Y.:

Members of the class of 1941 of public school 170, my fondest hope and wish for you is a world of peace.

Twenty-four years ago this month I occupied a seat similar to yours in a grammar-school graduating class. This country had but 2 months before entered into the first World War. Scarcely 6 months later, a first-year high-school student, I had to march from our school with my fellow students, lads of 14 to 17 years of age, to the Seventh Regiment Armory on Sixty-ninth Street and Park Avenue, New York City. There we were trained and drilled for 2 hours each week by Regular Army officers. This brought home forcefully to our young minds the meaning of war, its disruptive influence on young lives, and gave life to the full meaning and import of the dreadful reports in the daily newspapers depicting the horrors of armed conflict. This has left an indelible imprint on my mind. And so, when I pray for a world of peace for you, I do not refer to a similar training and preparation. The present preparedness program of our country will undoubtedly obviate the necessity of drilling and training boys between 14 and 18 years of age.

However, there is not one of you, young boys and girls, and members of this graduating class, who will not be greatly affected and undoubtedly the course of your lives changed in the event that the United States participates in the present war conflagration that has involved the entire Eastern Hemisphere. You know from your geography classes that practically all of Europe is bathed in bloodshed, that practically all of Asia has been for years stirred to sanguinary strife, that the issues of war have poured over into nearly all of Africa, and that Australia, which is really a sixth continent, has sent the flower of her manhood into the fiery furnace that is consuming the present generation. The Western Hemisphere of North and South America is the only land which remains untouched by the blood-dripping hands of Mars. When I express my hope of peace for you, it is my prayer that our hemisphere and our great United States should remain out of the present contest of power politics or war for the control of the continent of Europe.

As young Americans who will in a few years undertake the management and direction of our Government, who are the beneficiaries of the sacrifices of our forefathers and our own parents, who are the recipients of the great blessings of freedom and the traditions of our country, it should be your present purpose, youthful as you are, to insure that these blessings shall remain secure. If we enter the present conflagration, it follows as a natural step that we must give up this freedom and our traditions to a dictatorship.

While the declaration of war between Germany and Russia is too recent for anyone as yet to venture an opinion as to its effect upon this country, let us now resolve that we shall consider any change in our present program of peace and preparedness with calm deliberation and selfish devotion to our own welfare. But the fact that Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Communist Russia are now warring on each other shows clearly how ridiculous it would be for this country to enter this war at the present time or in the near future. For I do not distinguish between dictatorships—Hitler, of Germany; Mussolini, of Italy; or Stalin, of Russia—they all spring from the same loins of dictatorship. To espouse the cause of one against another is equally fraught with danger to ourselves. Let us, therefore, review the recent developments and weigh them carefully. In my opinion, the war between Germany and Russia gives us less reason for even considering involving this country in war.

In conclusion, young graduates, it is my hope that on this glorious occasion you have received some real food for future thought and that you will join in my prayer of peace for you and resolve that you will only be in favor of our country entering the war when it is just and equitable and necessary for the sake of our principles and traditions.

Defense Plants in Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT, TO HON. PAUL J. KILDAY, OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the policy of the War Department in locating newly established defense industries. A couple of months ago, Mr. William S. Knudsen, Director, Office of Production Management, was interrogated on this point by the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas, before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. The questions and answers are as follows:

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Knudsen, in the early days I believe the National Defense Advisory Commission issued a policy with reference to the location of newly established defense industries, and there were a number of considerations in that policy with reference to the availability of labor, and so on, and as to the locality, to the effect that they should be placed strategically, from a defense standpoint?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. And that included the territory between the Alleghanies and the Rockies and far enough from the borders and the coasts?

Mr. KNUDSEN. 200 miles.

Mr. KILDAY. Have you pretty generally adhered to that?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir. Of course, you must understand that we have expanded some plants, but they were outside the line because we could not move them away from there.

Mr. KILDAY. As I understand it, that has applied to new installations?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILDAY. And you have adhered to that pretty carefully?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILDAY. Is it still your intention to do that?

Mr. KNUDSEN. It is still our intention to do that; yes.

Mr. KILDAY. That would apply to those plants financed through contracts made by the Government contracting agencies?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILDAY. Would it also apply to plants which might apply to the R. F. C. for financing, and require your recommendation?

Mr. KNUDSEN. I think that has been followed there also.

Mr. KILDAY. My city is located about 150 miles from the Mexican border and about 150 miles from the Gulf Coast, and I take it we would be pretty badly out of line.

Mr. KNUDSEN. The only thing I would suggest is that you have a little industry of your own. Of course, I do not make the maps.

I would like to make a statement for the record. This matter of plant locations, of course, is quite a ticklish subject whenever

we have them to place. But we have no brief for any particular place in the United States. We began in the O. P. M. to try to do it as fairly as we knew how. We have not any particular pet location in the United States.

Mr. KILDAY. Your idea is to put these places where they would not be in danger from attack?

Mr. KNUDSEN. The map was given us by the General Staff, showing the locations for strategic reasons.

Mr. KILDAY. And that is the continuing policy, so far as possible?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not hold you responsible for any advertisements in newspapers, but this morning the Washington papers carry quite a large advertisement by the Southern Governors' Conference.

Mr. KNUDSEN. I was asked to lunch with them, and I was there because I came here this afternoon.

Mr. KILDAY. I want to read you the third paragraph of that advertisement. It says:

"Up to January 31, seven and one-half billions of national-defense contracts (excluding shipbuilding) had been let, of which only 7 percent were placed in 11 Southern States. Of a total of 302 new plants, only 24 were located in the South."

Can you tell me whether or not that is roughly correct?

Mr. KNUDSEN. I imagine it would be. I imagine it would not be put there unless it was correct. But we are not over there, as you know.

Mr. KILDAY. Here is another paragraph:

"Of the eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts awarded up to February 15, a total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies of financially interrelated groups of companies. This short-sighted policy of centralizing national-defense contracts is dangerous to the welfare of the Nation because it will inevitably result in—"

And then they detail three things:

"1. A shortage of labor and, therefore, the movement of large labor reserves out of the South into highly industrialized areas, making for more congestion and creating vast economic problems when the emergency is over.

"2. Create intolerable bottlenecks in transportation of both raw materials into the congested industrial areas and in the shipment of finished products.

"3. Create vast plant and production facilities in areas already overbuilt industrially, which will become idle and useless when the need for defense production is at an end."

Of course, this is a complaint made by the Southern Governors' Conference.

Can you give us some statement with reference to the exact situation and the necessity for it, and whether that statement is correct?

Mr. KNUDSEN. It is very difficult to give a statement on plant locations without offending somebody. But I can tell you this, as I told the Governors before I came over here this afternoon, that we did have a talk with the Governors at inauguration time when Mr. Knox, Mr. Stimson, and Mr. Hillman and I were there, and we talked to the Governors at that time and told them there were not enough plants to be built to give everybody plants in their particular locality, and we thought the best thing for the locality would be, if we could summarize or sort of survey the existing facilities in that location and see if we could not add some pieces, or work in there, rather than build new plants.

Mr. KILDAY. If you are able to get this subcontracting in full swing, will the existing plants, even though they are small, be used to their full capacity?

Mr. KNUDSEN. I think we have done that, and we have done it in that way rather than to build a munitions plant which would have to be closed up after the emergency was over.

Mr. KILDAY. And leave a city in an industrial area with industrial employees there with nothing for them to do when it is over.

But the program will be to give them as much of the subcontracting as possible?

Mr. KNUDSEN. We are trying to spread that all over the country.

Mr. KILDAY. Frankly, this is the complaint which we have heard a great deal of the time here on the Hill.

I do not know anything about whether their figures or percentages are correct, but this advertisement says:

"Of the eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts awarded up to February 15, a total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies or financially interrelated groups of companies."

Mr. KNUDSEN. I have not anything to offer you against that. I only know that out of 12,000,000,000 we have 14,500 prime contracts, and I am quite sure we have over 60,000 subcontracts. Whether they are owned by somebody at some central point, I do not know.

Mr. KILDAY. You are not in a position to tell us whether there is a concentration such as they refer to?

Mr. KNUDSEN. I do not think so. I have no facts to give you on that. I will have somebody check that.

Mr. KILDAY. We find this coming out in an advertisement from 11 Governors.

Mr. KNUDSEN. I will put our statisticians on that particular paragraph. That is news to me.

Mr. KILDAY. You will furnish us that?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes.

(NOTE.—Mr. Knudsen subsequently reported that upon inquiry he had ascertained that the statistics in the form requested were not available in the files of the Office of Production Management.)

Paying the Price for the Last World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HUDSON DISPATCH OF UNION CITY, N. J.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Hudson Dispatch of Union City, N. J.

This editorial has been sent to me by Edward Steer, war veteran and civic leader of Guttenberg, N. J.

[From the Hudson Dispatch, Union City, N. J.]

PAYING THE PRICE—FOR THE LAST WORLD WAR

Unless you are a World War veteran, you probably did not notice it. But the Hudson Dispatch yesterday carried obituaries of 4 men who served in 1917–18 and who answered the last call before reaching the age of 50.

For a long time the Hudson Dispatch obituary pages have averaged a daily story of a World War veteran dying in Hudson or Bergen. Yesterday the Dispatch recorded these—

Harold H. Horton, 40, one of the youngest veterans of the World War, died of a heart attack. He had moved to New York from Weehawken about 3 years ago.

Otto L. Heinsohn, 44, Hoboken, died at Veterans' Hospital, the Bronx.

George Hess, 48, Hoboken, died at the same hospital.

Albert Sacco, 45, who was wounded in France and never fully recovered, died in Jersey City.

Death is decimating the ranks of the World War veterans with new rapidity and at an average age younger than that at which it has all but wiped out the thin line of Blue and Gray. Veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War usually came home to live to ripe old ages. The service in these wars, if they escaped the minnie balls and shrapnel, usually fortified them in strength and vigor so that they could expect a long life.

But the men who came out of the World War with its hell holes of gas poison, vermin-filled trenches, and exposure to shell shock, don't seem to rate the longevity of the comrades of the previous wars. Even in this war neither side has used poison gas, which both sides used in World War No. 1.

The veterans of that war are now paying the price at a greater death rate than was the daily average during the fighting, 1917–18.

Persuasion by Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year of the Federal Government ended June 30. On that day the last appropriation bill to be passed was one for more than a billion dollars. While a number of the items carried in the bill were severely criticized, the amounts requested by the executive branch of the Government for its own publicity bore the brunt of the attack.

Since 1933 the propaganda program of the Federal Government has grown by leaps and bounds. Millions of dollars have been poured out of the National Treasury to establish and maintain agencies which grind out a steady grist of favorable publicity for the administration. The methods of operation have been so bold and so palpably plain that the motives cannot be mistaken. A "vast enterprise in salesmanship" would be a fair description of the program.

Self-government depends for its success on an informed and intelligent citizenry. Only as the facts involved in any issue are analyzed and understood can honest opinions prevail. Only as such facts are presented in an impartial and uncolored way can a reasonable analysis be made and a proper understanding be reached. Only as the opportunities for such presentation are available to the same extent to both the proponents and to the opponents of any government policy can the rights of a free people to determine their destiny be safeguarded. Controversial questions should be brought before the bar of public opinion in the

same impartial way as evidence is presented to a jury. To permit one side a wider latitude than that which is accorded, or possible to the other side, amounts to a partiality which prevents a real appraisal of the merits of any policy.

The opposition to the top-heavy amounts carried in the last appropriation bill for publicity programs demonstrated that the dangers of systematic persuasion by Government agencies are recognized by men of both political parties. It is painfully apparent that the effort to develop these programs is a part of a plan to stimulate public support for and to insure widespread approval of administration policies. Chance could never have created such complete coverage as that which is enjoyed by the officials of the Government as a result of the campaign conducted at the expense of the taxpayer.

With the emphasis which has been laid on the need for economy in government before us, the increasing amounts demanded for propaganda purposes is disconcerting and discouraging. Persuasion by publicity specialists smacks of professional pressure. Freedom to choose is diminished as the appeal of propaganda progresses. Nor should it be forgotten that a program of this kind amounts to a censorship which is all the more dangerous because of its subtility.

"I'm So Happy I'm an American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

LETTER OF A PATRIOTIC AMERICAN TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President from a patriotic American citizen:

The text of the letter, dated June 29—just a few days before Independence Day—follows:

"DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: I am a married man, 28 years old; a boy 3, a girl 1. Here's how I feel about being an American:

"My ancestors were Czechoslovakians, my wife's English, but we're Americans.

"I look at my refrigerator, my oil heater, and my radio. I'm glad I'm an American.

"My children get cod liver oil, nourishing food, and a doctor's watchful care. They'll be glad they're Americans.

"This morning I went to church. Amongst my neighbors, unafraid and unmolested. I thanked God for giving us America.

"I went home to my wife and kiddies. My little boy, Douglas, came running and said, Hi, Pop. You gonna take me to see the ribber.'

"And I said, 'Sure, Doug., I'll take you to see the river.'

"'And we'll stand on the bridge and see the cars, Pop.'

"'Sure, Doug.'

"'Pop, see the sun. Look see, Pop. It shine in the car's window.'

"'Yes, Doug, the sun's shining on all America.'

"After our walk, we came home and sat down to veal chops, baked potatoes, fresh green beans and corn on the cob. I said grace with tears in my eyes. I'm so happy I'm an American.

"This afternoon, we listened to a radio broadcast of British children, here in America, talking to their parents in England, and I was proud to be an American.

"Tomorrow, I'll go to work. I work in an electrotype foundry, and I love my job. I made it, in fact, from errand boy to production manager in 2 years. I had ideas and I told the boss about them. He's an American.

"Tonight, before going to bed, I told my wife, 'Honey, I'm going to buy a large flag and hang it out the window Friday. The President wants everyone to pledge allegiance to a new and united America. And, honey, I'm going to do my part, because I'd rather be an American than anything else on earth."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF PLATTSBURG ENDORSING GREAT PROJECT

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Plattsburg endorsing the great St. Lawrence seaway project:

At a regular meeting of the common council of the city of Plattsburg, N. Y., held February 7, 1941, the following resolution was adopted:

"By Alderman Behan; seconded by Alderman Tyrell:

"Whereas for many years the common council of the city of Plattsburg has recorded itself in favor of national and State legislation leading to the early development of the navigation and power resources of the St. Lawrence River, assuring a higher standard of living for the industrial worker and the farmer, upon whose welfare business is dependent, through the benefits of cheap transportation and abundant electricity; and

"Whereas the completion of this project at the present time would assure the country an inland coastline, free from seaboard attack, making possible adequate development of existing shipbuilding facilities in the Great Lakes and on the St. Lawrence River, and would supply deficiencies of electric power in northern New York and other areas imperative to constant and sufficient national-defense production; and

"Whereas with the completion of the St. Lawrence project, construction of a Hudson-Champlain cut-off would permit down-State New York to tap the seaway and bring increased economic and social benefits to this region: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the common council of the city of Plattsburg petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the immediate construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; also

"Resolved, That the common council of the city of Plattsburg petition the Legislature of the State of New York to defeat the resolution under consideration which would put that body on record against this project and to substitute in its place a resolution supporting the project; also

"Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Plattsburg petition the Legislature of the State of New York to enact legislation aiding the work of the New York State Power Authority, the only existing agency to represent the interests of the people of this State in the St. Lawrence project, by continuing its present appropriation and enacting legislation necessary to its expansion, if called upon to assume supervision of actual construction of the St. Lawrence project; also

"Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Plattsburg petition the Legislature of the State of New York to give the people of the State the opportunity to vote on the constitutional amendment introduced at the present session by Assemblyman Robert F. Wagner, Jr., to safeguard the public-power resources of the State from private exploitation, legislation which is a necessary supplement to the Power Authority Act of 1931.

"On roll call, Aldermen Holland, O'Connell, Delaney, Golden, Behan and Tyrell voted in the affirmative; no one in the negative. Carried."

Condemn Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF ASSOCIATED MASTER PLUMBERS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter and a resolution adopted by the annual convention of the Associated Master Plumbers of Tennessee. The position taken by plumbers of Tennessee, as set forth in this resolution, I believe is a fair example of the patriotic attitude of labor in general in that State:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PRIEST: During the forty-fourth annual convention of the Associated Master Plumbers of Tennessee, held in Chattanooga, Tenn., May 23–24, 1941, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, That we go on record as supporting wholeheartedly our Government in the prosecution of this war emergency; that we condemn all strikes, sabotage, 'fifth columnists,' all 'isms' and all 'scisms,' individuals and organizations that delay, hamper, or prevent our Government in the full prosecution of the war emergency and its efforts to guarantee our liberty, freedom, our homes, and our manner of living; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, our Senators and Congressmen, and the Governor of Tennessee."

Sincerely yours,

ASSOCIATED MASTER PLUMBERS OF TENNESSEE,

J. R. WILCOX, *Secretary*.

My Statement to Labor Committee on House Joint Resolutions Nos. 59 and 76

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in speaking on behalf of my resolutions, House Joint Resolutions Nos. 59 and 76 before the subcommittee of the Labor Committee, headed by the gentleman from Georgia, I pointed out that a world-wide contest is going on between two opposing philosophies of life and government. One of those is the philosophy of force and its motive power is dictatorial decree. The other is the philosophy of freedom, and its motive force must necessarily be the intelligence and will to cooperate of a free people. Those free people designate representatives to act for them in many important respects. We, as Members of Congress, hold in our hands, therefore, the responsibility of seeing to it that our way of life and form of government wins that contest. One of the most important factors in doing so would be to demonstrate now that we have an answer to the maintenance of full production and employment after the defense program has been completed.

On a recent trip which I was privileged to make to my district I found, in talking to a great many of the people, that they were not complaining about new duties which they were being asked to assume, nor about taxes, nor about any sacrifices that might be necessary in the defense of their country. But everywhere I was asked this question, "What will we face in our American towns and cities when the Government stops spending all this money for defense and when peace has been restored? Will there be millions unemployed again? Will I lose my job, or is there sufficient vision and courage in Washington to prevent this happening?" These are the questions, gentlemen, that I heard most often. It is because of those questions that we are here considering these resolutions.

I have already explained in my previous statement and you have had evidence in these hearings of the very widespread approval for the setting up of such a commission as would be brought about by the passage of one of these resolutions.

At this time, in making my main statement, it is rather my desire to demonstrate the tremendous importance of these resolutions as I see the matter. All of us are concerned primarily with the national-defense program. We all know that that program will stand or fall depending upon how enthusiastically it is supported and entered into by the people generally. The fundamental question, therefore, is a question of morale. In the world-wide contest which I just mentioned, we are confronted with the competition of a controlled economic order in which the dictator is able continuously, whether in war or in peace, to so direct every person and every factor of production in the Nation as to achieve as nearly as possible their maximum use. Nearly everyone is employed, though under circumstances which no American would be willing to submit to. If our democracy can demonstrate that it has the answer to the type problem of this machine and power age, namely, unemployment, then in the long run the defeat of totalitarianism is, in my judgment, absolutely certain.

The purpose of these resolutions is to help us make this demonstration. Everyone in the United States realizes that the unemployment problem has got to be solved if democracy as we have known it is to survive. Everyone knows that it hasn't been solved. Everyone knows that its apparent current reduction is due to the tremendous expenditures by the Government and the billions of excess of expenditures over revenues. Over a long period of unemployment, the mere cost of relief will break down our system. If, therefore, it is our wish to protect and preserve democracy and a free economic order, it is absolutely imperative that we develop plans and programs for the solution of this problem and for the prevention of its aggravation and recurrence at the close of the defense-spending period. On the other hand, once we have proved that we can do this or even if we are able to give reasonable indication that we can do it, both the people of America and the people of other nations will begin to realize that here lives one great people who without the loss of liberty can gain full production and full employment. Once that has happened, totalitarianism is certainly doomed, but gentlemen, it is not certainly doomed until that day comes.

May I point out also that the alternative to the setting up of such a commission as is here proposed and the development of an orderly program for meeting the situation will inevitably be another period of great expansion of relief and an increasing growth of governmental action in order to meet the situation. If, then, we want to be able at the end of this great crisis in which we now find ourselves to return to a situation where Congress will occupy its proper place and where special administrative powers can be relaxed and, in any cases, abolished, we must have a fundamental and basic answer to the situation that we all know is going to arrive.

These things are not simply my own opinion. Indeed, I should like to read to the Committee a portion of the summary of conclusions of the Temporary Economic Committee which has just recently completed its work:

> Technology will continue to increase labor productivity, displace skilled occupations, and reduce unit labor costs. In the absence of effective offsetting forces, economic and social distress may be expected to accumulate.
>
> The existence of a large amount of long-term unemployment indicates a lack of balance between labor-displacing effects and the compensatory forces presumed to be inherent in our economic system. Estimates of unemployment at the beginning of 1940 range from 8,500,000 (National Industrial Conference Board) to nearly 12,000,000 (Congress of Industrial Organizations).
>
> Among benefits promised by economic theory to offset the evils of the machine are lower prices, higher wages, shorter hours, and development of new industries.
>
> Refusal to make use of price reductions is characteristic of mechanized industry. Price-fixing agreements among competitors are the rule rather than exception.
>
> Even during periods of greatest wage increases, unit labor costs decline, because advances in average hourly earnings are generally exceeded by still greater increases of output per man-hour.
>
> Further curtailment of working hours is distinctly remote, since legislation has established, and public opinion has accepted, the 40-hour week as the norm of employment.
>
> With the possible exception of the Diesel engine, there is in sight no great new peace industry offering promise of taking up any significant proportion of unemployment.
>
> While technology creates tremendous economic problems through labor displacement, it also induces concentration which impedes the operation of price reductions.
>
> A state of serious unbalance exists today. Under present conditions it is likely not only to continue but to become even more pronounced.
>
> The persistence of mass unemployment in the United States, despite marked economic recovery, and the growing emphasis on technological advance should cause grave concern to all thoughtful persons who seek the preservation of democracy.

No statement could be more forthright than that, and none so fraught with serious consequences for our country if we fail to heed it.

Again, from the American Youth Commission, whose personnel, headed by Owen D. Young, is, as I believe you all know, a most distinguished one, we find the following statement contained in a pamphlet entitled "Next Steps in National Policy for Youth:"

> After rising to a high point a year or more hence, the rate of defense activity must eventually come to a decline. When that time comes we shall confront a period of great peril to the internal stability of this country, a period when the most aggressive measures of economic reconstruction will be needed. It is not too soon to begin to plan for that day. The general welfare of the entire country will depend upon the success with which plans can be made. If there is a failure to take adequate steps, all of the recent difficulties of youth, and many of the difficulties which have confronted other elements in the population, will again be repeated on an exaggerated scale.

Here is the testimony of two distinguished bodies of American citizens to back my assertion that we must be about our job, and that perhaps the primary task we have at the moment is the one now under consideration by this subcommittee.

The suggestion as to the method to be pursued has come, as I indicated in my earlier statement, from many sources. I should like here, however, to quote from the findings of the Interfaith conference what they had to say about the importance of the establishment of a commission to develop a fundamental answer to these economic problems:

> To that end there should be a continuing commission, composed of representatives of consumers, farmers, labor, finance, manufacturing, commerce, government, education,

religion. We hereby call upon the national organizations in these various fields to come together to form such a commission. For enforceable and coordinated action by the organized social forces of the country governmental leadership is necessary. Government, we strongly recommend, should call those organizations together for devising cooperative, democratic measures to solve the unemployment problem.

The American Association for Economic Freedom, an organization sponsored by a most distinguished group of American citizens from all walks of life, has published and sent out a special little pamphlet entitled "Preparedness for Peace," urging support of the Wagner-Voorhis resolution. I should like to emphasize one thing which they say. The third paragraph of their pamphlet reads as follows:

In supporting the resolution and urging its prompt adoption by both the Senate and House there is, therefore, no commitment to any specific post-emergency economic plan or program. The sole commitment is to the idea that a commission should be created now to study our post-emergency economic problem in the light of our experience during the period immediately following the last World War and during the depression decade of 1930–1940. Hence, if this is clearly understood, it is anticipated that the resolution will encounter no opposition.

May I call the Committee's special attention to the fact that through these hearings, either by direct testimony or by messages sent, the following groups and organizations of national importance have, among others, indicated their support of the passage of this legislation:

The American Federation of Labor.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
The National Association of Manufacturers.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
The National Grange.
The Farmers Union.
The National Catholic Welfare Conference.
The Federal Council of Churches.
The Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
The Railroad Labor Organizations.
Cooperative League of the United States of America.
National Child Labor Committee.
American Association of University Women.

It seems to me that this unanimity of support from every possible economic and cultural group in the country is most significant.

I have tried very hard to think of valid arguments against the passage of this legislation. Frankly, I have been unable to do so. The expenditure of the money involved in enabling such a commission to do its work is, in my judgment, of absolutely no consequence whatsoever when we consider that it might well mean the saving of literally billions of dollars of relief expenditures which will most certainly have to be made unless some adequate answer to this problem is found by the method here proposed. It may be said by some that we can do but one thing at a time, that at present we must concentrate on promoting the defense program, that it is too soon to worry about what is going to happen when the present conflict has been ended. I am sure I have already answered this argument in a number of different ways and I shall only say at this point that I am convinced that it is entirely wrong and that it indicates an almost complete misunderstanding of the stuff of which national morale and the spirit of the people are made, and as I have already said so many times it is spirit and morale on which our whole defense program ultimately depends.

Indeed it is my conviction that for such a commission to be set up and to give indication of success in its work might go a long way toward removing one major reason for unrest in the ranks of labor, for if I have heard once, I have heard hundreds of times a remark to this effect:

It is true our wages are fairly good at present, but you know as well as we do that it is only a matter of time until this defense boom is over and then we shall find ourselves without jobs and in the street again, hence we must make the most of the opportunity that we now have.

Indeed, we find in the pamphlet entitled "The Right To Strike," issued by the C. I. O., this significant sentence:

When the arms program is finished, workers will have to face the crisis of mass unemployment and social misery.

Indeed, gentlemen, I do not think I could overemphasize the importance of this feeling on the part of millions of people and its bearing on the success of the defense program itself.

Furthermore, the reluctance of certain industries to expand their plant facilities cannot be attributed to any unpatriotic motives or unwillingness to cooperate with the defense program. On the other hand, what these industries justifiably fear is that we will permit another period of mass unemployment and failure of the American market to furnish an adequate demand for the output of industry when the defense program is completed. I ask the committee to consider how it might affect the outlook of industry in this respect if they felt that a program was developing which would reasonably assure them of a strong and full demand for their goods in the future. This same point could be made regarding our farmers who are producing now the most essential single commodity of all from the defense standpoint as well as from the standpoint of aid to Britain. What can they look forward to? Another period of foreclosure and bankruptcy? Or will they be able to feel their Representatives in Congress are finding ways in which the prices for their commodities and the demand for them can both be steadily maintained through the years?

In the third place, the argument may be used that this is not a job for Congress. But it seems to me that this is obviously the kind of job which belongs primarily to the legislative branch of Government, together with the representatives of the great economic and population groups. Furthermore, it is one way in which we can demonstrate that in this period when increased Executive power is, of course, necessary, we are still performing functions as a legislative branch of Government and are able to show a kind of initiative without which, indeed, the position of Congress in our governmental system is certain to suffer desperately. Furthermore, the period following the present crisis will, and I believe should be, one in which there will be a strong tendency for the Congress to assert its prerogatives and to act in more independent fashion than would be right for it to do under present circumstances. I think I hardly need to more than suggest these thoughts too, because everyone of you will agree with me that the dominant note in that period will be a resumption by Congress of a very independent spirit and attitude. If this be true, then I submit that a program developed solely by the executive branch of Government, however meritorious it would be, would have a most difficult road before it, should some of us attempt to secure its passage in the Congress in such a period. I am convinced that Congress should take this initiative and I am convinced that in developing a program for the continuous economic health of America, the Congress should, from the very beginning, play an important and coequal, if not a leading, role.

It is spirit and heart and hope the American people need. I know Congress is not primarily interested in the future but in the immediate present desperate problem. But the thing that makes people willing to go to Army camps, to pay taxes—heavy and burdensome ones—to run risks, and if need be, to suffer—the thing that spurs people to do these things with a will and a song in their hearts is hope—hope of a better tomorrow for themselves, maybe, but most of all for their children.

And so I appeal for favorable action on one of these resolutions to create now an outstanding commission to work out a program for the prevention of depression and unemployment and the assurance of sustained full production when this critical period of defense spending comes to an end. The Labor Committee has granted that consideration. I believe the resolution will be passed. I believe we are going to undertake our whole job, not just part of it.

There are only two impulses that can drive men to the greatest and most sustained effort and sacrifice. One is the impulse of desperation that comes to people when they see clearly that they must fight for survival itself. Such, I believe, is the impulse behind the British people today. But whether we like it or not, gentlemen, the plain and obvious truth is that the American people do not today feel any such impulse of desperation. The other impulse—and I believe the only other one that is adequate to call forth what has come to be known as an all-out effort—is the impulse of an ideal, an ideal that has some religious meaning in it, an ideal and a hope of a tomorrow that will be definitely and clearly better than today has been. It is upon the wakening of such an ideal in the hearts of the American people that we must today depend completely. And whether or not it is to be awakened depends primarily, I am convinced, on how well the Congress and other leaders of the Nation do their job. May God grant we shall not fail.

Our July Fourth Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTGOMERY INDEPENDENT, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Montgomery Independent, of Montgomery County, Md.:

[From the Montgomery Independent, Montgomery County, Md., of July 4, 1941]

OUR JULY 4 DECLARATION OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

INDIVIDUAL DECLARATION OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

On the 4th day of July, 165 years ago, a group of independent individuals signed our Declaration of Independence.

These men had a cause. It was understandable. They could fight and die for it. It united 13 colonies and made them into the United States of America.

In confusion, in delusion, and baited on by illusions, we individuals today are being robbed of our power to think normally or reason justly. To judge between the right and the wrong becomes almost impossible.

On one subject we can still definitely state our opinion—nay our firm belief. Of all countries in the world—bad as things may now seem or become in the near future—the United States of America is the best place for humanity to live and affords individuals the greatest opportunities.

It is our unpleasant duty, risking the making of enemies who can hurt us, to do our utmost to keep for unborn children what was left to us to guard.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY COMRADES

Under the Communist plan of government the farmers are not permitted to own any of the crop which they grow. Under Nazi rule, and under their form of government, the farmers are permitted to own the crops that they grow but the governmental control and restrictions have become such that the word "own" has lost its legal significance.

In Montgomery County, as well, too, the other counties and States throughout these United States, the recent change in our Government's dealings with the farmers has brought about a situation more closely akin to that followed in Russia and Germany than any dare to admit. We are not endeavoring to be alarmists; we are merely stating the facts.

Witness, if you will, the following. It is in no wise exaggerated, save for the use of the word "comrade."

Farmer Jones visits on the farm of Farmer Brown somewhere in upper Montgomery County. They have been neighboring farmers all of their lives. They are exceptionally close friends.

Farmer JONES. Good morning. I see you have a large wheat crop. Looks good, too.

Farmer BROWN. Yes; I believe I'll do all right with my wheat this year. I'll need a good bit for feeding and expect to sell the rest. I planted a few more acres this year—a little more than usual. Hope the price goes up.

Farmer JONES. Did I understand you right when I thought I heard you say that you had planted a larger wheat crop this year—a few more acres, I thought you said?

Farmer BROWN. Yes; I'm expecting to sell about the same amount as last year, but I need more for feeding. Why?

Farmer JONES. Brother, you didn't go above your Government allotment, did you? No; I'm certain you wouldn't be so foolish.

Farmer BROWN. It doesn't matter. I'm not in the Government program. I wasn't in last year, nor the year before, or ever. You see, I just don't go in, and even though I lose some advantages, such as borrowing on the wheat and a few others, I still can grow and dispose of what I want to. If I don't go in the program, I can grow what I think this farm should produce to pay me for operating it. This is a small farm and none of my crops are big.

Farmer JONES. Comrade Brown, you might not know it but you are in the Government program this year whether you want it or not. You're right in the middle of it. You're going to have to pay a tax on all the wheat you are growing over your allotment.

Farmer BROWN. What's come over you, Jones? What's this comrade stuff. You sound goofey to me. I'm not in any program; I feed the excess and sell the rest at the mill. (Brown cuts a stream of tobacco juice at a varmint hole and remarks under his breath, "Comrade, hmph.")

Farmer JONES. Comrade Brown, we farmers are now calling each other that out of deference to the new program. It's spreading like wildfire. I mean the comrade part. You may as well adopt it, too. You have been made a part of the program by Mr. Big's new farm policy. It was recently voted in by my other comrades.

And, comrade, don't get nasty; it won't do you any good. You ain't selling that wheat, or any wheat for that matter, 'cause it's boycott wheat at the mills unless you get the white card. Surely you have heard of the white card? You can get the card by paying the tax. The tax is 49 cents for each bushel. You gotta pay it 'cause you went over your allotment. Me I knuckled down and am better off than you by working less. It's the new order of things.

Farmer BROWN. Comrade, comrade, comrade, damn that comrade business. Damn the word comrade. Listen, Jones, I'll feed all the wheat. I ain't paying a tax of 49 cents a bushel for growing wheat when I didn't want to join such a communistic program. That's strictly communistic. It's just like being in Russia or Germany. (Brown again cuts a stream of tobacco juice at the varmint hole and again under his breath, "Comrade, what's the matter with this bird—wish his pappy was here—he'd whale tar out of him—he'd tan his hide, the lazy whelp—comrade, the guy's screwy.")

Farmer JONES. I sympathize with you Comrade Brown, you just don't understand the new order. I forgive your abusive language against the new order, for you know not what you say. But—you can't feed the wheat without paying the tax. The Government man from Washington will come out and collect it.

You can do but one of two things. If you don't want to pay the 49 cents a bushel tax you can either give it to the Department of Agriculture or destroy it. Either one or the other, nothing else. You can't keep it, eat it, feed it, store it, sell it, or give it away.

Farmer BROWN. Are you sure?

Farmer JONES. If you don't believe me, Comrade, ask the Department of Agriculture. One of the comrades there will be glad to verify everything I've said.

Farmer BROWN. In other words, a small Montgomery farmer can no longer grow wheat crops, and in what amounts, that he wants?

Farmer JONES. Comrade Brown, it is the new order.

Farmer BROWN. You get the hell off my property, you —, you —, you —, comrade, you —."

FINIS

Leaving off the word "comrade," such is the plight of some 23 small but relatively successful farmers in Montgomery County.

It is the new order.

Eminent Newspaper Writer Discusses Proposal for Meeting Post-Defense Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ARTICLE BY CHARLES G. ROSS IN ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be able to include with my remarks the following excellent article on the proposition of a post-defense economic commission, by Mr. Charles G. Ross, one of America's outstanding newspapermen:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 2, 1941]

NATIONAL GROUPS BACKING CONGRESS' MOVE TO MEET POST-DEFENSE EMERGENCY—TWO PLANS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE FOR FORMATION OF COMMISSION TO STUDY PROBLEMS AND RECOMMEND APPROPRIATE LEGISLATION TO MEET THEM

(By Charles G. Ross, contributing editor of the Post-Dispatch)

WASHINGTON, July 2.—Strong outside support has developed for resolutions introduced in the Senate by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER (Democrat), New York, and in the House by Representative JERRY VOORHIS (Democrat), California, calling for the establishment of a commission to study the economic problems that will confront the Nation at the end of the present defense emergency.

Hearings before the House Labor Committee have produced a wealth of testimony favorable to the proposal from a great variety of organizations. Among those which have supported it either through direct testimony or sympathetic messages are the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Federal Council of Churches, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the League of Women Voters, the Railroad Brotherhoods, the Cooperative League of the United States, the National Child Labor Committee, the National Association of University Women, and the National Grange.

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS

Consideration is being given by the House Labor Committee to two alternative plans with the same end in view—one, for a post-emergency economic advisory commission of 12 members, of whom 6 would be named by the President and 6 would come from Congress; and, another, for a similar body of 24 members, 6 of them from Congress and 3 each to be chosen by the President from

the executive branch of the Government, farmers' organizations, labor unions, business groups, consumer cooperatives, and church organizations.

In either case the commission would study the problems of post-emergency adjustment, report to the President and Congress from time to time on the results of its inquiry, and recommend appropriate legislation.

The objective, in brief, is to formulate a program to prevent the oncoming of depression after the defense emergency.

"WILL I LOSE MY JOB?"

"The people," said Representative VOORHIS, in arguing for prompt action on the proposal, "are not complaining about taxes or any sacrifices that may be required for the defense of the country. But everywhere one hears the question, 'What will happen when the Government stops spending all this money for defense? Will there be millions of unemployed again? Will I lose my job, or will there be sufficient vision and courage in Washington to prevent this happening?'

"Everyone in the United States realizes that the unemployment problem has got to be solved if democracy as we have known it is to survive. Everyone knows that it hasn't been solved. Everyone knows that its apparent current reduction is due to the tremendous expenditures by the Government and the billions of excess expenditures over revenues. Over a long period of unemployment, the mere cost of relief will break down our system.

"If, therefore, we wish to preserve our democracy and a free economic order, it is imperative that we develop plans for the solution of this problem and for the prevention of its recurrence at the close of the present spending period.

"Once we have proved we can do this, both the people of America and the people of other nations will begin to realize that here is one Nation which, without loss of liberty, can gain full production and full employment. Once that has happened, totalitarianism is certainly doomed, but it is not certainly doomed until that day comes."

In support of his contention that "a fundamental and basic answer" must be found to economic maladjustments, Representative VOORHIS of California cited some of the recent findings of the Temporary National Economic Committee (the O'Mahoney committee):

Technology will continue to increase labor productivity, displace skilled occupations and reduce unit labor costs. In the absence of effective offsetting forces, economic and social distress may be expected to accumulate.

The existence of a large amount of long-term unemployment indicates a lack of balance between labor-displacing effects and the compensatory forces presumed to be inherent in our economic system.

Among benefits promised by economic theory to offset the evils of the machine are lower prices, higher wages, shorter hours, and development of new industries.

Refusal to make use of price reductions is characteristic of mechanized industry. Price-fixing agreements among competitors are the rule rather than the exception.

Even during periods of greatest wage increases, unit labor costs decline, because advances in average hourly earnings are generally exceeded by still greater increases of output per man-hour.

THE NORMAL WEEK

Further curtailment of working hours is distinctly remote, since legislation has established and public opinion has accepted the 40-hour week as the norm of employment.

With the possible exception of the Diesel engine, there is in sight no great new peace industry offering promise of taking up any significant proportion of unemployment.

While technology creates tremendous economic problems through labor displacement, it also induces concentration which impedes the operation of price reductions.

A state of serious unbalance exists today. Under present conditions it is likely not only to continue but to become even more pronounced.

The persistence of mass unemployment in the United States, despite marked economic recovery, and the growing emphasis on technological advance should cause grave concern to all thoughtful persons who seek the preservation of democracy.

DRIVING IMPULSES

"There are only two impulses," VOORHIS continued, "that can drive men to the greatest and most sustained effort and sacrifice. One is the impulse of desperation that comes to people when they must fight for survival itself. Such is the impulse behind the British people today. But, whether we like it or not, the plain truth is that the American people do not today feel any such impulse of desperation.

"The other impulse, and the only one that is adequate to call forth an all-out effort, is the impulse of an ideal, an ideal that has some religious meaning in it, an ideal and a hope of a tomorrow that will be definitely and clearly better than today has been. It is upon the awakening of such an ideal in the hearts of the American people that we must today depend completely. And whether or not it is to be awakened depends primarily on how well the Congress and the other leaders of the Nation do their job."

War Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

LETTER AND BALLOT MAILED BY HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I am mailing a letter, together with a ballot, to every voter in my district. The purpose of this ballot is to get an expression of the views of the people of my district on the question of whether or not the people of my district are in favor of the entrance of the United States into the present World War. The letter and ballot are as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington.

To All Voters of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin:

Everyone realizes that we are face to face with war. That issue may have to be decided in the near future.

Congress alone has the power to declare war under our Constitution. As your Representative in Congress, it will be my duty to vote on that issue.

How would you have me vote—for or against war?

At this critical hour, the question of peace or war means more than anything else in your life. War affects every one of us.

In order that I may have an expression of opinion from the second district, I urge you to mark the enclosed ballot and return it to me at once. You need not sign your name; just vote and drop the ballot into a mail box.

This is not done because I have changed my views. They are the same as they were in 1917. I merely want to know how you stand.

Therefore, I urge you to mark your ballot and mail it today. All that is necessary is to mark and mail the enclosed card. You do not have to sign your name to the ballot; sign only if you wish.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY SAUTHOFF.

BALLOT

The United States should

Enter the war..... ☐
Stay out of the war..... ☐

Name.....
Address.....

(Signature optional)

Please return this ballot within 3 days of receipt.

HARRY SAUTHOFF.

Navy for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESSES OF REAR ADMIRAL ADOLPHUS ANDREWS, UNITED STATES NAVY, AND MAJ. GEN. IRVING J. PHILLIPSON, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews, United States Navy, Commandant Third Naval District and Commander North Atlantic Naval Coastal Frontier, before the Society of Tammany or Columbian Order, in the Great Wigwam, Union Square, New York, on July 2, 1941, in celebration of the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and the one hundred and fifty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the society.

I also include an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Irving J. Phillipson, United States Army on the same occasion, at the same time and place.

The addresses follow:

ADDRESS OF REAR ADMIRAL ADOLPHUS ANDREWS

Distinguished guests, gentlemen, it is a high privilege and a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity of addressing you on this occasion, marking as it does the one hundred and fifty-fifth annual Independence Day celebration of your distinguished organization.

The Society of Tammany was organized just after the Revolutionary War not only as a symbol of our philosophy of government, but also as a living, vital force in its development. At that time there were many persons who thought that the United States and its democratic principles of government could not long survive. Even then there were those who were working subversively for the destruction of the young country and the dissipation of hard-won freedom. These forces are

at work again today. The same contribution to the ideals of freedom which Tammany contributed in those critical days of our country's nascence is sorely needed once again.

The Archives Building in Washington carries a very important and interesting inscription: "The past is the prologue of the present." Today we are confronted with the grave question of whether this world is to find its way to the high levels of peace and happiness, or whether nations will be forced back into a dark age of brutality and spiritual death. In spite of our efforts in armament limitations, in spite of our humanitarian ideals and our endeavors to maintain peace among nations, the dictators have forced upon us a problem the solving of which will represent the prologue of our way of life in the twentieth century. Every liberty-loving American knows the only possible solution to that problem and will not hesitate to achieve it, whatever the costs.

In our oath as naval officers we solemnly swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Gentlemen, we are faced with both today. The first is the Navy's sphere; but to a great extent it is the duty of every patriotic American to ferret out and subdue every un-American element within our Nation.

The history of the United States has shown that to safeguard our Nation we cannot remain supine until the enemy is at our door. The American way of life calls for something more than mere physical security of the continental limits of the United States. It insists upon the equal recognition and opportunity for trade and peaceful intercourse throughout the world

In 1812 we took up arms against England to insure the proper respect and safety for American seamen on the high seas. Three years later we sent our fleet into the Mediterranean to fight the Barbary pirates to insure the safety of American merchant vessels embarked on peaceful trade in that area. The Boxer Rebellion in China, the defense of the Monroe Doctrine in the Venezuelan incident with Germany—Vera Cruz in 1914—all of these are historical proofs of our traditional stand for our rights on the high seas and throughout the world.

During the lulls of relative peace and prosperity, America has curiously drifted toward narrow isolationism; yet every crisis in our country's history has proved the necessity for the active defense of our rights wherever threatened. There is no such thing as eternal and ultimate security for our philosophy of government. At no given time can we afford to arm ourselves, then sit back and relax our vigilance, with the assurance that we are forever safe from subversive ideologies.

Democracy by its very nature is dynamic, and its defense thus must also be an active, ever-continuing process. It is a paradox that the very prosperity of our country grew out of our world-trade relationships. In lush days we are apt to enjoy the fruits of that hard-won situation without remembering the sacrifices necessary for its achievement or the obligations and safeguards essential to its preservation.

The Navy is the fighting expression of democracy. As a fundamental part of our Nation, it has undergone periods of great expansion when the dangers to democracy have alarmed us. Then when danger recedes, the Navy has been perilously reduced through the ensuing years of false security.

Today we are feverishly trying to make up for the short-sightedness of the 1920's, when we permitted our fleet to be drastically reduced. We know now that the world is not ripe for an idealistic reduction of armaments and a substitution of arbitration for armies and negotiation for navies.

We are now in the middle of the greatest naval expansion program in our country's history. In time we will complete this program and again may face the future with confidence. But until that time our every energy must be bent toward the goal of retrieving, in the shortest possible time, the grave oversights of yesterday.

It takes time to build ships, to equip bases, to train men. We are getting along with that program. Already two of our new battleships have been commissioned. Our outlying bases are being established and equipped with the utmost speed Unfortunately, good intentions are not enough. The task which may well be assigned to our Navy in the fateful months ahead may be gigantic. Every day, every minute saved is vital to the security of our Nation.

My duty as commander of the third naval district brings me in close contact with thousands of civilian workers, most of whom are employed in our great shipbuilding program. We have in the navy yard some 20,000 civilians who are cooperating 100 percent and who, by their loyalty, should be an inspiration to all of us. They realize the need for speed in this building program. Their spirit of unity and teamwork is an assurance of success for our country in this race against time, in this battle for preparedness.

Even as this great democracy has progressed and changed to meet new world conditions, so has our Navy developed to fulfill its protective function. We are improving our methods of fighting every day. We are taking advantage of the sad but valuable lessons being learned by England. New protection in our ships, new offensive weapons, new methods of operation—all are incorporated after proper evaluation. For example, we now find that portholes, particularly near the water line, are a source of weakness in bombing attacks; so we are eliminating them. We are evolving now methods of combating the submarine and airplane menace.

Shore establishments exist for the sole purpose of supplying the needs of the fleet. While we are working night and day to meet these needs in the construction of new ships and the repair and overhaul of old ones, we are also giving every assistance to Great Britain. Her heroic stand in this conflict should be an inspiration to all freedom-loving men.

Sea power has determined the destinies of nations throughout history. Today I am convinced that sea power will be the decisive factor in the present conflict. The seas must be kept free for the peoples and commerce of all nations. It is only through sea power that this can be accomplished.

Of course, the air arm of sea power assumes an ever-increasing importance. We are not content that the United States Navy today possesses the best naval aviation force in the world. We recognize that it must be expanded even more than the other branches of the Navy. It must be given more importance as the ship-based fighting wings of sea power.

Our two oceans are not mere barriers preventing aggression against us. They are the lanes of our commerce, over which we achieved our greatness. We cannot retire smugly behind them in safety. We must protect them, even if that means temporarily turning them into the battle areas of democracy.

You gentlemen are met here this evening, as you have been gathered through so many years in the past, to celebrate the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. On this occasion I suggest that this observance be reserved not for a celebration of the fruits of the democracy we have achieved but rather for a stern dedication to the serious task of defending it in this time of danger. We must not permit ourselves to be so softened through the enjoyment of our democracy that we can no longer vigorously defend it. This is the time for a serious evaluation of our priceless heritage and a firm resolve on the part of every American to make the necessary sacrifices to insure its preservation. There is a time for argument and a time for action.

As far as the Navy is concerned, it is not for us to decide national policy, not for us to decide whether there be war or peace; it is for us to maintain at maximum efficiency every ship, every naval instrument placed in our hands, to be prepared for any eventuality, to be ready at a moment's notice to defend America with everything at our command No navy in the world today has finer or more patriotic officers and men, each and every one of whom takes his job seriously and is ready to give his all for his country. As in the past, gentlemen, I assure you that your Navy stand ready today with decks cleared and stripped for action.

ADDRESS OF MAJ. GEN. IRVING J. PHILLIPSON TO SOCIETY OF TAMMANY, JULY 2, 1941

I need not tell ou how deeply I appreciate the opportunity of being with you today to commemorate the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of American independence and the one hundred and fifty-fourth celebration of the founding of the Society of Tammany of New York. These meetings are steeped in tradition, and my thoughts inevitably revert to the stirring events which animated the beginning of the Republic and enliven its early history. The Sons of Liberty—blood brothers of the Tammany societies—resisted the efforts of the mother country in its efforts to curtail the liberties of the American Colonies and actively participated in the struggle for independence. As far back as 1772 the first Tammany Society was established in Philadelphia The New York society in whose honor we assemble here was founded 11 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence and a year before the ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

It purposed to preserve the rights for which its founders had fought; to promote and cherish union between the States; to foster affection and kindness for one another and to assist the families of veterans. How well it has succeeded in these commendable purposes I need not remind you. Let us rather consider briefly its contribution to the defense of the Nation since, at this time, national defense is again of urgent and vital concern to every one of us.

Founded as it was by a group of fighting men that had risked their all in the struggle to free the Thirteen Colonies from British domination, the Tammany Society has supported the Government and contributed freely of its manhood and of its treasure whenever danger threatened Its national-defense record merits repetition wherever valor and sacrifice are recounted. Through a century and a half of conspicuous service this society has invariably arrayed itself on the side of those who believe that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

In 1812, the Tammany Society stood squarely behind the declaration of war against England; it strongly supported the hero of New Orleans in his struggle against nullification; it favored the annexation of Texas by force if necessary. At the beginning of the Civil War, it raised and equipped at its own expense, the Tammany Jackson Guard, Forty-second New York Infantry, and several other regiments and brigades were recruited and equipped in 1861 by the leaders of the Tammany Society. On Cemetery Ridge, at Gettysburg, near the "Clump of Trees" stands the Tammany Regiment monument in honor of the magnificent stand that organization made in stopping Pickett's charge. Before the stone wall on the edge of the Fredericksburg Cemetery, the Forty-second Regiment gallantly advanced under the heaviest of fires and many brave soldiers laid down their lives on that bloody field. At Antietam, Balls Bluff, Williamsburg, like deeds of valor are attested. The Forty-second

Regiment, in all, took part in 36 battles or engagements, of which 19 were major conflicts.

Then, in 1898, Tammany raised and equipped a regiment to participate in the Spanish-American War and tendered its services to President McKinley. That this regiment was never mustered into the service, in no way dims the glory of Tammany's willingness to accept its accustomed role. No less gallant were the sons of Tammany who participated in the first World War. Their fighting qualities and will to win brought honor and distinction to the commands with which they served.

And so we of the Army today pay our respects to the men of Tammany for their gallant and patriotic services extending over 150 years. And the end is not yet. The United States again faces an emergency and the sons of Tammany once more are in training for any eventuality which may require their service.

Much has been published recently purporting to show the changes in methods of warfare which the present struggle abroad is disclosing and criticizing the alleged failure of our Army to accommodate its organization, training, armament, and personnel, as well as itself to these changed conditions. Generally, these criticisms pertain to an insufficiency of air corps and armored divisions in our organization, old-fashioned leadership reluctant to rely on "all out" blitzkrieg, the need for new weapons and the improvement of old ones, slow promotion and senility at the top, establishment of a separate Air Corps, the substitution of civilian research and manufacture for the arsenals, employment of civilians to replace military personnel and the elimination of the traditional barriers between the different branches of the Army. Were I prepared to reply to such criticisms the time available to me is too limited to allow even a beginning. However, these are subjects concerning which there has been much controversy since the World War. There are two sides to each of the questions involved and the critics are presenting but part of one side and that side based on interpretations not always justified by the facts. I only ask in the words of your distinguished sachem that you "take a look at the record" before you accept these criticisms at their full value.

I enter no claim that mistakes have not been made, for the one most likely to make mistakes in public affairs is he that does things. I also realize that were our foresight as good as our hindsight we would be much better off. As far back as 1933, the year that Hitler came into office, the then Chief of Staff of our Army stated in his annual report: "As much as at any other time in our history, the Army's efficiency should engage the earnest attention of every loyal citizen. It is my conviction that at this moment the Army's strength in personnel and matériel and its readiness for employment are below the danger line. I consider it of the most urgent importance to the United States that this condition be rectified without delay."

Another common source of misinformation is the tendency to interpret each event that occurs abroad as directly and immediately affecting the operation of our Army. It is a well-established principle of logic that a general truth can only be arrived at from an infinite number of individual instances. To interpret correctly a particular event, one must be familiar with all the circumstances surrounding it in order to be able to assure himself that it is comparable to other situations. Otherwise, Switzerland might find herself building a navy.

Germany, located as it is in the middle of Europe, has been able to plan meticulously how to conduct a war against any of its neighbors and has been able to make its organization, armament, training, and personnel conform to the conditions under which it was apparent that it would wage war. Exact planning is far more difficult in our situation, as our Army must be prepared to fight wherever its services are required. This difference in missions vitally affects all the complicated elements which enter into the building of a modern army.

Much progress has been made in preparing the country and the Army for their respective roles in national defense. That there is still much to be done, and that the time for doing it may be pitifully short, no informed person can doubt. That changes to improve performance will constantly occur is equally apparent. Nor is there the slightest objection to just criticism, provided it is constructive and honest. Such criticism is patriotic and obviously a public duty. At this time your country and your Army are facing the greatest emergency that has confronted them since the attack on Fort Sumpter. Success depends in no small part on the loyal support of the American people. Your society has invariably thrown its wholehearted support behind the Government in every crisis that has occurred for the past 155 years. No higher tribute can be paid to any group or element. It is in the light of such patriotic devotion that we can gaze into the future with equanimity.

Bottleneck Arguments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 6, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 6, 1941]

BOTTLENECK ARGUMENTS

Add to the list of inconsistent opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway the testimony of the Great Lakes skipper who is afraid that tramp ocean steamers might run the lake vessels out of business. With the ocean trade crying for cargo carriers (and it will be crying for them for years to come), the ships would all desert such a fine opportunity and crowd into the Lakes.

The antiwaterway arguments are getting thinner and thinner. It might be of interest at this point just to call the roll on them, to see what they are like.

The port of New York is, of course, against the waterway. It wants all the trade to go through its bottleneck.

The port of Boston has registered its opposition with the congressional committee now holding hearings on the latest proposal to build. Look at a map and you see why. Boston, like New York, is on a detour for trade between Europe and the American Middle West. The way to keep the detour open is to keep the main road blocked.

Louisiana has filed a protest with the committee. It is afraid that the State-owned wharves at New Orleans will get less business. This runs counter to the common-sense fact that trade which should go by New Orleans will go that way anyhow, and trade which ought not, should not be forced to do so.

Analyze all these arguments and you find a common base—that of self-interest. Meanwhile, 40,000,000 people in the Lake States must sit and wait, blocked from tidewater except through the bottleneck ports that already exist. The potential shipbuilding industry on the Lakes must wait. The union of American and Canadian defenses that would be promoted by the waterway must get along without it.

For over 2 decades now, since the waterway became an active issue during the first World War, we have had this kind of fooling and jockeying. The war itself taught us the necessity of opening up the Lakes. Opponents said we could not start it then because we were too busy with military affairs. During 22 years of peace they defeated it on other grounds. Now they say it would interfere with the defense program—they are back to the arguments of 1918. If we got out of our present difficulties, they would switch back to the peace arguments, those of the twenties and thirties. When some future war came along, we would be too busy once more.

This ring-around-the-rosie is getting monotonous. Let's build the waterway now, for this and succeeding generations.

The Townsend Plan—Real National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, AT THE SIXTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE TOWNSEND CLUBS OF AMERICA AT BUFFALO, N. Y., JULY 3, 1941.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the address which I delivered before the sixth national convention of the Townsend Clubs of America at Buffalo, N. Y., July 3, 1941:

The address is as follows:

Doctor Townsend, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleagues, and delegates to this great national convention, I am happy, indeed, to have the honor and privilege of being with you on this auspicious occasion and to again deliver a message, as I have at our previous national conventions, in regard to our progress toward final victory. It is a pleasant experience, I am sure, for all of us, to meet in the Honeymooners' Paradise, which Niagara Falls is often called, and I know that many of our fine Townsend couples are making it a real honeymoon, which will recall joyous memories of the one which they spent together some years ago.

OUR NATIONAL CRISIS

My fellow Americans, we are living in one of the most crucial periods of human history, perhaps the most crucial of all time. The peace-loving people of 15 nations, not one of which desired to go to war and nearly every one of which declared a policy of neutrality, have been overrun by the most cruel

and powerful military machine the world has ever seen—Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Greece, and also Italy, for Italy has been taken over by Hitler and completely subjugated to the Nazi regime. It remains to be seen how long Russia can withstand the onslaught of the Nazi war machine.

World events of the past 2 years have compelled us to undertake the greatest and most costly national-defense program in our entire history. We have had to look some very grim facts in the face and become realistic in regard to the menace which threatens our own future as a democracy and a free people. We have been forced, reluctantly and perhaps all too slowly, to realize that aid to Britain and the other democracies is an insurance policy to insure our own safety and security and, if possible, to keep war away from the shores of America. If our aid to the democracies fails to prove effective, and Russia succumbs, it is altogether probable that Hitler and his Axis partners, Japan and Italy, will in the very near future also attempt to overrun the following countries: Turkey, Spain, Portugal, the French colonies in Africa, China, the Dutch East Indies, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, New Zealand, Eire, and Great Britain, whose Navy not only protects the English Channel but also the Atlantic Ocean—the sea lane to America—as well.

It has been repeatedly stated and openly avowed and written in official documents so often that there can be no doubt about their intentions that the Axis dictators, as soon as they have completed these conquests, will immediately devote their efforts to the penetration and conquest of Argentina, Chile, Brazil, the less important nations of South and Central America, and Mexico, which may prove a comparatively easy task for these countries are defenseless against modern warfare. The dictators' plans, their blue prints and their time tables are being rapidly translated into actuality, relentlessly and ruthlessly. They have proclaimed that the world cannot exist half totalitarian and half democratic and that they intend to make it all totalitarian. They intend to continue their conquests until they have completely encircled and truly isolated Canada and the United States, a fact which becomes more evident with the passing of each day.

OUR EFFORTS TO KEEP OUT OF WAR

President Roosevelt and Congress have put forth every possible effort to keep our country out of war and how well we have succeeded is proven by the fact that we are practically the only nation in the world which has not suffered any loss of life or property. In view of all the hazards and dangers to which we have been exposed, and the difficulties with which we have had to contend, this is a remarkable achievement. How thoughtless and unreasonable are those who, in the face of this record, can find it in their minds and hearts to accuse President Roosevelt and those who have supported him of warmongering and seeking to thrust us into war. President Roosevelt has shown more patience and toleration and submitted to greater threats and dangers to our safety and future as a free nation than all the war Presidents in our history combined, including Washington, Lincoln, McKinley, and Wilson. Let us read our histories.

THE PEOPLE'S RESPONSIBILITY

How vital and important is it to the United States that our aid to Britain and the remaining democracies is delivered in time to prevent their defeat and the capture and destruction of the British Navy? It is for the American people, for you, and you, and you, and all the men, women, and children of America, to answer that question, for upon you, and your children, and your children's children, will descend the blessing or the curses.

DOMESTIC DEFENSE

I have supported every national-defense measure, and full aid to Britain, because, as I have indicated, that is aid to America.

I have no sympathy with the views of those misguided and misinformed persons, in and out of public office, who favor our huge appropriations for foreign defense and then want to cut and curtail our appropriations and expenditures for domestic defense. I refer to those who advocate reducing our expenditures for the Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, soil conservation, Federal aid to roads, rivers, and harbors, and flood control, rural rehabilitation, food-stamp program, Work Projects Administration appropriations, and farm relief.

I disagree entirely with such a narrow viewpoint and hereby denounce it as undemocratic, unpatriotic, and thoroughly unwise. Indeed, it was such a short-sighted policy of indifference to social welfare which contributed to the downfall of France. I desire to quote from the Washington (D. C.) Post, February 24, 1941, as follows:

"FALL OF FRANCE BLAMED ON LACK OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

"An Austrian-born scholar, journalist, and diplomat told an American University audience yesterday that a main reason France fell was the failure of French democracy to provide social justice.

"Dr. Egon Ranshofen-Wertheimer, a visiting professor of international affairs, said that 'even after the outbreak of war the antagonism between French employers and workers did not come to rest.' He spoke to an audience in Hurst Hall.

"'French democracy had degenerated so far,' he said, 'that great sections of the people did not feel it worth while to sacrifice to maintain it. * * *

"'Had the French people believed their republic meant social justice and something higher than totalitarianism, the disastrous situation would not have arisen.'"

My friends, instead let us continue our program of social justice and economic security and thereby strengthen our national defense by increasing the "stake" which our people have in the preservation of our democracy. Our people will then again prove their loyalty, devotion and sacrifice as they have always done in the past. The Townsend Plan, cost of production for our farmers, a square deal for labor, unemployment relief, are just as essential to our national defense—if not more so—than planes, battleships, tanks, guns, and munitions. We are not going to repeat the mistakes and defeatism of France; we are going to insure victory by practicing the virtues of true American democracy. In the words of President Roosevelt, quoting from his Annual Message to Congress: "Certainly this is not the time to stop thinking about the social and economic problems which are the root cause of the social revolution which is today a supreme factor in the world."

PRESIDENT FAVORS NATIONAL PENSION

President Roosevelt, in his address before the national convention of the International Teamsters Union, held in Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., September 11, 1940, advocated a national system of old-age pensions, which is the Townsend formula, national in scope, uniform in every State, and financed by a national tax.

H. R. 1036, O'CONNOR BILL

It is estimated that under our present Townsend bill, H. R. 1036, introduced by our able colleague, Congressman JAMES F. O'CONNOR, of Montana, the sum of approximately $50 per month would be paid to our senior citizens who have attained the age of 60 years, based upon our present gross national income. With the increase in the national income, which will be considerably increased this year due to the national-defense expenditures, and the consequent increase in the volume and velocity of business turnover by the forced spending of these pensions within 30 days as required in the law, the amount of the pension payment would necessarily and gradually be increased also. Instead of paying $45 to $50 per month, as we would at the start, that sum would gradually increase as the volume of business and money placed in circulation increases.

The needs clause—which is one of the worst features of the present Social Security Act—is eliminated. Our senior citizens are now subjected to an inquisition—wholly un-American—and have to take a pauper's oath in order to establish their eligibility for the small amount paid. They are subjected to all the embarrassment and humiliation resulting from a callous probe of their personal affairs and cruel snooping into the most sacred details of their personal lives and in many cases constituting a species of persecution. We strike that abominable proviso from our bill and say that our senior citizens and builders, those who have materially assisted in building our country of today, shall receive their payment not as a matter of grace, but as a matter of right—deferred compensation, if you please, for past services rendered.

Authorities are agreed that our prosperity is measured to a great extent by the velocity of our money turn-over and the Townsend plan by accelerating and speeding up the spending and expenditure of $6,000,000,000 annually, divided among 10,000,000 persons past 60, would step up the tempo of circulation sufficiently to give employment to several million citizens whose services would be required to produce the added foods and merchandise which would be purchased, and sold by the merchant, storekeeper, and farmer. These facts are elementary and so self-evident that I shall not, for I have not the time to, cite and tabulate the mass of figures and calculations which have been compiled by numerous statistical organizations and departments of our own Government. They are contained in dozens of studies and surveys which are available to those interested and they have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many times during the past 6 years. Congressman O'CONNOR and I inserted some of these figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 18, 1941, and "those who run may read."

REAL NATIONAL DEFENSE

There is a certain irony in connection with the vast, colossal, and staggering sums which we are appropriating in Congress these days for national defense and for aid to Britain, and as I have stated, I have voted for all of them. But I cannot help thinking about those of my colleagues who for years have bitterly opposed the Townsend plan, decent housing, slum clearance, public improvements, all social-welfare reforms because of the cost involved. They have always argued that we could not afford to do these things for our senior citizens, for our less fortunate citizens, for our young men and young women, for the boys and girls of America. They always have asked and never answered themselves the question: "Where are we going to get the money?" What a silly, nonsensical question to ask in the largest, greatest, richest country, with the greatest wealth, natural resources, and productive capacity of any country in the world, in which our national income in one single year is twice our entire national debt, and if we utilized our full productive capacity of goods and services, we can produce in wealth in 1 year three times the amount of our national debt.

The irony—aye, the tragedy—of the present situation is that those who opposed and would not vote for appropriations and expenditures to construct a finer America and

bring manifold blessings to her communities and her citizens, young and old, are now compelled to vote 10, 20, 30 times as much money for the weapons of death and destruction. Is it a punishment visited upon us by the Judge of the Universe? It should make every Member of Congress think—and doubtless will before our present national crisis has run its course—for there are valuable lessons to be learned by all of us from the experiences of these momentous days.

We are going to continue our fight for the Townsend plan until the fight is won. We have more support now than we have ever had. Members of Congress are being converted to the soundness of a national system uniform throughout the Nation, financed by a national tax. They are dissatisfied with the present Social Security Act, with its State contributory and noncontributory system, and the un-American "needs" inquisitory test; they are discovering that money can be provided to save, to conserve, to sweeten life, as well as to maim, to cripple, and to destroy life.

APPLIED CHRISTIANITY

Those who have spurned and rejected the principles and teachings of Christianity on the alleged ground that these teachings are impractical are now being totally discredited. They have asserted their own realism and scoffed and sneered at what they have termed the impractical idealism of the Christian religion. The rulers of governments and those in high places in the fields of politics, education, business, and finance, and the arts and sciences, have a fearful responsibility to answer for. They have led mankind down into the darkest abyss and the blackest hell into which the human race has ever been plunged. These blind leaders have been proven to be wholly impractical and unrealistic. Their entire fabric of life, society, and business has crumbled and collapsed, and the idealism of the Christian religion is emerging from the wreck and chaos as the only realistic and practical way of life.

The Townsend plan is just one phase of applied Christianity, and I am glad to have the privilege of calling attention to that fact. It squares with the economics of the Old Testament. It is enjoined by the central commandment, the fifth commandment, Honor thy father and thy mother and thou shalt live long in the land. I called attention several years ago, and desire to remind you on this occasion, that in the Book of Numbers, viii: 25, God commanded Moses to retire the Levites at the age of 50 although they were to minister with their brethren. The Townsend plan is very similar to the plan of restoration to the aged proclaimed in the Book of Nehemiah, v: 1-2. The prophet also outlawed usury, which is undoubtedly the greatest curse of the human race, and the Townsend plan, by diminishing the scarcity of money in circulation, would be a decided step in the direction of abolishing usury.

The Gideons have done a wonderful work in placing Bibles in our hotels for the use and benefit of our traveling salesmen and all the guests. However, they have overlooked the largest semihostelry in America. They could accomplish a world of good by placing a Bible in the office of every Member of the House and Senate in the Congress of the United States at Washington, D. C., where very few offices have Bibles, and very few Members ever read the Bible. The Gideons would spread more light in dark places than they could anywhere, not even excepting darkest Africa, for we have heathen in Washington whom the foreign missionaries have never as yet reached with the Bible message.

In the Books of Exodus and Deuteronomy we find many passages and references to a plan sanctioned and ordained by God, which is very similar to the Townsend plan. The Townsend plan is in harmony with the Scriptures, and is a practical application of the economics and social teachings of the Holy Bible. As such, it is certain to be enacted into the law of the land, for as we approach Armageddon, "men's minds and hearts will turn to the Lord."

Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

EULOGIES BY REV. ALEXANDER SYSKI, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, ORCHARD LAKE, MICH., AND F. X. SWIETLIK, CENSOR OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the eulogies by the Reverend Alexander Syski, of St. Mary's College, Orchard Lake, Mich., and F. X. Swietlik, censor of the Polish National Alliance, delivered during the interment of the remains of Ignace Jan Paderewski at Arlington National Cemetery on July 5, 1941:

ADDRESS OF REV. ALEXANDER SYSKI

Your Excellency Apostolic Delegate to the United States, Your Excellencies Representatives of the President and the Government of the United States and of the Allied Nations, Your Excellency Ambassador of the Republic of Poland, bereaved sister of the deceased, Americans of Polish descent, People of Poland: At the funeral of immortal Skarga only a Skarga should preach. There is no eloquent Skarga among us today, yet silence at this funeral, which has brought us here together, would be a sin.

Since we cannot speak with the eloquence of Skarga, then at least let the mourning and lamenting that this day have broken from the breast of the Polish Nation as it sobs over this coffin be heard over all Poland and over all the world.

"Let tears run down like a torrent night and day; give thyself no rest, and let not the apple of the eye cease," O Polish Nation, because "a prince and a great man is slain this day in Israel."

Need I mention his name? There is no name for him, because every name is too small. His name represents millions. He was cradled in the bed of pain on which the Polish Nation lies. From his cold hand upon the land of graves, flooded today with torrents of blood, has fallen the scepter of the sovereign who succeeded Mickiewicz and Sienkiewicz as the Spirit-King of martyred Poland.

Where was his spirit realm? Alas, let us not ask. He was Poland's sun, her resplendent majesty. He lived in our thoughts of Poland, thoughts which today fairly burst our temples. He lived in our emotions, which this day threaten to burn our hearts to ashes. He was the soul and heart of the nation. He was the chariot and the driver of Israel, like Elias of old.

And as he traveled with us, leading the nation toward the liberation of Poland, suddenly that fiery chariot and fiery horses from heaven parted us asunder. Like Elias, he went up from us by a whirlwind to heaven, leaving us alone. Like Eliseus, wringing our hands, we cry: "Father, Father, the chariot of Israel and the driver thereof!"

Thus we cry, gazing heavenward. We see him no longer, but he hears our sobbing. Moved, he takes hold of the garment of his spirit and rents it in two pieces and lets fall into our hands the mantle of Elias in words radiant with power: "God and Country!"

And returning, Eliseus took up the mantle of Elias from the ground and twice struck the waters of the Jordan with it—as Holy Writ tells us. And behold, the waters were divided, and Eliseus passed over them. And the sons of the prophets of Jericho, seeing this, came to meet him. And falling to the ground, they worshiped him and said: "The spirit of Elias hath rested upon Eliseus."

O Polish Nation! thou art Eliseus. Thy sun has set amid lightning and thunder. Thy enemies have opened their mouths. They jeer and gnash their teeth and say: "Now we shall soon devour them. This is the day. Their strong man is slain. Their Spirit-King, their Elias, is taken from them."

O Polish Nation! thou art Eliseus. The sun of Poland has set. Our Spirit-King, our Elias, has been taken from us, but he has not left us orphans. He lets fall from heaven his mantle. He gives us his testament.

We believe in God, let us believe in the testament of our Spirit-King and Elias. "God and Country!" This is the testament he leaves us, as from the clavichord of life and labor he raises to God his white, lilly-like hands.

O Holy God, Mighty God, Holy and Immortal, deign to look down upon those hands which he raises to you this day from his coffin in supplication for the freedom of his country. See, they are unmarred by any injustice or blood of man. With his spotless palms he places into Thy hands Poland's cause. He preserved unscathed the glorious name of his country. He did not weaken in spirit. Though burdened with sorrow and pain, he did not bow in defeat. That is his testament.

Brothers! Brothers! What have we lived to see? What has come upon us? What do we witness? What are we doing? We are laying Paderewski to rest. We are reading aloud his testament. Immortal in life, he entered unaided, as a genius and a hero, the Pantheon not of Poland alone but of the world and of humanity. And we here return his body to mother earth.

Eternal rest grant him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him forever and ever. Amen.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE F. X. SWIETLIK

We are assembled in this Pantheon of American heroes to pay our last tribute to one of the great men of our generation—Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Our President has graciously suggested that his mortal remains find a temporary resting place in this national shrine until the time arrives when his native land, martyred Poland, will again eject the invaders from her soil, and take her rightful place among the free nations of the world. No act of our President could be more expressive of the identity of ideals of freedom which animate America and Poland, and of the strong ties of friendship which bind these two Nations than this noble gesture of good will. Arlington is the last resting place of American military and naval heroes.

Paderewski will not be among strangers. The freedom for which they fought and died was the burning passion of his entire life.

While the world acclaims him as a great artist, whose musical genius enriched the souls of millions in many lands for upward of a half century, history will also acclaim him as one of the greatest, if not the greatest statesman of his generation.

And if I were to search in our history for some distinguished American who possessed that love of humanity, unswerving devotion

to the cause of freedom, and all those noble and lovable attributes of character which we so admire in the life of Paderewski, I would point to our martyr Abraham Lincoln. For where can be found language which more eloquently portrays the character and life of Paderewski than the immortal words spoken by Lincoln in his second inaugural address:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

Poland owes Paderewski a great debt of gratitude for what he had done for her in her days of trial, but a similar debt of gratitude is owning him from every man who loves freedom, and who believes that love of country and devotion to a great cause are ideals worthy of our greatest efforts. Paderewski cannot be replaced. In the words of an eminent American scholar: He was a man of whom any civilization in any age could justly be proud.

It is no wonder, therefore, that his death was the occasion of so spontaneous and universal an outpouring of sorrow throughout this civilized world.

America loved Ignace Jan Paderewski, she admired his genius, his devotion to the cause of his native land, and always welcomed him to her shores as a conquering hero. She stands at his bier today, her head bowed in deep sorrow.

No man more eloquently expressed America's admiration for this great man than did an eminent statesman and a former Ambassador to Great Britain, John W. Davis. Presiding at a gathering of eminent Americans in the Hotel Astor in New York City, when Mr. Paderewski made one of his usual eloquent pleas on behalf of his native Poland, Mr. Davis turned to the honor guest of the evening and said: "Mr. Paderewski, of all men born on foreign shores, you are the closest to the hearts of the American people." The entire audience arose to give their unqualified approval to that sentiment. Paderewski reciprocated that sentiment, because, next to his beloved Poland, no other country was as close to his heart as was our own country.

Let us hope that his exile from his native land will be of short duration. At this very moment the brave sons of Poland are battling courageously at the side of Great Britain, who is so gallantly and at such great sacrifice opposing the forces of evil, and to restore freedom to all downtrodden nations.

They are determined to continue that fight until freedom is restored to their native land. When that moment arrives, and let us all hope that it will arrive soon, Paderewski will return home to find a final resting place in Poland's Pantheon in the Wawel Cathedral. There he will rest beside the heroes of Poland's past, whose deeds of valor earned for their country, in the words of an eminent American author the enviable title of Poland, the Knight Among Nations.

Reduction of Nondefense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

EXTRACT OF LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a letter which I recently received from a constituent:

JUNE 26, 1941.

Hon. E. E. COX,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COX: The National Economy League, a private, nonpartisan research organization, founded in 1932, has circulated the following petition throughout its Nation-wide membership and other citizens' groups:

"We, the undersigned, earnestly urge that the Congress of the United States, while imposing additional taxes of $3,500,000,000 upon the people, reduce to a minimum unnecessary nondefense expenditures. The Secretary of the Treasury has stated that a saving of $1,000,000,000 can be made. The Brookings Institution, in pamphlet No. 26, estimates a possible saving of between $2,000,000,000 and $3,000,000,000. Studies by the National Economy League show possible savings of over $1,600,000,000. We urge the following savings of $1,652,000,000 in nondefense expenditures, without cutting a penny from defense and without jeopardy to any citizen:

	1942 Budget	Recommended savings
Genera Government	$907,000,000	$100,000,000
Public works	503,000,000	263,000,000
Work relief	1,034,000,000	479,000,000
Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration, nondefense	363,000,000	201,000,000
Aids to agriculture	1,062,000,000	562,000,000
All other nondefense	2,716,000,000	47,000,000
	6,675,000,000	1,652,000,000

"Your petitioners make this plea with firm resolve that the people's confidence in popular government shall not be undermined by failure to turn our full economic strength to national defense."

A total of 14,680 citizens from 41 States have signified their desires for reductions in nondefense expenditures by signing the above petition.

* * * * *

Very truly yours,
H. G. W. SUNDELOF,
Executive Director.

Stop Negro Discrimination in Our Defense Industries

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to protest the discrimination against our Negro population in the defense industries. If we can take our colored boys, put them in camp and eventually make cannon fodder out of them, we should give some consideration to their brothers at home and permit the trained and skilled colored workers an opportunity to work in defense industry. Today in many cases they find the door locked against them because of their color.

It will not do to try to recommend our four freedoms to the world if we do not practice democracy at home. I hesitate to say what the morale of the colored boy in the Army will be when he contemplates the fact that his brother, his father, and his sister back home cannot receive any work in the defense industries because of their color. It is a crying shame, that out of a population of 13,000,000 Negroes, all Americans, they are not aliens—thousands and thousands are willing to work and help the Government, but cannot get work because certain industries draw the color line.

Mr. Speaker, the Negro has come a long way in the field of progress since the Emancipation Proclamation which broke the shackles that bound him to slavery. Despite the fact that he was made a freeman as a result of the Civil War, and the institution of human slavery abolished for all time in America, the Negro was still subjected to a form of slavery, an economic slavery with its attendant discrimination and intolerance toward the Negro because of his color.

In ordinary times this discrimination asserts itself in the industrial life of many communities, and it is very difficult for the Negro or friends of the Negro to overcome this obstacle, because many of these industries are privately controlled. But in times like these when the Government has supervision and control over practically all our defense industries, there is no fundamental reason why this discrimination against Negroes should continue.

At an early stage of our defense program the National Defense Commission declared:

Workers should not be discriminated against because of age, sex, race, or color.

The Selective Service Act passed in September 1940 provided that:

In the selection and training of men there should be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

Following up this policy the Office of Production Management recently wrote to all defense contractors informing them that in many localities there are workers available who are not being hired, solely because of their racial identity and because of this situation many Negro workers of skills and aptitudes are not being included in many of the training programs for defense. Such practices, the O. P. M. declared, are extremely wasteful of our human resources and prevent a total effort for national defense. In many sections of the Nation, continues the O. P. M., there are today available labor reserves of Negro workers. Plans for their training and employment in capacities commensurate with their individual skills and aptitudes should be undertaken at once.

Since the declaration of this policy there has been some improvement in breaking down discrimination against the Negro. The N. Y. A. is training some Negro youths for defense work. Here and there, carpenters and some other tradesmen are employed, but not in sufficient numbers to absorb the great number of

skilled Negroes available at the present time.

The President of the United States recently urged industry to consider the availability of the Negro worker for employment.

In some jurisdictions local committees of citizens composed of Negroes and whites banded together seeking at least a partial solution of the problem. More of these committees are necessary, in my opinion, to convince the employers in these defense industries that the Negro certainly has his place in the defense program, that he is willing and able to play his part, if only given the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost beyond understanding we who boast of our democratic processes and who condemn, and very properly so, the spread of the totalitarian philosophies abroad would not in the first place seek to remedy conditions at home. It is regrettable that there is more intolerance in the United States of America, more racial and religious bigotry than in any other part of the world.

It is not a pleasant fact to recall that there has been in the United States since 1882, 5,000 lynchings of the whites and blacks, but mostly blacks. The Negro has come a long way from slavery and has literally lifted himself up by his own boot straps.

Dr. R. R. Moton in his book, The Progress of a Race, has said that no race in such a limited period and under such circumstances has made more progress than the Negro in the United States of America. Instead of being discouraged over conditions which he has not been able to control, the Negro has simply faced the situation, forged ahead, and written on the pages of history a record which has challenged the attention and respect of the entire civilized world.

In 1860 the total Negro population of the United States, 4,441,830.

In 1930 the total Negro population of the United States, 11,890,143.

In 1940, according to the latest figures, the Negro population was approximately 13,000,000.

Cursed with illiteracy while held in human bondage the Negro has made a rapid decrease in illiteracy since he was made a freeman. In 1930 the percentage of illiteracy was 16.3 of the Negroes 10 years old and over, as compared with 22.9 percent in 1920, 30.4 percent in 1910, 44.5 percent in 1900, 57.1 percent in 1890, 70 percent in 1880, and 81.4 percent in 1870. The figures for 1940 are not available, but they are sure to indicate a substantial decline in illiteracy over those figures presented in 1930.

In the field of organization splendid progress has been made by the Negro. I recite the following as only partial list of splendid organizations destined to improve the social and economic life of our colored brethren.

ORGANIZATIONS

Educational: American Negro Academy, New York; Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for Negroes, national; Association of College Women, national; Association of Teachers in Colored Schools, national; Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers, national.

School fraternities, 6; school sororities, 9.

Organizations for economic advancement: Alliance of Postal Employees; Association of Colored Railway Trainmen; Association of Head Waiters, national; Association of Underwriters of Negro Insurance Companies; Beauty Culturist League, national; and 11 others on a national scale.

Organizations for professional advancement: National Negro Bar Association, Colored Graduate Nurses, National Dental Association, National Hospital Association, National Medical Association, National Association of Negro Musicians.

Organizations for general advancement: National Urban League, New York; National Negro Congress; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

NEGROES IN PROFESSIONS

The number of Negroes in professional service in 1890 was 32,878. In 1930, 135,925 were engaged in professions, an increase of 100,000.

NEGROES IN TRADES

In 1890, 172,970. The number in 1930 was 1,024,656, an increase in 40 years of 851,686.

A summary of progress for 70 years

	1866	1936	Gain in 70 years
Economic progress:			
Homes owned	12,000	750,000	738,000
Farms operated	20,000	880,000	860,000
Business conducted	2,100	70,000	67,900
Wealth accumulated	$20,000,000	$2,500,000,000	$2,480,000,000
Educational progress:			
Percent literate	10	90	80
Schools of higher training	15	200	785
Students in public schools	100,000	2,500,000	2,400,000
Teachers in all schools	600	55,000	54,400
Religious progress:			
Number of churches	700	45,000	44,300
Value of church property	$1,500,000	$210,000,000	$208,500,000

Since 1874, 155 Negroes have been elected to Phi Beta Kappa Fraternity; 132 doctors of philosophy.

The outstanding Negroes in music and arts are Marian Anderson, Dorothy Mainor, Paul Robeson, Roland Hayes, Ethel Waters, and Duke Ellington; in education, Dr. M. W. Johnson, R. R. Moton, Carter G. Woodson; in science, George W. Carver; in politics, Hon. Arthur Mitchell and Oscar DePriest; in literature, James Weldon Johnson, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, W. E. B. DuBois, Alain Locke, and Benjamin Brawley; in poetry, Langston Hughes, Claude McKay, Countee Cullen, and Jessie Fauset; and in the sports, Joe Louis, Jesse Owens, and Ralph Metcalfe.

The military record of the colored soldiers of the United States is one that every American should be proud of. Negroes have fought voluntarily in every war in which this Nation has engaged. They earned the commendation of Gen. George Washington; they fought with Oliver Perry at the Battle of Lake Erie; and with Andrew Jackson at the siege of New Orleans, in the War of 1812. There were several regiments of colored fighters in the Civil War, and 1 out of every 10 American soldiers in the first World War was a Negro. President Theodore Roosevelt on many occasions paid tribute to the valor and bravery of the Negro troops who served during the Spanish-American War, and every military commander who has had contact with the Negro in military service has paid tribute to the military record of these men for faithfulness, zeal, and patriotic fervor.

Col. James A. Moss, commander of the Three Hundred and Sixty-seventh Infantry, who was born and reared in Louisiana, and served for 18 years with the colored troops, said:

If properly trained and instructed, the colored man makes as good a soldier as the world has ever seen. I commanded colored troops in the Cuban campaign and in the Philippine campaign, and I have had some of them killed and wounded at my side. At no time have they ever faltered at the command to advance or hesitate at the order to charge.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the Negro gets discouraged at times when the doors of opportunity are closed to him because of his color and becomes an easy prey for demagogues or communistic leaders who preach to him the doctrine of racial equality?

In our metropolitan cities you will find large groups of Negroes centered together in their own community preferring to live in close proximity with one another just as other racial groups. There you will find a family life comparable to other segments of our population. It is true that in many sections of these industrial cities the Negroes, like a great many of their poor white brethren, are forced to live in what is sometimes called the slum sections of these cities, under insanitary conditions, and faces, because of these conditions, hardships and a high mortality rate. The Federal Government has assisted materially in remedying these conditions during the past few years by eliminating slums and erecting in their place modern housing, which is bound to have an effect on the health and welfare of these underprivileged people.

I am happy to record that since I have been a Member of Congress I have supported such a program. I have cooperated with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, seeking to write on the statute books of the Nation an anti-lynching law. Twice this measure passed the House of Representatives but failed of consideration in the

Senate. Just as the Congress did enact antikidnaping legislation it is certain some day to wipe out this foul blot upon our national history, the crime of lynching of human beings without due process of law.

The splendid advancement made by the Negroes in the field of education insures a strong leadership among this group. Thousands of young men and women are coming out of our high schools and colleges each year, trained to meet the social and political problems of their communities. No longer are they the tools of unscrupulous politicians, who express their friendship on election day and turn their back to them after the sun has set the same evening. No longer do the Negroes in most part vote as Democrat or Republican. They are today exercising intelligence and independent action when they go to the polls in any election.

That there are bad Negroes as well as bad whites all of us must readily admit. It was my experience as a judge for 8 years that when numerous Negroes were sentenced for petty crimes the average was not more than the whites in proportion to the population. The study of the facts revealed to me that there would be less petty crime and delinquency among the Negroes as well as the whites if society afforded a better environment, more opportunity for work, and better sanitary living conditions.

It is my opinion that there is a definite responsibility upon the leaders of the local government and the Nation to respond whenever possible to the assistance of the Negro, and all other groups who are endeavoring to better their social and economic welfare, and who profess an unqualified loyalty to the free institutions of America. Such assistance will pay dividends in years to come and will insure the gratitude of generations yet unborn.

Service Program of the D. A. V.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, a recent conversation with the National Service Director of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Miliard W. Rice, concerning various matters of interest to his group, reminded me of the fact that I am myself a member of that esteemed organization of America's wounded, gassed, and disabled World War veterans.

During these trying days of intensive preparation to provide adequate defense for America, we must not permit ourselves to forget America's disabled defenders of the past.

I think it would be appropriate to take advantage of this occasion to tell Members of Congress something about the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, commonly referred to as the D. A. V.

D. A. V. MEMEERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by Congress in 1932, to render service to, for, and by disabled veterans, the D. A. V. has, since its inception, been the spokesman for disabled World War veterans in Congress and before its various committees, as well as before the Veterans' Administration and its regional offices and facilities.

As implied by its name, the Disabled American Veterans of the World War is composed exclusively of honorably discharged World War veterans who were wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled in or by reason of their World War service. Its membership therefore is composed of a very exclusive class.

Active membership in the D. A. V. can only be secured by those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries or the blight of disease or disability incurred by reason of their World War service. Less than 10 percent of all living World War veterans are therefore eligible for membership in this rather selective organization.

Wearing the emblem of the D. A. V.—which, by the way, is a replica of the Accolade of Chivalry, portrayed on the wound certificates issued by President Woodrow Wilson—is therefore to wear a badge of honor, indicating that the wearer has sacrificed a part of his blood, a part of his body, or a part of his health in the Nation's most hazardous employment, serving in its armed forces during time of war.

The wearer of a D. A. V. emblem button can be proud of such proof of his patriotism—a real badge of honor.

No one certainly can justly question the true Americanism and patriotism of those who have paid such a high price as proof of their patriotism.

D. A. V. membership is restricted to those American citizens who have earned it by sacrificing their youth and a part of their bodies, or a part of the health of their minds or bodies, in service for our beloved country. There are no other limitations as to membership eligibility. Its membership, therefore, includes men who are Protestants, Jews, Catholics, Mohammedans, and Buddhists, of many different racial origins, engaged in various types of employment, if any, receiving incomes from the lowest up to the higher brackets, including both the humble and prominent; the poor and the rich; former buck privates, corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, captains, majors, colonels, and generals; the employed, the unemployables and the unemployed employables; the uninformed and the well-informed; the helpless and the helpful—a typical cross-section of American citizenry.

During its existence, the D. A. V. has elected former privates, corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and a general to the office of national commander. Its leaders have had service in Uncle Sam's Infantry, Artillery, Air Corps, Marine Corps, and Navy. It has been led by Jew, Catholic, and protestant. Its present national commander is Vincent E. Schoeck, a prominent attorney in Detroit, Mich. All of these men, with divergent backgrounds, have found a common ground in the D. A. V.—the union of America's disabled defenders—to help to render service to those who need service.

D. A. V. NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

The D. A. V. has had its national headquarters, almost since its inception, at 2840 Melrose Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. National Adjutant Vivian D. Corbly has been secretary-manager of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his assistant.

An excellent newspaper is published by the national headquarters, the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to the developments concerning all legislation—proposed and already a part of our Federal statutes—Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, Attorney General's opinions, Comptroller General's opinions, and Veterans' Administration regulations, service letters, and other policy matters of interest to veterans.

No disabled veteran is doing right by himself, and those dear to him, if he deprives himself of the interesting news and valuable information in the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly.

D. A. V. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During the 21 years of its history, the D. A. V. has initiated much liberalizing legislation on behalf of various groups of disabled veterans and their dependents and has also been largely responsible for the issuance of many liberalizing regulations by the Veterans' Administration from time to time, too numerous and too technical for me to set forth to you in detail at this time.

In spite of the enactment of many Federal and State laws, there are still many inadequacies, inequities, and inequalities of the privileges, preferences, and benefits as to and among various classifications of service-connected and service-connectable disabled veterans and their dependents, which the D. A. V. is striving to have corrected by proposed legislation. Its national service director, Millard W. Rice, has been vigorously pushing forward such objectives in hearings before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, as well as before other committees of the United States House of Representatives and of the United States Senate.

The D. A. V., as the recognized voice of the Nation's World War disabled, concentrates its collective strength to protect and to advance the best interests of its members and eligibles, and of their dependents, thus helping them, their respective local communities, and our country. Its constitution forbids it to take part, officially, in any partisan political, industrial, or religious disputes. Its national policies, as well as its national officers, are decided upon at national conventions, to which delegates are sent directly by local chapters, thus democratically providing for finding out and abiding by the expressed wishes of the majority.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The D. A. V. has had the offices of its National Service Bureau, also almost

from its inception, in the Munsey Building, in Washington, D. C., where it now has nine service experts to advise and to assist deserving veterans in the technical and legal prosecution of their equitable claims for compensation, pension, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, and in securing suitable gainful employment, private or public.

The national service director, with the assistant national service director, Thomas J. Kehoe, has supervision of the office of the National Service Bureau in Washington, D. C., and also exercises supervision over the services of the organization's 38 nationally paid national service officers—who, incidentally, receive very inadequate salaries, ranging from only $20 to $200 per month, depending upon the number of D. A. V. members in their respective States—as well as over its 56 unpaid national service officers and its 807 voluntary chapter service officers.

All of these unselfish, self-sacrificing officers are themselves disabled veterans. All of them have had the experience of prosecuting their own claims for service connection and compensation. All of them know, by reason of personal experience, of the difficulties and handicaps with which disabled veterans are confronted in their efforts to obtain and retain suitable gainful employment. These D. A. V. service officers know all about the complications and technicalities that disabled veterans must overcome legally to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of the claims and rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration. They understand, of course, that officials of the Veterans' Administration must adhere to the laws as enacted by Congress, with their limitations and restrictions as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

D. A. V. service officers well know that being equitably entitled to service connection and compensation for a disability, by reason of the handicap of such disability, is not the same as being legally entitled thereto.

Because of their understanding of these various problems with which disabled veterans are baffled, these service officers of the D. A. V. are naturally sympathetic to disabled claimants in their efforts to overcome such difficulties. I think it is safe to say that a person who himself has experienced some of the complexities incident to proving himself entitled to certain benefits because of a disability which he is convinced was caused by his World War service, and who himself has had the experience of trying to overcome the handicap caused by such disability, is, consequently, in a better position to advise and to assist other disabled veterans in the solution of their various problems, understandingly, sympathetically, and effectively.

D. A. V. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

The services and accomplishments of these national D. A. V. service officers during the past 12 years is indicated by the following brief résumé, compiled for me by Millard W. Rice, national service director:

Claims handled	672,695
Hospitalizations and medical examinations obtained	73,064
Appearances before rating agencies	164,608
Favorable decisions	90,787
Total monetary benefits	$51,433,774.88

It is, of course, impossible for a brief statistical résumé to indicate the many different types of services extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established on the basis of cases handled by D. A. V. service officers, which subsequently have proven of value to hundreds or thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot appear in the reports of such national service officers.

These compensation payments for more than 90,787 disabled veterans, and their dependents, have converted such individual disabled veterans from local liabilities into local community assets, bringing increased compensation payments into every community, thus increasing the distribution of purchasing power in such communities, with consequent benefits to each community and its citizens, as well as to each State, directly and indirectly.

Many disabled veterans who gained experience originally as chapter and national service officers for the D. A. V. thereafter have become national service officers, national service directors, national legislative representatives, national adjutants, and other types of service-giving officers of other national veteran organizations.

FINANCING THE D. A. V.

The principal source of income for the D. A. V., by which to maintain this extensive service program, has been through the support of individual disabled veterans themselves, by their payment of membership dues in the D. A. V., through its 37 departments and 807 chapters.

A national per capita tax of $3 per member per year is paid by each local chapter to national headquarters.

Those disabled veterans who have supported the D. A. V.—representing the collective voice of, by, and for disabled veterans—have so earnestly believed in its past accomplishments, in its current service program, and in its objectives for the future as to be willing to make the necessary sacrifices for payments of annual membership dues, which, by the way, average about $4 in most of the local chapters.

During the past 3 years the D. A. V. has extended to its membership the opportunity to acquire life membership, upon payment of $50, generally by a cash payment of $5 or more, plus $1 or more per month until paid. More than 43 percent of all D. A. V. members are now partial or full life members.

Disabled veterans who are members of the D. A. V. realize that it does not have any mysterious source of income. They realize that its strength, prestige, and ability to accomplish constructive services on behalf of individual disabled veterans, and their dependents, rests entirely upon the united force of all of those who are prompted to become and to remain paid-up members of their own outfit.

Local chapters of the D. A. V. finance their own social-service and relief activities out of their portion of annual membership dues, by annual forget-me-not drives, and by such small finance-raising projects as dances, and so forth.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS SERVICE FOUNDATION

Some donations, but not nearly enough, are made each year to the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio, and regarded as the D. A. V.'s incorporated trusteeship. Five trustees, all of them now past national commanders, are elected by each national convention for a 5-year term, the term of one of them expiring each year, whereas two additional trustees (generally the current national commander and national judge advocate) are elected each year for 1-year terms. This method of electing the trustees was designed to give assurance of real continuity to the policies of the D. A. V. Service Foundation, as to the conservation and administration of its funds, and as to the appropriations therefrom once each year to the National D. A. V. itself, for the maintenance of its national service officers in the various States.

Donations to the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation have been made by disabled men each year in sums that have ranged from $1 to $200—generally totalling only about $1,000 each year.

This D. A. V. Service Foundation has also been the beneficiary of bequests made in the wills of several disabled veterans. Contributions, moreover, have also been received from other social-service minded citizens.

NEED FOR D. A. V.

D. A. V. members are aware of the fact that the Disabled American Veterans has, in whole, or in part, been responsible for much legislation which has directly benefited thousands of disabled veterans who have never become associated as members—some because they know nothing about the organization, others because they are indifferent to the need for collective action, still others because they are too unthinking or too selfish, and many who have persuaded themselves that they cannot financially afford it.

It is a strange commentary upon human nature that this comparatively small organization of disabled veterans has continued to render very valuable service to thousands of individual disabled veterans in helping them to prove up service connections, secure increased compensation, hospitalization, insurance benefits, and so forth, apparently without their feeling any gratitude for such valuable service, apparently without the realization that they have been free wheeling, and that the service which they have secured has been paid for by other disabled veterans no better off financially, if as well, to contribute to the helping-hand effort, through membership in the D. A. V., to provide for its Nation-wide service set-up.

Every social-minded disabled veteran who is anxious to protect the benefits which may have been awarded to him, and at the same time to help secure needed benefits for other veterans who are even less fortunate, ought to be a

paid-up member, if not also an active member, of the Disabled American Veterans—generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's World War disabled.

Helping disabled veterans to help themselves and getting the help of the Nation for those who need help—a big dividend-paying investment in real Americanism—is the self-appointed task of the D. A. V.

Fellow citizens frequently need to be reminded, by an organization such as the D. A. V.—composed exclusively of, by, and for disabled veterans—that an important factor in providing security for America is for America to provide security for its own citizens, and particularly for its disabled defenders of the past, as well as of the future.

America can always feel assured that it will be enthusiastically protected and defended so long as America remembers to protect and defend its protectors and defenders.

An Invasion or an Occupation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, increasing apprehension is developing over contemplated economic policies of the administration which appear to threaten the survival of free enterprise under our capitalistic system. While the expansion of the defense program may account for the imposition of certain unusual limitations, nevertheless, there are indications which cannot be ignored that drastic controls are in the offing.

Men who have given careful thought to the tendencies and trends of recent years are fearful that an invasion of a temporary character into the fields of private enterprise is intended as a preliminary to a permanent occupation.

Since 1933 Government controls and regulations of business on an ever-widening front have been urged by keymen of the administration. In fact, this policy has been a part of the fundamental philosophy of the New Deal. Under the N. R. A. industry was required to toe the mark as orders were issued from Washington on production and prices. Agriculture was to come under the thumb of Government regulations as the A. A. A. sought to establish its limitations on the kind and capacity of farm productivity. The intention was to project the edicts of Government managers into every field of private enterprise to make it conform to the plans and specifications of theoretical specialists who had little, if any, practical experience. Only the decisions of the Supreme Court prevented the execution of the program which was designed to delegate absolute discretionary power to the executive branch of the Government over the business life of the Nation.

Under these circumstances it is but natural that those who were fearful of the past efforts to extend bureaucratic control should be suspicious of the present moves in the same direction. The evident desire of many of those who wield powerful influence in the administration to remake America along socialistic lines is so apparent that the more recent trends are alarming as well as disturbing. Federal financing of industrial plants, managed money, price controls—these, and other policies—all supported by a far-flung publicity organization of the Government—are inroads which have extraordinary potentialities.

It cannot be overlooked that the President himself boasted of the "new instruments of public power" that have been created, and which he admitted "would provide shackles for the liberties of the people" under certain conditions.

Much of the distrust and suspicion which exists and which is so exceedingly disturbing, could be eliminated by the selection of counselors and advisers who are committed to the preservation of our fundamental philosophies rather than resorting continually to the champions of the doctrine of an all-powerful state.

The Migrant Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. TOLAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN DIEGO (CALIF.) UNION

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Union, of San Diego, Calif.:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union of June 13, 1941]

THE MIGRANT PROBLEM

The investigation of the migrant problem in San Diego, conducted here this week by Congressman TOLAN, is designed to enable Congress to look into the future and be prepared to cope with the problem that is expected to arise when the defense effort slacks up after the war. It is a commendable effort, for the problem is, or will be, national in scope. No single community can solve it alone.

The migrant problem is nothing new to California. The one with which Congressman TOLAN'S committee now is concerned, however, differs in many respects from the one with which this State has been plagued for the last few years. Until a few months ago the problem arose from lack of employment elsewhere and a desire on the part of those who came here to find jobs, few of which existed. Consequently, the relief situation became acute.

Now, however, the migration is the result of a suddenly developed demand for skilled and semiskilled workers in defense industries. These industries, chiefly aircraft and shipbuilding, absorbed the available labor supply in short order and desperate calls have gone out from many communities, urging an increased number of migrants to come to California.

This is necessary and until and unless the call or the migration exceeds the supply of jobs, it is desirable. But it is, at the same time, developing a situation which quite easily could become a major problem in the event of a sudden let-down in defense industries. That is the problem which Congressman TOLAN'S committee is trying to anticipate.

Nobody knows, of course, how long the emergency will last or how long it will be before defense work slacks off. Everybody hopes that the let-down will be easy and that San Diego will feel few of the adverse effects about which there have been varied predictions Multiply the situation here by the number of communities maintaining large defense industries and some comprehension of the State's problem can be gained. Then multiply the State total by the number of States affected—which means most of them, one way or another—and the scope of the national problem can be visualized.

Concern over this phase of the situation cannot be permitted, of course, to overshadow the importance of completing the job we have set out to do. But it is of interest to note that some thought and attention are being given the matter now. If, by a series of hearings in important centers throughout the Nation, Congress can obtain a basis upon which to work out a program for reassimilation of the hordes of migrants that have, for various reasons, shifted the population centers, and have the program ready to apply when the need arises, there should be a minimum of worry when the defense workers finally are demobilized.

In this problem Congress has much to go on. It has the lessons learned over the last 8 or 10 years to guide it; and, while the causes of the present-day migration differ greatly from those which led to the great trek from the Dust Bowl to the coast, the essential features of the dislocation are the same. A great many people are going to require assistance in readjusting themselves then just as they require it now.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JAMES A. FARLEY, FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL, DELIVERED AT THE GRADUATING EXERCISES OF THE PACKARD COMMERCIAL SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY, ON TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1941

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, to the graduating class of the Packard Commercial School, June 24, 1941:

On this occasion, 35 years after my graduation from this school, I feel a keen temptation to dwell upon the past. There are so

many changes that have taken place in the course of that long stretch of years—changes in business methods, changes in the things that must be learned before going into business and, above all, changes in the attitude of the public toward business. It is a pleasure to note with respect to all these things that there has been a distinct gain. Business has, over the past 35 years, developed to an extraordinary degree in its capacity to accomplish greater units of work with smaller units of effort. This has benefited consumer, worker, and investor alike. Because of the great complexity of business, the training necessary to enter it with a fair chance of success must be vastly more detailed and scientific. And, finally, there has developed in the past few years a changed attitude on the part of the public toward the various business enterprises that serve it.

There was a time when it was regarded as good business to give as little and to get as much as possible. The objective of business now is to give as much at as small a price as is consistent with solvency. There was also a time when it was regarded as legitimate to exact long working hours from employees, to pay them small compensation for their work and, at the same time, to pay large dividends to the owners of business.

In the years since then, a change has taken place in the whole attitude toward these questions, partly through the legitimate efforts of organized labor, partly through a more enlightened attitude on the part of employers, and partly because of the necessity that the good will of the public be maintained. New principles of employment have come into being and many of these principles have become embodied in the law of the land.

The greatest change in business, however, has been the development of a new profession of business management. As businesses have grown in size and in complexity it has become impossible, except in the smaller units, for owners themselves to supervise and direct. That has brought about the development of a system of business enterprise in which essentially all the activities are carried on and the decisions made by that group which bears the general name of management. Upon this group falls a threefold responsibility. It is responsible to the public for providing at a fair price a sound and honest product. It is responsible to labor for good working conditions and a fair wage. And, lastly, it is responsible to stockholders for the preservation of their property and for a fair return on investment.

This threefold responsibility involves a great degree of skill in management, of diplomacy in handling human relations and mastery of the technical details of the business itself. Men and women charged with responsibility in management must therefore embody in their intellectual equipment the ability to do many things. In some of the more highly specialized businesses this means a combination of knowledge of finance, of acquaintance with engineering problems, of familiarity with sales methods, of mastery of difficult problems of public relations, and, above all, of the ability to get along with other people. Management has therefore become a highly specialized profession, an honored and respected profession, and a profession that requires the highest degree of training. The time has passed when anyone without training in management can go into business and hope to be successful.

Our schools have had to keep pace with this development and consequently their training has had to go far beyond the simple lessons that were taught when I was a student at this school. You have to know more than spelling, writing, and arithmetic these days to succeed in business.

I believe that this necessity of training efficient managers and directors of industry will, because of the present situation, change to a marked degree our whole system of education. We are going through a period now in this defense effort when the very salvation of the country depends upon the efficiency and the productiveness of American industry. When it succeeds, I believe that the American public will properly recognize the great contribution of American business to the security of our common country. Business will, when that happens, be given its proper place in the hearts and minds of the American people.

But, of course, we are only at the beginning of the development of the possibilities of American business and of business methods. To a greater and greater degree leaders in business must be possessed of all the qualities that will make for a better world. They will not only have to have vast familiarity with their own business, but a good many other businesses as well; not only a knowledge of their own State, their own community, but of the Nation and the world beyond; and, above all, not only a knowledge of things as they are, but an imagination that enables them to conceive of things as they can be in a better world. They must have imagination and courage and the ability to build, with the aid of that imagination and courage, more and more varied products.

I get a little impatient these days when I hear on all sides pessimistic predictions of what kind of a world we are going to have after this war. Some of the things that are being said do not sound like the old expressions of an American faith. However crude the methods of the past were, the leaders of business were men of courage and vision. When our country was a small collection of States scattered along the Atlantic coast, the spirit of the time was optimism. They were faced by hostile empires whose resources were vastly greater than their own. Wars were shaking the world then, as now. But these men made no dire predictions about what was going to happen to them. Instead, they stood up before the world and asserted their unbounded confidence in themselves and in their ability to take care of themselves in any kind of a world. For generations that was the spirit of America.

They asked for no favors, and they feared no future. They developed their industries, they built ships, they took from the earth the treasures that it contained. They planted their fields and gathered their crops. They sought new markets, and they made secure the markets they had. It was out of that enterprise and not out of the conquests of war that the greatness of their country came. And those courageous, bold generations have handed on to us a great Nation with great wealth and great possibilities. It should not be for this generation to sell the future short. It should rather express once more the courageous faith of the past.

I have recently visited South America and I have studied the markets there. I feel that we can work with the countries to the south of us. American enterprise need have no fear of meeting other nations in the markets of the world. We can have faith in our products and in our ability to sell those products and in our ability to make friends of those with whom we trade. We can do this with entire confidence because we know behind us is a country whose resources and inherent strength surpass those of any nation or any combination of nations in the world.

But the greatest strength of a nation is in the minds and hearts of its people. Its strength is in its integrity and its ability to keep its promises and to discharge its obligations.

The indispensable factor in every product is the honesty and truthfulness of the maker. Without honor in keeping promises and in discharging obligations there can be no business life as we know it. A most important book on modern economics is entitled "The Promises That Men Live By." The meaning of the title is that the keeping of promises is the cement that holds together finance, industry, sales, employment relations, advertising, and engineering. In the 35 years since I left this school, I have learned how true is the import of that title.

The same thing is true of all of the world's work. It holds true in government, in political affairs, and in international affairs. For centuries such peace as we have enjoyed has rested upon reliance upon international promises, international law, and upon principles of respect for the small and the weak. Woodrow Wilson said in 1918 in defining American ideals in international relations, "What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." That means the reign of integrity and truth telling.

In conclusion permit me to say that the security and permanence of those principles in the internal affairs of this country and in its dealings with other nations rests upon the maintenance of democratic principles here. Democratic institutions depend upon a true respect for the sacredness of the individual, upon a belief that he, in himself, has something of the divine in his make-up and that therefore we cannot respect God without respecting the God-like in human beings. No definition of democracy can afford to overlook this fact. Other forms of government have their day and then they fall from their own error. Democracy must live because it is free from that error. It may make mistakes, it may be slow in preparation, it may sometimes be inefficient in execution. But beneath it all, it carries a primeval strength. Upon that strength rests our faith. It is the faith of an American. There can be no America unless that faith lives.

As you graduates go out to take your place in the world and to carve out your careers, always remember that the opportunities of the present that you enjoy were born out of the toil, the foresight, and the patriotism of earlier Americans. When you face the uncertainties of the present world chaos, remember that your ancestry faced like perils and came through far stronger for the experiences. Every era of danger begot a greater Nation, just as every era of discouragement in your careers will beget a better character if you rise above your difficulties and fight through to a solution of your problems. As individuals and as a Nation, our problems may loom large. I am sure that every American is confident that their President and their Government will solve successfully the world problems which confront us. What all can do as a Nation, each can do as an individual. I leave you in full confidence that you will carry on your careers with distinction to yourself and honor to this school.

Address Before Ohio State Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, at Toledo, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE MARTIN L. SWEENEY, OF OHIO

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech delivered

by me to the delegates of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Ohio in convention assembled at Toledo, Ohio, Saturday, June 21, 1941:

Past Grand Worthy President Conrad H. Mann, Past Grand Worthy President now Grand Secretary John Abel, Mayor Edward Blythin, of Cleveland, worthy State president, and members of the Ohio State Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I am mighty happy to come here from the sultry climate of Washington to enjoy the cool breezes of Toledo. It is now about 90 degrees in the shade. You know what I mean.

I look forward to these occasions, never having missed an Ohio State Aerie convention since I was honored by you to serve as a worthy State president of the Ohio Aerie some years ago. More important than the social contacts made at these annual reunions is the serious business confronting us when we take inventory of the activities of this great organization.

At the outset I want to tell you how proud I am to once more be on this platform with the genius of this organization, Conrad H. Mann, and I pray God will spare him for many years and give him health to be with us at similar occasions until he passes on. The exalted position we hold today as a fraternal organization in these United States is primarily due to the untiring efforts of Colonel Mann.

Some years ago there was a popular song that went something like this:

"You made me what I am today
I hope you are satisfied."

Paraphrasing that title, I believe if the Eagles had a theme song today it would be dedicated to Conrad Mann in this fashion:

"You made us what we are today
You bet we are satisfied."

I congratulate you for the splendid membership record you made during the past fiscal year under the guidance of our great State secretary, Matt Brown of Springfield, who is now a national figure in our fraternity, and a worthy successor of those illustrious sons of Ohio who spent many years in the service of this order. I refer to our brothers who have passed to the great beyond, Tom Cogan and Michael Burns, and to our living brothers, Howard Ragland and Henry Berrodin, who, thank God, are still with us.

Ohio is and has always been the hub of Eagledom. Because she is the hub of Eagledom we have some mighty important things to say on occasions like this. The popular theme of expression today is national defense, and it is proper to have that subject discussed at a meeting of this kind.

The membership of this fraternity is made up of the working class of Americans, who, after all, are the backbone of the country. They are bound close to us because of the social and economic problems we have been trying in a small way for the past few years to solve. In the field of social economics we have made more progress than any fraternity in the country, thanks to the capable leadership of Conrad Mann and Frank Herring. We have made substantial contributions to the social gains enjoyed by the underprivileged in our midst. Because we have plowed the field and garnered the harvest we cannot sit idly by when attempts are being made under the guise of national defense to destroy the social and economic gains secured by labor after a struggle of a half century of effort. These social advances must not be retarded; on the contrary, they should be extended, and the weight and power of this organization should be in that direction.

Speaking of the Nation and defense, I must tell you the story about Pat Murphy in Cleveland, who was missed from his church on Sunday. O'Brien and O'Toole put the tail on him one Sunday and followed him. They discovered he was attending services at a local Baptist Church. Said O'Brien to O'Toole, "Something has come over Murphy; we'd better go and tell Father Gallagher." So they went and told Father Gallagher they had seen Murphy going into the Baptist Church. Father Gallagher did not believe the story and said he would send for Murphy. Murphy came, and Father Gallagher said, "What's this I hear about your going to the Baptist Church?" "That's right," answered Murphy. Father Gallagher said, "There must be a reason." Murphy replied, "There's a damn good reason." "What is it?" asked Father Gallagher. Murphy asked, "Haven't you heard about our national-defense program?" "Why, certainly I've heard about the national-defense program; what's that got to do with your going to the Baptist Church?" Murphy said, "It's got a hell of a lot to do with it. You know I was on W. P. A. for 4 years. My four sons were around the house idle without any work. Now I am working at the White Motor Co. at $50 a week; Jimmy is working at the powder plant at Ravenna for $100 a week; Tommy is working over at the Thompson Products making airplane parts and getting $75 a week; Eddie is out at the TNT plant at Sandusky making $65 a week; and the youngest boy, Jack, is making $50 a week as a steamfitter. We were going along fine until a few weeks ago, and I pick up the paper and saw a big story on the front page reading, 'The Pope comes out for peace.' Now, who the hell would not join the Baptist Church after that?"

I am not going to talk about a defense program that relates to battleships, tanks, and instruments of destruction, necessary as they are, because we live in a realistic world. I support wholeheartedly a defense program to protect our country from invasion by any foreign foe. We all agree on total defense for that purpose, but I have in mind another defense. It has been touched upon here today by the distinguished gentleman who represents the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Ohio, and by his honor the mayor of Cleveland, and that is the civilian defense program. In the setting up of this program we must insist that the cornerstone of such an enterprise be free speech, free press, and the right of free assembly. More than ever before the virtue of tolerance is needed during this war hysteria. In many communities are individuals who have been frustrated one time or another and who have ambition to become a detective, a G-man, or perhaps a spy. It is just possible, as we go forward in our civilian defense program, these individuals, armed with a commission and a badge, may embark upon the disreputable business of spying upon their neighbor—spending their own spleen against individuals they do not like by making false reports concerning their conduct and activities.

Those of us who lived prior to and during the last World War well remember the un-American system of espionage that caused many innocent people to suffer.

This order pioneered in the field of old-age pension, mothers' pension, workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, collective bargaining for the workers. These laws would not and could not have been placed on the statute books of the States of this Union without the ground work performed by the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Now it appears that some pseudo patriots wrapping the American flag around them and shouting in the name of national defense have determined to destroy these gains to which I referred, and without investigating accuse the organized labor groups of lacking patriotism because they dared to engage in their constitutional right to strike for a few cents per hour in their wages to meet the rising price in the corresponding cost of living. We see groups who were never friendly to labor groups, and individuals who believe in a disfranchising system by payment of a poll tax; groups and individuals who believe in the continuation of child labor and who are bent on destroying collective bargaining, because as they say some Communists have wormed their way into the labor movement.

Let me say without fear of contradiction that the Government of the United States has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars running down subversive activities; that our Department of Justice know full well who these Communists are and can put their finger on them any time they wish and very properly incarcerate them behind the bars. The mystery is why it has not been done to date. Because of the activities of a few of these subversive elements the splendid body of American workingmen are stigmatized.

I was more than proud to hear the representative of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in his address here today, emphatically state that since his Department took over the national-defense supervision of industries not one discovery of sabotage has been made to date. My friends, this is a fine record, and it demonstrates what some of us have been saying for months, that the so-called act of sabotage was a figment of the imagination, that it would not and could not take place where none but good American citizens are employed who have the interest of their Government at heart.

We need in this country today more of the Voltaire philosophy. Let it be remembered that it was Voltaire, the French liberal, who said: "I may disagree with everything you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

As I stand before you on this occasion, sharing this platform with Conrad H. Mann, I wonder what is in his mind as he reflects upon the condition of our country and the world in general today. Conrad Mann, you have been a symbol of what the United States of America has meant to a struggling youth. You have tasted the bitter dregs of poverty and hardship, and after grasping the opportunity presented, you became one of America's leading industrialists. The transition from poverty to security never changed your inner spirit. Your thoughts and actions were always in the direction of making life worth while for the little fellow, as you have often expressed it.

You have come from the poor. I am sure you do not believe that the poor people of England who run to their shelters at night to guard against a rain of fire and death from the sky, or the poor people of Germany, who have to run to their bomb shelters for protection against destruction, are the causes of World War No. 2? No; I believe you will agree with me when I say that the poor of any land do not bring about these incessant wars. War is a racket, so characterized by the late Gen. Smedley Butler. Selfish international bankers profit by wars. They are men who profess the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths; some are atheists, but all are strangers to Christ.

This World War No. 2 would not have occurred had it not been for the infamous Treaty of Versailles. An idealistic American President, Woodrow Wilson, sincerely sought to impose his 14 points for world peace upon this treaty-making body, but they literally, to use a vernacular, threw one after another of his peace points in the ash can, and it is reported and I have for my authority Lincoln Steffens, who in his autobiography stated, "One of the delegates to that memorable peace conference actually spat in the face of Woodrow Wilson." It was reported that the French delegate Clemenceau ere the ink was dry on that famous document said, "It was good for seven wars."

The reason why the peace treaty failed was because the delegates entrusted with the power of their respective countries closed the door to Christ, and like every criminal bent on further activity of crime proceeded to cut

up the real estate of the world and divide the loot.

We paid a terrible price for our entry into the last World War. We emerged with 23,000 new war-profit millionaires and the longest bread lines of any country in the world. We inherited a post-war depression that is still with us, not to speak of the tremendous loss of blood and treasure we sustained. Must we now, 25 years later, take our sons and lay them on the altar of sacrifice and once more have a nation we aided, characterize us as Uncle Shylock, refuse to pay their legitimate debts, and will it be possible at some future date when the American soldiers of World War No. 2 journey to the Capitol in Washington ask for a bonus to have the machine guns and bayonets turned upon them. No; I do not think it will happen if the American people will become articulate and insist that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt keep his solemn pledge that our boys will not be sent to fight in any foreign battlefield.

There are those who believe we should spend $7,000,000,000 and more to purchase tanks, guns, and airplanes to keep the war over there. I have no quarrel with that school of thought that restricts itself solely to material aid. If these instruments of destruction are blown up in the Atlantic Ocean, or destroyed on battlefields, they can be replaced, but the important thing for us to keep in mind is that we cannot replace the broken bodies of American-born boys. That is what we are going to guard against. [Applause.]

Let it also be remembered that approximately 1 year ago, when we were starting our general defense program, leading industrialists came to Washington and said: "We will not turn a wheel unless we know how much profit we are going to make." Did Congress reach out and draft industry then; did they call out the troops? No; they prepared and passed a bill giving industry the green light on the cost-profit system. Now, because labor, as I indicated before, exercises its constitutional right to strike when mediation fails, the threat is abroad that troops will be called out and the participants of strikes will be forced into concentration camps. I sincerely trust that reason will prevail and that we never reach that stage of industrial strife.

The United States of America is not the Soviet Russia of Stalin; it is not Germany under despot Hitler, or Italy under dictator Mussolini. We could well take a lesson from England, who has had two major strikes during the last year, despite the fact she is fighting for her very existence. It demonstrates to me the flexibility of the democracy of the working classes in the British Isles. Yet there are controlled radio announcers, and columnists, and that sort, who say that the laboring man is not patriotic because he dares exercise his right to strike under certain circumstances. Let me respond that it is the laboring man's sons who are now in camps, preparing to defend this country; it is the laboring man's son who will go to Dakar and who will be shipped to the Azores, to Africa, and to Iceland, and then, God forbid, over to Central Europe to finish the war and maybe to finish democracy over here.

Let us have respect for the other fellow's viewpoint and, like Voltaire, permit him to exercise his right of free speech. There is a line of demarcation between free speech and license which every sane citizen recognizes. While I am on the subject of propaganda let me say one does not have to be pro-British to be pro-American. To be pro-American all you have to be is a good American. Within the folds of this order are Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, all subscribing to America first. We march, shoulder to shoulder, in battle for social legislation, and we ask you to continue and hasten the work to be mapped out by our leaders in the future. Make no mistake; regardless of this war hysteria, America will find her soul.

When we passed the peacetime conscription law, which I characterized as a negation of democracy, they told us we were about to be invaded in a few weeks; when we passed the lend-lease bill the same argument was presented. Thank God we have not been invaded and with the resources and power that are ours we will never be invaded by any foreign power. During the last World War many of us will recall Lord Northcliffe, of England, who propagandized us into the war. He spent $75,000,000 deliberately telling lies to our people to stir up their emotions and bring about our participation in that horrible catastrophe. He went to England after completing his propagandizing and he is reported to have said, according to H. C. Peterson, author of Propaganda for War, "The Americans, they dress alike; they talk alike; they think alike—what sheep."

To an extent that statement may be true. We are a democratic people and we have our weakness as a Nation. We have some blank pages in our history. One page is a serious indictment against our democracy, since the year 1882 there have been 5,000 lynchings. This is nothing to boast about when we seek to impose our four freedoms upon other parts of the world. We had 12 years of national prohibition that no other country in the world would dare experiment with or put into law, but we do not talk about that. We have our weaknesses, but we are a power despite the fact that sometimes our people move on a mass-psychology basis.

In the University of Iowa some years ago while a professor was instructing a class in psychology, a young man rushed into the classroom shouting a kidnaping and murder had been committed. The fellow had confessed and some of the town folks were going to hang him. The professor said here is a good chance to try our my theory, and I shall give you three questions:

How many of you would be willing to join the lynching party?

How many of you would be willing to go as spectators?

How many of you would prefer to stay away?

When the results were tabulated 64 announced they were willing sight unseen to participate in the lynching, 60 said they would go as spectators, and 76 preferred to stay away. This is indicative of the cross section of America.

We have had bigotry and intolerance in this country during its brief history but we have always overcome it, and organizations of this type have done their part in driving under cover every agency that would destroy our free institutions.

I said before war is a racket. If it is not a racket I ask any one in this audience to answer this question:

Why did this Nation of ours sit idly by and allow Japan to buy scrap iron in this country for the past 5 years and process the same into cannon to kill the helpless Chinese, and at the same time make loans of millions of dollars to the Chinese Government to wage war on the Japanese?

If war is not a racket why did we loan millions to the gallant little nation of Finland to fight the Russian bear, and at the same time sell our oil and gasoline to service the bombers of Soviet Russia to rain death upon the people of Finland?

If war is not a racket why did we purchase Russian gold at $35 an ounce that they process in Soviet Russia at less than $4 an ounce?

If war is not a racket why do we permit at the present time American capitalists to engage in the oil fields of Brazil, the richest oil fields of modern times, and sell their oil to the Japanese who make possible delivery to Germany to carry on the war?

If we are part of that system we should be courageous enough to tell the truth, and the more we tell the truth the less chance of our involvement in a foreign war.

You patriotic Eagles have a duty to perform as you leave here and go back to your respective homes. Our duty as indicated is national defense, but I repeat it must be based on tolerance. This Fraternal Order of Eagles knows something about the virtue of tolerance. If I cannot speak well of a brother Eagle, I won't speak ill of him. That has been our slogan since the birth of this fraternity. That slogan is the essence of tolerance. Nations may well pattern after that philosophy.

A refugee wrote a beautiful poem. I feel it is apropos to recite here at this time:

"'What is the real good?'
I ask in musing mood.
'Order,' said the law courts;
'Knowledge,' said the school;
'Truth,' said the wise man;
'Pleasure,' said the fool;
'Love,' said the maiden;
'Beauty,' said the page;
'Freedom,' said the dreamer;
'Home,' said the sage;
'Fame,' said the soldier;
'Equity,' the seer.
Spake my heart still sadly,
'The answer is not here.'
Then within my bosom
Softly this I heard.
'Each heart holds the secret;
Kindness is the word.'"

That was written by John Boyle O'Riley 50 years ago, a man who knew the meaning of tolerance, who suffered in a British prison for his native land, and subsequently escaped and found asylum on the free soil of the United States. Here he became a poet and a writer of great reputation.

Thank God for the privilege of addressing you once again. May God bless you and this fine, liberal organization

Antilabor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK PM

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from PM, on the bill now pending before the House:

[From the New York PM of July 9, 1941]

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT SEEN AGAINST ANTI-LABOR LAWS AS HOUSE STARTS DEBATE

WASHINGTON, July 9.—With President Roosevelt reported to have thrown his weight against any drastic antilabor legislation, bitter conflict was expected in the House today when the May bill comes up for debate.

The bill, chief target of combined A. F. of L. and C. I. O. opposition, authorizes the use of troops to "afford protection to all persons engaged in the operation of such plant or industry who voluntarily desire to work." It is neatly appended to the bill authorizing deferment from the draft of men over 28.

Both A. F. of L. and C. I. O. leaders have contended that the measure in fact would

provide Government sanction for violent strikebreaking in any defense labor walkout.

Philip Murray, C. I. O. president, conferred with President Roosevelt yesterday, and the May bill, as well as other proposals aimed to curb unions, was discussed. While no statement on the outcome of the meeting was made, C. I. O. leaders appeared optimistic after a separate meeting with Speaker RAYBURN and Representative MCCORMACK, House majority leader.

Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers led the delegation. When the session ended he said it was very satisfactory. The comment was regarded here as indication that the President had passed reassuring views along to his legislative leaders.

THE HILLMAN STORY

Coinciding with the renewed optimism in labor circles was Sidney Hillman's comment to reporters. The labor spokesman in the O. P. M. said:

"I can't think of a strike affecting national defense orders at the moment."

He also met with President Roosevelt yesterday on the eve of the momentous Congressional debate.

The day's interviews climaxed a last-minute drive by labor groups here to stem anti-union measures. More than 200 C. I. O. representatives gathered here Monday for the campaign.

Another significant session on the defense-labor front was a meeting yesterday between Mr. Murray, Bernard M. Baruch, who headed the War Industries Board in the last war, and Brig. Gen. Edwin M. Watson, the President's secretary. Mr. Murray has been pressing for drastic overhauling of the defense set-up with "industry councils," representing labor and management, formed to push the production program. It was assumed that this was one of the subjects of discussion.

No Price Ceiling on Meat Contemplated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

LETTER FROM LEON HENDERSON, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVILIAN SUPPLY

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I am inserting a letter from Leon Henderson, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, which gives some assurance to the livestock industry that no action is contemplated to place a price ceiling on meat.

Since many cattle feeders have recently sold their fat cattle at prices below cost of production, some encouragement to continue feeding operations is necessary. Otherwise, numerous Corn Belt farmers would be inclined to sell their corn to the Government under the loan program and let their feed lots remain idle.

The following representatives of producer organizations attended the conference with the O. P. A. C. S. hereinafter referred to: F. E. Mollin, secretary, American National Live Stock Association; E. W. Sheets, secretary, United States Live Stock Association; B. B. Brumley, president, National Live Stock Marketing Association; J. B. Wilson, secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers; Fred R. Marshall, secretary, National Wool Growers Association; W. J. Miller, secretary, Kansas Live Stock Association; and C. J. Abbott, director, Nebraska Stock Growers Association.

This conference which I attended had two objectives from the producers' standpoint. The first was to protest the low price ceiling that had been placed on hides and the second was to obtain some assurance that no price ceiling would be placed on the principal livestock product, meat. Since the Department of Agriculture has encouraged meat production to meet the emergency, the livestock feeders who have been fearful of a price ceiling being established will welcome the assurance contained in the following letter from Leon Henderson:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
AND CIVILIAN SUPPLY,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1941.

Hon. HARRY B. COFFEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COFFEE: Following our recent meeting with the representatives of the livestock producers, I want to assure you again that the step which we have taken in this Office to check the speculative increase in hide prices should not be taken as indicating that we are contemplating action on livestock prices or the price of meat.

While under present circumstances you will understand that no one can make any long-range promises, I do want you to know that no such step has at any time been under consideration in this Office, nor do I see any present likelihood of such action. I would be very disturbed if anticipation of such a step should handicap the stocking of feeders during the coming year, and I would like livestock producers to know that I keenly appreciate the importance of maintaining a fair margin between the cost of feeder cattle and the price of finished stock. I know that a good many farmers are feeding cattle this year on a very narrow margin over the high prices paid for feeder stock and that actual losses have been considerable, in spite of a relatively strong beef market. Protection of feeder margins, as well as fair returns, must always be a factor in any consideration of cattle or meat prices.

Our action on hide prices, including kid and calf skins, was to meet a special situation more or less peculiar to this commodity. A speculative movement in these prices developed during the spring which led to forward buying of shoes and other leather products, heavy forward buying of leather from tanneries, and heavy buying of hides by the tanneries themselves. This promised to reflect in unreasonable prices for leather products and eventually a liquidation which would react on prices throughout the industry. In late May the Army found it necessary to reject bids on a million pairs of Army shoes and approximately one-quarter million pairs of Civilian Conservation Corps shoes, and this Office took steps to check the spiral. We had no thought whatsoever in seeking to control livestock prices.

I would appreciate any steps that you may be able to take to place this interpretation of our action before the livestock producers.

Sincerely yours,

LEON HENDERSON, *Administrator.*

Poll Taxers and the Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1941

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, so long as so many of our States require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, the unemployed anywhere in the United States will not get the proper consideration due them in a democracy where all men are supposed to have equality of opportunity. I make this statement without fear of contradiction, for I shall cite facts to prove my contention.

NATION-WIDE PROBLEM

I wish to express again the words in my statement, "anywhere in the United States." It is well known that Federal laws operate the same all over the United States and that they are passed by the votes of Representatives from all sections and districts of the country. Thus, if certain restrictions are put into the laws governing the W. P. A., largely by means of the votes of one section of the country, all W. P. A. workers will suffer from these restrictions, regardless of how their own particular Representatives might have voted on that issue. This is why the voting requirements of 1 State are of vital concern to every other section of every other State. Let me illustrate. The Casey amendment providing for an increase in the W. P. A. appropriation was defeated largely by the 78 Representatives of the poll-tax States. In other words, had the Representatives from these 8 poll-tax States had the same percentage for the amendment as did the other sections of the country the amendment would have carried, and a greater number of the already certified needy could have been cared for than will now be possible.

I want it understood that I quarrel with no man because of the way he votes on any issue. I believe every Member is honest and conscientious and votes according to the way his voting constituents desire him to vote—please note I said "voting constituents." In fact, in a representative government such as ours, the voters back home take care of the man who disregards their wishes too often. My colleagues from the poll-tax States are to be complimented for their faithfulness in following the American principle of representing their voting constituents.

Their faithfulness to this principle is attested to by the fact that, although they comprise but one-sixth of the membership of the House, they hold twice that number of chairmanships of the different committees. Committee chairmanships, it will be recalled, are rewards for length of service in the House.

SOME EVIDENCES

As I have said before, on every liberalizing amendment to the W. P. A. bill, the

poll taxers voted overwhelmingly against these amendments. Despite the fact that the administration strongly urged the elimination of the 30-day lay-off, for example, only 13 of the 78 poll taxers—all Democrats—saw fit to support the proposal.

As I have said before, the same general ratio was true on the Casey amendment. I have watched the procedure every time the W. P. A. bill has come up since I have been in Congress. It has always been the same. The section of the country which has been called our No. 1 economic problem has given the least support to the measures which would benefit their unfortunate people the most.

At first this seemed strange to me, but when I realized that these people had little money on which to live, let alone pay for the right of voting for their elected representatives, I could readily see that their interests would be sacrificed for the interests of those who can pay the poll tax.

The W. P. A. bill has two strikes against it before it ever gets out of committee, for the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill comes from one of our poll-tax States. He is one of the ablest men in the House and thoroughly believes in and practices the American principle given above—that in representative government the representative must serve his voting constituents.

Thus we see that justice to our unemployed of the Nation can be obtained only when they are able to go to the polls in all sections of the country with the power to reward or to punish according to the treatment their segment of society has received.

I urge all to sign discharge petition No. 1 to bring to the floor the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill which is now bottled up in a committee whose chairman comes from a poll-tax State.

More Dead Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President told Congress that, acting under his orders, forces of the United States Navy had arrived in Iceland. He further advised us that he had sent soldiers to Trinidad and British Guiana, and the press tells us that he has ordered the Navy to sweep the sea of German war vessels.

As the President carries on his undeclared war in violation of his oath of office, for the preservation of our Constitution, it might be well for us to read Sleeping in Flanders' Field, by Bond Davis. That our boys and we, before they meet the death to which the President is sending them, may consider the reason that death should come to them, let us read this message which runs as follows:

I'm just a dead soldier in Flanders,
Once again the bombardment is near,
And I wonder is anyone living
Can tell me just why I am here.

I fought in the war to free people,
And really I hated not one,
Like me, they were husbands and sweethearts,
Until, someone gave them a gun.

They marched you away from your village,
And poisoned your mind with war hate,
And told you of glories, unending,
If a bullet should meet you, by fate.

You were fighting the fight of the righteous,
You were making the world free for all,
But I wondered just what they were telling,
The boys in the other trench wall.

Since the summer of '15 I've lain here,
While the poppies grew over my bier,
And mothers and wives and children,
Watered our graves, with a tear.

I'm just a dead soldier in Flanders,
Once again the cannons will roar,
And I wonder if someone can tell me,
Just what they are fighting for.

—*Bond Davis.*

Let all those who believe that we should not again sacrifice American lives, join Stalin, the most vicious murderer of modern times in a war which may cause us our freedom, make known to the President and those Senators and Congressmen who would crowd us into this war, their opposition to such a course, this by letter to public officials, to the press, through public speech, and by private conversation.

Prize Winners in Fathers' Day Contest in Spokane, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I have upon previous occasions brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States the significant fact that Fathers' Day had its origin in the city of Spokane, Wash., which city is my home and a part of my congressional district. The originator of this beautiful idea is a very brilliant and estimable lady, who was born and reared in my congressional district and who still resides in Spokane, Mrs. John Bruce Dodd.

It was back in 1898, when Mrs. Dodd's mother died, leaving her and five other small children entirely dependent upon her father, that the idea was conceived by her that the Nation should set aside one day in the year and pay homage to the fathers of America. Mrs. Dodd, a few years ago, referring to the motives actuating her in giving to America Father's Day, said:

His kindness and the sacrifices he made inspired me. I thought fathers ought to be revered as mothers always were.

When Mrs. Dodd made this statement she had in mind her father, William Jackson Smart, who after the death of her mother was both father and mother to his six motherless children.

One of Mrs. Dodd's friends a few years ago, referring to the tragic experience in her childhood days wrote:

In the Big Bend hills of the State of Washington, the day had its nativity in a lonely farm dwelling. There sorrow ministered amid the moaning of the March winds.

A father sat with bowed head in his aloneness. About him clung his weeping children. The winds outside threw great scarves of powdered snow against the windowpanes, when suddenly the last-born tore himself from the group and rushed out into the storm, calling for his mother. Yet even his baby voice could not penetrate the great silence that held his mother.

Hurriedly the father gathered him back to his protection, and for more than two decades William Jackson Smart, alone, kept paternal vigilance over his motherless children.

From the day that the beautiful thought was first given currency in Spokane, Wash., by Mrs. Dodd, 43 years ago, the idea has grown until now by common custom it is recognized throughout the Nation and in many other parts of the world, and the third Sunday in June is known as the day when the sons and daughters of this Nation pay affectionate tribute to their fathers, just as they do to their mothers upon the second Sunday in the month of May.

Mother's Day is officially recognized by congressional action. In the Sixty-third Congress, both Houses passed a House joint resolution declaring the second Sunday in May of each year to be officially designated Mother's Day, and authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of America to give public expression of their reverence for the mothers of this country on that day.

I have always felt that the same official recognition should be given Father's Day, and therefore have introduced a similar House joint resolution and am hopeful that it will be enacted into law.

In order to emphasize Father's Day, the Spokane Chronicle, one of the leading daily newspapers in my district, conducted a contest this year, paying cash awards to the first and other prize winners. The contest was divided into two divisions. One was a grade-school division and the other an adult division.

The first prize in the grade-school division was won by a bright little fellow, 8 years of age, whose name is Eugene Kvalvik, a second-grade pupil of Samuels, Idaho, and the prize-winning letter follows:

WHY I THINK MY FATHER IS THE BEST FATHER A SON OR DAUGHTER EVER HAD

My father is a swell guy, and I am going to remember him on Father's Day because he

is a great sport and will play—help me fly kites—and, of course, he likes fishing as well as I do. But, O boy, he is strict. I guess it's because he wants me to grow up to be a good boy, and I am going to do everything he says, even pulling weeds in the garden, which no one hardly likes to do, but, you see, it's got to be done. So I am going to be good to my daddy so he will be proud of me, as I am of him.

Other winners of grade-school prizes were: Margaret Ruth Olsen, 9 years, 2920 Riverview Drive, Spokane, Wash., John Lewis Anderson, 10½ years, Rosalia, Wash.; Raymond Simonson, 14 years, North 5113 Washington, Spokane; Jerry Cawdrey, 11 years, North 1311 Lidgerwood, Spokane; Shirley Forriester, 10 years, 225 True Avenue, Pullman, Wash.; Vera M. Buth, Fairfield, Wash.; and Albert R. Stevens, 12 years, East 1928 Heroy, Spokane, Wash.

In the adult group, Howard E. Smith, North 2423 Stevens, Spokane, was the winner of first prize, his entry being a poem, as follows:

Any boy in the world would be proud of my dad,
Cause he's the best father any boy ever had—
In giving advice he's been more than fair
And convinced me it pays to be on the square.

In season we're out after pheasant and hun.
We don't always get them but we have lots of fun.
When fishing time comes, it's the old rod and reel,
And as a general rule we fill up the creel.

At horseshoes and golf we're always together,
And a swell game of pingpong in inclement weather.
I'm just twenty-one and feel like a man,
But still prefer dad to the rest of the gang.

I'm taking up flying and cruise fairly steady
And when Uncle Sam calls, I expect to be ready.
It kind of hurts dad but he admits that I'm right
And he'd like to go with me and help win the fight.

In addition to Mr. Smith as first prize winner, other winners in the adult division were Velma Stewart, Daisy, Wash.; Betty J. Cooke, West 1706 Dean, Spokane; Patricia Keenan, East 3140 Twenty-eighth, Spokane; Ellen McNutt, Rice, Wash.; Mack Worthen, West 1304 Dean, Spokane; Mary Elizabeth Thomas, 306 Colorado Street, Pullman, Wash.; Constance Matlock, 1204 Coeur d'Alene Avenue, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

There were more than 200 entries in this contest, and each of them was an exceptional written tribute of a son or daughter, displaying affection for his or her father.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these prize-winning letters and to give to my colleagues this brief biographical sketch of the fine lady who gave America and the world the idea of Father's Day, and the historical facts in connection with its origin.

I feel that the Spokane Chronicle deserves special mention because of the time and space it has given in furthering the idea of Father's Day through a prize-winning contest, and I am sure in time scores of other leading newspapers of America will emulate the practice inaugurated by the Spokane Chronicle.

Americans, Guard Against That Alliance With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ARTICLE BY LEE CARSON

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, when President Roosevelt allied this Nation with Communistic Russia by promising aid to the so-called "reds" he placed this country and himself in a dubious position. After the President promised to spread the four freedoms over the world, he now is pledged to aid a country and a form of government which is Godless and unmerciful, which has a record of bloodshed and starvation of millions, and a program which is designed to overthrow our own free institutions by force and violence. It would have been much better for this Nation to let the two ruthless dictators, Hitler and Stalin, fight it out, while we set our own house in order and prepared our own defenses.

As a result of this new-found affection for Russia which Roosevelt seems to display, the Communists may burrow deeper into industry, labor, and the Government. Americans must be on guard now more than ever before. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. The following newspaper article discusses the problem:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of July 5, 1941]

RUSS-NAZI WAR GIVES UNITED STATES REDS NEW CHANCE—BURROW DEEPER INTO INDUSTRY, LABOR, AND GOVERNMENT, REPORT OF DIES COMMITTEE SCOUTS

(By Lee Carson, International News Service staff correspondent)

WASHINGTON, July 4.—Dies committee talent scouts today returned from a swing around the red circuit to report that American Communists are taking full advantage of the Soviet-Nazi war to burrow deeper into industry, labor, and the Government.

Un-American activities experts declare the Communists expect Stalin and Hitler eventually to make peace, with Stalin losing a few oil fields and granaries. In the meantime, American Communist chapters are entrenching themselves more firmly in key positions.

GET INSTRUCTIONS

In the possession of the Dies committee is a copy of alleged instructions sent out to all Communist groups.

The instructions urge:

"Now that Germany has attacked the Soviet Union, the United States will have to go along with Great Britain and the U. S. S. R. in the fight against the common enemy, and as a result of this the Government will let up on the persecution of Communists. This will place the Communists in a wonderful position to accomplish things that otherwise would be hard to achieve. Everyone was urged to redouble their efforts in the branch organizations and to secure as many members as possible, and to continue the drive for the control of the basic industries through the trade unions."

JAPS ARE PROBLEM

Concurrent with worry over the Reds comes another anti-American problem. According to the investigators, the Japs are some 3,200 strong on the west coast, have a fleet of almost 1,000 small boats "manned by reserve officers of the Japanese Navy and under direct command of Tokio." The Japs, like the Nazis, keep an unrelenting hold on their subjects in this country by threats of reprisal to their families and friends still in Japan.

Home Versus Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday:

[From the Washington Post of July 8, 1941]

HOME VERSUS OFFICE

The taking over of the Dupont Circle Apartments by the Government has aroused a storm of protest from tenants, some of them on long leases, who have been asked to move on less than 2 weeks' notice. To hunt new quarters in the tropical heat of a Washington summer would be a hardship under any conditions. But it is a gruelling experience, and for some a hopeless quest, with the city already crowded to overflowing with newcomers. Yet the personal discomfort of the evicted tenants, who have been somewhat jocularly referred to as "refugees," would weigh little in the balance against the needs of the Government if one could be sure that the Government is acting wisely in casting out several hundred persons, many of whom are Government employees working on defense assignments.

And this has yet to be proved. The efficiency of a Government worker depends quite as much upon his having a bed as a desk in an office. Although the Dupont Circle Apartments will take care of a good many more office workers than roomers, dispossession of tenants cannot be justified on any such crudely statistical basis. The simple fact is that Washington is confronted by a housing problem that is daily becoming more acute. And the Government is aggravating that shortage by moving into quarters never intended for such use. This is only a single instance of encroachment. But it is sufficiently conspicuous to serve the purpose of a "stop and look" signal. It stands to reason that the legislation already introduced into Congress to control rentals will be made infinitely more difficult of administration if the Government itself enters the market as a competitive bidder for restricted living quarters. At least the authorities should ask themselves whether the time has not come to call a halt until they are assured that adequate accommodations can be found for the people whom they dislodge.

We have stated many times that the national-defense program has to be integrated and coordinated. No one program can be pushed ahead regardless of the effect upon other parts of the program. And obviously the program cannot be developed in disregard of the personal needs of the men and women without whom nothing could be accomplished.

The President Betrays Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, by ordering American boys to Iceland, Trinidad, and British Guiana, and sending other boys on ships to clear the seas of German raiders and submarines, the President has violated the promise he made us when he said, "Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign war." More reprehensible, if possible, is his conduct in sending them to fight a war for which we are not prepared.

We are not so blind that we cannot read what is happening throughout the world. We are not so deaf that we cannot hear what is being said in public and over the radio. Nor are we so dumb that we cannot realize and understand that ordering American warships and planes to wipe German combat units from the high seas, means a shooting war and the sending of American boys into a foreign war.

The President is deceiving no one by his statement that the freedom of the seas will be maintained. We know that his purpose is to prevent Germany being successful in her attempted blockade of England. He is not attempting to maintain freedom of the seas. He is giving orders that our Navy join the British Navy and aid in a blockade of Germany. He is sending our Navy to join the British Navy in destroying freedom of the seas.

We know, as does he, that sending American boys to Iceland means, if his claim that Germany intends to seize that land to be true, the sending of American boys into a foreign war in direct violation of his solemn promise—a promise made to secure his re-election.

We know that his statement that the sending of American soldiers to Iceland, Trinidad, and British Guiana, his orders to the Navy and to the Air Force is a defense move, is not true. We know that he is but following his usual practice of saying one thing—doing another, his custom of deceiving the American people, by false statements.

He knows that he has no right to make war.

He knows the sole power to declare war is vested by the Constitution in Congress.

He knows that this latest move of his, his previous moves, are steps in the making of offensive war. He knows, as do we, that he is violating his oath to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States, the oath which he took when he assumed office.

He knows that he is usurping the power of Congress.

This Congress, if it wishes to maintain and preserve this a republic should cite him before the bar of Congress and compel him to meet the charge that he has been unfaithful to his trust; that he is betraying our people on the foreign front as he betrayed us here at home when he aided the drive of communistic controlled and dominated unions to deprive Americans of free speech, of the right to work.

He is leading us into a war for which we are unprepared, which for us can only end in disaster under his incompetent leadership.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF DR. CLIFFORD E. BARBOUR, PASTOR OF THE SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following patriotic address by Dr. Clifford E. Barbour, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, of Knoxville, Tenn.

Dr. Barbour is an eminent minister of his church, occupies a large place in the affections and esteem of the people of Tennessee, and exerts a wide influence for good, especially among the young people. His address is well worth reading by the people of the Nation.

What America means to me! I suppose there has not been a day since the establishment of our country through the sacrifice of the founding fathers in which there have been more people earnestly concerned with discovering just what being an American means. The boys and girls in all our public schools in America are singing with gusto, I Am an American. Every literate man, woman, and child is singing with faith and hope the prayer song of Irving Berlin, God Bless America. Last Sunday 100,000 people gathered in Chicago to give expression to their joy in observance of "I Am an American" Day. Over 200,000 gathered in Washington, and the official estimate of those who came together in Central Park in New York was 750,000, the largest group ever to gather together in America for any purpose whatsoever, and probably the largest group ever assembled any place in the world except on the field of battle. No one was forced to attend any of these meetings. There were no parades. There were but a few men in uniform. No propaganda ministry had promoted the meeting. No one was made to attend. This was America awakening to all the devotion that had been too long dormant. We are all thinking about what America means.

America means something in the realm of the material. There are things that are physical that are peculiar to our country. We are a Nation where skyscrapers are built, towering to the clouds. We build the biggest railroad engines, the biggest bridges, the fastest airplanes, the most luxurious automobiles. America means assembling lines and mass production. America means steak and fried potatoes, fried chicken, and country ham. It means hot biscuits and gravy. It means bacon and eggs. It means apple pie and cheese. America means the best-dressed men and the most fashionable women in the world. America means mammoth high schools, palatial movie palaces—the picture magazines. America means these things in the realm of the material.

However, these things that distinguish America and Americans on the surface are not the things that we pray God to bless nor are most proud to possess. There are some other values that are much more significant and for which we would be willing, though perhaps not gladly, to give up these good material things that are ours. What are they?

I

First. Freedom! Not freedom of behavior, but freedom of opportunity and achievement. No society can offer to its constituents freedom of behavior. In order that the good of all may be maintained restrictions and restraints must be willingly accepted by each. That is how this and other democracies were instituted. In order that ideas and ideals for all might be maintained, each willingly assumes obligations and restraints. There is a discipline of behavior upon which a democracy must be built and maintained. During the last generation there developed a growing desire to throw off all restrictions and restraints, and insofar as we were successful in cutting ourselves loose from discipline, just so far also was democracy weakened. No; it is not freedom of behavior that America means, but freedom of opportunity and of achievement. America offers to each the free expression of his capacities and the achievement, great or small, which may result from such freedom of expression. An employer may establish standards for work and expect his employees to adhere to those standards. However, the employee is privileged to give up his job any time he likes and find expression for his capacities in some other avenue of industry, and there is no one to say him nay. Let a worker in Germany try to quit his job and the state will step in, either forcing adherence to the requirements of the program of production established by the state or the individual will find himself incarcerated in a concentration camp. In Russia a person who kills another man may be sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment, but a person who interferes with the industrial program of the state is executed. But in America freedom means freedom of opportunity for the expression of one's capacities and the achievement of the measure of success that such capacities may produce.

America means freedom also of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion—rights and privileges established for us under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. No one can tell me what to preach or what not to preach. In Germany those who dare to criticize, from the point of view of religion, the program of the state are either liquidated or confined. In America every man's conscience is his own guide concerning matters of faith. In America also it's still possible to have great assemblies of people speak out even against the Government that assures them freedom of assembly. In no place in the world except in the democracies could such things happen. In America we do not even have to agree with the President, and always there are a few millions who do not.

II

Second. America means equality. This does not mean equality of equipment. God created all men equal, but not of equal talent. To one it is given to be a great musician, to another to play only the second violin in the back row. To one is given the qualities of a great executive, but another only the virtues of humble service. To one is given the capacity to control men, to another

the capacity to follow. No; there is not equality of equipment either in America or anywhere else in the world. But in America there is the equality of expression for whatever one's equipment may be and fair play for all before the law, and, at least in ideal, fair play for all in the economic and social order. Whatever a man's economic position may be, he has the same voice in matters of government as every other citizen; and if he has much money, or if he has little, he has one vote at the ballot box. Whatever his social status, his position before the law is the same as the position of any American. Whatever his individual standing, he is free to express his opinion in the press, over the radio, or in private or public address. No Gestapo or Ogpu is going to eavesdrop in an effort to compromise him and bring punishment for any deviation from the support of the program and policy of the dictator. Every American has the privilege with every other American of expressing himself freely.

III

Third. In America the individual counts. In the totalitarian states the individual is of significance only as he becomes a useful contributor to the purpose of the head of the state. When the individual interferes with such purpose, he is either killed or confined. In America the Government functions by the will of the people and for the purpose of making sure the rights and privileges of individuals. In America the individual counts.

IV

Fourth. All of these benefits which come to us as Americans are based on the conviction of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We believe that God made man in his own image, and that life must be organized so that man may achieve God likeness. Whatever his racial background or national inheritance, every man in America is reckoned to be a child of God, with the impress of eternity upon his soul. It is because we believe in that which is spiritual that freedom and equality prevail, and that the rights of the individual are at the core of our democracy.

This is what America means to me, and with all reverence and humility I say, "Thank God I am an American!"

End the Un-American Practice of Employment Discrimination in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in regard to my bill (H. R. 4149) to prevent employment discrimination in defense industries on account of race, color, or creed, I wish to call attention to the Committee on Fair Employment Practices just created within the Office of Production Management by Executive order of President Roosevelt.

The purpose of this committee of five is to investigate complaints of discrimination in defense employment and to end such discrimination.

Every American, in and out of Congress, who have been shocked by the way in which Negroes have been barred by airplane and other industries having defense orders will be delighted to know that the President's order also specified that in all subsequent defense contracts negotiated by the Government there should be included a provision prohibiting the contractor from discriminating against workers because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The President directed further that all Government vocational and training programs for defense production shall contain special measures of assurance against discrimination.

This seems to make unnecessary further effort to get my bill, H. R. 4149, favorably considered. However, I am sure that every Member of Congress who receives future complaints as to discrimination will present these complaints to the new committee and thereby help to see that the Executive order is strictly obeyed. I, for one, am determined to do all in my power to end the un-American practice of race discrimination.

Small-Loan Companies Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

LETTER AND ARTICLE BY MERRELL DOUGHERTY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying article:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 8, 1941.*

HON. DEWEY SHORT,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: Since you have expressed a desire to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my front-page exposé of the un-American small-loan companies, which appeared in the Cincinnati Chronicle, Independence Day, July 4, 1941, I am enclosing herewith my article verbatim.

As I see it, there is no better way to serve the cause of American independence than to give back the inherent American heritage to those who have been filched by these financial heretics.

Not as a reformer but as an "informer," I prefer to be recognized. "Inform the people with truth, and truth will make the people free."

Thanking you, I am
Sincerely yours,

MERRELL DOUGHERTY.

BLOOD MONEY

While all free peoples throughout the world are united in the theory, if not the actual practice, of saving democracy and the sovereignty of the individual in war-torn countries, we Americans should not turn blindly away from the bleeding sides of our own brethren whose personal sovereignty is on the auction block of human slavery. I am referring to the pernicious practice of modern-day usury as legalized by most of the States and operating under the questionable misnomer of small-loan companies. Six percent interest is not unprofitable for any investor. Eight percent is too much, and 42 percent per annum should not be tolerated. Yet many States have legalized this 3½-percent interest rate per month.

I have before me the figures of Mrs. ———, who borrowed $160 December 2, 1940. Earning a salary of $100 per month as a charwoman in a Government office, and supporting an invalid husband, this poor woman (there are thousands more just like her) pays back the original loan at the rate of $13.89 per month. For the 5-month period ending May 2, 1941, Mrs. ——— paid in five equal monthly payments of $13.89 a total of $69.45. Of this amount $44.62 applied to the principal of the note and $24.83 applied to interest on the note, leaving a net unpaid balance of $115.38.

Small-loan companies were originally sold to the gullible politicians and the unsuspecting public under the guise of gross inefficiency of legitimate banking.

This might have been true in the days of the "10,000 bank failures," but there is no license for permitting this abominable plague to grow and spread its lethal virus further.

There is a growing suspicion that the same vested interests who dominate high finance were also behind this pernicious program; that they are the "holding companies," and the small-loan companies are their bootleg subsidiaries. An investigation of all small-loan companies should be made—now. And the facts should be disclosed.

Yes; civilization, humanity, democracy, and decency are at stake, and we must not try to establish them abroad while they perish at home.

The malpractice of small-loan companies, who wring their "blood money" from the warped minds and wracked bodies of our underprivileged—these are their only victims—should be definitely labeled un-American. They must go.

MERRELL DOUGHERTY.

Independence Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, OF NEW YORK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered on the village green of St. Paul's Church, located in Mount Vernon, N. Y., on July 4, 1941:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, ladies, and gentlemen, I know of no better place to celebrate the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of our National Independence Day than here on the village green at St. Paul's Church, Mount Vernon.

With the historical background of St. Paul's Church and the men whose names were connected with it in its earlier days,

what a fitting place it is to celebrate this great day.

Many of those who took part in the early history of our country, especially in the Revolutionary days, attended this great church. Many of them took a very patriotic part in establishing this great democracy which we have enjoyed for over 150 years.

Right here in this churchyard it has been said and acknowledged that the freedom of the press, which meant the dawn of civil liberty, was born in the fall of 1733 by one John Peter Zinger, who printed and published a small paper giving the accounts of an election for which the people were anxiously waiting. Later on, when our own independence was secured and the Constitution of the United States was adopted, it gave to the people of America freedom and liberty not equaled in any part of the world, for under our Constitution there is no discrimination against anyone because of his nationality, creed, or race, providing the individuals respect our laws and live up to the Constitution, which is so essential to keep law and order in our land

For over 150 years our people have lived as one united family, except during the Civil War, and in that war we positively established the freedom of man in this country. We must continue doing so and we must not let the Old World's intolerance or hatred enter our land. Unity is demanded more today than in any other time of our history. Realizing what is taking place in the Old World and with nation after nation being destroyed against the will of the people, we must prepare this country of ours to meet any emergency, and if we are attacked be in a position to destroy our enemy. I believe it is the duty of all loyal Americans to be ready at all times to make any sacrifice, even life itself, in defense of our flag and country.

For that reason we are assembled here today on this historic village green to acknowledge to the world that we are a united people, ready to defend the United States against all enemies at home or abroad.

The great trouble with the people of the world has been that they have been more interested in material things than in spiritual things and they have forgotten their religion, which means so much to the human race. If religion should be destroyed, civilization is lost, and when I say religion I mean "that which teaches the brotherhood of man."

We have a great responsibility in this crisis. We must not shirk it. We must do everything to make it safe not only for the present generation but for the future generations to come. It is our duty to build bridges of safety, bridges of security. Yes; bridges that will preserve this great democracy for those who are to follow. This is your duty. It is my duty.

I will recite to you a short poem which I believe is most appropriate at this time.

An old man, travelling a lone highway,
Came at the evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm deep and wide;
The old man crossed in the twilight dim;
The sullen stream had no fears for him.
But he turned when safe on the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.
"Old man," said a fellow-pilgrim near,
"You are wasting your strength in building here;
"Your journey will end with the ending day;
"You never again will pass this way;
"You've crossed the chasm deep and wide,
"Why build you the bridge at eventide?"
The builder lifted his old gray head,
"Good friend, in the path I've come," he said,
"There followeth after me today
"A youth whose feet must pass this way,
"This chasm that was as naught to me,
"To that fair youth may a pitfall be;
"He, too, must cross in the twilight dim;
"Good friend, I am building the bridge for him."

In conclusion I wish to sincerely thank the committee who honored me with the invitation to speak here today at this celebration. I trust this country will continue celebrating Independence Day for generations to come.

Federal Tax on Admissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

LETTER AND MEMORANDUM FROM JOHN J. BENNETT, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying memorandum:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF LAW,
Albany, July 1, 1941.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I enclose herewith copy of memorandum setting forth the position of the State of New York on the question of Federal taxation of admissions charged at pools, beaches, baths, and recreation facilities of the State of New York and its municipalities. I hope you will see your way clear to support the amendment to the Internal Revenue Act which is being proposed, copy of which is also enclosed.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
JOHN J. BENNETT, Jr.,
Attorney General.

[Enclosure.]

MEMORANDUM ON THE QUESTION OF FEDERAL TAXATION OF ADMISSION TO BATHE IN POOLS, BEACHES, BATHS, AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK AND ITS MUNICIPALITIES

The people of the State of New York, by many acts of the legislature, approved by the Governor, have adopted a program of recreation to promote the health and welfare of the people of the State. On several occasions the people have directly approved this program by voting affirmatively on bond issues to provide funds to finance the program. The various municipalities of the State have followed the lead of the State administrations in providing like recreational facilities for their own citizens. The Federal Government, during the depression, made large sums available in the form of loans, outright grants, W. P. A., C. C. C., N. Y. A., and other funds for like purposes.

The policy of the Federal, State, and municipal governments has been to provide funds from various sources for the acquisition of necessary lands and to construct buildings and equip them for recreational use. In the initial stages moneys are also supplied for maintenance and operation, but more and more the policy has developed to make modest charges for the use of recreational facilities wherever possible so that the cost of maintenance and operation may be paid by the people using the facilities and not out of general taxes. The policy is not to collect for the use of facilities more money than is actually needed for maintenance and operation. As a matter of fact, in almost no cases do the charges pay the entire costs of carrying on these projects. Resort is still made to the taxing powers to make up the difference between the actual costs and the amounts that can be collected.

In all cases the charges are adjusted to meet the ability to pay of the users of the facilities. Administrators in charge of recreational areas have always to keep in mind that the real purpose is to improve the health and general welfare of the people. The charges are continually adjusted whenever it is found that they are proving too much of a handicap and attendance is falling off. On the other hand, the administrator must always keep in mind that the public policy is to meet the recurring charges for maintenance and operation out of receipts instead of resorting to the tax roll.

Recently, the delicately adjusted control of this State and local policy has been thrown out of balance by demands of the Federal Government that State and municipal agencies collect from users of recreational facilities an admission tax to be turned over to the Government. This demand is contrary to the theory which has been sustained by the highest court in this country, that the Federal Government has no power to tax a State. The answer of the taxing authorities to this broad argument is that the tax is not levied on the State but on the users of the facilities and therefore the question of one sovereign taxing another is not involved. This is specious reasoning. The fact is that the State collects for admissions as much as can be collected without discouraging the use of recreational areas. Any tax that is added to what the State charges will simply cut down the use, which as a matter of policy, the State is encouraging. If the tax is not added to the present charges then it must be paid out of the charges collected by the State and the State has that much less money to pay the cost of maintenance and operation.

It would seem that Congress in enacting the admission tax section of the Revenue Act had in mind this fundamental theory, and considered it so well accepted that it was not necessary to make an exception to the law. In writing section 1701 into the Revenue Act providing exemptions in the case of admission to religious, educational, or charitable entertainments Congress extended the general theory that State functions should not be taxed, and specifically exempted all those things which are generally considered to be for the good of the people as a whole, even though they are conducted by individuals or private societies or associations. This section also exempts societies or organizations conducted for the sole purpose of improving any city, town, village, or other municipality, or of maintaining a cooperative or community center moving-picture theater where no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, or where the net earnings inure exclusively to the benefit of persons in military or naval forces of the United States or National Guard organizations or members of the police or fire department of any city, town, or village or other municipality. It is not reasonable to think that Congress would exempt from taxes entertainments which private individuals considered to be for the general good of the people, and at the same time tax admissions to recreational areas which the State itself has constructed and declared to be set up for the general health and welfare of its people.

There is no need to argue over the wording of the act or to go into a long dissertation on the right of one government to tax another. The fact is that this policy of recreation has been adopted by a number of States for the general welfare of the people and it should not be burdened by placing a tax on it. The best way to clarify the question is to amend the law and specifically

state that recreational facilities conducted by the State or any of its municipalities will be exempt from this tax.

A distinction is made in the case of facilities that are essentially entertainments rather than for the recreation of the people, such as shows and athletic events where the number of participants are few compared to the great number who go to enjoy the entertainments or diversions rather than to participate in them. For this reason the proposed amendment excepts from the exemption taxes levied on admissions of spectators.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE ACT

SEC. 1701. Exemptions from tax: No tax shall be levied or collected under this subchapter in respect of (a) any fees, charges, or admissions, all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to a State or any political subdivision thereof, or to any public corporation created by special act of the legislature of a State for a public purpose, no part of the net earnings of which inure to the benefit of any private stockholders or individual, provided that this exemption shall not apply to fees, charges, or admissions collected from spectators at athletic exhibitions, performances, or contests.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, OF MONTANA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered before the convention of Townsend Clubs at Buffalo, N. Y., last week:

My dear friends, it is a great pleasure for me to meet with this representative group of people who during this intense heat came from great distances and with great personal sacrifices to themselves. This convention is composed of the finest, sincerest, and patriotic group of American people whose purpose in meeting is not grounded on selfishness but to bring about a great and needed economic change in our distributive system. That there is a need for a fundamental change is admitted by all. A part of this change is the necessity for dealing more humanely with the aged or our senior citizens. Back of this great thought is the President of the United States. This is what he said on September 11, 1940, in an address in Constitution Hall in the City of Washington:

"Our old-age pension system must be improved and extended. The amount of the pension should be increased and above all, these pensions must be given in a manner which will respect the dignity of the life of service and labor which our aged citizens have given to the Nation.

"It is my hope that soon the United States will have a national system under which no needy man or woman within our borders will lack a minimum old-age pension which will provide adequate food, clothing, and lodging at the end of the road without having to go to the poorhouse to get it, and I look forward to a system which, in addition to this bare minimum, will enable those who have faithfully toiled in any occupation to build up additional security for their old age which will allow them to live in comfort and happiness."

Thus you will observe that our President has committed himself to a national system of pension.

I want to make clear one point before proceeding, that nothing can happen in Europe, Asia, or Africa that will free America from its economic ills, and victory, defeat, or compromise over there will leave us with our major problems, unemployment, poverty among our poor people and among our aged people, lack of distribution only magnified manyfold and made more difficult of solution. The repercussions whatever they are when peace is finally declared, will put us in a position of facing the most trying and ardous times through which this country has passed or we hope we will ever again have to face. So looking for no hope from that source on the conclusion of this debacle in Europe, unemployment and hunger, a lower standard of living for everybody will stalk our footsteps everywhere. We must prepare now to absorb the shock which is inevitably coming.

The phase of economic recovery in the Townsend plan has not been given the importance by the American people that it deserves. To my way of thinking it has chartered a proposed course that, if followed, would go a long ways in helping in this crisis and the one to follow. We have tremendous sums of idle money today, and upon the conclusion of this war we will, whatever the result, have still more. One of the reasons for this is that the Federal Government has entered the field of financing worthy projects and in that field it is there to stay. This leaves no place to go for this great bulk of private funds except to be invested in Federal securities. Remember idle money makes idle men. Expenditures of the annuities provided for in the Townsend plan would put a large part of this great huge sum of idle money to work. As this money is put into the economic stream and purchases goods or the necessities of life for our aged people, it gives employment to other persons to reproduce the same or similar things that are bought.

Again it will make room for the young fellows as the aged worker is retired on a competency. The young people must have employment. Many people say this country cannot afford this plan. My answer is that the country cannot afford not to adopt this or a similar plan. We cannot afford to have our young men tramping the roads, streets, and alleys, idle, hungry, and looking for work. They will fall into crime. That won't do. These boys are our future men.

This plan is not based on need to aged people. Our present social-security law is wholly wrong on this point. It provides for the payment of $20 per month, providing the State matches that sum. No State, to my knowledge, with the exception of California, has done this. Consequently, in some States the aged people receive very few dollars per month. Moreover, the States have the right to determine the question of need. The reason why the Townsend plan will work is that 85 percent of the people over 60 years of age are in need. It would cost more to determine need for all than it would to pay the other 15 percent their annuities. Besides, this 15 percent will have to spend that money. It might be proper to state, there will be approximately 11,000,000 people who will be qualified to receive this annuity. The bill which I introduced, the Townsend plan, will bring in around $50 per month per person. That will go a long way in providing a reasonable way of living and put into circulation a huge sum of money.

The method for the collection of this money is a simple one, a gross income tax with an exemption of $3,000 per year. It will be based on pay-as-you-go policy. In brief, if this plan is put into operation it will serve two specific needed purposes. First, to provide a decent living for our aged people to which they are entitled as American citizens of a Nation with more than 50 percent of the resources of the world and 7 percent of the population of the world. We should be ashamed of ourselves to permit any aged person to live on less than the necessities of life. This plan is a humane, decent, and American way of treating our aged people. Second, the plan will stimulate business. It will put into circulation as I said before a huge sum of money. It will cause a tremendous lot of goods to be consumed and will put to work hundreds of thousands of young men in reproducing the things consumed by this means. As we go along with this spending the national income will be increased and the amount to be paid to the annuitant will thereby be increased. Some people say, "Well, it will reach a run-away amount." The answer to that is, Congress will be in session and can always change the tax to regulate the amount to be paid.

Now, I introduced H. R. 1036, which is the Townsend Plan, at the request of the Townsend organization. I did this because I firmly believe in it. We who are backing this bill did everything we could to secure a hearing upon it before the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Up to date the committee has refused a hearing. Therefore it became necessary to file a discharge petition to take the bill from the committee and get it on the floor of the House for consideration. This petition was filed on June 10 of this year. Up to date 126 Members of Congress have signed this petition. You will recall that 101 voted for this bill when it was up for passage 2 years ago so you will see that the sentiment is growing for the bill. We will make every effort to secure the needed number, namely, 218.

I want to speak a moment about a rule of the House which provides that it takes a majority of the Members of the House to have a bill even considered where a committee serves as a bottleneck to prevent consideration of a bill. In other words, it takes as many to cause a bill to be considered as it does to pass a bill. That is a harsh and unreasonable rule in my opinion and sooner or later it must be changed if democratic processes are going to be observed. I tried to have this rule amended 2 years ago to provide on a petition being signed by 145 Members of the House that it automatically discharged the committee and placed the bill before the House for consideration, but I was unsuccessful in my attempt. I am going to try again. The highest number of votes ever cast for any bill this year was 391. Now then, nearly one-third of that number have already within 20 days signed my petition and there have been absent from the House during this period on an average of 140 Members. It is safe to assume that many of those would have signed if they were in attendance.

I want to leave this thought with you that Dr. Townsend, the founder of this plan, has made the Nation conscious of its need. He has earned a place in the affection and hearts of the American people that few in private life have ever attained. Whatever bill that is passed providing for a decent pension, Dr. Townsend must, in justice, be given the credit whether it is his plan or some other plan. Unselfishly and laboriously he has striven for this great humane, needed measure. I also wish to add that many Members of Congress, including myself, have fought and will continue to fight and struggle until victory shall crown our efforts.

We cannot hope to challenge the world's attention to the benefits of democracy unless we make democracy work in America. How should we make it work? We cannot sit supinely by and deal in platitudes and say we have a nation of four freedoms—the freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. In

theory, that is what we have, but we have not been making this theory work. One-third of our people would today be in want were it not for the defense program in being engaged in the manufacturing of things to kill people with, and with the defense program millions of our aged people are in want. What an indictment against the statesmanship of this country to have to admit that we could not or did not solve the want problem. Are those poor people who are in want free of fear? When they get up in the morning of the first day of the month, they don't know if they will have enough to get through until the last day of that month. Freedom of religion, let us see about that. We are all striving for the same objective, namely, the salvation of our soul and we are supposed to have the right to obtain that objective through any religious faith we adopt. Yet I have known where teachers in our public schools were discriminated against because they were of a certain religious faith. The old Ku Klux Klan is again sticking up its reptilian head emitting its poisonous spew. We have not equality of our racial groups. Persons are today being discriminated against because by accident they happen to belong to a certain group. This, my friends, is not democracy at work. Our job is to see that it actually works. After all democracy is the hope of the world and it can be and will be made to work.

Nazi-ism, fascism, and communism won't do. They deny the freedom of man. Man was not born to be dictated to by any person. I am unalterably opposed to any form of "ism" that has for its purpose a state or socialized ownership and control of the resources and property of the country, as well as the personal rights of the people. The most that can be said as between these "isms" is that there is a distinction without a difference. Hitler and Stalin, each the leader of a pack, are now at grips. So far as affecting the morals and welfare of the world, victory either way would make little, if any, difference. However, they have been hunting for victims in two packs in the past. Should either win now all would hunt in one pack. In the past each, fearful of the other, spent time on the watch. Should a winner emerge, the pack would give its entire time conquering free peoples. It would be better for the world, however, for Hitler not to win, as he is the shrewder and more efficient in his work, consequently more dangerous. The history of both show that they have been trying to outdo each other in brutality, human massacre, wickedness, and human slavery. Each hand is equally bloody. It is obvious that we must arm to the teeth as quickly and as effectively as possible. Let there be no doubt, if Hitler beats Stalin, my friends, we must be on our guard. We have called him and his people every name in the catalog, and we now must be prepared to back those accusations up or else take the consequences. I want to emphasize that we must not get into this European war. It is going to be a long, disastrous, and bloody one. Human lives do not and will not count. We must stay out of this caldron of human butchery. We must be on our guard to keep this country free from any foreign entanglements with any foreign nation. This we must fight until the end. Should we be so asinine as to be led into this European mess of killing, no such thing as a Federal pension will take place for years and years; any kind, Townsend or otherwise. I repeat again we must stay out. Let us not follow some finespun theory that England is our first line of defense. That is England's theory, not ours. We are willing to help her all we can short of war without stripping ourselves of our needed defense materials.

Now, my friends, in closing let us first of all thank God that we are Americans, that we are a free people, that we can and will reach a point of more nearly perfection than we now have. Let us be tolerant of those who do not agree with us. Let us try to help the weary, depressed, and those in want as we go along. Let us ask the Government to lend its helping hand to these millions of people who believe as you and I do. Let us continue to lend every mite of our power to preparing a defense for our Nation so that it may achieve victory in any contest. Let us at the same time spend more time on our knees and pray to our God that the leaders in our world, who are motivated by pride for fear someone else will go down in history greater than they, also by greed and selfishness because of the desire of power, be given light to the end that this insane destruction of human lives and property cease and that God in all His wisdom and charity will again become triumphant. Let us have faith in our God; let us have faith in our country; and, lastly, let us have faith in ourselves and we will win.

Independence Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I gave on July 4, 1941, at Hillsboro, Ill., at the Independence Day celebration sponsored by the Montgomery County Republican Central Committee:

Friends, as we meet here today to celebrate our country's anniversary, war rages, and brutal tyranny is rampant in the world.

We cannot help but realize that only in free America is it possible to gather in meetings of this kind and exercise the right of free speech. These rights are a heritage—won by our ancestors in their war of independence. Now, as the war fever rises, we have to be more diligent than ever to insure open and full discussion of the grave problems affecting every American. It is not too late to see that tolerance and understanding, rather than bigotry and persecution, are necessary if we are to maintain our strength and morale in these critical times.

As the crow flies or the bomber speeds, Hillsboro, Ill., is today the same distance from London, Berlin, or Moscow as it was in 1776. It is also true that because of the shortening of the time it takes to traverse space today Europe is much closer to us and more able to influence our political decisions and foreign policy than during the Revolution when we hoped we had severed for once and for all the political ties which bound us to the Old World. We are closer to Europe's troubles today, but it is just as much our desire to avoid the conflict as it was the wish of our colonial forefathers to be released from participation in the troubles on the Continent and nearby isles. By judicious statesmanship and an alert foreign policy, backed by an impregnable defense—the best Army, Navy, and air force in the world—we can keep the distances from Europe's war capitals just as far removed.

Our revered revolutionaries, whose courage we are gathered here to commemorate today, declared their independence and desire for freedom from Europe with its tyrannies and endless wars. Yet now 165 years later we are almost up to the firing line of the worst holocaust which the incendiary European nations have ever started.

The 3,950 miles from Hillsboro to London, the 3,100 miles from Hillsboro to Berlin, and the 5,000 miles from here to Moscow, were put between us by the spirit of the men of 1776. Theirs was more than an act of liberation from the despotic control of a grasping, selfish European monarch who symbolized the old world's exploitive philosophy toward the Western Hemisphere. They fought for the true philosophy of freedom. They implemented that philosophy with a system of government which has safely weathered every crisis confronting our land. They created the "four freedoms" about which we hear so much said today One would almost think that the current "patriots of publicity" not only coined the four freedoms but had a monopoly patent to dispense them among the Americas. The men of that age which is summed up in the phrase "the spirit of 1776" fought and bled that we might be here today to enjoy our freedom and seek happiness.

Not only do we hear a lot of ballyhoo about the four freedoms, but we are being asked to fight abroad for them. But there are other freedoms. One is the freedom to vote on issues which are vital to every American citizen. Another is freedom to learn where the Government is leading its people. I doubt that any country in Europe has been less informed about the intentions of its government than we have been in the United States. It is doubtful, in my opinion, that any country has been more misled about the actual developments of the war. For many years the true facts about Europe have been hidden from us. Whenever anyone made an attempt to disclose the facts they met with the utmost criticism and opposition.

The rights, liberties, and freedom which we still possess were not purchased in the international market place; they were bought with the blood and toil of patriots. Valiant Americans have, in the past, given their lives gladly to protect these blessings. What a mockery of that faith to send our young men to be slaughtered again in the useless carnage of a foreign war. In the last World War, Americans fought to end all war, and yet what an unholy fraud was practiced upon them. Shortly it became all too apparent that instead of banishing war the seeds of another conflict had been sown and democracy was fast withering. Are we again to be plunged into the fight to save Europe from itself?

In this hour let us hope that an enduring peace may yet be achieved in this warring world. The men who sacrificed their lives in the last war fought and suffered to achieve peace. Peace founded on justice is the only path to progress and prosperity. War not only destroys the lifeblood and resources of a nation but leaves a terrible aftermath of depression and misery in its wake. Before we again plunge headlong into the dark whirlpool of strife we must be sure that we are fighting in defense of American independence. Much as we may abhor the barbarism and complete disregard of human values in other lands we should recognize the tragedy of hurling ourselves into the abyss.

We must beware of the subtle propaganda of those who would lead us into war to serve their own selfish ends. What shall it profit this country to save the world and lose its own heritage?

Fellow Americans, 80 percent of the American people are against America's involvement in the war. I believe that 80 percent is a good majority, and that the majority ought to rule. This is a democratic principle. We were told and are still being told that at the election last November the majority of the people elected a President, that in a democracy the majority rules, and that the elected President must be accepted by all the

people. If that be true, and I am not questioning it, by what new principle of democracy does the majority rule in one case and not in another? And who determines when it shall rule and when it shall not rule? Was the election last November a free election or a controlled plebiscite? If a much smaller percentage of the American people was a ruling majority in November 1940, why should 60 percent of them not be a ruling majority in July 1941?

But I believe, and all the indications are, that the American people's war against war is succeeding. It is gaining ground steadily and notably. The President himself is hesitating because of it to take the last fatal step toward which he has been moving. It will fully succeed if we do not relax our efforts now that the advantage is with us; in spite of name-calling and smears by those on the war side; in spite of incidents to put a ban on free speech recently in Florida and Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love; in spite of interventionist propaganda, aided and abetted from overseas; and in spite of saber rattling in high places.

The American people do not want war, and they are determined that they shall not have it—at least not until they themselves say so. When the people themselves say so, that is democracy. When it comes by Presidential decree, that is dictatorship. When it comes by the will of the few, that is oligarchy. We are a republic governed by the will of a majority of our people, and we want to remain so. The will of the people in 1776 decided our country's fate. If this Republic is still a nation of, by, and for the people, we should all be allowed to decide our fate today.

The intensity of the so-called "racial" animosities in Europe, perpetually fanned by political propaganda, is difficult for the average American, the man with little personal contact with those countries, to comprehend. I think such understanding is important in our decision between the advice of President Washington: Stay out of the quarrels of Europe; and the advice of President Roosevelt: All out for another Don Quixote crusade in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the isles of the seas. I believe that racial animosities and conflicts are intensified, not minimized by war. We disregarded the advice of George Washington in 1917. The result was a bigger and better headache for us and for Europe, if not for the world. Are we foolish enough to repeat in 1941? Is it not possible that by staying home this time, giving all our intelligence and resources to creating a better and stronger democracy here, and with "Malice toward none, with charity for all" we may give a more substantial impetus to a more peaceful world order like the one we are gathered here to celebrate today, based less on force and more on understanding and justice. Do we imagine, again, that we, really and truly, are defending our own homes, our own shores, our own way of life, by running bloody errands for other people in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa?

Let us, for a few minutes, take a look at the latest outbreak in Europe between Hitler and Stalin. Communistic Russia, whom we were denouncing a few weeks ago, has requested and is now awaiting material aid from the United States. This brings me back to our highly publicized "four freedoms."

When "red" Russia beckoned as an ally, it certainly caused the "four freedoms" to blush. The Bolsheviks are not on speaking terms with freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. They don't know each other and have never met. The Communists are fighting Finland, the only European country which did not default on her debt to us, and now we are about to freeze her credits and help to starve her people while our lips piously proclaim the "four freedoms." What an embarrassment? Surely enough to cause red faces.

The inexorable law of events has exploded the unsound, hypocritical contention that this war is for the "four freedoms." It is, as the European wars for centuries have always been, for power and economic domination. The slogans such as, "Make the world safe for democracy" in 1914–18, and now the same tune in the key of the "four freedoms" are merely means for the administration leaders in Washington to mislead the people.

Are we going to fight Russia to force her to adopt the "four freedoms"? And if Poland, Greece, and China are restored will we then force the "four freedoms" on each of them or will we permit those countries to revert to pre-war status quo of dictatorships?

And who would restore our four freedoms here at home if in the newest of the ever-recurring European wars we should intervene and lose our democratic way of life? And remember that if we do intervene in a foreign undeclared war, despite the fact that the American people have been told many times before election day that our boys would not be sent into a foreign war, then democracy has been dealt a staggering blow at home. In my estimation, our Republic will be dead if this happens.

We will have lost everything we have fought for and cherished since our 1776 Declaration of Independence, which we are all gathered here to celebrate today.

It is not a new thing for an administration which fails to solve domestic problems at home to turn to a foreign war as an escape measure, and it has been suggested in a newspaper column that the present administration is following precisely this course.

I say to you here and now that we can best serve ourselves and humanity by maintaining inviolate our free institutions here at home. And to that end, realizing our sacred obligation to defend America at all costs, I pledge to you that as long as I represent the people of the State of Illinois in the halls of your Congress, I will not cast my vote to sacrifice the flower of American youth in any foreign war.

Penalties Against Farmers For Raising Wheat in Excess of Their Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH, OF OHIO

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio recently:

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to discuss with you this evening an issue of the gravest moment, namely the penalties which are to be in effect against wheat farmers who had not signed up under the A. A. A. program.

While this question naturally is of more immediate concern to farmers than it is to those of us living in urban areas, yet it involves very much that vitally concerns all of us.

Most people know something about the A. A. A. program, that some farmers have signed up under it, and that some have not; that those who have signed are subject to what is known as crop quota controls, or restrictions in the amount of, say, corn and wheat they may plant; and that those who have signed up receive certain money payments from the Government.

Some have participated in the Government's farm program because they believed in it.

Others have not taken part in it because they did not believe in it.

Many farmers have participated in the program who did not believe in it at all. Since they are forced to pay additional taxes to pay for the program they have felt their only means of protection was sharing in it.

The most important thing for us to keep constantly in mind in considering the questions we have under discussion is this: The farmers and all the people of our country have been from the beginning of the Government's farm program assured and reassured by every spokesman and advocate of the program that it would never be made compulsory. Every assurance has always been given that individual farmers would always be perfectly free to join or not to join.

Never, never was the program to be compulsory. So long as it was not compulsory, we were told, nobody could complain, all the farmers would still be free and our democracy would not be in jeopardy.

The truth is the program has been largely compulsory from the start, but we shall not discuss this now.

But those of us who understood the law and had watched, knew better. We were never deceived by these promises. We knew and repeatedly warned that this scheme would ultimately become completely compulsory.

As is now known the Government's farm program has become completely compulsory. The farmer is no longer free to sign up or not to sign up. Now the strong arm of the Federal law stands over him and tells him he must sign on the dotted line, or else he will be severely punished.

Aye, what is so much worse that we are terrified is that some of those farmers who had not signed up are now forced by the law passed on May 26 of this year, not only to sign for the future, but are being penalized and punished for not having signed up a year ago.

Wheat farmers who had, of course, sowed their wheat last fall, who had not signed up under the program, and who planted more acres of wheat than they would have been allowed to plant had they signed up, these farmers must now pay a penalty of 49 cents a bushel on all such excess wheat they harvest.

Five weeks ago today there was held throughout the country in the rural area what was termed a wheat quota referendum. The purpose of this so-called referendum was to determine whether the wheat farmers who had not signed up under the A. A. A. program should be forced to do so, and be penalized for having planted more wheat last fall than the farm bureaucrats would have allowed them to plant had they been signed up.

This so-called referendum was not only to fix the amount of wheat farmers can plant in the future, but applied to wheat sowed last fall. It was retroactive.

This so-called referendum passed. The effect is, as stated, those farmers who had not signed up, and who have more wheat planted than they would have been allowed to plant had they signed up, will be penalized on all such excess.

Suppose a farmer who had not signed up has planted 20 acres of wheat, and he is allowed only 15 acres. He must do one of several things with the 5 excess acres:

He must pay the Government 49 cents a bushel for all of the wheat raised on the 5 acres; or

He must store this excess wheat under Government bond for an indefinite period of time, until the A. A. A. at some future unspecified date decides it can be released; or

He must store it under Government bond and receive a loan on it amounting to 60 percent of what the farmers who are signed up under the A. A. A. can get on all the wheat they raise.

The farmer who has not signed up can get a loan on his excess wheat only, but only 60 percent of the amount made to cooperating farmers. Farmers who have signed up can get a loan of 85 percent of parity on all their wheat.

If the wheat is stored the farmer is liable for any and all storage charges.

This farmer is forbidden to feed his excess wheat, give it away, except that he can give it to the A. A. A., or do anything else with it but what I have indicated.

There is no way whatever that this farmer can escape some sort of penalty.

Let us examine the eligibility of the participants, the machinery and method of the wheat quota referendum.

I do not now have the figures for the whole Nation, but the number of wheat farmers who were eligible to vote was very small.

In Ohio less than 25 percent of the total number of wheat farmers was eligible to vote.

Actually only 75 percent of the eligible farmers voted.

The referendum lost heavily in Ohio, the vote having been 16,943 against and 15,543 for.

A two-thirds vote was required for the measure to carry. While it lost in Ohio, it carried in the Nation.

But I want you to listen carefully to the next figure I shall give you.

When the vote in Ohio is analyzed it is seen that less than 9 percent of the wheat farmers in the whole State cast their ballots for the measure.

Is there a single person listening to me who believes that was right?

Yet this so-called wheat referendum was hailed by the agricultural bureaucrats as a democratic procedure.

All the farmers who had planted 15 acres or less of wheat, whether they had or had not signed up were not eligible to vote.

Who was eligible to vote?

Only farmers who had planted more than 15 acres of wheat, whether they had signed or not, were eligible to vote.

Nevertheless, farmers who have 15 acres or less of wheat, though they are not allowed to vote, will be forced to secure wheat market cards before they can sell their wheat.

The farmers who had more than 15 acres planted had the whole say as to whether or not their group should be penalized. Furthermore, only farmers who had more than 15 acres of wheat were permitted to serve on the voting board.

Just what brand of democratic process is this?

Who will say this was right?

The people who conducted the so-called wheat-quota referendum and tabulated the votes were, in this section, at least, and more than likely all over the country, composed mostly of A. A. A. township committeemen and county supervisors. Committeemen and supervisors are paid employees of the A. A. A., and therefore had a financial interest in the outcome of the referendum vote. This is not meant as any reflection on the integrity of any of these people. I know many of them and they are fair and honest and can be fully trusted. Some of them do not even believe in the program.

But will anyone contend that this was a proper procedure? Should not those farmers who were opposed to the quota have been entitled to equal representation on the board that conducted the voting?

In view of this manner of conducting the referendum vote on wheat quotas, how do we know a majority was cast for it?

Furthermore, most, but not all, of the people who conducted the vote made an active campaign to get out all the votes favorable to their side, even to the extent of hauling them to the voting places.

They made no effort to get out the votes of those they knew were aginst the quota.

In fact, it is clearly evident that in many instances there was deliberate effort to keep farmers who opposed the quota from voting.

All the farmers who were eligible to vote were supposed to have been notified in writing of the time and place of the referendum. I know of numerous cases where farmers who were opposed had not received any notice. There are two such instances in my own family.

The most significant thing about the campaign made in favor of the quota restrictions was the complete silence about the penalties to be imposed. These were never mentioned. Many of the cooperating farmers, as well as those who had not signed up, did not have all the facts relating to the penalties when they voted, and many cooperating farmers who voted in favor of the measure would not do so again, since they have learned of the viciousness of the penalties.

I have failed to see in any notices that were sent to farmers or appeared in newspapers any explanation of the penalties that were to be imposed.

Much propaganda was put out by the proponents of this measure that unless the quota was approved wheat would drop materially in price. Assurance was given that voting for the measure meant dollar wheat, that if it lost the price would drop very low. In answer to these wholly unfounded statements I should like to refer you to an analysis I made of the effects of crop loans on prices of wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco, which analysis appears on page 5561 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26, 1941. That analysis shows that when no loans were made during the time since crop loans have been in operation prices were higher than when loans were made. It shows, furthermore, that when the least amount of loans was made the prices of crops involved were the highest, and vice versa.

The real evidence at hand appears to indicate that this political interference in agriculture is actually lowering farm prices, rather than raising them. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which considers much of this legislation, I feel the A. A. A. is right now striving to keep agricultural prices from rising more than it is to raise them.

The farmers have not had their share of income since 1920. Now when they might have an opportunity to get what they are entitled to, why shouldn't they have it?

Many other irregularities, or what would be when compared with ordinary election procedures considered as irregularities, took place in conducting the so-called wheat quota referendum.

If the people of this country are going to stand for this unjust, this inequitable and unfair penalty on the wheat farmers, God help us.

Not only will the farmers become regimented to the point of becoming slaves to the Washington bureaucrats, but it should be expected that labor and all industry will be bound to go the same way.

For the farmer next would come corn, then oats, rye, and so on until the last farm product was under centralized political control.

Can it be we are blind to what all this really is and means? Can we not see and understand that this is communism? Is it possible we do not realize that unless this is stopped it will go on and on until it has destroyed all property and human rights, the home, the church, and even the dignity of man himself, just as it has already done in Russia and is on the way of doing in Germany and other nations?

As you know, I have introduced a bill in Congress to repeal the act which makes these penalties possible. I want your support. The wheat farmers who are adversely affected by this act are rising up in the mightiest protest that this Nation has ever witnessed. Certainly I have never seen anything like it. Counties and States in great numbers are rapidly and spontaneously forming a national organization to bring the necessary influence to Washington to have these penalties repealed.

Marion County farmers are organizing. Give them all the help you can.

Suits are being instituted here in Ohio and possibly elsewhere to enjoin the A. A. A. from imposing the penalties.

My friends and fellow Americans, we just dare not let this pass. As stated, I am certain many who voted for this measure did not understand the penalty features. Surely many did not know the terrible effects the penalty would have upon those affected who, let us be careful to remember, are our own countrymen and neighbors.

Roosevelt Tours, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN GUARDIAN

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the May 2, 1941, issue of the American Guardian. This article is very appropriate at this time, when the administration, in repudiation of its preelection pledge, is now urging Congress to repeal the present law restricting the service of the National Guard and draftees to the Western Hemisphere.

The article follows:

[From the American Guardian of May 2, 1941]

ROOSEVELT TOURS, INC., ANNOUNCES FREE TRIPS ABROAD

Excursion to Belgrade, Cairo, Buenos Aires, and all corners of the earth.

Luxurious American flagships.

All expenses paid—including Bethlehem bayonet, Goodyear gas masks, Du Pont grenades, hospitalization, knotty-pine coffin, dignified white cross, and gold stars for mothers.

No passport required.

We have left no stone unturned in our untiring efforts to make this unique trip a reality for this summer—the best that big money can buy is being rapidly made available.

For further information inquire at the White House or our branch offices at Wall Street and Downing Street.

"See the world through a gun sight."

We plan, you go.

The Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Is an Invasion of the Rights of the American Workingman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following address opposing the St. Lawrence project delivered by me as a participant in the National Radio Forum sponsored by the Washington Evening Star and broadcast over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. Monday evening, July 7, 1941.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, so that there may be no misunderstanding, let us remember that the proposed St. Lawrence project is divided into two component parts—first, as a seaway which contemplates the establishment of a 27-foot channel from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth, Minn., a distance of 1,677 miles.

The second part of the St. Lawrence project involves the construction of a large hydroelectric power dam at Messina, N. Y. This dam is calculated to produce 5,000,000 horsepower of electric current annually, 4,000,000 horsepower to go to Canada and 1,000,000 horsepower to New York State alone, no other State being a beneficiary of this hydroelectric power dam. The cost of the dam will be paid by the Federal Government and will be approximately $93,000,000. The power project, when completed, will be turned over to the State of New York, who will operate it, and over a period of 50 years pay back to the Government from the revenue obtained the original cost of construction.

When you view the project in two parts, namely as a seaway and power project, the natural question arises: What is the total cost? Those in favor of such a project are ultraconservatives in arriving at a cost figure, while those opposed to the project are unable to accept the modest cost claims of the advocates of the St. Lawrence project. On the other hand, leading and reliable industrial engineers in Canada and the United States place the cost in excess of $1,000,000,000, some contending that $1,350,000,000 is a sensible and sane estimate.

That these industrial engineers are proceeding on a sound basis is very evident when we recall the estimates that were given for the construction of the Panama Canal. The original estimate of $160,000,000 was absurd when the final cost was revealed as $375,000,000. Then, too, the Suez Canal was estimated at $30,000,000, but when completed the total cost was $80,000,000.

Aside from the great cost of this proposed project, let us keep in mind that we are being asked to construct this project at a time when the American people through the Lend-Lease Act are pledged to give Great Britain the necessary implements of war to continue her resistance against the Nazi government. England needs ships, planes, cannon, ammunition, and other military supplies. Why should we be asked at this critical period in world history to divert our manpower, materials, and financial resources to a project that cannot possibly be completed before 1947, and when completed the seaway portion will be frozen over 5 months of each year? In addition, only 15 percent of the population of the United States will benefit from the St. Lawrence project, with the remaining 85 percent of American citizens being called upon to pay their share of the cost of construction, estimated to exceed $1,000,000,000.

In estimating the cost of construction, there has been nothing said concerning the cost of defending the St. Lawrence project. Military experts are of the opinion that it will require $1,000,000,000 to erect the necessary defenses at strategic locations along the 1,677-mile front. Nor has a word been uttered about the maintenance cost of these defense posts. For the maintenance cost of the channel and locks alone, $20,000,000 will be expended annually for the seaway part of the project.

When we consider the cost of construction estimated to exceed $1,000,000,000 and add another billion dollars for the erection of defense posts requiring additional millions for maintenance costs, we can readily see that this proposed St. Lawrence project is destined to cost us billions of dollars. I am sure you will agree that this is a tidy sum of money to saddle on the already overburdened taxpayers of America.

For a moment let us dwell on the effect the St. Lawrence seaway will have on the American market and transportation facilities. Upon completion, the St. Lawrence project will open the Great Lakes to world shipping and within a few months you will have dirty, cheap, ill-manned foreign tramp steamers flying foreign flags dumping their cargoes at Great Lakes ports instead of on the Atlantic seaboard, as is being done at the present time. These foreign vessels do not meet the standards of American shipping—in wages, living or sanitary conditions. The wage paid these foreign seamen is about half of the amount paid our American seamen. In addition, the foreign vessels or their crews pay no taxes, nor are they subjected to any toll charges. On the other hand, American shipping interests and seamen pay taxes, only to see such revenue applied to building a project that is establishing ruinous competition and threatening to sabotage American shipping and the American market.

As a striking illustration, let me cite the invitation to bid issued by the city of Detroit on May 1, 1939, for 642 tons of cast-iron pipe. This invitation was sent to six firms in Chicago, one in Virginia, and one in Nancy, France. The bid was finally awarded to the French company at a price of approximately $24,400, and the next highest bidder was the Virginia company at $29,400, or $5,000 higher. The difference between the French bid and the Virginia bid was reflected in the transportation cost and the cost of labor. This pipe was shipped from France through the Strasbourg Canal, thence down the Rhine to Rotterdam and thence by a dirty, ill-manned tramp steamer to Detroit, utilizing the present 14-foot channel from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to the Great Lakes. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that if the St. Lawrence project is approved, the American manufacturer may expect severe competition of this type in all commodities.

These foreign tramp steamers in addition to disrupting the American market will deal a death blow to the transportation facilities of our Nation.

At the present time American railroads employ more than a million American citizens, and long trains carry millions of tons of freight to and from seaboard ports. These foreign tramp steamers will deprive the railroads of this freight traffic, and the devastating effect is more fully realized since every thousand tons of freight lost to the American railroads means the elimination of one freight train. When you remove freight trains you destroy the jobs of railroaders. Thus we have foreign seamen on these dirty tramp steamers benefiting at the expense of the American railroad employees.

The proponents of the St. Lawrence project are making glib promises to the farmer of the great Middle West. They promise new markets and increased prices because of a reduction in transportation costs. The farmer is told he will save 4 cents a bushel on wheat; yet in order to save that 4 cents the American taxpayer will be called upon to pay 15 cents a bushel in the form of a subsidy. We must not forget that on general cargoes the subsidy to be paid by American taxpayers will be $3.50 per ton. The farmer must not forget that when the Great Lakes are opened our farm markets will be open to agricultural products of foreign nations, such as we experienced in having Argentine beef competing with American packing-house products.

So far little has been said concerning the effect of the St. Lawrence project on the coal industry of the United States. We must not forget that these tramp steamers coming into the Great Lakes region with cargoes of foreign coal will create a greater import market for subsidized and tariff preferred coal of Great Britain, Nova Scotia, and Russia. This foreign coal produced by sweat labor and transported at distress rates will displace American coal produced at American mines under American working conditions. This would be in addition to the competition of crude and fuel oil produced from foreign sources under the same conditions.

The power part of the St. Lawrence project will produce hydroelectric power which will displace, both in Canada and the United States, the use of American-mined coal. And let us keep in mind that while this hydroelectric power may appear cheap, it, too, is subsidized by the American taxpayer.

Taking into consideration the importation of foreign-mined coal, and crude and fuel oil, together with the coal displaced by the power part of the St. Lawrence project, you will have destroyed a 35,000,000-ton American coal market. For every million tons of coal displaced we must keep in mind 1,000,000 man-days are lost to good American citizens in the mining and transportation industries.

The St. Lawrence project is nothing new. For the past 40 years it has been talked of at different intervals, only to be shunted aside as impractical and unsound. Now, when we are engaged in a gigantic effort to build an adequate national defense, advocates of this economic monstrosity have garbed it in the armor of national defense and presented it to the American people, hopeful that patriotic fervor will cause the Nation to accept it lock, stock, and barrel.

In foisting this project on the American people, advocates of the St. Lawrence project have forgotten that the timely admonition attributed to Abraham Lincoln was never more justified, when he said "you can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

Surely you good people in the State of Minnesota are not going to accept a project that will permit Finnish iron ore to be dumped on the American market at a cheaper price and in competition with the ore from the great Minnesota iron range; you good people in Michigan and Wisconsin are not content to see your great agricultural market destroyed by foreign competition and the wages of labor seriously menaced; you good people in the great Mississippi Valley should not be expected by your Government to see your great import and export market destroyed by foreign vessels plying our inland waters; you good people living along the Great Lakes who have been asked to visualize the construction of huge shipyards cannot help but realize that should the St. Lawrence

project be completed, when the war is over such shipyards would be in deadly competition with shipyards on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts, who would then be free to engage in construction of trans-Atlantic as well as Great Lake vessels.

As Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, so aptly said when commenting on such a situation—"it would be the survival of the fittest."

Finally, you good people who dwell in railroad communities in the great Middle West are fully conscious that when railroad traffic is reduced by the St. Lawrence project your jobs are in jeopardy and many thriving railroad towns are faced with the stark reality of being transformed into veritable "ghost towns."

We who live in the industrial States and on the seaboard are not being fooled by parading an old political pet—the St. Lawrence seaway—in the cavalcade of national defense. Nor are we fooled by the efforts of the great State of New York through political affiliations to secure a power project benefiting New York State alone—yet being paid for by the already overburdened American taxpayers. Nor are we going to play the "sucker game" with real estate agents in the Great Lake region who are licking their lips and rubbing their hands in glee awaiting the golden opportunity to profit from their speculations in land.

In joining us in defeating this political and economic monstrosity—the St. Lawrence project—you are enlisting in a cause that will repel an invasion of the rights of the American workingman and contribute to the general welfare of every American citizen. Yes—you will be giving voice to the sentiments that should be inscribed on every heart—Let us preserve the home and the job of every American workingman.

Mass Meeting of America First Committee, Akron, Ohio, July 7, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at a mass meeting of the America First Committee, Akron, Ohio, July 7, 1941:

The time has passed when the Congress of the United States can be stampeded. Every hard-working Congressman has from necessity become a student of world affairs. Every Congressman who appreciates the vital need of America in this crisis knows that no solution will be accepted by the American people which is not an American solution. In this new spirit of appraisal and with the expression of over 80 percent of the millions of American people before them, the Congress of the United States is prepared to make a decision. That decision will be that the United States of America will make every preparation for American defense, but will never vote to send the son of an American father or mother to fight and die on foreign soil in any European, Asiatic, or African war.

A noticeable change has taken place among the leaders in Congress who have supported the New Deal wholeheartedly. The turning point came on June 28, 1941, in the pronouncements from the floor of two outstanding administration supporters. The first of these was Senator WALTER GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and who more than any other carried through to adoption the lend-lease bill. Senator GEORGE, speaking after the fullest study and reflection, weighing the trend of America toward totalitarianism, said in part as follows:

"Mr. President, the way to national unity in America is not through methods of totalitarianism. It is not through asking for powers for which there is no need, and which cannot be wisely exercised without disrupting the orderly processes of living and making a living in the United States.

"The way to national unity is to give our people the assurance that when we are called upon to move into the actual range of fire and send our men there, whether on board naval vessels or in the aircraft, the American people themselves will have some opportunity to pass upon that question; in other words, that they will have the ultimate decision, through the machinery to which they have become accustomed and the only machinery which they have at hand, will be able to pass upon the question of whether an actual state of war shall be brought into being or a formal declaration of hostilities shall be made by the people of the United States."

My fellow Americans, Senator GEORGE has joined with WHEELER and Lindbergh and with the America First Committee that the Congress of the United States must pass upon the question of war for the American people. I can say to you tonight that the voice of the American people has been heard in Washington and that the Constitution of the United States still lives in all its glory and integrity in the hearts of a loyal Congress.

On the same day Congressman WOODRUM of Virginia, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who piloted through the House the authorization of $7,000,000,000 to implement the lend-lease bill, arose on the floor and in answer to the statement that the War Department was planning to ask the Congress to make a formal declaration of a national emergency which would put the Nation on a virtual war status and make it possible for troops to be sent anywhere in the world, said:

"The man today who stands before the American people and advocates a declaration of war either does not know anything about what he is talking or else he is utterly stupid, or both.

"The idea of this country going off now and trying to settle the conflicting emotions and ideologies of Europe to me is ridiculous, even if we were prepared to do so, and we are not. There are many reasons why we should not go abroad. It is only necessary to state one, and that is we have not the troops nor the equipment.

"Mr. Speaker, if anybody has a notion in his head, either in the War Department or in any other department, that they can come to this Congress and get any sort of declaration that will put us aggressively into the European war or that will send American expeditionary forces abroad, I think the sooner they get the idea out of their heads the better it will be."

How ridiculous is the proposition that we should go to war now? The answer is provided in a fair consideration of the following facts. If we go into the war, we cannot go in part way. It must be total war and involve not only our Navy and our air force, but our men. We must provide and equip and successfully land on foreign soil an expeditionary force of 10,000,000 men. To transport this vast army abroad will necessitate the building of 40,000,000 tons of shipping. It will take 10 years to provide these ships. To my mind it is not merely ridiculous but criminal to urge the slaughter of American boys into a war now when all authorities know that we are hopelessly unprepared.

We have heard much about blowing Hitler off the map. Commanding, as he soon will, the entire continent of Europe with the most perfectly mechanized army and powerful air force the world has ever seen, those who call for a complete victory over Hitler must weigh their words. No advocate of war can now say that if it is America's duty to insure a British victory we can do it without the use of our manpower. I do not ask you to take my word for this but I call your attention to an interview on July 4, 1941, of General Wavell, commander in chief of the British Armies in the Middle East, to Harold Denny, of the New York Times. General Wavell, you will recall, is the one British commander in chief who has some victories to his credit. He stated in part as follows:

"Mr. DENNY. Do you hold with the views that only tools are necessary to win the war?

"General WAVELL. No; undoubtedly we will need manpower if the war continues long enough. I have no doubt it will.

"Mr. DENNY. Can you win the war without America's full-scale participation?

"General WAVELL. We will have to have airplanes, tanks, munitions, transport, and finally men."

Reflecting upon these words from General Wavell, what are we to think of the recent utterances of Colonel Knox, our great Secretary of the Navy, who has become a one-man general headquarters? Colonel Knox urges us to get into the war now, utilizing the American Navy to drive all German submarines from the seven seas. The colonel, without regard to the expressed statements of Senator GEORGE and Congressman WOODRUM, has no patience with Congress. He wants to declare war himself. He knows that we are totally unprepared for war and that shooting of submarines will bring total war. He knows that after this shooting by the American Navy we must go to the extent indicated by General Wavell. He knows that it will take 40,000,000 tons of shipping to transport the gigantic American expeditionary force and that these ships cannot be provided in less time than 10 years. Then why does Colonel Knox make these belligerent statements which have not been made by President Roosevelt? There is only one answer. Colonel Knox has watched the development of the American Navy with such enthusiasm that he is like a little boy who wants to shoot off fireworks on the Fourth of July. He simply cannot wait to hear the big naval guns sending their salvos over the waters of the high seas. Colonel Knox is hysterical and as an able newspaper man cannot resist the thrill of big headlines. Cooler heads prevail in Washington and Colonel Knox must indulge in a cooling-off period.

To understand the present world situation we must realize just where we stand today. Eliminating a few small neutral nations, Britain and Soviet Russia are not fighting merely Germany but the combined nations of the world. Lined up with Germany are Italy, France, Hungary, Rumania, Finland, Japan, and Turkey. Spain and Portugal are in sympathy with Germany and Norway, Holland, Belgium, Yugoslavia, and Greece have been conquered by Germany. China is still fighting Japan and can be of no help to Britain. We can now say to those who urge that we defeat Germany, they must realize that we must also defeat practically the entire world in both Europe and Asia.

President Roosevelt has stated that we must by force impress the four freedoms on

the entire world. To do this we must overthrow by our armed forces all of the nations which I have just mentioned and in addition thereto India and the entire continent of Africa. President Roosevelt has stated that we must become the arsenal for the entire world, to help all nations fighting Germany. The Congress has already appropriated $43,000,000,000 for our national defense and aid to Britain. The President has stated that he will provide total aid for Soviet Russia in her fight with Germany. Trained experts have estimated that if we enter the war we must appropriate at least another $100,000,000,000 and that the war will last from 10 to 30 years.

Think what this means. Small boys now 11 years old will ultimately be drawn into the hell of war and perhaps millions yet unborn. There is no use trying to dodge the inevitable consequences of our involvement in this war. President Roosevelt has said that it is a war between two philosophies of government and that we cannot hope for peace in America until the Hitler philosophy has been entirely crushed from the face of the earth. Fellow Americans, this can mean only one thing. America must decide now, if it follows the Roosevelt leadership, to make destructive war the permanent policy of the United States for from 10 to 30 years. It means national suicide for our form of government—and economic slavery.

Men have differed as to the definition of dictatorship. But men do not differ that our involvement in a war of this magnitude must mean dictatorship. President Roosevelt is 59 years old. He may be this dictator for 10 years but it is practically impossible that he can live long enough to be our dictator for 30 years. Who will be this dictator? He may be now just a young boy. These facts are astounding. But, can anyone say that they are not true prophecies? With the world engaged in a war of this magnitude, the only peace that could follow would be a peace following exhaustion. It is time that we seriously reflect on the awful machines of war which men have in their hands. It is time that a united America solemnly resolve that we will spare no time or effort in making this Nation strong and impregnable for the protection of ourselves and the Western Hemisphere and that we shall not destroy our beloved America, by involvement in a suicidal war that will destroy every vestige of the institutions which we love so dearly.

I wish to say a few words on the situation in Britain. The British Empire which we are asked to help at this hour is not the British Empire of 1917 and 1918. The British Empire of 1941 is controlled by left-wing Socialists. The real power in Britain is not Churchill, it is Beaverbrook, Bevin, and Laski. If we understood the true situation we would not be surprised that Britain is willing to make an alliance with Stalin. Similar forces control both of these nations at this hour. The British Empire of 1917 and 1918 would never have embraced the red doctrines of communism. The world shudders at the prospect of a triumphant Soviet Russia. Total aid to Soviet Russia by the United States means the use of our armed forces to perpetuate the power and sway of godless communism. This change of events has made millions of Americans pause and reflect. Today we are fighting France—short of war, it is true—but if we follow the leadership of those who advocate war now, our American bombers will soon be dropping their instruments of death upon Paris and the cemeteries where lie our American dead of the last war. These bombers will also be carrying death and destruction to Rome and even the Vatican itself. Senator PEPPER has openly advocated that we should blow Tokyo off the map. Picture if you can the products of American industry and American labor passing over the lands where millions are starving in Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France and not carrying food but deadly bombs to make worse the suffering of these helpless people. Will the people of these lands bless us and ask for the four freedoms or will they forever curse us?

I have given much study to a movement that is growing in America to overthrow the Constitution of the United States and to destroy forever our American independence. This group chose the free soil of the great State of Ohio for the holding of their annual convention at Cleveland, on June 28 and 29, 1941. We dare no longer refrain from understanding what this movement called Federal Union and led by Clarence K. Streit means to those who love American liberty. The scheme is for union now between the United States and Britain on a basis that will make the United States merely a dominion or colony of the British Empire.

All news now coming out of Washington is censored, and the people are not told the facts. The truth is known only to the President and those within the inner circle handling and operating the $7,000,000,000 of war materials which we are giving to Britain. When the plan for union with Britain is completed there will be no need for Britain to repay us, since the American people and all subjects of the British Empire in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Ireland, the British Isles, and Africa will be all citizens of one government, the rulers of which will be Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

When news came that Soviet Russia was under attack by Germany, who first took to the radio and told the American people what was their duty in this changing scene? Was it not the voice of Winston Churchill speaking from London who told us that we must join our blood, sweat, and tears with Stalin and his blood-soaked comrades to save the world for the new order and the triumph of the new triumvirate of democracies? Who practically commanded us to waste no time in helping that great democrat, Josef Stalin, before President Roosevelt had made any pronouncements?

The backers of this movement do not advocate a League of Nations or a mere alliance. They go much further and advocate a complete union. Union now with Britain means also union with Soviet Russia and the hordes of India and the tribesmen of Africa. We would no longer be citizens of the United States but subjects of the British Empire and on the same voting basis with the millions who now live in abject poverty in many parts of the British Empire. The scheme seeks to delude the American people with the promise that our 130,000,000 people will constitute the largest segment in this federal union. It is common knowledge that Britain has offered a dominion status to India, and its 350,000,000 are almost three times as large as the United States in population. General Wavell has been transferred from the Middle East to India, and I have no doubt he has been sent there to cement the ties that bind the poverty-stricken denizens of India to the British Empire. If Britain enables Soviet Russia to defeat Germany, the 167,000,000 denizens of Soviet Russia will be in the Federal Union. What chance would our 130,000,000 of Americans have as against the 350,000,000 of India plus the 167,000,000 of Soviet Russia plus the millions of inhabitants of the British Isles, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa? Mr. Streit claims that the Constitution of the United States authorizes this sort of a treasonable selling out of the American people, and for this I have asked the Dies committee to investigate him and his followers, and just as sure as there is a God in heaven I shall not stop my fight until this treachery to free America has been branded with the same brand that we place upon Communists, Fascists, and Bundists in the United States of America.

An Associated Press cablegram from London on July 2 stated that it was suggested that an honorary seat in the House of Commons and an honorary membership in the British Empire be offered by Winston Churchill to President Roosevelt so that henceforth July Fourth will be known as Interdependence Day instead of Independence Day. This follows the plan of Federal Union, Inc., sponsoring Union Now with Great Britain. Under that treasonable proposal, as set forth in Mr. Streit's book, Union Now With Britain, there is to be a joint presidency of Churchill and Roosevelt. The Congress of the United States is to be subordinated to the Union Parliament. President Roosevelt as an honorary Member of the British House of Commons would be able to build the Union Parliament. Such a suggestion shows how far we have gone along the road that must end in the complete selling out of the United States of America. Friday was July Fourth, Independence Day. So long as red blood still circulates in the hearts of real Americans this shall never be known as Interdependence Day. I am more determined than ever after receiving a tremendous response from all over the Nation to my broadcast of June 15 to fight those who would betray America into Union Now. Over 100,000 copies of this broadcast have been requested by patriotic Americans, and within another week a second hundred thousand copies will be printed.

The tide is turning in Washington. The Congress is determined to drive the serpent of internationalism from the free soil of America. We have commenced to put the Communists in their place. They must not be allowed to regain their power and influence in Washington because of the German-Russian war. We must not stop there. With your help we will check the betrayal of America into a Union Now with Britain. We have a right to cherish our American independence. No man can take this birthright from us. Just as in 1776 the wrath of the American people must be made known, and when the American people decide that this mongrel new union shall not happen here, then I am satisfied we shall remain free and independent.

I could not return to Ohio without expressing my affection for this great State, which gave me birth. I was born but a few miles from Akron, in Canton, the home town of President McKinley, the great Christian President. True to the teachings of my boyhood in Ohio, I want to be known as an American who loves his country and no other. These critical times call for a full measure of devotion so that liberty shall not die in the last great citadel of its protection. We can have sympathy with foreign nations, we can divide on questions of domestic and foreign policies, but all true Americans must feel in their hearts that America is first.

I shall return to Washington and tell the Members of Congress that there is no need to question where Ohio stands in this critical time. Men and women of Ohio, you who have furnished many of the Nation's great leaders and many of her immortal Presidents, I ask you to do everything within your power to preserve the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence. I ask you to give of your time and effort to arm and defend the United States of America, not for aggressive foreign war but to uphold in shining glory before the suffering peoples of the world the living example of tolerance, peace, and charity in a great republic dedicated to liberty regulated by law. Valiant Members of Congress from both parties are fighting for your peace and prosperity, and I can assure you here tonight that the Congress of the United States shall never vote a declaration of war. We need your help so that this Nation shall live to complete the great tasks remaining before us, and that the vision of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley shall not perish from the earth.

Papal Pronouncements and American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND JOSEPH P. HURLEY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Most Rev. Joseph P. Hurley, Bishop of St. Augustine, over the Columbia Broadcasting System network, July 6, 1941:

I have accepted the kind invitation of Columbia Broadcasting System to speak on the subject, Papal Pronouncements and American Foreign Policy, because I consider that an address on this topic might serve some useful purpose at the present time. People with short memories are apt to forget the heroic struggle of the Popes in our day for human liberty and for human dignity just because a few Catholic publicists in America have been giving expression to views which are comforting to the Axis Powers. Due to my past connection with the Papal Secretariate of State, I deem it well to say at the outset that this address is delivered without any mandate from the Holy See; that I use only documents of public record, and that I engage only my own authority.

Let me pass in brief review some recent pronouncements of the Popes touching the present world conflict and its antecedents. In his encyclical letter, Mit Brennender Sorge, addressed to Germany in 1937, Pope Pius, of blessed memory, stated that religious freedom in that country was beset on all sides; that Government officials were using their positions to induce Catholics to apostatize from the faith; that "intrigues had been laid bare which aim at nothing less than a war of extermination." Later, he referred to the hooked cross of national socialism, the swastika, as "the enemy of the Cross of Christ." On Christmas Eve, 1937 he declared textually: "We will call things by their real names. In Germany there is a real religious persecution. A persecution so terrible and so grave as has rarely been seen before. A persecution in which are lacking neither brutality nor violence nor the snares of falsehood and lies."

The war prepared by the Nazis in cold blood for over 6 years came closer and another Pope sat on the Throne of Peter. From the first hour of his Pontificate Pius XII sought to fling himself across the path of those who wanted war. On August 24, 1939, in an appeal for peace to the rulers of Europe, and their people, he said: "Nothing is lost by peace; but everything may be lost by war." Pronounced before the war broke out, and on the day following the Russo-German pact, this appeal was directed in the first instance to Germany; England and France were passionately desirous of peace and were leaving no stone unturned to preserve it. Indeed, then as now, the world knew who was the disturber of the peace. Their knowledge was to receive terrible confirmation a week later when Christian Poland was assaulted by the panzer legions of paganism. It is typical of the unscrupulous methods of American apologists for nazi-ism that this phrase of the Pope, uttered before the war began, is now being used by them to dissuade America from steps necessary to safeguard her national interests.

Pope Pius XII issued his first encyclical in October 1939. It condemned the makers of war; prayed that martyred Poland might have a resurrection in peace and justice; it laid severe strictures upon the German doctrine of race, the paganizing of youth and cynical infidelity to the plighted world. The reference to Germany was so unmistakable that only the most garbled accounts of the encyclical found their way into the controlled German press.

On Christmas Eve, 1939, in his annual allocution, Pius XII enunciated the following five points of a just and honorable peace: 1. The right to life and independence of all nations, great and small. The will of one nation to live must not mean the sentence of death passed upon another. 2. Cessation of the race for armaments. 3. A juridical institution to guarantee the fulfillment of treaties. 4. Respect for the rights of racial minorities. 5. Acceptance of the law of God, and of the spirit of justice and of universal charity as the basis of international relations.

On January 7, 1940, in his reply to President Roosevelt's letter announcing the mission of Mr. Myron Taylor, the Pope wrote: "This appointment is an exemplary act of fraternal and hearty solidarity between the New and the Old World in defense against the chilling breath of aggressive and deadly, godless and anti-Christian tendencies that threaten to dry up the fountainhead whence civilization has come and drawn its strength."

Spring came and the murderous hosts of Nazi Germany once again, contrary to solemn treaty, without provocation and without previous declaration of war, invaded Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg. To King Leopold, of Belgium, heroic son of a hero father, went these words of a hero Pope: "When for the second time against their will and rights, the Belgian people see their territory exposed to the cruelties of war, profoundly moved. We send Your Majesty and all your beloved nation the assurance of our paternal affection. Praying Almighty God that this hard trial may result in the reestablishment of full liberty and the independence of Belgium. We accord with all our heart to Your Majesty and to your people our apostolic benediction." Similar telegrams were sent to the Queen of Holland and to the Grand Duchess of Luxemburg. When these messages were published in the Vatican newspaper, the Osservatore Romano, the paper was banned from circulation in Italy, and priests and laymen were beaten in the streets of Rome for reading or possessing it. It was one of the first attempts of the Axis to intimidate the Pope—and it failed as it was bound to fail. From that day to this, down to the preaching last Sunday of that beautiful, appealing homily of hope and encouragement, Pope Pius XII has not ceased to raise his voice against the evils of totalitarianism. He has condemned the wholesale murder of defectives and incurables in Germany; he has worked silently but effectively to alleviate the lot of war prisoners and of refugees; his radio station has continued to tell the world the awful truth about Poland.

This is a brief conspectus of the papal attitude toward the issue of this war. I shall leave it to you, my hearers, to judge if it gives any comfort to those who have loosed the flood of destruction and hatred upon the world; if it can, by any stretch of imagination, be construed as lending approval to those publicists who would deter us from defending our Christian civilization against the might of embattled paganism.

Let us turn now to the foreign policy of the United States Government.

I do not intend to imply that there is or has been any concerted action between our Government and the Holy See. As everybody knows, the Holy See is concerned primarily with the religious and with the supernatural, entering the field of secular affairs only where the primary interests of God and souls are involved. The Holy See and our Government have pursued independent policies, each in its own sphere. He who runs may read, nonetheless, a striking parallelism between their attitudes where moral questions were at issue.

Before the war American foreign policy was directed to the preservation of the peace, on the principle that "nothing is lost by peace; everything may be lost by war." We indulged in no falsely suave diplomacy of inaction and indifference; keenly alive to its duty as a great Christian power, our Government made intelligent, earnest, well-timed, and repeated endeavors to stave off war by finding a common ground upon which potential aggressor and potential victims could meet. After the war started, the same high-minded efforts were made to circumscribe it. I have already quoted the words in which Pope Pius XII bore public witness to the labors of President Roosevelt in favor of the peace. When the full story is known—and I venture to express the hope that our State Department may issue a white paper on the subject in the near future—we in America will have reason to feel proud of the role played by our Government, and to rest secure in the knowledge that no stone was left unturned, in parallel efforts with the Holy See, to safeguard the peace of the world.

It is history, of course, that we failed. We failed because one nation, confidently arrogant in its armored might, wanted war. This war is Germany's doing; it is a war of stark aggression; a war for European and world domination. And if you do not believe that the Nazi aims at our continent, then explain to me why his agents have spun their network all over Central and South America; why he has planted them here in this country by the thousands. It is therefore sheer ignorance mixed with folly to speak of this war, with a shrug of the shoulders, as if it were but another war of imperial conquest upon which Americans may look in philosophic indifference. Thank God, our Government never simulated a dishonoring neutrality which the American people did not and could not feel toward religious persecution and aggression. The war is rather an assault of one race against the world; in the words of a profound historian, the Hungarian Kolnai, it is a war against the west; it is a revolution of irreligion and paganism against the Christian ethic and the Christian civilization.

When we were compelled to face the realities of the war in Europe, which was also potentially a war against us and all the peoples of Christendom, we discussed and we agreed upon a national policy and upon a Government to enforce that policy. We did that last November when we chose a President and gave him the mandate to afford all possible aid short of war to the democracies. It now appears that there has developed a conflict between these two aims, aid to the democracies on the one hand and avoidance of war on the other. Indeed from the first, it was seen that we were taking sides in the war, and that it might be difficult to avoid being involved. We knew the risk and we took it. It was a superb policy, and statesmanlike genius presided at its conception. But as an enunciation of the American will in a war-torn world, it called for constant interpretation; it was of necessity subject to the condition which is implicit in all understandings rebus sic stantibus, that is to say, as long as matters remain as they are, and are not radically changed by contingency and vicissitude. If the conditions under which that policy was approved should change, then the policy

must change; if those conditions change rapidly, then we must be prepared for a rapid change in the policy. What shall be our guide should such a necessity arise? I think it is abundantly clear to anyone who will give it a moment's reflection. Behind our dual policy, there stands a single, permanent, indefeasible principle—the will and the right of our Nation to live. The policy sprang from that principle, in the light of that principle it must be interpreted. Any conflict between the necessarily provisional terms of a policy must be resolved by the basic principle of national security. The question of peace or war in the last analysis is a question which can be decided only with reference to the safety of this Union.

Since then we are confronted with a conflict between aid to the Allies and avoidance of war, who shall decide? Certainly not the people, for they have neither the experience, nor access to the facts, nor in many cases the understanding which are required. Nor does the Constitution demand it. The form letters and the chain telegrams and the threatened demonstration on the White House lawn are, therefore, quite beside the point. I have an abiding faith in government by the people; but I do not believe that questions of national security, in an epoch of crisis, should be submitted directly to them. It would be a lumbering process involving fatal delay, and fatal leakage of plans to potential enemies. Nor is the record of democratic peoples in the pre-war period such as would inspire much confidence. In France the will of the nation to live was paralyzed by the interminable acrimonious debates in press and forum; by sabotage on the left; and confusion of counsels on the right. There were elements in France as there are here, which preferred civil war to a war against a foreign foe.

England: The case of the English people differed from that of the French in degree but not in kind. If they are today fighting for time, with their backs against the wall, it is to a great extent because ten millions of them who signed the round robin for peace almost at any price paralyzed the military preparations of the nation. And the boys at Oxford, not unlike some of our own university men, voted to fight only on their own terms. It is all well to say that they are now battling heroically for God and country. But it is opportune to recall that it was their stupidity which laid their island open to attack, and brought them to the brink of disaster. Let us admire the English people in their magnificent penance, but let us not emulate their sin and folly.

To the Congress, under the Constitution, belongs the weighty responsibility of declaring war. That is clear, but I am afraid that it is not a complete answer to the practical question. For it is manifestly impossible that the day-to-day decisions which must be taken often in the greatest secrecy should be submitted to the Congress for discussion. Such matters are lawfully the competence of the Executive. Furthermore in times of emergency the powers of the Executive are very properly enlarged by Congress. In the very nature of the case, therefore, and with the fullest legality, important decisions of far-reaching effect must be taken by the President both in his capacity as Chief Executive and in his capacity as Commander in Chief. To all practical intents, it is up to him to safeguard the interests of the Nation in times of great emergency. As the Commander in Chief of our armed forces and as the one charged with the conduct of foreign affairs, he must be ready to act fast and decisively should the need arise, and it is all to the good that he is equipped by the Constitution and by congressional enactment to do so.

In the present circumstances we must not lose sight of the fact that the declaration of war, the constitutional prerogative of the Congress, is no longer in style; the Nazi has seen to that. We must, too, face the fact that we have already left the political and diplomatic zone and have entered the zone of strategy. I believe this to be true not only of ourselves, but of almost every country in the world. Since the Nazi had from the first marked us as his enemy, it is well that we accept that fact, even though it has not yet pleased him to make war upon us. But his policy of limited objectives, that policy by which he betrayed and enslaved a continent, is fast approaching the point of showdown with us. It will be folly if we do not appraise our whole relationship with the Axis Powers from the standpoint of strategy. We may not, we must not, wait for the start of hostilities before we make our dispositions. Pre-war strategy is so all-important today that wars are won or lost before they enter the shooting phase. With the example of all the countries of Europe before us, let us pray for peace but prepare for war. Even though we hope to avoid war we must put this country, its economy, its finance, its very thinking, on a footing of preparedness for war in the shortest possible time. Any other course may be literally national suicide. Let me say immediately that I pray with all my soul that we shall never need to go to war; that our aid to our friends and our own military strength may be such as to bring about the discouragement and the defeat of the enemy of Christendom. It is not the business of a churchman to call for war. But neither may any churchman do anything other than encourage a government to protect by all prudent and necessary means its sacred national interests. A fortiori, when the interests of religion the world over are placed in jeopardy by a ruthless persecutor of the Church of Christ. The faith which I profess and love teaches that war is a legitimate, though extreme, instrument of a just national policy. From time to time we churchmen are obliged to quote the Scriptures to governments which would encroach upon our sphere—"Render unto God the things that are God's." I believe that our Government in this awful hour may with justice say to certain churchmen, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's."

My great fear is that we will not be permitted to have the choice between war and peace; that the Nazi will not let us have peace as he did not let the nations of Europe have peace. Many qualified observers think that our only choice is when we shall enter the war. In other words, that we shall sooner or later be forced into the war by the Nazi lust for world domination. That is why this country is honeycombed with Nazi operatives, both American and foreign; that is why Central and South America are covered by a network of Nazi agents. In this view, which has much to commend it, the questions which America has to answer are three: (1) Shall we enter the war now or later? (2) Shall we enter the war on our own terms or on terms dictated by Nazi strategy? (3) Shall we enter the war with allies or shall we bear the brunt of it alone?

If there is any merit to the foregoing considerations, born of experience and of study, it may be all boiled down to this: Since our problem is primarily a strategic one, it should be left to the Commander in Chief who alone, in constant, loyal communication with the Congress and in consultation with his military and naval advisers, is capable of bringing us safely through the dangers which encompass us.

Let me add a word about the latest development—the Russo-German war. On the subject of communism the Christian stand has been defined by Pius XI in his Encyclical on Atheistic Communism. On the subject of National Socialism it has been defined by the same pontiff in his Encyclical to Germany. I am convinced that these two documents give us the one safe guide to the ideological questions involved in this war, which has pitted Nazi against Communist. The Nazi and his sympathizers over here are trying to make out that it is a holy crusade against communism. Crusade forsooth: Not God, but the enemy of God, wills it; its standard is not the Cross, but the swastika which a great pontiff called the foe of the Cross of Christ; the rape of Poland is scarcely a recommendation for Christian knights; and the recluse of Berchtesgaden is badly cast for the role of Peter the Hermit. The bald facts of the "crusade" are these: On Sunday morning, June 22, the Nazis, in violation of a treaty, launched an unprovoked and undeclared war of aggression against the Communists, their former partners in crime. America's attitude toward this new war should not be swayed by Red or Nazi propaganda; it must be based on purely strategic considerations. In point of urgency the Nazi remains enemy No. 1 of America and of the world.

There is much talk these days of national unity. It is our imperative need. Unity of thought, unity of purpose, unity of action. May I add that we have, too, great need of the virtues of reverence and obedience. In a free people these things must come from an inner discipline based upon conscientious conviction. If we are to be united, there is only one center around which, as a Nation, we can rally. That center is Washington. If our union is to be real and effective, we must school ourselves to reverence and obey our lawful authorities, our President, in the first place, and our Congress. They personify the ideals and the will of this country. They have led us admirably in this crisis, not of their making. They are for peace—for peace as long as it is consistent with the highest interests of the Nation. In the anxious hours of deliberation and decision which they—especially our President—must pass they are deserving of our deepest sympathy, of the comfort of our prayers. Patriotic men, bent on the protection of our beloved land, I have confidence in them. I confess that I have no confidence in anyone who seeks in a time of crisis to undermine legitimate authority; who speaks disparagingly or distrustfully of our highest magistrates. I have no confidence in those who opposed the steps by which we achieved our present stage of defense; I have no confidence in those who reserve all their fault-finding for America and who praise the Nazi with faint condemnation. They may be good men, and some of them are, but be their station high or low, Americans, to whom they are giving bad example of division, should disregard their counsels.

Among them is a small but noisy group of Catholics. We have suffered long from their tantrums. We have blushed with shame when they acted up before company as tantrum children will do in every family. Years ago they established the crank school of economics: latterly they have founded the tirade school of journalism; they are now engaged in popularizing the ostrich school of strategy. The school may change its curriculum, but the same professors hold the chairs, for they are specialists in the universe of knowledge. Many Catholics are inclined to apologize for them; but I think that is unwise. They are embarrassing, but not significant, and quite harmless as long as their tantrums do not lead them to break the furniture. They will disappear in time like those other exhibitionists—the marathon dancers and the flagpole sitters—who amused America for a while and vanished.

The American people will be wise if they turn themselves as individuals to the task of moral rearmament. The years which lie ahead will probe us with relentless fingers to find and to exploit our moral weaknesses. A democracy, above all forms of government, must find its strength in the virtue of the people; its greatest danger is decadence from within. It is my most fervent prayer that we may set ourselves with a will to the task

of sanctifying ourselves, our homes, and our public life to the end that in these days of trial and reckoning we may be and remain a Christian example among the nations, a people acceptable to Almighty God.

Sale of Alcoholic Liquors at Military Camps and Naval Establishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

LETTER AND RESOLUTION BY THE LIQUOR AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

STATE OF NEW YORK
LIQUOR AUTHORITY,
420 LEXINGTON AVENUE,
New York, July 1, 1941.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
1349 Lexington Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the members of the New York State Liquor Authority, I am enclosing a copy of a resolution expressing their views in connection with Senate bill 860.

Very truly yours,
HENRY E. BRUCKMAN,
Chairman.

Reslution adopted by New York State Liquor Authority relative to Senate bill 860

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States, Seventy-seventh Congress, bill S. 860, in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; and

Whereas sections 1, 2, and 3 of this bill prohibit the sale or possession of alcoholic liquor, wine, or beer at or within or in the vicinity of any premises used for military or naval purposes; and

Whereas there are located in the State of New York premises used for military and naval purposes and other premises which are affected by such legislation; and

Whereas the alcoholic-beverage-control law of the State of New York declares as the policy of the State that it is necessary to regulate and control the manufacture, sale, and distribution within the State of alcoholic beverages for the purpose of fostering and promoting temperance in their consumption and respect for and obedience to law, and that the restrictions contained in the alcoholic-beverage-control law are enacted for the protection, health, welfare, and safety of the people of the State; and

Whereas the liquor authority has the power to issue or refuse to issue any license or permit to traffic in alcoholic beverages, and to revoke, cancel, or suspend for cause any license or permit issued by it; and

Whereas the liquor authority has stated that very careful consideration will be given to the issuance of a license to sell alcoholic beverages in the vicinity of a military training camp or reservation, that the type of establishment and applicant will be closely scrutinized, and the commanding officer of the camp will be consulted in each case as to the advisability of issuing a license; and

Whereas premises licensed to sell alcoholic beverages in the vicinity of military and naval reservations are receiving rigid supervision by the liquor authority and operate under a privilege of a license or permit, which can be revoked when a violation occurs:

Resolved, That the liquor authority of the State of New York is unalterably opposed to the enactment of S. 860, insofar as it relates to the sale or possession of alcoholic beverages, for the following reasons:

1. It will not foster and promote temperance in the consumption of alcoholic beverages and respect for and obedience to law.

2. There is no existing evil in the traffic in alcoholic beverages in the State of New York which this legislation seeks to correct.

3. The alcoholic beverage control law of the State of New York and the regulations of the liquor authority provide adequate and effective control over the sale of alcoholic beverages in the State of New York.

Efficiency at Fort Devens, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received from Mr. Peter Redmond, 557 Palmer Road, Yonkers, N. Y., commending the commanding officer and his staff at Fort Devens, Mass., for their courtesy to him when his brother, a draftee assigned to Fort Devens, was suddenly stricken with a serious illness:

YONKERS, N. Y., *June 26, 1941.*

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: My brother, Pvt. John Redmond, Company K, Third Battalion, Sixteenth Infantry Regiment, First Division, stationed at Fort Devens, Mass., was stricken with spinal meningitis on Tuesday, June 17.

On Wednesday, June 18, my mother was notified of his illness and that midnight I took a train for the camp.

I arrived there at 8 a. m. on Thursday. Although I reported to the wrong hospital, the officers were quick to set me right, even to the extent of providing transportation to the other hospital.

I was greeted courteously, made comfortable by Lt. Col. Felch's office while I waited for him to return from the hospital and provided with a fine breakfast. Colonel Felch gave me all the information he had relative to my brother's ailment, including a report he got by telephone while I was with him concerning the spinal tap that had been made.

When I refused his kind and graciously extended offer to stay at the camp, he allowed me to see my brother before I returned to the town. He provided every precautionary measure, however, to eliminate any possible danger of infection.

I went back to the hospital on Friday and received the same considerate treatment from the colonel and his staff. Now that I have returned home, I have their promise of a weekly report on my brother's progress as well as immediate notification in case of emergency.

I know that people are quick to complain and criticize service camps and treatment; but when such people are as well treated as I was while I was there, and when they see how efficiently such a camp is run, I feel that they would be just as quick with words of praise and recommendation.

It is gratifying to a soldier's family to know that he is in such good hands, sick or well, and for that reason I am writing to ask you to see that credit is given where credit is certainly due—to the commanding officer and his staff.

Very truly yours,
PETER REDMOND.

M. Michael Edelstein

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JAMES A. O'LEARY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Speaker, the Nation, the State, and the city of New York have lost a faithful public servant through the passing of M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, who died in the glory of his mid career on the floor of this House, June 4, 1941.

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north-wind's breath,
And stars to set—but all,
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, O Death!

But M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN was victorious over Death. Through death he passed to immortality while the House Chamber still resounded with the noblest American principles expressed by him in his final words.

I have never been more deeply impressed with evidence of the immortality of the soul than that manifested by the sudden calling of MICHAEL at the moment that his mission had been accomplished, according to Divine Providence.

If M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN had lived the allotted three score years and ten he could not have made a more glorious contribution to the American way of life.

We, however, his colleagues, have been deprived of an unselfish, loyal, and sympathetic friend; he shall remain in loving memory as one who has enriched our association and experience in this House.

The career of M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN was typically that provided in America as in no other place in the world. He was born in Poland in 1888 and came to this country when a small child. He resided in New York City where he attended our

public schools, Cooper Union, and Brooklyn Law School. He was admitted to the practice of law in 1910. He had a lasting appreciation of the opportunities offered in America for advancement and therefore a burning desire to see that these privileges were perpetuated. He never forgot his origin, regardless of his material and official success, but maintained throughout his life a deep and sincere sympathy for the plain people of this country.

His family life was exemplary. His mother has lost a reverent son but will cherish the memory of his love and fidelity and the distinction that he brought to his family.

Production of Smokeless Powder

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take 5 minutes of your time today to discuss a matter of crucial importance in the development of our national-defense program, and to call to the attention of the House of Representatives a shortage that threatens to disrupt and retard production of smokeless powder.

Unless this shortage is frankly recognized, the Nation may find itself without enough powder to furnish the ammunition for the planes and the tanks and the guns that are just beginning to roll off our assembly lines for the common defense. Unless this shortage is corrected, we may find ourselves engaged in a desperate struggle to maintain our rights, with our powder horns empty and our guns therefore silenced.

The shortage I refer to is fast developing in the supply of chemical linters, which is a necessary ingredient of smokeless powder. Linters are the source of nitrocellulose. I rise today to warn the House that next year we will run into an apparent annual linters shortage of about 200,000 tons. Original calculations indicated that the pinch would begin to be felt about the middle of the year—in the summer of 1942. But now it appears that it will come several months earlier. In fact, O. P. M. officials are informed that it may come as early as February of next year.

Aside from the immediacy of the shortage, let me give you a picture of its magnitude. The shortage is larger than the entire annual supply of purified chemical linters produced in the country today. The supply is only 176,000 tons per year, as against an impending shortage of 200,000 tons. In other words, to meet the growing requirements of our defense program it will be necessary to expand production of linters more than 100 percent in the span of less than a year. Within the last few months we have had to revise upward many previous estimates of defense requirements of vital materials. Our needs of aluminum, steel, power, and other commodities were badly underestimated—almost shockingly so. Yet in few critical items do we find a threatened shortage as large as in the case of chemical linters.

These figures are based on powder requirements under the national-defense program as presently set up. They do not take into account any future requirements under the defense program as it may be expanded. My estimate of a 200,000-ton shortage contemplates an Army of its present strength of 1,400,000 men, plus whatever the British may need in the way of lease-lend assistance. If the size of the Army should be increased to 3,000,000 men, as was reported in the press only the other day, then it is obvious that my appraisal of the linters situation no longer holds, and will have to be revised upward accordingly. And if additional billions are requested of Congress to supply this augmented military establishment, this will but serve to underscore the seriousness of a shortage that is serious enough already.

Chemical linters come from two sources—cotton and wood. In the manufacture of nitrocellulose and its subsequent conversion into smokeless powder, cotton is today the sole source. While the production of linters from wood is a thoroughly proven process, it has not been employed up to this time because the supply of linters from cotton has been adequate.

This material is ordinarily derived from the relatively short cotton hairs or fibers adhering to the seed after the cotton is ginned. These fibers, known as raw linters, are removed from the seed in two cuttings. The first yields the longer fibers, which go into surgical cotton, mattresses, felts, cotton batting and the like. The second yields the shorter fibers which alone are suitable, after refining, for the production of nitrocellulose and smokeless powder and other cellulose derivatives like cellulose acetate and viscose rayon.

I should like to digress here a moment to observe how the defense program has quickened our interest in certain industries and in certain critical items and materials for which a brisk demand has suddenly developed under the defense program. Why, we hardly knew some of them existed before. For instance, the machine-tool industry never loomed large in the mind of the average American until he awakened to its importance in making machinery to equip the factories to turn out planes, tanks, guns, ships, and all the thousand and one articles that go to equip a modern army. So it is with linters. Not even the cotton farmer was particularly conscious of them. Why should he be? He merely sells his cottonseed at the gin. From there they go to a few concentration points where the linters are removed before the seeds are crushed for cottonseed oil. Insofar as the cotton grower is concerned, he does not get more than a cent a pound for his seed. Since the linters make up only about one-tenth of the weight of the seed, he gets only a fraction of that cent for the linters. So you see, insofar as his individual income is affected, linters are a negligible byproduct from which he does not materially profit.

Aside from the economics of the situation, at this crucial juncture in the Nation's history, chemical linters loom larger and larger each day as our precious supply dwindles away. Regardless of price or profit, we simply will not have enough on hand. The accompanying table shows at a glance how the Nation's balance sheet of linters from cotton looks today:

Linters balance

[Tons raw liners annually]

Supply:	
Total crop of all grades of linters (1,225,000 bales)	380,000
Chemical grades (comprising 52% of above)	235,000
Less purification loss (25% shrinkage)	58,750
Net supply of chemical linters	176,250
Demand:	
2,000,000 pounds smokeless powder daily requires 750 tons linters daily or	262,500
Viscose rayon industry requires	45,000
Acetate industry requires	58,000
Other commercial uses require	10,000
Total demand	375,500
Less supply of chemical linters	176,250
Apparent shortage	199,250

In calling this serious situation to your attention, I should like to advise against any hasty conclusions as to how the shortage can be met. Someone may say: "Why, that's easy. All you have to do is to raise more cotton." It is not so simple as that, and let me tell you why. Let me point out first, that the size of the cotton crop would have to be doubled in order to meet the linters shortage. Linters constitute only 5½ percent of the total cotton crop and represent such a minor item, as compared with the value of the staple and the cottonseed oil, that it would not be economical to double the crop for that purpose alone.

Think for a moment what such a tremendous increase in the cotton crop would do to cotton prices. If it meant the return of 5-cent cotton, then obviously we could not ask the cotton farmer to make such a sacrifice. It would mean the end of all the carefully planned crop-control programs which the Department of Agriculture has launched successfully for the benefit of the grower. Such a course would not be advisable, especially when our chemists offer wood as an emergency source of supply.

In directing the attention of the Members of the House to this situation, I wish to say a few words for the benefit of those officials of the Government who are charged with discovering and correcting such shortages. A special responsibility rests upon them. We who sit in Congress are not technicians, in the main, and we have no way of knowing of the imminence of defense shortages except when called to our attention by those who are charged with planning and procuring for the common defense.

I measured my words when I made the statement, but it has been my observation that this responsibility has rested all too lightly upon the shoulders of a few of our technical officials within the last several months. I am not trying to fix any blame, nor single out any individual, groups of individuals, or agencies for criticism. But the fact remains that our needs of vital defense supplies have been woefully underestimated in some instances, and deficiencies have grown up, and, in some instances, have developed to a late stage before being discovered and remedied. We may be able to get away with these mistakes as long as we remain at peace. Then again, we may not.

This is not a warfare of minimum needs and we cannot afford to err on the minimum side. It is better to have too much than not enough. It is better to have too much than lack the stuff that modern war is made of. Hitler's armies today are proving again that the determining factor in battle is superiority in firing power. It seems obvious that you cannot talk about firing power without having the powder to fire. And you cannot make satisfactory smokeless powder without chemical linters.

When the impending shortage of linters was first brought to the attention of experts in the Office of Production Management it can be said to their credit that they immediately launched a study of the situation. I understand their studies are virtually complete, and their estimates of the shortage are greater than I have stated to the Members of the House today.

I only hope that the Army in the execution of its own responsibilities in guiding our defense preparations will be equally alert in meeting a potentially serious situation. As for myself, I wish to serve notice here and now that I shall not relent in my efforts to remedy the situation, until I can rest assured that our American boys will have everything it takes to defend themselves, their homeland and their rights, whenever and wherever it may be necessary.

Morris Sheppard

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, late a Senator from the State of Texas

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, in the death of the Honorable MORRIS SHEPPARD my State of Texas has lost an able representative in the Senate of the United States and has suffered an irreparable loss. As dean of the Congress and chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, he was a tower of strength in the very grave emergency which confronts this Nation now. As always, he devoted himself unsparingly to the arduous duties which were his because of his position. He was truly a casualty in the service of his Nation.

Senator SHEPPARD was a man of deep convictions. It mattered not to him that the position he took was unpopular or politically inexpedient. He looked only to the fact that his conscience told him that it was right. He espoused the most controversial of issues and continued his support whether his position was the popular one or not. Those who disagreed with him may not have been convinced and may not have changed their position, but they did respect the honesty and sincerity of his purpose.

Texas will long feel the loss it has sustained.

Upper Selective Service Age Limit Should Be Lowered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there is one part of this so-called May bill before us today of which I approve. Certainly I favor a change and a revision downward in the age limit for inducting men into the Army under our Selective Service Act. It has been suggested that the measure should not only be passed but be made retroactive. I may vote for such an amendment if and when it is offered. It is plainly evident that we have a sufficient number of younger men more suitable for training, and the sooner we pass some such measure the less will be the cost to those between 28 and 35 on account of the very uncertainty under which they are now living.

Let it be understood that those who have been inducted into the service for training—most of them without a murmur—are not the only young men who have been willing to pay the price of patriotic duty, but many others have paid a price with the same degree of patriotism. I know of young men between the ages of 28 and 35, wanted in private employment because they have graduated from highly technical training institutions, but who are not now considered for employment because they are within the draft age and might be called. Employers in many instances have hesitated to sign up for the coming year, those who might be inducted into the Army. That means that for the past few months some young men have not been inducted but have been unable to secure employment because of the possibility they might be taken. The passage of the proposed legislation will improve their situation by changing that uncertainty.

Sabotage in National-Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I favor the passage of this bill as a reasonable measure for the curbing of sabotage in our national-defense industries. A democracy such as ours must prove itself capable of rising to the occasion when spies and saboteurs worm their way into the Nation's vital defense machinery. The only complaint I have with the bill is that it is too mild in its penalties. A spy found in the armed forces of the country should be dealt with far more drastically and summarily. And yet the production of defense weapons is just as important for the Nation's security as are the armed forces of the land. The Army and the Navy would be helpless without the instruments of defense. It follows that sabotage in the production of our arms is a direct attack upon our armed forces.

Every expert who has given his attention to the problem of sabotage is of the opinion that there are more saboteurs at work in the United States today than there were in 1917 and 1918. The Nazi and Communist dictators, far more than any warring nation in the first World War, employ the tactics of the Trojan Horse with all that is implied in the method. We must, therefore, deal effectively and promptly with the thousands of agents of Hitler and Stalin.

I am not unmindful of the fact that Stalin and Hitler are at war with each other today. This new conflict has not altered in the slightest the fact that communism is still just as great an enemy of American democracy as it was last week. In fact, the new situation creates a new peril for our institutions. That peril lies in the possibility that there may be a tendency to relax our vigilance against Communist saboteurs. The Communists will not hesitate to use the new situation as a means of entrenching themselves more securely than ever before in government and in labor unions. They will now begin to shout that they are full-fledged patriots of unquestionable loyalty to the United States. The truth is that their course today, just as their course yesterday, is dictated by the interests of their red boss Stalin. It has nothing to do with loyalty to the United States. It will be as false and hypocritical as their pretensions in the days of the People's Front when they penetrated unhindered into government and labor unions. We must, therefore, redouble our vigilance rather than relax it against Stalin's agents. The passage of this bill will serve notice on agents of Hitler and Stalin alike that the Congress of the United States intends to perform its duty with respect to the safety of this country.

Despite the fact that the Communists will not now be engaged in wholesale typing-up of our defense industries on the pretext of organizing for better working conditions, they will be just as active, or even more so, in building their cells in all of our industries. Those Communist cells used one day for one purpose will be ready to serve an opposite purpose tomorrow. The war between Stalin and Hitler will not last forever. But while it lasts and after it is over, Communists are first, last, and always the enemies of this country. This bill will serve as a necessary protective measure when the Communists have done another of their awkward somersaults.

Furthermore, the menace now arising from the agents of Hitler is increased. The Nazis in our defense industries must go it alone for a time. They will not now be able to count on the collaboration which they have recently had from Stalin's saboteurs. I say to this House that Nazi agents are spotted throughout our national-defense industries. The Dies committee has the names of several thousand Nazis and Nazi sympathizers who are employed in our defense plants. They should, of course, be immediately weeded out. Likewise, we should weed out all Communists from from our Government agencies and from our labor unions, for the failure to clean house of Communists, Nazis, and Fascists, subjects our whole defense program to the wrath of sabotage. And lastly, we should not find it necessary to wait for the commission of an overt act of sabotage before we get these disloyal foreign agents out of places where they can work their damage.

I favor the passage of this bill because it is an important piece of legislation to have permanently on our statute books. It is not needed solely as a piece of emergency legislation. Its passage will signalize the fact that one great democracy at least is at last coming to its senses.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM S. CULBERTSON BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Honorable William S. Culbertson, former Ambassador to Chile, before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with negotiations for trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay. The statement was made at a hearing held in Washington, D. C., on June 24, 1941.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appear in behalf of the Argentina Meat Producers Corporation, for which I have also filed a brief. This corporation is not Government subsidized or Government controlled or owned. It receives no help from the Government at all. It is organized under a general law of Argentina providing for cooperation in this field, and the cattle growers of Argentina are required to participate to a certain extent under that law in the organization and activities of the corporation.

The corporation has offices in the United States for the importing and the distributing of its products, principally byproducts, and its office is located at 9 Rockefeller Plaza.

Mr. Chairman, may I make one or two preliminary observations before I summarize some of the points which I have made in my briefs. I have no intention of detaining you with a restatement of what I have endeavored to present in writing.

In these tariff discussions, with which I have a little experience over the years, it is quite common to abuse and cast aspersions on the foreigner. The years that I have had the pleasure of sitting on this bench, I used to listen to those aspersions, and criticisms, and implications, which were usually not very flattering. I suppose you have learned as I soon learned in my experience not to give them too much weight. They are sort of stock-in-trade of arguments which are presented by certain producing groups in the United States.

There is one point that has been made from time to time in these hearings yesterday and today to which I think I should refer. Reference has been made to the so-called peon labor of Argentina. It might be sarcastic to say that that reference does not reveal any great knowledge of the facts, and incidentally does not reveal very much good manners, internationally speaking, as the Argentine nation is a great nation with which I have had a little personal experience, and I know its people, and I understand the standard of living which prevails there.

The phrase "peon labor" implies starvation wages, and implies a sort of serf condition in which people live. I venture to say that the cowboy—the "gaucho" on the plains of Argentina—comes and goes in those histancias through as high a standard of living from the standpoint of real wages and the things that he gets that keep his body and soul together and give him the pleasures of life as any of those who herd sheep and herd the cattle of our western plains.

I have lived in our own West, and I have seen the standard of living there, and I have also seen it in Argentina, and I think that the phrase "peon labor" does not properly apply.

The second observation that I would like to make is in response to Mr. Arner's question this morning with reference to corned beef. I really did not intend to say anything about that subject today because it has been discussed and rediscussed to a point where one would think that the fundamentals of it were understood by everybody, and I am sure they are understood by you gentlemen upon the bench. But we have heard a great deal of what might be called the economics of corned beef. Those economics have been discussed in Congress and by representatives of the livestock industry on former occasions. I remember not very long ago the Washington Post undertook to review some of those arguments in an editorial, and concluded its observation with reference to those arguments—"the economics of corned beef"—by saying that it seemed to be a case of "corned beef between the ears."

The question was asked this morning, "Who is it that wants this canned beef?" The answer, of course, is that it is the millions of people in the United States on a relatively low standard of living who cannot afford to buy at the present prices the steaks and the roast beefs that are available in our markets; and the great advantage of proposing, as the committee has done, to include canned meats in the program of the negotiation with Argentina is that the duties of that product and similar byproducts can be reduced without injuring in the slightest degree the cattle-growing industry of the United States.

Since 1921 the duty on canned corned beef has been increased three times in the hope that the American source of supply might be increased, but every time the result has been negative. There is today, as was stated this morning by one of the representatives of the industry, no commercially produced corned beef in the United States today. It was found that the cost of preserving the meat—because that is what it is—was much easier, much cheaper, much less expensive to preserve it in casings in the form of sausages and hot dogs than it was to preserve it in cans, and thus the sausage and the hot-dog manufacturer, who was able to pay more for the trimmings and the cuttings of our cattle industry, is really the source from which the corned-beef manufacturer has found his trouble.

The solution, of course, was to produce corned beef in South America, where there was abundance of canner cattle to be used entirely for canning purposes, in addition to an abundance of trimmings which were available from the export meats which they sent out in fresh form. So that the real villian who killed the canned corned-beef business in the United States was not the cheap Argentine cattle but the American hot dog.

Now, directly responsive to Mr. Arner's question this morning, I want to give you some very recent figures with reference to costs, or at least figures which reflect the cost of production. There have been a number of controversies over this subject before the committees of Congress, particularly in connection with the purchase of corned beef by the Navy. You will recall that only a year or so ago Admiral Leahy, before the House of Representatives committee, was asked why the Navy purchased Argentine corned beef, and he answered that the award was made to the Argentine product both because of the difference in price and the better quality of the product.

Directly on the question of cost—and, Mr. Arner, this is in response directly to your question—the Army bids for 6,000,000 pounds of corned beef were asked for yesterday in Chicago. They were asked for on June 23, 1941. And please note these figures.

The lowest South American bid was 15.92 cents. If you will add to that the 6 cents a pound duty, you have a total of 21.92. The lowest domestic bid was 34.50 cents. In other words, taking the domestic bid and subtracting from it the lowest South American bid, you have a difference of cost of production or a difference in cost of 18.58 cents.

Now, I used to have friends in the protectionist field who argued that if a 50-percent duty was good a 100-percent duty was twice as good. And I suppose that it might be argued here that if a 6-cent duty is good an 18-cent duty is three times as good. But the experience in the past has been that to increase the tariff duty does not restore or bring back the corned-beef industry for the reasons of fundamental economics which exist in the industry itself.

Those facts, of course, have been recognized by Secretary WALLACE, now the Vice President of the United States. Speaking before the Senate Finance Committee a year or two ago, he said:

"Before the World War a considerable amount of beef was canned in the United States from so-called canner cows and low-grade beef; and since that time there has

been very little canning of beef in this country, mainly for the reason that a more profitable outlet for the low-grade beef has been found in sausage.

"It is not likely that the exclusion of the relatively small amount of imported canned beef would have any appreciable effect on the domestic price of sausage or of any other meat products. Consequently, if canned beef imported were excluded the result probably would be that there would be no canned beef consumed in the United States."

Perhaps one of the results would be, as suggested by one of the speakers, that we would eat canned pork instead of canned beef. Well, that is one of those interesting arguments for substitutes in the field of the tariff which suggests that we ought to have a duty on bananas because if a man doesn't eat a banana, why, he may eat an apple.

May I now say a word about the fundamental question of our trade relations with the Argentine Republic. Before the early thirties, or in the early thirties at least, there was no strict necessity for the United States, in order to maintain its export sales in Argentina, to maintain its imports from that country. Those of you who are familiar, as you gentlemen on the bench are, with the fundamental principles of trade know that the triangular trade which was developed at that time permitted us to send a great many more products to Argentina than we took from them, and our exporters received not dollars in return but pounds or francs or other counters in the international exchange, which gave them value in international trade; so that the normal trade between Argentina and the United States in that period was conducted on the basis of a large excess of imports from the United States into Argentina over the exports of Argentina to the United States.

Now, beginning in 1930, the great change began to take place. The canalization of trade began to come upon the world, and it was necessary for Argentina, being in a somewhat weak position economically, to yield to that tendency of bilateralism which was forced gradually upon her by European economics. So she made an agreement with Germany; she made an agreement with Great Britain, and with other countries, forced upon her by the exchange situation.

Now, the effect of that was to pull our export trade down to the level of our import trade with the Argentine, and we lost a great deal in the international field, and we lost nationally in that sense.

Now, the European war has intensified the already stringent exchange situation prevailing in Argentina and United States trade, but while on the one hand the war has made Argentina more heavily dependent upon the United States for products, it has cut down the exchange wherewith she can pay for her products which she must receive from us. Now, of course, if the policy of the United States is economic isolationism, why that sort of argument has no bearing, but you know I could not help but think as I listened to the arguments that were presented here, that if the cattle-growing industry of the United States wants to get rid of this competition from the Argentine, they should be an enthusiastic supporter of Mr. Hull's trade-agreement program which will tend to restore the triangular trade and thereby relieve this pressure which requires us, as the Pan American Union has said in one of its reports, to buy an increasing amount of products from the Argentine; but if the policy of the Government is as proclaimed in the preamble of the Trade Agreements Act, if it is to increase our normal and natural development of foreign market, then in view of the strenuous opposition which comes from producer interests in the United States whenever any one of their products is mentioned—in view of that, it becomes relevant to select products for importation into the United States which will produce the maximum of benefit with the minimum of injury.

Now, those are products, gentlemen, that I have discussed in the brief which I have submitted. They include the items on the list—prepared and preserved meat, hides and skins, tallow, animal food, meat extract, and certain of the others.

Now, the United States will never, never be self-sufficient in these byproducts of the cattle industry. All livestock producers regulate their production according to the demand for their product and not according to the demand for their byproducts, which has little effect upon production. That is in response to another of the questions that Mr. Arner asked.

Cattle, for instance, are produced according to the demand for beef, and not according to the demand for hides. I mean, if the arguments were relevant which have been made with reference to hides today—if they were relevant at all we would have to have a breed of cattle that shed its skin once a year, and thereby we could make a specialty of producing hides according to the demand of the industry. The principle should be carried further and applied to the different cuts of beef. If the American public should suddenly acquire, let us say, a fad for eating tongue at every meal, it is obvious that the meat producers of the United States could not supply the demand, since they cannot afford to grow steers merely for the production of their tongues. They can produce a greater number of carcasses, but they cannot change the proportion of cuts within those carcasses themselves. And the thing that really determines the income of the industry is the rounds and the ribs and the loins which are produced in the industry, and not the plates and the navels and the trimmings that come along and produce these byproducts. And so it was in former time that those byproducts were used for canned beef, and then they came, as I said, to be used primarily for hot dogs and for sausages.

Something was said this morning about oleo oil and fat. I shall not undertake before a board that knows much more about it than I do to discuss all the intricacies of animal and vegetable oils and fats, but there is a rather interesting point that can be quickly made with reference to these two products, because they illustrate how the tariff can hurt the same industry that it is trying to benefit.

This excise tax which was placed on these products is so high that it has destroyed all the natural relationships between oils in the international markets. Now, one of the very serious consequences—and this is only an illustration, because it can be paralleled with other cases—one of the serious consequences of this excise tax has been to make all the oils of the world much cheaper than American lard. Whale oil, for example, and other oils, shut out from our markets, have flowed into the international market, and by scientific processes some of them have been made more edible than they were before, and they have cut down the price. They have undersold American lard, and the United States has been losing the lard market, which was a very great and important source of income to the American farmer a generation ago.

The producers of oils and fats in the United States cannot have their cake and eat it too, and this is a very good example of that, and so that, just to recall to you some of the figures about the lard situation which has been created by this maladjustment in the question of animal and vegetable oils, of the Federal-inspected production in the United States in 1929, 47 percent was exported, and for a number of years all through there, almost a half of our lard went abroad. That has been followed in 1935, which was 15 percent; 1936, 11 percent; 1937, 18 percent; 1930, 22 percent; and 1940, 13 percent.

* * * * *

But I want to conclude simply by saying this, that while I have tried to amplify particularly in my brief the broad national significance of dealing with these relatively unimportant products in a favorable way with Argentina because of the broad national significance and the international problems which are involved, I believe that a general trade agreement satisfactory to Argentina can be concluded not only without detriment to American agriculture but with benefit to our producers of agricultural products, and the benefits are two—directly, from the expansion of our export trade to Argentina in those products; and there are products of that kind that go there from our agricultural community; and, indirectly—and this is very important—indirectly, through the consequent increase of the domestic demand for such products, that is, the products of our livestock industry, through the consequent increase of domestic demand for those products as a result of the greater employment and higher purchasing power in the centers where commodities are produced for export—the defense plants, the men who are working there, for their products; or, if the products of our manufacturing centers are flowing abroad we are getting a dollar exchange. Those men, those populations will have more with which to buy steaks and roast beef, which is the real basis for the standard of living of our farming community.

Constitutional Powers of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS BY EDWARD H. FOLEY, JR.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, a few days ago I asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered before the New York Bar Association at Saranac in New York on June 27, 1941, by Edward H. Foley, Jr., General Counsel for the Treasury Department, on the subject Some Aspects of the Constitutional Powers of the President. I have since been advised that the address referred to exceeds by one-third of a page the limit provided by the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing. The estimate of the Government Printing Office indicates that the publication will cost $105. I now renew the request that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One month ago today the President of the United States declared the existence of an unlimited national emergency. Since this proclamation vague fears have been expressed that the steps taken during the emergency will be at the expense of our system of popular government.

The expression of these fears comes from two sources: First, there are those who oppose the policies of the President. They cry "dictatorship" whenever he takes vigorous action. Obviously, so long as they disagree with the administration they will not yield to persuasion.

Second, there are those who, in good faith, declare their fear of future consequences to our democracy simply because they misunderstand the nature and scope of the

Executive power. It is to this group that I am speaking.

My purpose today is to describe some aspects of the President's constitutional warrant for extraordinary action—action which is called extraordinary only because the circumstances which require the action are themselves extraordinary.

The framers of the Constitution were well aware of the need for concentrating powerful authority in a single executive. With a foresight which seems at times to have amounted almost to clairvoyance, they provided us with a strong and unified Executive with sufficient powers to preserve, protect, and defend the Union.

The Delegates to the Constitutional Convention represented an unusual array of talent and legal ability. Among them were two who were to be President and one who was to be Vice President, five who were to become judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, and also such legal giants as Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, and Edmund Randolph, first Attorney General of the United States, and Luther Martin. These Delegates were just emerging from a bitter experience with weak executive authority under the Articles of Confederation. They had also seen the serious effects of usurpation of executive power by some State legislatures.

I shall consider only those powers of the President which spring full blown from the Constitution without statutory implementation. Furthermore, I shall limit my discussion to some aspects of (a) his powers as Commander in Chief, (b) his powers to control foreign affairs, and (c) his powers as President to protect the Union.

I. POWERS AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF

The Constitution designates the President as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the service of the United States. The various powers included in this grant are not stated in detail in the Constitution.

When the Constitution was being drafted and ratified the only objection made to this power seems to have been that it permitted the President to command in person.

This objection, however, made little headway. And today if President Roosevelt wished to command the north Atlantic patrol from the bridge of the *Augusta*, he could point to the precedent established by President Washington who left the Executive offices at Philadelphia and rode with his troops for a month during the Pennsylvania Insurrection.

When the Constitution was adopted, the power of commander in chief over the armed forces of a State was frequently vested in the Governor of the State. Hamilton commented in The Federalist on what the framers of the Constitution contemplated when they inserted this power. He said:

"The propriety of this provision is so evident in itself, and it is, at the same time, so consonant to the precedents of the State constitutions in general, that little need be said to explain or enforce it. Even those of them which have, in other respects, coupled the Chief Magistrate with a council, have for the most part concentrated the military authority in him alone. Of all the cares or concerns of government, the direction of war most peculiarly demands those qualities which distinguish the exercise of power by a single hand. The direction of war implies the direction of the common strength, and the power of directing and employing the common strength, forms a usual and essential part in the definition of the Executive authority."

"The direction of the common strength"—that is an important concept. It proves that, even in the eighteenth century, statesmen realized, first, that the waging of war not only involves the sending of armies into battle but also calls for the strength of the whole Nation, and, second, that it is of paramount importance that the powers of directing the common strength in the common defense be concentrated in the Chief Executive of the Nation.

Our war Presidents have never hesitated to use their powers as Commander in Chief for purposes other than for directing the movements of our military and naval forces.

During the Civil War, for example, Postmaster General Blair, at the direction of the President, closed the mails to matter that might instigate others to cooperate with the Confederate States. He specifically refused transmission through the mails to certain newspapers which publicly advocated that the Federal Government accede to the demands of the Confederacy.

The House of Representatives' Committee on the Judiciary investigated this activity by Blair and determined not only that he had authority to act as he did but that it was his duty to do so.

Again, during the first World War, President Wilson created the Committee on Public Information under his authority as Commander in Chief. Without any statutory authority he exercised a censorship over cables, telephones, and telegraph lines.

The powers of the President as Commander in Chief are not contingent upon a declaration of war by the Congress. Furthermore, as the late Chief Justice Taft pointed out, Congress "cannot provide an Army of which the President must be Commander in Chief, and then in the law of its creation limit him in the use of the Army to enforce any of the laws of the United States in accordance with his constitutional duty."

Instances where this power has been exercised are well known. For example, in 1854 during political upheavals in Nicaragua, the President and the Secretary of the Navy ordered an American warship to proceed to Greytown to defend the lives and property of American citizens.

Subsequently, in a lawsuit growing out of this incident, Mr. Justice Nelson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, sitting in circuit, declared:

"Now, as it respects the interposition of the Executive abroad, for the protection of the lives or property of the citizen, the duty must, of necessity, rest in the discretion of the President. Acts of lawless violence, or of threatened violence to the citizen or his property, cannot be anticipated and provided for; and the protection, to be effectual or of any avail, may, not unfrequently, require the most prompt and decided action. Under our system of government the citizen abroad is as much entitled to protection as the citizen at home. The great object and duty of government is the protection of the lives, liberty, and property of the people composing it, whether abroad or at home; and any government failing in the accomplishment of the object, or the performance of the duty, is not worth preserving."

The Santo Domingo expedition during Grant's administration, the use of Federal troops in the Pullman strike under Cleveland, the American expedition to China during the Boxer uprising, the bombardment of Veracruz in Wilson's time, the numerous landings of marines in Latin America in more recent years—all these indicate the broad limits of the President's discretionary power to use the armed forces of the United States.

In this day when there is so much discussion over convoys, I wonder if it is generally realized that without any authority from the Congress, and in time of peace, President Buchanan, who usually took a narrow view of the powers of his office, nevertheless ordered a naval force to Cuba "to protect all vessels of the United States on the high seas from search or detention by the vessels of war of any other nation."

As you all know, the most recent example of the use of this impressive power of the President is the Executive order in which President Roosevelt directed Secretary of War Stimson to take over and operate the North American Aviation Co. plant and produce the aircraft called for by its contracts with the United States.

Not far from here, on a hillside near the village of Lake Placid, John Brown is buried. His grave reminds us of the fight to free the slaves. It is well to remember that Abraham Lincoln justified his Emancipation Proclamation liberating slaves in the States in rebellion on the ground it was within his authority as Commander in Chief. When he was attacked for usurping a power he did not possess, Lincoln replied:

"You say it is unconstitutional. I think differently. I think the Constitution invests its Commander in Chief with the law of war in time of war. The most that can be said, if so much, is that slaves are property. Is there, has there ever been any question that by the law of war, property both of enemies and friends, may be taken when needed? And is it not needed whenever taking it helps us or hurts the enemy?"

A President possessed of determination to preserve democratic processes must employ all his powers with the boldness of a war executive in a period of national danger and unlimited emergency.

II. POWERS TO CONTROL FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The President's powers as Commander in Chief are, however, no more impressive than his powers to control foreign affairs.

In 1800 John Marshall, who was then a Member of the House of Representatives, said:

"The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations."

The Constitution vests in the President the appointment of ambassadors, ministers, and consuls by and with the consent of the Senate. However, since Washington's time the President has designated special or private agents to carry on diplomatic functions without consulting the Senate. Thus, Washington employed Gouverneur Morris to confer with the British Government concerning its further performance of its obligations under the treaty of peace, and Andrew Jackson sent a special commission to Turkey. The activities of Colonel House on behalf of President Wilson and of Norman Davis on behalf of President Roosevelt are matters of common knowledge.

Although the Constitution also vests in the President power to make treaties, with the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate, he alone negotiates them.

The Constitution is silent on the President's power to make international agreements, other than treaties, without the consent of the Senate. It does, however, distinguish between treaties and agreements. It prohibits the States from making any treaty with foreign governments, although it authorizes the States to make agreements with foreign governments with the consent of the Congress.

It is frequently difficult to distinguish in nature or importance between a treaty and an Executive agreement. But the power to enter into important international engagements without the consent of the Senate has been asserted by several Presidents and is now well established.

This power to make Executive agreements arises not only from the President's control over foreign affairs, but also from his military powers, and those great residual powers which inhere in the President as the Chief Executive of the Nation.

The Rush-Bagot Convention between the United States and Great Britain, which limited the naval armaments of both countries on the Great Lakes, was entered into by the mere exchange of notes in 1817 and was

not submitted as a formal treaty to the Senate until a year later.

Similarly, between 1882 and 1896, Executive agreements were entered into whereby the United States and Mexico undertook to permit the regular troops of each country to cross the boundary line of the other when in pursuit of Indians.

The important Executive agreement providing for the open door in China and the Lansing-Ishii Agreement, recognizing special interests by Japan in China, were neither previously authorized by the Congress nor subsequently submitted to the Senate for ratification.

The so-called gentlemen's agreement relating to Japanese immigration into the United States provided a friendly and satisfactory solution of a most vexatious problem without formal action by the Senate or the Congress. In fact, it is now generally agreed that this happy solution was vitiated by the action of the Congress in passing the Japanese Exclusion Act.

Even the substance of an unratified treaty may be included in an Executive agreement and the agreement performed, regardless of ratification by the Senate. Thus, after the bloody disturbances in 1905 throughout the Dominican Republic, Theodore Roosevelt proposed that the United States should collect Dominican customs and allocate part of the receipts for payment of Dominican debts and the rest for the Dominican expenses. He submitted a treaty embodying this proposal to the Senate, but after a long debate the Senate adjourned without ratifying it.

The President then included the terms of the treaty in an Executive agreement, and for 28 months the program continued in operation under that agreement. Later this precedent was followed in Executive agreements with other Latin American countries and in Liberia.

A few years ago the Litvinoff Agreement, by which the Soviet Government assigned to the United States all its claims against American nationals was held by the Supreme Court of the United States to be fully warranted under the Constitution.

The recent acquisition by President Roosevelt of naval and air bases in the Western Hemisphere in exchange for 50 destroyers could be justified not only on the basis of power delegated to the President by statute, but also on the basis of his constitutional powers, either as Commander in Chief, or as the official charged with the control of foreign relations.

In fact, Attorney General Jackson in his opinion advising the President that the acquisition was authorized, rested its validity partly on the President's power over foreign relations and cited as authoritative the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Curtiss-Wright case. In that case Mr. Justice Sutherland said:

"It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power but with such an authority plus the very delicate, plenary, and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution."

It is important in this connection to emphasize again what Justice Sutherland asserted earlier in this opinion, namely, that although the Federal Government has only enumerated powers in respect of domestic affairs, its powers of external sovereignty do not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers of the Federal Government over foreign relations which are not otherwise defined or allocated in the Constitution are for the President to exercise.

Certainly, the Congress, the limits of whose authority are set forth in the Constitution, is not the proper body to exercise such powers. "The transaction of business with foreign nations," said Jefferson, "is Executive altogether."

This residual power over foreign relations vested in the President is closely related to his residual power to protect and preserve the Union.

III. RESIDUAL POWERS TO PROTECT THE UNION

Speaking before the American Bar Association at Saratoga Springs in the summer of 1917, Charles Evans Hughes pointed out that "the framers of the Constitution did not contrive an imposing spectacle of impotency. * * * Self-preservation is the first law of national life and the Constitution itself provides the necessary powers in order to defend and preserve the United States."

It is true that at the time of the drafting of the Constitution many persons were fearful of a strong Executive. This attitude grew mainly from the fear that such an establishment might develop into monarchy.

Notwithstanding this fear that the Presidential chair might be converted into a kingly throne, the framers recognized that a republic cannot long exist without great powers in a Chief Executive.

The idea that a vigorous Executive is inconsistent with the genius of representative government was emphatically repudiated by Hamilton. Urging the necessity of conferring adequate power upon the President, Hamilton wrote in the Federalist:

"Energy in the Executive is a leading character in the definition of good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attacks; it is not less essential to the steady administration of the laws; to the protection of property against those irregular and high-handed combinations which sometimes interrupt the ordinary course of justice; to the security of liberty against the enterprises and assaults of ambition, of faction, and of anarchy. * * *

"A feeble Executive implies feeble execution of the Government. A feeble execution is but another phrase for a bad execution; and a government ill-executed, whatever it may be in theory, must be, in practice, a bad government."

The power which has been delegated to the Federal Government is exercised through the three great coordinate branches—the President, the Congress, and the courts. Legislative powers are vested in the Congress by the first section of article I of the Constitution, and it is noteworthy that it has no powers other than those enumerated in that article. The exact language is: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress."

Similarly, article III of the Constitution carefully limits the grant of power to the Federal judiciary.

When, however, we turn to the grant of power to the Executive under article II of the Constitution we find that there is no similar restriction on the executive power vested in the President.

The exact language of the Constitution is: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

Hence it is manifest that so much of the power of the United States not enumerated in the grant to the Congress or not included in the defined extent of the judicial power is vested in the President. In other words, the President is the repository of the residual Federal power.

This doctrine is not new. In the first of his Pacificus Papers, which appeared on June 29, 1793, Hamilton defended the right of the President to issue a neutrality proclamation with respect to the war between France and England. It may seem surprising in some quarters that the issuance of this first neutrality proclamation brought down on the head of George Washington untold abuse and bitter charges of usurpation and dictatorship.

Hamilton, however, found power to issue the proclamation in the President's residual authority. The right to remain neutral, being a recognized attribute of Federal sovereignty, there remained only the question: What branch of the Government should make the proclamation? It was obvious that such action did not fall within the province of the judiciary. Nor did the powers of Congress as enumerated in the Constitution cover the situation.

"A correct mind," said Hamilton, "will discern at once that it can belong neither to the legislative nor judicial department, and therefore, of course, must belong to the Executive."

This residual power is particularly important in times when the safety of the whole Nation is threatened.

Chief Justice Marshall recognized the existence of the power of national self-preservation in the early case of *Cohens* v. *Virginia*, and the Supreme Court later reiterated this position in the *Second Legal Tender* cases.

The very form of oath set forth in the Constitution under which the President swears that he will to the best of his ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States supports this view. The Constitution did not contemplate imposing on the President a duty and simultaneously withholding from him the means and the powers with which to perform that duty.

Our great Presidents have never hesitated to do whatever was necessary for the preservation of the Union. Abraham Lincoln, on taking office, was suddenly confronted with a rebellion that threatened to disrupt the whole Union. Congress was not in session. Immediate action was necessary.

Abraham Lincoln took that action. By Executive order of April 25, 1861, the President directed that, if the Maryland Legislature should take action to arm the people of that State against the United States, prompt and efficient steps to counteract such action would be taken, even to the bombardment of Maryland cities.

By proclamation of May 3, 1861, President Lincoln increased the Regular Army by adding 22,714 officers and men. He increased the Navy by directing the enlistment of 18,000 men.

He ordered $2,000,000 to be advanced out of the Treasury, without security, and paid to persons whom Congress had not authorized to receive it.

And he suspended the writ of habeas corpus. When what Lincoln had done was attacked as unauthorized, he made his classic reply:

"Are all the laws but one to go unexecuted, and the Government itself to go to pieces lest that one be violated? Even in such a case, would not the official oath be broken if the Government should be overthrown when it was believed that disregarding the single law would tend to preserve it?"

Lincoln, like the framers of the Constitution, was well aware of the dangers inherent in a weak Executive. The framers did not want to see the history of State governments during the critical years repeat itself in the new Federal Government. Governors had been reduced to legislative puppets; judges had been made dependent upon legislators for their subsistence in office; and civil rights, such as trial by jury, had been extensively violated.

"One hundred and seventy-three despots would surely be as oppressive as one," wrote Madison, gravely disturbed by developments. That great believer in democratic rule by the people spoke the thoughts of the framers when he wrote in The Federalist:

"In a government where numerous and extensive prerogatives are placed in the hands of a hereditary monarch, the Executive department is very justly regarded as the source of danger, and watched with all the jealousy which a zeal for liberty ought to inspire.

In a democracy, where a multitude of people exercise in person the legislative functions, and are continually exposed, by their incapacity for regular deliberation and concerted measures, to the ambitious intrigues of their executive magistrates, tyranny may well be apprehended on some favorable emergency, to start up in the same quarter. But in a representative republic, where the executive magistracy is carefully limited, both in the extent and the duration of its power; and where the legislative power is exercised by an assembly, which is inspired, by a supposed influence over the people, with an intrepid confidence in its own strength; which is sufficiently numerous to feel all the passions which actuate a multitude, yet not so numerous as to be incapable of pursuing the objects of its passions, by means which reason prescribes, it is against the enterprising ambition of this department that the people ought to indulge all their jealousy and exhaust all their precautions."

In countries like France the subjection of the executive to a legislature torn by faction and given to intrigue and petty political bickering made a mockery of democratic government. A government which cannot govern, which even in normal times cannot cope with the complex problems of modern industrial society, is a push-over for dictators in time of crisis.

It was not because the executive was too strong in Germany, Italy, France, and Spain that these countries succumbed to dictatorship.

On the contrary, it was because the executive was reduced to little more than a puppet of the legislature.

By way of contrast, the heroic resistance of the English people during the present war has been made possible in no small degree by the powers which have been conferred upon the Prime Minister and his cabinet.

In every time of great national emergency which calls for dynamic and courageous leadership there are always those who pretend to see in such leadership the threat of dictatorship. Fortunately for us these timid souls are in a minority now, as they were in the days of Washington and Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Wilson.

The "last frontier of democracy" is even now at the English Channel. We in the United States have constituted ourselves the arsenal for the defense of that frontier. Fancied fears of dictatorship at home should not blind us to the real threat arising from the upsurge of tyranny abroad.

We lawyers have a peculiar responsibility to avoid the kind of distortion which represents the exercise of the powers of national self-preservation by the President as a threat to our democracy. The framers of the Constitution were not unmindful of the dangers this Nation would encounter in the unfolding future. But they had the faith and vision to see that the power to govern in the hands of a responsible Executive was a necessary condition of survival. It is for us to show the same faith and the same vision today.

United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS OF HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on July 4 I had the privilege and honor in participating in an Independence Day program of the United States Marine Corps. On that occasion I paid tribute to the United States Marine Corps, and I should like to have the speech inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I was a youth and stood along the line of march to view an occasional military parade, I noted that as the sailors of the Navy and the soldiers of the National Guard and Regular Army passed by, an expectant murmur among the spectators arose, "Where are the marines?" "Where are the marines?" Later came whispers of exultation—"Here they come." "Here they come."

To this very day I have observed this same attitude upon the part of our people who line the sidewalks along our public streets to witness parades in which our military organizations participate. At first I did not understand the full purport of these expressions of special interest in the marines. Now, I know that it was the people's admiration for their attractive well-fitted uniforms, their fine physique, and their impressive and snappy military bearing which represents the acme of perfection in military training and appearance.

I observed more than public admiration for the martial swing of our manly looking marines. I sensed a real affection on the part of the American people for them. The enlisted men of the Navy and of the Army are appreciated by all Americans and we are proud of them, but somehow the marines seem to catch the fancy of the American people and to command a special affection.

It is the history of the United States Marine Corps from the days of the Revolution to this very hour, outranking as it does, the thrills of fiction. That is the explanation. They—the marines—have typified in all our history the appropriateness of their motto, "Semper Fidelis"—"Always Faithful."

No structure is stronger than its foundations and in the foundation of the United States Marine Corps lies a cemented host of traditions deeply entrenched in the soil of the United States—traditions not developed by orators or propagandists, but earned in the past by the Corps on the blood-soaked fields of battle; and by faithful service to the Nation for more than 165 years.

Tradition demands a high physical standard for marines. They must be prepared to display the quality of physical endurance in the performance of their varied duties, as well as on the athletic field. They must exemplify neatness and cleanliness, together with military bearing and smartness on the quarter deck, parade ground, and in the field. I said their military bearing commands respect. So does their marksmanship. For they are ready to shoot straight should the occasion demand it. You must have often noted that when perfect marksmanship is illustrated, the gun is always placed in the hands of the marine.

Every marine is taught to respect high moral qualities and to emulate the examples of trustworthiness, courage, faithfulness, and self-sacrifice of those who have gone before them. From the achievements of his predecessors in the Marine Corps he is taught to gather strength of character and to be worthy always of being called a marine.

About a year ago I was invited to deliver a brief address at the erection of a simple tablet over the grave of a marine who was killed at Harpers Ferry in the historic John Brown's raid. Incidentally, it is not generally known that it was the marines that went out from the navy yard at Washington who captured John Brown. I became deeply interested in the idea that the little community at Harpers Ferry were to erect a small monument to a forgotten and unknown marine hero. I learned that the only one marine killed in that skirmish was a lonely immigrant boy who enlisted in the marines at 19 years of age, shortly before his death. For a long time his grave was unknown and unmarked. A local citizen interested himself, and after years of research finally discovered (by the preservation of the buttons on the uniform the marines then wore) the grave of Luke Quinn, the unknown marine hero of Harpers Ferry. He had no known relatives. He had come to America like millions of others who fled from Europe to America to enjoy the priceless opportunity of being free from poverty and oppression, and to enjoy the rights and privileges of citizenship in this free land.

This story illustrates the type and caliber of those who enlist in our marines. They are descendants of every race, representative of every creed, and from every section of our country. They are typical Americans.

The esprit de corps of the marines is superb, their loyalty adamant. Thousands and thousands of boys like Quinn at Harpers Ferry have come and gone, their services unsung, but they have imbedded into the hearts of all Americans a deep and lasting affection for our marines.

You will be interested to know something of the numerous duties performed by the marines. First of all, they are a component part of the United States Navy, their chief and outstanding duty is on board our naval vessels, accompanying them in their attacks at sea, and when the Navy has successfully bombarded an enemy shore the marines leave the naval vessels and go ashore to seize and protect advanced bases for our Navy and our Army.

Leaving the ships they have guarded at sea, they proceed directly into the difficult, hazardous, and extremely dangerous task of placing in subjection and under control a hostile population in a foreign land. They are the first to land bearing the flag of our country, inspired with the courage that has characterized the marines in all its undertakings. I like to believe also that they are strengthened in their purpose in the realization of what the unstained flag of our country represents to humanity. In these operations they are not only subjected to military opposition, but also to ambush attacks from civilians and unsympathetic forces who are not a part of the enemy military organization.

Tonight on every battleship, cruiser, and aircraft in the United States Navy, in Honolulu, the Philippines, and the waters of China, in every sea where our naval vessels are stationed there is a detachment of marines, who, in addition to performing regular guard duties aboard ship, furnish the gun crews of the secondary battery and antiaircraft guns, as well as providing a nucleus for the landing-force organizations. It is interesting to note that all antiaircraft firing from naval vessels is done by the marines at sea.

It will surprise many Americans to know that the Marine Corps has in it almost every feature of an army organization. It has airplane and parachute-jumping units, field artillery, chemical companies, tank companies, communication units, engineering detachments, and the regular infantry regiments. The present personnel of the Marine Corps is 50,908, about 1 marine for every 5 enlisted men in the Regular Navy, and the objective of our Government at the present time is to enlarge it to 75,000, with a corresponding increase in the Navy personnel.

Marines are popularly known as soldiers of the sea and also among themselves as "leathernecks." This word has come down from colonial days, when marines wore a leather stock about their necks as a brace to hold up the standing collar of the uniform, which served the purpose of correct military bearing by holding the chin up.

If all our people would read the history of this splendid corps, which time prevents me from detailing, there would be fewer Americans listening to soap-box agitators and subversive propagandists.

The Marine Corps is now being rapidly expanded in order to meet the requirements of our two-ocean Navy fleet. The age limit for first enlistment has been reduced to 17 years, but more important than age are the moral, mental, and physical requirements.

In conclusion, let me add that the United States Marine Corps is composed of American youths of whom the men who signed the Declaration of Independence, and whose memories we especially honor today, would have been proud, for they exemplify everything that is good, clean, healthy, and fearless in American youth.

Young men of the marines, wherever you are on duty tonight throughout the wide world, we salute you. We are grateful to you and proud of you. Americans know they are safe and secure even in this mad-war-ridden world as long as the marines live up—and, speaking from personal knowelge, none are exemplifying it more than the marines of today—to their noble traditions and their motto, "Semper fidelis"—always faithful.

Tribute to Private Luke Quinn, United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF LT. JOHN S. OLDFIELD, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, AT HARPERS FERRY, MAY 5, 1940

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in the address which I delivered in tribute to the United States Marine Corps on the Fourth of July, I referred to a monument which was dedicated at Harpers Ferry on May 5, 1940, in honor of a young marine, Private Luke Quinn, whose body was found after many years, the monument having been erected by the people of that locality. On that occasion, at my request, Lt. John Oldfield, of the United States Marines, represented the Marine Corps, and paid a tribute to the young marine, whose body had been found. I ask that the tribute be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am pleased to participate in these exercises as a junior officer in the Marine Corps assigned to this duty by the Commandant of the Marine Corps upon the request of United States Senator DAVID I. WALSH, who unfortunately, is unable to be present today.

In reviewing the life of Private Luke Quinn of the United States Marine Corps, one is instinctively impressed with the great contribution that foreign-born American citizens, and the men of all religious faiths, have rendered to the military service of our country. He was an immigrant, coming to this country from Ireland at the age of 9 and was only 20 years of age when he enlisted. Whether or not his parents were in America is unknown; his trials and loneliness as a poor immigrant boy will never be recorded, but we do know he possessed that American patriotic spirit that prompted him to desire to serve his adopted country by joining the Marine Corps.

The fact that we honor him is due to his having been a man of character and of discipline. Of these two, it is my privilege to speak before you today as an officer of the United States Marine Corps, speaking from the viewpoint of the necessity of discipline. I feel proud to mention the very word "discipline," for never in the history of the Marine Corps has there been a breach of discipline. Discipline is the very foundation of a well-ordered life. I do not mean mere physical discipline; the men of Sparta had that. Their historical failure attests the weakness that must result from eliminating the discipline of a mental and moral nature. I do not mean mental discipline alone. The untimely death of Lord Byron, the poet, forcefully illustrates the necessity for physical discipline. There must be a balance.

Discipline itself has been defined as the treatment suited to a disciple or learner; education, training, drill. It is developed by instruction and exercise. It is an intangible thing. It becomes tangible only when found in man, for only in man is there a proper evaluation of discipline both physical and spiritual—the latter including mental and moral discipline.

Private Quinn must have been such a man. His service record indicates such. Physically he had the strength to perform his duties. Mentally he had the intellect and memory for the proper execution of commands. Morally he had the strength of will power, as indicated by the fact that he was mortally wounded.

I am informed he was of the Catholic faith. The religious man is of special value from the viewpoint of a soldier, for such a man must be a man of discipline.

It is fitting that at this historic spot where he lost his life—his grave—a memorial should be erected. It is more than a memorial to Quinn—it is a memorial to every enlisted man in the Marine Corps and always will be a reminder to the American people of the spirit that continues to prompt young men, whether born in America of so-called American stock, or of foreign birth, to serve their country even to the point of being willing to lay down their lives for it.

The members of the Marine Corps are honored by your action and grateful for your remembrance of a forgotten marine hero.

Townsend National Convention at Buffalo, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech I delivered in Buffalo on July 2 before the Sixth Townsend National Convention at the Buffalo Memorial Auditorium, Buffalo, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGES OF THE PRESENT

Mr. Chairman, my friends, it is a pleasure to speak to this fine group of Americans and to your distinguished leader, Doctor Townsend. He, above all men, has brought to the attention of all America the problem of old age, and he has submitted through H. R. 1036 the only national plan to take care of that problem.

My colleague, FRANK KEEFE, from my own State, and others have given you the situation in Congress as far as it relates to the proposed legislation. I am speaking to you on the subject Challenges of the Present.

Unless and until these challenges which I speak about are met, it is my opinion that no solution of the old-age problem will be put into effect by the present administration. In other words, America must be kept safe and free in order that such legislation may be considered and enacted.

I am speaking today to Americans. We are a peculiar people—a people set apart. Our parents, or in some instances our remote forbears, came to America and became Americans. They anchored their roots deep in the soil of this great land.

They left the old lands, for many reasons. Some left for political reasons, some for religious reasons, others for economic reasons. All who came here looked upon this as the land of promise. They found here a new idea of life—of government. They found a new concept of freedom and liberty and equality of opportunity.

Many who are listening to me are, like myself, children of immigrants from Europe. Our parents were grateful for the political and economic freedom that they found here. Our parents felt that America had been good to them. They believed in our system of life. They believed that this country was entitled to 100-percent loyalty, from all of its sons and daughters, and they felt as we feel today, that most of the political thought of Europe has nothing of value for us.

THESE DAYS PRESENT GREAT CHALLENGES

These are anxious days—difficult days. They present a great challenge to each one of us. They call to each of us for sacrifice, balanced judgment, and common sense.

Before this war started in Europe we had the problem of balancing our Budget—of a more economic distribution so that agriculture would get a more equitable share of the Nation's income. There was the problem of unemployment. In some places there was a need for seeing that a living wage went to labor. There was the great problem of relief. There was the economic problem of men and women past 60 years of age, many of whom had made a great contribution to the economic and social life of the Nation and who were facing want. There were the problems which arose out of unfair trade practices; there was the problem of economic barriers rising between States; there was the problem of distribution of the products of our farms and factories. These problems haven't been solved, but they are now part of a great new problem.

This problem came with the war. With the war came an awakening to America of the dangers to our way of life. We saw other nations go down before the might of the totalitarian governments; we saw great peoples overrun and enslaved; we saw solemn international treaties thrown out the window; we witnessed the pledged word of nations broken; and we saw hunger and distress and pillage sweep over Europe.

We saw also courage reborn—we saw a new technique of war developed by the Nazi government. War became a thing of machines, flying air squadrons, submarine sharks. We saw cities destroyed and the whole economic and political life of a large portion of the globe disarranged.

Then we witnessed in our own land a gradual awakening to the fact that we, too, had been asleep to the pending dangers—we had become, under our leadership, smug and complacent. We had developed a great bureaucratic form of government. We had

permitted leaders to create classes among us. We saw the rise of racketeers in and out of government.

REALISTIC LIVING DEMANDS FAITH, INDUSTRY, AND SACRIFICE

But, thank God, we are getting out of this condition of smugness and complacency—this rut that we were in. We are living more realistically. We are developing in America a rebirth of faith, industry, and spirit of sacrifice.

Faith is the thing. Faith in our own land, faith in our citizenry, faith in America's future and in America's destiny to lead, to grow, to solve her problems.

Yes; we are a peculiar breed—we stem from every land in Europe, but we are not British-Americans, Scandinavian-Americans, German-Americans, Italian-Americans, Polish-Americans, etc.—We are Americans without a hyphen.

Our fathers left the old country to get rid of the old hatreds, the old barriers, the old limitations, and we who were born here are called upon now to preserve the freedoms and the American way of life which obtain here—and only here.

These great freedoms did not just happen. They are the result of sacrifice for a thousand years, and as we witness Europe we know that those freedoms can disappear unless the people who enjoy them are awake and are willing to sacrifice to preserve them.

Yes, faith is the thing. Faith in the great source of life. The people of America are turning more and more to their God for direction and guidance. "Let us trust in the Lord with all our hearts. Let us cease leaning unto our own understanding," the way of bigotry, selfishness, and intolerance. "In all our ways let us acknowledge Him and He will direct our paths."

OUR FIRST CHALLENGE IS TO BUILD THE MORALE OF OUR PEOPLE

The first challenge which comes to us is to build ourselves strong. Let us build the morale of this people. Let us recognize that we are one people, and if there are those who in heart and soul are not loyal to this country, let us cast them out. This is no time for weak-kneed internal appeasement with the "fifth column" termites in our midst.

This America of ours is something more than geography—something more than lakes and streams, mountains, and countryside, villages and cities, and material wealth. This America of ours is a living thing. It is made up of 131,000,000 people—a living thing of freedom and democratic ways. It is a thing of great schools and churches. It is a land where men can talk freely and read a free press, where men can sell their own work and efforts and collect their own pay, where men can own property and transmit it to their children, where the courts are open and free to all, where freedom is a watchword and a reality.

WE MUST DESTROY CLASS DIVISIONS

So, we must build America strong. We must destroy the wall of division and dissension which has been built up between labor and capital in America. The wall of division was built by those who deal in distrust, in classism, hatred. They are false prophets. The racketeer and the saboteur of our faith and unity (and there are many kinds) must go. Are we not all in the same boat, labor and capital, farmer and businessman?

In fulfilling this challenge, we must dam up the backwash of European ideas. No matter in what guise they come to us—nazi-ism, fascism, communism—none of these has a place in our American scheme of things.

While we have a great program on our hands which will necessitate the sacrifice of much of our earnings, we must nevertheless put a premium on the man who produces. We must not take the fruit of his labor away from him. In other words, we must put a premium on industry and thrift and savings.

On this subject of maintaining the morale of our people, each of us must remember that it requires of all of us, a common sense approach to the immediate problems. We must keep our heads. We must not become stampeded by propaganda (the papers, and the radio and the forum are often dominated by men who do not discuss the issues but who do discuss personalities).

We must be considerate of the other fellow. We must be considerate of the businessman and the man who labors—of the statesman and the man who manages industry. We must be considerate of the aged and those who have little security against the economic jolts which are up ahead. We must not sabotage the morale of the unfortunate by "shelving" his problems. This is especially true in times of stress.

When we become advocates of any particular idea, we must get perspective and see where that idea fits into the general scheme of things. I am gratified in speaking to leaders of your group, to hear of their endeavors to fit their objectives into our general economy.

With a nation of thinkers, conscious of the interplay of all of our problems, we can be sure that there will be little or no chance for that nation going wrong. If, however, we were to develop the mob spirit, if we develop unreason, if we become unpoised mentally, then we can be led astray.

WE MUST PROCEED CALMLY

So, we meet the first challenge by saying that we will stand firm—we will proceed calmly—we will keep our heads in this difficult period. If we go forward, having in mind the fundamentals of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Sermon on the Mount, we will be guided as a people to do what is right.

In spite of all the false prophets, we know there is no substitute for common honesty, for honest work, for cooperation, for faith, hope, loyalty, and charity. We know also that there is no substitute for the American way of life—for political liberty, for harmony between labor and capital, for security for every strata of society, and for justice between man and men.

We will preserve our liberty if we maintain the American system of checks and balances. It will be preserved by maintaining the courts free from Executive domination, by keeping the legislative branch of our Government free from domination and by the Executive's fulfillment of his Constitutional duties.

OUR SECOND CHALLENGE IS PREPAREDNESS

The second challenge is that which results from the words "national defense" or "preparedness."

The Nation's job today is defense. Does that mean defense in the narrow military interpretation of the word? No; it means defense in its broadest aspects. It means not only a military defense, but an economic defense, a social defense, and an individual defense. It means building not only the steel armor plate of mechanized defense, but also of building the bombproof barriers of mental and spiritual defense.

EACH INDIVIDUAL HAS A JOB WHICH IS A PART OF THE NATION'S JOB

You and I are part of 131,000,000 people. Each of us has a great job to perform. It may be a job that is unheralded and unsung. It may be a little job as the world evaluates success. Nevertheless, to the degree that we give it our best efforts and to the degree that it squares with our American concepts, it is a great job.

The tenement-house mother who has reared her sons in the love of America; the crossroads country doctor on his lonely circuit; the workman whose grimy hand guides a machine lathe, the farmer, the businessman, the small-town preacher—men and women in every walk of life—each contribute to the Nation's job.

THE FIRST JOB OF THE NATION TODAY IS PREPAREDNESS

The No. 1 job of the Nation today is preparedness—adequate defense of the Nation—and now a bulwark against war. This calls for the creation of national unity, strengthening our morale.

In my judgment, we have made great strides in our preparedness, but we still have a tremendous task ahead of us.

SECOND, WE NEED PRODUCTION

Once the governmental mechanism for our defense agencies has been clearly defined, once the machine has been oiled and put into running order, we must produce at top speed. Wars today are machine wars, and if America is to remain safe, we must increase our machine output.

We must further break down the unhealthy concentration of defense orders in the East.

There are idle machines and idle facilities in the small factories which must be employed. Defense must be decentralized still further so that the machines of the small factory are used and the idle workman of the small town is employed.

Government must do its part in keeping the wheels of industry turning. Industry must not be compelled to wade knee deep in red tape. There must be a decisive, businesslike policy in our defence agencies.

The coordination of our defense activities is definitely a vital part of the Nation's job.

THIRD, THERE IS NEED FOR INTELLIGENT COORDINATED PLAN

As a part of our coordinated effort, the great crying need for our defense activities today is a plan. The spectacular success of the totalitarian machine has not been purely accidental.

I believe we need a great defense laboratory, involving the Navy Department, the War Department, and the State Department, and embodying a first-class observation system.

OUR NEED IS FOR MODERN MECHANIZED EQUIPMENT

Part of America's job today then is for modern mechanized equipment rather than for a tremendous Army of infantry and cavalry and field artillery. We need more motorized divisions. We need more armored divisions. We need more highly trained men to mobilize these motor divisions.

Let us be equipped and trained accordingly.

I cannot accept the "ruttist" approach of the military brass hats.

Defense today must be written in the mechanized terms of invention and initiative. Defense today is written in the progressive terms of today and tomorrow, not in closed minds, antiquated caste systems, and red tape.

I believe the great majority of the American people want to remain at peace. I believe, however, that this great middle group recognizes a terrifying menace to our peace at the present time, and realizes that we cannot have peace merely for the asking—that some constructive steps must be taken to maintain peace.

People who fall in this classification are frequently subject to criticism from extremists on both sides—the extremists who believe that we can retain peace merely for the asking—and the extremists who believe that we must participate in the European war.

My own views on foreign policy have been criticized because I refused to condemn either side in this question. I believe that with a few obvious exceptions, men on both sides of this controversy are sincere.

I might add that I think the greatest single menace which could come to any na-

tion is a condition of disunity among its people, reflected in hate and in intolerant name-calling.

INTERNAL DISSENSION CREATES BREAK-DOWN

That type of internal dissension is one of the greatest factors in the break-down of those countries which fell before the Hitler machine.

So, at the outset, let me repeat what I have already said, namely, that we must not create a great American schism on this question of foreign policy. Each of us must retain the right to our own convictions. Each of us must do everything we can to advance our own convictions in an intelligent manner. We must marshal the arguments we have on our beliefs and advance them to the best of our ability. We cannot advance those beliefs by condemning all views which do not coincide with our own.

With certain obvious exceptions, the great majority of the American people are facing the problems of this chaotic world sanely and in a high spirit of confidence.

This great majority cannot be classified as isolationists or interventionists. This group—the great majority—wants peace and is willing to make tremendous sacrifices to retain peace. This group also wants to retain our great American freedoms, and it is their fervent hope that they can retain these freedoms without sacrificing peace. I can agree wholeheartedly with these hopes.

Our question, however, is how we may best realize these hopes. I have opposed many of the present administration's measures in this crisis on foreign policy. At the same time I am perfectly willing to concede sincerity to the administration, and in several instances I have found myself in agreement with the administration.

I do not believe that this is an inconsistent stand. I believe it is thoroughly consistent. We cannot write a foreign policy based solely on the shifting bold-faced headlines in the daily newspapers. Decisions which you and I make, on foreign policy, and, in fact, on everything which affects government, must have some definite objective—some guiding pole star which does not vary from day to day. If we follow such a policy, we cannot honestly be accused of being inconsistent.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY MUST BE DECIDED ON BASIS OF WHAT IS BEST FOR AMERICA

If we are to reduce our present objective in a foreign policy to its simplest possible terms, I would say that our foreign policy must be directed solely and only toward what is best for America—thinking in terms of self-interests—self-preservation.

It is true that we are concerned with international moral values. It is inevitable that, as individuals, we should hate pillage and conquests. It is inevitable that, as individuals, we should favor those who resist oppression and tyranny, but our hates and our affections cannot be the determining factor in arriving at our foreign policy.

Because we are trustees of great values, which we hope to hand on unimpaired to generations who will follow, we have an obligation beyond our hates and our affections. The trustee of an estate cannot take the same financial risks, cannot follow the same inclinations and judgment for his trusteeship which he might employ in making his own personal investments.

As trustees, our primary obligation must be solely and only what is best for America—and that does not always mean that what is best for America cannot coincide with our individual preferences as to foreign policy.

It is true that we are concerned, gravely concerned, with international morality, but apparently our views on international morality are subject to a great many changing factors.

A few years ago we were unanimous in our fervent opposition to everything which Russia represented. And today, as a government, on the basis of governmental morality and ideological integrity, we still condemn everything Russia represents.

Yet today, this Government is committed to a policy of assistance for Russia. This policy certainly could not have been determined on the basis of any ideological bond between this country and Russia. It was determined solely and only on the basis of a realistic appraisal of the situation, and a careful weighing of which force in this conflict constituted the greater menace to the peace of the United States.

On the basis of what is best for the United States, I cannot favor any acts by the United States Government which are an immediate invitation to involvement.

Aside from the terrible consequences of such an involvement—aside from the tremendous costs, not only to our economy, but to our way of life, to our manpower, to our homes, but because in any event, I do not believe that we are ready for such a conflict. I do not believe that we are ready for such a conflict, either psychologically or from a military standpoint.

Consequently, I have opposed anything which I believed would bring immediate involvement. I want to be realistic, I want to see this country remain in peace.

I think that one of the best guarantees that America can have for peace, is an efficient highly mobile army with a coordinating air arm, and an unparalleled navy with a coordinating air arm.

I believe another insurance against involvement is the removal of strategic air and naval bases which are located in zones where they constitute a temptation to Hitler to use them as convenient posts, from which he might some day launch an attack on this country.

I feel keenly, that we must be aware of the menaces in this present world situation and that we must be realistic. In other words, we must continue to do everything in our power to create unity in this country, to give assistance to those forces which constitute a bulwark against the ravages of the totalitarian plague and to take whatever realistic steps may be necessary to insure our freedoms.

It is my fervent hope that we can do these things without involvement. It is my fervent hope that we are evolving a foreign policy which will be an insurance against a destruction of American values.

FOURTH CHALLENGE IS IN POST-ARMAMENT PERIOD

The fourth challenge is found in the post-armament picture—the post-war period. You and I can have a lot to say about what that picture will be. During this great emergency, if we use the brains we are endowed with we will antidote a lot of the problems which might come into being. If we are realistic we will take steps which will benefit America. What are some of these steps?

First, we will insist that Government pass a realistic tax bill—one that will require sacrifice by its citizens, but one that will do the job.

In the last 8 years Government, under this leadership, has run into the red on an average of three and a half billion dollars a year. We are going to spend $25,000,000,000 this year. If we are good citizens and statesmen we will insist that we will pay as much as we can of that load now and not pass it on to our children. If we do this thing we will preserve our financial structure intact. If we fail to do it we will have termited the foundation.

I believe the American people want to do the job now and not postpone it for another generation when such a postponement might be disastrous.

We are ready to pay the taxes if—

(1) We cut out a lot of unnecessary Government overhead.

(2) If we will reduce expenditures on non-defense items.

(3) If we will insist that we get value received for every dollar of the taxpayers' money.

(4) If in the program under the Lease-Lend Act the President will be practical and get collateral whenever it is possible. Many months ago I called attention to the fact that Britain had $4,000,000,000 in South American securities. If Hitler ever got possession of that collateral he would win this war in South America without firing a shot in this hemisphere. Or, if that war were a stalemate and he got possession of this $4,000,000,000 in stocks and bonds, he would own South America.

(5) The farmers are ready to do their share in relation to the tax bill, but they have a right to demand that Government approach their problems sensibly. Under the terms of the Lease Lend Act there are $500,000,000 available for the purchase of farm products to be sent to Britain. It seems reasonable that the farmers can expect that this Government will see to it that they get at least the cost of production for the products which the Government gives away—products purchased by the Treasury of the United States with the people's money.

PEOPLE ENTITLED TO COMMON-SENSE GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

All America is defense conscious. The folks who are paying the bills have a right to demand that the managers of Government become realistic in their approach to our problems. That realism is merely a synonym for common sense or horse sense.

We have heard the saying so often that the day of reckoning is coming. If so, it is about time that we realistically considered what the phrase "day of reckoning" means.

In the last 8 years, under the present managers of Government, we have run behind on the average of three and one-half billion dollars a year. This year we may spend as much as $25,000,000,000.

At the present time we are spending about a billion dollars a month.

By early fall we will be spending anywhere from $1,400,000,000 to $1,600,000,000 each month.

By the first of next year it is possible that we may be spending between $2,000,000,000 to $2,500,000,000 monthly, and it is possible that this figure may be raised to $3,000,000,000 a month.

In other words, every minute that your clock ticks off 60 seconds we spend $23,000 for defense and Britain.

By fall we will be spending $32,000 to $37,000 a minute for defense and Britain.

By early next year it is possible that we may be spending between $46,000 and $58,000 a minute, and it may rise to $69,000 a minute before the year is out.

How long these vast expenditures will continue no one can tell. Our first necessity, however, is to pay as much as we can out of earnings.

WE MUST STOP SPIRAL OF INFLATION

Our second necessity is to proceed reasonably and sensibly to stop the spiral of inflation. We can, whenever it is possible, buy defense bonds instead of spending our earnings. We must make saving a virtue once again. We can never insure a permanent security and independence for our aged and our unfortunates if we do not reestablish a sound American economy.

There must be no excessive inflation. During the last war we had a dollar worth 50 cents. That must not happen again. If it happens, the problems of the aged and the unfortunates would be intensified a thousandfold.

WE MUST ACCUMULATE A RESERVOIR OF NONDEFENSE PROJECTS

Our third requirement is to accumulate in every city, county, and State a reservoir of nondefense projects, and along with these, if it is possible, whatever money we can save to pay for these projects when the present emergency is over. The purpose of accumulating such projects is that when our boys come back from the Army and the Navy and the defense industries there will be something for them to do. We will be able to absorb part of the shock of a post-armament economy geared to nondefense needs.

WE MUST PRODUCE MORE AT LOWER COSTS

Fourth. There will be powerful forces after the European war which will tend to drive us into a depression even worse than the past depression. If we are to escape that kind of depression all of industry and government must be geared, after the close of our defense effort, toward a policy of producing more goods at lower costs and lower prices. There must be no restriction of output.

WE MUST EMPHASIZE COOPERATIVE TECHNIQUE IN BUSINESS

Fifth. After the impetus of defense financing is over, we must emphasize the cooperative technique in business; to shift the emphasis from a purely profit-seeking motive to the motive of rendering services at costs which are in proportion to the contribution made by each individual.

WE MUST CREATE NEW INDUSTRIES THROUGH RESEARCH

Sixth. In any post-armament period we must endeavor through research to create new industries, new products, and new jobs. The history of the plastics industry in recent years is an illustration of what I mean.

In my own State of Wisconsin, for example, we can accomplish a great deal if by research we can create new industrial uses for casein, one of the byproducts of milk production.

One of the ways in which we can bring the farm economy into balance with urban economy is by an increased utilization of the products of the farm in the city.

WE MUST BE ALERT TO POSSIBILITIES FOR FOREIGN TRADE

Seventh. In any post-armament period we must immediately seize whatever opportunity may be offered to us for foreign-trade expansion. In all probability our European markets may be curtailed, but we must look to South America wherever it is possible to satisfactorily integrate our economies.

WE MUST REESTABLISH A SOUND MONETARY SYSTEM

Eighth. It will be necessary in any post-defense period for government to reestablish a respectable monetary system with a balanced budget and with business free from unwarranted government competition.

GOVERNMENT MUST BE READY TO AID INDUSTRY IN SHIFTING TO PEACETIME OPERATIONS

Ninth. It may be necessary in the post-defense period for government to aid private industry in financing its shift back to normal operation.

POST-ARMAMENT PERIOD MAY PRESENT OPPORTUNITY

Tenth. In general our post-armament problems can be anticipated if we do not permit prices to run away. In the world post-armament era we will have idle capital, idle labor. We will have tremendous accumulated human needs, and we will have a willingness to work together. Those are all the bases we need for a recovery.

If government is able to reduce taxes in the post-armament period, and if government is able to lighten its controls, it may be that we can accomplish a real recovery.

We know that the last World War brought inflation. We know that after the inflation there came depression and deflation. We know that there were terrifying periods of economic readjustment.

The unstable world economy makes it very probable that there may be a fierce economic war in the international markets. Whether we will be able to meet that economic war will be determined by the course we adopt at the present time. It stands to reason that we will be in a better position to wage that economic war if we maintain our financial equilibrium today; if we do not permit a tremendous, unwarranted increase in the public debt; if we shun the easy way of borrowing more and more funds; if we defer satisfaction of some of the wants which we are now able to gratify; if we follow a policy of less credit and more cash purchasing.

NEED FOR SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN POST-ARMAMENT PERIOD

Let us also bear in mind that while we cannot disassociate ourselves from the world, we are, nevertheless, to a degree, a world in ourselves.

In the fiercest economic wars up ahead, in the international cutthroat competition of the future, when this war is over, it may be necessary for us to develop an ever-increasing degree of self-sufficiency to develop production in this hemisphere of products for which we have been dependent on sources which may be closed to us for years.

Security demands that we cannot be dependent now and in the future on sources in the Eastern Hemisphere for vital commodities.

In this drive for self-sufficiency it will be necessary for us, with certain exceptions, to retain the American market for America, to build in the post-armament era self-sufficient economic ramparts against any foe.

We must do that thing that will build purchasing power in our people, and they will expend their money for American products produced by American workmen.

AMERICA CAN MEET THE CHALLENGES OF THE PRESENT

These, then, are some of the challenges of the present which confront our people today. I am confident that we can meet them.

While in other lands there is a blitzkrieg on freedom and a black-out on democracy, I feel that the people of the United States will continue to reaffirm their faith in America and her ways.

Democracy is dynamic. The ideals of our Republic must live and grow. Our way of life cannot stand still. We must go on building. We must go back to first principles. We must restore the health of our social organism through faith in God and faith in the great destiny of this Nation.

The road up ahead will be a hard one. The task confronting our citizens will not be easy.

The challenges which confront us are challenges which will require sacrifice and a toughened moral fiber. I believe that we will meet the challenges. Great challenges in critical times produce great men.

These challenges are not met only by men in uniform. They are met by folks such as those who are gathered here today. They are challenges which confront the average citizen. I believe it is our obligation to become informed on affairs of government so that we may intelligently participate in the affairs of government and use wisely the sovereignty of the people.

Probably history will record these days as the story of the quick and the dead among nations. Our Nation must continue dynamic and growing.

The challenges of the present are our opportunities for growth, our opportunities for leadership.

As Holland said:

"God, give us men! The time demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands."

Soon we will celebrate the anniversary of the birth of our Nation. May we possess the faith that God will guard and guide this people, through the turbulent waters of today and tomorrow, and that this Nation will in peace and helpfulness lighten the burdens of the other nations of earth.

Occupation of Iceland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, entitled "Iceland and the Atlantic."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—ICELAND AND THE ATLANTIC

(By Walter Lippmann)

Those who dislike the American occupation of Iceland should imagine how they would have felt if they had learned instead that the Nazis had landed in Iceland. This is the acid test of the Government's action: Is it better that the Americans or the Nazis should be established in Iceland?

Before Denmark and Norway and France were invaded, the United States did not have to worry about Iceland or about Greenland or about Newfoundland or about Ireland or about the British Isles or about the Azores, the Cape Verdes, or Dakar. These stepping stones from Europe to America were held by friendly nations. The Axis was locked up in central Europe by the power of the British Fleet and the French Army.

The occupation of Scandinavia, the collapse of France, and the turnabout of the Vichy government radically altered the whole situation. In the last 12 months the paramount American question has been whether American public opinion would sanction the measures that are necessary in order to counteract the dangers created by Hitler's victories in France and in Scandinavia. Experience has shown that the people have been reluctant to approve the necessary measures while they were beeng discussed theoretically but that they have approved overwhelmingly the specific measures when actually undertaken.

Thus, a year ago there were fierce outcries at the first of the series of measures to redress the balance after Hitler's continental victories; it was necessary 12 months ago to transfer destroyers to Britain to make up for the desertion of the French Navy, and it was necessary to establish American bases in the Atlantic, from Newfoundland to Trinidad. This transaction which was denounced by some as outrageous warmongering is now almost universally approved as wise and prudent statesmanship.

The second series of measures was proposed a few months later—the lease-lend program and the opening of American navy yards for the repair of British warships. Again there was strong theoretical objection; in the end there were not, according to Senator VANDENBERG, more than five or six Mem-

bers of the Senate who did not vote for some form of aid to Britain. The American people had realized that the survival of Britain was an American interest and the courage of the British people had convinced them that, with help, the British would survive.

The next measure consisted in the American occupation of Greenland. There was no substantial objection from any quarter; the American people looked at the map and saw that if we did not hold Greenland, a victorious Hitler would.

Greenland was followed by the Presidential declaration of May 27 which served notice on the Axis and upon the satellite governments, particularly Vichy, that not only Newfoundland and Trinidad and Greenland but all islands in the Atlantic and all jumping-off places for raiding and for conquest were within the sphere of the vital interests of the United States. The isolationists have said many harsh things about the President but they have never ventured openly and directly to challenge this momentous declaration of American policy. For few if any among them would wish to take the only alternative position, which is to say that they would not object to seeing Hitler's air force and submarines established in Iceland, Greenland, Ireland, Britain, the Azores, the Cape Verdes, and Dakar.

The occupation of Iceland is, therefore, no sudden departure. It is rather a stage, to be sure a very important stage, in the development of a policy which became the inevitable and necessary American policy after Hitler's victories last year. That policy is to exclude Hitler from the Atlantic Ocean by the combined action of Britain and the United States.

For the Atlantic Ocean is one ocean, not two oceans divided by an imaginary line between the Western and Eastern Hemispheres. There can never be peace in the Atlantic nor genuine security in the Western Hemisphere unless all the strategic positions on the shores of this ocean are strongly held by friendly powers. If one shore were held by the United States and the opposite shore by a hostile coalition, there could be no peace. The Atlantic is too narrow from east to west and it is also too long from north to south to be a peaceful sea unless it is dominated entirely by friendly and trustworthy nations. A dubious navy on the other side of the immense Pacific is bad enough; a hostile navy across the narrow Atlantic would be intolerable.

Iceland, it is obvious, is one of the points that must be held if the Atlantic Ocean is to be made secure. It commands the route from North America to the British Isles and to Scandinavia and Germany. But we must be under no illusions about Iceland as an outpost of North America. Iceland is an outpost only if the British Isles are invincibly held. So while it is true that the control of Iceland is vital to the defense of North America and of Britain, it is equally true that the power of Britain is indispensable to the defense of Iceland. If Hitler took Iceland, he would gravely threaten Britain and the whole North Atlantic; if Hitler took Britain, it would be impossible for us to defend Iceland.

What this goes to prove is what almost every serious student of American defense has always known: that the defense of the Western Hemisphere requires the survival of a powerful and friendly Britain, and that what we call with unjustifiable condescension "aid to Britain" is literally and exactly the defense of the Americas. These are not two separate and different things: They are, as Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe knew more than a century ago, the same thing, and some fine day in Washington and London there may yet be performed an act of statesmanship in which there is defined and proclaimed the fundamental truth that the security of the Americas and the security of Britain are reciprocal, each being indispensable to the other.

On that day the foundations of law and order in the Atlantic world will have been laid down.

Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE NEW YORK JOURNAL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there has lately been a great deal of talk about the possibility of cutting nondefense expenditures. From time to time I have made remarks on this subject in the Senate, apparently to no great avail. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorial, one from the New York Times of July 9 entitled "Nondefense spending," and one from the New York Journal of July 9 entitled "Fiscal Disaster."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 9, 1941]

NONDEFENSE SPENDING

The failure of the administration to demand, or of Congress to provide, any net economies in nondefense expenditures for the current fiscal year is the greatest single weakness in the Nation's effort to maintain economic stability in the rearmament period. Employment is increasing, prices are rising; we are planning this year to spend the record total of $22,269,000,000. Yet nondefense expenditures are scheduled to be larger than in the fiscal year just ended.

This is a condition which fully justifies the formation of the new Citizens Emergency Committee on Nondefense Expenditures. The composition of the committee, comprising chiefly college presidents, economists, and tax experts, assures a public-spirited viewpoint. The college presidents, no doubt, are mindful that continued deficits and mounting debt menace the safety of their endowments, but they cannot be accused of being actuated by a selfish desire to escape taxes, as would probably be the case if the committee were made up of wealthy men and representatives of big business.

The greatest danger of our present budgetary situation is that long-continued deficits and the great defense spending program have dulled the sensibilities of Congress and the administration to the need for restraint in nondefense spending. The task the committee has set itself is to make recommendations for economies as a partial offset to the huge defense spending, and to inform the citizens of the need for restraint in nonessential spending. In tackling this job the committee is undoubtedly aware of the need for specific recommendations, based on research and not on slogans. But in a period of rearmament spending and rising employment the committee should not find it difficult to point out how both relief and public works may be curtailed. In a period of sharply rising prices there is no justification for record-breaking Government subsidies to jack up farm prices and the costs of living.

[From the New York Journal of July 9, 1941]

FISCAL DISASTER—THE NEW DEAL'S NONDEFENSE SPENDING FOLLY

"It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright," said wise old Benjamin Franklin.

The United States Treasury today is that sack.

It is quite empty—and therefore it is, to use Franklin's figure, a flat sack.

That, at least, is what Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, tells the American people in the form of figures.

The next fiscal year, according to the Director, will see a deficit of $12,767,000,000.

That will be a jump of $3,557,000,000 over the current deficit.

What is a deficit that steadily increases?

It is this, Mr. Plain American Citizen:

A steady decrease of national revenue in relation to national outgo.

It means that this gap has got to be stuffed up—or an attempt will be made to stuff it up—with more taxes.

Taxes are slices off of your wage roll.

They are bits taken out of your very life.

When the National Budget becomes a flat sack so will you, eventually.

The deficit 8 years ago was a symptom.

Solemn promises were made by the administration that the Budget would be balanced.

But what was then a mere symptom has now become a chronic disease that threatens the very life of our country.

It is all nonsense to put the blame for this growing colossal deficit, as some administration leaders do, on defense speed-up.

Long before we went in for intensive defense spending, the gap in the National Treasury between outgo and intake was daily widening.

This was due not to the quite necessary defense of the Nation but to socialistic experiments on which billions were squandered by moonbeam "economists" and Congresses that seemed to think their only mission was to take care of the boys back home by handing them vast sums in subventions—for the farm and otherwise.

Nothing threatens the Nation's welfare so menacingly as this growing deficit—for a growing deficit is nothing but progressive bankruptcy.

The only possible way now to keep the deficit in bounds, and eventually eliminate it, is to eliminate at once every item of nonessential, nondefense spending.

Another quotation from Benjamin Franklin also fits the doings of our wrong-way financial wizards at Washington today:

"He that goes a borrowing goes a sorrowing."

And that applies to your Uncle Sam as well as to your Uncle Zeke.

Military Record of Americans of Jewish Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE JERSEY JOURNAL

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Jersey Journal of

Thursday, June 26, with reference to the military record of Americans of Jewish faith.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jersey Journal of June 26, 1941]

THE JEW—RECORD PROVES—AS BRAVE AS ANY MAN

With the advent of another national emergency, the story is again revived in some quarters that Jews "duck" Army service and are cowards. Many statistics could be cited against this canard. But to nail the lie—a vicious form of Hitler "fifth column" propaganda, because it abuses a whole race and strives to create disunity within the Nation—it is only necessary to cite comprehensive and conclusive figures gathered by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, 276 Fifth Avenue, New York. These figures, which pertain to the greatest martial effort in which Uncle Sam ever took part—World War No. 1—show that Jews took at least their fair numerical part in the actual conflict.

First of all may be cited the acolade pinned on the Hebrew soldiers by the commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Force, Gen. John J. "Black Jack" Pershing:

"When the time came to serve their country under arms, no class of people served with more patriotism or with higher motives than the young Jews who volunteered or were drafted and who went overseas with our other young Americans. I well remember in my inspections of New York divisions seeing so many patriotic, well-disciplined, well-behaved young Jewish soldiers, whose commanders spoke of them in the highest terms."

Lt. Col. Douglas Campbell declared that "the Jewish boys of the Seventy-seventh Division (A. E. F.) were the best soldiers on earth. They participated in the greatest battles and emerged sound. The Seventy-seventh, of which 40 percent were Jewish young men, was the only American division to reach the Aisne, after having penetrated farther into the German lines than any other division."

Six Jews won the rare Congressional Medal of Honor, highest United States decoration.

Now for some figures which tell the story in a nutshell: The 16 nations engaged in the war had 65,000,000 men under arms. Of these 1,500,000 were Jews, or 2 percent of the total mobilized, which is twice the normal proportion, since the Jews were 1 percent of the total population of all the countries at war.

Jews formed 2½ percent of the total under arms in the Allied forces; Jews in the population were 1 percent. Jews formed 2 percent of the armed forces in the Central Powers; Jewish population slightly over 1 percent. (Do Propaganda Liar Goebbles and his United States stooges deny this? Ask the Jewish War Veterans).

Now for the United States armed forces in 1917–18: The United States mobilized 4,355,000 men, or 4.3 percent of the total mobilized by the Allies. The Jews mobilized numbered 250,000, or 4.5 percent. "By proportion of population," assert the J. W. V., "the Jews should have numbered about 3 percent of America's total armed forces. Actually they contributed between 4 and 5 percent, or a third above their normal share."

Of the Jews under the red, white, and blue, 190,000 were in the Army, 25,000 in the Navy, 14,000 in the Marine Corps, and 21,000 in other branches. One of the most interesting statistics shows that men of this ancient race, whose warrior exploits are recorded in the Bible, served in almost twice their ratio in the ranks of the foot-sloggers, the Infantry. These are the hombres who use the rifle and come to grips man-to-man with the foe, using the cold steel of the baycnet and the trench knife. They are fellows who traditionally have to take it as well as dish it out. The percent of the Infantry to the total mobilization was 26.6 percent; the percent of Jewish doughboys to the total Jews mobilized was 48. Every other Jew was an infantryman.

The exploit of one of the Congressional Medal winners, Gunnery Sgt. Charles F. Hoffman of the United States Marines, is a sample of Jewish heroism and a refutation of the Hitler chant that Jews are yellow:

"Hoffman, during the battle of Chateau Thierry, though warned of the advance of the enemy with five light machine guns, rushed the detachment (one might vision, like Benny Friedman or Sid Luckman rushing a football line), bayoneted the two leaders, forced the others to flee and abandon their guns, and thus forced the enemy from a position by which they could have swept the field with machine-gun fire and forced the withdrawal of the American troops."

When this war is done, and its lies and crimes and vicious, un-Christian hatreds have been swept into the aftermath before the new reconstruction of the world, and when, in the inexorable rise of due justice, the bloodthirsty guttersnipe of the Wilhelmstrasse is brought to book and receives by legal means what he has so freely and illegally handed out to others, how appropriate it would be if it were a Jew who sprang the trap on the archmonster of the modern age.

What Are You Defending?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS BY CHARLES M. THOMAS TO COLORED AMERICAN DRAFTEES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of an address delivered by Charles M. Thomas, public relations counsel, to the colored American draftees on July 4, 1941. The subject of the address is, What Are You Defending?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It must be prideful knowledge that you are walking in the paths and practices of your forefathers since colonial days, when they served in the militia in the New England region against the hostile Indians. In the War of 1812 again color was no bar to American patriotism on land or sea or the Great Lakes. When Mexico vainly tried to prevent a natural spread of a vigorous land-hungry population into the sparsely settled Southwest, again the valor of men and women of your blood and tradition played no small part in the outcome, and many of their descendants live in Texas today. The record of the conflict of ideas as to the sovereignty of the Federal Government, which took the arbitrament of war from 1861–65 to arrive in a clarifying addition to the Constitution in the fourteenth amendment, is too well known to you to need a reminder of your racial services, sacrifices, and loyalties to both sides in the dispute.

With your own eyes you have seen the returned heroes, and with your own ears you have heard the echoes from across the seas, where all the world saw your fathers and uncles and friends pay the last full devotion to the cause of democracy.

This last was in 1918; but 20 years earlier your older brothers were across the other sea to the west and across the Gulf to the south rescuing oppressed peoples from tyranny. Here again, on land and on water, valor, loyalty, heroism, and sacrifice were not thought too great a price for the advancement of liberty among fellow human souls—Cubans and Filipinos and Puerto Ricans.

HUMANITY'S GREAT STRUGGLE NOT ENDED

It was more than a thousand years before Christ when Moses proclaimed liberty throughout the land to the Hebrews who had fled Egyptian bondage (Leviticus XXV:10). It was not until the first century after Christ that Paul sought the protection of a law of Rome which is a counterpart of our fourteenth amendment (Acts XXV:16). It was not until A. D. 1863 that Lincoln proclaimed freedom for slaves in States in rebellion, and until 1865 that the Congress of the United States announced the end of slavery in this Nation following it by citizenship, due process of law, and equal protection of the laws in the fourteenth amendment in 1868.

The invention of gunpowder, with the printing press and the translation of the Bible into English, advanced liberty by recruiting to it the strength of the masses with moral consciousness. Recently the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, proclaimed against every form of discrimination based upon race, creed, or color in employment in defense industries, because today lovers of liberty must struggle in unity against intolerance, prejudice, vulgarity, and false pride of race supericrity. Today witnesses white men enslaved by conquerors under dictatorships, placing democracy on a double defensive both against loss of its accumulated gains and its way of life.

Your conduct is not only physically defensive but is based upon moral convictions of individual responsibility and inherited intelligence. He being greatest who serves most, you who serve the whole people, humanity, in the greatest of struggles, need not ask favor of any man, but know that you are aiding liberty to enlighten the world.

TAKE STOCK OF YOUR POSITION

The President's proclamation not only contrasts democracy with dictatorships, but it is implemented by recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, which declares "equal protection of the laws" as well as "due process of law" for the humblest American citizen. In the short span of 80 years, the attitude of the self-governing American people has shifted from the Dred Scott decision in which a man with African blood had no rights bound to be respected, to equality before the law for all men.

SELF-GOVERNMENT IS A DUAL RELATION

Another parallel with human history lies in the history of the Hebrews, where Moses announced with the sanction of Jehovah (God), the Ten Commandments, operating against man's animal nature.

Self-government likewise imposes an obligation with the sanction of centuries of struggle and sacrifice by our forebears, to know, obey, and respect the laws enacted by the representatives of the people, and subject to review by the courts as guardians of the Ark of the Covenant, the Constitution.

This is all the more incumbent, since the Court has decided that exclusion from primary elections where men are nominated for public office, shall not be allowed. Every qualified citizen may now be represented in his choice for those who shall govern him, and an incentive to become qualified in mind and in behavior is supplied in the guaranty.

Being 21 years of age and in uniform, you are thus generally qualified, but as the pro-

visions for electors are matters for the several States, excepting such as depend upon "race, color, or previous condition of servitude," it is incumbent upon each and every one to familiarize himself with the bases of full citizenship in his State. Citizenship in a democracy demands that all be schooled to know the law and the freedoms won at such pains, struggles, and sacrifices that every man is willing to defend them.

Those freedoms which we cherish and which so distinctly mark the American way of life—freedom of speech, of the press, of worship, and the right to habeas corpus—call for eternal vigilance to protect them against both loss and abuses. To aid in that work, schools are maintained, and where the burden is too heavy for the wealth of a community of the people, the Federal Government is aiding; while that family that finds itself unable to forward the march of its own children, finds the whole people with a helping hand. Much has come to each of us in America, and much may be demanded of us. Every privilege carries its responsibility, as every right, its duty. Only that man is truly free who knows and vows and labors to live up to this mutual relation.

He who would have his life, liberty, and property safe under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution must stand not only ready to defend them, and to have due regard for the rights of others, but he must be against every invader of those rights, here by law and abroad by force. Until minority groups or backward individuals learn and practice that mutuality, they have not been initiated into the full stature of citizenship.

WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS OF LIFE?

You are defending the right of every American to accept the responsibilities of that mutuality and to cooperate in its priceless benefits. You are defending the almost boundless resources of a land extending from sea to sea and lakes to gulf; now, by a common threat, including all lands and waters lying between the North and the South Poles on this hemisphere, and elsewhere millions of people struggling to realize liberty's proven benefits.

Today you are defending not only the institutions developed here, but a culture felt to be superior to any on the earth. "A culture comes into being when the manifold activities of a people and their interests can be made to derive their deepest significance from a common understanding of the meaning and value of human life." It is a cooperative answer that civilized men give to the riddle of their existence; without it civilization is but a conglomerate of unrelated activities.

Your experiences in the armed forces of the Nation has shown you how the mind of man may organize millions of men. From the enlisted private to the commander in chief, every grade has its rights and its duties, all directed to the main purpose, defense, by the application of scientific research, by accumulated material resources without stint, by forethought covering your own and your possible enemies' plans and movements, and, above all, by the preservation of your own best interests and highest health, happiness, and morale. In a short century and a half has this organized people reached this height, only to be faced by the barbarian who would destroy it all and reduce you to worse than slavery of body, mind, and free spirit.

Man's problems are broadly three: (1) To live, (2) to make a living, and (3) to realize himself in his life. Here in America, the wisdom and resources of all the people are aiding each man in solving those problems. Beyond any other people, human life is here protected before birth and throughout its length by numerous guaranties and facilities. So true and general has this protection become, that the taking of a life by deliberate murder is our most heinous crime. Lynching and mob violence have almost disappeared from among us, and criminals have their mental condition tested by experts to discover why they depart so widely from the national pattern of mutuality. The safety of man, woman, and child is here the serious concern of every community, and even the occasional fiend is given due process of law including a fair trial before a jury of his peers.

In the competition for food, clothing, and shelter, labor is honorable and protected as nowhere else on earth; not only in the right to work, but in security when not working and in old age. The avenues to preferment by assuming responsibilities too heavy for the ordinary man, are opened to merit, and, by the recent proclamation by the President going beyond that of Lincoln; for then men of your color and tradition could find employment only with difficulty and intense opposition. Politically free, they were mentally and economically still slaves. But in the past 80 years, the democratic system has provided opportunities never before grasped by any former slaves in so short a time.

Should a man by his energy, thrift, or mind amass more than another, he pays more than that other in taxes to the general welfare, again proving mutuality and advancing the whole people.

This system you are defending. Its base is liberty. Its apex is service, thus realizing life to its fullest extent.

Let no one tell you that July 4, 1776, and its annual commemoration mean nothing to you. Men of your blood were with Rogers' Rangers heroically holding the Northeast for the English against the Indians and French to secure the colonies; freemen defended at Lexington and Concord as well as on Boston Common, and the official records prove them to have been at Bunker Hill, Rhode Island, Valley Forge, and in the South where they received the highest commendation from General Greene to General Washington. Hundreds attained freedom through service in arms and heroism. "Act well your part; there all the honor lies."

Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ARTICLE BY CHARLES A. BEARD

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles Austin Beard, entitled "Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels." I have obtained an estimate from the Government Printing Office as to the cost of printing the article and am informed that it will cost $225.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIDDY MINDS AND FOREIGN QUARRELS—AN ESTIMATE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Charles A. Beard)

In the fourth act of Henry IV, the King, on his deathbed, gives his son and heir the ancient advice dear to the hearts of rulers in dire straits at home:

"I . . . had a purpose now
To lead out many to the Holy Land,
Lest rest and lying still might make them look
Too near unto my state. Therefore, my Harry,
Be it thy course, to busy giddy minds
With foreign quarrels; that action, hence borne out,
May waste the memory of the former days."

Since the foundation of the American Republic there has been an endless procession of foreign quarrels with which giddy minds could have been busied. The following brief citations from the record hint at the thousands of possibilities scattered through the days and years from George Washington's administration to the advent of Theodore Roosevelt:

1793–1815. Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars.
1815. Alliance of England, Russia, Prussia, and Austria to hold down republican and democratic agitations.
1817. Popular outburst at Wartburg.
1819. Carlsbad decrees establish despotism in German confederation.
1820. Revolutions in Spain and Italy.
1821. War for Greek independence opens.
1822. "Triumph" of Holy Alliance over democratic movements.
1827. English, Russian, and French fleets crush the Sutlans' fleet at Navarino.
1828–29. Russian war on Turkey.
1830. Revolutions in France and Belgium; uprising in Poland.
1831. Insurrections in central Italy.
1838–42. British war on Afghanistan.
1840. British opium war in China.
1845. British war in the Punjab.
1847. France finishes conquest of Algeria.
1848. Revolution in France; spreads to Hungary, Germany, and Austria.
1849. Violent reaction, Austrian war on Hungary.
1851. Louis Napoleon makes a coup d'état in France.
1852. Napoleon III establishes an 18-year dictatorship in France.
1853. T'ai-p'ing rebellion starts in China; millions killed; great cities destroyed.
1854–56. England, France, Sardinia, and Turkey wage war on Russia.
1856–60. France and England wage war on China.
1857. Sepoy mutiny in India; vigorous suppression.
1859–60. France and Sardinia wage war on Austria.
1861. England, France, and Spain act against Mexico.
1863. Insurrection in Poland.
1864. Prussia attacks Denmark and seizes Schleswig-Holstein.
1865. Insurrection in Spain.
1866. German-Italian axis treaty; Germany wages war on Austria.
1867. Insurrection in Spain; Fenian uprisings in Ireland.
1868. Overthrow of Spanish monarchy.
1870–71. Franco-Prussian war.
1873–75. Establishment and subsequent overthrow of the Spanish republic.
1875. Insurrection against Turkey in Herzegovina.
1876. Palace revolution in Turkey and Bulgarian atrocities.
1877. Russia wages war on Turkey.
1881. France finishes conquest of Tunis.
1882. Italy makes an axis with Austria and Germany; British seize Cairo.
1883. France finishes conquest of Annam.
1885. France takes Tonkin from China by war; Serbo-Bulgarian war.
1889. Boulangism flares up and bursts in France.
1891. Franco-Russian alliance.
1894. Persecution of Dreyfus begins.

1895. Japan finishes war on China; Jameson raid in the Transvaal.
1896. Italian war on Abyssinia.
1897. Germany seizes Kiao-chau in China; missionary troubles.
1898. Bloody uprising in Milan; British reconquer the Sudan.
1899. Britain opens war on Boer republics.
1900. Boxer rebellion.
1901. Peaceful era of Queen Victoria closes.

Until near the end of that wonderful century of peace, religion, and international good faith the Government of the United States kept aloof from the aggressions, wars, and quarrels of Europe. It proposed no world conferences for correcting the wicked, settling conflicts, and curing unrest in the four corners of the earth. From time to time, it is true, groups of American people held meetings in favor of one country or party or another, but even they did not try to force their Government to play the role of universal preceptor and manufacturer of rules for settling everybody and everything under threats of armed intervention. Only in relatively recent times has wholesale interference with foreign quarrels and disturbances become a major concern of the intelligentsia, the press, and professional politicians in the United States.

But phrenetic preoccupation with foreign quarrels has now reached the proportion of a heavy industry in this country. All our universities have funds and endowments for teaching what is called international relations, and since about 1918 a large part of this instruction has been stripped of all scientific pretensions and has been little more than propaganda for the League of Nations, collective security, collaboration with Great Britain and France, or some kind of regularized intervention by the United States Government in foreign controversies everywhere, except perhaps at Amritsar or in Syria. Hundreds of professors, instructors, and assistants, sustained by endowments, lecture to students, forums, women's clubs, academies, and dinner parties on their favorite theme—the duty of the United States to set the world aright. Peace societies, associations for the study of foreign affairs, councils, leagues, and committees for this and that, with millions of dollars at their disposal, are engaged in the same kind of propaganda, openly or under the guise of contemporary scholarship.

In fact, advocacy of American interventionism and adventurism abroad has become a huge vested interest. The daily press and the radio, thriving on hourly sensations, do their best to inflame readers, listeners, and lookers with a passion for putting down the wicked abroad. Foreign propagandists, often well paid by American audiences, play the same game. And brash young tom-tom beaters in journalism, who know no history beyond a few days ago, write books on the "inside" of this or that, all directed profitably to the same end. How did we get this way? This is the fundamental question for all of us who are trying to take bearings.

II

The era of universal American jitters over foreign affairs of no vital interest to the United States was opened in full blast about 1890 by four of the most powerful agitators that ever afflicted any nation: Alfred Thayer Mahan, Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Albert J. Beveridge. These were the chief manufacturers of the new doctrine correctly characterized as "imperialism for America," and all of them were primarily phrase-makers, not men of hard economic experience.

The ideology for this adventure was cooked up by the bookish Mahan and was promulgated by politicians. It was "sold" to the country amid the great fright induced by the specter of Bryanism, and amid the din of the wars on Spain and the Filipinos. As the British agent who framed a portion of the new gospel for John Hay, Secretary of State presumably for the United States, shrewdly observed, this was one way of smashing the populist uprising and getting the country in hand. It was not Woodrow Wilson, the schoolmaster, who first invented the policy of running out and telling the whole world just the right thing to do. It was the new men of imperialism.

The heady ideology put forth to sustain the imperialist policy may be summarized as follows: America has grown up, has acquired man's stature, and put on long pants; the frontier has passed; the continent has been rounded out; America must put aside childish things, become a great big world power, follow the example of Great Britain, France, and Germany, build a monster navy, grab colonies, sea bases, and trading posts throughout the world, plunge into every big dispute among European powers, and carry "civilization" to "backward" races.

For this creed of lunging and plunging Alfred Thayer Mahan caught the clew from Mommsen's history of Rome and furnished the sea-power slogans. An army of literary artists supplied sentimental prose and poetry. Clergymen did their bit by citing the rich opportunity to "Christianize" the heathen. Steel makers and other naval merchants put sinews of war into the propaganda chest of the Navy League and pronounced it good for business—their business, at least. Shipyard constituencies whipped up political support. The middle classes, terrorized by populism, applauded.

Albert J. Beveridge provided the eloquence: "American factories are making more than the American people can use; American soil is producing more than they can consume. Fate has written our policy for us; the trade of the world must and shall be ours. And we shall get it as our mother [England] has told us how. We will establish trading posts throughout the world. * * * We will cover the ocean with our merchant marine. We will build a navy to the measure of our greatness. Great colonies governing themselves, flying our flag and trading with us will grow about our posts of trade. Our institutions will follow our flag on the wings of our commerce. And American law, American order, American civilization, and the American flag will plant themselves on shores hitherto bloody and benighted, but by those agencies of God henceforth to be made beautiful and bright." Cheers, cheers, cheers. And mighty men among the intelligentsia joined the Mahan-Lodge-Roosevelt-Beveridge storm troops in full cry, shouting for the new gospel, while damning Bryan as a fool, Altgeld as an anarchist, and opponents of imperialism as "white-livered cowards" and "little Americans." What a Roman holiday!

Taking advantage of the national furor over the war against Spain and the unrest created by the populist upheaval at home, the imperialist agitators "put their creed over on the country" for a brief season. As an accident of politics, Theodore Roosevelt became President of the United States and started his big parade. The water-cure torture was administered to recalcitrant Filipinos. Endless notes were written to Kaiser Wilhelm II. The Navy was sent around the world. The big stick was brandished furiously. The United States participated in the conference of the great powers at Algeciras and helped to dish Germany in a quarrel that had no relation whatever to any vital interests of this country. But from the point of view of finding outlets for "our surpluses" and bolstering up national security, the show was a farce. In an economic sense it brought an enormous expense to the Nation, not the promised profit. In respect of national defense, it gave us the Achilles heel of the Philippines.

For a time the monster demonstration entertained the intelligentsia and the mobs, like a Roman circus. But underneath it all there was a revolt. The sober second sense of the country gradually came to estimate it at its true worth—that is, as a frenzy. Despite the big carousal, "pusillanimous, cowardly, contemptible, mollycoddles" at home continued to insist on devoting attention to the state of the American Union.

By one of the ironies of history it fell to the lot of Wilson, whom Theodore Roosevelt hated like poison, to mount the world stage and outdo Roosevelt in using the power of the United States to set the whole world aright. Roosevelt had lunged and plunged here and there—at Pekin, Algeciras, Morocco, and other troubled spots. Wilson's ambitions were without limit. He proposed to make the wide world safe for the American brand of democracy and transform backward places into mandated trusts for civilization.

The lines of the Wilsonian creed of world interventionism and adventurism are in substance: Imperialism is bad (well, partly); every nation must have a nice constitutional government, more or less like ours; if any government dislikes the settlement made at Versailles it must put up its guns and sit down with its well-armed neighbors for a "friendly" conference; trade barriers are to be lowered and that will make everybody round the globe prosperous (almost, if not entirely); backward peoples are to be kept in order but otherwise treated nicely as wards; the old history, full of troubles, is to be closed; brethren, and presumably sisters, are to dwell together in unity; everything in the world is to be managed as decorously as a Baptist convention presided over by the Honorable Cordell Hull; if not, we propose to fight disturbers everywhere (well, nearly everywhere). The American people did not vote for exactly this in 1916. At the very first chance, the congressional election of 1918, they expressed decided distrust and in 1920 they seemed to express more than distrust. But the intelligentsia of world affairs continued unshaken in their faith, agitation, and propaganda.

Although the Republican Party was dubbed "isolationist" after 1920, its politicians in power were really nothing of the sort. On the contrary, they tried to combine the two kinds of jitters over foreign affairs that had recently been sponsored by Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. They sought to make the most of both kinds. They played the old Roosevelt-Lodge-Beveridge game of imperialism wherever they could and whenever they had a chance in the Far East and in the Near East. They turned the Government of the United States into a big drumming agency for pushing the sale of goods and the lending of money abroad, and they talked vociferously about the open doors everywhere except at home. On the other hand, they lectured Soviet Russia and discoursed sagely on peace for worried mankind in the best Wilsonian style. It was near the high noon of normalcy, while the American marines were waging peace in the Caribbean, that the State Department proudly arranged for the Kellogg Pact and the powers of the earth solemnly renounced war forever as an instrument of national policy.

But this experiment in combining two kinds of jitters did not fare any better than the experiment in taking on each kind separately. The big drumming game blew up. Foreign bonds to the tune of billions went into default. The Kellogg Pact became a gibbering ghost. The industrial boom, fed by pump priming abroad at the expense of American investors, burst with a terrific explosion, which produced the ruins amid which we now sit in sackcloth and ashes.

III

For a brief season the American people had enough jitters at home to keep their giddy minds away from foreign affairs, and in a quest for relief they swept into office Franklin D. Roosevelt, who promised to get them

out of the slough of economic despond. At first President Roosevelt concentrated his energies on those domestic measures of reform and salvation known as the New Deal. He scouted the idea that world economic conferences, tariff tinkering, and diplomatic notes could contribute materially to relieving the frightful distress at home. Slowly, however, he veered in the direction of world lecturing and interventionism, and now he displays a firm resolve to interfere with the affairs of Europe and Asia as if he were arbiter of international relations and commissioned to set the world aright. The causes of this reversal are obscure, but the fact remains. Internal and external changes may partly account for it. The state of jitters in domestic economy has not been cured by the New Deal, despite the best of intentions. And Great Britain, after playing Germany off against France and treating Russia with studied contempt, has once more got what Henry Adams called "the grizzly German terror" on her doorstep, and needs American help again.

The veering tendencies of the Roosevelt administration are to be observed in every phase of our foreign affairs. At the outset, Latin American countries were informed that the good old imperialism of earlier times was to be renounced. In 1934 the provision of the Platt amendment, which gave the United States the "legal" right to military intervention in Cuba, was abrogated. American Marines were withdrawn from various places in the Caribbean region. Latin American governments were allowed to default on their bonds held in the United States, and to seize property owned by American citizens, without evoking anything stronger than diplomatic notes from Washington. Instead of thundering and drawing the sword after the style of Theodore Roosevelt and Albert Fall, the administration has resorted to negotiation. Instead of sending Marines to collect on defaulted bonds, it is arranging to use public money to revive the trade which collapsed after private lending had ended in disaster for American investors. Thus, Latin American politicians have been given smaller excuses for straining their lungs over "Yankee imperialism" and seeking counterweights in Europe.

Yet through the Latin American negotiations, especially since 1936, the Roosevelt administration has evidently been seeking to line up Latin American governments in defense of democracy, shrewdly with an eye to developing a united front against Hitler and Mussolini. These two disturbers of the order in Europe are not making any demands on the United States, but their efforts to get trade and win supporters in countries to the south of the Rio Grande furnish points for the Roosevelt administration's agitation against them in Europe and at home. Things have been brought to such a pass that American citizens given to alarms are imagining German planes from Bolivia dropping bombs on peaceful people in Keokuk or Kankakee.

Schemes for promoting democracy in Latin America have been less successful. The people of the United States have only vague ideas about the countries below the Rio Grande, but they know enough to know that most governments in that vast region are not and never have been democracies. At the close of the year 1938, according to J. Fred Rippy, at least 12 of the 20 Latin American countries were governed by dictators of their own and if the term is interpreted broadly, "perhaps 2 or 3 more should be added to the list." These 12 dictators "were ruling 75,000,000 people in Latin America—three-fifths of its population—and dominating a land area almost twice the size of the United States." It would seem, therefore, that the rhetoric of democratic solidarity in this hemisphere does not get very far below the surface of things.

In respect of Far Eastern affairs, the Roosevelt administration, early in its career, made a brave gesture in the direction of anti-imperialism by accepting the act of Congress granting conditional independence to the Philippines. At the moment this maneuver was widely interpreted to mean that the United States intended to withdraw its armed forces from the Orient and fix its front upon the Hawaiian line. Organized agriculture was dead set against competitive imports from the Philippines. Organized labor was firm in its opposition to the immigration of "our little brown brothers" and to the importation of cheap goods made by them in their island home. Against these two forces organized business could make no headway. From an economic point of view the whole experiment in the Philippines had been a costly fiasco, as more than one copious balance sheet demonstrated. Imperialism certainly did not provide the outlets for American "surpluses" which Senator Beveridge had promised. Besides, even amateur strategists discovered, as Theodore Roosevelt had done after the first uprush of his berserk enthusiasm, that the Philippines were the Achilles heel of American defense.

Nevertheless, the question of naval bases in the Philippines has been left hanging in the air under the terms of the independence act, and the outburst in Washington last winter over the preliminaries to the fortification of Guam indicates that someone in the Capital is toying with the idea of transforming our obvious liability in the western Pacific into what is euphoniously called an asset of naval power—for exerting pressure in Asiatic affairs. That the Philippines, with Singapore not far away, could be used as a lever in world politics is obvious.

While Philippine independence was being promised with a great flourish and the American people were busy with their jitters at home, the Roosevelt administration put aside the old delusion that booming the China trade would help in getting the country out of a depression through the sale of our surpluses. In fact, that balloon has completely burst. For years western merchants and their intellectual retainers, including consular agents, filled the air with a great noise about how much money could be made in China as soon as 400,000,000 customers got round to buying automobiles, bath tubs, typewriters, radios, refrigerators, and sewing machines. Probably a few of these myth makers were honest. But many among them must have realized that this swarm of customers had neither the money nor the goods with which to pay for western gadgets. However that may be, and despite tons of diplomatic notes, despite gunboats, marines, soldiers, open doors, and all the rest, the trade of the United States with China has been and remains relatively insignificant; in an absolute sense it is of no vital importance to the United States.

Notwithstanding this well-known fact the Roosevelt administration, from the very outset, in dealing with China has followed rather closely the old Hay-Knox-Hughes imperialist line, laid down in the open-door fiction supplied to the United States by British negotiators—that curious form of direct interventionism that was sold to the country as "a fair deal." Even before he was inaugurated in 1933 Franklin D. Roosevelt apparently committed himself to that amazing fantasy known as the Hoover, o. Stimson, doctrine. We were "never" going to recognize any conquest of territory made contrary to treaties, especially the Kellogg Pact. So efforts were made to induce other cosigners of open-door and peace treaties, especially Britain and France, to join in putting the screws on Japan. But those two democracies wriggled out of the net.

Later, when Japan again started to make war on China, the President managed to instigate another European conference, composed of governments solemnly committed to the open door. Our peripatetic ambassador extraordinary, Norman Davis, was sent over the sea to take part in the feast of reason and flow of soul. When Mr Davis returned home a reporter asked him point blank, "Was it a bust?" He could not quite admit that, but the reporter was right. It was a bust. Yet the Roosevelt administration still labors hard at taking the open-door delusion seriously, and still seems to regard it as a tangible asset, at least in the manipulations of world politics.

After the Japanese invasion of China flamed up in a major war the Roosevelt administration blew hot and cold, but ended by using the affair to strengthen its general campaign for setting the world aright. At one time it declared that it did not intend to keep American forces in China for the purpose of protecting American citizens who refused to withdraw from the war zones. American merchants in Shanghai emitted a vigorous protest. Then Secretary Hull put the soft pedal on the notion that the Government of the United States was not duty bound to uphold American rights to do business even on Chinese battlefields, and the administration tried to make a national sensation out of the *Panay* incident.

Yet, curiously enough, this same administration refused to find a state of war existing in China and to apply the munitions embargo to the belligerents. Voices were heard saying that an embargo would hurt China more than Japan. Perhaps that was so. Perhaps not. Anyway, Americans made hay while the sun shone by selling Japan enormous quantities of munitions and raw materials of war. The Roosevelt administration had run into a violent economic slump and that trade was good for American business. Every little bit of profit helped in the gray days of 1937 and 1938. Even so, Japan was included among the enemies of the United States in the Chicago speech of October 5, 1937.

The sharp shift from focusing attention on the disturbing plight of domestic economy to the concentration of attention on foreign affairs is most clearly evident in respect of European relations. Shortly after the Roosevelt administration opened in 1933 it took part in the London World Economic Conference, for which President Hoover and Congress had made preparations. True to his economic style, Secretary Hull, at this mondial assembly, derided isolationism, ridiculed the efforts of nations "by bootstrap methods" to lift themselves out of the economic crisis, declared that each nation by domestic action could improve its condition only "to a moderate extent," and offered a plan of salvation in lower trade barriers. But President Roosevelt took the onus of putting a stop to the palaver in London. The affair was another failure from the outset. If the President had waited a few months, the conference would doubtless have worn itself out and adjourned. He did not wait. By a sharp message to the august assembly he exploded the works. In so doing he declared that "the sound internal economic system of a nation is a greater factor in its well-being than the price of its currency in changing terms of the currencies of other nations." After proclaiming this policy he turned to the business of trying to stimulate domestic agriculture and industry by domestic action.

For a considerable time after the explosion in London, President Roosevelt gave his special attention to domestic affairs. It is true that he signed the reciprocal-trade bill, so dear to Secretary Hull's heart, and allowed the State Department to set out on its crusade to "lower trade barriers," but at the same time he tried to keep on good terms with George N. Peek, who believed that Secretary Hull was employing sentiment—not

hard-headedness—in driving trade bargains. When the plan for taking the United States into the World Court was before the Senate, the President endorsed it, but lukewarmly, and put no heavy pressure on his party's Senators to force ratification. The defeat of the project gave him no sleepless nights. By recognizing Soviet Russia he yanked the State Department out of the high dudgeon stirred up in Wilson's administration, and kept going by Hughes, Kellogg, and Stimson, and simply restored the old policy, consecrated by usage, of maintaining diplomatic relations with saints and villains abroad. This looked like attending to our own business.

The real reversal of American policy and return to constant jitters over European affairs came after the election of 1936. In the campaign of that year, President Roosevelt gave no hint that he intended to take a strong hand in European quarrels. The Democratic platform, made in his own office, declared positively: "We shall continue to observe a true neutrality in the disputes of others; to be prepared resolutely to resist aggression against ourselves; to work for peace and to take the profits out of war; to guard against being drawn, by political commitments, international banking, or private trading, into any war which may develop anywhere." This looked like a pledge to keep out of foreign conflicts and wars. The pledge President Roosevelt confirmed in his Chautauqua address of August 14, 1936: "We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war." If words meant anything in 1936, those words confirmed an evident desire to avoid meddling with the incessant quarrels of Europe and Asia.

Although his platform declared that "we shall continue to observe a true neutrality in the disputes of others," President Roosevelt, in December 1936, a little more than a month after his victory in the election, moved to violate neutrality in connection with the civil war in Spain. On his initiative a bill was drafted and jammed through Congress putting an embargo on munitions to the loyalist government at Madrid. Whether he took this action at the suggestion of Great Britain, or to parallel British action in the nonintervention committee, so farcical in its operations, the upshot pointed in one direction—intervention in European affairs. The embargo was a violation of international law. It was a violation of a specific treaty with Spain. It was an insult to the government of Madrid, which the Government of the United States recognized as de facto and de jure. It smoothed the way for those noninterveners, Hitler and Mussolini, to destroy that government. Whatever may have been President Roosevelt's intentions, he violated neutrality and entered into collaboration with Great Britain and France in a fateful policy which was responsible for the triumph of depotism, Hitler and Mussolini, in Spain—the very kind of depotism and two of the biggest despots that he now denounces to the world.

The pledge of the Democratic platform stood written in the record. The Chautauqua speech of 1936 stood there also. But on October 5, 1937, President Roosevelt went to Chicago and called, in effect, for collective action by all the "democracies" against Germany, Italy, and Japan. He declared that if a holocaust came the United States could not avoid it and appealed to "the peace-loving nations" to put a quarantine on aggressors. The significance of this address was grasped immediately. Advocates of collective security and collaboration with Britain and France hailed it as a sharp change of front on the part of the President. But the counterblast of criticism from all parts of the country was startling, and for a few weeks President Roosevelt lapsed into silence. Nevertheless he had evidently made up his mind that he was going to take a big hand in European and Asiatic affairs anyway and that the country would have to bend to his will or break.

Additional proof of his resolve soon came. On January 28, 1938, President Roosevelt sent a resounding message to Congress on the subject of armaments. He demanded an enormous increase in naval outlays, with special emphasis on battleships, and called for a mobilization bill which had no meaning unless he wanted a huge army that could be used in Europe. This increase in armaments, he said, was made necessary by the growth of land and sea forces in other countries which "involve a threat to world peace and security." One week before this bombshell message landed in Congress, the House of Representatives had passed the regular naval appropriation bill granting the Navy substantially all that it had called for in the largest peacetime naval appropriation in the history of the country. Why had the Navy Department suddenly discovered that it needed another billion or more? This question was put to Admiral Leahy by a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, and the honest old sailor blurted out: "I am not accurately informed in regard to that."

This was the cold truth. The sudden demand for an immense increase in the Navy had not come from the Navy Department. It had come from the White House. It was not related to defending the American zone of interest in the Western Hemisphere. Admiral Leahy testified that the Navy was then ready to defend this zone. The new bill took on significance and utility only in relation to the President's resolve to act as a kind of arbiter in world affairs. It is true that the Democratic managers in Congress, while pushing the bill through the House and Senate, repudiated all "quarantine" doctrines and rested their case on grounds of continental security, but by citations from the testimony of naval experts the opposition demonstrated the hollowness of all such pretensions.

Victorious in securing his extraordinary naval authorization, President Roosevelt renewed his battle in 1939. His message to Congress in January vibrated with emotions connected with foreign tumults and asserted that the United States is directly menaced by storms from abroad. These storms, the President said, challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans. The first is religion. It is the source of the other two—democracy and international good faith. Evidently he was clearing a way to make the next war a real holy war. This clarion call President Roosevelt followed by another demand for an increase in armaments on a scale more vast.

As if undaunted by all that had happened in the previous autumn when he had, metaphorically and yet truly speaking, gone to Munich with Chamberlain and Daladier, President Roosevelt, on April 14, 1939, issued to the world a peace appeal to Hitler and offered in exchange another round table on disarmament and another economic conference. All the while the Tory Government in Great Britain and the reaction government in France were playing with Hitler and Mussolini and aiding in the destruction of the Spanish Republic.

Apparently indifferent to the real nature of British and French tactics, President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull grew bolder in their determination to help Britain and France in whatever they were doing. In the summer of 1939 they opened a public campaign to break down the provision of the Neutrality Act which imposed an embargo on munitions in case of a foreign war "found" by the President. They had all along covertly fought this provision, without taking the risk of officially and openly denouncing it in the name of the administration. The will of the country to stay out of foreign wars had been too strong. That will would have to be crushed. The President and the Secretary of State were well aware that Congress was not likely to give them the coveted power to name "aggressors" and throw the country into a conflict on the side of "peace lovers"; but they were nonetheless resolved if possible to erase every line of the Neutrality Act that stood in the way of their running the foreign affairs of the United States on the basis of constant participation in the quarrels of Europe and Asia, with war as their ultima ratio.

Now President Roosevelt's foreign policy is clear as daylight. He proposes to collaborate actively with Great Britain and France in their everlasting wrangle with Germany, Italy, and Japan. He wants to wring from Congress the power to throw the whole weight of the United States on the side of Great Britain and France in negotiations, and in war if they manage to bungle the game. That using measures short of war would, it is highly probable, lead the United States into full war must be evident to all who take thought about such tactics.

IV

From the point of view of the interest of the United States as a continental nation in this hemisphere, the Roosevelt policy is, in my opinion, quixotic and dangerous. It is quixotic for the reason that it is not based upon a realistic comprehension of the long-time history of Europe and Asia and of the limited power which the United States has over the underlying economies and interests of those two continents. It assumes that the United States can in fact bring those continents into a kind of stable equilibrium, assure them the materials of a peaceful economic life, and close their history in a grand conference of the powers—perhaps as successfully as Locarno. It assumes that somebody in the White House or State Department can calculate the consequences likely to come out of the explosive forces which are hidden in the civilizations of those immense areas.

Does anyone in this country really know what is going on in Europe, behind the headlines, underneath the diplomatic documents? Is it true, as French publicists contend, that the Pope, having blessed the triumph of Franco in Spain, is striving for a union of Fascist and other powers for the secret purpose of liquidating Soviet Russia? Has Russia just grounds for distrusting the governments of Chamberlain and Daladier? If Hitler and Mussolini are liquidated either by pressure or by war, will the outcome be a Victorian democracy, a communistic revolution, or a general disintegration? Are not the powers immediately and directly entangled in all this strife in a better position to adjust their disputes than President Roosevelt and his assistants in the State Department?

Even assuming that the United States ought to do its best to help the democracies in Europe and Asia, the Roosevelt policy is quixotic in that it does not look far beyond a temporary pacification—a pacification that might be affected by a mere show of force or by another war. It does not propose any fundamental adjustment in the economies of nations which would provide any guarantee of peace after the temporary pacification, either by pressure or by war. And if the United States really had the knowledge, good will, and intention necessary to construct a formula for such a permanent economic peace, it does not and cannot have the power to force it upon other nations. In my opinion it does not have the knowledge, the will, or the intention.

Hence, in my judgment, it is folly for the people of the United States to embark on a vast and risky program of world pacification.

We can enjoy the luxury of hating certain nations. We can indulge in the satisfaction that comes from contemplating a war to destroy them. We can rush into a combination that might temporarily check them. But, it seems to me, it would be wiser to suggest that those countries of Europe which are immediately menaced by Germany and Italy put aside their jealousies, quarrels, and enmities, and join in a combination of their own to effect control over the aggressors. If countries whose very existence seems at stake will not unite for self-protection, how can the United States hope to effect a union among them? After temporary pacification what? After war what? After peace what? To these questions the Roosevelt foreign policy makes no answer. And they are the fundamental questions.

The Roosevelt foreign policy is also quixotic because it is based on the assumption that the economy and democracy of the United States are secure, that our industry, agriculture, farmers, workers, sharecroppers, tenants, and millions of unemployed are safe, that the state of our public finances is impregnable, and that the future of our democracy is scatheless; so that we have the power to force pacification, self-government, and economic prosperity upon recalcitrant nations beyond two oceans. Is the management of our own affairs so efficient and so evidently successful that we may take up the role of showing other countries just how to manage their internal economies? Have we the economic and military power required to set their systems in an order to suit our predilections, even assuming that we could get wholehearted collaboration from the Tory Government of Great Britain, the reactionary Government of France, and the Communist Government of Russia? If the very idea of world economic pacification in such circumstances is not a dream of Sancho Panza, then I am unacquainted with Cervantes.

V

On what, then, should the foreign policy of the United States be based? Here is one answer and it is not exaggerated in any professor's study or supplied by political agitators. It is the doctrine formulated by George Washington, supplemented by James Monroe, and followed by the Government of the United States until near the end of the nineteenth century, when the frenzy for foreign adventurism burst upon the country. This doctrine is simple. Europe has a set of primary interests which have little or no relation to us, and is constantly vexed by ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice. The United States is a continental power separated from Europe by a wide ocean which, despite all changes in warfare, is still a powerful asset of defense. In the ordinary or regular vicissitudes of European politics the United States should not become implicated by any permanent ties. We should promote commerce, but force nothing. We should steer clear of hates and loves. We should maintain correct and formal relations with all established governments without respect to their forms or their religions, whether Christian, Mohammedan, or Shinto, or what have you. Efforts of any European powers to seize more colonies, or to oppress independent states in this hemisphere, or to extend their system of despotism to the New World will be regarded as a matter of concern to the United States as soon as they are immediately threatened and begin to assume tangible shape.

This policy was stated positively in the early days of our Republic. It was clear. It was definite. It gave the powers of the earth something they could understand and count upon in adjusting their policies and conflicts. It was not only stated. It was acted upon with a high degree of consistency until the great frenzy overtook us. It enabled the American people to go ahead under the principles of 1776, conquering a continent and building here a civilization which, with all its faults, has precious merits for us and is, at all events, our own. Under the shelter of this doctrine, human beings were set free to see what they could do on this continent, when emancipated from the privilege-encrusted institutions of Europe and from entanglement in the endless revolutions and wars of that continent.

Grounded in strong common sense, based on deep and bitter experience, Washington's doctrine has remained a tenacious heritage, despite the hectic interludes of the past 50 years. Owing to the growth of our Nation, the development of our own industries, the expulsion of Spain from this hemisphere, and the limitations now imposed upon British ambition by European pressures, the United States can pursue this policy more securely and more effectively today than at any time in our history. In an economic sense the United States is far more independent than it was in 1783, when the Republic was launched and, what is more, is better able to defend itself against all comers. Why, as Washington asked, quit our own to stand on foreign ground?

This is a policy founded upon our geographical position and our practical interests. It can be maintained by appropriate military and naval establishments. Beyond its continental zone and adjacent waters, in Latin America, the United States should have a care; but it is sheer folly to go into hysterics and double military and naval expenditures on the rumor that Hitler or Mussolini is about to seize Brazil, or that the Japanese are building gun emplacements in Costa Rica. Beyond this hemisphere, the United States should leave disputes over territory, over the ambitions of warriors, over the intrigues of hierarchies, over forms of government, over passing myths known as ideologies—all to the nations and peoples immediately and directly affected. They have more knowledge and power in the premises than have the people and Government of the United States.

This foreign policy for the United States is based upon a recognition of the fact that no kind of international drum beating, conferring, and trading can do anything material to set our industries in full motion, raise the country from the deeps of the depression. Foreign trade is important, no doubt, but the main support for our American life is production and distribution in the United States and the way out of the present economic morass lies in the acceleration of this production and distribution at home, by domestic measures. Nothing that the United States can do in foreign negotiations can raise domestic production to the hundred billions a year that we need to put our national life, our democracy, on a foundation of internal security which will relax the present tensions and hatreds.

It is a fact, stubborn and inescapable, that since the year 1900 the annual value of American goods exported has never risen above 10 percent of the total value of exportable or movable goods produced in the United States, except during the abnormal conditions of the war years. The exact percentage was 9.7 in 1914, 9.8 in 1929, and 7.3 in 1931. If experience is any guide, we may expect the amount of exportable goods actually exported to be about 10 percent of the total, and the amount consumed at home to be about 90 percent. High tariff or low tariff, little Navy or big, good-neighbor policy or saber-rattling policy, hot air or cold air, this proportion seems to be in the nature of a fixed law, certainly more fixed than most of the so-called laws of political economy.

Since this is so, then why all the furor about attaining full prosperity by increasing our foreign trade? Why not apply stimulants to domestic production on which we can act directly? I can conceive of no reason for all this palaver except to divert the attention of the American people from things they can do at home to things they cannot do abroad.

In the rest of the world, outside this hemisphere, our interests are remote and our power to enforce our will is relatively slight. Nothing we can do for Europeans will substantially increase our trade or add to our, or their, well-being. Nothing we can do for Asiatics will materially increase our trade or add to our, or their, well-being. With all countries in Europe and Asia, our relations should be formal and correct. As individuals we may indulge in hate and love, but the Government of the United States embarks on stormy seas when it begins to love one power and hate another officially. Great Britain has never done it. She has paid Prussians to beat Frenchmen and helped Frenchmen to beat Prussians, without official love or hatred, save in wartime, and always in the interest of her security. The charge of perfidy hurled against Britain has been the charge of hypocrites living in glass houses while throwing bricks.

Not until some formidable European power comes into the western Atlantic, breathing the fire of aggression and conquest, need the United States become alarmed about the ups and downs of European conflicts, intrigues, aggressions, and wars. And this peril is slight at worst. To take on worries is to add useless burdens, to breed distempers at home, and to discover, in the course of time, how foolish and vain it all has been. The destiny of Europe and Asia has not been committed, under God, to the keeping of the United States; and only conceit, dreams of grandeur, vain imaginings, lust for power, or a desire to escape from our domestic perils and obligations could possibly make us suppose that Providence has appointed us his chosen people for the pacification of the earth.

And what should those who hold to such a continental policy for the United States say to the powers of Europe?. They ought not to say, "Let Europe stew in its own juice; European statesmen are mere cunning intriguers; and we will have nothing to do with Europe." A wiser and juster course would be to say: "We cannot and will not underwrite in advance any power or combination of powers; let them make as best they can the adjustments required by their immediate interests in Europe, Africa, and Asia, about which they know more and over which they have great force; no European power or combination of powers can count upon material aid from the United States while pursuing a course of power politics designed to bolster up its economic interests and its military dominance; in the nature of things American sympathy will be on the side of nations that practice self-government, liberty of opinion and person, and toleration and freedom of thought and inquiry—but the United States has had one war for democracy; the United States will not guarantee the present distribution of imperial domains in Africa and Asia; it will tolerate no attempt to conquer independent states in this hemisphere and make them imperial possessions; in all sincere undertakings to make economic adjustments, reduce armaments, and cooperate in specific cases of international utility and welfare that comport with our national interest, the United States will participate within the framework of its fundamental policy respecting this hemisphere; this much, nations of Europe, and may good fortune attend you."

VI

Some of our fellow citizens, of course, do not believe that America can deny or refuse to accept the obligation of directing world destiny. Mr. Walter Lippmann is among them. "Our foreign policy," he has recently said in a tone of contempt, "is regulated finally by an attempt to neutralize the fact

that America has preponderant power and decisive influence in the affairs of the world. * * * What Rome was to the ancient world, what Great Britain has been to the modern world, America is to be to the world of tomorrow. * * * We cling to the mentality of a little nation on the frontiers of the civilized world, though we have the opportunity, the power, and the responsibilities of a very great nation at the center of the civilized world." These are ornate, glistening, masculine words, but are they true words, and what do they mean in terms of action?

America has "preponderant power." According to the most encyclopedic dictionary of the English language, "preponderant" means "surpassing in weight, outweighing, heavier; surpassing in influence, power, or importance." It is a word of comparison. If Mr. Lippmann's statement has a meaning that corresponds to exact usage, it means that America outweighs the rest of the world, surpasses it in influence and power. This, I submit, is false. Mr. Lippmann's "fact" is not a "fact." It is an illusion. America has power in the world, but it is not preponderant anywhere outside of this hemisphere. A lust for unattainable preponderance and a lack of sense for the limitations of power have probably done more damage to nations and the world than any other psychological force in history.

The same may be said of Mr. Lippmann's "decisive influence." Decisive means having the quality that determines a contest. There are some conceivable contests in which America could presumably exercise a determining power. Given the status of things in 1917, America probably did determine the combat outcome of the World War. But in fact America did not determine the larger outcome of the World War, either the little phase at Versailles or the multitudinous results that flowed from it. America certainly has influence in the world. Within its competence it may exercise a decisive influence in particular contests. But America does not have a decisive influence on the larger course of European and Asiatic history.

Mr. Lippmann says that America is to be "what Rome was to the ancient world." That sounds big, but the test of facts bursts the bubble. Rome conquered, ruled, and robbed other peoples from the frontier in Scotland to the sands of Arabia, from the Rhine to the Sahara, and then crumbled to ruins. Does anybody in his right mind really believe that the United States can or ought to play that role in the future, or anything akin to it? America is to be "what Great Britain has been to the modern world." Well, what has Great Britain been to the modern world? Many fine and good things, no doubt. But in terms of foreign policy, Britain swept the Spanish, the Dutch, the French, and the Germans from the surface of the seven seas. During the past 300 years Britain has waged numerous wars on the Continent to maintain, among other things, the balance of power. Britain has wrested colonies from the Spanish, the Dutch, the French, and the Germans; has conquered, ruled, and dictated to a large part of the globe. Does anyone really believe that the United States can or ought to do all these things, or anything akin to them?

Mr. Lippmann's new brew of Roman grandeur and British philanthropy is of the same vat now used by British propagandists in appealing to Americans who have a frontier mentality. These propagandists have at last learned that, between the submarine and airplane on the one side and events in Russia, Germany, and Italy on the other, the jig is up for British imperial dictatorship in the old style. So they welcome the rise of the United States as a sea power to help maintain security and order, that is, the British Empire. With this, for obvious reasons, French propagandists agree. But Americans who are bent on making a civilization in the United States and defending it here will beware of all such Greeks bearing gifts and set about their own work on this continent.

Is this retreat or cowardice? Walter Lippmann says that Americans are suffering from "a national neurosis," defeatism, and "wishing to escape from their opportunities and responsibilities." In my opinion the exact opposite is the truth. American people are resolutely taking stock of their past follies. Forty years ago bright young men of tongue and pen told them they had an opportunity and responsibility to go forth and, after the manner of Rome and Britain, conquer, rule, and civilize backward peoples. And the same bright boys told them that all of this would "pay," that it would find outlets for their surpluses of manufactures and farm produce. It did not. Twenty-two years ago American people were told that they were to make the world safe for democracy. They nobly responded. Before they got through they heard about the secret treaties by which the Allies divided the loot. They saw the Treaty of Versailles which distributed the spoils and made an impossible peace. What did they get out of the adventure? Wounds and deaths. The contempt of former associates—until the Americans were needed again in another war for democracy. A repudiation of debts. A huge bill of expenses. A false boom. A terrific crisis.

Those Americans who refuse to plunge blindly into the maelstrom of European and Asiatic politics are not defeatist or neurotic. They are giving evidence of sanity, not cowardice; of adult thinking as distinguished from infantilism. Experience has educated them and made them all the more determined to concentrate their energies on the making of a civilization within the circle of their continental domain. They do not propose to withdraw from the world, but they propose to deal with the world as it is and not as romantic propagandists picture it. They propose to deal with it in American terms, that is, in terms of national interest and security on this continent. Like their ancestors who made a revolution, built the Republic, and made it stick, they intend to preserve and defend the Republic, and under its shelter carry forward the work of employing their talents and resources in enriching American life. They know that this task will call for all the enlightened statesmanship, the constructive energy, and imaginative intelligence that the Nation can command. America is not to be Rome or Britain. It is to be America.

America's Stake in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF GOV. CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Governors' Conference met recently at Boston, Mass., and Oregon's Governor, the Honorable Charles A. Sprague, delivered an address at that conference on July 2 entitled "America's Stake in the Pacific." I ask leave to extend my remarks and to include therein the address of Governor Sprague. It follows:

It was just a little over a year ago that the second world war, which had been referred to with a degree of taunt as a phony war in its first winter, exploded with unexpected fury in the north and west of Europe. The 1940 conference of governors, meeting at the height of the smiting blitzkrieg and on the eve of the capitulation of France, registered the degree of shock affecting this country when it adopted a statement pledging for each State its agricultural, industrial, and military resources for the adequate and effective defense of the United States. Dunkerque and the exposure of Great Britain to invasion produced a measure of panic here. There was a hasty muster of men and might, a swift appraisal of our military hazards.

While immediate apprehension of possible British collapse subsided as the R. A. F. fended off the Nazi bombing fleets and blasted enemy debarkation points, our fears have risen again with the reverses in the Mediterranean theater, with the threat of the Axis to pull the drawstrings at Gibraltar and Suez, and with the terrible toll of shipping in the battle of the Atlantic. Our Government has secured bases outside its territory from Greenland to Trinidad, and the President has made it plain that on any provocation our armed forces will move to prevent such potential outposts as the Azores, Cape Verde, and Canary Islands from falling into the hands of the Axis. Time and again attention is called to the fact that it is but 1,800 miles from Dakar to Natal, the clear meaning being that from the former as a base enemy operations might be extended to South America and a foothold gained in this hemisphere.

The declared military policy of this Government has been hemisphere defense. While if necessary that policy would be enforced unilaterally, on the basis of the Monroe Doctrine, our diplomacy has moved with marked success toward consolidating hemispheric unity. This is the fruit of effort of our national administrations since the World War, and particularly of the present administration. We are carrying out elaborate plans, at very considerable cost in money, to solidify all American nations in opposition to the axis.

Coming as I do from the Pacific coast, and representing a State fronting on the Pacific Ocean, I wish to report that we of the West understand your exposures on the east and south. My own sentiment, which I believe reflects that of the majority of the people along the western coast, is one of approval of the administration's policy of assistance to Great Britain, of unqualified opposition to the Nazi-Fascist-Communist ideologies, of protection of American shipping on the high seas, and of securing South American cooperation. I desire, however, to direct your attention to our national interest in the Pacific. This is not to distract you from the Atlantic theater, for we recognize that the preservation of Great Britain is the major political and military objective. Nor is it to promote a provincial viewpoint, that of the Pacific coast. Rather my purpose is to inform you of the magnitude of our national stake in the resolution of the present struggle for power in the Far East.

In that theater Japan is endeavoring to impose by force "a new order in Asia." Japan, in fact, is the original aggressor following the establishment of the League of Nations, the signing of the Nine Power Treaty (1922), and the Kellogg-Briand pact (1929). The first appeasement was Sir John Simon's refusal to go along with our Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, in denouncing Japan's seizure of Manchuria (1931–32). Italy, in its conquest of Ethiopia, merely imitated Japan; and Germany is now repeating on a vaster scale what its Axis colleagues once got away with. And Japan itself has steadily followed its own example. North China was seized in 1933, Shanghai and Nanking in 1937, Canton and the island of Hainan in 1938. The success of its Axis partner, Germany, over Holland and France, and the impairment of British

strength now tempt Japan to launch a southward thrust to secure what is one of the richest natural areas on the globe, the lands rimming the bowl of the South China Sea. Japanese influence predominates in Thailand, French Indo-China is now well in the orbit of Tokyo. But Singapore bristles with British naval and military power; the Netherlands East Indies, loyal to Queen Wilhelmina, courteously declines to supply more oil to Nippon. The real brakes on the "southward thrust" are the presence of American naval power in mass at Pearl Harbor and of American fighting planes in the Philippines, and fear of Russia on the north. The expansion of Japan, which began with Formosa in 1895 and continued with Liaotung (Kwantung) in 1905 and Korea (Chosen) in 1910, has moved with swifter pace the past 10 years. If it can conclude successfully the "China incident" and gain control of southeastern Asia and its adjacent islands, then indeed Asia will be in the grip of a "new order."

Let me review the recent history of China. In brief, it is that of a nation, the oldest and most populous on earth, undergoing the travail of political, economic, and social revolution. Chinese insularity, which culminated in the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, at last yielded following the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty and the establishment of a republic under the enlightened Sun Yat-sen in 1911. The effort of Yuan Shi-kai to establish a military dictatorship in 1911 proved abortive; but the central government was weak; war lords ruled in the provinces; banditry was rampant; the infection of communism from neighboring Russia spread into China. The civil war of 1927 saw the Kuomintang Party emerge with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his brilliant wife Madame Chiang (Mei-ling Soong) as leaders. They have commanded respect and established remarkable unity among the vast majority of the people of China.

In spite of the years of revolution and civil disorder the social revolution of China under the impact of western ideas has progressed with rapid strides. At its base was education of the masses inspired and directed by the graduates of colleges of this country and Europe and of schools established in China under western auspices. The present war has not retarded, rather it has accelerated the modernization of China, for it has driven industries, science, technology, medicine, and modern literature far into the interior.

But what, one may ask, has all this to do with the United States? Why, when our eyes are riveted on developments in Europe, should we pause to attend to what is happening on the other side of the globe? Here, fellow Americans, is the answer.

The swift ascent of the Axis Powers has given us alarm, not only that we might face a strong and hostile military alliance, but that we might be subjected to economic isolation in the event of Axis victory. We see the impossibility of maintaining an American standard of living where our free labor system, with high wages, is forced to compete with a barter economy and a compulsory labor system. That is one reason why we thrust our neighborliness upon South America, to save one continent which we may trade with. I would not discourage that effort, but I want to point out an alternate area where we may, if our affairs are properly ordered, preserve zones for friendly interchange. That area lies across the Pacific. To acquaint you with its importance let me give you some facts comparing the trans-Pacific region with South America which I am sure will surprise most of you. In the matter of distances, do you realize that the Panama Canal and the entire west coast of South America are closer to New York than they are to San Francisco and Portland, Oreg.? Yokohama is closer to Portland and San Francisco than Rio de Janeiro is to New York; and Shanghai is closer to our Pacific ports than Buenos Aires is to New York.

Compare the populations of the Pacific countries with those of South America. Exclusive of Siberia there are 952,719,000 people living in the former, east of 70 degrees east longitude, while there are only 92,997,000 persons living in South America.

In the matter of commerce our trade with the Far East greatly exceeds that with South America. I do not want to bore you with statistics, but here is the comparison of our total foreign trade with these regions for specific years:

	South America	Trans-Pacific
1913	$359,967,000	$482,699,000
1920	1,361,902,000	2,443,933,000
1930	764,957,000	1,850,570,000
1940	806,125,000	1,585,631,000

But America's stake in the Pacific is not measured alone by the volume of commerce. The commodities themselves are vital. Coffee, bauxite, nitrates, are the principal South American products which are essential and not easily obtainable elsewhere. The Pacific countries furnish us such strategic or necessary products as rubber, tin, tung oil, chromite, tungsten, silk, copra, jute and hemp, bristles. I quote from Robert Aura Smith's recent book, Our Future in Asia:

"Economically, southeastern Asia possesses world control of rubber and of tin; one-fourth of the world's oil; all of the world's manila hemp; all of the world's quinine; the major producers of the world's tungsten and antimony; the greatest exporters of rice; the world's control of copra and coconut oil; the largest chromite deposit and the sixth gold producer in the world. Those products of the southeastern Asiatic market comprise with its purchases a foreign trade of a billion and a half dollars annually."

Quoting again:

"When we thought of defending our trade relationships against outside invasion, we thought naturally of trade with South America. When we thought of penetration and aggression, we thought of Nazi deals with Brazil and Nazi plots in Uruguay. But while this was going on we were being faced with the equally dynamic threat to a political and economic position vastly more important than mere hemisphere defense.

"Our connection with southeastern Asia makes our ties to South America look like child's play. We buy more from three colonies on the South China Sea than we do from all of South America combined. While we contemplate lightly throwing away our Philippine position, our trade with the Philippines has systematically outranked our trade with Brazil, or Argentina, or any other South American country, for the last 15 years."

But there is more to exchange than copra and kettles, tea and petroleum. The culture of the Orient, Japan and China in particular, has long been a worthy import of occidental nations. Beside the mellow culture of China our own is almost an improvisation. We have much to give the Far East in modern technology; we can learn much from its peoples in art and philosophy.

If we make a realistic appraisal we must recognize certain factors of weakness in our policy of hemispheric defense. The military burden would fall almost wholly on this country; our Navy, Army, and air force would have to defend South America, a not inconsiderable task. With a lifeline to the Orient, however, we could under pressure retreat to the bulge of South America or to the Panama Canal. Even the loss of the Canal would not be fatal to this country when we have a two-ocean navy and an adequate air force and transcontinental motor highways to supplement the rails.

We must recognize that the present pan-American harmony is not of long duration. Fear and perhaps jealousy have made some of our western cousins refer to this country as the Colossus of the North. For most of the time since their colonization the South American countries have had as their cultural capitals Madrid and Paris and Rome, and London for a financial capital. In some respects the economics of North and South America are parallel rather than complementary. Europe should remain a leading market for the wheat, meat, and fruits of both hemispheres, and a supplier of manufactured goods to the Southern Hemisphere. With the Orient, on the other hand, products exchange more readily and with less competition. Japan, which is a real competitor, has long ranked first among Pacific countries in our foreign trade. Very important in this time of fears of isolation is the fact that most of the peoples of the Orient are friendly to the United States. Between this country and Japan there is still on both sides a popular friendliness even if relations are strained. With China there is a firm and long-standing attachment, which, if effectively served by us now, will give us an anchor in the Orient which the gales of Europe will not loosen.

The Monroe Doctrine, which has been the principal basis of our foreign policy since 1823, was adopted when our territory did not stretch to the Pacific, when the 24 States of the Union clustered east of the Mississippi except for Missouri and Louisiana. I propose no desertion of the Monroe Doctrine, now fortunately expanded into one of hemispheric cooperation; but I urge that our people recognize our outlook, our opportunity, and our hazard on the Pacific.

The Philippine Islands call for attention at this point. While under the terms of the Tydings-McDuffie law the Philippines are due to receive independence in 1946, it seems incredible that in the present state of upheaval they will be turned adrift without some protection from the United States. Certainly some arrangement should be made to protect our economic interests there. Besides being an important supplier of sugar and hemp and copra, the Philippines are extremely rich in vital minerals—gold, iron, chromite, manganese. We shudder over the scrap iron we have shipped Japan lest the stove lids and old mower wheels come back at us in bullets and bombs. If we let Japan get hold of the Philippine Islands we have given it a mineral storehouse of untold richness.

In part, our decision to retreat from the Orient was based on the difficulty foreseen of properly defending the Philippines against a strong foe with nearby bases. That may have been a correct appraisal up to a few years ago; but the scene has changed rapidly of late. European dislocations have forced British and Dutch outposts of empire into ready alliance with us for their self-defense. In event of trouble undoubtedly Singapore would be put at the disposal of our fleet, giving us with Pearl Harbor two of the strongest bases in the world.

The events of the present war demonstrate the potency of the air arm. Surely the Philippine Islands would afford adequate air bases to make our position there vis-a-vis Japan reasonably secure. Air power not only supplements, it extends the range of naval force. It is therefore proper to revise our military policy in the Far East by giving proper weight to the factor of aviation both for offense and defense.

The United States is forced by the current of events to consider its national security. We are spending billions on billions for the national defense, but it is of the utmost importance that we use brains in charting our policies. The mad race for power based on military might has gripped the world. Unless we are alert we may find ourselves if not defeated then isolated by Axis domination. We must at all hazards protect our line of communication with the Orient for the supply of such essentials as rubber, chromite, tin, tungsten, and hemp. If we permit Japan to consummate its "southward thrust," our line of supply is severed.

Our Pacific coast feels no immediate fear of invasion. Hawaii and Alaska with the Aleutian Islands will soon be bastions making a sustained trans-Pacific attack virtually impossible. But an enemy power controlling the vast resources of materials and manpower of the Orient and making military utilization of those resources would threaten this continent; yes, and this hemisphere for the indefinite future.

Fortunately this country has a Pacific policy whose abstract is clear from the famous note of John Hay in 1899, demanding an open door in China, to the decision of the Hoover administration not to recognize Manchukuo, the fruit of Japan's aggression in Manchuria. All that is needed is the determination to implement our Pacific diplomacy to make it effective.

I do not mean for this statement to be provocative as against Japan. We of the Pacific coast would hate to see an interruption of the long friendly commercial and cultural relations we have enjoyed with Japan. But in the present imbroglio our sympathies lie strongly with China, which has been ruthlessly set upon by Japan as aggressor. We should be ready in Asia, as in Europe, to make history record that the way of the aggressor is hard.

It is easy to work out a satisfying formula of appeasement for the Orient if we so desire. We might make a deal with Japan, and that has been proposed, in which we would bless with recognition and capital loans Japan's "new order in Asia." That might bring immediate gains. But I believe that in the end we will profit more and have greater security if China and Japan remain free and independent, and the balance of power in southeast Asia is not disturbed. Japan itself is bleeding economically. The "incident," expected to last 3 months, has lengthened into 4 years, with Chinese resistance growing. It is true that the Nipponese Navy blockades the coast, that armies of the invader hold the seaports and rail centers. But that control does not spread over the country even in occupied territory. Taxes are collected there which are remitted into Chinese treasuries. Cooperatives deep in the interior are new sources of supply for arms, munitions, and manufactures. Guerilla bands make life miserable for Japanese garrisons. In truth, Japan has bogged down in China, with no important advances, save in the southeast, in the past 2 years. Give China time and supplies and it should ultimately regain much of its lost territory. Unless Japan soon can consummate its ambitions in China or the southeast, it would be better off to liquidate the "incident" and seek through peaceful means to rebuild its economy and reestablish its prestige. We of the west hope sincerely that this undeclared war will terminate without sacrifice of the integrity of Chinese territory and yet without undue humiliation to Japan.

The imminent danger is that Japan in desperation may gamble for the high stake of power in the Far East. It may see in the involvement of Germany and Russia an opportunity either to displace Russia in eastern Siberia or Mongolia and thus make its northern flank secure. Or it may make the long-threatened thrust toward the Dutch East Indies and Singapore. If the latter is attempted then American naval action is clearly warranted in protection of our national interests and in support of British and Dutch interests in that area. Germany or Japan or both standing at Bering Strait in northeastern Siberia would jeopardize our Pacific security.

I offer no criticism of our Government's policy in the Pacific. It is informed, definite, and I believe will be vigorous. There should be no appeasement with Japan; there should be continued and expanded aid to China; there should be no precipitate action on our part to provoke warfare with Japan. We should work out a better solution of the status of the Philippine Islands than the hazardous independence now scheduled for 1946, a solution which will give Filipinos the substance of free government under American protection; and will give us an advance base by which, in cooperation with other free powers, we may preserve economic freedom in the Far East.

The working out of the details of this policy must be left to our Government, which alone knows the factors of relative strength and weakness and best can weigh the effects of affirmative action. Decisions on such matters as embargoes should be left to competent governmental authority. The prime need is for popular understanding of the problems of the Pacific; so there may be, on the part of our Government, neither lethargy nor hesitancy through fear if a time for action arrives.

Europe may be destroying herself. The Battle of the Atlantic may end in the dawning of the era of the Pacific. The United States, its territory astride the North American continent, faces both oceans. Its policies must face the realities in both basins; and so must its armies and its navies.

The Problem of Steel Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES I. FADDIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF WALTER S. TOWER, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Walter S. Tower, president, American Iron and Steel Institute, before the annual meeting of the purchases and stores division of the Association of American Railroads, at Chicago, Thursday, July 10, 1941:

When your eminent chairman invited me to speak here today, he did not prescribe any topic. I carefully avoided the question, for fear that I might not get the right answer.

You will all agree, I believe, that making speeches, especially in these days, is risky business. If one sticks to history, no one is interested. It is all out of date. If one tries to probe the future, the swift turn of events tomorrow may discredit every diagnosis.

And yet, as I told your chairman, you are too important to the steel industry for me to refuse to run that risk.

It seems to me safe to assume that you have more than a passing interest in steel. In fact, I have often heard it said that you do not hesitate to remind steelmakers of the attractive size of your annual purchases. I suspect that steel men may, in turn, call your attention to the desirable volume of their shipments.

Thus is created a basis for perfect understanding.

For that reason, I want to cover some aspects of the steel industry in which I hope you may be interested. I refer to such matters as supply, delivery, price, which normally concern purchasing agents of all important industries.

Let me take the question of supply first, because, in theory at least, the adequacy of supply is supposed to affect both delivery and price. Much publicity has been given in recent weeks to three items concerning steel supply. First, there was much commotion over the tonnages which would be needed for prospective expansion of shipbuilding and car-building programs. Next came the report to the President by Gano Dunn suggesting possible shortages in total steel supply both this year and next, if one accepts unmodified the estimates of requirements that were the basis of his calculations. And then we read of "a 10,000,000-ton steel expansion program," as if all the details were in blueprints, ready for placing contracts.

A few basic facts may help in appraising these items.

Rated steel-making capacity today is more than 85,000,000 net tons of ingots in a year. Next year it will be substantially more. If pushed by stern necessity for the last available ton, the industry as it now stands probably could make at least 87,000,000 tons in 12 months, provided there were no interruptions in flow of materials and supply of labor. So far this year, and it its half gone, actual output has been at the rate of about 82,000,000 tons, with no record of important lack of steel for any essential industry. Some users for civilian purposes have taken record-breaking quantities. Competent outside observers come to the conclusion that production has been consistently ahead of actual consumption. Inventories are reported to be still on the increase, and probably at the highest level ever known.

The first charge against the present potential supply is for enough tonnage to meet all domestic military uses, including Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission programs. Close beside that comes the tonnage which we are committed to furnish for Britain and Canada. For this calendar year, 1941, according to current official estimates and reports, those two items, defense program and British-Canadian tonnages, represent an ingot equivalent of not more than 18,000,000 tons. For the calendar year 1942, the current estimate for our own program is a little larger. The British need next year is still uncertain, but is hardly likely to expand very much, when the limiting factor of shipping space is considered.

Available facts, therefore, justify the belief that both in this year and in 1942 there will be fully 67,000,000 tons of steel-making capacity which can be used for domestic civilian consumption and for whatever exports may seem desirable to countries other than Britain and Canada.

Such other exports are not likely to call for more than 3,000,000 tons of ingots, leaving a minimum of 64,000,000 tons for domestic civilian uses. This country has never in any year been able to use any such quantity of steel. Even in 1940 total domestic consumption including defense and civilian uses was only 55,000,000 tons.

But, say the prophets of scarcity, national income will rise to unheard of levels, and the resulting demand for steel will be terrific. The broad answer to them is that the theory of intimate connection between national income and demand for steel is not sound, and it is particularly unsound under the distorted conditions of wartime economy.

So far there have been no figures offered by anyone to show that maximum defense requirements will amount to more than a minor fraction of total ability of the industry to produce steel. Nor is there any basis in facts for expecting that civilian consumption of steel products will take more than will be available, after the needs of the defense program have been satisfied.

A careful reading of the recent report to the President by Gano Dunn reveals the conclusion that in his considered opinion, after studying the subject intensively for several months, expansion of steel-making capacity is not now justified beyond the normal and

natural increase which is always going on in the industry, plus certain special additions, like electric furnaces, to meet specific defense requirements.

Any other conclusion, I think, is untenable because it must be based on the theoretical assumption that requirements for nonmilitary uses will soar to fantastic levels. Instead of an orgy of consumption, some sacrifice by everyone is the likely price of the job that this country faces.

Dunn's report itself, I believe, is more than liberal in respect to the assumed figure of steel likely to be needed for civilian uses. In arriving at his final estimate Dunn took a compromise figure halfway between a higher estimate and a lower one, both from outside sources. Even the lower of the two estimates which he quotes does not take fully into account the restrictive influences on steel consumption which are bound to operate before the end of 1942.

Under that head I would include scant supply of various materials, like zinc, nickel, tin, used in making important types of finished steel; diversion of skilled labor and plant facilities to production for defense; higher prices for many consumer goods; the burden of greatly increased taxes; disorganized world markets for all kinds of products; curtailed shipping facilities; and the like.

It is quite true that some additional equipment for finishing and for specially treating steel products may be required in order to meet all the needs of the defense program. In fact, members of the industry are installing such facilities as rapidly as they get the necessary information as to what is needed. That, however, is a problem quite separate from a wholesale increase of basic steel-making capacity.

But in the face of all these facts, and having in mind the ship-building and car-building programs, you may say, "Yes; plenty of ingots, but how about plates?" the chief form of steel needed both for ships and for cars.

I believe that the present program is to build about 170,000 cars over the next 18 months. With a liberal allowance of plates per car, the car program to the end of 1942 is likely to call for a maximum of about 1,500,000 tons of plates.

The shipbuilding program, naval and merchant, totals considerably less than 1,000 vessels on which any work is likely to be done before the end of next year. The principal cargo type, which is the largest single item in the program, takes about 2,100 tons of plates per vessel. Few of the craft, chiefly in the naval type, take more than 3,000 tons of plates per vessel. If the entire lot were completed by the end of next year, which now appears unlikely, even impossible, the tonnage of ship plates needed would not reach 2,500,000 tons.

For cars and ships the combined figures are not over 4,000,000 tons, over a period of 18 months. Existing plate capacity can turn out at least 7,500,000 tons in that time. Some changes in other mills, to adapt them for rolling car plates and ship plates, can, within 6 months, add a further yearly plate capacity of 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 tons. With those additions, plate capacity will be much more than double the prospective needs of the two programs for cars and ships.

In tying these figures back to ingot supply, it is important to remember that all of the tonnage of ship steel was included in the estimate for military requirements, taken as the first charge against capacity. The car tonnage comes out of the 64,000,000 pot for civilian uses, and in terms of ingot equivalent, plates for the car program are equal to only a little more than 2 percent of that pot.

It should be evident from these facts that anxiety about supply of plates for vital needs is exaggerated. The real problem is to get all essential needs translated from broad generalities into specific details as to descriptions, delivery dates, and orders. When the mills know precisely what the job is, they will find the answer of how to do it.

The case of plates, in which you happen to have a special interest, is basically typical of other kinds of steel products. I do not claim, nor do I think anyone in the industry would claim, that the industry can make all the steel which everyone might like to buy for early delivery. But I do say, and I think everyone in the industry will agree, that the industry can make all the steel which anyone may need to use, provided buying is orderly and in proportion to what is currently going into actual consumption.

As you all know, an appearance of shortage can quickly be created by a sudden general clamor for immediate deliveries. It is perhaps a natural trait to try to protect one's own position as far ahead as possible. But unless actual and continuing physical shortages are in prospect, the only sound reasons for extensive anticipation of remote future needs must be either price or delivery.

In respect to the future price of steel products, I think you know as much as anyone. If official policy is to be taken at face value as stated, a continued relative stability of steel prices can be confidently expected. In fact, insofar as may be consistent with the need for maximum output and the costs of production, such stability of prices is highly desirable. We all know that the menace of fatal inflation hovers over this country. If it is to be avoided, costs and prices, Siamese twins of the industrial world, cannot be allowed to run away.

As men carrying responsibility for buying many millions of dollars' worth of steel, you are for the moment, I suspect, more than ordinarily free from any pressing concern about possible adverse price movement for steel products. However, I think it is fair to raise the question whether higher prices in general can be avoided, if wage increases are encouraged and basic prices for farm products are uncontrolled.

Like most buyers, I suppose your first motto is, "We must have the stuff now." But it is not in the nature of human affairs that the element of time can be ignored. Satisfactory deliveries are the joint product of good planning on the part of both buyer and seller. If a steelmaker asked one of your lines for a hundred of the extra long gondolas on less than a day's notice, he probably would be answered with a fishy stare. By the same token a buyer who wants steel must be willing to look far enough ahead, so that his suppliers may fit the desired tonnages into orderly and efficient production schedules.

The real answer to the problem of delivery is good scheduling. In the case of steel the first obligation is on the buyer. Until the buyer's wants have been made known, in all essential detail, the steelmaker has little notion about what he may have to furnish. When those wants are known in time to be combined in efficient mill schedules, satisfactory deliveries are the rule.

Right now, with demands on the mills being maintained at a level higher than ever experienced before, it is probably true that many more than a million transactions are being completed every month. The very small percentage of those transactions not completed on time is no more than the inevitable allowance for lack of perfection from which all heavy industry must suffer.

But some of you will ask, "How can we feel sure about deliveries, if there is to be a general shortage of steel, as suggested in the Gano Dunn report?" There are two possible answers to that question. The first is that the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply has issued an order giving preference to materials for car building and car repairs, over all other civilian uses.

We have already noted the generous size of the pot of steel for civilian uses. With that order from the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, and such a pot, there is no shadow of doubt whatever that you will get yours in the amounts and the deliveries desired. Extended deliveries are not new to any of you who recall the years prior to 1930.

The second answer is that the alleged shortage is only on paper. No one can know in advance what the precise demand for steel will total in this calendar year. Much less clear is the prospect for 1942, although for both years the broad estimates of our military and the British needs are fairly specific and the totals are less than one-fourth of the steel industry's ability to produce.

With three-fourths of steel capacity available for nonmilitary needs, the question of whether it will be enough or too little has led to a lot of discussion. The best basis for a wise guess is past experience. The outstanding fact on that side is the failure to find any year of record when civilian uses of steel rose even close to the figure represented by three-fourths of present capacity.

As already noted, there are reasons for believing that production this year is outrunning actual consumption. Hence, unless the balance of the year holds something which we cannot now see, the figures that produce a shortage on paper are already proved misleading.

There is no sound factual basis for expecting a shortage of steel supply for any essential use. Deliveries of individual products may temporarily get congested, because of common striving for immediate shipment. But one fundamental fact must be remembered. Steel for civilian uses goes largely into durable and semidurable goods. In the nature of things the market for such goods presently tends to become saturated.

The automobile industry offers a good illustration. Leaders in that industry some time ago agreed to cut production in the model year beginning August 1. It is common knowledge, however, that the record-breaking volume of output during recent months could not be kept up indefinitely. With the average life of autos about 8 to 9 years, it is obvious that annual output at the rate of 6,000,000 cars could not continue forever. Auto makers themselves have been credited with the statement that letting nature take its course would lead to fewer units made next year. And the automobile industry is the greatest single user of steel. Its product is typical of the semidurable goods for civilian consumption.

If any acute condition in respect to steel supply is to be experienced, it is already close at hand because of the coincidence of various pressing demands for early delivery. Like a river in flood, that sort of demand rises rapidly to the crest, but it does not rise forever. Any shortage of steel for military uses can arise only from lack of materials like nickel or tungsten, or from lack of special processing facilities, for which there was no peacetime need. It cannot arise from lack of basic steelmaking capacity.

Any real shortage of steel for nonmilitary uses seems both unlikely and unnecessary. Should the unlikely happen, it will come early, it will be brief, and it can be dealt with only in one way; that way is temporarily to ration or to curtail the more dispensable uses. The machinery for such action already exists. It could be applied promptly. It should not be necessary to use it generally, or for very long in any case.

Any such condition, if it should happen, could not be dealt with by a program of wholesale expansion. Here and there, as I have pointed out, additions to steel-making facilities are under way all the time. Some important ones are due to become productive before the end of this year or in the course

of 1942. But any large scale expansion must be a matter of many months to create. Probably very little of "the 10,000,000-ton program," which is referred to so blithely by the unknowing, could be realized within 2 years. In fact, the limiting item might prove to be the problem of getting the necessary ore shipped down the Lakes.

It has been estimated for example, that such a program of expansion would involve 30 new ore boats. If they were laid down as soon as ways were available, with none now vacant, they would not be ready for use before the opening of the Lake season in April 1943.

Is it strange then that members of the industry, before they accede to any such request for large additions to capacity, would like to know the answers to expansion where and for what? I do not know of any steel man who can answer the questions satisfactorily for himself. Members of the steel industry, as in every other industry, of course, will cooperate in doing everything possible to further the defense effort. But enthusiasm in cooperation is always stimulated by the feeling that the effort is worth-while.

Let me make one more point about this matter. From various quarters there is sharp criticism of the steel man's hesitation about plunging blindly into expansion of capacity. It is referred to as "temporizing with critical situations" and ascribed to fear of "post-war dislocations of our economy." I have read that in some places the opinion in respect to expansion of capacity borrows from the buyers' motto, "we must have it now," and adds "to hell with post-war consequences."

But I do not believe that the steel man's hesitation rises from purely selfish interests or concern about the future. No one knows better than he does that the steel industry is the very foundation of defense, as it is of peacetime economic progress. I believe the steel man is sincere and justified in his feeling that if he could be told what is expected of the industry, the industry could show how it can handle the job with what it now has. But, so far as I know, he has not been so told.

Let's forget the more distant future. Ignore the question of post-war consequences. Who knows when the war will end, or how any part of the world will then stand? Unless we are to be saved from world totalitarianism, it is idle for any industry now to worry about post-war problems. They would then all be answered for us. Let's deal only with the present problem.

That problem may be simply stated. The primary need is for enough steel for our own defense and for Great Britain. No one can question our ability to fill that need three or four times over. Beyond that comes the miscellany of nonmilitary demands. To satisfy them there will be available more steel than such demands have ever before taken in a single year. Only those who hold to purely theoretical expectations of a civilian spending spree can question the adequacy of that supply.

With a general practice of orderly buying there should be plenty of steel for all civilian needs, for as high a standard of living as this country has ever enjoyed. In the unlikely event that concentrated civilian demands should for a time outrun supply, the only effective solution would be in temporary rationing rather than in undertaking forced expansion. Such expansion would, in effect, amount to using the defense emergency for further penetration of the Federal Government into private industry.

All of the talk about alleged steel shortages and the need for more steel-making capacity has tended to blind the American people to the real proportions of the industry.

If it is true that the power of a nation to defend itself is measured by its capacity to make steel, then the people of this country are fortunate in the possession of an unequalled bulwark of security. The industry is turning out more steel than has ever been produced before in this or any other nation, and its total capacity today is nearly equal to the capacity of all the rest of the world combined.

I think one can say with every assurance that the railroads will be able to get all the steel they may need for the building of cars and for other essential uses. All that the steel industry asks is that it have your cooperation in orderly purchasing.

National Youth Administration in Southwest Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the National Youth Administration enjoys the confidence and respect of the people of my district in the State of Washington. Its services have been extended to every county to the benefit of both the youth, the agency or school served, and the entire community.

Since the agency has directed its efforts toward being of assistance in the national-defense program, hundreds of youths have received work experience which will be of benefit to them not only in this emergency, but after the emergency ceases to exist. The flexibility of the National Youth Administration program has permitted it to exist in every type of community in the Third Washington District.

In Thurston County the youth have been offered the opportunity to gain clerical experience by doing practical work in Federal, State, county, city, and public governmental offices. The work experience consists of all phases of office work, including typing, shorthand dictation, transcription, filing, reception and switchboard work, and social-service work. Some of the youth have gained experience in assisting school nurses in health examinations.

In one community I have in mind, high-school youngsters assisted in building a farm shop where the district lacked sufficient funds otherwise to secure these facilities, and in the evenings the youth attended classes in repair and upkeep of farm machinery as well as practical maintenance experience in plumbing, heating, and electricity. One group of young folks gained experience in the State patrol machine shop in the maintenance of radio apparatus in patrol cars.

A traveling N. Y. A. crew exists within Mason County. This group consists of 30 boys who travel to job locations at various rural schools and perform improvements on city and Federal property. Recently the crew completely remodeled a recreation hall on the Skokomish Indian Reservation.

In Grays Harbor County the National Youth Administration has 30 boys employed in the carpenter shop which is completely equipped with all hand tools and power machinery necessary to produce woodworking, cabinet work, and carpentry of all types. The girls have a project on which they gain work experience in the making of clothing, house linens, rugs, and so forth. A great deal of work has been accomplished for the American Red Cross, all of which is for domestic consumption. Also, a traveling crew is maintained in this country to serve the rural areas.

Blacksmithing, welding, and sheet-metal experience is gained in the shop in Lewis County. At the present time the youth are engaged in producing metal signs of all shapes and sizes for the cities of Chehalis and Centralia.

In Clark County the metal shop has been producing such items as iron park benches, reflectorized signs, chisels, punches, welding tables, nail and rivet sets, and warning signs for school crossings. The mayor of Vancouver, city council, and other city officials have all expressed their amazement at the work that can be turned out by inexperienced youth. For the parks the N. Y. A. youth are producing picnic tables, benches, and open-air kitchens. Nearly all the materials used are found in the parks. The material includes peeled logs for buildings, stone for fireplaces and decorative work, and cedar shakes for the roofs.

The activities of the National Youth Administration are too numerous throughout my district to mention individually. In addition to all the work experience given, the opportunity for related training is offered to the youth whereby they receive special instruction.

I am extremely proud of the results obtained by the youth workers in my district and the administration of George P. Sheridan in charge of the N. Y. A. in the State of Washington has won the complete confidence of my constituents. I am happy to report that the turn-over in the number employed is approximately 25 percent each month, with most of these obtaining private employment as a result of the work experience gained with the N. Y. A.

Amendment of Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration, entitled "An act to authorize the deferment of men by age

group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940," embraces more than one subject.

By section 1 it provides that "men who, on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year," are liable for training and service under the Selective Service Act of 1940, (2) and who have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training or service, and (3) are 28 years of age, shall be deferred from training and service under the Selective Service and Training Act in the land and naval forces of the United States until Congress shall declare otherwise. To the enactment of this provision of the proposed law there is virtually no opposition. I shall vote for it and I urge every Member of the House to support it.

But the proposed act goes further than this. It proposes to enact into law, under the deceptive and misleading caption of the act, drastic provisions for the seizure of private property and for the use of the armed forces of the United States in labor disputes.

Section 2 of the bill reads as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new paragraph:

"Refusal in any labor dispute to utilize existing Government conciliation and mediation facilities in an effort to settle such dispute on the part of any individual, firm, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any such plant or industry with which an order has been placed for defense materials shall be construed as a refusal under the foregoing provisions of this section."

This section of the bill, under the provisions of section 9 of the original Selective Service and Training Act, authorizes the President, through the War or Navy Departments, to seize possession of any plant in the Nation with which an order has been placed for defense materials. If this amendment to the original act becomes law, the President, through the Army and Navy, can seize the property of any citizen to whom has been awarded a contract for the production of defense materials, on the ground that such citizen, in the event of a labor dispute, has refused to submit such dispute to existing Government conciliation and mediation facilities in an effort to settle such dispute. This is an arbitrary power which the act proposes to delegate to the Chief Executive. It is violative of the letter and the spirit of the Constitution of the United States and of the Constitution of Tennessee, and, I believe, of the constitutional safeguards thrown around the property rights of their citizens by the Constitution of every State in the Union.

It overrides and nullifies the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the pertinent parts of which read as follows:

No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

In keeping with the letter and spirit of this provision of the fifth amendment to the Federal Constitution, the Constitution of Tennessee provides:

That no man shall be taken or imprisoned, or disseized of his freehold, liberties or privileges, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, or deprived of life, liberty, or property, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land.

And—

That martial law, in the sense of the unrestricted power of military officers, or others, to dispose of the persons, liberties, or property of the citizen, is inconsistent with the principles of free government, and is not confided to any department of the government of this State.

And that—

The Declaration of Rights, heretofore prefixed, is declared to be a part of the constitution of this State, and shall never be violated on any pretense whatever. And to guard against transgression of the high powers we have delegated, we declare that everything in the Bill of Rights contained is excepted out of the general powers of the Government, and shall forever remain inviolate.

The committee reporting this provision of the act has publicly declared, and the evidence introduced before it on the hearing has warranted such declaration, that the citizens of this Nation owning and operating our industrial plants have whole-heartedly and loyally cooperated in the production of defense materials. The exact words of the committee are these:

From the evidence, it is apparent to your committee that private industry has, without exception, cooperated to the fullest degree with both the War and Navy Departments and all other agencies of the Government.

Section 3 of the proposed act adds a new section to the original act, which reads as follows:

SEC. 9 (a). That in the event of the stoppage of production through subversive influences or otherwise, not constituting a refusal under the foregoing provisions of section 9 hereof, of any article or material which may be required for national defense, or which may be useful in connection therewith, in any plant or industry, the President, if he finds that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary or desirable in the public interest, shall order such plant or industry to resume production immediately. The President shall have the power, through the heads of the War and Navy Departments, to enforce such order, and to afford protection to all persons engaged in the operation of such plant or industry who voluntarily desire to work in such plant or industry. Such power and authority as is hereby vested in the President may be exercised with respect to any such plant or industry only during the existence of a national emergency, or in time of war.

Nothing contained in section 9a hereof shall be construed to authorize the President or any Government agency to seize or operate any plant or industry or to give to any persons affected thereby, in any respect whatsoever, the status of Government employees.

No person who is separated from or refused employment in any such plant by reason of any such order or action by the President shall be entitled under any other existing law to any claim against his employer for time lost.

Under the language of this proposed section the President is authorized to seize the property of any citizen, even though the stoppage of production in such citizen's plant is brought about through no fault of his own. The loose language employed, "in the event of the stoppage of production through subversive influences or otherwise," makes it possible for the property of the citizen to be seized by the Government, through its armed forces, as the result of the illegal interference with the operation of such property by anyone, or on any pretense on the part of the Government whatever.

And the Government is empowered to order the owner of a seized plant to resume immediate operation of the plant, and to enforce such order against the owner through the armed forces of the Nation. The President, through the Army or Navy, can force a seized plant to resume operations, even though such operations may result in the plant's bankruptcy, and despite the fact that the employees refuse to work and render its successful operation impracticable or impossible.

Section 9 (b) of the proposed amendments provides:

SEC. 9 (b). (1) It shall be unlawful to prevent or to attempt to prevent, by force of violence or by threats thereof, any person from accepting or continuing in employment in any defense plant, or from entering or leaving any defense plant in the course of such employment. Nothing in this section shall limit the right of any person or organizaton to strike, or to engage in peaceful picketing.

This provision of the proposed act is unnecessary, for the following reasons:

In the report on this proposed measure made by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, it is stated, with reference to the President's seizure of the California airplane plant, and its operation under the protection of the armed forces of the United States—

The President of the United States was required to exercise his constitutional power as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, but due to the fact that there is some question as to the power of the President under the Constitution to deal with such questions, it was thought wise by the administration and the War and Navy Departments that legislation make clear and unmistakable the right of the President to intervene in such cases, and therefore your committee, after hearings and careful consideration, has reported this bill.

Here is an admission by the committee reporting the bill that the President already has the power sought to be conferred upon him by this measure. In addition to this fact, section 51 of chapter 3 of title 18 of the United States Code Annotated (Criminal Code, sec. 19), provides:

It two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same * * * with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured, they shall

be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not more than 10 years, and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to any office or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Under this provision of the Federal law, which is now in full force and effect, it was held by the circuit court of appeals (229 Fed., p. 65), and which holding was approved by the Supreme Court of the United States (255 U. S., p. 568, 65 Law Ed., p. 794), that—

An indictment under this section, charging defendants with conspiracy to intimidate and oppress citizens in the exercise of their rights, and that in pursuance of such conspiracy they threatened and intimidated persons to prevent them from furnishing munitions, ships, and supplies to the Government for war purposes under sales, orders, and contracts, was held sufficient.

It is known to all of us that illegal interference with workers, through violence, threats, or intimidation in a defense industry is never the work of one individual. Such activities are the result of concerted action on the part of large numbers of individuals, and such concerted action on their part constitutes a conspiracy, and such a conspiracy to interfere with the right of a citizen to work is denounced as a crime by the above provisions of the law, and all those engaged therein, upon indictment and conviction, are subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for a period of not more than 10 years, and such persons, when convicted, are rendered infamous and ineligible to hold any office or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

In addition to this, the laws of every State in the Union denounce such acts of violence against the person, rights, and liberties of the citizen as a crime, and those guilty of such a crime are punishable both by fine and imprisonment under the laws of the several States.

And, furthermore, this proposed seizure of the property of the citizen, and this attempted military coercion of the working people of the Nation, is uncalled for, unnecessary, and unwise at this time. I believe that these drastic provisions of the proposed measure are contrary to the sober, considered reason, judgment, and feelings of the great majority of the businessmen and laboring people of the Nation. Mediation and conciliation boards have been set up by the Government for the adjustment and settlement of industrial disputes. They are supported by the law and by the overwhelming weight of the enlightened public opinion of the country.

The Nation is not legally at war. Congress has not declared a state of war, and, under the Constitution, only Congress can declare war. If war is being waged, it is an undeclared war by Executive decree and by the ill-considered, intemperate, and violent declarations on the part of certain high officials of the Government and by a small minority in private life who are bent on dragging this Nation into this war. The great majority of the people do not favor the entrance of the Nation into this war.

It was Edmund Burke who said:

You cannot indict a state.

And we may well say that you cannot indict the American businessmen as a whole, nor can you indict labor as a whole. This legislation is provocative. It is a double-barreled assault upon American business and American labor. The thousands of patriotic, unselfish American businessmen who are devoting their life's savings, their energy, their ability, in the national interest should not be libeled with the provisions of this law. The millions of loyal American laboring men and women who, in the grime of the mine, the heat, dust, and uproar of the great manufacturing plants of the country, are driving the wheels of industry, naturally do not wish to carry on their voluntary and free labor under an act which questions their loyalty and their patriotism.

"You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink." Under our system of government there is no such thing as forced labor, except upon conviction for crime. We now have national unity on the question of national defense. The wrongs committed by the comparatively few recalcitrant businessmen and the comparatively few disloyal labor leaders and alien sympathizers in the ranks of labor should not be permitted to bring down this uncalled-for visitation of arbitrary miltary power upon the heads of the millions of loyal working men and women of the Nation. "Two wrongs do not make a right." This is no time to throw a monkey wrench, this is no time to put sand in the bearings of the industrial machinery of the country. If and when we go to war, and if and when we can no longer function as a free people under the law of the land, and we can no longer produce articles of defense except at the muzzle of a gun and the point of a bayonet, it will be time enough to resort to such legislation as this. It ought to be defeated because it withdraws from the businessmen and laboring people of the country the shield of the law's protection; because, in time of peace, it shuts the doors of the courts of the country, abrogates due process of the law, condemns without a hearing, convicts without a trial. By the terms of this force bill, in a star-chamber proceeding, where the accused is not present or heard, the citizens of the Nation, both businessmen and laborers, may be deprived of their property and liberty, by Executive decree, or, worse still, by decrees issued by martinets and bureaucrats.

This act constitutes the President and the Army and Navy accusers, prosecutors, judges, jurors, and executioners.

It is a dictator bill. And there is too much of that form of unrestrained power abroad in the world and in this land without further surrender to the executive branch of the Government.

For these reasons, the bill in its present form should be defeated, and I shall vote against sections 2 and 3.

Keep Our Boys Out of European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ARTICLE FROM WABASH (IND.) PLAIN DEALER AND LETTER SHOWING FINAL POLL VOTE

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer of June 3, 1941, and also a letter showing the final vote in the poll referred to:

[From the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer of July 3, 1941]

KEEP BOYS OUT OF EUROPEAN WAR, SAY VOTERS

Overwhelming opinion of readers of the Wabash Plain Dealer and Times Star is that circumstances have not changed sufficiently to justify the sending of American boys to fight in Europe.

This belief was revealed Tuesday when the first tabulation of the poll taken among the Wabash city readers of the newspaper was completed.

Of the 2,350 ballots distributed inside Wabash, 712, or approximately 30 percent, have been returned at present, and additional returns are expected in the next day.

Each ballot contained answers for both the husband and wife, so that the 712 returned ballots contained a total of 1,306 votes which were divided as follows: "No," 85.5 percent; "yes," 11.5 percent.

The question asked was, "President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie both promised last fall not to send American boys to fight in Europe unless the United States is attacked. Do you think the circumstances today have so changed as to justify a departure from these pledges?"

Of the 624 votes cast by men, 541, or 87.6 percent were "no," while 83, or 12.4 percent, were "yes."

Women readers showed greater opposition to the war trend, balloting 615 to 67 against any departure from the campaign pledges of last fall. The percentage ran 90.2 percent "no" and 9.8 percent "yes."

Among the comments written on the ballots by citizens, indicating the deep feeling that has been engendered by the war issue, were the following:

"Please publish these facts in the paper and let the people know how the United States stands. F. D. R. wants folks to think the Germans are coming."

"Why not let the President of the United States and Congress decide? I believe they understand what is needed better than either of us."

"While conditions have changed, it is always poor policy to make promises when one cannot control the conditions under which they are made."

"Both Roosevelt and Willkie have pursued a course that will inevitably lead to war. Millions of youths will be sacrificed to the gods of wealth."

"He (Roosevelt) is sure frightened by Hitler, ha, ha!"

"It seems funny to me that we send all the fools to the White House and leave all the smart men in Wabash as newsmen that can't run a little paper."

"We do not want to send our boys overseas. We did that once. We value their lives more than anything else."

"Absolutely not. This is their war, and we should keep out of it as far as sending our boys over there is concerned."

"Stay out of war."

"We will be left holding the bag after it is all over anyway, so why kill a lot of men on top of it."

"Hell, no."

"Wilson kept us out of war, so F. D. R. will keep us out? Nuts, let Britain get licked, then we get ours in the neck."

"The pledges were no good when they were made."

(Those voting in the poll felt free to express themselves, inasmuch as the ballots were unsigned.)

WABASH PLAIN DEALER,
Wabash, Ind., July 8, 1941.

Mr. FOREST A. HARNESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARNESS: The results on our recent war poll are as follows:

		Percent
Ballots sent out	2,350	
Ballots returned	920	39.1
Total vote cast	1,682	
Yes	196	11.6
No	1,487	88.4
Number of men voting	807	
Yes	102	12.6
No	701	87.4
Number of women voting	876	
Yes	89	10.1
No	786	89.9

In our June 3 issue we carried a story regarding the first tabulation. Enclosed is a marked copy.

Very truly yours,
LERA MAE DELAUTER, *Secretary.*

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWNSEND CLUB, OF CARTHAGE, MO.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record I include therein a resolution recently adopted by the Townsend Club of Carthage, Mo. I also request that a petition, accompanying said resolution, signed by 2,016 residents of Jasper County, Mo., and praying for passage of H. R. 1036 be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

GREETINGS: The members of the Carthage Townsend Club, uniting in a plea that the Congress of the United States enact legislation providing pensions adequate not only for the American standard of living for the aged but as well, and more so, for national recovery, giving the youth of our land assured employment, have adopted the following resolution: That—

"Whereas the members of the Carthage, Mo., Townsend Club No. 1 are in all sincerity convinced that a uniform Federal pension for the aged, based on citizenship and the age limit, and not on conditions of need, should be enacted; and that

"Whereas the outstanding issues confronting our Nation today are the need of an efficient social-security program on a pay-as-you-go basis, the circulation of buying power constantly in every section of the country, and guaranteed jobs for the millions of our unemployed, principally of the younger generation; and that

"Whereas the answer to these perplexing problems is not readily to be found in the ability of the States to raise sufficient revenues to finance the distribution of the wealth necessary for the elimination of distress and for adequate national recovery; and that

"Whereas the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) now in committee provides that a general Federal tax, known as the gross-income tax, be levied, the returns from which to be divided pro rata and paid to all eligible citizens of the United States who have reached the age of 60 years or over: Now and therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Carthage, Mo., Townsend Club No. 1, in regular session here assembled in the Jasper County Courthouse, Saturday afternoon, June 21, 1941, with the highest regard for the citizenry of our national legislative body, do appeal to the Congress of the United States to give earnest and conscientious consideration of our appeal that the principles of the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) be enacted into a law of the land."

Praying for divine guidance.

THE CARTHAGE TOWNSEND CLUB,
HENRY EASSON, *President.*
MRS. FLORENCE GOULD, *Secretary.*

Addendum. These resolutions are accompanied by a roll of petitions representing an overwhelming voting strength in this community favoring the Townsend plan.

Federal Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, why is it so difficult to pin the national administration down on this important question: What is to be done about the thousands of unemployed in the United States, particularly in the face of predictions of sharply rising price increases?"

I have asked many persons in Government service just such a question, but I cannot get a logical, sensible answer.

We seem to be in a worse paradox than ever. During the depression there was a constant cry that people were starving in the land of plenty; that farmers' crops were rotting while people in the city, unable to find employment, were going hungry.

Now we have a spectacle in the greatest industrial activity in our national history, and in all important industrial key cities there is perpetual demand for more workers, skilled and otherwise. Meanwhile there are thousands of persons in countless American inland villages and cities anxious and willing to work and in these communities are many idle factories, with rusting machinery. If we had more common sense in our national-defense plan and less personality and statement making some of the important work could be assigned to these communities and these people.

But more important still is the question of how the poor are to cope with the rising prices. Leon Henderson, Federal Price Administrator, has told the press in Washington that living is bound to increase during the national emergency.

Many of the poor are able to eke out 90 meals per month, but with the prices rising they are confronted with the prospect of having fewer and smaller meals.

This is no theory developed by a dreamer sitting behind a mahogany desk in Washington—this is an actual fact and unless the Federal Government does something and does it definitely and quickly, it is not discharging its first obligation—of serving the people of our own land.

NORTH AMERICAN PLANE PLANT RETURNED TO PRIVATE OPERATION

By Executive order dated July 2, President Roosevelt directed the Secretary of War to return to Inglewood, Calif., plant of North American Aviation, Inc., to private operation. The Army took control of the plant by Presidential order on June 9, after other efforts to terminate a strike were unsuccessful.

CIVIL-SERVICE JOBS OPEN

Applications for the following positions can be had by writing to my office: Executive officer, $8,000; chief administrative officer, $6,500; principal administrative officer, $5,600; senior administrative officer, $4,600; administrative officer, $3,800; junior Public Health nurse, $1,800; farmer-fieldman, $2,600, and assistant messenger, $1,080.

ATTENTION BLONDES

The War Department announced human hair is not being purchased by the Army. The Department stated it had received many requests for information concerning the sale of human hair as a result of a newspaper story that blonde human hair was needed by the Army in the manufacture of certain instruments.

SILK STOCKINGS AND PERMANENT WAVES

O. P. M. Conservation Chief McConnell told his press conference that many luxury and common items will not be

available to "both the rich and the poor" during the emergency. He said:

Silk used in parachutes will make silk stockings more scarce, women will have fewer permanent waves, cosmetics, and creams, because the ingredients are needed for national defense.

ICELAND

It is about the size of Kentucky, 40,000 square miles (only one-fourth habitable), mountains, lava fields, glaciers, and high plateaus sloping to coastal lowlands, no mineral resources, nearly all water power—estimated at 2,500,000 horsepower—remains unharnessed. Reykjavik, the largest city with a population of 36,100, is the capital. The entire population of 120,000, almost entirely of pure Scandinavian stock, literally lives off the seas, as fish and fish products constitute about 85 percent of all exports. Only about one-half of 1 percent of the total area is cultivated, and short summers limit crops largely to hay and potatoes; on large tracts of grass lands, sheep raising is important; altogether 36 percent of the population derives its living from agriculture, while 30 percent gets its living from the fishing and fish-products industry. The fishing trade was severely affected by the Spanish civil war; Italy, Spain, and Portugal took 52 percent of all Icelandic exports in 1929, but only 15 percent in 1939.

Based on figures for 1939, Iceland's foreign trade: Imports, $10,879,000, with 22 percent from the United Kingdom, 21 percent from Denmark, 16 percent from Germany; exports, $12,294,000, with 17 percent to the United Kingdom, 11 percent to Denmark, 11 percent to Germany, and 11 percent to the United States. Previously United States trade with Iceland was largely by transshipment over Hamburg and Copenhagen, but in November 1939 direct shipping connections were established.

TWENTY-ONE-YEAR-OLD DRAFTEES

Selective Service National Headquarters announced the 21-year-old men who registered for Selective Service on July 1 will be integrated for induction among previous registrants with order numbers larger than the last inductee of their local board, rather than placed ahead of or after the older registrants on their local-board lists. The new registrants will be integrated proportionately in the order to be determined by a national lottery to be held in Washington within the next few weeks, Selective Service Headquarters said.

WHEAT UNDER THE A. A. A.

The Department of Agriculture announced wheat farmers desiring to avoid payment of wheat-marketing-quota penalties by delivering excess wheat to the Secretary of Agriculture, may now deliver the actual wheat to the treasurer of their county A. A. A. committee, in cases where it is "impracticable to deliver the wheat to an elevator or warehouse and obtain a receipt." The regulations previously provided the farmer must first deliver the wheat to an elevator or warehouse, obtain a receipt, and then deliver this receipt to the treasurer of the county A. A. A. committee, the Department said.

UNCLE SAM'S POCKETBOOK

The official Daily Treasury Statement of June 30 showed the financial condition of the Treasury since July 1, 1940, to be:

Expenditures	$12,710,000,000
Receipts	7,607,000,000
In the hole	5,103,000,000

The gross Federal debt on that date was $48,961,443,535.

Your per capita share of that debt is $372.58.

MORE MONEY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The House on Wednesday passed another deficiency appropriation bill calling for more than $800,000,000. Most of it is for national defense. The debate developed the fact that over 300 dollar-a-year men are working in the emergency production administration. Charges that they may represent big firms which get big contracts, are made. In private life they get from ten thousand to a hundred thousand dollars a year. For patriotic reasons, they work for Uncle Sam for a dollar a year. If their firms make excess profits, it is felt that taxes will even things up. Anyway one agency of government is now trying to stop these firms from raising prices and if they make big profits it will have to be on the basis of volume. To stop profiteering rackets which were prevalent in the last war, is a job which Congress has asked the administration to perform right now.

OFFICIAL VISITORS TO THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. and Mrs. Edward A. Bundy, Thompsonville; Harry Holland, Marion; Neil J. Robertson, West Frankfort; Evan M. Elkins and E. K. Elkins, Carbondale; Paul Bussler, West Frankfort.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY VARIOUS MICHIGAN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Exchange Club, of Pontiac, Mich.; Detroit-Strathmoor Kiwanis Club, Detroit, Mich.; Lincoln Park Exchange Club, of Lincoln Park, Mich.; Strathmoor Business Association, Detroit, Mich.; and the Bergian-American Business Men's Association, Detroit, Mich., urging the enactment of legislation which will bring about the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway:

Resolution to the Congress of the United States of America from the Exchange Club of Pontiac, Mich.; Detroit-Strathmoor Kiwanis Club, Detroit, Mich.; Lincoln Park Exchange Club of Lincoln Park, Mich.; Strathmoor Business Association, Detroit, Mich.; Belgian-American Business Men's Association, Detroit, Mich.

Whereas the Detroit industrial area and the State of Michigan are a part of the great midwestern section of our country in which 40,000,000 people live; and

Whereas a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives the people of the United States of a direct outlet to the ocean; and

Whereas the deepening of the channel in the St. Lawrence River will enable us to make our full contribution to the needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas our national defense requires full utilization of the potentialities of the Great Lakes shipbuilding; and

Whereas investigation has shown that active shipyards on the Great Lakes could build and the proposed-deepened channel could pass all naval ships except battleships and airplane carriers; and

Whereas, the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River provide an unparalleled natural highway of 2,350 miles from the heart of our Nation to the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas a deep waterway from the heart of our industrial, mineral, and agricultural region is vital to our Nation and a bulwark of strength to our defense; and

Whereas engineering surveys made by our Government have approved the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project and forecast a benefit to the entire Nation; and

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his message to the seaway conference recently held in Detroit, called to the attention of the American people the importance of completing the St. Lawrence seaway as soon as possible, not only as a national-defense measure but as a means of bringing a new era to the country's most important agricultural and industrial regions: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Exchange Club of Pontiac, Mich.; Detroit-Strathmoor Kiwanis Club, Detroit, Mich.; Lincoln Park Exchange Club, of Lincoln Park, Mich.; Strathmoor Business Association, Detroit, Mich.; and Belgian-American Business Men's Association, Detroit, Mich., That we do formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation which will bring about the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America and to the Michigan Senators and Representatives in our National Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

EXCHANGE CLUB, of Pontiac, Mich.
DETROIT-STRATHMOOR KIWANIS CLUB, Detroit, Mich.
LINCOLN PARK EXCHANGE CLUB, of Lincoln Park, Mich.
STRATHMOOR BUSINESS ASSOCIATION, Detroit, Mich.
BELGIAN-AMERICAN BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION, Detroit, Mich.

JUNE 30, 1941.

Rededication—July 4, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE H. BENDER, OF OHIO

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the Mutual network on the evening of July 4, 1941:

This is the most critical Fourth of July since the year 1917. The difficulties which face our Republic cannot be exaggerated. Our people are standing on the brink of war, and the outcome of that war is shrouded in uncertainty. In our own country, we are troubled by divided counsel. The struggle between our national administration, pulling us toward direct involvement in wars across the oceans, and 125,000,000 people who do not want that war, is so tense that it can be felt everywhere. As we read the terrible headlines, we can understand why our people hesitate. The confusion of world affairs tells us to move slowly. Today's friends become tomorrow's enemies. Aid to suffering Finland has overnight become aid to aggressor Germany. Our policy toward Russia becomes more obscure than ever before. No wonder we are at a loss for words. No wonder the Nation is perplexed.

But there are still some truths to which we Americans can cling in this agonizing hour. Despite the cries of interventionists, isolationists, New Dealers, reactionaries, and all the rest, there is still something solid beneath our feet. This Fourth of July must serve to recall these things to mind.

Let us remember that no matter what tomorrow may bring, we still live in the United States of America. Our country was born from a deep-rooted abhorrence of all that Europe represented. It grew from roots watered by a determination to leave the hatreds of the Old World behind. It took its origin in a fierce struggle for human friendship, for tolerance, for the right to live as free men. We know that the narrowness and bigotry of old Europe was hard to escape. It cropped up again and again in the history of the American Colonies. But when those colonies had grown to manhood, when they brought forth their Declarations of Independence and their Constitution of the United States, the battle was won.

We have destroyed the last vestiges of tyranny which bound us to the slavery of Europe. Today the nations of the Old World are battling again. They are killing innocent men, women, and children by every foul means of which the human mind is capable. Hitler's divisions marching upon Stalin have cleared the atmosphere. They are not seeking to replace one system of life by another. It is no longer a struggle of totalitarians against free peoples. It is the same old story of world dominion. Men bent upon mastering the earth are marching hypnotized robots into the jaws of death.

We in America remember those marching armies. Those armies marched in Europe before our Declaration of Independence. We heard their echoes in our own country back in the days of the French and Indian War. We have heard them all too frequently since. Our country was forced into the Napoleonic wars in 1812. We were fighting European battles again in 1917. We may be fighting them again unless the American people decide the issue otherwise.

The Old World is determined to keep the new in its power. It does not easily relinquish its grasp upon our thinking. It is our task to see to it that the Western World does not surrender. This Fourth of July should be the day when all of us realize the distance which separates our continent from Europe. It is not a question of physical space. It is not the Providential blessing of the Atlantic and the Pacific of which we speak. Not these physical things, but the things that are of the spirit mark us as a people apart.

Today, on the holiday of our national redemption, everyone of us should reread the immortal documents of our history. Every one of us should seek to understand the meaning of our civilization. This is the only land in the world where men have conceived the ideals of our Declaration of Independence. Here alone is there a Nation which holds those truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Here is the land which long ago answered the challenge of totalitarian Germany, Russia, and Italy. On July 4, 1776, we told the world that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Every charge which we can make against the dictators today was made in that Declaration of Independence. We submitted the facts to a candid world, and among those facts, the men who wrote our freedom into law told the world the story of our grievance.

The people of America did not stop with this statement of their troubles. They were so eager to assure themselves an end to the European system that they refused to ratify the Constitution until it had wiped out the last traces of the Old World. So few of us today remember the Bill of Rights. We know vaguely that they constitute a guarantee of our fredeom, but the words themselves should be part of our Fourth of July. These words were not the talk of idealists. They were practical terms, written by men who were talking specifically. Apply them to Europe today, and see how far apart our civilizations stand.

The first provision of the Bill of Rights once and for all time proclaimed that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. No European nation has ever known such freedom. No state on the continent has ever had a free press to speak its mind, to criticize the government, to protest against wrong.

The second amendment to the Constitution declared that a well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

No state in Europe would dare to place weapons in the hands of its people today. Houses are searched before the rulers of the state dare march through a street. Only in America does this freedom persist.

And to spare us the enervating influence of an army constantly engaged in politics, forever interfering with private affairs, the people of our early days wrote into the Bill of Rights their third amendment. No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

How the suffering peoples of Europe and Asia would welcome a law like this today.

And how would they react to the fourth provision of our Bill of Rights. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

It is a far cry from the Gestapo of Herr Hitler or the Ogpu of Josef Stalin to the protection of these words.

And the sanctity of human life guaranteed by the fifth amendment to our Constitution strikes a note which separates us from Europe no less certain than the oceans. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

The right to speedy trial, to meet the witnesses face to face, to enjoy the privilege of trial by jury, to demand fair treatment and normal punishment—all these are the rights guaranteed the American people by the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. But our people were not content with these safeguards alone. They wanted to be sure that the powers they had seen abused by the governments of Europe were not abused here. And so they reserved for themselves in the last provision of the Bill of Rights, every power not specifically delegated to their Federal Government.

This was the structure of our New World. It cut a channel between our point of view and the system of Europe deeper than the Grand Canyon. There can be no compromise between the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, and the hatreds, suspicions, and tyrannies of the Old World.

All these things are with us on this Fourth of July in the troubled year of our Lord 1941. They must continue to be with us, no matter what happens across the seas. For these are ideals which have become real. These are principles which have been translated into our daily lives. To defend them, everyone who glories in the name American would stand up and fight—not for the preservation of a feudal Europe, bent on self-destruction, not to perpetuate a system of hatreds which has driven men from their homes more than 200 times in 2,000 years of history to kill their fellowmen, but to keep this American way of living.

This is a day for rededication. It is a day for every citizen of America to reaffirm his loyalty to the traditions of our land. As we look across the seas, we know that we have achieved something which no other nation has ever known. Alone among the peoples of the earth, we are free. Free to think, to act, to speak, to write, to do as we choose to

a greater extent than any other men and women in the history of mankind.

In this country, all of us agree on the basic fundamental principles which guide our lives. To Republicans, to Democrats, to political dissenters, the Bill of Rights must remain sacred ground. So long as America remains worthy of its name, these rights will continue inviolate. When once a political party challenges the validity of our basic freedoms, our Nation will cease to be America. By the grace of God, we trust and pray that our people will never alter the human guaranties which form our most precious heritage—freedom for all men.

Our people in America face many dangers on the Fourth of July 1941. There is the menace of physical warfare. But no less dangerous is the spreading danger of poisonous hatreds which engulf the world. Everywhere in the world, these poisons are pouring into the blood stream of unsuspecting men and women. America must fight this disease. Whether it calls itself fascism, nazism, communism; whether it takes the form of Berlin or Leningrad, tyranny is still the same. It crushes mankind everywhere. It destroys every value for which men live. It makes life barren and meaningless. Everywhere it moves it creates suspicion and animosity. People begin to regard their neighbors with suspicion. They look upon their fellow citizens with an eye to complaints. Human kindness crushed to earth is slow in rising.

Here in our free Nation we have built a household anchored in tolerance. That tolerance extends to all men who love this Nation. It reaches out to all those who come to our shores seeking the right to live in peace and happiness. Live and let live in America means live and help live. Perhaps we are still idealists in a world which looks with contempt upon ideals. But our ideals are not far above us. We have brought them out of the skies to dwell among men.

Today the idealisms of America are under fire. Europe never knew them. Yet Europe is seeking their destruction. Whatever may be the cost, we cannot permit that destruction.

On this Fourth of July, we in America owe a solemn duty to the world. Ours is not the cause of oppression. It is not the love of conquest. It is not the will to hate. We have might; we have strength. Within our armies lies the potential force of a resolute Nation. Our cannons can roar. Our planes can fly into the skies, unlimited in their numbers. Our ships can rule the waves.

We do not choose to terrorize the earth with the strength of our arms. We seek a different answer to the problems which assail the world. We visualize our Nation as the leader in a battle to reestablish the lost hopes and ideals of a peace-starved world.

Everywhere on earth today, men, women, little children have forgotten goodness. They have lost the memory of tolerance, kindness, justice, and love. Let it be said in the United States of America on this Fourth of July, on this anniversary of our freedom, that here we have not forgotten.

Ours must be the mission of peace. Each year on this day, we rededicate ourselves and our Nation to the preservation of freedom. That preservation may prove harder in 1941 than it has ever proven before. We shall not fail. This great Nation, the last outpost of true civilization, cannot fail because it must not fail.

Congress Should Act To Save the Legitimate Stage From Extinction in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

LETTER FROM EDMUND PLOHN, MANAGER NATIONAL THEATER

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Edmund Plohn, manager of the National Theater, Washington, D. C., who presents reasons why he believes H. R. 1047 should be passed by Congress:

NATIONAL THEATER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RANDOLPH: Under the constitutional right to petition, I am addressing you in behalf of H. R. 1047, favorably reported by your House District of Columbia Committee, and awaiting some conclusion by the Congress.

In the present national emergency we all realize that essential defense legislation must hav the right-of-way, and that much of the time of a filling and patriotic Congress is devoted to imperative appropriation bills needed to carry out administration policy.

Consequently, we of the professional theater are indeed gratified that your committee has moved toward enactment a resolution which will help remedy a situation, slowly but surely strangling the so-called legitimate stage in Washington. Unless Congress furnishes relief, the stage—or that part of it we call the spoken drama—is threatened with extinction in the National Capital. It simply cannot survive with its main avenue of profit barricaded by a law, completely idealistic, and completely impractical in today's world.

As the only representative of the professional legitimate theater in Washington, I have a keen appreciation that the majority of Congress—in both the Senate and the House—are interested in the stage and its people. I know that in the promotion of the general welfare and morale they would not endorse a ruinous curb on any legitimate business or enterprise, nor one that adds to unemployment. Yet that is what the existing child-labor law, in operation and practice, imposes on the Washington theater.

It can only be regarded as regrettable that an amendment to the child-labor law which will lift this repressive influence should confront opposition which beclouds the real issue. Let us examine the situation from a realistic standpoint.

The condition which confronts the Washington theater with relations to bookings for the 1941–42 season opening in September is one that will recur frequently while we are prohibited from bringing in attractions which employ juveniles in the cast. There are at the present time in New York City five plays or musical comedies of such overwhelming popularity it is fair to assume, that they can look forward to highly successful engagements in those road cities which are permitted to book them. They are:

Life with Father. A delightful play by Russell Crouse and Howard Lindsay (founded upon Clarence Day's novel), which is in its second year on Broadway, ran a year in Chicago, and has enjoyed record-breaking engagements in Boston, Philadelphia, and Detroit. So clean it could be played in a Sunday school. Barred in Washington.

Watch on the Rhine. A play by Lillian Hellman, which won the 1941 Pulitzer prize and was also given the season's highest honors by the New York critics' circle. It was the ardent wish of Playwright Hellman to open this drama here, but because of legal curbs it was forced to play elsewhere.

Lady in the Dark. A musical play by Moss Hart, starring Gertrude Lawrence, and the outstanding hit of the late New York season.

Panama Hattie. The most successful of the 1941 musical comedies on Broadway, with a book by Herbert Fields and B. G. De Sylva, and music by Cole Porter.

Pal Joey. A George Abbott production of a Rodgers and Hart musical comedy, one of the reigning New York hits.

These are attractions of proven box-office magnitude, and it is a reasonable assumption that if they were shown in Washington they would attract widespread patronage. The receipts from these plays could well represent the difference between operating over the season at a profit, or facing a deficit. To deny them engagements here must inevitably involve dark weeks, meaning periods when the National Theater must be closed, with a consequent loss of employment to more than 60 of the personnel, back stage and front.

From the standpoint of Federal revenue, the legal barrier which prohibits these plays on the Washington stage denies the United States Treasury an estimated $25,000 or more in ticket-tax income. In these days when the national economy is being stretched to provide funds for all-out defense, and when Congress is studying every source and resource to bolster the national income, I submit this sum is worth consideration.

H. R. 1047, if and when passed by Congress, would alleviate a condition causing economic distress in the Washington legitimate theater. May I say that it was drawn up with the cooperation of Dr. Frank W. Ballou, head of the District of Columbia schools, and he approves its terms. It also has the endorsement of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who (in a January press conference) said: "That she felt that the law barring children from the stage in Washington should be modified, that children should be allowed to appear, provided there were certain requirements to safeguard their health and make it possible for them to continue their education."

It is the contention of the proponents of H. R. 1047 that the resolution provides the safeguards suggested by the First Lady, and the measure has the further endorsement of:

The National Child Labor Committee.
The United States Department of Labor.
The Board of District Commissioners.
The District Budget Bureau.
The District Corporation Counsel.
The District Bar Association.
The District Board of Education.

Now, I submit to the Members of Congress, that these organizations, and the people who voice their will, are as jealous as anybody in America that the health, the morals, and the general welfare of juveniles making their liv-

ing in the theater, should be surrounded by every safeguard and zealously protected. Nor does the organized theater have any desire to do other than give them the most elevating environment. Any study of testimony taken at the hearings on these measures will reveal that the average child of the stage is well cared for in the matter of education and moral surroundings. Usually their parents travel with them. As a rule they are especially gifted or talented, with incomes far greater than that of the average juvenile.

For those who have not had an opportunity to attend the hearings, or familiarize themselves with the testimony, may I recount briefly what the measure provides.

It permits minors, at least 14 years old, to take part in professional theatrical performance in the District of Columbia.

It stipulates that a child shall not appear on the stage after 11 p. m., or more than 6 hours, or two performances in 1 day, or more than 6 days a week, or more than 24 hours in 1 week.

Under its terms the Board of Education is authorized to issue permits. But only to minor children who have completed eight grades in elementary instruction, or their equivalent.

Permission to appear must be sought at least 14 days in advance of such an appearance.

The board, or its agent, may issue a permit if satisfied that the parent or guardian of such minor has made adequate provision for the educational instruction of such minor, and for safeguarding his or her health, and for the proper supervision of such minor.

This measure, it sems to me, throws a legal mantle of protection over professional children. The Board of Education has full power to examine and approve the conditions under which stage minors work, and absolute power to withhold the necessary permission if there is the slightest breach of good taste.

I need not recount at great length at this time what a depressing influence the present child labor law has been on theater operation in Washington. Over the years the National Theater has lost as many as 100 attractions, desirable for their entertainment value, but barred by this unjust restriction. Such attractions as the Pulitzer prize play, The Old Maid, has never been permited in Washington.

New plays constantly skip Washington because they are unable to meet the conditions, and prime hits are all-too-often barred. Any examination of the books would show that "dark weeks" and consequent unemployment for stage hands, musicians, ticket-office personnel, ushers, cleaners, and executives can be directly traced to booking tangles enforced by District regulations.

The legitimate theater in Washington asks only for reasonable security and the opportunity to function without unnecessary burdens that add to economic distress. Its primary purpose is to furnish entertainment, but like all other business enterprises, it is fueled by the profit motive. To ask that it continue to struggle against handicaps which are palpably unjust is to jeopardize the future of the stage in Washington.

As I interpret the will of Congress, expressed in national-defense measures and other legislation, I perceive an intent to preserve the American way of life and, if possible, to improve it. The amusement industry, insofar as I can speak for it, subscribes to that laudable aim. It will cooperate in every way that the Government requests to carry out the national idea and promote health and happiness. In that connection it would like to swell the National Treasury with amusement taxes, that must remain uncollected while this barrier is on the books.

May I thank the members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for the patience and generosity they have shown the proponents of H. R. 1047. If their fellow Members of Congress show the same understanding and consideration, I feel sure of success.

Most respectfully,

EDMUND PLOHN,
Manager, National Theater.

Communists In C. I. O. Defy Our Courts—Violate Our Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 2d of May attention was called to the strike against the West Penn Hospital of Pittsburgh, instigated and carried on by the Hospital Workers' Local Union No. 255 of the State County and Municipal Workers of America, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. David Kanes, Robert Weinstein, Foss Baker, John Donnelly, and John W. Filer, using communistic methods and procedure seemed to be the directing leaders and spokesmen.

At that time the files of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were cited, showing the prison and communistic records of some of these leaders and it seemed clear that the strike was instigated and carried on by the Communists. The union and its officers maintained pickets and the pickets assaulted and beat men—yes, women who sought to enter the hospital for the purpose of aiding and caring for the sick and the unfortunate in this State and charitable institution.

It was the purpose of the Communists in this union to use this strike and the unionization of this hospital as the opening wedge to force their organization upon the other 25 hospitals in Allegheny County and then to extend their organization throughout the country until they were in a position to control the services rendered in all hospitals in the United States.

One of the ringleaders responsible for the conduct of the pickets and who directed their violence was John W. Filer.

The attention of the House was called to the fact that this man Filer, prominent in the union, as long ago as January of 1921 was sent to the Morganza Reformatory for a period of 2½ years for breaking and entering. It appeared that later and in 1926 he was sentenced to the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., for 1½ years for deserting the Army. That in February of 1931, he was charged with a $5,400 robbery, convicted and sentenced to serve a term of from 5 to 10 years in Western Penitentiary.

Shortly after this exposure of his record, he resigned from the union and gave up his position as an employee of the Mayview Hospital, a State institution in Allegheny County. The hospitals of Allegheny County sought and obtained a preliminary injunction which restrained the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board, its officers and agents from aiding the strikers or the pickets. This on the ground, among others, that the hospitals were in part at least, operated as charitable and as State-supported institutions.

The unlawful activities of the pickets and the Communists who were aiding them were condemned in no uncertain terms by the court and the decision of the local court was later affirmed by the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. A final decree was entered on June 11, 1941, decreeing, among other things, that the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board and its officers should not interfere with the operation of the hospital or entertain complaints filed by Local 255 against the hospital and further decreed that the union itself, its agents, and officers should not in any way interfere with the employees of the hospital or with the management in its operation of the hospital.

Although the acts of the union, its officers, and those pickets were unlawful and were forbidden by the court, the city welfare director of Pittsburgh, Clarence C. Klein, according to newspaper reports, granted a leave of absence to John M. Kennedy, a male asylum attendant at City Home and Hospital, Mayview. Kennedy obtained this leave of absence, which was later extended, on the theory that he needed the time to attend to his personal business.

Investigation reveals that Kennedy used this leave of absence for the purpose of assisting the strikers and appearing in their defense at police hearings when they were charged with violence.

Investigation also reveals that Klein failed to notify the Civil Service Commission of Kennedy's absence and the extension granted. The Civil Service Commission has stated that it had no record of Kennedy's leave.

During the strike automobiles loaded with clubs descended upon helpless women employees of the West Penn Hospital, who were waiting for streetcars or private conveyances to take them to their homes, and without provocation assaulted and beat them.

Notwithstanding the fact that the highest court in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania ordered the union to desist and refrain from interfering in any way with the operations of the hospital or with its hiring of employees, on the 26th day of June the union held a meeting at Sitz's Hall, 3701 Fifth Avenue, in the city of Pittsburgh. At this meeting, which was a secret meeting, officials of the union, though they knew of the injunction, announced defiance of the courts, and it was publicly stated, by Donnelly

who was backed up by Kanes, at this meeting that a drive would be instigated to unionize all the Allegheny County hospitals and that when such drive began it was the intention of the union to resort to "goon squads" to accomplish their purpose. It was further stated at this meeting that when the strike was called no employee was going to get into any hospital in Allegheny County without a union card.

It should not be forgotten that this strike at the West Penn Hospital was a strike against the State itself and that it was unlawful under the fair, liberal, labor law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Nor should it be forgotten that the acts of violence advocated at this meeting of June 26 were in violation of the criminal laws of the State, had been expressly forbidden by the courts of the State, and that those present at the meeting—and there were some 61 persons present—knew that the course of conduct which was there advocated was unlawful and a defiance of the State and county court.

If Kanes carries out the plans formulated at the meeting of June 26, and if the authorities of Pittsburgh are not on guard, he will cause some sort of an incident to be created which will give him and the Communists who seek to create disorder here their much-sought opportunity to instigate and carry on a riot.

Whether the hospitals of Pittsburgh will be able to operate, to continue to minister to the sick and unfortunate, depends entirely upon the attitude of the officials of the city of Pittsburgh, of the county of Allegheny, and of the State of Pennsylvania.

The fact that the mayor, who holds membership in the American Civil Liberties Union, is running for reelection, that the district attorney is running for judge of the court of common pleas of Allegheny County should in no way prevent these gentlemen from enforcing the law and giving protection to the respectable, peaceful, God-fearing people of the city of Pittsburgh. There is now no uncertainty as to the law, the Court of last resort has spoken. It has condemned the conduct of Kanes and Local Union 255. The citizens of Pittsburgh should keep an eye on Kanes and on Donnelly. These gentlemen intimated at the secret meeting of June 26 that those who sought to continue to minister to the sick and the unfortunate, the poor and the needy at the West Penn and in the other hospitals of Allegheny County might expect violence and serious disorder.

Perhaps they were encouraged to believe that they could continue their campaign of violence and of terror, of intimidation of the hospital employees by the fact that in the earlier days of the strike their lawlessness was not prevented.

Perhaps they relied upon the fact that the Mayor of Pittsburgh did not prevent the unprovoked beating of honest citizens whose only offense was that they sought work.

There is an old saying that men are to be judged by the company they keep: that birds of a feather flock together. Perhaps the fact that the Mayor holds membership in the American Civil Liberties Union, which all too often has been the champion of lawlessness; too often ready to defend those charged with subversive activities, is one of the reasons for their defiance of law and order.

The American Civil Liberties Union has many times been condemned as Communistic. Roger Baldwin, its present head, was convicted and served time in the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., for counseling evasion, during the World War, of the draft law.

It is no credit to the mayor of Pittsburgh that he finds himself a member of such an organization as the American Civil Liberties Union.

It is no credit to him that in this strike against the hospital, against the State; a strike which brings not only inconvenience but actual suffering to the unfortunate; he finds himself alined in that controversy with John W. Filer, Kanes, and the Communist Party.

The citizens should keep an eye on their candidates for office as well as upon all those now in office who are charged with the enforcement of the law.

The Nation is extending aid to the Communists in Russia, but there is no reason whatever why the Communists in Pittsburgh, in Allegheny County, in the State of Pennsylvania, or anywhere else in these United States should not obey the law of the land, show respect for the courts, and the rights of American citizens.

Notwithstanding the order of the court, plans were made at this meeting to organize the other hospitals of the county and it was openly stated that whatever was necessary to bring about that organization would be done.

Note this defiance of the law of the court. Here is a group among which were Communists, who advocate the overthrow of this Government by force, who announced as their purpose, actions which were in direct violation of the order of the court. It should be remembered, as will be later pointed out, that when the pickets got into difficulty because they attempted by force to prevent employees working at the hospital, the union and Kanes ran to the police and to the courts for the protection which they denied to peaceful American citizens.

It was at this meeting of June 26, that Mr. Kanes advised that Mr. Donnelly, president of the union, had been delegated to attend the sessions of the American Youth Congress, which, it may well be recalled, has been charged with being a communistic movement. It was at this meeting of this communistic organization that Mr. Donnelly, according to Mr. Kanes, was to give a report of the strike against the West Penn Hospital and of the plans which the union had in mind for the organizing of other hospitals of Allegheny County.

The fact that the Communists in Local 255 should send its president to make a report of its strike against the hospital to a communistic organization and to there ask for the support of the Communists to carry on its organizing drive against other hospitals is further proof, if proof be needed, of the communistic influence back of this strike.

It was at this same secret meeting, held on the 26th day of June, and where defiance of the court was planned, that Mr. Kirchfield, who was then living at the employees' quarters of the West Penn Hospital but who, out on strike, speaking from the floor, told of his plans to assist in organizing the St. Francis Hospital. This in spite of the fact that such organizing activities had been forbidden by the highest court in the State of Pennsylvania.

More recently Kanes, whose pickets were guilty of molesting and beating women employees of the West Penn Hospital, has complained because hospital employees, when accosted, annoyed and threatened, have attempted to defend themselves against his pickets. Mr. Kane can hand it out, especially if he hires some poor ignorant picket to assume the post of danger and commit the assault, but he just cannot take it when some of his distributors of violence, of broken heads and black eyes, meet an employee who hands back some of the same sort of treatment. Kanes, like all advocates of violence by others, squawks when he gets a dose of his own medicine. He appeals to the courts, to the police, for protection, though he has no scruples whatever about beating and intimidating those who seek employment at the hospital. It makes a difference to Mr. Kanes whether he is on the receiving or the giving end. He is a big, strong man. He is a courageous man when he hires a picket to beat up a woman, helpless and defenseless, but he whimpers and he cries and he runs to the police, and he appeals to the courts for the enforcement of the law when one of his thugs gets it on the chin.

This man Kanes did not do so well over in the neighboring city of McKeesport. He went over there to organize a strike against the city, but Mayor George Lysle, of McKeesport, a man who has been mayor in a union town for some 30 years, would have none of him. The mayor exposed Kanes and his record befor the city council and as a result, so it is reported, Kanes was asked by the members of the local union of McKeesport to get out and to remain out.

What Pittsburgh, and for that matter every other community in these United States, needs is a strict enforcement of the law, respect for the courts, more officials like Mayor Lysle, of McKeesport. When once we have that, then these Communists will find themselves without influence or power.

Ignace Jan Paderewski—Now He Belongs to the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a résumé of the life and death of one of the world's most noble characters, a musical genius, and a great patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski. I dedicate this tribute to the liberty-loving people of Poland, and the lovers of liberty everywhere throughout the world, and especially to the Polish-American citizens of the United States who have made such splendid contributions to the stability and security of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, it is reported that when the Great Emancipator, President Abraham Lincoln, closed his eyes in death in the presence of his son Robert and members of his official family, his Secretary of War, Edwin McMasters Stanton, turned to the bereaved group around Lincoln's deathbed and said:

Now he belongs to the ages.

When Ignace Jan Paderewski closed his eyes in death on Sunday, June 29, 1941, no doubt there were millions of liberty-loving souls and music lovers throughout the world who reechoed Stanton's tribute to Lincoln, and said of Paderewski:

He now belongs to the ages.

Ignace Jan Paderewski was born in the Province of Podolia, then southwest Russia, in the village of Kurilovka, November 6, 1860. His father, though a man of some wealth and the administrator of large estates, was a rebel at heart, and a leader of numerous uprisings against Russian tyranny in 1863. For his activities he was arrested and exiled to Siberia when his famous son was scarcely 3 years old.

Paderewski's mother was the daughter of a university professor who was exiled by Russia after the war for independence against the Russians in 1830. An uncle of his mother's, who was a member of the cabinet of Poland, was murdered during that war against Russia. Little is known of his mother, who died a few months after the birth of her son. It is significant that Paderewski's blood on both sides rebelled against oppression. Hence the Polish genius was destined from youth to be a leader of free men.

From his mother, who was very musical, he inherited his musical talent that was destined to acclaim him as the world's greatest living pianist. Paderewski's father shaped his son's career by providing him with splendid teachers, one of whom was Michael Babinski, a Polish refugee who had fled to France after the disastrous war of 1830 and 1831. Later he returned to Poland after he was pardoned, and became the tutor of Paderewski from 1868 until his death.

He was in charge of shaping the education and assisted in the musical development of young Ignace Jan Paderewski. Being a great student of Polish history he did more to impress young Paderewski with the story of the internal struggle of Poland against ruthless invasion than any living being. How well he impressed his young pupil is recited in Paderewski's Memoirs, written by the great musician and patriot himself. He said:

When I was 10 years old I read the description of the Battle of Grunwald, which was fought in 1410 against the Knights of the Cross (then Germany) and which was a tremendous victory for the Poles. I conceived then the idea that as the year 1910 would be the five-hundredth anniversary of that victory, how wonderful it would be if I at that time could erect a monument for that great anniversary. I thought of that during the whole of my life. Years later I realized this dream. In 1910 I gave that monument to the city of Cracow.

The world is familiar with the progress made by Paderewski in the field of music. His father on his release from prison became his companion in his early days, and through the influence of the wealthy Count Chadkiewicz, young Paderewski was able to attend the Conservatory of Music at Warsaw. His talent attracted the attention of the memorable Polish actress Helena Modjeska. It was she who made possible the raising of funds for tutorship under the great Theodor Leschetizky, of whom Paderewski later said:

I learned more in 3 months' study in Vienna under Leschetizky than I had learned in the 24 years of my life to that time.

Beginning with this first public concert in Vienna, 1887–89, and in Prussia in 1888 he was soon on the way to success. He was triumphantly received in London, and reached the height of his ambition when he made his first concert appearance in New York City November 17, 1891. This was the beginning of the 20 concert tours he was to make in the United States of America up to his last public appearance in this country, when he returned for his final music tour in 1939.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that the language of music is international, and any one of us who has ever heard Paderewski play must have been impressed with the finesse with which he executed the difficult compositions, reflecting in his interpretations the patriotism and love of liberty he ever cherished. Like Victor Herbert there was something uncanny in his portrayal of the work of the masters and his exemplification of the very soul of his native land expressed musically by this genius.

The artist in Paderewski was second only to the patriot who took his place in world affairs and spent his money lavishly in behalf of his native Poland, organizing a Polish brigade in America to assist the fatherland, and emerged after the Treaty of Versailles as the Premier of the new-found Polish Republic.

He was a devout Roman Catholic, as was and is the great majority of Polish people. Faith in God spurred him on to great heights, and there is not recorded in his political activity any despicable act that characterizes some of the national political leaders in other lands.

It was under his leadership as Premier of Poland that he achieved amicable relations with Czechoslovakia and Latvia, and other nations born with the last World War. He obtained German and Austrian recognition of the new Polish Republic, and recognition by the United States Government of his native land. He was the recipient of many testimonials in this country as a tribute to his patriotism, and in 1926 received from the American Legion the Distinguished Service Medal in recognition of his contribution of $28,500, the receipt of four concerts, to the American Legion endowment fund.

The political difference between him and Marshal Pilsudski for a time was a severe blow to his prestige, but like all political differences between great leaders it did not detract in any way from his love for his native land, and his desire for a stable government.

In early June of 1939, after a physical collapse, Paderewski left the United States and arrived in France at the time when Poland and Germany were in the throes of altercation that led 3 months later to Hitler's invasion of Paderewski's native Poland. He organized a Polish defense fund in December 1939. After the rape of Poland by Hitler and Stalin, Paderewski became a member of the Polish National Commission, and it was his influence primarily as a member of the League of Nations that Soviet Russia was dropped from membership in that body.

Saddened by the turn of events in Europe, especially by the dismemberment of his native Poland, Paderewski once more journeyed to the United States, the place he loved second to his native land, and decided to make a permanent home on the soil of the free Republic. He remained with us until his death June 29, 1941.

Although physically weakened by his last illness, he was in spirit with the Polish delegation who called on the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, to discuss with him the plight of their native land, and to join with him in prayer, at which time the Holy Father said:

May Christ, who wept at the death of Lazarus and over the ruins of His fatherland, gather and some day compensate you for the tears you spill over the death of Poland, which will not die.

On the occasion of a testimonial dinner tendered to Ignace Jan Paderewski, Wednesday, May 16, 1928, under the auspices of the Kosciusko Foundation, held in the Hotel Commodore, New York City, in the presence of the President of the United States, the Governors of most of the States of the Union, clergymen, and laymen from all over the country, phrased a brilliant speech in response to the toast tendered to him with these words which were a splendid tribute coming from a great artist and a great patriot:

I thank you all who have so generously supported me during the long years of my artistic career, who have so bountifully rewarded my public services. I thank you all who have so nobly helped me and permitted

me to realize the patriotic dreams of my youth. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for having imparted magnitude and charm to this reunion, and by your presence enhanced the importance and the meaning of the present hour. But as you feel, think, and act, as you have always thought, felt, and acted in the spirit of your country, so let me incline my head with profound reverence and infinite gratitude before the sanctity and greatness of that spirit which has also done so much to restore to the Polish plough the ancient soil of my forefathers.

Our beloved national hero, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, has served your country unselfishly and usefully. Blessed be his name. But blessed be the name of every one who has served your country unselfishly and usefully. Blessed be whoever contributed to the enlightenment, to the happiness, to the mightiness of your people. Blessed be whoever added to the glory of that sacred symbol of your young Nation, "The Stars and Stripes," the flag that never retreats, in the folds of which we have found at last, hidden for over a hundred years, the independence of Poland.

With services befitting the great contribution made by Paderewski, all that is mortal of him was laid away temporarily in our National Cemetery at Arlington on July 5, 1941. The Nation accepts the responsibility of guarding the sacred dust of Paderewski until such time as his dust can be returned with proper pomp and ceremony to his native Poland at some future date. May God hasten the day a free Poland will stretch out her arms to welcome one of her greatest sons and take to her bosom his mortal remains. Until that day he will sleep in peace in the shadow of the tomb of our American unknown soldier, who may be an American boy of Polish ancestry, a race that had made such splendid contributions to the spiritual and material development of the United States of America.

Construction of Roads in Idaho With Federal Funds a Necessity for Greater Production of Strategic Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

LETTER FROM S. E. JOHNSON, ACTING DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS OF IDAHO

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a letter received from Mr. E. E. Johnson, acting director of highways of the State of Idaho, with reference to the necessity for the allocation of Federal funds for the construction of roads into latent mining districts with proven strategic mineral deposits requisite for the manufacturing program under national defense. The passage of the bill, H. R. 5110, would expedite such a construction plan.

The letter follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Boise, June 12, 1941.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: Gold began the settlement of Idaho in 1862, and that same gold went far in financing the Civil War to a successful end. Agriculture and growth followed. Now, 80 years later, in an age of high metallurgical development, we are again in preparation for war, and to win we must have other metals which Idaho has stored in the ramparts of her mountains.

These metals are available in the back country, miles from adequate transportation. They are latent. For war they must be moved to smelters. To move them, mountain roads must be financed and built. An advanced stage of mineral development is now under way, but is impeded by lack of a link of transportation.

The phenomenal growth of our country is due to the discovery and use of our mineral resources. It has been asserted that one-half of the total wealth of the Nation has resulted from mining and the utilization of minerals. From 1924 to 1928 inclusive, the taxes paid by mining industries were six times as great in amount as those paid by the largest other industry in the country.

Mineral industries contribute to Federal revenues running into several hundred million dollars annually. Mineral products enter into almost every field of human activity, and are indispensable to modern civilization. We might say, "As mines and their affiliated industries go, so goes the Nation." In the procurement and development of minerals necessary to defense, Idaho should play a leading role.

The development of motor truck has brought about a great change in methods of transportation of mineral products, and in nearly all cases, has replaced other methods of transporting minerals to rail and sea.

In this period of national emergency, we need access roads to mineral deposits of all kinds. Factories are lagging for lack of minerals and, as time elapses, this condition will no doubt grow worse.

Most of our mineral areas are accessible within comparatively short distances. From these main highways and railroads these relatively short gaps are the ones which now demand immediate construction or improvement. The only solution seems to be the appropriation of Federal funds to be used exclusively on mine-to-market roads.

True, many mining companies profit to the extent of constructing their own access roads, but in the majority of cases the small and intermediate operator is handicapped by insufficient starting capital to care for all of his immediate needs.

The United States Bureau of Mines has spent much time and effort in exploring mineral regions of Idaho. Surely that agency knows what minerals are necessary to national defense and should be able to recommend justifiable access roads to these areas.

Assuming that minerals exist in quantity and kind necessary to defense, and we know that the demand exists, and knowing the return from the investment, the expenditure of Federal funds seems justified.

If improvements were made only on existing mountain trail roads to the point where transportation costs could be reduced, mining would open up to the extent of employing thousands of additional men in Idaho. Such development would directly affect agriculture because our agricultural products would then find a greatly enlarged market at home, dispensing with the necessity of shipping expense to distant markets.

In one-half of the counties in Idaho there are producing mines employing thousands of men at over average wages, and the average annual production is more than $30,000,000 and the average annual pay roll is more than $10,000,000.

We know that our State has great deposits of copper, lead, zinc, and other metals necessary to our national defense, and it is our duty to bring these facts to the attention of those upon whom the responsibility rests.

Practically all of our mines are located in timbered country, where ample water power is available for operations. Access to mines is access to timber and to power development and culminates in employment and expansion of agriculture to home markets. Our commercial deterrent is long hauls to the general markets. Our salvation is greater home markets for agriculture. The present emergency provides a twofold opportunity. One, to supply military needs so essential for our national defense, and the other, a vast expansion in mining operations and related activities, which will continue in more peaceful times.

Respectfully submitted.

S. E. JOHNSON,
Acting Director of Highways.

May-Connally Amendments to the Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the vicious attempt being made in this bill to restrict labor and take away from it all of the rights it has secured after long bitter years of struggle. Every Member of the Congress, whether Republican or Democrat, is anxious to pass this bill insofar as it refers to the ages of the selective service trainees, but we find here a vicious attempt by labor baiters to tack on provisions which should, if brought before the House at all, have been deliberately considered by the Committee charged with dealing with labor legislation, after all sides had been given an opportunity to be heard.

This legislation is not now needed and never was needed. I should like to call the attention of the House to an article printed on Monday, June 30, 1941, in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, dealing with a fair proposition made by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce. No one has ever accused a Chamber of Commerce of being partial to labor, but here is a body in my City of Pittsburgh, which has suggested a local mediation board to voluntarily arbitrate labor disputes.

Concerning the activities of the Congress, Frank L. Duggan, President of the Chamber, said—and remember, Mr. Speaker, this is the President of a Chamber of Commerce in an industrial city talking and not an official of a labor union:

Congress can do something in the way of regulating the conditions of employment, but it cannot by statute compel a man to work if he is unwilling to work. The old

adage about driving a horse to water still holds good. We cannot get to the core of the situation by enacting laws.

Mr. Speaker, vicious restrictive laws enacted by a hysterical Congress will not bring about labor unity.

Unity can be achieved by such proposals as that made by Mr. Duggan, who said that when a dispute arises it would be submitted to a board composed of representatives of labor, capital, and the general public. This board would be local, and every member would have more than a working knowledge of the individual conditions bringing about the dispute.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Labor Today," from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, in which the Duggan proposal is explained in detail:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 30, 1941]

LABOR TODAY

(By Guy L. Ralston and Joseph H. Shea)

The Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce is supporting a plan to curb strikes through establishment of a local mediation board composed of representatives of labor, capital, and the general public.

Chamber President Frank L. Duggan, in outlining the plan, said that when a dispute arises it would be submitted to the board and talked out around a council table. With the support of the three parties on the council, he believes such a plan cannot fail to be successful.

Mr. Duggan emphasized that the Chamber offers this proposal as a representative of the general public, and not of either management or labor. The chamber has taken a similar stand in labor disputes for the last several years.

"The Pittsburgh district is engaged upon the gigantic job of supplying much of the material for rearming the United States and for supplying the nations this country is pledging to defend," Mr. Duggan said. "We cannot afford to let lesser difficulties and grievances distract our attention from the gigantic and imperative job of defense.

WOULD KEEP UP OUTPUT

"I refer to strikes, lock-outs, shut-downs, and interruptions of any and every kind that decrease the flow of production. In this respect employees and employers and the whole public have a common responsibility.

"Congress can do something in the way of regulating the conditions of employment, but it cannot by statute compel a man to work if he is unwilling to work. The old adage about driving a horse to water still holds good. We cannot get to the core of the situation by enacting laws.

"The Government has taken over plants in one or two instances, but this is a remedy that should be administered only as a last resort. If it were a fixed policy, both labor and management would lose their birthright of freedom. In the dictatorships labor is forbidden to organize. Workers are told when and how to work and what wages they are to receive. Capital is commandeered and used to serve the purpose of the dictators.

"COERCION HELD DANGEROUS

"Coercion under any circumstances is a dangerous weapon and its use can be justified only by relentless necessity. I think that is the viewpoint of responsible leaders of both labor and management. The President himself has given assurances that the plants will be promptly restored to their owners as soon as the emergency which has led to taking them over has passed."

The only solution to the problems, Mr. Duggan holds, is voluntary cooperation.

The plan proposed by the Chamber has been tried in a number of communities. Two examples are the Newark Labor Relations Board and the Toledo Peace Board. These two differ somewhat in make-up but not in essentials. On both, labor, management, and the public are represented.

Good Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from one of my constituents. I am hopeful that others will be interested in the idea he presents. Mr. Huppke is well qualified to express an opinion on this subject.

The letter follows:

LOMITA, CALIF., *July 5, 1941.*

Congressman LEE GEYER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEYER: I had a long chat with your field secretary Thursday regarding some ideas of mine for the betterment of our relations with the Latin American countries. He seemed to think the ideas were very constructive and suggested that I present them to you and tell you what I have done to further them thus far. He thought you would like to know about them and probably could suggest the best method to get a program of this nature started.

Briefly, here is the story. For a number of years I have been interested in a plan to promote better feeling and closer cooperation between our country and the Latin-American countries. If we want to neutralize the effect of foreign propaganda and improve our status in South America, we must work out a really constructive and far-sighted program. At present the agricultural products of Latin America are, to a great extent, competitive with those grown in this country, therefore, they look to Europe for their markets. We should be able to change this condition because they can raise an infinite number of commodities which we need and cannot raise here. This is where our scientists—mainly chemists with agricultural experience—could beat the Nazis at their own game if they were given the opportunity. I believe we should send some of our technical men down there as colonists—not as exploiters. They can help to develop the countries by initiating diversified agricultural programs and real farm chemurgic practices. For instance, these alert scientists could set up cooperative enterprises to make products other than coffee from the coffee berry—caffeine, other alkaloids, coffee oils, proteins for plastics, and the residue for cattle fodder. This would tend to relieve the economic distress of the coffee growers and at the same time supply us with materials we need instead of surplus coffee. I know that some effort along this line is in progress in Brazil among the huge coffee plantation owners, but there are lots of other countries in which there are only small growers who have no technical help to show them what else their coffee can be used for. In many cases these small growers could band together to form a cooperative to maintain a small extraction plant under proper technical guidance.

The flora of the tropical countries, being so diverse, make them a regular paradise for a chemurgist—a chemist looking for new plant products to develop. There are many native plants which contain valuable alkaloids or medicinal chemicals. Many other tropical plants contain essential oils which are widely used in the perfume and chemical industries. A small extraction unit can be built at a relatively low cost which will serve a community where the plants grow readily. The market for these alkaloids and aromatics is usually large enough to guarantee a good living for the people in a limited area.

There is a huge market in the United States for tasty fruits to be used in the ever-increasing beverage industry. Mangos, mangosteens, lichi, and many other delicious tropical fruits are, for the most part, unavailable in the United States. These tropical fruits can be made available by modern quick-freezing or concentration processes. Papaya fruit and leaves can be used for the extraction of the enzyme papain, for alkaloids, carotin and chlorophyll. The market for papain is huge and at present the supply is chiefly obtained in the Far East. It is used to tenderize meat, mixed with other fruit juices for curing stomach disorders, it can even be used in detergents to break up and remove proteins, or it can be used in the manufacture of valuable amino acids by treating cheap proteins—possibly derived from otherwise useless fish.

Rubber-, quinine-, and rotenone- (insecticide) containing plants are at present grown mostly in the Far East. It is of great strategic importance to develop a large supply of these essential materials in this hemisphere.

I believe it is of the utmost importance that we try to avoid the obvious exploitation of Latin America by big financial interests. Rather, I believe that a more wholesome and beneficial condition can be brought about by encouraging the more or less natural development in Latin America of industries whose products are not competitive to our own, but are commodities which we need. We should encourage not only the growing of these plants but also the actual industrial processing near where they are grown because it is more efficient and more beneficial to that area.

We have in our country thousands of brilliant young technical men who are striving to make something of themselves. Opportunities in this country for them are somewhat limited and the competition is severe. I believe we can work out a program by means of which these men can be encouraged to go to Latin America to work in this field. Surely a program of this type would do much more permanent good in promoting better inter-American relationships than the mere loan of money to huge financial interests to further exploit these countries.

First, we should send competent men all over Latin America to study conditions and to obtain initial data so that a comprehensive program can be worked out effectively. Then we should canvass our schools and technical organizations for promising young men. These men should be given a course of training in Latin American customs, language, the elements of diplomacy, and all the technical information available which is applicable to their particular line of work. They should then be sent to various locations to cooperate with the natives and, in effect, work as missionaries in a technical sense. It would be necessary to subsidize these men but it would be expected that they would be self-supporting when their programs matured.

I don't have the financial backing to initiate a program of this sort by myself. However, it remains that this should be sponsored by our Government. I have written to everyone in Washington whom I believed

might be in a position to initiate some action. Each one refers me to some other bureau head and I am getting nowhere. Mr. Mills Dean, assistant to Nelson Rockefeller, and Dr. E. C. Auchter, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, have both expressed their appreciation of my generously offered services and said they would communicate with me promptly should a suitable occasion arise. In other words, nothing is being done to really produce tangible results.

During the present emergency is undoubtedly the opportune time to launch a program such as this. I believe that by way of training and experience I have the unusual prerequisites and the desire to put over a program of this kind with utmost efficiency. I took my bachelor and master of science degrees in chemistry and agriculture at Washington State College in 1923 and 1924. For years I have studied the economic and agricultural conditions in South and Central America. I have grown many of their plants in my own greenhouse and have worked out methods of extraction of many of the valuable products. For 16 years I have been a research chemist and have developed many processes and patents. As president and founder of the Plant Culture League, I have the good will and cooperation of the leading technical institutions in this country. In this capacity, I have taught home gardeners all over the world the applications of the latest developments in plant science. I compose our monthly News Letter, which discusses some new development in plant science each month. I have answered thousands of inquiries on the growing of plants and their treatment with chemicals to speed up natural processes.

You will note in the enclosed annual report a brief description of the work our league is doing and a statement of our objectives. Our chief technical cooperation is obtained from the California Institute of Technology, Department of Plant Physiology, from which three members of our board of directors have been selected, Dr. Went, Dr. van Overbeek, and Dr. Bonner. I mention my work with the league chiefly because I believe it has given me a broader knowledge of agricultural science and chemurgy than anyone without similar experience. As far back as November 1935 I was given a rating of 88 as senior chemist in engineering chemistry by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Under separate cover I am sending you a complete set of the Plant Culture League news letters for your information. I will appreciate it a great deal if you will consider these ideas carefully and advise me what you think can be done about them.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. HUPPKE.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, James Monroe would be surprised.

Japan evidently does not believe in a shooting war.

Iceland now and Dakar in January makes climatic sense.

There are new and bigger fishes in the Atlantic every day.

The first gesture for peace was removing 7 years from conscription.

The Chief now proceeds to give Iceland a solemn promise regarding our boys.

Why was it important that the Congress should know that troops had been landed?

Wall Street Willkie seems to think we should establish bases at Brest and Copenhagen.

The Signal Service must have a long-range program in mind with the $350,000,000 request.

The House of Lords, the House of Morgan, and Hyde Park seem to be hooked up with the same drain.

The America First Committee should have started at Salina, Kans. The heart of America is the most American.

It is an addition to the sum total of human knowledge to have it announced that Iceland has a prime minister.

The little island in the North Atlantic may not be a bottleneck but it may be a neck carrying a hint of protrusion.

Between the penalized farmers and the pinched taxpayers we know Congressmen who would find solace in northern Ireland or Scotland.

The Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY ARGUS-LEADER, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

[From the Daily Argus-Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.]

AMERICA'S STURDY BASE

(It was late in the afternoon of July 4, 1776, that the Continental Congress, assembled in the Pennsylvania State House in Philadelphia, adopted a "declaration of independence," proclaiming to the world that the American Colonies had broken all ties with Great Britain and had become the free and independent United States of America. That document is now a historic symbol of freedom—a text of liberty that provided the foundation for the greatest nation the world has ever known.

(Particularly on Independence Day this year, it should be read in full by every American. Fathers should read it to their assembled families. Individuals should study it. For their convenience, it is reprinted herewith in full.)

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient suffering of these colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government.

"LET FACTS BE SUBMITTED"

The history of the present King of Great Britain is history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and, when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature—a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly for opposing, with manly firmness, his invasion on the rights of the people.

He has refused, for a long time after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected, whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the state remaining, in the meantime, exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

"ACTS OF PRETENDED LEGISLATION"

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitutions and unacknowledged by our laws, giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us;

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States; for cutting off our trade with all parts of the world;

For imposing taxes on us without our consent;

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury;

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses;

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies;

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering, fundamentally, the forms of our governments;

For suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated government here by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the work of death, desolation, and tyranny already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow citizens, taken captive upon the high seas, to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren or to fall themselves by their hands. He has excited domestic insurrection amongst us and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms; our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in our attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them, from time to time, of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them, by the ties of our common kindred, to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They, too, have been deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends.

"FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES"

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare: That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do; and, for the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Bonneville-Grand Coulee Industrial Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert the informative article by Mr. Richard L. Neuberger, published in the Christian Science Monitor, July 5, 1941, describing the industrial empire which is being created by the Bonneville and Grand Coulee hydroelectric dams in the State of Washington. The Bonneville project is in my congressional district on the Washington side of the Columbia River and most of the industrial development resulting from its construction has taken place in the communities in my district.

The article referred to reads as follows:

Through the last lingering reaches of the American wilderness men are erecting steel towers to carry electric power to America's newest industrial empire. Factories and workshops are rising along the Columbia River. Against an imposing background of peaks and evergreen forests, these factories are producing strategic materials for the defense of the United States and for the embattled British Isles.

A year ago no aluminum was produced west of the Mississippi. Before the next snows tint the Cascade Mountains, plants in the shadow of their ramparts are expected to manufacture a third of the country's aluminum output. Aluminum is produced when an electric current is run through a chemical bath of bauxite, and electric current is available in unlimited quantity where the Columbia River drops through mountain gorges to the sea. The Columbia Basin, says Richard S. Reynolds, president of the Reynolds Metal Co., is to become the aluminum production center of the world.

The Washington State Planning Council recently predicted that at least three more aluminum factories and an aluminum fabricating plant soon will be constructed within transmission distance of Grand Coulee Dam.

Defense authorities estimate that United States requirements, plus the aid-to-Britain program, make imperative an extra 800,000,000 pounds of aluminum each year. Plants operated by Columbia River power will be called upon to furnish half this quota. Business groups hope that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will finance these plants, with actual construction and operation left to private concerns. New Dealers, on the other hand, want federally owned factories as a "yardstick" for aluminum quality and prices.

From Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, transmission lines fan out like the rays of the sun, carrying hydroelectricity to shipyards and metal-reduction units which dot the entire Pacific Northwest. In this new citadel of industry, civilization and frontier meet in strange contrast. To build a network of wires that serves the recently constructed plants, men have hacked into deep fir and pine fastnesses. Backbone lines loaded with 220,000 volts have been strung across the crags of high mountains.

Coal and iron ore have been the basis of numerous strongholds of American industry. The foundation of this newest stronghold is water power. In the Columbia River and its tributaries lurks nearly half the latent hydroelectricity of the Nation. No four rivers combined contain as much energy as the Columbia. It foams out of the Canadian Rockies and twists across Washington and Oregon with a force which has worn down granite mountains and basalt cliffs.

Today, for the first time, this force is hooked to the wheels of industry. In the present emergency the greatest power waterway on the continent has been called to the colors. Grand Coulee Dam is 2 years ahead of construction schedule. Its vast output is already needed by the defense program. Already the Bonneville Power Administration has signed contracts for more than 250,000 kilowatts of energy which will go directly to new factories.

Aluminum is one of the main symbols of the Northwest's industrial boom. In two Washington towns that lie along the banks of the Columbia are the first aluminum plants ever built on the Pacific slope. The factory of the Aluminum Co. of America at Vancouver has an annual capacity of 150,000,000 pounds of aluminum. The Reynolds Metal Co. plant at Longview, now under construction, will be on a 60,000,000-pound annual production basis by autumn. Congressman MARTIN F. SMITH, in whose district the factories are located, estimates that this is enough aluminum to build 21,000 military planes—planes that might alter the course of the war.

Power is a vital element in the manufacture of aluminum. Two kilowatts, running night and day for a year, are required to make a ton of this essential national defense material. This is the real importance of the Columbia River in the present crisis. At Grand Coulee a huge generator capable of producing 108,000 kilowatts will be switched into operation in July. Late in October another such generator will be ready, and next January still another. These are the largest generators ever designed, yet Grand Coulee can whirl 18 of them. A train of 75 freight cars is necessary to carry the parts for one generator.

Longview, where the new Reynolds Metal plant is rising, is in the heart of the lumber industry in the Columbia River Basin. Trees from the uplands, floated to Longview, are sawed into boards, planks, shingles, and plywood. Timber represents half the payroll dollars in the region. At present the forests are being depleted twice as fast as they grow.

In the Grays Harbor area and other parts of the Northwest the trees have disappeared like a great green carpet being shredded thread by thread. Mills penetrate farther and farther into the mountains for their lumber supply. At the insistence of the Forest Service, conservation practices have been followed, but often too late. The Northwest Regional Council, an organization endowed by the Rockefeller Foundation, has pointed out that, due to ruthless lumbering, economic decay and community dissolution confront many people in the region unless some substitute employment is discovered.

The industrial boom due to Columbia River power and the defense emergency may be the answer to this employment problem. In addition to the aluminum factories, energy from Bonneville Dam is being sold to carbide plants, salt plants, machine shops, and shipyards. Government officials also have talked about a colossal steel mill at Mount Pleasant, Utah, which would be run by hydroelectricity from Grand Coulee. And recent proposals by Secretary of the Interior Ickes for Federal aluminum plants all involve extensive use of the great energy resources of the Columbia River.

One of the features of this latest American industrial boom is the fact that most of the big factories are in small communities rather than in the major centers of population. When the President dedicated Bonneville Dam in 1937 he said he hoped there would be no "new Pittsburghs" in the Northwest. He urged that industry be decentralized and said that concentration of plants in one or two places would lead to unhealthy expansion and overpopulation. Bonneville officials have followed this doctrine by charging a "postage-stamp" rate for power instead of granting reduced charges to factories in the immediate vicinity of the project.

Both new aluminum plants are in places of less than 20,000 inhabitants. Mount Pleasant, site of the proposed steel mill, has fewer than 5,000 people. Planning agencies maintain that industries in communities of this size will lead to better living conditions and that many workers will be able to have an acre or so of land as an anchor to windward should the jobs give out. This trend showed in the 1940 census figures. Although neither Seattle nor Portland made any substantial gains over 1930, the adjacent countryside filled up enormously as families bought suburban homes and small farms.

Authorities at Bonneville Dam attribute recent industrial developments to the fact that Columbia River power rates for industry are the lowest in the Nation. Factories can buy Bonneville hydroelectricity for 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. This contrasts with 3.4 mills in the Tennessee Valley Authority and 7.3 in Boston. Just as oranges are cheap in California and cotton cheap in Alabama, power sells at low rates along the Columbia River because of the huge quantities available. Although it is the second largest river in the Nation, the Columbia in some stretches attains a velocity of 15 miles an hour, a speed comparable to that of swift mountain creeks.

Besides Bonneville and Grand Coulee, there are seven other sites for dams on the Columbia which the Federal Government might develop. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee recently authorized construction of the Umatilla Rapids project, 175 miles upstream from Bonneville. Many power sites also exist on the Columbia's main tributary, the Snake, where it surges through the 6,100-foot trough of Hell's Canyon. Development of all these power resources would enable the Northwest to produce as much energy as is used in the entire Nation.

Of course, such a program as this is only for the distant future. Were it not for the national-defense emergency, some newspapers in the Columbia Basin doubt whether the Government could sell all the available power at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. Much of the Pacific Northwest is wilderness. Forests and upland deserts cloak a large proportion of its land area. Migrants from the Middle West boosted the population 15 percent in the last decade, but many horizons are vacant still.

The fact that electricity is not an exportable commodity accounts for the Northwest's present industrial boom and also insures its industrial future. Power must be transmitted by alternating current. Direct current transmission is prohibitively expensive. Alternating current can be sent only about 300 miles. This distance would get energy from the Columbia River only to the Rocky Mountains. Thus the Northwest's most valuable resource can be shipped away only in the form of manufactured goods.

The main obstacle to the establishment of factories in the Northwest is the long distance from the great centers of distribution. Goods manufactured on the shores of the Columbia must be hauled across the continent to be sold in New York and Philadelphia and Boston. Yet in any situation where cheap and abundant electricity is a more important factor than the transcontinental haul, the rolling meadows and uplands of the Pacific Northwest will be chosen over industrial sites in Pittsburgh and Cleveland and Detroit. This already has proven to be the case in aluminum, carbides, and other industries.

The value of manufactures for the United States as a whole is $196 per person. In the Columbia Basin it is only $146, and with the lumber industry subtracted it is only $68. Industrial use of water power is gradually balancing this situation. The Pacific Northwest today is expanding more industrially than in the past generation. Streams rushing down mountainsides are the cause of this manufacturing boom—the Lemhi as it flows to the Salmon, the Salmon as it flows to the Snake, the Snake as it flows to the Columbia, and the Columbia as it flows on to the sea.

Address Before General Agency Convention of the State Mutual Life Assurance Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR., OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the banquet of the General Agency Convention of the State Mutual Life Assurance Co. at Virginia Beach on the evening of Tuesday, June 24, 1941:

I have wanted very much to accept your kind invitation since it was first extended so graciously to me by Mr. Ben Cottrell. For a time it looked as if it would be impossible for me to get away from Washington. The situation overseas is so acute and events are moving with such rapidity that one hesitates to make an engagement very far in advance for fear that the legislative program might develop to such a point as to render it unwise and improper to absent himself from Washington. Luckily no such contingency has arisen and I am made much happier and you are shortly to be made very miserable, indeed.

I thought Mr. Cottrell was a very trustful person or a very injudicious person at least, when he wrote me last week that "we want you to feel that there is no time limit on your talk." Let me assure you at the outset that I have no idea of taking advantage of such benign innocence. I have, however, been asked to discuss two subjects very close to your hearts. They concern, I believe, great struggles yet to be made. The first involves a contest on the home front, not soon, I hope, to begin in view of the fact that we are confronted with much more pressing problems. I refer to the recent report of the Temporary National Economic Committee, and more particularly to that part of the report dealing with insurance.

Your distinguished president, Mr. Chandler Bullock, in presenting Commissioner Detrick, of California, to the annual convention of the Association of Life Insurance Presidents, in 1928, at the Hotel Astor, said this:

"He hails from California, being insurance commissioner of that State. It happens that he went to the same university, Leland Stanford, that graduated Herbert Hoover. It may be that he is going to high Federal office. I can't say: In any event, I can assure you that he is going to spare us two things. He has promised that he will not boast of the unparalleled success of the various California football teams, and that he will not drag in mention of that tiresomely salubrious sunshine of that remarkable California climate. With this remarkable self-denial (and it is remarkable in any Californian), we are very glad to have him here."

While Mr. Bullock has not up to this good moment given me any specific charge, I shall nevertheless strictly adhere to that admonition despite the fact that it is nearly 13 years old. I solemnly promise to make no reference to the beauties of my native State or to that galaxy of early Virginia statesmen to whose farsightedness and wisdom you owe a great deal. It seems to me, however, I might be permitted to say with becoming humility and meekness that Virginians hereabouts are delighted to have so distinguished a group of their countrymen in such close proximity to the beginnings of this great country.

It is a bit puzzling that the recent Temporary National Economic Committee's monograph on insurance has provoked such little public discussion. It projects the Government's possible entry into an untried field. If the suggestions of this committee are as truly a genesis to governmental participation as congressional investigating committees usually are, it would seem to me that every policyholder in these United States, employers, and employees of insurance companies should be on the alert. Summarized, the committee made the following recommendations:

"1. Designate a Federal agency or create a new commission to assist the States in strengthening their regulatory machinery.

"2. Create an insurance advisory council of 12 to assist insurance-company managements in solving their own problems without legislative compulsion. This council would report annually to Congress on the state of the insurance business.

"3. Have Congress designate a Federal agency to conduct a thorough investigation of all forms of fire, casualty, and marine insurance."

Frankly I have welcomed the investigation which has thus far been made because I have had an abiding conviction that such an investigation would reveal nothing to cast any very real reflection upon the institution of life insurance, for I believe that no other line of human endeavor has written a finer chapter than that presented by the record of the life-insurance companies of America. This must be true if Mr. Leon Henderson, valued scout for reformation that he is, in commenting upon the investment record of life-insurance companies in the last 10 years, says:

"I think it is an extraordinary record as far as the integrity of the insurance policies is concerned."

Studious, conscientious investigations are welcome. They are made unwelcome only by those who fear the results. The danger, however, in these reports are twofold. First, they may encounter nothing more than a

passive resistance on the part of insurance companies in this country. Secondly, in this world of confusion the imprimatur of a congressional committee expressing one side of an economic theory has a great chance for survival. I shall not find the report of this Committee welcome, however, if its documents and reports are only to be used in future years as source material on the part of some professors who play a part in this century not unlike the role played by their brethren in the thirteenth century in France, whose illogical deductions contributed immeasurably in building up the power of the French throne at the expense of the French people themselves.

Recently a Government official of high standing stated in effect to a group of insurance men that we are living today in an era of change at home and abroad, to which we all must adjust ourselves whether we like it or not, that failure to appreciate and accept these changing conditions will not alter what has already taken place or what still may need to be done one iota, and that all of us might just as well realize now as later that the pages of history were not going to be turned backward, and that social laws will not be repealed even if they did increase the Government's Budget.

This gentleman was no oracle. He could not be considered as a harbinger of things new. There is nothing new about social security, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, restriction of hours of labor, minimum wages, and the abolition of child labor. A Germany of a more distant day under Bismarck had all of these things, and I might add that they were not even new to Rome. They are not even old wine in new bottles.

These domestic problems before the country today are not new. There will be nothing new even in their attempted solutions, unless if, indeed, they are successful. To fail now is but to reenact the familiar tragedies played to bewildered people in the earlier democracies long, long ago. Appeals to the Government and suggestions that Government intervene is not the answer. Business and Government have their particular spheres of operation and they must not be merged in any wholesale plans and systems. Not if we wish to preserve the balance between the two, which has given this country the most remarkable development in a short space of years that the world has ever known.

Admittedly there are a number of things that need correction, but the report of the T. N. E. C. reveals complaints of such scarcity and triviality that they are, it seems to me, in themselves a strong recommendation for State-controlled insurance companies when one considers the vastness of the business. Critics find it all too easy to dwell upon some of the shortcomings of the present system, and to forget its good work. Too little has been made of the fact that under the State-controlled system, the business of insurance was nurtured through its early life, was guided along the path of safety and sanity and has climbed to the heights upon which it stands today. Let these gentlemen point out also that through the years adjustment and correction have constantly been made and that the insurance business in this country is about the only one existent that has purged itself, overcome adversity, and all the vicissitudes encountered by business and today faces the future virile and unafraid.

The Congress is constantly importuned to pass laws, to assist the States as suggested by this committee in the insurance field, and to establish organizations, perhaps I had better say, establish bureaus, to meet what is sincerely represented at the time as a merely temporary emergency. Here in the realm of emergency, fancied or real, lies the pitfall which from the very beginning has always threatened the democracies. If ever this Government of ours comes to devour itself it will be a feast served by Americans and sumptuously spread upon the tables within the halls of legislation, long since deserted by wise, courageous, and prudent statesmen.

We cannot go on forever characterizing every problem as of varying degrees. I, for one, hold there is always an emergency when the Nation is confronted with the choice between good and evil—right or wrong.

It would be a pity indeed after all these years to have the Government interrupt. The business of insurance involves long contracts. The fidelity of performance of those contracts will not brook interruptions. For over 100 years the business has functioned smoothly and under every sort of condition. It has a pretty good constitution; it has survived all the diseases of adolescence and all the shocks. I, for one, cannot believe that there are greater dangers lying in wait than those already passed; and if this be true, why should we tamper with a system thus far proven? About the only investment I can think of today worth 100 cents on a dollar is a life-insurance policy in a good company or a Government bond. There are some who will always advocate change. Change is not always good. There are many illusions wrapped up in change. Merely to change is not to progress; what will it profit us to follow after change if in the process we miss the path along which we have come so gloriously? It is so easy to be fooled by the illusions of change.

We are moving through a period in which concentration of power at Washington is the unmistakable trend. Until recently a great many insurance companies could not believe that the concentration-of-power idea was moving in their direction. They have been consoling themselves with a line of Supreme Court decisions beginning with *Paul* v. *Virginia* in 1868, in which the Court has decided that a constitutional law could not be enacted that would give the Federal Government direct supervisory power over insurance companies. However, since the World War the world has been treated with a course in circumvention. There are several techniques, and none more effective than the "let me advise you brother" method. That is a suggestion of the T. N. E. C. First advise, then embrace, and then—oh, why bother about a definition of interstate commerce?

If then the avenue of approach by the Federal Government is to take some part in the business of insurance, if only to supervise by reason of the failure of insurance commissions in the several States of the Union to control the situation, then I have this word for you gentlemen: Go back to your native States and see that the statutes under which your State insurance commission operates be strengthened if they need it, and even if it be against your own company. If the commissioners of insurance in your States are inefficient, address yourselves to the problem of putting someone in their places who will administer the insurance laws of your respective States impartially. If the Government is to keep its hands off this business, you gentlemen can contribute immeasurably in seeing that your company carries its share of the burden of working out social obligations and responsibilities. If your house needs cleaning, be sure to clean it yourself, and if it is as tidy in the future as it has been in the past I think you have nothing to fear. Life insurance to our fathers was an unheard-of thing—unbelievable. To make credible the incredible is the mission of your fraternity.

If we are to stem the tide of concentration at Washington the task is as much yours as it is your duly elected Representatives. We are a mentally alert people. We have the courage to experiment, and in this field if it is overdone is to be found the seeds of our destruction. You remember Shakespeare speaks of the "quick forge and working house of thought." Sometimes we are poor smithies in striving to mold a good idea, not because of poor tools, for we have the sharp edge of experience and the full power of the world's history. Let us not forget that our fathers before us labored mightily in the quick forge and working house of thought not to mold but to strike away the enslaving shackles of the past.

It is difficult for one who has lived with every news dispatch on the world situation through these passing unhappy months to lose one single opportunity to speak of the great threat to the security of our beloved country. Somehow I feel that my right to speak to you stems from an authority over and above my service in the Congress as one of your representatives. As one who served through the last war, and still a member of the Naval Reserve, having passed successfully his physical examination a few weeks ago, as a father of two sons, both shortly eligible for the high honor of service to their country, permit me a few words with which I hope to sound a warning.

When Admiral Darlan and Hitler conferred at Berchtesgaden it was evident that the most critical phase of the war for America was in the making. Petain's blessing and direction to the French to follow Hitler without mental reservation brought the war closer to us. These events were cause enough for serious speculation but when Darlan announced a few weeks ago that France was about to take an active role in insuring speedy victory for Hitler, banished was all hope that the French might at least be counted upon to stand. The distressing thing is that France no longer believes that Germany can be defeated, and what is worse, that so far as they appraise their own interests, the defeat of Hitler is not even desirable. In addition, there is the Turkish nonaggression pact and the fact that Germany will surely either crush Russia or enter into another pact with that country more far-reaching than the one signed nearly 2 years ago.

These things and the President's last address have served to invite the question, What would it mean to us if Germany can collaborate itself across the Atlantic into the Western Hemisphere? I know that there are some good Americans, stout in their resolves to keep the conquest of totalitarianism from coming even close to America, have decided to do so by measures that suggest staying in a hole until that hole is bombed and invaded. More sensible to most people is a policy of meeting aggression where it shows its fangs, of supplying those who are making a first-line defense, of keeping honor alive as well as courage, and of having still the possibility of a final defense here in the Western Hemisphere.

We have come now to the ultimate issue of the war raging overseas. We cannot stand in the middle of the road all summer, engaging in halfway measures. Our foreign policy to date has been faithfully following after events, never ahead. The result is that we have reached the point now where any decision we make involves war risks. Standing between this country and the raw forces of destruction in Europe is the British Navy and the British people. If England is defeated, no longer may we rely upon that nation as a buckler and a shield. There is no sentimentality in that statement. The effect of that statement is to bare an ugly fact, the fact that ultimately the American people will admit its truth in a rush to do for their own protection what they should have done months before. It may be then too late. We have watched one surrender after another—Spain, Manchuria, Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia. The fate of France and the smaller democracies of Europe induced by indecision merits the epitaph: "Too late."

There is ample excuse and explanation for the slowness with which democracies move, but there is no reasonable excuse for our

inability as a great nation to formulate now a definite, affirmative foreign policy. We have followed events long enough. This great decision now before the American people, sad to relate, is befogged by personal animosities and political partisanship. Every vote taken on the floor of the House relating to this war and touching the course of conduct that we as a nation should pursue has nearly every time resulted in a division marked by the center aisle, Republicans on one side and the Democrats on the other. If ever this country needed leadership in every State, town, and hamlet it is today. I well know the import and the responsibility which the statement I am making entails.

Those of us in Washington, fully conversant with the dangers of the present situation, must speak out now. In the cloakrooms, on the street corners, in clubrooms wherever Americans meet, it is rare to find a person who does not sincerely suggest the use of convoys if without that assistance British defeat is imminent. We face that possibility now, and the time has come for a definite and courageous decision. Sinkings of ships leaving ports of this country for England thus far this year have not been so numerous. Sinkings of empty bottoms headed this way for cargoes have, however, been heavy. I favor convoys as a preventative of sinkings and as an earnest on our part that we fully intend to see that supplies reach England. This summer Germany will launch her greatest attack of the war. It will be unrestricted submarine warfare in the Atlantic. Shall we wait for that, and follow events once again?

We should favor convoys to be employed now, not tomorrow nor the day after tomorrow. Of course, there is an alternative—if we fail to convoy we must begin to dig in here, and who knows but perhaps to become prisoners within our own fortress. One thing is certain, digging in here when Britain is no more will neither preserve our peace nor our property. We can no longer afford to stand another hour vacillating, wondering, doubting the future.

The time for decision is at hand—most certainly we shall have to decide upon our course. For us the possible loss of sea control is the real danger. For us this war is a war to determine who shall dominate the waters of the two oceans. We who live on the seaboard know this. Our neighbors in the mountains and on the plains are unfamiliar with the implications of sea power. But if the light goes out in England they will then understand—it will be clear to everybody. Those who today are unable or unwilling to see this danger will, when it comes, be the loudest to shout for our Government to do something about it.

We must resist on moral grounds; we must resist on the ground of security. If we permit Britain to be defeated we shall find ourselves in a few short months in a zone of danger from which our enemies may never permit us to escape. A year hence, with all of our construction, we will have 18 ships of the line, the Japanese will have an equal number, and Germany will have 9. If Britain is gone the Germans will, with unlimited slave labor and innumerable shipyards, outbuild us 2 to 1. Strikes nor wages nor hours will not embarrass or interfere with their program. We shall truly be prisoners within our own lines.

In this day, when dictatorships rise to turn upon and fight one another as they are doing now, and to plague civilization, and when there is a decreased emphasis on independence, we know that it is history repeating itself once more. Perspective is lent to this problem when we recall that Paul the Apostle faced it. He had preached freedom to the Galatians. He found them regimented by a legal code. From the eighth day of their existence until they died they were under the duress of a detailed legalism. And Paul freed them from that. He said, "Love God and do as you please." He presented to them a Christ as an inner possession and a mentor, and then in a little while, as you remember, the Galatians grew tired and weary with their liberty. They grew weary of responsibility and making decisions for themselves and they yearned for the apparent security of the old tradition. They were careless. Paul wrote them:

"For freedom did Christ set us free. Stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage."

Few sentences of Holy Writ could be more applicable to our present world. If we are wise, this kind of a situation time and again repeated from Paul's day to our own, and as obvious and menacing, can teach us valuable lessons about freedom. We have been facile in our praise of it. We have taken it too lightly as a priceless boon. We have sung too much with Robert Burns in his poem, Liberty's Glorious Feast.

The great advantage which has been Germany's in putting in years of preparation, particularly in the manufacture and use of airplanes, is for the first time definitely threatened. Hitler knows he cannot successfully invade England until his army has achieved unquestioned security in the east. In that great undertaking against Russia the German air force must play the leading role. While Nazi aerial squadrons are hovering over these new lines, we must throw every contribution possible to Britain. Hitler undertakes in a sense a task which he no doubt has ardently hoped it would not be necessary to perform. The result is the English have been made beneficiaries of an unexpected opportunity provided we can increase our aid.

Once again we are shown just where the road of appeasement leads. This new war is eloquent proof of the perfidy of Hitler. It is ample proof that the Germans are out to conquer the world. After the World War we heard much of the expression, "What price glory." The immediacies of the present situation demand a course on our part which will compel the average German to ask with considerable spirit, "What price victories for us?"

Napoleon, 128 years ago, rode at the head of a half million men toward Moscow, with all continental Europe at his feet. Few saw that he was riding to his doom in the snowstorms of the Russian steppes. May Providence decree that another war-mad militarist will soon be retreating from Moscow, not because we have any affection for the shabby Stalin or the other shadowy forms within the Kremlin. The Russians are not fighting a good fight; they campaign for no great principles; they are but jackals perhaps to be driven from the carcasses of Finland and Poland. There is an old saying when thieves fall out honest men get their just desserts. We can't, even if we would, help Russia. The thing to do is to redouble our help to Britain. I have faith that in a little while perhaps that looking back we shall have the comfort of knowing that all the would-be usurpers of the rights of free men have come and gone while truth has persisted and freedom has once again raised herself from the dust and fundamental human rights have emerged again. Whatever of fault be ours, and there has been fault, it must not be said in history that our Republic faltered in its tasks, its duty to its people, its duty to mankind, or has taken one step backward in honor, or in retreat before those who would seek to destroy our virile life stream, our institutions, our homes, our bodies, or our souls.

America is gradually awakening to the realization of the folly and the peril of isolationism. Not all the king's horses and the frenzied voices of the isolationists in these United States can drown out the ominous sounds increasing in volume in Europe. The question dismally repeats itself here, Will we defend our interests at once and by every means in our possession and while we have a faithful ally or shall we wait, to follow after events once more, until all the advantage of decision is with our enemies? That decision must be faced now, without another moment's delay. We need truth; we need courage; we need determination.

With great decisions come great visions. Whatever the future may hold for us we can never lose the vision of these United States united—as our fathers before us have seen it, as most of us here have been permitted to see it. Our country is not just a name, it is a living force; our country is not a sentiment, it is a vital engine of righteousness. We have seen; we have learned; we know.

For great decisions, greater visions, greater opportunity—for these we thank the God of our fathers. Let us say with Rupert Brooke as he went gallantly to his death at Gallipoli, "Thank God he has matched us with this day!"

A Convenient Cloak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of national defense is uppermost in the minds of all of us. Its magnitude and importance and the disastrous delay in directing attention to it should make it the first objective of the administration which is responsible for its execution. Every ounce of our strength as developed by freemen working under a free economy should be made available for the assurance of a sense of national security. Social philosophies and political experimentation can await a quieter and more settled season for their advancement. First things should be put first. The attempt, therefore, to foist upon the American people a program for the socialization of our domestic economy by the insistent demand that radical proposals are necessary for defense purposes is disheartening and demoralizing.

For some years such efforts were made by those who claimed that our domestic difficulties could only be overcome by a departure from established landmarks and by the substitution of some form of Marxist philosophy. Most of these disciples of a new order are still entrenched in positions of power in Washington. To them the defense program offers a convenient vehicle for furthering their socialistic ambitions. As a result of these efforts, confusions and conflicts, instead of singleness of purpose, have become increasingly apparent in Washington to such an extent that the sense of direction which is so sorely needed today is woefully lacking.

The opinion has been expressed that these confusions and conflicts are not at all distasteful to that group of advisers which has insisted for a long time that private enterprise is an enemy that must be punished rather than a friend that should be encouraged. If a sufficient degree of sabotage could be effected by a continued program of cross-purposes, the resulting frustration could easily be seized upon as the necessary excuse for

the exercise of more drastic and inclusive powers by the Federal Government.

What might not have been possible, therefore, by direction could be accomplished by indirection under the very convenient plea of necessity. Thus there would be leveled at our processes of self-government the false indictment of failure in the hour of grave emergency, with the attendant specious plea that revolutionary readjustments were required for the successful prosecution of the defense program.

The economic planners, the state ownership advocates, the collectionist collaborators have not been dismissed by the President. Instead they have been permitted to assume the presently more acceptable and covering cloak of national defense. Thus the dynamic energy and productive capacity of America continue to be subjected to the insidious attack of a band of buccaneers which has boasted of its purpose to remake America according to a socialistic pattern.

Taxes Paid by American Industry in 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE JULY 1941 ISSUE OF INVESTOR AMERICA

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from Investor America dealing with the amount of taxes paid by American industry in 1940. I believe this article will be of interest to the House in connection with the new tax bill. It shows that 165 representative business concerns paid 56 percent of their net earnings in 1940 in taxes, which is equivalent to $3.92 for each share of common stock, $451 for each owner of common stock, and $735 for every employee on the pay rolls of these companies.

It must be remembered, of course, that corporation earnings are also subject to tax when distributed to their stockholders in the form of dividends. These dividends are subject to both the normal individual income tax and the surtax.

Under the proposed tax bill, much heavier taxes will be imposed, both on corporate and individual incomes.

The article is as follows:

[From Investor America for July 1941]

TAXES FOR 1940 TOOK NEARLY 56 PERCENT OF NET EARNINGS (BEFORE TAXES) OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY—SURVEY OF 165 REPRESENTATIVE CORPORATIONS BY AMERICAN FEDERATION OF INVESTORS REVEALS THAT BURDEN OF TAXATION IS INCREASING DESPITE HIGH RATE OF INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY

(By Charles A. Segner)

That the fears of investors regarding the ever-increasing tax burden imposed upon American industry are well founded is indicated by the results of an exhaustive survey of 165 representative corporations just completed by the American Federation of Investors.

Despite the impetus given to industrial activity in 1940 by the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars in the national-defense effort, and the appropriation of additional billions to be spent as rapidly as possible, the percentage of total taxes to net earnings continued to rise.

Under the severe terms of the two revenue acts passed by Congress last year, the large slice that taxes have been taking out of industry's income dollar grew in size. Whereas taxes for 1939 of these same 165 companies amounted to 53½ percent of net income (before taxes), the new tabulation shows that taxes for 1940 amounted to nearly 56 percent of net income.

These 165 corporations represent a fair cross-section of American industry. Their combined assets approximate $45,000,000,000, and their capitalization $16,811,000,000. Total profits last year, after taxes, amounted to $2,023,000,000. Net earnings, before taxes, were $4,588,000,000, but taxes of all kinds for the year took more than half of such earnings. The total taxes amounted to $2,565,000,000.

The capitalization of these 165 companies is represented by 699,000,000 shares of common and preferred stock, which are owned by 6,360,000 shareholders. The total common stock outstanding represents 654,000,000 shares, owned by more than 5,686,000 stockholders. The average number of common shares held by each stockholder is 115.

Taxes of all kinds for 1940—Federal, State, and local—of these 165 representative American corporations exceeded $2,565,000,000, equivalent to $3.92 for each share of common stock outstanding and $451 for every owner of common stock. Tax collectors took from these 165 companies for the 1940 fiscal period 87 cents more per common share of stock than for 1939, and $97 more per common-stock holder.

The 1940 taxes amounted to $735 for every employee on the pay rolls of these companies, compared to $612 for 1939, an increase in taxes equivalent to $123 per worker.

Whereas the total taxes of these companies for 1940 showed an increase over 1939 of five hundred and eighty-five and one-half million dollars, or 29.6 percent, the total net earnings (after taxes) of all the 165 companies showed an increase of only three hundred and one and one-half million dollars, or 17.5 percent. In 1940 the aggregate net earnings were $2,023,000,000, compared with $1,721,000,000 in 1939.

Stockholders received in dividends in 1940 a total of $1,247,000,000, compared with $1,077,000,000 in 1939, an increase of $170,000,000. Total dividends paid in 1940 amounted to but $1.91 per share of common stock compared with the $3.92 per common share taken by taxes. In other words, the amount received by stockholders for the use of their invested savings was less than one-half the amount paid in taxes.

The average number of employees of all these companies in 1940 totaled 3,490,000, compared with 3,237,000 in 1939. Based on the average number employed for each of these years, the increase of 253,000 does not properly reflect the real increase in the number of workers at the end of 1940, inasmuch as pay rolls were growing rapidly in the closing months of last year due to the pressure for industrial production in connection with national-defense preparedness efforts and the greatly augmented armament orders placed in the United States by Great Britain.

Since the first of this year the vast program of plant expansion in American industry has provided employment for hundreds of thousands of additional workers, and the liberal wage increases granted throughout industry have added greatly to the total pay rolls. Contrary to the popular belief, the present high rate of industrial activity does not mean record profits for industrial corporations generally. The increased cost of labor and materials, combined with a Government policy of price fixing and the most severe Federal taxes in history, act as an effective check against excessive profits. In fact, the concern of investors is whether even reasonable profits may be expected under the circumstances.

The weeks and months immediately ahead are certain to witness a further transition from "normal business" to "production for defense"—or for war—and many nondefense industries will find it increasingly difficult to continue operation on a normal scale, due partly to Federal rationing of materials urgently required for armament production.

The repercussion of the new World War upon the pocketbooks of all Americans will be more keenly felt when the effects of the new Federal Revenue Act, now under consideration in Congress, are fully realized. Individuals subject to Federal income tax under present laws will be required to pay two or three times the amounts paid this year, and it may be that Congress, contrary to present indications, before it enacts the 1941 tax legislation will reduce the personal exemptions to take in hundreds of thousands of citizens in the lower-income brackets who have never been required to pay Federal income taxes. More than $1,000,000,000 in new taxes is expected from increases in individual income provisions. Another billion dollars of additional revenue will be extracted from the people of the United States through new and increased excise and sales taxes on consumer goods. These are the so-called nuisance taxes and scores of other hidden taxes that are supposed to be "painless" because the people seldom realize that they are paying them.

But it is already apparent that, notwithstanding the present onerous taxes on corporations, the burden upon industry is to be greatly increased. The revenue bill agreed upon by the House Ways and Means Committee, which forms the basis for tax legislation to be passed by Congress late this summer, broadens the excess-profits tax base established in the Second Revenue Act of 1940 and provides other revisions that are expected to increase Federal revenue received from corporations by approximately one and one-half billion dollars annually.

Following the recommendations of the Joint Congressional Committee, instead of the more severe plan submitted by the Treasury Department, the Ways and Means Committee retained the earnings alternative to the invested-capital method of determining the excess-profits-tax exemption of corporations. However, it tightened up drastically on deductions allowed and reduced the invested capital credit from its present level of 8 percent to 7 percent on capital in excess of $5,000,000.

By requiring that companies compute their excess profits before, not after, deductions for Federal corporation income taxes, the proposed bill operates to push a higher portion of excess profits into the higher-rate brackets. These excess-profits-tax rates are sharply increased, the present minimum rate of 25 percent on the first $20,000 of excess profits being lifted to 35 percent, and so on upward, the present maximum rate of 50 percent on excess profits above $500,000 being raised to 60 percent. New corporate surtaxes also are included in the bill.

Originally intended to increase present Federal revenue by 3½ billion dollars to a total of 12½ billions, there is the possibility that before the new revenue law is enacted, Congress may be faced with a situation suggesting the inadequacy of the total revenue to be expected from the bill now under consideration. The Treasury's plan of financing the defense emergency provides for two-thirds of the spending to be raised through taxation

and one-third by borrowing. Since the 12½-billion-dollar total for taxes was proposed, the Government's spending program has expanded at an alarming rate and it is now apparent that, unless a great deal more can be expected from taxes, the proportion regarded by the Treasury as necessary to reasonably safe financing of national defense cannot be maintained. Borrowing far beyond the one-third ratio will be inevitable, and the Federal debt, now approximately 49 billion dollars, will quickly pass the statutory maximum of 65 billions fixed by Congress earlier this year. There have been predictions that the Federal debt may reach or exceed 100 billion dollars. Where this debt will go if the United States becomes involved in a long war is impossible to predict.

One course should be clear to Congress and to the administration in Washington: Wasteful spending on unnecessary nondefense projects should be stopped immediately. One, two, three—no one knows how many—billions of dollars could be saved each year if Congress and the administration were to waive political considerations and apply the economy ax to needless and extravagant expenditures. Whatever sacrifices are necessary will be willingly made by the American people in the interest of national defense, but in this grave financial crisis the people are justified in demanding and expecting of their Government a policy of strict economy.

Forty-nine Cent Penalty On Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, two rather stormy, but I hope helpful, hearings have been held by the Committee on Agriculture as Members of the House get demands for relief from the 49-cent per bushel penalty on excess quota retroactively imposed on wheat-growers not in the triple A.

The protests arise on the point to which I directed attention when the matter was before the House, April 29. During that debate I said:

> This bill affects a situation that has already been created. It is retroactive. The farmer who has planted his wheat planted it on the supposition that if he was not a cooperator, he would be subject to a penalty of only 15 cents on the wheat that he might market in excess of his normal production quota—

if marketing quotas should be voted. I also pointed out that the 1938 act permitted the farmer to consume his excess wheat on the farm but that a sentence in the committee report said the new bill—

> puts the marketing penalty on the excess of wheat regardless of whether it is actually marketed.

Others joined in the protest and we drew up an amendment which was offered by Congressman O'CONNOR, of Montana, to exempt the 1941 crop from the increased penalty. It was defeated, however, on the argument that the mandatory loan feature of the bill would increase wheat prices by 20 cents so that the penalty on the excess quota would be more than offset by the better price on the marketing quota, presumably the larger part of the producer's crop.

Today, however, although wheat prices have advanced since the loan was voted, hardships created by the increased penalty have raised a storm of protest from Ohio to Oklahoma. Farmers are saying, as I predicted they would, that they took their choice when they planted and that increase of the penalty from 15 to 49 cents afterward was unfair, that war and weather have something to do with present prices. In Ohio a case is being started to test the constitutionality of "changing the rules after the game has started." Many letters point out, as I said in the House, April 29—

> A great many farmers' quotas have been reduced to the point where they could not sign up * * * and support their families and pay their interest to the Federal land bank * * * or pay rent and other expenses.

In my office we are getting many letters on the subject. Those that present some new or specific problem we are taking up with the administrative officials in the Department of Agriculture. They point out that a noncooperator can—

First. Place his wheat in storage until a year comes without quotas or until he can work it into his marketing quota of normal production for his quota acres.

Second. Store on his own farm. The farmer may then borrow 60 percent of the 85-percent loan on this stored excess quota.

Third. Turn it over to the county committee for the Secretary of Agriculture, which, in effect, means selling it for 49 cents.

These, however, do not meet the problem of the farmer whose crop was hurt by drought, hail, freezing, or what-not, so that his actual total production hardly exceeds his excess quota, nor do they meet the basic injustice to the man who measured benefits of "signing up" against the chance of quotas and a 15-cent penalty and deliberately made his choice.

During the hearings this week four suggestions have been made:

First. To waive the bond requirement on farm storage. This was agreed to by A. A. A. officials today.

Second. To figure the penalty on harvested acres rather than seeded acres.

This suggestion has been made to remove the hardship on the man who overplanted but will not actually harvest more than his "penalty" quota, forcing him to pay 49 cents on all, or nearly all, of his production.

Third. To permit the farmer to feed his excess wheat on the farm.

This suggestion has considerable support. I have added the suggestion that the farmer be permitted to use the excess wheat for seed as well as feed.

Fourth. To reduce the penalty on the 1941 crop from the 49 to 15 cents as it stood at planting time.

This is being opposed on the ground that the majority of the wheat growers are signed up and get the benefit of the 85-percent loan and that the will of the majority should prevail.

On that point I have taken sharp issue. When that point came up in the House, April 29, I said:

> One of the greatest concerns of government is to protect the weak or the minority. The strong always have ways of protecting themselves.

On the same issue in the committee hearing today I read these sentences from a Fourth of July address by Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina:

> There is such a thing amongst men as that which is called Americanism. Politically it is a government by representative democracy, restrained by a Constitution that defines the limits of the power of those who govern; that erects as against the Government itself a bill of inalienable rights in behalf of each individual. It proposes a justice that goes far beyond the courts, an economic and social justice for each and all, the weakest no less than the strongest.

It is obvious that the 80 percent of the wheat growers would vote for marketing quotas since they were in compliance and would be eligible for mandatory loans as 85 percent of parity, a figure equal to the then market price of wheat. Farmers should get full parity, which means the price of just ratio and fair relationship between farm prices and industrial prices. That, however, does not excuse the Congress for acting unfairly to the minority or permitting an injustice to be done them. They could not protect themselves. The Congress has created a situation which it should correct immediately.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

SHIFTING GOVERNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1939, Congress enacted a measure known as the Reorganization Act which conferred upon the President certain powers to reorganize and consolidate the various agencies in the executive branch. In pursuance of that authority, the President issued five reorganization plans. A recent estimate of the effect of these plans indicates that about 115 different agencies of Government have in one way or another been affected. Some have been abolished altogether. Others have been transferred from one department to another. Some have been abolished and their functions transferred to other agencies. Some have been slenderized and renamed, and still others have been expanded. Two of the most provocative changes were the transfer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service from

the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice and the transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce. It takes a considerable time for those dealing with Government agencies to readjust themselves to so many changes.

FARM PARITY

For many years a substantial portion of the membership in Congress was lukewarm on the subject of parity prices and parity income for farmers because parity as recognized by the Farm Act of 1938 applied only to the 5 basic commodities of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco. These commodities were selected because we have always produced and exported the surplus and the price of these commodities was most quickly affected by lower world prices or by a curtailment of the world market as a result of war or the export restrictions in other countries. Growers of citrus fruits, flax, hops, soybeans, and many other commodities as well as producers of milk, cheese, and dairy products were, therefore, not particularly enthusiastic about parity unless their products were included. For some time congressional committees have had under consideration some modification of the basic Farm Act of 1938 to make it more inclusive and bring other crops and products into the parity picture. It remained, however, for the House Committee on Banking and Currency to bring in a bill relating to commodity loans on farm commodities which contains a provision reading as follows: "It is the policy of the Congress that other purchase, loan, or other operations of the Department, taking into account the funds available for such purposes for all commodities and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand, shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of such commodities to a fair parity relationship with other commodities." This may appear as a lot of involved language to the average person but it does in fact constitute the recital of a legislative policy that may result in parity for all commodities whether basic or not. It seems amazing, indeed, that a policy so drawn should be announced by Congress in the last 7 lines of a measure which dealt entirely with this subject matter.

3237

It is estimated by the Bureau of the Census that between October 16, 1940, and July 1, 1941, 832,000 young men will have attained the age of 21. That means that they have moved across that invisible line which separates 20 from 21 and makes them eligible for military training under the Selective Service Act. From October 16 to July 1 is 257 days. In that period there will have been 832,000 birthdays, or an average of 3,237 birthdays every day.

THE NEW OATH

Congress takes its own medicine. In order to assist in rooting communism and subversion out of government, it has inserted in all of the departmental appropriation bills a provision to the effect that no part of the funds can be used to pay the salary of any person who advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. That same provision was written into the appropriation bill which provides the funds for the legislative branch of the Government. Therefore every Member of Congress, before he can receive his salary, must take an oath which reads:

I solemnly swear that I do not advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence; that I am not a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; and that I am a citizen of the United States.

The Tribune and the Azores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. McKEOUGH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TIMES

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Times of July 7, 1941:

[From the Chicago Daily Times of July 7, 1941]

THE TRIBUNE AND THE AZORES

Comes July after the fourth and Chicagoans look for hotter weather. We're used to it—expect it. We don't like it particularly, but it's part of living here—there's the good lake—we can take it.

Along with the expectancies of weather, part of life here is the invariable disagreement of the Chicago Tribune with each personality, phase, and policy of the national administration. The vagaries of this invariance are even less predictable than the whims of weather. Mr. Roosevelt, as President in unpredictable times and as head of an unpredictable family, puts the Tribune into such a mood of estrangement that it even disagrees editorially with the opinion of its own editor and publisher, Colonel McCormick, that we should take the Azores as a defense contingency.

After Colonel McCormick had testified on February 6 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the lease-lend bill, the Tribune published a story from which the following extracts are taken verbatim:

"Senator PEPPER. To whom do the Azores belong?

"Colonel MCCORMICK. To Portugal.

"Senator PEPPER. Suppose Hitler should capture and occupy Portugal and set up a puppet government in Portugal, what would you recommend this country to do about the Azores?

"Colonel MCCORMICK. I would get there first.

"Senator PEPPER. You think that would be a policy calculated to keep the peace of the United States?

"Colonel MCCORMICK. Yes, I think so.

"Senator PEPPER. Wouldn't Hitler do anything to resist?

"Colonel MCCORMICK. I think England will make an arrangement with us to occupy the Azores. You understand that England has the right.

"Senator PEPPER. If Hitler conquered both England and Portugal and decided there should be a Hitler base at the Azores, what would you do?

"Colonel MCCORMICK. Get there first. Just as General Jackson did in Florida. I would go right in and take them. That is how we got Florida.

"Senator PEPPER. Suppose Hitler declared war on us for occupying the Azores?

"Colonel MCCORMICK. Then we should have to fight. These Germans are not so tough. I have been up against them and there is no use being scared of them."

Colonel McCormick said that if it could be assumed that the British, French, Italian, and German Navies were combined and in control of the Cape Verde Islands, the United States probably would have to act on the defensive. If our fleet were able to get to the Azores first and occupy them, he added, it could defend them against the combined naval strength of the navies mentioned.

"I would like to get to the Azores right away," he told PEPPER. "The British would be glad to have us."

"Senator PEPPER. The British do not own the Azores, do they?

"Colonel MCCORMICK. They have a right to occupy them. They did 23 years ago. We based our Navy on the Azores in the war of 1917–18."

"Senator CLARK concluded the questioning of Colonel McCormick. 'When you were being questioned by Senator PEPPER,' he said, 'there was some discussion about the occupation of the Azores. You did not mean, or did you mean to leave the impression that the defense of the United States was dependent or contingent upon our occupation of the Azores?'

"'No,' was the answer. 'It would be improved; that is all.'"

We gathered from this testimony 5 months ago that Colonel McCormick suggested getting to the Azores right away because the defense of the United States would be improved thereby. It seems we were mistaken. Last Thursday in an editorial entitled "Hemisphere Defense" the Tribune said:

"The suggestion that we occupy the Azores or Cape Verde Islands as a defense measure is not made in good faith. We occupied the Azores 23 years ago as a part of our invasion of Europe and we abandoned them when we returned home.

"We will need the Azores only if we have aggressive intentions to invade the Old World. Then we would need the Azores and possibly the Cape Verde Islands. But if self-defense is our motive, an occupation of these possessions of Portugal would be an international wrong and an aggression such as the German occupation of Holland and Belgium. * * *"

And so here we are again in July weather, and what's the prediction for tomorrow?

Discipline in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram

received by me from the Reverend O. W. Robinson, of Newport, Ky.:

NEWPORT, KY., *July 10, 1941.*

Congressman BRENT SPENCE:

As a member of draft board from Campbell County I protest the senile action of General Lear in his uncalled-for action regarding the discipline of troops. I feel that our young American men called to the colors deserve leaders who are really qualified to lead men. Does he not deserve to be disciplined for his childishness?

Rev. O. W. ROBINSON.

Annual Commencement of Boston University, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE J. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our country is today passing through a grave period, and times like the present demand the services of men with high achievements, leadership, clear minds, and courage in order that we may better absorb the shocks by the dictators and tyrants against our American way of life and keep the torch of democracy and liberty aflame with unceasing brightness.

Men of this type deserve the honors that the Nation wishes to bestow upon them, and I wish to congratulate our very able and distinguished colleague from Missouri, the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, and upon whom Boston University has conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

The House of Representatives, I am sure, rejoices in this tribute. For many years the House has benefited from his clear insight into economic and political problems, his devotion to his duties, and desire to be helpful to all. DEWEY SHORT's remarkable ability as a speaker has made him extremely effective in presenting his ideas backed by a steadfastness of purpose to uphold the very highest ideals in our American way of life.

On June 7, 1941, Congressman SHORT delivered an address which, in my opinion, is filled with elevated thoughts and eloquent language, and characteristic of our colleague. It is inspiring to us all in these troublous times, and I can readily appreciate the impression it must have made upon his audience. I know my colleagues join with me in congratulating him not only upon the honor bestowed upon him, but also upon this address, which speaks for itself more convincingly than I could in any words describe it.

After Congressman SHORT finished his discourse before a large group of fine young men and women of Boston University, he was presented by President Daniel L. Marsh, who spoke in part as follows:

CITATION BY DR. MARSH

DEWEY SHORT, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress from the State of Missouri, graduate of Boston University, a Christian scholar who has consecrated superb eloquence, the eloquence of sincerity, to the intelligent and patriotic service of his country—Doctor of Laws.

Under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by Congressman SHORT before the graduates of Boston University at Boston, Mass., on June 7, 1941:

OUR AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(Address of Hon. DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri)

President Marsh, members of the board of trustees and of the faculty, and fellow alumni of Boston University, it is both a distinct honor and an immense pleasure for me to return with thousands of my fellow alumni to attend the sixty-eighth commencement exercises of our alma mater. It is now nearly a score of years ago that I graduated from the oldest college in this great university.

When I was a little boy I read with curiosity about the seven wonders of the world, and during the past two decades it has been my privilege and good fortune as a Missourian who has to be shown to have traveled rather widely and to have seen for myself some of these wonders of the world. The longer I live the more widely I travel and the more I study men and institutions the more I am convinced that there is only one wonder left in the world today and that is the United States of America.

There are other countries larger than ours in area, that cover more acres, that have richer mineral deposits, and more diversified agricultural products, and perhaps that possess vaster natural resources; just as there are also other countries that are larger than ours in population, outnumbering us three or four to one. Notwithstanding the fact that other countries are larger than ours both in area and population, within the brief span of a century and one-half the United States has grown to be the greatest Nation on earth and our people, in spite of all the vicissitudes of fortune through which they have passed, have become the happiest and freest people under the face of the shining sun.

Why is it then that we are supreme among the sovereign nations of this earth? Our preeminence is due not to accident because neither geography nor population is the true criterion by which to judge the greatness of a nation or its people.

Among many fortunate factors, there are at least three great forces that have contributed to our supremacy. First, the Christian religion—the founders of this Republic and the men who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were God-fearing men who accepted the tenets of our Christian faith. This faith looks upon the soul as a pearl of great price, acknowledges and respects the dignity of man, and stresses the eternal value of individual redemption. Men must be saved one at a time before they can be saved as a whole. The faith of our fathers believed not only in the good-neighbor policy between nations but also between individuals and groups within a nation. We are our brother's keeper and should do unto him as we would have him do unto us. Never should we demand for ourselves that which we are not freely willing to grant unto others. This is the very essence of democracy. It is the backbone of liberty. We all want economic recovery in America but we need most a spiritual revival. Moral regeneration must precede the return of a normal, sound, and lasting prosperity.

The second force contributing to our greatness and which goes hand in hand with our Christian faith is our American form of government—a constitutional representative republic where the people themselves are the supreme sovereign, a government which derives all its just powers from the consent of the governed. When Washington refused a kingly crown the divine right of kings was challenged and instead of one-man rule the Father of our Country and his copatriots established a government of, by, and for the people. They were as careful and anxious to avoid a pure democracy as they were to avoid an autocracy because they fully realized that autocracy ends in tyranny and democracy ends in anarchy. In order to keep final authority in the hands of the people through their legally chosen representatives the powers of government were divided into three separate, distinct, coordinate, and coequal branches—legislative, executive, and judicial.

It is true that the Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court are in Washington, D. C., but the Government of the United States is in Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, and every little hamlet of our land. The Government, in other words, is in the people and not outside them, and the people themselves are above the President, the Congress, the Court, or all three combined. If freedom is to be kept alive and our liberties preserved we must ever keep the three branches of our Government separate and distinct, each to act as a check and balance to the other two, and we must never suffer the usurpation of the powers of one branch of the Government by either of the other branches. Over-concentration of wealth in the hands of a few is dangerous to the freedom of a people but over-concentration of political power in the hands of one man or any single group of men is fatal to their freedom. In defending liberty and democracy abroad let us make sure not to lose it at home. One must put his own house in order before he is able to save the world.

The third great force which coincides with and supports both the Christian religion and our republican form of government in making America the land of freedom is our underlying, basic, economic philosophy of individual initiative and private enterprise. This philosophy sets no limit upon the accomplishments of the individual except his own talent, genius, and untiring industry so long as he does not trespass upon the rights of others. Those men imbued with the Christian spirit who wrote our Constitution wanted to establish a government ruled over and controlled by neither a monopolistic capitalism nor a proletarian communism. When the fathers wrote that "all men are born and created equal" they did not mean that all men are possessed with equal capacities or energies, but they did insist that all men should be given equal opportunity to develop the talents and to exercise the energies with which God had endowed them. These three forces, then, the Christian religion, our republican form of government, and our basic economic philosophy of free, individual enterprise comprise our American way of life. This way of life is being threatened more today—from without and within—than ever before.

While times and conditions change, truth never changes and one of our greatest needs in this time of confusion and bewilderment is to return to the eternal verities; to recognize, defend, follow, and cultivate once more these three great forces that have contributed to our greatness.

In a republic such as ours where the democratic processes of government have been exercised and decisions are made by the force of public opinion we must always exercise diligence and care to see that public opinion is fully and impartially informed. Indeed the Father of our Country warned us that "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened." This important role—perhaps the most important role in a democracy—is played by the university, especially a school such as

Boston University where the faculty and the students, unhampered and unfettered, pursue with an open mind the quest of truth. One of the first lessons a Member of Congress learns is that there are so many desirable ends that an act of Congress cannot accomplish. Indeed, we have learned through trial and error—and the experience has been bitter at times—that it is impossible to legislate either morality or prosperity. It requires something more than presidential fiat, parliamentary laws, and court decisions to make men good. The greatest need at this hour is for the American people to have more internal conviction for we would then need less external compulsion. Cooperation and not coercion is the method of democracy. This, of course, can be achieved through education and not by legislation. Powerful as is Congress, we cannot yet control the weather from Washington—the laws of God and Nature are still a bit above us. The significant thing then is the proper training of the mind and cultivation of the soul. Perhaps Boston University alone has contributed as much to the Nation's and to the world's good as has the Congress of the United States itself.

Mere education in itself, however, will not solve our many complex modern problems. Education brings knowledge and knowledge is power but unless directed into the right channels this power, as the world sadly knows today, can be used for evil as well as good. If education then is to be valuable to mankind and helpful to humanity it must be inspired by motives that are right and intentions that are noble. In short, it must be education based upon moral principles, ethical ideals and shot through and through with the Christian spirit. Education that is not based upon morality and religion is worse than no education at all. Knowledge without character is devilish and dangerous.

You and I should feel profoundly grateful this evening and rejoice that it was our good fortune to attend Boston University which believes in this kind of education and which inculcates these principles. Thousands upon thousands of our fellow alumni—judges, legislators, administrators, artists, musicians, business executives, captains of industry, bishops, and ministers of the gospel, architects and builders, common laborers, humble folks in all the walks of life, rich and poor, Gentile and Jew, Protestant and Catholic, men and women of every race, creed, and color—are bringing not only enlightenment to the poor distressed peoples of the world but are instilling the spirit of God into the hearts of men. They are sowing seeds of good will and spreading the spirit of brotherhood throughout the world.

Judging from the present status of the world's vortex of rebellion and slaughter, it would seem that we had failed in our task but we have not. True, today is one of the dark pages in the world's history but it is one of those periodic transitions through which the world has passed before. The world bleeds but hope never dies. Every cloud has its silver lining. Christ himself had His Golgotha. The purest beauty is born of pain and the greatest understanding comes through suffering. Much rubbish will be consumed by this terrifying conflagration. This awful present carnage will cease some day and mankind will turn its attention and efforts away from destruction to the building of a better world.

Imbued with the teachings and the spirit of this great institution, our Boston University family will convince men through reason and by example rather than at the point of a bayonet or through intolerant dogmas that the real enemies of America and of mankind are poverty, disease, ignorance, intolerance, and injustice. Cannon cannot destroy ideas; torpedoes cannot sink ideals.

Boston University itself has had her Gethsemanes. During the recent prolonged, unparalleled, and devastating depression this great beacon light of learning, which holds out hope, peace, and progress to the world, has faced many trials. Notwithstanding her present inadequate equipment and lack of proper facilities, in spite of reduced income on endowment investments, and though tuition fees have dwindled because of smaller enrollments, this great institution has been writing its annual reports in black while our Federal Government has been writing its daily statements in red. More than once I have wished that we could bring such an able administrator as President Marsh down to Washington. I believe the country would welcome him. I know the taxpayers would get relief from his presence. Because of his broad vision, untiring industry, cautious planning, coordinating capacity, and administrative ability he has been able not only to keep this university's head above water while many others were sinking throughout the Nation, but he has improved its service, advanced its influence, and made it truly one of the great universities in the world today. No doubt Daniel L. Marsh has been discouraged at times, but his unconquerable faith in this institution and his burning desire to see its ideals make an indelible imprint upon the Nation and the world has enabled him to carry on successfully in the face of almost insuperable difficulties. Dr. Marsh has great dreams and hopes for the continued growth and development of Boston University, but he cannot do the job alone.

As loyal alumni of this blessed alma mater we should not only pledge him but give him our full and wholehearted cooperation in achieving such noble aims. This we can do by urging young men and women to attend Boston University, by giving of our own substance, by enlisting the help of others who can give and most of all by carrying the spirit of this great institution into the lives of those people who inhabit the communities where we live. Boston University teaches men both how to earn a living and how to live a life. The practical and theoretical sides of education are properly balanced.

When this present terrible war is all over the task of readjustment will be exceedingly difficult and the problem of reconstruction will be almost overwhelming. More than ever before Boston University and all kindred institutions will be needed to furnish the young men and young women in all walks of life to go out and erect a new and better civilization on the ruins of the old. That is our great challenge, and my earnest hope and fervent prayer is that each one of us will meet his own personal responsibility. Liberty has duties to perform as well as rights to enjoy. Hail to thee, Boston University! May God help you and your sons and daughters to preserve our American way of life.

Amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many of us are placed in a dilemma. We wish to support the provision providing for deferment. If we do we are compelled to support sections 2 and 3 which are an invasion of the rights of a free people.

You heard yesterday from the floor a statement that sections 2 and 3 of this act were the best legislation ever designed to preserve and protect the rights of labor, and that labor should welcome it. In substance, Hitler said the same thing to Austria and to all invaded countries. Quisling said it to the Norwegians. The wolf said it to Little Red Riding Hood. I hope no one is so naive as to believe this. Both labor and industry have much to fear from this legislation. I have sat on both sides of the equation. From that experience—over 35 years—I garner the fact that you cannot have compulsory or enchained labor and a high morale. Free Americans are unaccustomed to that method. Enchained labor means the lash. It is the method of the dictator. Do we want that here?

Let us be logical for a moment. Admitted that a few subversives have caused trouble, do you propose to use compulsion on 40,000,000 of our free American citizens to throttle these comparative few? Would not the logical procedure be to reach in and stifle this few if they be criminal and dangerous? A strike is a symptom of discontent and unhappiness. You cannot order a symptom to cease manifesting itself. That can only be done by finding the cause and then providing the remedy. It is a delicate mechanism to which our American life is geared. Interference with any part has its reverberations throughout the whole structure. In the hysteria of the day, with which we are afflicted too, we are prone to do something which will damage the structure forever.

Adequate American Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

POEM WRITTEN FOR THE AMERICAN DEFENSE ASSOCIATION

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem written for the American Defense Association, of Washington, D. C., by Col. J. E. Myers, retired, president, in behalf of its efforts for air-mindedness and preparedness in the Americas:

EAGLE WINGS

(Dedicated to the creation of an adequate American air force by T. M.)

From Flanders fields the anguished souls of men
Once called to us, and now they call again,
To grasp the torch they tossed; to hold it high;
And keep it ever flaming in the sky—
In Freedom's cause.

America, the dreamer, from her sleep,
Shakes off the dust of slumber; and, at last,
Resolved her consecrated vow to keep,
Doth now begin to fill the heavens, vast—
With eagle wings.

Behold! the vault will darken with her planes,
And with the storm of motors full resound;
Now, will she change from woeful lack to gains,
And seek expansion to the utmost bounds—
Of eagle wings.

Who rules the air shall also rule the sea,
And land, and all and everything beside;
'Tis ours to serve the cause of Liberty,
And turn the Armageddon battletide—
With eagle wings.

We must not fail: split seconds yet may spell
World liberation from a Nazi hell;
And thus, while "larks still bravely singing, fly,"
We'll keep the faith with all of those who die—
In Freedom's cause.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 4, 1941.*

Cooperation With Our Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. RAYMOND H. GEIST AT WEEHAWKEN'S GOOD-NEIGHBOR NATIONS EXPOSITION

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, last month there was conducted under the auspices of the town of Weehawken, N J., a good-neighbor nations exposition. The exposition continued throughout 5 full days and nights and was attended by many thousands of people from Weehawken and adjacent communities. The exhibits were furnished not only by many of the leading industries of America, but by a number of official representatives of Mexico and Central and South American republics. The exposition was highly educational in character and gave considerable impetus to the American policy of cementing closer and friendlier relationships with those countries.

Hon. John G. Meister, mayor of Weehawken, and the town officials who cooperated with him in the development and conduct of this novel exposition, are to be highly commended for their patriotic enterprise. So far as I know, they have set a precedent and, as well, have furnished a laudable example for other municipalities throughout the land.

One of the important features of the exposition was the opening address delivered in the presence of several thousand auditors by Hon. Raymond H. Geist, Chief of the Division of Commercial Affairs of the United States Department of State. The impression made by Mr. Geist will long remain with those whose privilege it was to hear his inspiring and instructive address. Mr. Geist is, of course, an expert on the commercial relations of the United States with our Latin American neighbors and the information and ideas which he transmitted in such effective fashion to his multitude of hearers must necessarily be productive of a greater understanding on their part of the desirability of closer cooperation with the other nations of this hemisphere, as well as a greater understanding of the objectives and ideals of these people.

Mr. Geist's address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to participate in the opening of this exposition which you have dedicated to the Americas and to the task of creating a common feeling of good will and esprit de corps among the nations of this hemisphere. It is a tribute to the citizens of Weehawken and the leaders of this city that you are willing to devote your energies not only to fostering civic progress in your own community, but to turn your attention to all the countries of these continents, and as has been announced, send greetings to the Americas, all the way from the northernmost tip of Alaska to the southernmost part of South America; from the Aleutian Islands to Cape Horn. By creating this exposition you give reality to an effort commonly made by the citizens of this city to foster good will and knit together closer bonds of our country with the pan-American nations. I congratulate you upon this undertaking and applaud you for the vision you manifest.

Today the greatest civilization in the world is established in these continents of the west which we call North and South America. All the riches of the earth are here distributed far and wide throughout the broad expanse of almost limitless territory. We are free peoples. The freedom which we have inherited from our fathers is our most precious possession. It is our common purpose to bequeath that freedom to our children, so safe-guarded and strengthened, that they may bequeath it to theirs; and so from generation to generation down the long vista of time.

The traditions upon which the culture of the New World is founded have their origins in eras and epochs which have passed, and among the nations of the Old World whose histories have been darkened by devastating conflicts and where millions have suffered and are again suffering the horrors of war. From the scenes of those age-old struggles our forefathers came to found a new world, where success in the quest for happiness and well-being was assured. They came not with any hatred in their hearts for the lands that they had left, but, inspired by a hope that life in the Americas would be worth while, they sought to establish better homes for themselves and their posterity. The millions who live in these continents today have realized much of the better life they sought; and the determination that it shall continue is the steady purpose of all. But this purpose can be achieved only by a common and united effort to make Americanism and the future of the Americas the aspiration and motive of every citizen. We in this country are proud to be Americans. Our allegiance to our country and to the American way of life is unshakable. And our loyalty extends further. We welcome the closest ties of friendship and sympathy with the peoples of all the countries in this hemisphere. Our neighbors to the south and our neighbors to the north share with us a common destiny. That destiny is to advance civilization, to make life nobler, and preserve those institutions upon which well-being depends. It has been the policy of the American people and of the American Government to foster and promote good relations between the nations of the Americas; but never in the history of these continents has this impetus found more common acceptance than now. In international relations, as in human friendships, the value of such ties depends upon the service rendered, and not upon the material advantages which may be obtained. This great Nation of ours, with all its wealth and resources, with its manifold actualities and potentialities of leadership, has much to offer fully and honestly to its neighbors. This, I understand, is the purpose of organizing the Good Neighbor Nations' Exposition at Weehawken. In giving intercontinental emphasis to the Pan American ideal, we wish to make our western civilization the product of a common effort in which we all participate and of which we all partake. We are disposed to place at the service of the other nations in North, Central, and South America the vast experience that we have acquired in developing our resources, industries, educational and cultural institutions. We wish to make available to all the processes by which we have raised the standard of living in this country and fostered health among our people. We wish to acquire from our sister republics to the south and from our neighbor to the north those peculiar advantages of civilized life which they have developed by their genius, industry, and talent.

At this particular time in our history, when the impact of world events arouses us to greater effort on behalf of the general health and strength of every individual in our commonwealth, the promotion of closer relations between the countries of this hemisphere in matters of public welfare are most important. The development of new machinery, and the technological progress made in this country through research and study, which costs millions of dollars annually and the efforts of thousands of scientists, engineers, and specialists, are advances made for all the nations in this hemisphere and not for the United States alone.

It will ever be the chief concern of mankind, as it was from the beginning of the human race, to develop the art of agriculture and the natural fruits of the soil, as here in New Jersey, the Garden State. Those countries of the earth are especially fortunate whose basic industry and commerce have had their origins in the products of rich and fruitful lands, which have not only provided sustenance for the inhabitants but also surpluses for other peoples living beyond the national borders.

The inventive genius of man during the last hundred years has made such progress that the existence of human life has become revolutionized. And where this process has been to ameliorate the lot of mankind and to make commonly available advantages which previously were reserved for the few or entirely unknown, the nations of the earth have been uplifted and advanced definitely to a higher standard. It is fitting, too, that enterprises which have as their object not alone the furthering of commerce, but the advancement of knowledge and technical skill should receive common support.

The Government of the United States has initiated a program of cooperation with the other American republics which has been conceived in the spirit of friendly and neighborly service and designed to make available, wherever it is desired and needed, technical progress and development. The Congress has made appropriations and approved legislation, in support of the policy of the United States, to further in every practical way the development of cordial and friendly relations with our neighbors to the south. This willingness of the United States to assist its sister republics in the utilization of their resources and the expansion of their industries has met with cordial reception, and considerable progress has been made since the inception of the program. Experts have also been detailed for

a limited period to collaborate with governments in South America in an advisory capacity in connection with the development of their resources and the furtherance of their public projects.

In this general program of cooperation with the other nations of this hemisphere, probably none will be of more interest than the projects involving the collaboration of the Department of Agriculture. The chief of these are the investigations being carried on and projected in connection with complimentary trade. As you know, in recent years, since the inauguration of the trade-agreements program which Secretary Hull has so earnestly fostered and promoted, the attention of the American Government has been devoted to every phase of international commercial relations. It has been our concern not only to sell American products and manufactured goods in foreign markets but to buy the products and goods of other countries in this hemisphere as well. The time has come when American merchants must give as much attention, if indeed not more, to the possibilities of buying from other countries as to the opportunities of selling. If our neighbors have resources which are now only partially developed, and which we need as normal consumers or users in our industrial processes, we should hasten to assist them, in order that the production of such resources increase and that our purc' ases from them become larger.

We are bound, in view of the gravity of the international situation, to dedicate ourselves to finding a realistic solution of the problems which consequently arise in our economic and trade relations with other countries, particularly with our neighbors in the Americas. We must take a long-range view of these economic problems, and endeavor to build up a permanent trade on a complementary basis. We must sell to our neighbors the things which we produce and which they need; and we must buy from them the products which we need and of which they produce more than they need. We can exchange our goods for many products grown in tropical and subtropical areas. The Department of Agriculture has undertaken projects which will eventually enable us to obtain an increasing amount of such products from our neighbors in the south. The list of noncompetitive products which we can import from Central and South America is constantly increasing, and efforts are being made to expand it still further. One has only to mention woods from the forests of the Amazon and Orinoco, tropical oils, plants, seeds, and fibers. The surveys undertaken by the Department of Agriculture cover investigations and geological studies in soils, climatic factors, plant experimentation in the tropical areas of the other American republics. Certain of these acts of cooperation, notably that of defense, may be necessary only while our common peace and tranquility are threatened; but in those spheres of collaboration, of which the results are permanently beneficial, we shall continue to march together after the present turmoil in world affairs has ceased.

Much emphasis has been placed repeatedly upon the obligations of our Government to assist in establishing sound economy and mutually beneficial international trade among the nations of this hemisphere. Our own Government, in collaboration with the other nations of the Americas, is moving as swiftly, as resolutely and as directly in the solution of all our problems as government can; but business and industry cannot be spectators in this historical and epochal effort. The whole weight of our national strength, marshaled and set in motion under the leadership of our captains of industry and commerce must move forward to the task. The Government of the United States, through the various departments and independent agencies, is facing these questions, not only in our own behalf, but with the determination of securing for all the countries in the western world the maximum of prosperity and well-being. Moreover, the loyal cooperation of all the governments concerned is essential to ultimate success. If the long-range program of making all the nations on this side of the Atlantic economically sound and stable is to succeed, there will be required as well the unstinted cooperation of all the financial, industrial and commercial interests of all the countries in the Americas.

You are today celebrating the friendship existing between the United States and the other nations of the Americas. President Roosevelt announced what is known as the good-neighbor policy in his inaugural address in 1933 when he used the following words: "In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who, respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors." Furthermore, the President said that the policy of the good neighbor is "a policy which can never be unilateral. In stressing it the American Republics appreciate, I am confident, that it is bilateral and multilateral and that the fair dealing which it implies must be reciprocated."

The good-neighbor policy which the President proclaimed in his first inaugural address 8 years ago has inspired the peoples of this hemisphere to work together for those ideals and principles which may be shared and cherished in a great international community such as ours in the western world. In paying a tribute to the statesmen who in this hemisphere have laid the foundations for a lasting peace among us let me finally quote the words of our great Secretary of State from an address which he made in New York in 1937:

"What a boon to humanity it would be if other groups of nations were, at this crucial stage in world affairs, to give their plighted faith to a similar undertaking—if they were, in a spirit of peace, unity, and moral consecration, to reassert and revitalize the law of nations, international morality, and treaty obligations, and to pledge solemn observance of the doctrine of the equality, the sovereignty, the territorial integrity, and the liberty of all nations."

The Bishops Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of July 7, 1941:

[From the Boston Post of July 7, 1941]

THE BISHOPS SPEAK

With a boom of thunder that reverberated around the world, the first fissure in the impregnable armor of the Nazi hosts developed yesterday.

Although long predicted by many out of sheer wishful thinking and by a few in position to know internal conditions, the source of the crack in the vaunted invincible shield, came as a surprise to practically all.

On the basis of common sense and past experiences of history, it was apparent that the politico-military might with which Hitler confronted the world had its weakness.

Some thought the first break would come from the belt tightening, due to food shortages, reaching the limit of endurance. Others felt that lack of fuel would be responsible. And more even considered the remote possibility that the Germans themselves would tire of the soldiering and bloodletting.

But the appearance of the disaffection on the religious front, coming with such force and suddenness, so outspoken and so daring, is bound to have greater effect than even a serious military set-back.

The vigorous condemnation by the bishops of greater Germany, of what the Nazis were doing to the Catholic religion, must have come as a shock to the Sabbath congregations yesterday, because it was the first protest from the pulpits since the Nazis marched on Poland in 1939 and, more so, because the bishops resolved the situation into a battle for "the existence or nonexistence of Christ" in Germany.

But the pronouncement held other implications that went deeper. It came at a time when Hitler and his hosts are trying to give the impression to their people and the world that the march on godless Russia is something of a holy crusade which should be applauded.

Deeper still was the fact that the bishops stressed where the message was drawn up—at the tomb of St. Boniface in Fulda. To German Catholics that held much meaning.

St. Boniface is known as the apostle of Germany, having been a great missionary who converted the heathens, organized the Catholic Church, and died a martyr at the hands of infidels in Germany in 755.

The emphasizing of St. Boniface will rankle the Nazis bitterly, for in a day when they were trying to devise a state religion, based on gods out of mythology, St. Boniface is remembered in legend for having destroyed a sacred oak of Thor at Hesse.

Since Catholics make up more than 34 percent of the population of Greater Germany, the dissenting party does not constitute any weak minority.

The single rent in the shield may not make it very vulnerable. But whether concessions are made to the Catholics or Himmler, with his bully boys, goes to work on church defiant, the break will not mend easily.

And it would be a sort of poetic justice if the spirit of St. Boniface, who was born and educated in England and began his missionary career from that island which is the stumbling block of the Nazis, should start Hitler along the road to ruin.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the

San Francisco Chronicle regarding national defense.

On Sunday, June 29, the San Francisco Chronicle issued a notable defense edition, and congratulations should be extended to the entire management and personnel for the patriotic motives which prompted this splendid edition.

It reflects signal honor on George T. Cameron, publisher, and Paul C. Smith, editor. These gentlemen are brilliantly carrying on the forward-looking public policies sponsored by the late Gen. M. H. de Young, who for many years was the dominant personality on the Chronicle. This newspaper not only wields a powerful influence in California—it is one of America's truly great dailies.

The defense edition graphically sets forth how the many essential raw materials and natural resources of California are being coordinated and developed so as to be the more readily available for the Nation's defense program.

One article in the paper entitled "What You, the Individual, Can Do To Aid in Defense," explains how each individual may serve. While the suggestions and instructions refer particularly to the citizens of San Francisco, nonetheless, they are applicable to every community in the United States. It reads as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of June 29, 1941]

WHAT YOU, THE INDIVIDUAL, CAN DO TO AID IN DEFENSE

Buy United States Defense Bonds. They're on sale at post offices and banks. MArket 2500 will give you information.

Manufacturers should register their facilities with the Defense Contract Service located in the Federal Reserve Bank Building.

Offer your services to the Red Cross and other relief agencies. Red Cross headquarters are at 1136 Eddy Street. WAlnut 3011.

Participate in civil defense activities. Watch for the mayor's committee, which will soon begin registration of local citizens for parts they may wish to play. In Alameda County address letters to Ralph E. Hoyt, district attorney, Alameda County Courthouse. In other cities contact chiefs of police. State Guard and the State Guard aviation section are looking for men. San Francisco headquarters are at National Guard Armory at Fourteenth and Mission. Contacts may be made Monday and Thursday nights after 7 o'clock.

Don't hoard food supplies or spread tales of price raises—the United States Government is watching them and will exercise control where necessary.

Better yourself for participation in defense by study at home or night school. For information call the Board of Education at HEmlock 4680. If you are unemployed and have mechanical knowledge or experience, register with the State Employment Service at 154 Sansome Street: EXbrook 5656.

Radio amateurs can help the Federal Communications Commission police the air waves by reporting unusual disturbances to the local inspector at Customs House: SUtter 6208.

Be watchful but not an "investigator"—report suspicious activities to the proper authorities—F. B. I. headquarters are at 111 Sutter: EXbrook 2679; S. F. Police Department: SUtter 2030.

Be courteous and helpful to men of the armed forces.

Plan entertainment and parties for men of the armed forces.

Hon. Morris Sheppard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. U. S. GUYER OF KANSAS

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address I delivered May 11, 1941, at the Calvary Baptist Church in Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the memorial to the late Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas:

Shakespeare, in his tragedy of greatness, put upon the lips of Marc Antony the naked truth concerning human grandeur. Antonius was standing above the body of his assassinated friend and comrade, that "piece of bleeding earth," that pathetic clay that but yesterday was Julius Caesar "whose word might have stood against the world." As he gazed upon the prostrate form he exclaimed:

"O Mighty Caesar! dost thou lie so low?
Are all thy conquests, glories, triumphs, spoils,
Shrunk to this little measure?"

Massillon delivering the funeral oration of Louis XIV in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, declared: "Dieu, seul est grand." God alone is great. Such is the tragedy of human greatness. So the old Romans said: "Sic trancit gloria mundi." So passes the glory of the world.

But Senator Sheppard in his long and notable career achieved more than is the lot of most of our national legislators. He was an idealist, he was devoted to an idea, and ideas rule the world.

I want to speak briefly only of one of his ideas. That idea was temperance and his unyielding fidelity to the cause of prohibition. In that he sincerely believed to the day of his death. I always looked forward to the 16th of January for Senator Sheppard's annual address on that subject. He believed from the bottom of his heart that repeal is and has been a monumental failure and every year he marshaled his facts to prove it.

He saw the rising tide of drunkenness and a kindred brood of evils ever increasing, and he exposed the tragic facts in most striking and eloquent words. The agencies and causes of these conditions he fought early and late wherever he found them. His sincerity and earnestness disarmed even those who disagreed with him. Those who diametrically opposed his ideas regarding the liquor traffic had great respect for his character and admired his unflinching fidelity to his principles. His place in this worthy cause will be difficult to fill.

NEVER LOST FAITH

Senator SHEPPARD did not share in the despair and apathy of most advocates of this reform but remained firm and active during all the fluctuating fortunes of this cause. For instance, it was not difficult for one to go along with the crowd when I first came to the House in 1924 when the so-called wets could not muster enough votes to successfully demand a roll call. Then it was easy to ride along with the tide of public opinion, which favored the eighteenth amendment by great majorities. But the time came when it was the reverse when it is impossible for the drys to muster enough votes to order a roll call. But this only aroused the Senator to renewed faith and activity which he directed toward convincing the people that repeal was a tragic mistake and that it had proved a great failure in every sense.

As Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs he strove to banish intoxicating beverages from training camps where our soldier youth are to be trained. He would have exempted them from the temptation to indulge in intoxicating liquors. The Congress should pass his bill for that purpose as a monument to his integrity and his interest in the welfare of our soldier youth. He believed with Gladstone that strong drink had caused more misery and suffering than war, pestilence, and famine combined, and so believing he never ceased to wage a relentless battle against the traffic in ardent spirits.

On January 16, 1941, as usual he delivered his address on prohibition and I quote from the last few sentences of that last address of his on the 16th of January.

"I CONDEMN ALCOHOL"

I quote: "Mr. President, I condemn beverage alcohol as a threat to the health, happiness, and prosperity of our citizenship. I condemn it as a contributing factor in the premature death of hundreds of thousands of our people. I condemn it as a charge upon the public, intolerable in an era of strenuous effort toward national security and defense. I condemn it because an alcohol-drinking democracy cannot develop the maximum strength for national defense."

That was the last of these speeches of January 16 and it is a fine testimony to his fidelity and the faith that was in his heart—a fitting exit from his career in the Senate.

I know of no better manner of concluding this faltering eulogy of Senator SHEPPARD who has gone to the land of his dreams than by quoting a little poem by the great dramatic critic, William Winter:

"One other bitter drop to drink,
And then—no more!
One little pause upon the brink,
And then—go o'er!
One sigh—and then the lib'rant morn
Of perfect day,
When my free spirit, newly born,
Shall soar away.
One pang—and I shall rend the thrall
Where grief abides,
And generous Death shall show me all
That now he hides;
And, lucid in that second birth,
I shall discern,
What all the sages of the earth
Have died to learn."

Addresses Nineteenth Biennial Convention of Catholic Daughters of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF DR. JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following address by Dr. John K. Cartwright, chaplain, Court District of Columbia, at Mayflower luncheon of Nineteenth Biennial Convention of Catholic Daughters of America, Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

There is no subject today which comes more closely home to men's business and bosoms than peace. We who live in the region of uncertain twilight between peace and war are most conscious today of this great problem. We used to live (we who are in middle life) we used to live in a social climate where peace had reigned so long that we took it to be the normal and almost necessary condition of mankind. But two great shocks separated by the 25 years that make our adult life have deprived us of that easy confidence. After an earthquake one loses the sense of security that one had about the terra firma. After 1914 and 1939 we begin to wonder whether all the rest of our life will be spent under gloom and disaster. "Never bright confident morning again."

The world is full of men and women with advice and bright suggestions. These suggestions have their merits and demerits; their chief fault at the moment seems to be their bewildering multiplicity. But if we look beneath the surface and analyze them in their real nature, we shall find that they fall predominantly into two classes of proposals. The one class of suggestion is in the nature of mechanics: We are told to shift the boundaries and shuffle the treaties and change the parliamentary arrangements, and put the balance of material power securely within the grasp of one group. The other class of suggestion is along the line of political idealism and is expressed in terms of class justice or international morality or the spirit of democracy or the respect for freedom. Along one or other of these lines most of the remedies seem to run. But both lines of thought seem to run very much upon the surface of human nature and to hold out very little hope of a solution radical enough to deal with our very radical international disease of war. For to propose a mechanism (such as a new league of nations or a union now) is to presuppose a spirit. And to propose a spirit in the body politic (such as love of freedom or democracy) is to presuppose a spirit in the millions of individuals who make up this body or bodies politic. There is nothing wrong with many of the proposed mechanisms, as such. There is nothing wrong with the spirit of freedom or democracy, as such. The wrong of the world today is deeper seated. It is a decay of the spirit of religion in the hearts of individual men and women. The spirit of freedom is great, but it is not a source. The spirit of democracy is glorious, but it is not a primary nor a fundamental thing. What is wanted to inspire these spirits is the spirit of all spirits in every individual being.

This spirit is lacking in too many millions of people today to give us any hope for peace until it is restored.

Twenty-seven centuries ago a little nation was surrounded and engulfed by a totalitarian peril. The people of Israel in their unpreparedness were menaced with destruction by the horses and chariots of the Assyrians, which were the tanks and bombers, the mechanized instruments of evil of that day. Doubtless there were captains and rulers in Israel—and even politicians and even statesmen who found the remedy for their troubles in mechanization, in treaties, and in whatever corresponded to the spirit of democracy 2,700 years ago. But one great statesman, the prophet Isaias, told them that "not in chariots and not in horsemen but in the Lord God is your strength." "And there shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse—and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him. He shall not judge according to the sight of his eyes. He shall not judge according to the hearing of the ears. And justice shall be the girdle of his loins and faith the girdle of his reins." Then and then only, according to the prophet, then and then only, when justice and faith shall be the spirit of the people, then and then only "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb and the leopard shall lie down with the kid"; then and then only will they turn their swords into plowshares and their spears into sickles; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they be exercised any more to war. "O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord."

For 2,700 years that has been the true philosophy of politics, national and international. For 2,700 years the true heroes of the nations, the true statesmen and benefactors and thinkers of mankind, have raised that standard only to have it thrown down and trampled by the peoples before they turned to trample on each other. For 2,000 years the center and rallying point of those who believed in that message has been the chair of the supreme pontiffs. Today amidst all the clamor and agony of war, amidst all the confusion of the counselors of peace, amidst all the shifting of the battle lines, amidst all the changes of politics and strategies, amidst it all there is a watchman who cries out to the world the need of peace and the secret of peace—the spirit of religion and brotherhood in the multitudinous hearts and under the myriad countenances of men.

We can be frightened—as we are—at the cruelty and destructiveness of war. We can be alarmed—as we are—at the opportunities for the encroachment of tyranny. But our chief enemy today is neither the explosives that tear down our cities nor the drums and trampling of the tyrants who seek the possession of our souls. Our enemy—our veritable enemy—our profound enemy—our permanent enemy—is the moral irresponsibility and intellectual malice of those who conceal from the minds of men or who pervert in the hearts of men the message of the spiritual which is the secret of their peace. The hideous criminals who march under the swastika and under the hammer and sickle are at least hideous enough to chill our hearts with hatred. The real, lurking, menacing, destructive foe is the unspiritual, irreligious, intelligentsia who are depriving the youth of all people of their trust in God, and with it of the basis of all faith, of all courage, of all loyalty, and of all freedom.

Against armies we can be protected by armies; against tyranny we can be protected by the institution of democracy and the spirit of freedom. But who shall keep democracy wholesome and who shall keep freedom free? Only the spirit of spirits, only the freedom of all freedoms, only the spirit of the Lord and the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free.

Catholic women, you have come here to the Capital of the Nation which you love. You will find much here to reinspire your loyalty as Americans. But that American loyalty will be inspired by nothing so much as by the abiding faith which, as Catholics, you hold in the goodness of God and in your responsibility to Him for patriotism and for civic duty. No American can love his country more than you and few as well as you who love it because God gave it to you. No American can serve the institution of freedom and democracy more than you—and few so well as you who receive your citizenship as a sacred trust. No American can look to the future with more hope than you—and few with as much hope as you who see in the greatest of this country's blessings the opportunity for the exercise of the greatest of all the freedoms—the freedom for the soul to be a soul and to honor the primacy of the spiritual in the individual, in the home, and in the family. No American can honor the national monuments of Washington more than you—and few as well as you who have received from Rome the message of the spiritual which from the days of the prophet has contained the secret of peace for all the nations and tongues of men.

For in Rome today, as in the ages past, is the center of the primacy of the spiritual for all the world of men. Rome once faced the barbarism of filth and ignorance, and won that age to civilization and to light. Today Rome faces the barbarism of mechanized power and herd psychology and it will again be her voice that will bring the nations to sanity and peace.

Some might think, looking at today's disaster—some might think that we have come to the brink of the end. Some do think thus, even some in America. But that is not the feeling of those who look on history with faith. Not on the brink of destruction do we stand, but on the threshold of a new empire, of an empire which will measure its limits not with the Rhine and the Danube but with the very poles of the world; an empire that shall at last show into Christ the fair harvest of all nations and the tongues of men, an empire whose census will be taken not by Cyrenius and the tetrarchs, not by the filing systems of the soviet of world republics, but by the recording angels and ministers of grace. Of that empire each nation shall be the shining province, and our own country shall attain within that spiritual realm the crown of its destiny. That empire will depend not on mechanical institutions and not on secondary loyalties. It will be a spiritual dominion that will rest on loyalty to Christ and that will find in Him its peace and its glory. Of that spiritual dominion the capital will be eternal Rome—not the Rome of Romulus and Caesar, not the Rome of the barbaric kings, not the Rome of Pius, that is the Rome of Peter, the spiritual citadel that is the Rome of God.

Kenneth Farrand Simpson

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of this House, I attended the funeral of my neighbor and friend, KENNETH F. SIMPSON. The religious services were held at St. James Protestant Episcopal Church in Manhattan. Gathered at the church, to pay tribute to Congressman SIMPSON, were

throngs of men and women of every religious, political, and racial group.

By long and constant service to his political party he was recognized as a student of government and as an astute leader of men. While he was an ardent partisan, he was considerate of the views of his political adversaries.

Throughout his adult life the Republican Party honored him with positions of importance and trust. His useful career was capped with further distinction in his election as a Member of this great legislative body. While his service was brief, he made a most favorable impression here in Washington and gave evidence that he would have brought to his new high position the same degree of capability, industry, and energy that marked his life as a distinguished lawyer and public official.

He left a devoted wife and four lovely children.

FOR HE WALKED WITH MEN AND UNDERSTOOD

Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music on the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journeyed on,
His is a fame that never ends
And leaves behind uncounted friends.

Demands for American Blood To Fight Great Britain's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles:

[From the New York Times of July 5, 1941]

WAVELL SEES NEED FOR A NEW A. E. F.—BRITISH GENERAL ASSERTS NAZIS WILL BE BEATEN EVENTUALLY BY INVASION OF GERMANY

(By Harold Denny)

CAIRO, EGYPT, July 4—Gen. Sir Archibald P. Wavell, soon to relinquish his post as commander-in-chief in the Middle East, in which he has won the greatest distinction of any British soldier in this war, discussed the war today in an informal interview that may be considered as his valedictory to the command he is leaving.

In his office he reminisced briefly on the victories and defeats of the past glorious and tragic months and, responding to conversational questions, sketched opinions as to the future that are of special interest at this critical point in American and world history.

The most interesting of these from the American point of view sum up to this:

Whatever happens in eastern Europe, where the Germans and Russians are battling, the final issue of the war will be decided in the west, as it was in the last war, and in the end it will be a battle of manpower.

HE EXPECTS LONG WAR

If the war continues long enough—and General Wavell appears to have no illusions that this will be a short war if it is to be effectively and permanently won—American manpower will be needed. Our airplanes, tanks, and guns, decisive though their aid has been in helping Britain hold out this long, will not be enough. There is a limit to Britain's own manpower.

Germany can and will be beaten eventually by an invasion of her soil after she has been hammered sufficiently from the air.

When and where American troops should eventually be employed are matters to be determined by events.

Britain has no intention of abandoning this theater of war.

General Wavell's conclusions on the part the United States may play, though they coincide with those of many highly placed Americans, were not volunteered by him, but were disclosed only in replies to specific questions and sometimes were revealed more by inference than by statements. Like every other high British official, he has studiously avoided advising Americans what they should do.

The interview was given to only two correspondents, Frank Gervasi, of Collier's, and the writer, who had been trying to arrange it for some time—not an easy thing to do, for the general has a terrific working schedule. Once one gains access to him, General Wavell proves once more what every reporter learns early, that the bigger the man the more gracious he is.

The commander in chief's office, in a big Cairo office building taken over by general headquarters, has no hint of war except maps, studded with pins, that almost entirely cover the paneled walls. There are no other decorations. On a large, plain flat-topped desk are reports from subordinates and a few reference books.

The general left his desk as we entered and led us to a small table in a corner where we could talk close together in complete informality. The general apologized for his shirt sleeves. He has a fine military bearing, listens carefully, and speaks directly to you in the language of an orderly, well-stocked mind and gives the impression of perfect frankness and intellectual honesty.

It was evident General Wavell was relinquishing this command with some regret although he looks tired and in great need of rest. Everywhere among subordinate officers one finds regret at the general's leaving.

"How do you feel about your new post, General?" was the opening question.

"I was in India 30 years ago as a subaltern," he replied. "It will be a new job and quite a change. I have had 2 quite strenuous years here. We have had our ups and downs, Auchinleck (Gen. Claude J. E. Auchinleck who will succeed General Wavell in the Mideast command) is a very good soldier. It will be a good thing to have a fresh mind work on this situation. If one is too long in one place he is likely to become fixed in his thoughts about it. A fresh mind may see things in a new perspective."

Then the conversation began roving over the whole subject of the war, beginning with the present Russian-German conflict. It can hardly be reported chronologically for topics were begun and dropped and then resumed in some other connection.

STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF PLANES

General Wavell avoided any predictions as to the outcome or duration of the Russo-German war except to indicate that air power might prove the controlling factor there and that the German air force was strong. But he saw Germany assuming many disadvantages from the point of view of the war as a whole in plunging into the east.

"Germany in this war, as in the last, has been able thus far to operate from a central position and rely upon her existing network of railways, waterways, and highways to move her weight westward or eastward as she required," he said. "Meanwhile we have had to move and maneuver on the outside of that circle at long distances from our sources of supply.

"Germany, by this drive eastward, has lengthened her line of communication while ours remains constant—and our supplies are coming in increasing quantities from America.

"Can Germany sweep through the Caucasus, Iran, and Iraq?" came another question.

"We cannot speak of sweeping," said the General. "Communications there are bad and the terrain is difficult. Russia's strength lies in the vastness of her numbers, her lack of communications, her ability to withdraw long distances and continue withdrawing.

"If the Germans penetrate deeply into the Ukraine they will find themselves in difficulties for they will be far from their bases; faced with the necessity of transporting supplies over a very long line of communication."

The question of all-out American participation in the war was launched with the writer's query, "Do you hold with the views that only tools are necessary to win the war?"

MORE MANPOWER NEEDED

General Wavell paused and answered, "No, undoubtedly we shall need manpower if the war continues long enough and I have no doubt it will.

"To my mind the west remains the decisive battlefield, notwithstanding this drive eastward, as it was in the last war. England must remain secure (meaning Britain cannot risk weakening home forces for fear of an attempt at invasion.) It will be a battle of manpower in the end."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 8, 1941]

"WIN ON NAZIS' SOIL," MIDDLE EAST CHIEF'S DICTUM TO BRITAIN

CAIRO, EGYPT, July 8.—Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck, new commander in chief of British forces in the Middle East, said yesterday United States manpower was needed if the war is to be won properly—on Germany's own soil.

"And it must be won properly, not half won," he told correspondents.

The new commander, who exchanged posts with Gen. Sir Archibald P. Wavell last week, was former commander in chief in India.

"I've always thought the war must be won in Europe, in Germany, on Germany's own soil," he replied to queries.

"They must be beaten in the way Napoleon was beaten. Therefore, I see as much need for American manpower in this war as in the last. In 12, 14, or 24 months this need will certainly arise. How we are to get into the German's country is another matter, but ways and means will present themselves."

Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, daily we hear one or another Member of the Congress of the United States condemn labor and charge labor with being controlled by Communists. Labor is charged with being unfaithful and lacking in patriotism and loyalty in this national emergency. These Members insist that labor should be denied the right to strike in this national emergency. They demand that labor give its all to its country and sacrifice every right so that we may reach maximum production in order to help the democracies of the world. Yet this same group says nothing about the loyalty, the faithfulness, or the patriotism of industry in our national-defense program. This same group says nothing of those employers who refuse to recognize unions or even adhere to decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, an agency or instrumentality of the court. The fact that the earnings of all major industries in America have shown a tremendous increase over those of the preceding year is not even mentioned. Nothing is said about the increased living costs affecting the life and welfare of every workman and his family in America. And the majority of the press of America commends these statesmen and editorializes their stands. To be frank, I must say that the people of America do not get a true picture of the situation as it actually exists.

Labor is on the spot. Daily the newspapers headline stories of strikes in defense industries. The question now being publicly asked amounts to this: Will labor strike up the band for national defense, or will it merely strike? That question shows not only ignorance of the facts, but betrays a willful and criminal attempt to destroy labor's rights; to wipe out all the social gains of the New Deal, and to pervert the whole purpose of our national defense effort.

Is labor unreasonable in its demand? Should it seek wage increases now? Should it keep its right to strike in this emergency? These are vital questions which concern the entire Nation.

Has labor been unreasonable? Since May 1940, when our defense program really got under way, the number of strikes has decreased over that of the corresponding months in 1939. The total number of strikes for the present period is much less than for 1917 when we were actually at war. The right to strike is basic to all workers' rights and to all liberty in the United States. Without this right, labor has no real protection against low wages and decent living standards. Labor must keep this right in order to remain free, in order to keep and improve standards won over past years of struggle. Abraham Lincoln, one of our greatest Presidents, said: "Thank God we have a country where workingmen have the right to strike."

It should be clear that if our defense program is to defend democracy then every act which strengthens democracy is an integral part of our defense program. An increased standard of living is just as important as an increased schedule of airplane production. All the sacrifices necessary for democracy? Of course. But in view of our vast unused resources and the swollen industrial profits of the last months, it is sheer nonsense to say that labor must sacrifice living standards to enable this country to continue producing for defense.

My investigation with the Department of Labor verifies this statement, and I can quote no greater authority than the senior Senator from my State, Senator JAMES J. DAVIS, of Pennsylvania, who was Secretary of Labor under three Presidents, when voicing his opposition to antistrike legislation said:

> No one should be permitted to believe that labor troubles are more acute now than in the last World War period. In 1919 there were seven times as many workers involved in strikes as in 1940; and in 1917 there were twice as many strikes as in 1940.

There are now dozens of bills before Congress, including the bill now under consideration, designed to freeze wages, to penalize strikers, impose severe criminal penalties for pickets, Government seizure of plants, denial of wages to workers, to force compulsory mediation or the so-called cooling-off period, which are all aimed at the workmen of America. I am unalterably opposed to bills of this nature which attempt to force or regiment American workmen to the same status as the workmen of the totalitarian nations. This certainly will not bring about the national unity we are all clamoring for in this crucial period of our history. Collective bargaining and the right to strike has had behind it the support and influence of outstanding statesmen in this country, and the leaders of other countries throughout the world. Just within the last month Pope Pius XII made his plea to the people of the world for labor's right of collective bargaining; and just recently the Methodist National Conference Board made a declaration in favor of this same principle and stated that after a thorough 2-year investigation much of the propaganda, rumors, and statements against organized labor were erroneous and misleading. It is evident that we cannot force labor to do things by repressive legislation and it is my firm belief that in the Vinson bill and other similar measures now before Congress, the rights of organized labor now guaranteed under the law would be stricken down and destroyed.

Each day sees new proposals to take away the right to strike, or to curb that right so severely that its value to the workers will be destroyed. The greater part of the press of the Nation has been championing these proposals. Most of the schemes originate among Congressmen from poll-tax States who have very few industries in their districts, and who know very little about the problems of workmen in the industrial districts of America. One of the greatest antilabor campaigns in history is in the making, all aimed at labor's basic right—the right to withhold work in order to enforce a little share of those increased profits through higher wages so that the workmen of America can maintain decent standards of living, which bring about happiness, unity, and an invulnerable America. As the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CASEY, so well stated to this House several days ago: "We must stem the hysteria that has enveloped this Congress, or we will be undermining the very democratic principles we are trying to preserve." Labor naturally is trying to fortify its position during this emergency in view of the profits of the large corporations of America. And I believe the vast majority of Congress will agree that if we are to maintain our present standard of living, labor is entitled to its share of profits for its "all-out" efforts in this national-defense program by means of increased wages to the average workmen. The following are undisputed facts of the 1940 profit figures of the six largest corporations of the United States:

Corporation	Profit	Workers employed	Average profit for worker employed
General Motors	$195,500,000	200,000	$917
American Telephone & Telegraph	188,544,052	260,000	725
Standard Oil	110,000,000	55,000	2,000
U. S. Steel	102,180,000	260,000	393
DuPont	99,900,000	65,800	1,550
General Electric	55,000,000	65,000	846

In other words, these six leading corporations made $776,000,000 profit in 1940, an average of $860 profit a year on each worker employed, over and above the wages paid to him.

For the first quarter of this year, the profits exceed the earnings of 1940 by approximately 15 percent, yet some Members of Congress denounce labor because of its attempt to secure increased wages commensurate with the increased cost of living. The Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, represented for the first quarter ended March 31, 1941, profits of $4,160,507, after all charges were deducted. This compares with the net profit of only $1,134,611 for the same quarter last year. Yet we hear labor berated when it threatens to strike upon making a reasonable demand of industry for an increase in wage rate. We hear the cry of Communists in full control of labor in America. These statements grossly exaggerate the actual situation. True enough, there are some Communists in labor's ranks who have caused much of the unwarranted trouble. There are some Communists in labor's ranks who even refused to heed

the warnings of labor's recognized leaders. But will we in Congress add to national unity by abolishing the right to strike, by forced cooling-off periods, or compulsory mediation, or by freezing wages and conditions by outlawing the union shop and pleasing the open shop by seizing struck plants, by penalizing pickets because of a few radicals—a very few in labor's ranks in America?

There are Communists among the businessmen of America. There are Communists in the colleges of America. There are Communists in the legal and medical professions. Communists are everywhere. But thank God, so few, yes; so very few. Can we condemn labor as a whole because of a few undesirable Communists within Labor's ranks? Would we by logical reasoning condemn the law profession, the medical profession, or any other profession because of some shysters or quacks or frauds in any of them? Of course not. Their respective obligations are to clean their own households. Labor is attempting to do just that, and is doing so with distinct credit. The number of strikes throughout the Nation has reached the lowest ebb since the early part of this year. The organized workers of this country are good, true, loyal, and patriotic Americans interested in the preservation of our democracy and of helping this country in this emergency. We cannot impose upon them undue hardship by the enactment of compulsory mediation, or totalitarian policies such as now rules the controlled countries of Nazi Germany and communistic Russia.

In the Thirty-first Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I represent, the heart of the industrial district of America, and in which district are located the United States Steel Corporation, the Westinghouse Electric Co., the Westinghouse Airbrake Co., the McKeesport National Tube Co., the Edgar-Thompson Steel Works, the McClintock-Marshall Co., the Christy Park Works, the Firth-Sterling Steel Corporation, the Union Switch & Signal Co., Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corporation, the Glassport Copperweld Steel Co., the Pittsburgh Steel Foundry Co., and the United States Glass Co., represented by 18 local C. I. O. unions, comprising over 70,000 workmen engaged in national-defense work, there was not even the semblance of a strike. Industry and labor sat down at the counsel table and conciliated their differences with distinct satisfaction to all parties concerned. And my district is typical of every industrial community in America. It is unfair for Members of Congress and the press of America to condemn labor because of isolated infractions in remote sections of our Nation. Do the Members of this Congress wish to change this situation by enacting legislation to compel the workmen of our Nation to do anything contrary to their wishes and create hatred and enmity in the minds and hearts of labor toward Congress and the Government? Of course not. The greatest weapon in America is the morale of its people. To build morale and unity in America, industry and government must be considerate, just, and equitable in their dealings with the American workmen, as they, too, are sacrificing, and it is their sons who are serving this country in our armed forces during this emergency.

Let us deliberate with caution on these vital problems affecting the welfare of the workmen of the Nation, and if industry, labor, and Government, in a real spirit of national unity, will arbitrate and conciliate their differences in the good old American manner of give and take, America will continue to go forward in her progress as the greatest democracy in the world, where workmen will retain the priceless heritage given them by our forefathers, namely, freedom, justice, and equality.

I therefore request the committee to defeat these amendments.

Sixth Monthly Report of Government Finances, Fiscal Year 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

LETTER AND STATEMENTS FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statements from the Secretary of the Treasury concerning receipts, expenditures, and the public debt. Each month, commencing with January of this year, I have placed similar exhibits in the RECORD. These statements bring the data down to the end of June, which marks the close of the fiscal year 1941. The material now presented shows the actual receipts, expenditures, and the status of the public debt for the completed fiscal years, 1940 and 1941, and similar data, on an estimated basis, for the fiscal year to end on June 30, 1942.

The totals relating to "expenditures" as set forth in these statements should not be confused with the totals of "appropriations." An appropriation is authority to spend money for a certain purpose. An expenditure is the actual drawing of money out of the Treasury pursuant to the authority of that appropriation. Generally speaking, "expenditures" from an appropriation can be spread over 3 different fiscal years, the larger proportion, however, being spent in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. It is important, therefore, for those who follow the granting of appropriations by Congress, not to confuse the totals of "appropriations" made during any session and the totals of "expenditures" for any given fiscal year as displayed in the statements of the Treasury Department. The terms "appropriations" and "expenditures" are not synonymous. They are intimately related but vary widely on a time-factor basis.

The matter referred to follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 10, 1941.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By direction of the Secretary and in accordance with the arrangements made with you as outlined in his letter of January 31, 1941, I am enclosing herewith the following statements:

Statement No. I, general Budget summary: Receipts and expenditures, showing (1) Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1942 and (2) actual figures for the fiscal years 1941 and 1940.

Statement No. II, effect on the public debt of financing the deficit, showing (1) estimated amounts for the fiscal year 1942 and (2) actual figures as of June 30, 1941, and June 30, 1940, respectively. This statement shows the extent to which the net deficit has been met through borrowings and reductions in the Treasury's cash balance. It also shows the debt at the beginning and the close of the period.

Statement No. III, statutory debt limitation, showing the amount of the debt outstanding which is subject to the debt limitation and the balance of the borrowing authority, that is, the amount of additional debt which may be issued pursuant to existing limitations.

Statement No. IV, general fund balance, showing an analysis of the general fund balance and the changes therein during the period. This statement sets forth the balances at the beginning and the close of the period classified as to working balance, increment on gold, and seigniorage. It shows how the general fund balance was affected by (1) borrowings, (2) excess of receipts or expenditures in trust accounts, etc., and (3) the net deficit as set forth in statement No. I.

Statement No. V, obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest as of June 30, 1941: This statement shows the contingent liabilities of the Government, that is, the outstanding securities issued by corporations and credit agencies which are guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest.

Statement No. VI, combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies, as of May 31, 1941, based upon the latest official reports received by the Treasury. This statement shows the total assets of such corporations and agencies, the liabilities (including reserves), and their net worth. The liabilities are segregated according to obligations guaranteed by the United States and obligations not so guaranteed. The net worth is classified as to the amounts of the Government's proprietary interest and of the proprietary interests not owned by the Government. The total amount of interagency interests of all corporations and agencies included in this statement is also shown.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

I. *General Budget summary—Receipts and expenditures*

[On basis of daily Treasury statements, i. e., checks paid by Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Budget estimates,[1] fiscal year 1942	Actual	
		Fiscal year 1941	Fiscal year 1940
Receipts:			
Income tax	5,420.0	3,469.6	2,125.3
Miscellaneous internal revenue	3,135.0	2,966.9	2,344.6
Taxes under Social Security Act	847.0	788.2	712.2
Taxes upon carriers and their employees	145.0	136.9	121.0
Customs	390.0	391.9	348.6
Return of surplus funds from government corporations		319.2	53.6
Other	177.0	195.8	219.5
Total receipts	10,114.0	8,268.5	5,924.8
Less net amounts transferred to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	712.0	661.3	537.7
Net receipts	9,402.0	7,607.2	5,387.1
Expenditures:			
Departmental	[3] 875.0	[4] 810.7	809.9
Agricultural program [5]	1,202.0	1,126.3	1,425.0
National defense:			
War	6,940.0	3,635.5	667.1
Navy	3,950.0	2,216.8	891.5
National defense funds for the President	353.0	[6] 103.1	
Selective Service	32.0	17.5	

Classification	Budget estimates,[1] fiscal year 1942	Actual	
		Fiscal year 1941	Fiscal year 1940
Expenditures—Continued.			
National defense—Continued.			
Emergency ship construction (U. S. Maritime Commission)	200.0	11.6	
Defense aid (lend-lease)	3,500.0	21.4	
National defense housing (Federal Works Agency)	225.0	[8] 42.0	
Other agencies	300.0	[7]	[11]
	15,500.0	6,047.9	1,558.6
Interest on the public debt	1,275.0	1,110.7	1,040.9
Federal Loan Agency	9.0	11.5	14.2
Federal Security Agency	872.0	944.0	799.3
Federal Works Agency [8]	[3] 1,134.0	1,673.9	[3] 2,066.7
Tennessee Valley Authority	40.0	51.2	39.1
Veterans' Administration	569.0	552.7	556.7
Transfers to trust accounts	268.0	234.6	207.9
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations		[9] 329.0	
All other	425.0	[4] 476.1	479.9
Total expenditures [10]	22,169.0	12,710.6	8,998.2
Net deficit (excess expenditures over receipts) [10]	12,767.0	5,103.4	3,611.1

[1] Revised June 1, 1941.
[2] Not including departmental expenditures of Department of Agriculture.
[3] Revised to adjust classification.
[4] Includes national-defense expenditures augmenting regular activities.
[5] Revised to include revolving fund transactions.
[6] Reflects adjustment to give effect to sec. 5, act of Oct. 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1127), by merging funds allotted to Federal Works Agency from allocations made by the President to the War Department for national-defense housing with funds appropriated to Federal Works Agency for the same purpose.
[7] Expenditures included in totals for departmental, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Security Agency, and all other. See note 4.
[8] Exclusive of National Defense Housing activities shown above.
[9] Credits, deduct.
[10] Exclusive of debt retirements pursuant to sinking fund and other appropriations
[11] Expenditures included in totals for departmental.

II. *Effect on the public debt of financing the deficit*

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Budget estimates,[1] fiscal year 1942	Actual	
		Fiscal year 1941	Fiscal year 1940
Net deficit (statement I)	12,767.0	5,103.4	3,611.1
Changes in cash accounts during period:			
Add: Increase in general fund balance during period	[2] 663.4	742.4	[2] 947.5
Total	12,103.6	5,845.8	2,663.6
Deduct: Excess of receipts over expenditures in trust accounts, etc., during period	37.8	[2] 148.1	135.6
Total financed by increase in public debt	12,065.8	5,993.9	2,528.0
Add: Public debt at beginning of period	48,961.4	42,967.5	40,439.5
Public debt at end of period	61,027.2	48,961.4	42,967.5

[1] Revised June 1, 1941. [2] Decrease, deduct. [3] Increase, add.

III. *Statutory debt limitation*

[Under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. As of June 30, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Limitation		65,000.0
Deduct:		
Gross public debt outstanding June 30, 1941	48,961.4	
Unearned discount on United States Savings Bonds (difference between current redemption value and maturity value)	1,110.1*	
	50,071.5	
Less—Debt outstanding not subject to statutory limitation	577.9	
Total		49,493.6
Balance of borrowing authority		15,506.4

IV. *General fund balance*

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Estimates,[1] fiscal year 1942	Actual	
		Fiscal year, 1941	Fiscal year, 1940
Balance in general fund at beginning of period:			
Working balance	1,884.6	1,162.7	2,159.5
Increment on gold	143.1	142.8	142.4
Seigniorage (silver)	605.4	585.2	536.3
Total	2,633.1	1,890.7	2,838.2
Increases:			
Borrowings—net increase in public debt	12,065.8	5,993.9	2,528.0
Net receipts, trust accounts, etc.	37.8	[2] 148.1	[2] 135.6
Total	14,736.7	7,736.5	5,501.8

Classification	Estimates,[1] fiscal year 1942	Actual	
		Fiscal year, 1941	Fiscal year, 1940
Decreases: Net deficit (statement I)	12,767.0	5,103.4	3,611.1
Balance in general fund at end of period	1,969.7	2,633.1	1,890.7
Analysis of general fund balances at end of period:			
Working balance	1,195.8	1,884.6	1,162.7
Increment on gold	143.7	143.1	142.8
Seigniorage (silver)	630.2	605.4	585.2
Total	1,969.7	2,633.1	1,890.7

[1] Based on Budget estimates as revised June 1, 1941. [2] Decrease, deduct.

V. *Obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest*

[As of June 30, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Limit of authority	Outstanding liabilities [1]			Corporation or agency	Limit of authority	Outstanding liabilities [1]		
		Total	Matured [2]	Unmatured			Total	Matured [2]	Unmatured
Commodity Credit Corporation	[3] 1,400.0	696.2	----------	696.2	Tennessee Valley Authority	61.8	----------	----------	----------
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000.0	1,269.5	0.1	1,269.4	U. S. Housing Authority	[7] 800.0	226.3	----------	226.3
Federal Housing Administration	[4] 4,165.0	17.4	(8)	17.4	U. S. Maritime Commission	[8] 200.0	----------	----------	----------
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	[6] 4,750.0	2,419.4	10.5	2,408.9					
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,141.8	1,741.4	----------	1,741.4	Total	----------	[9] 6,370.2	10.6	6,359.6

[1] Exclusive of obligations owned by the Treasury.
[2] Funds have been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for payment of all obligations guaranteed by the United States, representing outstanding matured principal amounting to $16,000,000 and interest of $3,100,000.
[3] Excludes an increase of $1,250,000,000 approved July 1, 1941.
[4] Limit of authority to insure mortgages. This amount may be increased by $1,000,000,000 upon approval by the President. Debentures may be issued and tendered only in exchange for insured property acquired through foreclosure.
[5] Less than $50,000.
[6] The Corporation was authorized to issue bonds for an amount not to exceed $4,750,000,000 to be exchanged or sold to obtain funds for financing home-mortgage loans or for the redemption of any of its outstanding bonds. Its authority to make loans expired on June 13, 1936, and the above limit may only be increased for the purpose of retiring its outstanding bonds by an amount equal to the amount of the bonds to be retired, which would not affect the net amount outstanding after June 13, 1936.
[7] Represents gross limit of borrowing authority. The corporation has issued obligations totaling $488,256,000 leaving a balance of borrowing authority amounting to $311,744,000.
[8] Limit which may be outstanding at any one time with respect to the insuring of mortgages and the issuance of debentures.
[9] The total amount of assets of these corporations and agencies is in excess of the total amount of liabilities, including obligations guaranteed by the United States. See statement VI.

VI. *Combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies*

[As of May 31, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Assets		Liabilities			Net worth	
	Exclusive of amounts due from Government corporations and agencies	Due from Government corporations and agencies [1]	Obligations guaranteed by the United States [2]	Due to Government corporations and agencies	All other (including reserves)	Proprietary interest of the United States	Other
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,055.3	10.0	696.9	[3] 0.1	128.0	100.3	----------
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,467.0	4.5	1,276.6	1.8	93.1	100.0	----------
Federal Housing Administration	84.5	----------	17.3	----------	3.6	63.6	----------
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	2,494.1	100.0	2,438.2	----------	47.7	108.2	----------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,695.7	972.1	1,745.2	45.4	345.3	531.9	----------
Tennessee Valley Authority	400.0	1.0	----------	57.2	18.0	325.8	----------
U. S. Housing Authority	445.4	----------	226.8	75.1	5.9	137.6	----------
U. S. Maritime Commission	388.4	14.6	----------	----------	242.4	160.6	----------
Federal land banks	2,226.4	9.3	----------	.7	1,801.1	213.2	220.7
All other	3,612.4	331.7	----------	671.2	972.2	2,098.2	202.5
Subtotal	13,869.2	1,443.2	[4] 6,401.0	991.5	3,657.3	3,839.4	423.2
Less: Interagency interest shown above	----------	—1,443.2	----------	—991.5	----------	—451.7	----------
Total	13,869.2	----------	[4] 6,401.0	----------	3,657.3	3,387.7	423.2

[1] Includes capital stock and paid-in surplus of Government corporations and agencies.
[2] Includes principal and accrued interest.
[3] Excludes 271.8 millions held by the Treasury.

NOTE.—The foregoing figures are compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury Department from the respective corporations and agencies. The amounts coverin. obligations guaranteed by the United States differ from those shown in table V for the reason that they are stated in this table as of May 31, 1941, instead of June 30, 1941 and include accrued interest.

Psychological Fortification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSH LEE, OF OKLAHOMA, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on the occasion of the commencement exercises of the University of Oklahoma on June 9 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Bizzell, class of 1941, distinguished guests, members of the faculty, ladies and gentlemen: May I thank you with all of my heart for the invitation to deliver this commencement address. May I also congratulate this university for having had at its head a man like Dr. Bizzell who has given this institution such cultural and spiritual leadership through the past years.

Graduates, it is unfortunate that we must discuss questions of war and national defense on the occasion of your graduation instead of being allowed to discuss educational, economic, and cultural subjects, but since the future of America, as well as the entire world, depends upon the outcome of the present struggle, I believe it entirely appropriate that I discuss at the present time the fortification of America against the psychological assault which is now being made by Nazi Germany.

Twenty-three years ago this month the class of 1918 graduated from this university. Most of the men of that class walked out of the auditorium and exchanged their academic robes for military uniforms. They went into the service of their country because of a firm belief in the ideal of liberty. They fought and won a war to make the world safe for democracy.

VICTORY LOST AFTERWARD

They did make the world safe for democracy for a period of time. That is, it was safe for all of the little peoples of the world. For after that victory there was no fear in the earth that some powerful nation would invade the small countries and destroy their rights to self-government and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore, I repeat, the world was made safe for democracy.

For 20 years the tourists who visited the Forest of Compeigne saw there a small railroad car and near it, on a granite stone, they read this inscription:

"Here on the 11th of November succumbed the criminal pride of the German Empire, vanquished by the free peoples which it tried to enslave."

The American tourists who read that inscription said to themselves, as they turned away, "Yes; that's right; we fixed that, all right," and continued their sightseeing tour with a feeling that that victory for right had been nailed down securely for all time.

But, ironically enough, in that same little car, the same forces which would have enslaved the world in 1918 placed a booted heel on the neck of France in 1940. Thus ended the period in which the world was safe for democracy.

The victory of the boys of 1918 was a great victory and a great success. Don't let anyone tell you differently. We made the world safe for democracy, all right, but we did not keep it safe. The failure came afterward when we threw away that victory by abandoning the ideals for which we had fought. It is not enough that some should die for an ideal; others must live for that same ideal, or else the ideal itself may perish.

No victory for right is secure for all time unless we make it secure by constant vigilance and sacrifice. There is no such thing as a permanent victory. Life itself is a continuing struggle, with two forces in the world, one pulling up and the other pulling down. It is not possible for one generation, by pouring out its blood and sweat and tears, to purchase liberty for all time to come, but each succeeding generation must, by its own vigilance and sacrifice, make secure for its time the citadels of liberty.

POLICY OF ISOLATION REPLACED IDEALISM

There is a constant deterioration which goes on all the time and wears away even our ideals unless we work just as constantly at the job of rebuilding those temples of faith. So it was with the victory of 1918. For the victory which was won on the battlefields of that war was lost afterward in the council halls and classrooms during the peace which followed.

After the victory of 1918 we turned away from the noble leadership of men like Woodrow Wilson, who offered us an opportunity to build a "brave, new world," and an opportunity of assuming our share of responsibility in keeping the victory which we had won. We were diverted from the idealism of 1918 by the lure of materialism during the "gold rush" period which followed. We no longer championed the cause of the weak and the oppressed, but we turned to follow the voice of the isolationist, who said, "Am I my brother's keeper?" "No," said the isolationist, "not unless he happens to be on my premises." Dr. George W. Truett, in his masterful baccalaureate sermon yesterday from this platform, referred to Cain as a "slacker" when Cain said, "Am I my brother's keeper?" with the inference that he was not responsible for his brother's welfare.

Thus we decided to live unto ourselves alone. We decided that there was no obligation on our part to champion the cause of right against wrong except, perhaps, in the limited domain of the United States. We decided that moral obligation is hemmed in by imaginary boundaries and that we had no duty with respect to the world in which we lived, except the small corner which we ourselves inhabited.

We turned from a policy of vision and future greatness to the short-sighted policy of isolation, which is based on the erroneous theory that the United States is not a part of the world. It is based on the mistaken theory that, regardless of the economic and political upheavals in other countries, we can go on our way without being affected. It is based on the foolish theory that our Nation will not be threatened by the military power of our neighbors. Isolation, as an international policy, is as out of date as the Chinese Wall and just as ineffectual in protecting a nation from modern war.

Thus the policy of isolation helped to lose the great victory which was won for the ideal of democracy.

CYNICISM

Furthermore, cynicism contributed to the loss of that victory. For, after the armistice of 1918, a great wave of cynicism swept over the world, eating out the faith of men in their ideals. Sarcastic writers and cynical teachers set about "debunking," as they said, our ideals and pulling our heroes down to the level of commonplaces. These intellectual sophisticates sneered at religion, ridiculed democracy, and scoffed at things we considered sacred. Teachers were afraid of being laughed at if they taught the thrilling story of The Midnight Ride of Paul Revere. Fewer school children memorized Emerson's poem about the patriots who "fired the shot heard around the world." We soft-pedaled the immortal story of Nathan Hale, who said, "All that I regret is that I have but one life to give to my country." Even George Washington was shorn of some of his glory, and Abraham Lincoln was pictured as merely a clever politician. Thus, we were led to believe that all men's motives were selfish and that no man achieved greatness because of a high and noble purpose. The result of this world-wide wave of cynicism was to cut the ground from under our faith and leave us reaching up for something to hold onto. The cynics had robbed us, as Shakespeare would say, of "that which in nowise enriched them, but left us poor, indeed."

DEMORALIZED CONDITIONS IDEAL FOR DICTATORS

Then came the economic break-down with its millions of hungry people to make a mockery of our words, "freedom, liberty, and democracy." This paved the way for communism, which like a pestilence, always strikes when the victim's resistance is low.

Thus millions of people had their faith in humanity shaken. They ceased to believe in the ideals of democracy, and some even surrendered their faith in a just God. They were drowning in a sea of lost hope. This was an ideal condition for the establishment of dictatorships. And out of this chaos of confused thinking there arose Josef Stalin, Benito Mussolini, and Adolf Hitler.

When people no longer believe in anything or anybody, they are already defeated because they have nothing to fight for.

HITLER'S PLAN INCLUDES PSYCHOLOGICAL ATTACK

This is exactly the condition which Hitler has undertaken to create in every country before he has invaded it with his military blitzkrieg. Long before military hostilities broke out in Europe, Hitler had told the world how he planned to undermine a nation psychologically before he undertook to overthrow it militarily. Let me quote from Hitler himself, as told by Herman Rauschning:

"We need armies," said Hitler, "but we shall not use them as in 1914. The place of artillery preparation for infantry attack will in the future be taken by revolutionary propaganda, to break down the enemy psychologically before the armies begin to function at all.

"The enemy people," continued Hitler, must be demoralized and ready to capitulate, driven with moral passivity, before military action can even be thought of."

And then Hitler summed up his philosophy of modern warfare when he said:

"Mental confusion, contradiction of feeling, indecisiveness, panic—these are our weapons."

Hitler told the world beforehand just how he proposed to conquer it. His plan was so bold, so frank, so fantastic, that very few people believed him. His threats of world domination were dismissed as the dizzy ravings of a madman.

HUMAN OSTRICHES

Then he began to carry out his fantastic plan for total conquest. One nation after another fell before his assault as the diabolical scheme began to unfold. The people of the world have grudgingly awakened to the fact that Hitler has, up to date, carried out his plan to the letter. This awakening has been slow. It has been painfully slow.

In spite of the fact that 14 nations have, one after another, fallen under the power of this evil man, there are those in this country who still refuse to believe that Hitler's plan includes the Americas, although Hitler has been as outspoken with respect to his plans for South America and the United States as he was with reference to all of the countries which he has already conquered.

Yet there are still those in this country who, ostrich-like, hide their heads in the sand and say over and over to themselves, "I don't believe it."

Hitler's actions have followed the same pattern in the conquering of each country. Always the psychological assault precedes military action.

PROPAGANDA HITLER'S SECRET WEAPON

From the very first, it has been well understood in the Nazi regime that propaganda is as much a part of Hitler's plan of world domination as military attack.

It is generally understood now that propaganda is Hitler's "secret weapon."

Ewald Hermann August Banse, a well-known German writer, explaining the technique of the Hitler propaganda weapon, said that the purpose was "to convince the people of the enemy nation that they are being deceived, misled, and brought to destruction by their own government, in order that they may lose confidence in the justice of their cause."

May I say that Hitler has already launched this psychological attack on the western world.

FORGING WEAPONS FOR HITLER

There are some sincere but mistaken Americans who are unintentionally lending themselves to this Nazi attack. They have become the dupes of Hitler's revolutionary propaganda methods.

The time for division in the United States has passed. We should have unity. America has already charted her course. We have launched our program of national defense. That program contemplates all-out aid to the Allies. The American people have passed on that program and put their stamp of approval on it, and Congress has passed the lend-lease bill to make it effective. Therefore, the day of debate and dissention should be over. We should have 100 percent unity in this country today in support of this program to which we are already committed—irrevocably and irretrievably committed by word and deed.

Yet our radios blare with the voice of opposition which continues to forge weapons for Hitler, because Hitler has said, "Mental confusion, contradiction of feeling, indecisiveness * * * these are our weapons."

STRONG MORALE NECESSARY

This modern war is a three-dimension war. It is psychological, industrial, and military.

Your Government has already thrown into high gear industrial and military defense, but it remains for you, the people, to fortify yourselves against the psychological assault which Hitler is now making on this country.

Mechanized weapons and military training are necessary, but even if our Army has excellent military training and superior mechanized equipment, we are still not fortified unless our people have the spirit of unity and determination. Therefore, I ask you to steel yourselves against this psychological attack in order that "the well-knit, solid, powerful fabric of national unity" may not be broken down as planned by Hitler.

Vacillating people who have no faith in anything are the easiest to conquer. But those people who are united by their faith in an ideal are the toughest to vanquish. That is why religious wars are usually the bloodiest wars, for the more firmly that men believe in their cause, the more invincible they are.

If a great revival of patriotism should sweep over this country today it would be worth more to the cause of national defense than 10 divisions of trained soldiers. Strong unity of purpose right now in America would strengthen our national defense more than any one thing that we can do at this time.

No matter if we build the most powerful tanks, planes, and battleships in the world, they will not defend us unless we have the spirit of liberty.

FRANCE UNDERMINED PSYCHOLOGICALLY

France spent billions of francs on her military defenses. She had, numerically, the largest army in the world. The Maginot Line was conceded to be the most impregnable fortress ever constructed. But all of that military fortification did not defend France, because the people of France no longer believed in their ideals of "liberty, equality, and fraternity." The body of defense was there, but the spirit was dead.

Communists and National Socialists, posing as "liberals," had wormed their way into the schools and colleges of France as teachers and professors. They had shot the poison of cynicism into the young brains of the French children, and one after another the temples of French faith were undermined. The idealistic story of Joan of Arc, which had inspired French patriotism for years, was "debunked." The beautiful Biblical story of the creation of man was replaced by the materialistic theory of evolution. The ideal of liberty itself was explained away by economic arguments. The thrilling ideal of "equality" was ridiculed by pointing out obvious inequalities. The magic word "fraternity," around which armies had rallied, was mocked by citing racial prejudices.

Thus, France was a nation with an army but without a soul. She had lost faith. She had lost faith in humanity. She had lost faith in the ideal of democracy. She had lost faith in God. France was, therefore, demoralized and defenseless. For there is no fall so dangerous as the fall of those invincible towers of faith.

Thus France was ripe for Hitler's propaganda. The people were cynical and skeptical. "Fifth columnists" spread the poison of suspicion among the civilians and caused them to mistrust their public officials. They, likewise, sowed the seed of doubt among the soldiers and shattered the morale of the Army.

Do you recall how in the hectic days preceding the fall of France, the people, in their confusion, doubt, and suspicion, changed their government officials and their military commanders one after another on the eve of the fall of France? This lack of confidence on the part of the French people was worth many armored divisions to Hitler's cause.

France had fallen a victim of the deadly Nazi propaganda.

The story is told of the eagle which lay dying on a rock. And as his lifeblood ebbed away, he was saddened even more when he noticed that the feather which guided the arrow to his heart had come from his own wing.

Surely, today, as the last pulsing hope of freedom has been crushed out of poor France by the ruthless heel of the dictator, she must be saddened even more to know that she contributed to her own downfall by surrendering those spiritual fortresses of faith.

PETAIN CHOSE SLAVERY

Following the recent and final capitulation of France, in which General Petain agreed to full collaboration with Germany, Vice Premier Darlan made the announcement that General Petain had to choose between life and death, and that Petain had chosen life. But it would have been more accurate to have said that Petain had to choose between resistence or slavery, and Petain chose slavery.

What a contrast between Petain's foul choice of slavery and the statement of that great British leader who recently said, "The English people would rather die on their feet than live on their knees."

What a contrast between the cowardly choice of the Vichy government and the statement of that great American, Patrick Henry, when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

What a contrast between the weak and craven statement of Vice Premier Darlan and the immortal reply which King George, of Greece, made to Hitler's demand for collaboration when he said, "The infamy is too great for so small a country, and the blood of too many Britons is in the soil of Greece for Greece to forget."

UNITY FOR YOUR GOVERNMENT

Today you graduate from this university, but your efforts will all have been in vain unless the forces of democracy are able to stop the totalitarian powers in their march around the globe.

You are asking yourselves, "What can I do to help in this great struggle?" I will tell you. It is as important to fortify America psychologically as it is militarily. Therefore I call upon you for a full measure of confidence in your temporal leaders. Hitler is trying desperately at the present time to shake the faith of the American people in their public officials and thereby undermine their confidence in the integrity of their own Government.

Therefore you can do no more patriotic service today to your Government than to repel this present wave of Nazi propaganda which undertakes to poison people's minds with doubt and suspicion.

If Hitler is able to shake your faith in the integrity of your leaders, he will have won his psychological war against the United States. No matter how noble our ideals are, they must be championed by human leaders. Consequently if your belief in the integrity of those leaders can be shaken, your fighting spirit will have been undermined and you are then, as Hitler said, "demoralized and ready to capitulate."

Therefore, if you would do your part in strengthening the defenses of America, you can help to weave the strong fabric of national unity by maintaining loyal faith in the leadership of President Roosevelt. The most defeating blow which you can deal to Hitler in America today is to support Roosevelt like the English support Churchill.

RELIGHT TORCHES OF LIBERTY

Then again we must not only manifest loyalty to the champions of democracy, we must renew our devotion to the ideal of liberty itself. We here in America have enjoyed freedom so long that we have come to take it for granted. We treat our freedom just like we do our health. We never think about it until we are about to lose it.

The glowing words of democracy have lost some of their meaning because they are so familiar, but what a dynamic meaning those words must have to the poor souls who are today languishing in the concentration camps of Europe.

What a meaning they must have to those unfortunate human beings who are tracked down and murdered by the Gestapo bloodhounds of Hitler.

The right of habeas corpus, trial by jury, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—these are only some of the dynamic words of democracy which we have rubbed shiny in our pockets.

Yet there is enough explosive power in these words to blow Hitler to kingdom come if free men everywhere will but touch off the dynamite which they contain.

REKINDLE FAITH IN GOD

Then again, not only should the torches of liberty be relighted, but the fires of Christianity should be rekindled. Christian people everywhere should be rallying their forces to oppose this anti-Christ barbarian. Christian men and women of America, if Hitler is able to spread the Nazi curse over the world there will be no room for Christianity—no room for the worship of any God but Hitler—no room for any religion but the state.

According to Hermann Rauschning, Hitler said:

"The religions are all alike, no matter what they call themselves. They have no future—certainly none for the Germans. Fascism, if it likes, may come to terms with the church. So shall I. Why not? That will not prevent me from tearing up Christianity root and branch and annihilating it in Germany."

Then again Hitler said that the ministers would "replace the cross with the swastika" and that they would turn from the "worship of the blood of their quondam Saviour to the worship of the pure blood of the German race." The best answer that Christians can give to this challenge is a revival of faith in God.

When people have unshakable faith in their God it gives them strength. They have something to anchor to. They are not easily demoralized by propaganda. Therefore Christian people should come together under the banner of the cross and unite around their faith in God. Such unity will frustrate Hitler and strengthen America.

Here I wish to quote part of a letter written by a commander in the British Navy to a kinsman in America. The letter was sent to me by a graduate of this university, Mr. Bill Potter, of Ardmore. Mr. Potter is also a kinsman of the author of this letter, whose name is Commander Ronald Kinnear. Please bear in mind as I read this letter that it was written by a commander of the British Navy, one of the toughest fighting units in the world:

"MY DEAR KINSMAN: * * *

"Thursday, February 6, 4:25 a. m., and a beastly cold morning—snowing and blowing hard. The carrion night birds are in their foul nests across the Channel. * * *

"Well, the gong will soon go now for the next round, which we expect to be a gruelling one. Hard blows will be exchanged. If we go down for a count, do not lose heart. We shall get on our feet again and fight back harder than ever. It is then that we are always at our best; then that we are the most dangerous opponents. So never lose heart about us. We shall be O. K. Our real strength lies in the fact that we never forget the good God. The Germans discarded Him. The French forgot Him. The British remember Him.

"In my time He has performed at least four miracles for us. The first was in November 1914. The 70,000 remnants of seven British divisions were making a desperate stand against 200,000 of Imperial Germany's best, fresh and superbly armed, before Ypres. The tide of battle turned heavily against us. All seemed lost. Our people, led by King George V, fell upon their knees. And lo; the 70,000 held and fought to a standstill the 200,000. Do not ask me how; but they did.

"The second was in April 1918. British armies were being driven back to the Sucre—even, it looked, to the sea. Again all seemed lost. Once more our people, led by the King, fell upon their knees as Haig gave his famous order, 'Backs to the wall.' A desperate struggle then ensued; and lo, again our armies held and fought to a standstill the Imperial German hordes. Nor can I tell you how it was done; but it was.

"The third was when the life of King George V, who seemed to be on his death bed, was spared for 7 more years.

"The fourth was in June, last year, when our army seemed to face certain destruction on the beaches of Dunkirk. Mr. Churchill warned the Commons that he might have 'very grave news' for them in a week's time. Again our people, led by King George VI (who is indeed his father's son), fell upon their knees that our 350,000 might be saved. And saved they were, at a cost of some 35,000 casualties—note that figure—a tithe, a tenth part, of their strength. Do not ask me how it was done. One of my colleagues here was through it all. I have asked him, but he cannot tell me. But done it was.

"Foreigners sneer at you Americans and us British because we both believe in days of intercession and of thanksgiving. But we are right, my dear kinsman. Therein lies our great—and invincible—strength."

That concludes the part which I wished to quote from this remarkable letter. Remember that these sentiments came from the iron heart of a fighting man, Commander Ronald Kinnear, of the British Navy.

CONCLUSION

This war is different from any other war because the psychological attack has played such a deadly part in the fall of every nation which Hitler has conquered. Therefore, I feel that it is highly important that America stiffen her defenses on this front.

Graduates, each generation has drawn upon a bank account which was built up by its ancestors in the blood bank of liberty. This bank account was established by the Minute Men at Concord and Lexington, by Washington's ragged troops at Valley Forge and Yorktown. It was added to by Jackson's boys at New Orleans, and by the Rough Riders who followed Teddy Roosevelt up San Juan Hill.

The boys in blue with Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay made a deposit in the blood bank of liberty, and the doughboys who met the Hun at St. Mihiel, Cantigny, and Belleau Wood made a deposit which paid liberty's premiums in advance for 20 years.

But today once again that liberty is being threatened; therefore, I call upon you to fortify America's psychological defenses by maintaining your faith in the integrity of your temporal leaders, by rededicating yourselves to the ideal of democracy and by renewing your faith in God.

I thank you.

A Reply to the War Cry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. on July 7, entitled "A Reply to the War Cry."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the British Isles the Germans have made use of "scream bombs" to excite and confuse the people. Here in the United States the same device has been let loose upon the American people. These American "scream bombs" work under a handicap, because most of them are too old for service and yet they have some effect in creating confusion among the people and in driving them nearer and nearer to the fire of all-out involvement in the war.

The latest American "scream bomb" stunned the people of the Nation last week when, at the Conference of Governors, he called for total war by the United States, saying: "Now is the time to strike. * * * The time to use our Navy to clear the Atlantic of the German menace is at hand." There is no responsible party in America who does not realize that all-out war by our Navy will inevitably result in all-out war by every man in our armed forces and those yet to be conscripted—a war calling for expeditionary forces by the tens of thousands to Europe, Asia, and Africa.

To those of us in the Congress who are bestowed under the Constitution with the determination of whether and when this Nation shall declare war—to those of us in the Congress who, every week, receive thousands of letters from the plain people of America, pleading against a repetition of our 1917 venture—this call to war coming from one who is not the elected representative of the people coming from one who is not the elected President of the United States, is a serious and irresponsible action which calls for an explanation to the people of America. This member of the President's Cabinet is an executive head without authority as a policy maker in foreign affairs. The people had no voice in his selection for the post which he occupies. He was not chosen to speak for the people. His war declaration, uttered in disregard of our country's announced policy of aid short of war creates confusion in the public mind at a time when such confusion is the greatest enemy of national unity and national strength.

Fellow countrymen, it is a serious thing for a responsible official of the Government to call upon you to go to war without giving you the necessary information about our preparedness for war upon which you can base your decision on this crucial question.

This Cabinet officer did not tell you of the facts contained in the report of the House Military Affairs Committee, which for months has been making an intense study of our military situation. He did not tell you that this Military Affairs Committee has recently issued a report advising that our preparedness program has been shot through with confusion and failures and unwarranted delays.

This Cabinet officer did not give you the information about our Army which was recently revealed by Hanson Baldwin, military correspondent with the New York Times. He did not tell you, as Mr. Baldwin has reported, that our high Army officials have stated that not one American division is ready for war; that the Army conception of modern tactics is primitive; and that there are grave deficiencies in equipment, in training, and tactics and leadership in our Army.

This Cabinet member did not tell you of the report of Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, who, upon returning from a month's maneuvers in Tennessee by the Second Army, has advised that unless the performance of commanding officers is improved, disastrous embarrassments and failures will be encountered during battle.

Why should not the people of this country be given all of the facts frankly and without evasion? The American people are not children. They are capable of making sound decisions. They are the ones who will do the dying and fighting. I ask you, Does this member of the Cabinet speak for the common people of America or does he represent the view of a few college professors and other individuals who are ready at the drop of a hat to cheer the other fellow on to battle?

When this Cabinet officer was appointed, he was summoned to appear at public hearings before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee and made statements to reassure those who had apprehension that he would use his office to lead our Nation into war. He testified that he was in favor of a program short of war. The following is taken from the official transcript of the testimony:

"Senator JOHNSON of California. What do you mean by short of war?

"Mr. KNOX. I mean everything short of sending military assistance—either naval or Army assistance.

"Senator JOHNSON. Now, you would not go to war under any circumstances in this particular misadventure that is occurring in Europe, would you?

"Mr. KNOX. That is right.

"Chairman WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the committee understand that you favor moral and economic aid to the Allies through the sale by the United States of goods, products, and munitions by the businesses and citizens of the United States, but you do not favor direct economic aid to the Allies by the United States Government itself or any steps by the United States Government which will involve this country in the war?

"Mr. KNOX. That is my conviction."

This Cabinet member gave those replies knowing that the overwhelming sentiment of the Senate which had the confirmation power of his appointment was against participation in the war, and that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the Nation was against involvement. He was confirmed by the Senate and now he assumes the prerogative of the Congress and of the President in declaring for all-out war, at a time when production is inadequate and our military equipment and training is far short of that required for a nation about to enter a death struggle in a world-wide war.

Nothing can create national disunity and national confusion so much as the directly contradictory advices and reports regarding our foreign policy and military situation by responsible officials of the Government. This at a time when we need calm judgment and the presentation of the true facts—at a time when we need national unity for greater and greater production of military materials.

In a time of war, declarations by unelected Cabinet officials and the resultant fear of the people that the administration will start a shooting war without consulting the Congress, it was refreshing to hear the words of Senator GEORGE, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which he made on the floor of the Senate a few days ago. I quote: "I recognize the necessity for all-out total preparation as strongly as anyone can, and I think a little more strongly perhaps than some of our friends, because to my mind all-out total preparation never can be made by the American people without the resolution which has characterized them in all their great undertakings, unless and until they feel that they themselves are a part of the great decision which brings on that effort. So, when I was thinking of total defense I was thinking primarily of the strong spirit of unity which will not exist if our people are possessed with the fear that great decisions and commitments may be made without any opportunity on their part to participate in making such decisions. * * * I profoundly hope this country will not become an active participant in the present war or any other war. I have not yet accepted the fatalistic doctrine that our actual military or naval participation is inevitable."

These are the words of the duly elected chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made in the face of the call to war by the unelected member of the Cabinet. It represents the struggle between those who seek to uphold the democratic method of national policy making and the method by which the people are not consulted—are not represented—in a matter which involves the very life of the people.

One of the most potent and far-reaching aggressors of the world is Soviet Russia. Her system of invasion is not so much through her armed forces but through sinister propaganda spread through her fellow travelers throughout the world. It was the influence of these Russian agents in France which largely contributed to France's downfall. It was the Russian Armies which imposed suffering on the people of Finland by an indefensible and cruel attack. It is the Russian agents in the United States who have been largely responsible for the stoppage of production in many of our defense industries.

There are many people of my State of Finnish and Polish extraction who have written to me in protest against the cruel treatment of the Finnish and Polish people of Europe by the Russian Government and yet, now that the Russians have become involved in

the war, the interventionists have immediately called for all-out aid to Soviet Russia in her battle against the troops of Finland and the troops of Hitler.

In the June issue of the Readers' Digest you will find an article by Stanley High which makes revelations about the Communist plans and activities in the United States. For example, work on more than one-third of all the Nation's defense production contracts was fully or partially paralyzed 76 days from January to April this year by a strike at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., whose products are essential to production in many of our defense industries throughout the Nation. This article by Mr. High reports that according to sworn testimony of a former Communist worker given before a committee of the Wisconsin Legislature the Communists decided 5 years ago that a strike at Allis-Chalmers would give them a chance to display their disruptive technique and power. Their efforts were directed from headquarters in Moscow, and yet the administration has announced it will give all possible aid to Russia.

Under the new propaganda effort of the interventionists we will be told that all of the revelations about Communist activities in the United States are nothing more than Nazi propaganda. The labor unions that have sought to purge their organizations of "reds" are now finding it a patriotic duty to reinstate all Communists. We have officially been called upon to put our arms around the Communist shoulder in a sober march down the road to war.

Already our Treasury has released $40,000,000 in Russian assets to the Soviet Government to enable it to increase its bombing against the defenseless populace of Finland. We will be called upon to join Soviet Russia in a campaign to establish the freedom of worship, the freedom from slavery, the freedom of speech, and freedom from want in Europe. We will be asked to gain for Stalin the hold of communism on Russia and to increase Russia's ability to extend communism to other parts of the world. Our marching boys will be told that this will be the battle of freedom—a religious crusade.

No! America has no place in Europe. The United States with her productive capacity can outproduce Hitler and can outlast Hitler if we build for national unity in the United States and devote our efforts to speeding up production week in and week out, month in and month out.

Only recently Bernard M. Baruch, who directed our unprecedented industrial effort of 1917–18, in an exclusive interview, pointed out that Germany, not the United States, would be "on the spot" economically if Germany were to seek control of the European Continent—that under a proper economic policy the United States should be able to drive Germany out of any desired neutral market.

Chief Justice Hughes has advised that he doubts that we can survive as a democratic nation if we enter into this war. Even the most passionate warmonger cannot accuse Mr. Hughes of being a fifth columnist or a Nazi agent. Such a charge would carry as little weight with the American people as the recent charge, by a responsible element of the British censored press, which accused our only living former President, Herbert Hoover, of being a spokesman for the fifth columnists.

It has come to the point where the alien, coming to this country to urge us into the war, is held by certain elements as a patriot, while an American-born, red-blooded American, who dares to give his honest advice in favor of noninvolvement, is accused of being a Nazi spy. What lengths these interventionists are willing to go to to achieve their end.

Fellow countrymen, the reassuring statement by Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is evidence that you have one body in America, the body of Congress, made up of your own duly elected representatives to whom you can turn to counteract the call to war by the nonelected Cabinet member. The Constitution, which your forefathers drew up and which your forefathers ratified and which we all hold so sacred today, provides that the Congress shall have the sole power to declare war.

To your Representatives and Senators in Congress then, in this hour of crisis, direct your appeals and register your views in reply to the war cry of the determined Cabinet members who seek to force the President into a policy of war for the people of America.

Fourth of July Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered on the Fourth of July at Crandon, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, in this grave period it is right that today we thoughtfully observe the anniversary of our Declaration of Independence.

Today we commemorate the birth of our great Nation in an observance which is probably our greatest secular holiday.

Today we observe a tremendous event in human affairs, the enactment of the social compact, a real and sacred bond, voluntarily and with deliberate dignity, consciously chosen by millions of free men to announce the solemn sovereignty of a great people.

One hundred sixty-five years ago today, under a cloudless summer sky, a number of men met in a plain red brick building in Philadelphia. It was the Philadelphia State House.

Hancock was in the president's chair. Before him there were half a hundred delegates. A committee had been appointed to draft a Declaration of Independence. The committee included Jefferson, the youngest and the tallest; John Adams, Robert R. Livingston, Sherman, the shoemaker, and Franklin, the printer.

It was about 2 o'clock before the Declaration was signed. A little boy ran from the doorway into the street with uplifted arms and gave the tidings of the Nation's birth to the man who was waiting to ring the great liberty bell on which was inscribed, "Proclaim liberty to the land; to all the individuals thereof."

It is not enough to say that on the 4th day of July 1776, representatives of the United States of America assembled in Congress to declare that the colonies would henceforth be free and independent States. Those representatives did much more than declare our independence from Great Britain. They proclaimed the first principles on which civil government is founded. They proclaimed a system where the sovereignty of the people is paramount.

They proclaimed the political equality of all citizens. They established justice. They established a reign of law, not brute-force law, based on the consent of the governed.

They said, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

These declarations define the American way and breathe life into these great values which we take for granted today. These great values of the race were attained through struggle and sacrifice. Are we awake to the truth, they can be retained and maintained only in the same way?

Those declarations, meant struggle and sacrifice but the founding fathers were fighting for the first principles of civil government. They knew what they were fighting for. They knew why the principles they fought for were of great importance. Are we awake as they were?

Because the founding fathers held as self-evident the great truth that all men are created equal, throughout our history we have never known pillage or privilege for individuals or for groups.

We have freedom and equality of opportunity. Political equality in this land has not been a theory. It is a reality. We are a Nation of laws and before the law every man is equal.

The whiplash of oppression never cracks in this land. There is no witch hunting of any group. Rich and poor, the mighty and the powerless—all are equal. The poorest citizen in his humble home has the same rights, the same privileges, and is an equal before the law with the mightiest financier in the land.

Government is not the master here. Government is the servant of the citizens. The sovereignty of a free people, politically equal, is the basis of our system.

In the Declaration of Independence our founding fathers said that we had "certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." In almost every land on the globe today, man's rights have been crucified and man has only those privileges which the state gives to him.

Our founding fathers knew that there were certain rights beyond the power of any state to confer. They are rights which come from the Creator. Our founding fathers acknowledged these rights and what is more, they acknowledged the source of the rights.

Of all the nations, we alone acknowledged at the inception of our Government, that there were rights which came from the Creator. We alone acknowledge that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are the rightful heritage of men from their Creator. They are the written embodiment of all of the hopes of mankind.

Those words have a tremendous far-reaching meaning. They define the right to live, not at the whim or the caprice of any dictator, but because the Creator gave us that right.

That means that there are no blood-purges, no massacres of minorities, no firing squads at dawn, no black-outs of the freedoms of worship, of speech, of the press.

They give us the right to liberty, not because a power-drunk ruler slackened his grasp on the clanking chains of oppression, but because the Creator endowed us with liberty.

That means, that there are no concentration camps in this land, no old-world blood-stained torture chambers, no dungeons with men trudging the dreary lock step of imprisonment.

Those words define the right, to engage in the pursuit of happiness. That means that we do not devote all of our toil to the State. It means that unlike other lands we recognize that a man has a right to the pursuit of happiness and that it is the obligation of government to make it possible for him to seek gainful employment, to become married and raise a family.

It means that in this land a man can seek the happiness of his hearthside free in the conviction that no Gestapo is lurking in the shadows of his doorstep.

The founding fathers said that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." There is a statement of tremendous importance. These words should be carved in the intellect of every American.

It means that government is the servant and not the master. It means that sovereignty rests in the people. It means the establishment of justice and a reign of law based on the consent of the governed.

Our Government is unique, in that our people deliberately choose a government for themselves, deliberately and with dignity wrote their social compact. Our Declaration of Independence was written as an act of conscious choice. It was written as a demonstration of the capability of man for self-government.

Our Government has never been an instrument for venal self-seeking groups. Instead, our Government, as born in the Declaration of Independence, established the sovereignty of a great nation as a solemn trust, and it is with that trust that we are concerned today.

It has been the custom on days like this to recall the sacrifices of the great men and women who have builded this Nation. We remember our heroes on land and on sea; we recall the names of Putnam and Lafayette, John Paul Jones, Washington, and many others, and we do not forget the unknown and unsung common soldiers, and the mothers of men who gave their boys that America might be free in the days of the Revolution.

We follow along the pathway of history with Perry and Lawrence and Andrew Jackson, Generals Scott and Taylor. Then we reach that period when this country of ours fought out the issue, whether we were one Nation or whether we would have on this continent a repetition of Europe—a group of nations.

There were great men—valorous men on both sides. In the South there were Lee, Longstreet, Johnson, and "Stonewall" Jackson. On the North there were Grant and Sherman and Sheridan and many others.

But again, there were the common soldiers and the mothers of men—heroes all; but above them all towered the great form of the immortal Lincoln—great because he loved the North and the South; great because he recognized the imperative need of our remaining one people—one Nation.

Then there followed the post-war period—the reconstruction days, and our war with Spain in 1898 when we became an empire, taking over the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and freeing the Cubans from the Spanish yoke; and eventually there came the World War in 1917 when for the first time American soldiers set foot on European soil.

We fought for a great principle then. It was for the freedom of the seas and to abolish war and bring democratic principles to the peoples of the world. What would have happened if we had not gone into that war no one can tell. Nowadays the last war and our part in it becomes a prolific source for discussion. Orators differ on that subject as they do on all subjects. What might have been no one knows. What has been, history records. What shall be, God alone knows.

Yes, indeed, it was a glorious age, this march of our people from a fringe of States on the Atlantic across a continent. A glorious age in growth and in accomplishment; but, as the present is so full of challenges so tremendously important to our lives, we must discuss it today in the light of those first principles. We must consider our obligations as citizens in this troublesome period, this critical hour.

We must weigh the facts as they appear to us. We must calmly arrive at some conclusion which will determine the Nation's course.

If, up ahead there is to be a period of stress, of crisis, then we must be prepared to meet it. So today, instead of making the usual Fourth of July oration, I want to ask you to reason with me, to follow the bibilical injunction: "Come, let us reason together." It is only in calmness, it is only in balanced judgment that we can arrive at the right course.

I said previously that 2 years ago the nations of Europe, most of whom have been overridden and enslaved now, were free people. Witness Czechoslovakia, Poland, Esthonia, Lithuania, Denmark, Norway, France, Holland, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Greece.

I was in Europe when the war broke out. I represented this country at the Interparliamentary Union in Oslo, Norway. I was in Copenhagen when the news came through from our embassy in London to stop me from going into Germany. In going to Oslo it was my privilege to stop first in Plymouth, England, and then to visit London.

It was in London where I had a remarkable talk with Mr. Rhys Davies, a Laborite from Manchester. He stated, among other things, that he hoped Britain would have at least 1 year longer in which to prepare. He said that if Hitler had struck 2 years before he would have found the English people so peace-minded, so unbelieving that war could come, that he could have taken over Britain. He said that it was Hitler's breach of treaties, breach of the pledged word, and Chamberlain's appeasement policy that finally began to awaken the people of Britain that war was imminent. "But we are unprepared," he said, "we need at least another year. Pray God we have it." But they did not have it.

When Hitler, in violation of his pledge to Poland, invaded that country, and Chamberlain, recognizing the unprepared condition of Britain, tried to appease, the British, speaking through their representatives in Parliament during Chamberlain's speech, cried out, "Speak for England," and war followed.

In my conversation with Rhys Davies, he brought out the fact that the democracies of Europe were asleep, because after the last World War the nations were bled white, and they were looking for sanity; they were looking for a solution to this terrible problem of war, and then he said, "There came from out of the west your great President Woodrow Wilson, and he brought to us the idea of the League of Nations."

"Then there followed the Locarno Pact, the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war" (I can see Rhys Davies now with a smile on his face saying "You can't outlaw war").

"As a result, our people dreamed a great dream," he said. "They thought war could not come and could not happen. Our people became great pacifists. This was true of other nations except Germany, Italy, and Russia. These nations armed and armed to the teeth. These nations by their propaganda, however, divided, or sought to divide, the peoples of the peaceful nations. They succeeded, he said, in France. France went to pieces, as we all know, because there was no cohesion, no unity within, no willingness to sacrifice and to get ready to meet the onslaught that was inevitable."

I remember another scene. I sat with King Haakon, of Norway, in his office in the palace in Oslo. (His office was full of ship models.) This was about 10 days before the war broke. We talked about nothing else but the coming events. He hoped that the treaty he had with Hitler would keep his country safe as a similar neutrality pact did during the last war, but now he is a fugitive king in Britain and his land is overrun by half a million German troops; his people are enslaved.

Out of this holocaust in Europe there has come into the consciousness of the American people the imperative need of being prepared for any emergency. Therefore, Congress has voted billions of dollars for defense. The lease-lend bill is law, but before it was passed it was the policy of this Nation to furnish aid to Britain and the democracies. The reason for this was that we were just as unprepared as Britain and as long as Britain stands there can be no successful onslaught on the Western Hemisphere.

All the world recognizes that the technique of war has changed. Hitler's blitzkrieg, or lightning stroke, is based on, first, infiltrating other people with saboteurs and "fifth columnists" with ruinous propaganda which breaks the morale of the people and breaks their unity.

Second, a lightning stroke, not with the old style Army technique, but with mechanized units, great tanks followed by mechanized motor vehicles for creating a spearhead, and synchronized in the air with fighting ships, or Stukas. It is said that a hundred and twenty thousand Germans, consisting of 10 Panzer divisions of 12,000 each, mechanized and synchronized, broke the backbone of 3,000,000 French.

Third, after the fighting forces are demoralized, the infantry comes in and takes possession of the land.

Fourth, already in advance every bit of the industrial and agricultural life has been inventoried and Hitler's men take over the whole political and economic life of the occupied nation. When I say they take it over, they own it. They circulate their worthless printed paper, and require that the occupied people sell whatever they have for this paper. They take over the banks, manufacturing plants, and the farms. They take over the people and require them to perform like slaves for their masters.

Fifth, the Gestapo is everywhere. Freedom of speech, the press, trial by jury—all are gone, and there is imposed upon the people, through the regulation of schools and churches, the ideology of what has been called the new order.

The like of this has never before been seen, possibly in the history of the world—at least not on such a large scale.

Many of these conquered people had solved their political and economic problems. Many of these nations were outstanding lighthouses serving as guides for all mankind. He has taken these people and attempted to turn them back into slavery.

Now, I dwell upon these facts, because there is no reason for us to hide them. Hitler and Mussolini and Japan have entered into a tripartite treaty to divide the world between them. In each of these nations the individual is nothing, the state is everything.

Hitler has interfered with all the worthwhile values such as we call values. In his "new order" of things there is a new religion which he attempts to impose on his own people and those he conquers. In America we have freedom of worship. In this "new order" men are told what to think and how to think.

In our American way men are permitted to be explorers of unfathomable reaches of the mind.

So we come to a recognition of the fact that a world revolution is on. I personally feel that there is not a great deal of difference between the technique of Hitler and Stalin.

Under each, men are regarded again as chattels and serfs, all except a few who constitute the ruling group.

Now, where does this lead us? We certainly must reach the conclusion that if we are interested in our American values, if we want to maintain the great freedoms which most of us do not appreciate because we never did anything to obtain them—we must build a bulwark against anyone attempting to take them away from us.

I said most of us do not appreciate these freedoms of ours because they seem to us to be just as natural and as matter of course as the air we breathe, but they are not. It has taken a thousand years, or more, of human sacrifice to gain them, and right now we know, as I have stated, that they can be lost as they have been in Europe if we do not build ourselves a strong defense.

Now, this strong defense consists first, as I have intimated already, of a spirit of unity in our people. We are not English-Americans, German-Americans, Scandinavian-Americans, Polish-Americans—we are Americans. When our fathers came to this country they dug their roots deep into the soil, and we who are born here are Americans and our fathers before us were Americans. They came here for various reasons—political, economic, emotional—anyway, they came here to be free and they found freedom here. Now, we will not be recreant to their memories—we are going to maintain that freedom. So, the first thing is to build unity.

Unity of purpose—of understanding—of nationality. Hitler says we are a divided people because we stem from so many different blood sources. Let us prove that that is our strength. Let us be a discriminating people. We must learn to take everything we read in the papers and magazines with a "pinch of salt." There is so much propaganda.

If you and I were British subjects, of course, we would do everything we could to get America into this war to help Britain. If you and I were Hitler men—followers of Hitler—we would do everything we could to stop America from getting into this war. We would sabotage, we would indulge in propaganda. Well, that is just what is being done. Therefore, we should become discriminative—keep our heads and use a little horse sense in analyzing news and radio accounts, and what we do, do as Americans, realizing our job is to preserve America.

We do not have to hate any other people. We have enough to do, to love our great America, and, oh, how great she is, and to think of it, that we are a part of her and that she calls to us now, to help to preserve her.

The second thing we have to do, of course, is to build this Nation strong with modern weapons. This calls for a navy adequate to meet any emergency with a coordinating air arm. It calls for an independent air arm which could repel any attack on our shore—an air arm of bombers and fighting planes. It calls for an army mechanized with the most modern weapons and possessing also a coordinating air arm.

It calls first for common sense on the part of our leaders in the field of invention and initiative.

I made the statement some time ago that if Hitler moved into Spain and took over Spain and Portugal, I was in favor of moving into the Cape Verde Islands and the Azores. They do not belong to Hitler; they would be an outer line of defense against the bombardment of our eastern seaboard.

I hear a lot of people say that we do not have to worry about Hitler—he is never coming to America. Well, I am not one of those who worries, because worry never makes for efficiency, but my eyes are open. He is already in America with his saboteurs and "fifth columnists." He is already in South America.

You think he would have had enough to do to look after Europe and Africa, but his "fifth columnists," saboteurs, and propaganda artists are already in South America. We have to be realistic.

Third, I believe America today should get its best brains working on what we might call the post-armament problems. I believe every city and village, county and State should build up a reservoir of projects with the idea that after this war is over there will be jobs for our soldier boys and boys in the Navy and boys in the defense plants to go to work on. Consequently these political divisions should seek to accumulate cash reserves for those purposes. Let them be invested in defense bonds.

The Federal Government is putting on this big defense program and the local municipalities should, wherever it is possible, curtail the imposition of taxes, because the Federal tax load is going to be so severe. In other words, we should, all of us, as far as possible, bring into play more foresight and less hindsight. We can let the dead bury the dead, but we should, as far as possible, anticipate the problems which may come into being and find the solution for them.

I am in favor of finding the solutions now and stopping a lot of problems from coming into being. This subject of post-war problems is so immense that I could discuss it for many hours with you.

We are a great people—we are blessed in so many ways. I believe in the rule of expressing gratitude each morning when I awake and expressing gratitude the last thing at night when I go to sleep for the blessings we possess as Americans.

I believe also that exaltation will come to the man and the woman who dedicates his best service to his country in this period. That service may not be in high position or high rank. The ordinary citizen can be lending courage and direction to his fellows by his example of thrift, tolerance, and industry and thereby he will render the greatest service to his country. Give me a nation of level-headed, God-fearing, industrious people and I will show you a people sufficient, safe, and strong.

This is no time to break ranks, this is no time to listen to the saboteurs, some of whom are Americans who are trying to create classes among us.

This is a time for reason. The time for constructive thinkers has come.

Through the columns of our newspapers and over the radio, and through the talks of our forum speakers, we hear men who, instead of talking on the issue, are constantly damning their opponents.

In my opinion, 99 percent of the people of this country want to stay out of war. There is probably less than 1 percent who can be classified as interventionists, and there is equally only a small percentage who might be called old-time isolationists.

In between these two classes can be found the great mass of level-headed Americans—men and women who realize that other nations did not want war but they got serfdom—men and women who realize that there is a fire abroad which may spread to our shores, and men and women who realize that it is a time to thank God that an ocean separates us from Hitler and an ocean separates us from Japan; but these men and women also realize that the whole technique of war has changed, that there are bomber planes that can travel 6,000 miles without refueling, that the world is on fire, and that there is need for every precaution.

You, each of you, are called to leadership in this hour, a leadership of sane thinking, without hysteria. A leadership of poised minds, with perspective and vision. There is no hate or intolerance there.

All over our country people are wondering which way we are going. We find extremists on both sides befuddling the people. What we need now is to proceed cautiously as trustees of property of great value. We must not go down the way to war if it is possible to avoid it. Ninety-nine percent of the people of this country do not want to go to war unless it becomes necessary as a matter of self-defense.

I have told you today of some of the dangers which confront us. I speak of these dangers because I do not believe that we can ignore them, ostrich fashion, by putting our heads in the sand. They are facts. We cannot ignore them.

Because I present these facts, however, do not conclude that I am for intervention. I am not for intervention. Every vote which I have cast on matters of foreign policy has been motivated by the idea that we must avoid involvement. My conclusions on foreign policy will continue to be based on the idea that we must avoid involvement. If we are realistic we know that even if we sought involvement (and I do not believe that we should) we are still woefully unprepared.

To seek the involvement of the Nation at any time, and certainly when the Nation is still unprepared, involves a criminal responsibility.

In the past few weeks we have seen an illustration of the great international "about face" with reference to Russia.

Once Germany aided Russia against Finland. Now Germany and Finland are together. A short while ago Germany signed a 10-year nonaggression treaty with Russia—she had similar treaties with all her conquered nations.

On the 17th of September 1796 George Washington said: "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations.'

He also said: "Nothing is more essential than that permanent inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded."

George Washington also said: "The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop."

Certainly events of the past few weeks illustrate the wisdom of formulating a foreign policy apart from "permanent inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others."

Certainly the German, Finnish, and Russian situation is an illustration of the undesirability of adopting a permanent policy on the basis of something which may be changed overnight.

This Fourth of July is different from any other. It is different because we cannot simply appraise the picture of America emotionally. There are too many challenges staring us in the face. Frankly, we have to ask ourselves, each of us. What is my job in this great period of challenges? What can I do?

May I summarize briefly a few of the things I think each of us can do:

1. Let us really get a sense of appreciation of the worthwhileness of American citizenship—of being Americans. Let us know the greatness and the glory of America.

2. Let us in our lives, in our daily actions, live greatly, in that we exemplify tolerance, industry, thrift, love of country, and love for all mankind.

3. Let there come into our consciousness the thought that we are living in one of the great challenging periods of the race. This hour will require sacrifice, submergence of petty differences, and a realization that we are one people—one people called upon to keep the light of liberty and freedom burning on this continent.

We are concerned with the past primarily in the light of the present. The people's sovereignty which the founding fathers wrote into the Declaration has been a heri-

tage and a birthright but, more than that, it is a trust, a trust which we must preserve and pass on to future generations unimpaired.

Mighty ferments work among us today, and we need more than lip service to render a good account of our trusteeship of the great freedoms.

Today we are free to assemble, to speak, to write, and to worship as we choose. We observe our independence today not to inflate our national vanity and to boast of our achievements. We do not celebrate an idle tradition. We observe our independence today partly because we need a renaissance of patriotism, but more particularly we observe this day because it is vital that we reaffirm our faith in the great principles of the Declaration, that we rededicate ourselves and our allegiance to that Declaration, and that we repudiate anything which menaces its freedoms.

It is moreover a time for us to reconsecrate our highest efforts to the protection and preservation of our trusteeship so that we may hand on these values unimpaired to yet another generation.

As William Cullen Bryant wrote of America:

"There's freedom at thy gates and rest
For earth's down-trodden and opprest;
A shelter for the hunted head,
For the starved laborer toil and bread."

We need first of all a great unity in our appreciation of the American freedoms and of our way of life. Then we need a unity of desire to preserve those freedoms and the great American values—the will, the flame within, to protect them.

Once we have a deep-rooted understanding of what America means to us, and once we have the will to retain the American values intact, we will have a fervent spirit of unity of purpose and conviction which will be our greatest bulwark in maintaining our morale against aggression.

We may then differ as to the best methods of preserving our American values just as men differed in the days when the Declaration was written, but we will be one in our common ideals.

It is well also for us to remember today that the founding fathers wrote into the Declaration that, "* * * for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

These are perilous times and momentous events are stirring in the world which may be of as lasting consequence to the world as was the Declaration of Independence. It is well for us then today to again place a "firm reliance in the protection of Divine Providence."

It was in 1863 on July 4 that an unknown man wrote a hymn which I think is as applicable now as it was then. He wrote:

"Lord, the people of the land,
In Thy presence humbly stand;
On this day, when Thou didst free
Men of old from tyranny;
We, their children, bow to Thee.
* * * *
"With one heart the Nation's cries,
From our choral lips arise:
Thou didst point a noble way
For our fathers through the fray;
Lead their children thus today!"

I am speaking to free men about an event which 165 years ago lit a light in a foggy world.

The world is murky now again. The lights have been going out all over the world. We who love America and appreciate the significance of this day—4th of July—must pledge to each other our property, our lives to maintain that light—maintain America a lighthouse in a foggy world—so that those who come after us will say, "Our fathers kept the light a'burning."

Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

BACCALAUREATE SERMON BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. DOUGLASS TO GRADUATING CLASSES OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the baccalaureate sermon delivered to the graduating classes of The American University, Washington, D. C., by President Paul F. Douglass. The subject was of general interest—Morale.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"For who is this uncircumcised Philistine that he should defy the armies of the living God?"—I Samuel xvii: 26.

One six-letter word sums up the objective of national effort in this year of your graduation. That word is "morale." The fabrication of morale is this season a national adventure.

Morale is, of course, nothing other than group persistence in the pursuit of a collective purpose. Tenacity in the face of adversity is its most unequivocal index. Your generation of college graduates comes of age when each man is forced to think of his relationship to a program which organizes him into a common undertaking, and in which the control of fear is effected by a crusade for values (now being laboriously defined from the contemporary nihilism). Sometimes our national effort is alleged to be organized to defend democracy, sometimes to save our skins, and sometimes its imperialistic ambition is the extension of the four freedoms to people who must first be spanked as a prelude to their enjoyment of our Christmas presents.

During your 4 years in college you have seen a change in the targets at which American thought and effort are aimed. The anxiety of Archibald MacLeish over the indifference of the current college generation toward moral values in the present war is the same Archibald MacLeish who himself not so long ago was a semipacifist writer. A Hemingway who cried out against the evils of war in Farewell to Arms picks up a gun and goes to war to fight the evils of something he felt was worse than war in Spain. You ask yourself, Have these men been changing sides? If you examine their thought, you will have to answer no. They have merely changed targets. The MacLeish of 1931 was propacifist; the MacLeish of 1941 is antipacifist. You may be puzzled in their apparently spiritual somersault until you find a continuing devotion to humanitarianism as a common denominator.

You are graduating tomorrow into a world which doubts itself; which is talking violently about morale; a human society in fear of itself; and which in our particular culture areas is rampant with nihilism.

It is therefore our privilege in searching for perspective upon our problem of morale this afternoon to turn to the record of events of men and warfare as recorded in the First Book of Samuel. Things weren't going very well either in those days for culture which revolved around the Hebrew tradition. The immediate issue then was, of course, the operation of the original panzerkraft division named Goliath. Goliath was a streamlined, armored, Nordic "totalblitzkrieger," if I may take liberty in inventing a word. He handled his own propaganda from his own loudspeaker. He kept saying the same thing then as now: "I defy the armies of Israel this day." I grant you that if any human being listened day after day to that loud-speaking tank, the threats would jar any human nerves. We can therefore probably be sympathetic with the Israelites. The news report from the field tells us that they were dismayed.

The problem of morale in Israel was a national concern. How was King Saul going to build up a fighting field force to reckon with this Panzerkraft? Well, the 25th verse tells us what the program of the army morale division was. It was to encourage men to fight for these values: the promise of the government to take over the mortgage on the victor's home; (2) to give him a pretty girl to marry; and (3) to supply him with a marriage settlement in cash.

You see, Israel was very modern in its morale program; it almost had a Nordic philosophy, yet somehow the morale program didn't work. Whether it was because men preferred mortgages to Goliath; or were disinterested in charming matrimonial prospects; or were really not in need of cash funds, we do not know. All we know is that the morale program of Israel's war department was unsuccessful. Israel was afraid; horribly afraid.

But now note the news report from the front: It is commencement season and a new generation begins to speak on the problems of the day. A new young man was beginning to ask embarrassing questions—asking questions of the terror-stricken members of the expeditionary force. Question No. 1: "Who is this uncircumcized Philistine that he should defy the armies of the living God?"

The question vanished into an argument between David and his older brother who was terribly embarrassed by the nuisance value of his little brother. He wanted him to go back home and tend the sheep. You will hear the same advice when you tackle perennial problems with new methods and fresh enthusiasm.

Question No. 2: Little brothers don't stop with asking one question. "Really, aren't you fighting for a cause?" inquired David. The graduate in the year of Goliath found the same low ebb of morale wherever he went. But he called attention to himself. Everybody knew that David had entered the active arena of public life. Presently we find him before King Saul, still asking questions; but now also building morale at headquarters.

Imagine the insubordination of this pep talk of David to King Saul: "Let no man's heart fail him because of this panzerkraft! I'll go out and fight him." David was a volunteer.

Saul was astounded by the nerve of this new candidate for a degree. "What," he said, "You, a college senior fresh from the campus up there where the sheep mow the grass?" David explained that he had had a little laboratory work back there with lions.

Now note this: David wasn't intending to fight the Panzerkraft with obsolete methods. He couldn't use the apparatus that belonged to the demoralized field force to which his brother was attached. He tackled his problem. He analyzed it. He discovered the vulnerable part of Goliath—a little spot in the forehead 9 feet from the ground. He then adjusted his technique to his objective. He introduced new methods into the struggle—and the alarming simplicity of the tériel necessary for victory won the war.

Now all these facts make the total picture. (1) A new generation. (2) A new kind of mind that thinks objectively in terms of ends and means. (3) Sustained courage. (4) Expertness. But the power of the morale we find discussed in the 45th verse.

David expresses the motive power of his effort. He says to Goliath: "You come to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a

shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of Hosts.

"Who is this uncircumcised Philistine that he should defy the armies of the living God?" That was David's question.

His answer was his performance of his conviction that Goliath must be liquidated by the instrument of God. That, of couree, is the ultimate source of morale. Appeal to that divine source as a rule, is made by both sides in every war.

The deed which David perfo.med was sufficient to reestablish morale—or group persistence in the pursuit of a collective purpose.

PERSISTENCE

Persistence is a difficult thing in life. It is so easy to give up. You must look at life with a kind of humor which enables you to have tenacity in the face of adversity. The adversary may be a "panzerkraft" or a "totalblitzkrieger" or the mud on the cutover maneuver fields of Louisiana. The fact is that to have morale you must first persevere.

PURSUIT

But that perseverance must be properly directed in the pursuit. Michelangelo painted the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel lying on his back. For a long time after the paintings were completed he could read only by holding the page above his head and raising his eyes; but he took advantage of his impaired sight to prepare a medical treatise on the eyes, which is preserved among the manuscripts of the Vatican. Perseverance in the pursuit is difficult; but the power of morale can win over obstacles. Michelangelo wrote of the impeachment of night:

"They err who praise this gloomy birth,
So frail and desolate and void of mirth
That one poor firefly can her might appall."

Alan Knight Chalmers asks the question: "Did you ever try to carry a candle in the wind?" It flutters and sputters. You bring it down in front of yourself to guard it with your hand from the wind. The thing which you carry to light the way soon demands your complete attention. You see nothing but that fragile light; you are once more a prisoner of the darkness from which the burning tallow should redeem you because all your attention is taken up with guarding the flame, your feet stumble. "Some gusty night," says Chalmers, "along a country road, try to carry a candle in the wind." You see morale demands perseverance and pursuit.

PURPOSE

Morale demands something more—and that is purpose. The ultimate factor in morale is purpose—even purpose in adversity. When we hear talk of the nihilism of our age, and of the allegation that your generation is morally invertebrate, we must, like David, ask questions. What is the purpose of life? It is something your older brother cannot answer for you. And until you answer that question yourself, morale is impossible.

I am concerned this afternoon with a purpose which is worthy of your years of intellectual comradeship in the American University. I am concerned with the definition of a purpose which you can pursue persistently and with enthusiasm. I am concerned with a coherent statement of that purpose in this day of nihilism. May I state what that purpose seems to me to be: To affirm the social technique by which the individual as a part of a pattern of political association participates in political power which collectively he sustains and distributively he shares within a realm of immunity for the mobilization of opinion which makes government amenable to an educable concensus of opinion. The major affirmation which you and I must make with all the resources at our command is the insistence that in full freedom of deliberation we work out the programs for the control of our collective selves.

The March letter in the journal of the American Bar Association reports that a bomb has destroyed Middle Temple. Middle Temple is the very symbol of the English common law—violence annihilating the bulwark of liberty. A screaming, blazing weapon of death from the land where Nicholas Copernicus testified: "I do not ask the pardon accorded to Paul; I do not hope for the grace given to Peter; I beg only the favor which You granted to the thief on the cross." A bomb rained on the hall where Shakespeare's Twefth Night was first performed, the Shakespeare who wrote:

"The bosom of my conscience, enter'd me,
Yea, with a splitting power, and made to tremble
The region of my breast."

Men and women of 1941, the rallying cry of your commencement year is "morale." You go forth as a new generation of Davids to face Goliaths. This is my prayer for you, that you will face the problem of your day with the same new enthusiasm and reasonable new methods which were David's; that you will volunteer as David did; and that by analysis and the selection of proper means to proper ends, you will raise your testimony to God in making possible the free collaboration of men in the collective control of themselves. May you dedicate your endeavors to the liberation of mankind from habits of violence which intensify the fears of men into desperate enterprises for mutual destruction.

Presentation of Award to Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY MRS. GUILFORD DUDLEY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Guilford Dudley at the White House on May 16, 1941, on the occasion of the presentation of the national achievement award to Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our great leader, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, came to Nashville at our urgent request and stayed until after the passage of the ratification, helping us with her counsel and wisdom and breathing into us her own indomitable courage and will to win.

Three minutes to tell you of one of the most sensational episodes in all the dramatic history of Tennessee.

First of all, in the year 1920 our legislature had adjourned before the suffrage amendment could be submitted. I happened to be the first woman delegate at large from Tennessee to the San Francisco Democratic National Convention. Mrs. George Fort Milton was the alternate. We persuaded the Tennessee delegation to wire Governor Roberts, urging him to call a special session of the legislature for the purpose of ratification.

When he consented the fight was on.

From all over the United States our opponents rushed to defeat us.

Every legal, political, and parliamentary trick was tried against us.

We had thought our majority was secure, but the most tremendous pressure was brought to bear upon the legislators supporting our cause. They were threatened with loss of jobs, ruined careers, and they fell away from us like autumn leaves in a high wind. They got ill, they got drunk, efforts were made to spirit them away. But we passed the senate before the opposition got fully under way. There were 99 members in the house. I checked the roll call twice a day with all our women and men workers. We counted 49 certain votes if all our men were in their places—a precarious majority of 1, since 2 men were absent.

When the great day for taking the vote dawned the suffragists stole in the house in the early morning and decorated it with yellow roses and tiny golden sunflowers. The antis were out in full force with their red roses, so the newspapers inevitably spoke of the war of the roses.

The suffragists did magnificent picket duty. Every one of our men was in his seat. Then came that heart-stilling moment when the roll call began. I was permitted on the floor of the House at the rear.

With trembling hands I checked each name. All went well until we came to the T's. Then a man named Thronesberry voted no instead of aye. We will never forget that name. You could hear the hushed gasp from the galleries—we were lost. But a young man named Burns jumped up and changed his vote from no to aye in order to move to reconsider, thereby giving us our constitutional majority of 50 and pulling his first boner in the campaign.

Governor Roberts stood stanchly by us. He was about to certify the ratification of the suffrage amendment giving all the women in the United States the right to vote when a man rushed breathlessly into his office with an injunction prohibiting the Governor from signing because a motion to reconsider was on the speaker's desk. Now, according to our State laws, you cannot enjoin a Governor, it just isn't done. He, however, submitted it to the supreme court then in session. The injunction was dissolved and the certification of our victory was sent by special messenger to Washington to Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby.

The rest is anticlimax. Our opponents wouldn't give up. A motion to reconsider can lie over 2 legislative days. In order to keep it from being brought up while we still had a majority, over one-third of the legislature ran away to Decatur, Ala., and remained for days hoping to break into our ranks and defeat us in the end. While these poor men were hiding out in Decatur, a group of influential lawyers went to Washington to protest to Bainbridge Colby who told him simply he could not go back of the Governor's signature, that the nineteenth amendment had already become the law of the land.

And that's how we won in Tennessee.

An Explanation Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL ON OCCUPATION OF ICELAND

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "An Explanation Due." It refers to the fact that the President's message last Monday asserted that the American forces in Iceland are there eventually to replace the British forces, whereas Prime Minister Churchill's address to the British House of Commons on the following Wednesday said:

We still propose to retain our Army in Iceland.

I simply want to observe in passing that an American occupation of Iceland for American defense purposes would have to be exclusively an American occupation. It seems to me that a joint British-American occupation would be a direct invitation to our participation in a shooting war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EXPLANATION DUE

On Monday President Roosevelt addressed to Congress a message which contained this paragraph:

"In accordance with the understanding so reached, forces of the United States Navy have today arrived in Iceland in order to supplement and eventually to replace the British forces which have until now been stationed in Iceland in order to insure the adequate defense of that country."

On Wednesday Prime Minister Churchill addressed the British House of Commons as follows:

"We still propose to retain our Army in Iceland, and, as British and United States forces will both have the same object in view, namely, the defense of Iceland, it seems very likely that they will cooperate effectively in resistance to any attempt by Hitler to gain a footing.

"It would obviously be foolish for the United States to have one plan for defending Iceland and for British forces to have another."

Mr. Churchill then spoke of collaboration.

For 48 hours the American people and Congress believed that the British were about to quit Iceland because the troops were needed elsewhere. So American forces had taken over to forestall a German occupation.

Now another situation appears. British troops are not to quit Iceland and American forces are to operate in collaboration with the British forces.

Between those two situations there is a world of difference. To Congress and the country was presented the picture of a necessity to occupy a territory which might be forfeited to a nation which would use it as a base for offensive operations against this hemisphere. As such it was a defensive measure.

But the picture we now get from London is that American forces are stationed shoulder to shoulder with British forces; our forces are collaborating with those of a nation actively in a shooting war and subject to attack for reasons which may be wholly disconnected with any defense of this continent.

There is an explanation due.

Any failure by Congress to insist on that explanation will be more than the acceptance of the loss of its own self-respect. It will be an ill omen for the cause of constitutional government. It will be the betrayal of a people the great majority of whom do not want to go to war.

Address at Beaver Dam, Wis., Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered at Beaver Dam, Wis., on the sixth day of July, on the occasion of the Beaver Dam Centennial.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, we are met here today to observe the centennial of the city of Beaver Dam.

A full century has passed since Jacob P. Brower first bought land where the city of Beaver Dam stands today.

Longfellow once said:

"The shadow on the dial, the striking of the clock, the running of the sand, day and night, summer and winter, months, years, centuries—these are but the arbitrary and outward signs—the measure of time, not time itself. Time is the life of the soul."

And so, in a larger sense, the history of Beaver Dam on this one-hundredth-anniversary celebration is not merely a history of days and months and years, but a history of men—of souls—who gave their highest efforts throughout the century so that out of the crucible of time this beautiful city has emerged.

THIS CENTENNIAL OBSERVATION SYMBOLIZES A CENTURY OF GROWTH

This centennial observation is a momentous one. It symbolizes a century of growth—a century of growth, not only in terms of population and homes and industry, but a century of continued growth in the character and quality of leadership which you have given to all of your endeavors.

It is difficult to realize that your community has its taproots as far back as 1841.

In 1840 there were hard times on the prairies. The Nation was in the midst of a turbulent Presidential campaign, staged with tremendous rallies, parades, log-cabin floats, and barbecues. That was a significant year in American history. It marked the Whig victory and it marked the end of the Jacksonian era.

WORLD HAS CONTRACTED SINCE EARLY DAYS WHEN TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION WERE LIMITED

Those were days when men still jolted over the oxcart roads in a covered wagon which faced the setting sun.

Those were days when water transportation was slow. As they broke trails from the Atlantic seaboard to the Middle West and the West, men traveled in wagons and canal boats, or rode on horseback, or walked alongside the wagon, with the cows tied to the tailboard.

There were traders who followed these trails until they were deep-rutted roads and finally wagon roads built of planks, and eventually followed by the locomotive.

Those were the days, when one of your early pioneers, a Mr. Shafer, made the trip on foot from Milwaukee to Beaver Dam in 24 hours. He arrived in Beaver Dam at daylight and then ran a foot race with a neighbor before he rested.

Those were the days when the first stage, a four-horse mud wagon, reached Beaver Dam from Watertown in the spring of 1848 to drive up before old Eagle Tavern, in true frontier style. It was not until 1848 that the Concord coach was begun, and the daily stage line was established, and it was not until 1856 that the railroad was completed.

Because transportation facilities were so limited, and because communication facilities were similarly limited, community life was particularly important and communities, to a certain degree, lived unto themselves.

Today, communities are more than ever an integral part of the Nation, and nations in turn (because modern transportation and communication has annihilated space), are more a part of the world. The world has contracted. That is a primary reason for our concern today with our foreign policy.

MATURITY OF EXPERIENCE BRINGS LESSONS APPLICABLE TODAY

It is interesting to recall, in view of our present foreign policy, that a hundred years ago, when Beaver Dam was founded, we also had a foreign-policy problem. Relations with England were very strained in 1841; as a matter of fact, they were worse than at any time since the War of 1812.

It will be recalled that in 1842 the Webster-Ashburton Treaty was made, fixing our northeastern boundary in its present location. Those were stirring days. Your community lived through those early years, almost a century ago when our expansion to the Rio Grande and to the Pacific coast reopened the old question of the status of slavery in the western territory—a question which was supposed to have been settled by the Missouri Compromise of 1820.

Your community lived through the tumultuous days when the compromise failed, and your community struggled through the 4 dark years when this Nation sought to decide whether we would be 13 nations or 1. We have been one, from that day until this, and since Lee surrendered his sword at Appomattox in 1865 no State has sought to withdraw from the Union.

Out of the rich maturity of wisdom and experience which comes to a people because they have lived through tumultuous years and trying days, there emerge lessons which are applicable today as then, and probably the greatest lesson to be learned from the first three decades of the past century was the lesson of a united people facing common problems of reconstruction in a spirit of unity and understanding.

There is a great need for us to reexamine that lesson today. We face grave problems—graver perhaps than any the past century has known, and we must meet them with the strength that comes from a united people. Nowhere is the strength of a united people and the vitality of our way of life better demonstrated than in a community such as Beaver Dam.

When the Bureau of Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture made a special study of small cities, Beaver Dam was selected as one of these typical small American cities.

The Bureau of Home Economics selected these cities largely on a basis of certain economic factors which made them typical communities. I think there is infinitely more involved in the selection of a typical American community.

There is involved in any typical American community a great and fundamental strength, the heritage of pioneer forbears grown virile, through long contact with the

soil—of forbears who built in communities like these, a living memorial to our way of life, our beliefs, our freedoms, our ideals, and our highest hopes.

These are the things we think about when we review a century of history.

BEAVER DAM HAS GREAT PIONEER HERITAGE

When we enter Beaver Dam on United States Highway 151 we drive down well-shaded streets, we see large lawns, beautiful and typical American homes, we see a number of factories and a splendid business section—we see a great community.

It is great in what it has accomplished. It is great in the potential accomplishments of its manpower. It is great in terms of homes and hearthsides. It is great because it represents the greatness of free-born Americans living in a typical American city.

But, my friends, the greatness which belongs to this community is the greatness of its men and women, and of their spirit—a spirit which is ever looking forward to new achievements—toward the dawn of a better tomorrow.

A great Middle Western statesman once said, "This is but the dawn. We stand in the vestibule of the temple. The achievements of the past will pale into insignificance before the completed glory of the century to come."

You people have a great pioneer heritage—a heritage of independence, courage, resourcefulness, and democracy.

It is a far cry, since that day in 1840, when Jacob Brower came to Beaver Dam, on a pony through the woods from Fox Lake and purchased the three forties between the western line of Division Street and the lake.

It is a far cry since those days when Thomas Mackie and his son-in-law, Joseph Goetschius traveled to Beaver Dam in March of 1841.

It is a far cry from the days when Reverend Ordway and Jacob Brower surveyed and marked all of the roads in and out of Beaver Dam.

It is a far cry from the days when these men built the pole bridges and cleared the streets and plotted the lots and built the grist mill and the sawmill. Those were days of early growth.

Prior to the panic of 1857 and for a decade and a half, Beaver Dam grew very rapidly. There was some speculation—property doubled in value, particularly after the railroad became to be considered as a reality.

It is a far cry, from those days when your population could be numbered on the fingers of one hand, to the present time when your population is more than 10,000.

It is a far cry, from the original Beaver Dam settlement when the farms of the seven first settlers were located toward the southwest terminus of Railroad Avenue, to the present time when you are a city of many factories, great industries, and thousands of workers.

More than three centuries have passed into the mists of time since Nicollet traveled through the Beaver Dam region on his journey southward.

Almost a century and a quarter has elapsed since James Duane Doty camped overnight in Beaver Dam on what was later known as West Front Street.

THREADS RUNNING THROUGH BEAVER DAM HISTORY ARE PART OF PATTERN OF AMERICAN LIFE AND IDEALS

It is a far cry from 1841 to 1941, and yet, throughout the century, there have been certain threads running through the pattern of community life in Beaver Dam, of territorial life in the northwest territory, of statehood in the State of Wisconsin and in the life of the Nation, which threads, thank God, remain part of the pattern of American life and American ideals today.

Today, as then, we are a Nation of free and independent people. Today, as then, we are a Nation of religious people.

We meet today to look back over a span of a century. It is good to know that throughout that century your community has developed not only its material resources but the great spiritual values—the values the Nation needs most today.

Reverend Ordway and Reverend Miter were among your pioneer clergymen. There were meetings in some of the cabins of the first settlers, and there was a church organized on the 1st day of June in 1843 in Thomas Mackie's cabin, and later the timber for the first church was hauled from the woods in the spring of 1844.

I believe with Hans Christian Andersen that "Time is so fleeting that if we do not remember God in our youth, age may find us incapable of thinking about Him."

I believe that in the days up ahead it will be necessary for us to lift our philosophy of living to a high spiritual level, where we have faith in the ultimate victory of righteousness, faith in the strength of our people, and faith in our destiny as directed by the Creator.

These are not the twilight years of democracy. We face the dawn of a new world, though it is not Hitler's new world.

These are not vague ideals. They are just as real as the iron sinews of the men and women who made them a reality in your own community and in our State and in our Nation.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT MUST BE GREAT BECAUSE OF GREATNESS OF ITS PEOPLE

The people of Beaver Dam have always striven for social and political betterment. You have always built great churches and great schools. You have always demonstrated a spirit of self-denial and sacrifice, to support the community welfare.

We will need that spirit in the days up ahead. We will need to rekindle the flame which your pioneer forbears lit. We will need to strengthen our moral fiber. We will need to reassert fundamentals in government.

We will need to recovenant our faith in vital principles. We will need patriotism. We will need to ground our education, as your forbears did, in the same solid virtues of thrift, and morality, and integrity, and honesty, and fair dealing.

We will need to reinstill the simple, homely virtues of the American spirit that made this country great.

The American Government must be and will be great because of the greatness of its people in communities such as Beaver Dam. The people do not become great solely because of the Government.

THROUGHOUT AMERICAN HISTORY OUR PEOPLE HAVE ALWAYS MET THE CHALLENGES WHICH CONFRONTED THEM

Your community has seen, since that day in 1840 when the Jacksonian era was closed, hardy explorers defying the Rocky Mountain blizzards and crossing the arid wastes of sands, threading their way through sagebrush and cactus through the passes of the Great Divide, to follow the courses of the boiling rivers in a far-western migration.

Your community has seen the driving force of westward expansion sending thousands of land-hungry pioneers out from the Mississippi Valley far across the Sabine and Red Rivers.

Your community lived through the days when Taylor won his victory at Buena Vista, when Scott took the Mexican capital, when we completed our program of expansion by the cession of New Mexico and California, when we made our businessmen's peace in the new far West, when the compromise of 1850 was written, when America asserted her manifest destiny, and when our Nation became a house divided.

Those were the decades which saw the peninsular campaign and the Battle of Antietam, the emancipation proclamation, the year of defeatism in 1863. They saw the battle of Gettysburg, the fall of Vicksburg, the Battle of Chickamauga. They saw Grant move on Richmond, they saw Lincoln reelected, and they saw Sherman's march to the sea and the collapse of confederacy.

Then there were years when they saw a united country fighting for wealth and power. There were reconstruction years. There was a great economic revolution and a new industrial age with the opening of a mighty western empire.

There was a tremendous period of agricultural development and the first beginning of the era of big business.

There were years of colorful political battles, there were years of fighting for tariff reform, there were years of trust battling. There was a western land boom.

There was the Spanish-American War and there was a Hague Conference—now almost forgotten. There was a Roosevelt era—and, though it is hard to believe, it was not the same Roosevelt that we know today.

There was a revolution in Panama. There was a progressive movement. There was seething social agitation. There was a period of woman's suffrage and municipal reform.

There was a rise of nationalism. There was an era of "new freedom" with Wilson. There were the same old problems of struggling for neutrality, and there was the war.

There was the post-war neurosis and the post-war shell-shocked economy. There was the gruesome aftermath of that war.

There were the days of market manipulations, and there was the inevitable crash of 1929.

Beaver Dam lived through all of these periods and it survived the experimentation of recent years.

At the turn of the century the United States entered upon the "new and untried path" of empire. We entered a great war. We began a period of international idealism, and we supplanted the ideal with a devotion to "national interest." We had a period of unexampled prosperity—prosperity not built on the bedrock of sound principles, but growing like a speculative mushroom. We hit bottom in 1929.

Throughout the history of America every step of American development has brought new responsibilities to communities such as Beaver Dam, to our Government, and to our people. The Government and the people have always met these challenges, have always met these responsibilities, have always met these duties and these obligations.

PEOPLE HAVE ALWAYS EMERGED STRONGER FROM PERIODS OF CRISIS

Out of every crisis in American history the American people have emerged stronger physically, morally, and spiritually than ever before.

That is the legacy which comes to you from your century-old history. That is the heritage of high hopes and courage born of the knowledge that America has always met every challenge, whether it was a dissension-torn people in a reconstruction era, a carpetbag government, or a greenback economy.

The important thing to remember about this legacy is the simple truth—that our people have always met every crisis and emerged stronger. We have emerged stronger because we grasped our way back the hard way. We tightened our belts. We made sacrifices. We lived within our means. We paid our bills. We cut out luxury in government. We sweated our way to prosperity.

There is no record anywhere in the history of the United States where the people of this land have ever been coddled and spoon-fed through a major crisis. The people of the United States as individuals and as a nation have always stood on their own feet to fight adversity, and in so doing they have always become stronger. We develop through sacrifice, hard work, and decent living.

WISCONSIN ONCE A PART OF TERRITORY DOMINATED BY EUROPEAN CONTROL

The people of our State have frequently fought adversity. Just 2 days ago we celebrated Independence Day. It is interesting for us to recall that our founding fathers knew little or nothing about our section of the country, although our vast area of some 56,000 square miles had already been traversed by the French explorers.

It is not my purpose today to discuss the two centuries of romance and adventure which preceded the days when Wisconsin emerged from the winding Indian trails onto the broad highways of this great agricultural, dairying, and industrial State.

I think it is well for us, however, to recall that when John Jay and John Adams went to Paris to join Benjamin Franklin, the fate of the West and the fate of Wisconsin was at stake.

There was a treaty signed on September 3, 1783, and under the terms of that treaty Wisconsin was included in the United States.

Again, during the War of 1812, the fate of Wisconsin was dependent upon a European treaty. The Treaty of Ghen ended European control in the Northwest, and Wisconsin Territory was still a part of the United States.

It is natural for all of us to be concerned with the present world crisis, and it is probably even more natural here in Wisconsin, with our heritage and with our mingled bloodstreams, that we should be gravely concerned.

In 1863, on July 4, an unknown man wrote a hymn which I think is as applicable now as it was then. He wrote:

"Lord, the people of the land,
In Thy presence humbly stand;
On this day, when Thou didst free
Men of old from tyranny,
We, their children, bow to Thee.
* * * * *
"With one heart the Nation's cries,
From our choral lips arise:
Thou didst point a noble way
For our fathers through the fray;
Lead their children thus today!"

It is appropriate today, when we observe a century of history—a century of freedom for Beaver Dam—that we recall that Wisconsin was once territory dominated by European control.

During the Revolutionary days, our State was a land of virgin forests, inhabited only by the painted tribesmen of Wisconsin. Its towering pines reached up to the sky, and its Great Lakes, Superior and Michigan, and the great Father of the Waters, the Mississippi River, were known only to a few, and they thought of them as names associated with distant lands.

Our Commonwealth was little known in the days when the Nation was born, but today we have a population comparable with that of the Thirteen Original Colonies.

From the days when our Nation established its independence to that day some 65 years later when the city of Beaver Dam was founded this Nation underwent tremendous social and economic changes. In the century since the founding of this community we have undergone even more tremendous social and material changes.

WE MUST CLING TO FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

Through these changes, however, we have clung steadfastly to the fundamental American freedoms and to our fundamental American ideals.

We are confronted with changes in our way of life today, but we are confronted also with the obligation of holding steadfast to those same freedoms and those same ideals which made America great.

The lesson of the legacy of the past 10 decades is the simple lesson that we cannot whip a crisis with a nation whose initiative and courage and resourcefulness has become permanently hospitalized.

There are days of sacrifice up ahead—lean, hard days—but they will be days which will make us strong and successful.

On this hundredth anniversary of the founding of Beaver Dam, we could say of this community and of this people, as has been said of individuals, "Come along and grow old with me—the best is yet to be."

Our sacrifices must make us stronger—that is the message of a fighting hope for our economy and for free enterprise today. That is a message which repudiates every bit of demagogic claptrap and "fifth column" defeatism which would crucify our vitality and sap our morale.

We must continue to believe in social progress and social betterment, but we must never subscribe to a social progress which crucifies our traditional American freedoms and initiatives.

We must continue to stand for the most widespread benefit of the blessings of civilization. We must continue to strive for security, for savings, for protection against unemployment and impoverished old age, but we must gain these securities without a destruction of human or material values.

The days of the oxcart trail winding into Beaver Dam, the days of the highly individual self-sufficiency of your pioneer forebears—those days have vanished in the social mists which hang low over a great mechanized and urbanized world, but the sturdy pioneer spirit which accomplished them must live on.

These are historic days. It is vital that as citizens we maintain our mental poise. It is vital that we think clearly. So long as we do so, the Congress of the United States will not be stampeded by hysteria, whether it be on matters of foreign policy or domestic economy.

The men in Washington are the servants of the citizens of the United States. The citizens must remain the masters and government the servant.

We stand today on what may be the brink of a new world, but we must never lose sight of those great values which we see today through the mists of a hundred years of community growth.

We must never lose sight of the courage, of the initiative which it took to carve communities such as Beaver Dam from frontier lands.

We must never lose sight of the great values which our forebears created and maintained.

We must never lose sight of the fact that this is the land of great freedoms—this is the land where you and I can speak our minds, can express our convictions, can write our beliefs, can worship as we choose, can assemble when we will, can petition as we desire, can collect our wages and invest them as we choose, can retain our property as we will, can cherish our independence as we always have.

These are the freedoms which our forebears won and builded into the framework of our lives.

When we meet today to observe a century of history, we do homage not only to these pioneer forebears, but to these ideals.

It is not enough for us to review the achievements of the past decades. It is not enough for us to retell the stories and the legends of the pioneers who peopled this section. For us to merely retell these stories is but to render lip service to the past.

Our job is to rededicate ourselves and our communities and our State and our Nation to those ideals which have made us a great people.

I believe in the doctrine of growth. I believe that on firm foundations of the achievements of the past century you will build even more glorious achievements.

John Greenleaf Whittier once wrote a great centennial hymn which was sung at the opening of the World's Fair in Philadelphia in 1876.

In the first stanza he said:

"Our fathers' God, from out whose hand,
The centuries fall like grains of sand,
We meet today, united, free,
And loyal to our land and Thee,
To thank Thee for the era done
And trust Thee for the opening one."

And in his last stanza he expresses the hope that however glorious the achievements of the past may have been, the achievements of the future will be even greater.

"Oh, make Thou us, through centuries long,
In peace secure, in justice strong;
Around our gift of freedom draw
The safeguards of Thy righteous law;
And, cast in some diviner mold,
Let the new cycle shame the old."

Let us have faith that God will guard and guide this great Nation and that our acts as a people under his guidance will redound to the peace, happiness, and joy of all the peoples of earth.

Delay of Defense Projects by Strikes, and Ban on Criticism of C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles from the New York Times of July 14. One is entitled "One Hundred and Eighty-seven Strikes Cost 2,458,150 Man-Days"; or a total of nearly 20,000,000 man-hours in the first 6 months of this year on War Department contracts alone.

Another article, which I ask to have printed in connection with the first one, is headed "Anti-C. I. O. Talk Tabooed in Plant"; in which the Allis-Chalmers Co. agrees to punish, or even discharge, men showing union hostility.

I think these are two important items in connection with our defense program, particularly the latter item, which goes as far as forcing a company to agree to punish or discharge men for showing hostility to an existing union.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 14, 1941]

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN STRIKES COST 2,458,150 MAN-DAYS—TIE-UPS ON DEFENSE PROJECTS IN HALF YEAR INVOLVED 213,900 WORKERS—DECLINING NOW

WASHINGTON, July 13.—Strikes in factories working on Army contracts and among workmen on War Department and defense industry construction projects resulted in a loss of 2,458,150 man-days during the first 6

months of 1941, a study of War Department charts of labor disputes disclosed tonight.

Army contracts were delayed by a total of 187 strikes, involving 213,900 workers, with each strike lasting an average of 11 days and involving 1,144 men.

While officials are heartened by the steady decline in strikes which began in mid-June, the Department's records showed little difference in the rate and magnitude of strikes during the first quarter as compared with the second.

In January, February, and March there were 93 strikes, involving 100,750 men, which cost 1,193,500 man-days, while in April, May, and June there were 94 stoppages, involving a total of 113,150 workmen and a resultant loss of 1,264,650 man-days.

ALLIS TIE-UP LASTED 75 DAYS

The strike wave reached three peaks during the 6-month period. The first was in March, when the 75-day Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. strike at Milwaukee was at its height. That strike alone cost 421,000 man-days.

The second was late in May, when the total of man-days lost was increased by the wildcat strikes in a few General Motors plants. These strikes lasted only a few days while the corporation was deciding whether it would accept a National Defense Mediation Board recommendation that it grant the United Automobile Workers, C. I. O., a 10-cent hourly wage increase.

The third peak came early in June, caused by the C. I. O. strike at the Inglewood, Calif., plant of North American Aviation, broken after 6 days by Army occupation of the plant, and the aluminum workers' strikes at the Cleveland plant of the Aluminum Co. of America and the Detroit plants of Bohn Aluminum & Brass Co.

The decline in labor disputes began about June 16, even before the German invasion of Russia dictated a change in the Communist Party line calling for obstructing aid to Britain and United States defense efforts. Officials believe, however, that only a few of the 187 strikes listed could be attributed to Communist or Nazi influence, and Secretary Perkins has set the figure at 7 or 8.

TWENTY-ONE STRIKES IN PROGRESS NOW

The comparative peacefulness of American industrial relations at present is indicated by War Department figures showing that on Friday only 21 strikes were in progress, involving fewer than 11,000 workers.

Officials said that the War Department records did not include the April-long shutdown of the Appalachian bituminous-coal fields, with a resultant loss of 6,000,000 man-days, because that industry had no direct War Department orders. The records also did not include the 1,000,000 man-days lost in the Ford Motor Co. River Rouge strike because it was impossible to determine the exact extent of the delay in War Department projects.

Surprise was expressed in some quarters that more days were lost in the machine-tools and parts industry, a vital link in expanding defense production, than in the booming aircraft industry. In the machine-tool industry each of the 16 strikes lasted an average of 15 days and involved an average of 860 workers, while in aircraft engines and parts each of the 17 strikes lasted an average of only 7 days and involved an average of 1,800 men.

Strikes in plants working on mechanical and electrical equipment and parts lasted an average of 14 days and involved an average of 820 workers, and all but 148,000 of the 569,000 man-days lost were chargeable to the Allis-Chalmers U. A. W.-C. I. O. walk-out.

The strike study was the first of its kind dealing solely with War Department orders, and the figures for the first 6 months of this year cannot, therefore, be compared with the 1940 period, when the all-out defense program had not been started.

TRYING TO END CURRENT STRIKES

This week the National Defense Mediation Board will intensify its efforts to end the walk-out among U. A. W.-A. F. L. workers at the Sealed Power Corporation, Muskegon, Mich., which already has closed two other defense factories and is causing War Department officials "extreme concern."

The Board also will speed efforts to bring about a settlement of collective-bargaining differences between the A. F. L. Chemical Workers Union, which twice has threatened a strike at the East Alton (Ill.) smokeless-powder division of the Western Cartridge Co., which has $4,800,000 worth of Army orders.

There was talk of the Government commandeering the plant to prevent a production stoppage during the period in which the company had refused to grant the A. F. of L. union recognition as exclusive bargaining agency. The company later accorded such recognition.

C. I. O. vice presidents will assemble here Tuesday for a conference with Philip Murray, C. I. O. president, and the organization's full executive board will convene on Wednesday to discuss new plans for organizing campaigns and internal union problems.

The executive board is expected to award the 1941 convention to Detroit, and it is expected the session will be held late in October.

ANTI-C. I. O. TALK TABOOED IN PLANT—ALLIS-CHALMERS AGREES TO PUNISH, EVEN DISCHARGE, MEN SHOWING UNION HOSTILITY—BAD FOR "SHOP DISCIPLINE"—DEAN GARRISON, REFEREE, TELLS OF WEST ALLIS PACT—SAYS NO ONE HAS TO JOIN UNION

MADISON, WIS., July 13.—Employees of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. can refrain from joining plant unions but may be subject to discipline, possibly discharge, for hostile speech or actions against the local C. I. O. union on company premises under an agreement just announced.

Terms of the agreement, reached between the West Allis management and its C. I. O. United Automobile Workers local, have been outlined by Dean Lloyd K. Garrison, of the University of Wisconsin Law School, whom the National Defense Mediation Board appointed referee May 1 in deciding plant grievances.

His appointment had followed a 76-day strike at the plant which ended in April after halting production on $45,000,000 in national-defense orders.

A summary of the agreement issued by Dean Garrison stated in part:

"An employee who elects not to join Local 248 (C. I. O.) or to join a rival labor organization may do so, but he is warned that if he says or does anything against Local 248 on the company premises he is likely to cause an 'interference with shop discipline,' which, under the agreement, will subject him to being disciplined.

"Specifically, hostile remarks about Local 248, sneering at or insulting its members or officials, directing special attention to the buttons of rival organizations by pointing to them in front of others and similar acts of an aggressive nature against Local 248, particularly when performed by persons known for their antagonism to Local 248, have been found to interfere with shop discipline and to justify lay-offs or, if necessary, discharges, according to the circumstances."

The post of referee in company-employee relations was set up by the Defense Mediation Board in its negotiations settling the strike, which was called originally by the union over demands including a closed shop.